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 25, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130773

Claimants: Samuel and Beverly Mason and Thomas Thomsen Jr.

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 Samuel and Beverly Mason, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER A CLAIM NO. M130773

Claimants: Samuel and Beverly Mason (the Claimants)

Property: Township 4S, Range 1E, Section 33, Tax lot 1301, Clackamas 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 Samuel and Beverly Mason's division of the 10-acre subject property into four parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 September 20, 1971.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Samuel and Beverly Mason to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 20, 1971.

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 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 subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject 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 subject 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 subject property by the claimants.

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 use the waters of the state.

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 25th day of July, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 25th 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."

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 Thomas Thomsen Jr., CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER B CLAIM NO. M130773

Claimant: Thomas Thomsen Jr. (the Claimant)

Property: Township 4S, Range 1E, Section 33, Tax lot 1301
Clackamas 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 denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

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 chapter 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 chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 25th day of July, 2007.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 25th day of July, 2007.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

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)

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

July 25, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130773
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Samuel and Beverly Mason Thomas Thomsen Jr.
MAILING ADDRESSES:	Samuel and Beverly Mason 8491 SE Barnards Road Canby, Oregon 97013 Thomas Thomsen Jr. 25355 NE Glass Road Aurora, Oregon 97002
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 4S, Range 1E, Section 33 Tax lot 1301 Clackamas County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	November 15, 2006
DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:[1]	May 8, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Samuel and Beverly Mason and Thomas Thomsen Jr., seek compensation in the amount of $100,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 10-acre subject property into four parcels and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel.[2] The subject property is located at 8491 SE Barnards Road, near Canby, in Clackamas County. (See claim.)

---

[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.

[2] The claim does not indicate the number of parcels the claimants desire to create from the subject property. On May 16, 2007, department staff spoke with Thomas Thomsen Jr. (the claim's contact person), and he indicated that the claimants intend to develop four parcels.

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 in part. 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 Samuel and Beverly Mason's division of the 10-acre subject property into four parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33. These laws will not apply to Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 September 20, 1971.

The department has further determined that the claim is not valid for Thomas Thomsen Jr. because he has no present right to use the subject property in a manner that is restricted by state land use regulations. Therefore, no laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict his right to use the subject property with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On May 23, 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 15, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 3, ORS 92, 94, 197, 215, 536, 541 and 561 and

provisions of OAR 660 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

Claimants Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the subject property on September 20, 1971, as reflected by a real estate contract included with the claim. Claimant Thomas Thomsen Jr. acquired an interest in the subject property on October 12, 2005, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. However, that deed is subject to a life estate in favor of Samuel and Beverly Mason, which reserves in them the exclusive right to use the property during their lifetimes. Thomas Thomsen Jr.'s future ownership interest does not provide him with any present right to use the subject property during the term of the Masons' lives. Because he has no present right to use the subject property, no land use regulations restrict his use of the property. The Clackamas County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

Claimants Samuel and Beverly Mason are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 20, 1971. Claimant Thomas Thomsen Jr. is not an "owner" as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C) because he does not have a present interest that provides him with a right to use the subject property in a manner that can be restricted by land use regulations.

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 10-acre subject property into four parcels and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel, and that the use is not allowed under current land use regulations.[3]

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 claimants' property is zoned EFU by Clackamas County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[4] 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.[5]

Claimants Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the subject property on September 20, 1971, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the subject property in 1971 and do not allow

---

[3] The claimants summarily list numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants' 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 claimants' property or do not restrict the use of the claimants' 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants' description of their desired use.

[4] The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–IV soils.

[5] 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 for EFU-zoned land.

the desired division or residential development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the property.

As discussed above in Section V.(1), Thomas Thomsen Jr. is not an "owner" of the subject property for purposes of ORS 197.352 because his future ownership interest does not provide him with any present right to use the subject property in a manner that can be restricted by land use regulations. Therefore, no land use regulations restrict his use of the subject property with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value.

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 claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to Samuel and Beverly Mason's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to their 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 Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 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."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $100,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimants' assessment of the subject property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Samuel and Beverly Mason who acquired the subject property on September 20, 1971, and Thomas Thomsen Jr. Thomas Thomsen Jr. is not an owner of a present interest and right to use the subject property. Therefore, no laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict his desired use of the property with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value.

Under ORS 197.352, Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 enacted or adopted since Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the subject property restrict their desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the property is a reduction of $100,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject

property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines 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 since Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the property.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

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

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Clackamas County has implemented through its current EFU zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 were in effect when Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the property in 1971. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

As set forth in Section V.(2), Thomas Thomsen Jr. does not have any present right to use the subject property; therefore, no land use regulations restrict his use of the property and the question of whether any land use regulations are exempt is not relevant to him.

Laws in effect when Samuel and Beverly Mason acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to their use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to Samuel and Beverly Mason'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 Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 subject 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 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 record, the department finds that the claim is not valid as to Thomas Thomsen Jr. because he does not have a present right to use the subject property. Therefore, no land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department restrict his restrict his right to use the subject property with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value. The department further finds laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Samuel and Beverly Mason's desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by $100,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which Samuel and Beverly Mason's desired use of the subject 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 Samuel and Beverly Mason to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on September 20, 1971.

Conclusions

Based on the record before the department, Thomas Thomsen Jr. is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department because no state land use regulations restrict his right to use the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Therefore, the department recommends that the claim be denied as to Thomas Thomsen Jr.

Based on the record, the department otherwise 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 Samuel and Beverly Mason's division of the 10-acre subject property into four parcels or

to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Samuel and Beverly Mason 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 September 20, 1971.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Samuel and Beverly Mason to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 20, 1971.

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 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 subject property imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of the subject 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 subject 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 subject property by the claimants.

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 use the waters of the state.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on June 18, 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.