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

July 9, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130701

Claimants: Richard A. Muhlnickel and Teresa A. Muhlnickel

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	)FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352	)CLAIM NO. M130701
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)
Richard A. Muhlnickel and Teresa A. Muhlnickel, CLAIMANTS	)

Claimants: Richard A. Muhlnickel and Teresa A. Muhlnickel (the Claimants)

Property: Township 35S, Range 6W, Section 16, Tax lot 1900, Josephine 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 Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel's division of the 5.28-acre subject property one-acre parcels for their residential development: the applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 adopted after December 9, 1996. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that the use was permitted when they acquired the property on December 9, 1996.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 9, 1996. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 14, as implemented by Josephine County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations, then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the property may not be used without a permit, license or other

form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the property by the claimants.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under 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 9th day of July, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 9th day of July, 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

July 9, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130701
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Richard A. Muhlnickel Teresa A. Muhlnickel
MAILING ADDRESS:	745 Pleasant Valley Road Merlin, Oregon 97532
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 35S, Range 6W, Section 16 Tax lot 1900 Josephine County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Willard L. Ransom, Attorney Cauble, Dole and Sorenson PO Box 398 Grants Pass, Oregon 97528
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	November 13, 2006
DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:[1]	May 6, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel, seek compensation in the amount of $250,000 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 5.28-acre subject property into one-acre parcels for residential development. The subject property is located at 745 Pleasant Valley Road, near Merlin, in Josephine 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] ORS 197.352, as originally enacted, required that final action on claims made under Measure 37 be made within 180 days of the date the claim was filed. In response to the large volume of claims filed in late 2006, the Oregon legislature passed House Bill 3546, which became effective on May 10, 2007. This legislation increased the amount of time state and local governments have to take final action on Measure 37 claims filed on or after November 1, 2006, by 360 days, to a total of 540 days.

by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel's division of the 5.28-acre subject property into one-acre parcels for their residential development: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-004-0040, adopted after December 9, 1996. These land use regulations 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 they acquired the property on December 9, 1996. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On May 16, 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, 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 November 13, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 14, OAR 660-004-0040 and Josephine County comprehensive plan 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 claimants, Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel, acquired the subject property on December 9, 1996, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. The Josephine County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C) as of December 9, 1996.

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 5.28-acre subject property into one-acre parcels for residential development, and indicates that the desired use is not allowed under current land use regulations.

The claim is based on the provisions of state law that regulate rural residential zoning. The claimants' property is zoned Rural Residential Zone (RR-1) by Josephine County. The RR-1 is a rural residential zone, in accordance with Goal 14, which prohibits urban use of rural uses. Josephine County's RR-1 zone requires a minimum of two acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel and was in effect and applied to the subject property before October 4, 2000.

Goal 14 was effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that local comprehensive plans identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land in order to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In 2000, as a result of a 1986 Oregon Supreme Court decision,[2] the Commission amended Goal 14 and adopted OAR 660-004-0040 (Application of Goal 14 to Rural Residential Areas), which was effective on October 4, 2000.

The rule states that the area of any new lots or parcels in a rural residential zone in effect on October 4, 2000, must be at least two acres. If a county rural residential zone specifies a

[2] *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

minimum lot or parcel size smaller than two acres, the area of any new lot or parcel shall equal or exceed two acres (OAR 660-004-0040(5)(b) and (7)(d)). The creation of any new lot or parcel smaller than two acres in a rural residential zone is considered an urban use, and may be created only if an exception to Goal 14 is taken (OAR 660-004-0040(7)(a)). Some relief from these provisions is available for lots or parcels having more than one permanent habitable dwelling pursuant to OAR 660-004-0040(7)(h). Because Josephine County's rural residential zone was in effect on October 4, 2000, and allows a lot or parcel size less than two acres, OAR 660-004-0040 requires that all new lots or parcels have a minimum lot or parcel size of two acres or more, unless an exception to Goal 14 is taken.

The claimants acquired the property on December 9, 1996. At that time, the property was subject to Josephine County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and R-1 zone, which required a minimum of one-acre for the creation of a new lot or parcel. Residential development of the subject property at that time would have been subject to the provisions of the county's comprehensive plan and RR-1 zone, including the provision of Goal 14 implemented by those regulations.

Conclusions

The minimum lot size requirements for rural residential lots or parcels established by amendments to Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 were adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property in 1996, and do not allow the desired division of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired level of development would have been permitted under the laws in effect in 1996 when the claimants 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 property based on the use that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that 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$250,000 as the reduction in the 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' assessment of the value of the subject property.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel who acquired the subject property on December 9, 1996. 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 adopted since the claimants 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 $250,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the property could be divided in 1996, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the 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

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 claimants' property, including Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, which Josephine County has implemented through its RR-1 zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property on December 9, 1996, these land use regulations were adopted after the claimants acquired the property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the 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 the general goal and rule restrictions on residential division of the claimants' property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were adopted after the claimants acquired the property. Provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimants acquired the property in 1996 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable, given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in 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 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 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 $250,000. 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 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 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 Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on December 9, 1996.

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 Richard and Teresa Muhlnickel's division of the 5.28-acre subject property one-acre parcels for their residential development: the applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 adopted after December 9, 1996. These land use regulations will not apply to the

claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that the use was permitted when they acquired the property on December 9, 1996.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 9, 1996. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 14, as implemented by Josephine County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations, then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the claimants first obtain that permit, license or other form of authorization or consent. Such requirements may include, but are not limited to: a building permit, a land use decision, a "permit" as defined in ORS 215.402 or 227.160, other permits or authorizations from local, state or federal agencies and restrictions on the use of the property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the property by the claimants under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimants to use the property, it may be necessary for them to obtain a decision under ORS 197.352 from a city and/or county and/or metropolitan service district that enforces land use regulations applicable to the property. Nothing in this order relieves the claimants from the necessity of obtaining a decision under ORS 197.352 from a local public entity that has jurisdiction to enforce a land use regulation applicable to a use of the property by the claimants.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on June 12, 2007. 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.