



# 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>

October 3, 2007

To: Claimant and Interested Persons

From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director



*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130921*

*Claimant: William Kilts*


---

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

This Draft Staff Report and Recommendation sets forth the department's evaluation of and recommendation on the claim. Oregon Administrative Rule 125-145-0100(3) provides that the claimant (or the claimant's agent) and any third parties who submitted comments on the claim may submit written comments, evidence, and information in response to any third-party comments contained in the report, and to the staff report and recommendation itself. Such response must be filed no more than 15 calendar days after the date of mailing of this report. Any response from you must be delivered to the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), 1225 Ferry Street SE, U160, Salem, Oregon 97301, and will be deemed timely filed if either postmarked on the 15th day or actually delivered to DAS by the close of business on the 15th day.

This department will review any responses submitted, and a Final Order on the claim will be issued after such review.





**ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION**

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
Draft Staff Report and Recommendation**

October 3, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130921

**NAME OF CLAIMANT:** William Kilts

**MAILING ADDRESS:** 63024 Marks Road  
Joseph, Oregon 97846

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 2S, Range 45E, Section 33  
Tax lot 9102

Township 3S, Range 45E, Section 4  
Tax lot 1300  
Wallowa County

**OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:** D. Rahn Hostetter  
203 E Main Street  
PO Box 400  
Enterprise, Oregon 97828

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** November 20, 2006

**DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:<sup>1</sup>** May 13, 2008

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimant, William Kilts, seeks compensation in the amount of \$1 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 four 10-acre parcels from the 282.7-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each of the 10-acre parcels. The subject property is located at 63024 Marks Road, near Joseph, in Wallowa County. (See claim.)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

## II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preliminary 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 William Kilt's division of four 10-acre parcels from the 282.7-acre subject property and to his development of a dwelling on each of the 10-acre parcels: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, enacted or adopted after July 31, 1987. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on July 31, 1987. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

### Comments Received

On June 26, 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, two written comments were received in response to the 15-day notice.

The comments do 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 letters 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. 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 20, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies OAR 660, division 23, 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, William Kilts, acquired the subject property on July 31, 1987, as reflected by a real estate contract included with the claim. The Wallowa County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimant’s current ownership of the subject property.

## **Conclusions**

The claimant, William Kilts, is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of July 31, 1987.

## **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 the claimant desires to divide four 10-acre parcels from the 282.7-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each of the 10-acre parcels, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.

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 Wallowa 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.<sup>2</sup> Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

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

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.<sup>3</sup>

The claimant's property is also subject to Wallowa County's Moraine Protection overlay zone, which was adopted in 2002 and acknowledged to implement Goal 5.<sup>4</sup>

Under Goal 5, as adopted and effective January 25, 1975, local governments were required to adopt programs to protect natural resources and to conserve scenic, historic and open space resources. Under OAR 660, division 16, requirements and application procedures for complying with Goal 5 became effective on June 29, 1981. OAR 660, division 23, replaced division 16, and established additional procedures and requirements for complying with Goal 5, and became effective on September 1, 1996.

At the time the claimant acquired the subject property, it was subject to Wallowa County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and EFU zone.<sup>5</sup> At that time, the claimant's desired use of the property would have been subject to compliance with Goal 5 and OAR 660, division 16, and Goal 3, and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through the county's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The claimant's property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-VI soils.

<sup>3</sup> The Commission adopted amendments to OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135 to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. These amendments clarified but did not further restrict dwelling standards under OAR 660, division 33, for EFU-zoned land.

<sup>4</sup> The Wallowa County's Moraine Protection overlay zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 5 on December 31, 1997.

<sup>5</sup> Wallowa County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on February 24, 1978.

<sup>6</sup> 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

In 1987, ORS 215.263 (1985 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) (1985 edition) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they 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.

Prior to the adoption of local government programs, the requirements of Goal 5 were directly applicable to individual properties through the land use application process. Specifically, when the claimant acquired the property in 1987, Goal 5 and OAR 660, division 16, required applicants to establish how the natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open space resources on individual properties would be protected through the proposed development.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired division and development of the subject property were allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired the property on July 31, 1987.

### **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1987 and do not allow the claimant's desired division or development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land divisions and development under Goal 5 and OAR 660, division 16, and Goal 3 and OAR 660, divisions 5, as implemented through Wallowa County's comprehensive plan and EFU zone, and applicable provisions of ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired the property on July 31, 1987.

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 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."

---

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).

### **Findings of Fact**

The claim includes an estimate of \$1 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 the subject property's value.

### **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is William Kilts, who acquired the subject property on July 31, 1987. 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 \$1 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired the property, 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(3)**

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

### **Findings of Fact**

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, which Wallowa County has implemented through its current EFU and Moraine Protection overlay zones. With the exception of amendments enacted or adopted after July 31, 1987, Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660 were in effect when 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 the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) only to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the property on July 31, 1987. Provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660 in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property in 1987 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are also 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 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 he 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 his 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 \$1 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 the 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 he acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow William Kilts to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on July 31, 1987.

## **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 William Kilts's division of four 10-acre parcels from the 282.7-acre subject property or to his development of a dwelling on each of the 10-acre parcels: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, enacted or adopted after July 31, 1987. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on July 31, 1987.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on July 31, 1987. On that date, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 5 and OAR 660, division 16, and Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Wallowa County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable 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 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 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 him 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. NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT**

This staff report is not a final decision by the department and does not authorize any use of the property that is the subject of this report. OAR 125-145-0100 provides 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. Such response must be filed no more than 15 calendar days after the date this report is mailed to the claimant and any third parties. Responses to this draft staff report and recommendation will be considered only as comments related to the claim described in this report. All responses must be delivered to the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), Measure 37 Unit, Risk Management–State Services Division, 1225 Ferry Street SE, U160, Salem, Oregon 97301-4292 and will be deemed timely filed if either postmarked on the 15th day, or actually delivered to DAS by the close of business on the 15th day. Note: Please reference the claim number, claimant name and clearly mark your comments as "Draft Staff Report comments." Comments must be submitted in writing only. Those comments submitted electronically or by facsimile will not be accepted.

