

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. M118617
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)	
Donald and Diana Dahl, CLAIMANTS)	

Claimants: Donald and Diana Dahl (the Claimants)

Property: Township 3N, Range 2W, Section 3, Tax lot 703
Township 3N, Range 2W, Section 10, Tax lot 100
Columbia 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 Donald and Diana Dahl's division of the 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 703) into four 4-acre parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, enacted or adopted after August 20, 1979. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on August 20, 1979.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on August 20, 1979. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and the Commission's Enforcement Order dated April 10, 1979, 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 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 Condition 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.

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 Deputy 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 26th day of April, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE
SERVICES:


Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division

Dated this 26th day of April, 2006.

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 197.352¹, 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.”

¹ By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, “all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely” on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Final Staff Report and Recommendation

April 26, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M118617

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Donald and Diana Dahl

MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 291
Scappoose, Oregon 97056

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 3N, Range 2W, Section 3
Tax lot 703
Township 3N, Range 2W, Section 10
Tax lot 100
Columbia County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: June 16, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: May 1, 2006¹

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Donald and Diana Dahl, seek compensation in the amount of \$600,000 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 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 700) into four 4-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at 31850 Valley Hideaway, near Scappoose, in Columbia County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Donald and Diana Dahl's division of the 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 703) into four 4-acre parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6 and 33, enacted or adopted after August 20, 1979.

¹ This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted, as extended by the 139 days that all timelines under Measure 37 were suspended during the pendency of *MacPherson v. Dept. of Admin. Svcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).

These laws will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on August 20, 1979. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On August 26, 2005, 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, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comment is relevant to whether the restriction of the claimants' use of the subject property reduces the fair market value of the property. The comment has been considered by the department in preparing this report.

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 criterion 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 criterion, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on June 16, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies county regulations and OAR 660, division 6, as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for “owners” as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

The claimants, Donald and Diana Dahl, acquired the subject property on August 20, 1979, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. A May 24, 2005, title report submitted with the claim establishes the claimants’ current ownership.

Conclusions

The claimants, Donald and Diana Dahl, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of August 20, 1979.

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 subject 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 703) into four 4-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, which is restricted by local regulations and OAR 660, division 6.

The claim is based generally on the county’s FA-19 and PF-76 zones and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. Tax lot 703 of the subject property is zoned FA-19, which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone adopted to comply with Goal 4 and the implementing provisions of OAR 660, division 6 (effective on February 5, 1990), subsequently amended on March 1, 1994, to comply with the provisions of House Bill 3661 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). Tax lot 100 of the subject property is zoned PF-76, as required by Goal 4 in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because this tax lot is “forest land” under Goal 4.

With regard to the FA-19-zoned tax lot 703, under OAR 660-006-0050, all the uses permitted under Goals 3 and 4 are allowed in mixed agriculture and forest zones except that for dwellings, either the Goal 3 or 4 standards are applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.² Depending on the predominant use on January 1, 1993, tax lot 703 is subject

² No information was provided to the department regarding the predominant use of the subject property on January 1, 1993.

to either the requirements for dwellings applicable under Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning required by Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 33, or forest zone provisions required by Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6.

For land divisions, OAR 660-006-0055 authorizes the creation of new parcels based on the standards applicable to farm or forest zones that implement the minimum lot size specified in ORS 215.780. Under ORS 215.780(2)(a), the minimum lot size in Columbia County's FA-19 zone is 80 acres. The claimants' property cannot be divided into parcels smaller than 80 acres.

With regard to PF-76-zoned tax lot 100, Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest land be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on September 1, 1982, and ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

Under ORS 215.780(2)(a), the minimum lot size in Columbia County's PF-76 zone is 80 acres. The claimants' property cannot be divided into parcels smaller than 80 acres. Uses are regulated under OAR 660, division 6, as explained for tax lot 703.

The claimants acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Columbia County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251.³

Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimants acquired the subject property on August 20, 1979, the applicable statewide planning goals would have applied directly to any development application for the claimants' property.⁴ In particular, for tax lot 100, Goal 4 applied directly to that tax lot when the claimants acquired it. Goal 4, as adopted in 1975, required that forest lands be designated for forest uses. Tax lot 703 would have been subject to either Goal 3 or 4, depending on the predominant use of the property. Goal 3 required that agricultural lands be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. Therefore, depending on whether it would have been subject to Goal 3 or 4 when the claimants acquired tax lot 703, it would have been subject to either EFU zoning pursuant to ORS 215 or forest zoning adequate to retain forest lands for forest uses.

For tax lot 100 and if subject to Goal 4, tax lot 703, the state standards required uses to "conserve forest lands for forest uses." Specifically, Goal 4 only allowed land divisions that would protect

³ Columbia County's Comprehensive Plan was acknowledged on July 25, 1985.

⁴ 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. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992); *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

commercial forest lands for commercial forest uses. Dwellings in forest zones could only be allowed if found to be “necessary and accessory” to one of the enumerated forest uses listed in Goal 4.⁵ Those forest uses were defined as follows: “(1) the production of trees and the processing of forest products; (2) open space, buffers from noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses; (3) watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habitat; (4) soil protection from wind and water; (5) maintenance of clean air and water; (6) outdoor recreational activities and related support services and wilderness values compatible with these uses; and (7) grazing land for livestock.”

If tax lot 703 was subject to Goal 3, the state standards for a division of land required that the created lots or parcels be of a size “appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area.” (See Goal 3.) Further, ORS 215.263 (1975 edition) required that all land divisions subject to EFU zoning comply with the legislative intent in ORS 215.243 (Agricultural Land Use Policy). Thus, under Goal 3, the opportunity to divide tax lot 703 when acquired by the claimants on August 20, 1979, was limited to new lots or parcels that were (1) appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise in the area and (2) shown to be consistent with the legislative intent in ORS 215. At that time, under Goal 3, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be “customarily provided in conjunction with farm use” under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1975 edition),⁶ and non-farm dwellings were subject to ORS 215.213(3) (1975 edition).⁷ Other uses were authorized and governed by the applicable provisions under Goal 3 and ORS 215.213.

In addition, when the claimants acquired the property on August 20, 1979, it was subject to an Enforcement Order dated April 10, 1979, adopted by the Commission under ORS 197.320 (1977 edition), which required Columbia County to adopt, consistent with Goal 3, either an interim protective measure for the protection of agricultural lands or an EFU zoning ordinance and map. Further, until such ordinances were adopted, the Order required the county to apply certain land use standards to any land use action on agricultural or forest lands, as defined in Goals 3 and 4, outside mutually adopted urban growth boundaries.⁸

⁵ Goal 4 prohibited uses that were not enumerated by Goal 4 as permissible uses for forest lands as well as those that were not necessary and accessory to an enumerated forest use. *Lamb v. Lane County*, 7 Or LUBA 137 (1983). Dwellings in forest lands were required to be “necessary and accessory” to show that such dwellings complied with the Goal 4 requirement that local land use regulations must “conserve forest lands for forest uses.” *1000 Friends v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986). A dwelling that may “enhance” forest uses is not “necessary and accessory” to a forest use to the extent required by Goal 4. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Lane County)*, 305 Or 384 (1988). For additional guidance, the Goal 4 provisions were interpreted under OAR 660, division 6, effective on September 1, 1982, in *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Lane County)* and in *1000 Friends v. LCDC (Curry County)*.

⁶ Under ORS 215.213, a farm dwelling could be established on agricultural land only if the farm use to which the dwelling relates exists (*Newcomer v. Clackamas County*, 92 Or App 174, modified 94 Or App 33 (1988) and *Matteo v. Polk County*, 11 Or LUBA 259, 263 (1984), affirmed without opinion 70 Or App 179 (1984)). Guidance on the application of the statutory standards for farm and non-farm dwellings in EFU zones can be found in the Commission rules (OAR 660, division 5, adopted on July 21, 1982, amended on June 7, 1986, and repealed on August 7, 1993).

⁷ When determining whether land is “generally unsuitable for the production of farm crops and livestock” under ORS 215.213(3), the entire parcel or tract must be evaluated rather than a portion thereof. *Smith v. Clackamas County*, 313 Or 519 (1992).

⁸ The Enforcement Order required the county to determine whether any land use approval:

2(a) is consistent with or authorized by ORS 215.203(2); or

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimants' desired division and development of the subject property comply with the applicable standards in place when the subject property was acquired in 1979.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established under Goal 4 for lands zoned for mixed farm-forest use and for forest use and the statutory and rule restrictions under applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the subject property in 1979, and do not allow the claimants' desired division and development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land division and development under Goals 3 and 4 and the Commission's Enforcement Order dated April 10, 1979, applicable and in effect when the claimants acquired the property on August 20, 1979.

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 use that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that any land use regulation 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 \$600,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to current regulations. This amount is based on comparable market values from realtor listings.

-
- b) involves an area which is already built upon or irrevocably committed to nonfarm uses; or
 - c) involves the approval of a nonfarm residential dwelling which:
 - 1. is compatible with farm uses described in subsection (2) of ORS 215.203 (1977 edition) and is consistent with the intent and purposes set forth in ORS 215.243; and
 - 2. does not interfere seriously with accepted farming practices; and
 - 3. does not materially alter the stability of the overall land use pattern of the area; and
 - 4. involves land which is generally unsuitable for the production of farm crops and livestock, considering the terrain, adverse soil or land conditions, drainage and flooding, vegetation, location and size of tract.

3 If the land referred to in Paragraph 2 is determined by the County to be predominantly forest land as defined by Goal 4, the land shall be treated in conformance with Goal 4.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.1 of this report, the claimants are Donald and Diana Dahl who acquired the subject property on August 20, 1979. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.2 of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimants acquired the subject property restrict the desired division and development of the property. The claimants estimate the reduction in value due to the restrictions to be \$600,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or to what extent the claimants' use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation. Nevertheless, based on the submitted information, the department determines that it is more likely than not 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 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, which Columbia County has implemented through its current FA-19 and PF-76 zones. With the exception of provisions of Goals 3 and 4 and ORS 215 in effect on August 20, 1979, these laws were not in effect when the claimants 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 residential division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(e) to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired the property on August 20, 1979. Provisions of Goals 3 and 4 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property in 1979 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(e) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(e), and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. These provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest lands. ORS 197.352(3)(b) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building

codes. . . .” To the extent they are applicable to the claimants property, the siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3).

There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants’ 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 subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimants seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(a) to (d).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the use 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.

V. 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 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 current owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimants’ ability to divide the 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 703) into four 4-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The claim asserts that the laws enforced by the Commission or the department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by \$600,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other specific documentation for how the specified restrictions reduce the fair market value of the subject property, and without verification of whether or to what extent the claimants’ desired use of the property was allowed under the standards in effect when the claimants acquired the property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based likely 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 Donald and Diana Dahl to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on August 20, 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 Donald and Diana Dahl's division of the 16-acre property (tax lots 100 and 703) into four 4-acre parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6 and 33, enacted or adopted after August 20, 1979. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimants only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on August 20, 1979.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on August 20, 1979. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and the Commission's Enforcement Order dated April 10, 1979, 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 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 Condition 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.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on April 10, 2006. 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. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.