Oregon
Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150
Salem, Oregon 97301-2524
Phone: (503) 373-0050
First Floor/Coastal Fax: (503) 378-6033
Second Floor/Director's Office Fax: (503) 378-5518
Third Floor/Measure 37 Fax: (503) 378-5318
Web Address: http://www.oregon.gov/LCD

March 29, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130207

Claimant: Maxine Erdman

Enclosed, in regard to the above-referenced claim for compensation under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352), is the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Final Order.

This Final Staff Report and Recommendation and the Final Order constitute the final decision on this claim. No further action will be taken on this matter.

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 Maxine Erdman, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M130207

Claimant: Maxine Erdman (the Claimant)

Property: Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 12, Tax lots 400 and 405
Washington 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 Maxine Erdman's division of the 84.8-acre subject property into 1-acre parcels, to her development of a dwelling on each parcel or to her development of a community water system to serve the development: applicable provisions of Goals 3, 11 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations 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 on July 15, 1963. Goal 11 will not apply only to the extent that it prohibits the claimant from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on July 15, 1963.

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.

6. Nothing in this report or the state's final order for this claim constitutes any determination of ownership by the State of Oregon as to submerged or submersible lands, or as to public rights to the use of waters of the state.

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 29th day of March, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 29th day of March, 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

March 29, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130207
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Maxine Erdman
MAILING ADDRESS:	25550 NW Meek Road Hillsboro, Oregon 97124
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 12 Tax lots 400 and 405 Washington County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Thomas Cutler, Attorney 5000 SW Meadows Road, Suite 400 Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
OTHER INTEREST IN PROPERTY:	Jerry Erdman (Residential renter) 2330 SW 325th Avenue Hillsboro, Oregon 97123 Allen VanDyke (Lessee of farm acreage) 4100 NW Susbauer Road Cornellius, Oregon 97113
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	October 5, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	April 3, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Maxine Erdman, seeks compensation in the amount of $5 million for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 84.8-acre subject property[1] into 1-acre parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop a

[1] The subject property includes two tax lots. Tax lot 400 consists of 45.65 acres, and tax lot 405 consists of 39.15 acres.

community water system to serve the development.[2] The subject property is located at 2330 SW 325th Avenue, near Hillsboro, in Washington 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 Maxine Erdman's division of the 84.8-acre subject property into 1-acre parcels, to her development of a dwelling on each parcel and to her development of a community water system to serve the development: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands), 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and 14 (Urbanization), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33. 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 on July 15, 1963. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On February 5, 2007, 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.)

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] The state claim form does not clearly establish the parcel sizes the claimant desires. However, the claimant's Washington County claim form, submitted with her claim to the state, indicates that she desires to divide the subject property into one-acre lots. This report relies on the information that the claimant entered on her county claim form.

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 October 5, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 4, and 33, and "660-0135" 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

The claimant, Maxine Erdman, acquired the subject property on July 15, 1963, as reflected by a real estate contract included with the claim. On August 23, 1994, the claimant transferred the property to a revocable trust, the Erdman Living Trust, with herself as trustee, as reflected by a certificate of trust included with the claim.[3] The Washington County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Maxine Erdman, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of July 15, 1963.

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.

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

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 84.8-acre subject property into 1-acre parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop a community water system to serve the development. The claim also indicates that the use is not allowed under current land use regulations.[4]

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned EFU by Washington County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant's property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[5] 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 215.213, 215.263 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land in marginal lands counties 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 in a marginal lands county under ORS 215.213. OAR 660-033-0130(4)(e) (applicable to non-farm dwellings in marginal lands counties) became effective on August 7, 1993. 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 11, which also became effective on January 25, 1975, generally prohibits urban levels of public facilities and services on lands that are outside an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Goal 11 and its implementing rules have two components: one that prohibits an owner from utilizing urban-level facilities or services to serve the property, and another that prohibits service providers from extending their facilities to serve property outside a UGB. The former can restrict a claimant's use of property. The latter is a restriction on service providers. Goal 11 and OAR 660, division 11, restrict the claimant's use of the property only to the extent that they

---

[4] The claimant summarily cites numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but does not establish how the laws either apply to the claimant's desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of the regulations either do not apply to the claimant's property or do not restrict the use of the claimant's 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 subject property, based on the claimant's description of her desired use.

[5] The claimant's property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I—IV soils.

would restrict the claimant's development of urban-level public or community sewer or water facilities on the subject property.

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

The claimant acquired the subject property on July 15, 1963, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. At that time, the subject property was zoned (Agriculture) F-1 by Washington County.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3, 11 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1963 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 the claimant acquired the property.

Those elements of Goal 11 that prohibit a public service provider from extending or establishing public facilities or services outside of a UGB restrict the actions of local government rather than the claimant's use of the property. That component of Goal 11 is not subject to ORS 197.352 and will continue to apply to those service providers. Only the general prohibition under Goal 11 on the claimant's establishment of an urban level of public facilities and services is subject to ORS 197.352 and restricts the claimant's desired use of his property.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the 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 $5 million 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 assessment of comparable property sales.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Maxine Erdman who acquired the subject property on July 15, 1963. 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 property is a reduction of $5 million.

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, including applicable provisions of Goals 3, 11 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Washington County has implemented through its current EFU 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 division and development of the claimant's property were in effect when the claimant acquired it in 1963. 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. In addition, Washington County notes that a portion of the parcel is located in a flood plain zone. ORS 197.352(3)(B) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety. . . ." To the extent the county's flood plain regulations are based on state law, these regulations would be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B). Nothing in this report alters the application of state land use regulations restricting uses within a floodplain, including but not limited to Goal 7 (Natural Hazards).

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 uses 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 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 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 $5 million. 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 Maxine Erdman to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on July 15, 1963.

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 Maxine Erdman's division of the 84.8-acre subject property into 1-acre parcels, to her development of a dwelling on each parcel or to her development of a community water system to serve the development: applicable provisions of Goals 3, 11 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations 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 on July 15, 1963. Goal 11 will not apply only to the extent that it prohibits the claimant from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on July 15, 1963.

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.

6. Nothing in this report or the state's final order for this claim constitutes any determination of ownership by the State of Oregon as to submerged or submersible lands, or as to public rights to the use of waters of the state.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on March 8, 2007. 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.