



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>

September 14, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M131022

Claimant: Ronald A. Wade

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. M131022
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Ronald A. Wade, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Ronald A. Wade (the Claimant)

Property: Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 25: tax lot 1600
Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 31: tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609
Washington County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimant by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimant submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Ronald Wade's division of the subject property into 15 parcels or to his development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040. 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 uses described in this report, and only to the extent those uses were permitted when he acquired tax lot 1600 on January 14, 1970, tax lots 604 and 605 on June 2, 1973, tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the uses described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 14, 1970, for tax lot 1600; June 2, 1973, for tax lots 604 and 605; July 15, 1977, for tax lot 601; and April 12, 1979, for tax lot 609. In 1977 and 1979, tax lots 601 and 609 were subject to compliance with statewide planning goals including, in particular, the provisions of Goal 14 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 subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for 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.

This Order is entered by the Acting 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 Manager for the Measure 37 Services Unit 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:



Cora R. Parker, Acting Director
DLCD

Dated this 14th day of September, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



Carla Ploederer, Manager
DAS, Measure 37 Services Unit

Dated this 14th day of September, 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

September 14, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M131022

NAME OF CLAIMANT: Ronald A. Wade

MAILING ADDRESS: 42292 SW Withycombe Road
Gaston, Oregon 97119

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 1S, Range 3W
Section 25: tax lot 1600
Section 31: tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609
Washington County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 21, 2006

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ May 14, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Ronald Wade, seeks compensation in the amount of \$2.64 million² for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the subject property³ into 15 parcels⁴ and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel. Tax lot 1600 is located at 30855 SW Unger Road, near Cornelius, in Washington County, and tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609 are located at 42292 SW Withycombe Road, near Gaston, in Washington 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 This amount represents total compensation sought for all five tax lots subject to this claim.

³ The claimant submitted separate claims for relief under ORS 197.352 for each tax lot. Those claims are consolidated for this review. The subject property consists of five tax lots. Tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609 are contiguous. Tax lot 1600 is not contiguous to the other tax lots that are the subject of this claim.

⁴ Specifically, the claimant desires to: (1) divide tax lot 1600, a 2.95-acre parcel, into two parcels; (2) divide tax lot 601, a 4.82-acre parcel, into three 1.6-acre parcels; (3) divide tax lot 604, a 10.45-acre parcel, into four parcels; (4) divide tax lot 605, an 11.69-acre parcel, into four parcels; and (5) divide tax lot 609, a 3.03-acre parcel, into two 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. 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 Ronald Wade's division of the subject property into 15 parcels and to his development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-004-0040. 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 uses described in this report, and only to the extent those uses were permitted when he acquired tax lot 1600 in 1970, tax lots 604 and 605 in 1973, tax lot 601 in 1977 and tax lot 609 in 1979. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report).

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 13, 2007, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding property. According to DAS, one written comment was received in response to the 15-day notice.

The comment does not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See the comment letter in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or
2. 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 21, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 14 and applicable provisions of OAR 660, division 4, 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, Ronald Wade, acquired tax lot 1600 on January 14, 1970, as reflected by a contract included with the claim; tax lots 604 and 605 on June 2, 1973, as reflected by bargain and sale deeds included with the claim; tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, as reflected by an assignment of contract received from Washington County Land Development Services; and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979,⁵ as reflected by a bargain and sale deed received from Washington County Land Development Services. The Washington County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimant’s current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Ronald Wade, is an “owner,” as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of January 14, 1970, for tax lot 1600, June 2, 1973, for tax lots 604 and 605, July 15, 1977, for tax lot 601, and as of April 12, 1979, for tax lot 609.

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.

⁵ The claimant asserts that he acquired tax lot 609 on June 2, 1973. Although the claimant originally acquired an interest in tax lot 609 on that date, a bargain and sale deed received from Washington County Land Development Services indicates that the claimant conveyed his ownership interest to another party through a land sale contract dated July 21, 1976, and reacquired the property on April 12, 1979.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the subject property into 15 parcels and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired uses.

The claim is based on the provisions of state law that regulate rural residential zoning. Tax lot 1600 is zoned Agriculture and Forest (AF-5), and tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609 are zoned Agriculture and Forest (AF-10) by Washington County. The AF-5 and AF-10 zones are rural residential zones, in accordance with Goal 14 which prohibits urban use of rural lands. The county's AF-5 zone requires a minimum of five acres and the AF-10 zone requires a minimum of ten acres for the creation of any new lot or parcel. The AF-5 and AF-10 zones were in effect and applied to the subject property on or before October 4, 2000.

Goal 14 became 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,⁶ 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 if a county rural residential zone in effect on October 4, 2000, specifies a minimum lot size of two acres or more, the area of any new lot or parcel shall equal or exceed the minimum lot size then in effect (OAR 660-004-0040(7)(c)).⁷ Because Washington County's rural residential zones were in effect on October 4, 2000, and require a minimum lot size of five-acres as applied to tax lot 1600, and ten-acres as applied to tax lots 601, 604, 605 and 609, the minimum lot size for all new lots or parcels must equal or exceed five acres and ten acres, respectively.

The claimant acquired tax lot 1600 in 1970 and tax lots 604 and 605 in June 1973, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules. At that time, those tax lots were zoned by Washington County as F-1, which may have been a qualified exclusive farm use zone, and required that dwellings be permitted only in conjunction with farm use.

The claimant acquired tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979, after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Washington County's land use regulations to be in compliance with statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Tax lots 601 and 609 were recognized as resource land when the claimant acquired them in 1977 and 1979, and because the Commission had not acknowledged Washington County's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired these tax lots, the statewide planning goals, and particularly Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), in addition to Goal 14, would have applied directly to tax lots 601 and 609 had the claimant

⁶ *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

⁷ Some relief from this provision is available for lots or parcels having more than one permanent habitable dwelling pursuant to OAR 660-004-0040(7)(h). The rule also provides that a county's minimum lot size requirement in a rural residential zone shall not be amended to allow a smaller minimum lot size without approval of an exception to Goal 14 (OAR 660-004-0040(6)).

sought the desired use at the time he acquired those portions of the property.⁸ Alternatively, the claimant would have been required to establish a basis for an exception to compliance with those goals pursuant to the Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) exceptions process. However, through the county's acknowledgement process, tax lots 601 and 609 were ultimately acknowledged as exceptions land pursuant to Goal 2, and zoned by the county for rural residential use. Therefore, while the county could now require that these portions of the property be evaluated as resource land, as would have been required in 1977 and 1979, because of the subject property's ultimate designation as rural residential exceptions land, the county could also require that the claimant's desired use be subject to compliance directly with Goal 14.

The claim does not establish whether the claimant's desired division of tax lot 601 to create three 1.6-acre parcels or whether his desired division of tax lot 609 into two parcels could have satisfied this standard.⁹

Conclusions

The minimum lot size requirements for rural residential lots or parcels established by Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 were adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 1600 in 1970, tax lots 604 and 605 in 1973, tax lot 601 in 1977 and tax lot 609 in 1979, and do not allow the desired division of the property. However, when the claimant acquired tax lot 601 in 1977 and tax lot 609 in 1979, the statewide planning goals, and in particular, the general requirements of Goal 14, applied directly to tax lots 601 and 609. The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired level of development would have been permitted under the laws in effect in 1977 when the claimant acquired tax lot 601, or in 1979 when he acquired tax lot 609.

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.

⁸ The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's land use regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, rev den 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 569 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer directly applied to such 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 interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Foster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992); *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

⁹ When Washington County's plan was acknowledged for compliance with Goal 14 on July 30, 1984, tax lots 601 and 609 were zoned AF-10, which required a minimum parcel size of ten acres for new parcels.

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 \$2.64 million as the reduction in the subject property's fair market values 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 values.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Ronald Wade who acquired tax lot 1600 on January 14, 1970, tax lots 604 and 605 on June 2, 1973, tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979. 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 \$2.64 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lots 601 and 609 was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired those tax lots, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

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

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, which Washington County has implemented through its AF-5 and AF-10 zones. With the exception of provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lots 601 and 609, these land use regulations were adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without specific development proposals 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, with the exception of provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 601 in 1977 and tax lot 609 in 1979, the general goal and rule restrictions on division of rural residential land were not in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 601 in 1977 and tax lot 609 in 1979 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to those tax lots.

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 has provided to the department in his 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 values of the subject property by \$2.64 million. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the 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 Ronald Wade to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lot 1600 on January 14, 1970, and tax lots 604 and 605 on June 2, 1973, tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979.

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 Ronald Wade's division of the subject property into 15 parcels or to his development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040. 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 uses described in this report, and only to the extent those uses were permitted when he acquired tax lot 1600 on January 14, 1970, tax lots 604 and 605 on June 2, 1973, tax lot 601 on July 15, 1977, and tax lot 609 on April 12, 1979.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the uses described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 14, 1970, for tax lot 1600; June 2, 1973, for tax lots 604 and 605; July 15, 1977, for tax lot 601; and April 12, 1979, for tax lot 609. In 1977 and 1979, tax lots 601 and 609 were subject to compliance with statewide planning goals including, in particular, the provisions of Goal 14 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 subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).
5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for 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. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 14, 2007. OAR 125-145 0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation.