



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT

ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (MEASURE 49) SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW  
OF MEASURE 37 CLAIM  
Final Order of Denial

STATE ELECTION NUMBER:

H134245A<sup>1</sup>

CLAIMANTS:

James B. and Karla K. Grimes  
10249 Highway 140 East  
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

MEASURE 37 PROPERTY  
IDENTIFICATION:

Township 39S, Range 10E, Section 16  
Tax lot 300  
Klamath County

The claimants, James and Karla Grimes, filed a claim with the state under ORS 197.352 (2005) (Measure 37) on December 5, 2006, for property located at 12049 Highway 140 East, near Klamath Falls, in Klamath County. ORS 195.300 to ORS 195.336 (Measure 49) entitles claimants who filed Measure 37 claims to elect supplemental review of their claims. The claimants have elected supplemental review of their Measure 37 claim under Section 6 of Measure 49, which allows the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) to authorize up to three home site approvals to qualified claimants. However, a claimant was not eligible for relief under Measure 49 as initially enacted in 2007 if the claimant filed a Measure 37 claim with the state after December 4, 2006 but did not comply with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020, then in effect.<sup>2</sup> James and Karla Grimes were not eligible for relief under Measure 49 on that basis.

However, the Oregon State Legislative Assembly subsequently amended this Measure 49 requirement through the passage of House Bill 3225 (Chapter 855 (2009 Laws)) (HB 3225). As a result, this requirement no longer prevents the claimants, James and Karla Grimes from obtaining Measure 49 relief. The claimants elected to seek relief under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, and submitted the \$175 fee required by Section 18 of HB 3225 in order to have their claim reviewed.

This Final Order of Denial is the conclusion of the supplemental review of this claim.

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim H134245 has been split into two claims, H134245A and H134245B, because the Measure 37 claim sought relief for three non-contiguous parcels. Claim H134245A addresses the claimants' eligibility for Measure 49 relief on tax lot 300 and H134245B addresses their relief on tax lots 200 and 2200.

<sup>2</sup> The claimants initially elected to have their claim reviewed under Section 7 of Measure 49, but amended their election to request review under Section 6.

## **I. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM**

### **A. Maximum Number of Home Sites for Which the Claimants May Qualify**

Under Section 6 of Measure 49, the number of home site approvals authorized by the department cannot exceed the lesser of the following: three; the number stated by the claimant in the election materials; or the number described in a Measure 37 waiver issued by the state, or if no waiver was issued, the number of home sites described in the Measure 37 claim filed with the state. The claimants have requested supplemental review under Section 6 of Measure 49. No waiver was issued for this claim. The Measure 37 claim filed with the state describes nine home sites. Therefore, the claimants may qualify for a maximum of three home site approvals under Section 6 of Measure 49.

### **B. Qualification Requirements**

To qualify for a home site approval under Section 6 of Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225, the claimants must meet each of the following requirements:

#### **1. Timeliness of Claim**

A claimant must have filed a Measure 37 claim for the property with the state before Measure 49 became effective on December 6, 2007. If the claimant filed their state Measure 37 claim after December 4, 2006, the claimant must also have either (a) filed the claim in compliance with the provisions of OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect; (b) submitted a land use application as described in OAR 660-041-0020 then in effect prior to June 28, 2007; or (c) filed a Measure 37 claim with the county on or before December 4, 2006.

#### **Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

The claimants, James and Karla Grimes, filed a Measure 37 claim, M134245, with the state on December 5, 2006. The claimants filed a Measure 37 claim, M37 102-06, with Klamath County on December 4, 2006. The state claim was filed after December 4, 2006 and the claimants also filed a county Measure 37 claim on December 4, 2006.

The claimants filed a timely Measure 37 claim with the state along with any additional claims or applications that the claimants had to have filed in order to be eligible for review under Measure 49, as amended by HB 3225.

#### **2. The Claimant Is an Owner of the Property**

Measure 49 defines "Owner" as: "(a) The owner of fee title to the property as shown in the deed records of the county where the property is located; (b) The purchaser under a land sale contract, if there is a recorded land sale contract in force for the property; or (c) If the property is owned by the trustee of a revocable trust, the settlor of a revocable trust, except that when the trust becomes irrevocable only the trustee is the owner."

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

According to the deed submitted by the claimants, James and Karla Grimes are the settlors of a revocable trust into which they conveyed the Measure 37 claim property and, therefore, are owners of the property under Measure 49.

Klamath County has confirmed that the claimants are the current owners of the property.

**3. All Owners of the Property Have Consented in Writing to the Claim**

All owners of the property must consent to the claim in writing.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

All owners of the property have consented to the claim in writing.

**4. The Majority of the Measure 37 Claim Property Is Located Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary and Outside the Boundaries of Any City or the Measure 37 Claim Property is Located within the Boundaries of A City and Entirely Outside Any Urban Growth Boundary**

Either the majority of the Measure 37 claim property must be located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the boundaries of any city or the Measure 37 Claim Property must be located within the boundaries of a city and entirely outside any urban growth boundary.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

The Measure 37 claim property is located in Klamath County and the property is located outside any urban growth boundary and outside the city boundary of the nearest city, Klamath Falls.

**5. One or More Land Use Regulations Prohibit Establishing the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling**

One or more land use regulations must prohibit establishing the requested lot, parcel or dwelling.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions:**

The property is currently zoned Exclusive Farm Use-Cropland (EFU-C) by Klamath County, in accordance with ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3. Goal 3 requires agricultural land to be zoned exclusive farm use. Applicable provisions of ORS chapter 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, generally prohibit the establishment of a lot or parcel less than 80 acres in size in an EFU zone, and regulate the establishment of dwellings on new or existing lots or parcels.

The claimants' property consists of 19.09 acres. Therefore, state land use regulations prohibit the claimants from establishing on the Measure 37 claim property the three home sites the claimants may qualify for under Section 6 of Measure 49.

**6. The Establishment of the Lot, Parcel or Dwelling Is Not Prohibited by a Land Use Regulation Described in ORS 195.305(3)**

ORS 195.305(3) exempts from claims under Measure 49 land use regulations:

- (a) Restricting or prohibiting activities commonly and historically recognized as public nuisances under common law;
- (b) Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety;
- (c) To the extent the land use regulation is required to comply with federal law; or
- (d) Restricting or prohibiting the use of a property for the purpose of selling pornography or performing nude dancing.

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Based on the documentation submitted by the claimants, it does not appear that the establishment of the three home sites for which the claimants may qualify on the property is prohibited by land use regulations described in ORS 195.305(3).

**7. On the Claimant's Acquisition Date, the Claimant Lawfully Was Permitted to Establish at Least the Number of Lots, Parcels or Dwellings on the Property That Are Authorized Under Section 6 of Measure 49**

A claimant's acquisition date is "the date the claimant became the owner of the property as shown in the deed records of the county in which the property is located. If there is more than one claimant for the same property under the same claim and the claimants have different acquisition dates, the acquisition date is the earliest of those dates."

**Findings of Fact and Conclusions**

Klamath County deed records indicate that the claimants acquired the property on March 3, 1987.

On March 3, 1987, the Measure 37 claim property was subject to Klamath County's acknowledged Exclusive Farm Use-Cropland (EFU-C) zone. Although Klamath County's EFU-C zone was acknowledged to comply with the Statewide Planning Goals, the zone did not establish a fixed minimum acreage standard for the creation of a lot or parcel on which a dwelling could be established. Rather, applications for division and development were evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure compliance with the Goals and the applicable requirements of ORS chapter 215. Because of uncertainty regarding the historic application of the county's acknowledged plan, the 2010 Legislative Assembly amended Measure 49. Senate Bill (SB) 1049 (2010) specifies that, for purposes of determining the number of home site approvals that would

have been lawfully permitted when a claimant acquired Measure 37 claim property that was subject to an acknowledged resource zone without a fixed minimum acreage standard, the minimum acreage standard is 40 acres unless the record for the claim demonstrates that the claimant was lawfully permitted to establish a home site on a lot or parcel of a different acreage.

The claimants' property consists of 19.09 acres, and is developed with one dwelling. Therefore, based on the analysis under SB 1049 (2010), it appears that the claimants lawfully could not have established any additional home sites on their date of acquisition unless the claimants establish that the county's acknowledged plan and land use regulations would have lawfully permitted one or more additional home sites on the subject 19.09-acre parcel.

## **II. COMMENTS ON THE PRELIMINARY EVALUATION**


The department issued its Preliminary Evaluation for this claim on July 16, 2010. Pursuant to OAR 660-041-0090, the department provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. No written comments were received in response to the 28-day notice.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the analysis above, the claimants do not qualify for Measure 49 home site approvals because the claimants were not lawfully permitted to establish the lots, parcels or dwellings on the claimants' date of acquisition.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Final Order of Denial is entered by the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development as a final order of the department and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.300 to ORS 195.336 and OAR 660-041-0000 to 660-041-0160.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT AND THE LAND  
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION:



Kristin May, Division Manager  
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development  
Dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2010

#### **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 is available to anyone who is an owner of the property as defined in Measure 49 that is the subject of this final determination, or a person who timely submitted written evidence or comments to the department concerning this final determination.
2. 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 must be filed in the Circuit Court in the county in which the affected property is located. Upon motion of any party to the proceedings, the proceedings may be transferred to any other county with jurisdiction under ORS 183.484 in the manner provided by law for change of venue.
3. Judicial review of this final determination is limited to the evidence in the record of the department at the time of its final determination. Copies of the documents that comprise the record are available for review at the department's office at 635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150, Salem, OR 97301-2540. Judicial review is only available for issues that were raised before the department with sufficient specificity to afford the department an opportunity to respond.