BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND
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 Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon, CLAIMANTS	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M124322

Claimants: Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon (the Claimants)

Property: Township 02N, Range 10E, Section 22, Tax lots 800 and 1900
Hood River 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 1) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of 16.87-acre tax lot 800 into 80 parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and 2) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of 10.25-acre tax lot 1900 into two approximately five-acre parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. 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 Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property on December 29, 1971, and when Dianna Sheirbon acquired the property on December 31, 1991. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Joseph Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use tax lot 800 in the manner set forth in the claim. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Dianna Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization Joseph Sheirbon to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 29, 1971, and to Dianna Sheirbon to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 31, 1991. On December 29, 1971, the property was zoned A-1 farm zone and subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 (1971 edition) then in effect. On December 31, 1991, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Hood River County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the 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.

This Order is entered by the Deputy 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 Director 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

Cora R. Parker

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 5th day of September, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Lindsay A. Ball

Lindsay A. Ball, Director
DAS
Dated this 5th day of September, 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 197.352, 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 5, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M124322
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon
MAILING ADDRESS:	4296 Summit Drive Hood River, Oregon 97031
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 02N, Range 10E, Section 22 Tax lots 800 and 1900 Hood River County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Steven B. Andersen Cascade Planning Associates PO Box 135 Mosier, Oregon 97040
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	March 13, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	September 9, 2006

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon, seek compensation in the amount of $4,587,890 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 1) divide 16.87-acre tax lot 800 into 80 parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel, and 2) divide 10.25-acre tax lot 1900 into two approximately five-acre parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at 4025 and 4225 Chamberlain Drive, near Hood River, in Hood River 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 1) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of the 16.87-acre tax lot 800 into 80 parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 14 (Urbanization), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, and 2) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of

10.25-acre tax lot 1900 into two approximately five-acre parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. 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 Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property on December 29, 1971, and when Dianna Sheirbon acquired the property on December 31, 1991. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Joseph Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use tax lot 800 in the manner set forth in the claim. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Dianna Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 2, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, two written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

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

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

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

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or

2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on March 13, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies numerous provisions of Hood River County zoning ordinances, ORS 197 and 215 and OAR 660, division 33, 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

Claimant Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property on December 29, 1971, as reflected by a contract and a June 5, 1980, fulfillment warranty deed included with the claim. Joseph Sheirbon conveyed an interest in the subject property to his wife, Dianna Sheirbon, on December 31, 1991, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. An October 28, 2005, plant service report submitted with the claim establishes the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property on December 29, 1971. Dianna Sheirbon acquired the subject property on December 31, 1991. Joseph Sheirbon is a "family member" of Dianna Sheirbon as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A).

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 1) divide 16.87-acre tax lot 800 into 80 parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel and 2) divide 10.25-acre tax lot 1900 into two approximately five-acre parcels and develop a dwelling on each parcel. It indicates that the desired use is not allowed under current land use regulations.[1]

---

[1] The claimants summarily cite 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 claimants' desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report

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 High-Value Farm land by Hood River 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.[2] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by the Goal 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. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135.)

Goal 14 would likely apply to the division of tax lot 800 into parcels less than two acres. Goal 14 generally requires that land outside of urban growth boundaries be used for rural uses. Goal 14 became effective on January 25, 1975.

Claimant Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property on December 29, 1971, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. At that time, tax lot 800 was subject to Hood River County's A-1 and A-2 farm zones, and tax lot 1900 was subject to the A-1 zone. The A-1 zone was a qualified farm zone, which established a five-acre minimum lot size for new parcels and dwellings in conjunction with farm use, subject to ORS 215 (1971 edition). The A-2 zone established a 7,500 square foot minimum lot size for new parcels with access to public sewers.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property in 1971. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property.

---

addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimants' use of the subject property, based on the claimants' asserted desired use.

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

However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use satisfies the provisions of ORS 215 (1971 edition) in effect and applicable to the A-1-zoned portion of the subject property when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property.

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 $4,587,890 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 difference between the subject property's current assessed value and an analysis of an average $85,000 per eighty 7,000 to 10,000 square foot parcels and an average of $500,000 for two five-acre parcels.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Joseph Sheirbon who acquired the subject property in 1971 and his wife Dianne Sheirbon. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the 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 Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations(s) on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $4,587,890.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards of ORS 215 (1971 edition) in effect when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the 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 Joseph Sheirbon 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 relative to the uses permitted when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Hood River County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of ORS 215,

related to qualified farm zones, all of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject proepryt, 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 ore of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. With the exception of provisions of ORS 215 (1971 edition) related to qualified farm zones, it appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property were in effect when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property on December 29, 1971. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when Joseph Sheirbon acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. 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).

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 findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimants' 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 $4,587,890. 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when Joseph Sheirbon 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 Joseph Sheirbon to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on December 29, 1971, and to allow Dianna Sheirbon to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on December 31, 1991.

At the time Dianna Sheirbon acquired the subject property, it was subject to Hood River County's acknowledged EFU zone.[3] When Dianna Sheirbon acquired the subject property, the claimants' desired use of the property would have been governed by the county's acknowledged EFU zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.[4] In December1991, ORS 215.263 (1991 edition) required that divisions of land in EFU zones be "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area" or not smaller than the minimum size in the county's acknowledged plan. ORS 215.283(1)(f) (1991 edition) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they were determined to be compatible with farm use, not interfere seriously with accepted farm practices, not materially alter the stability of the land use pattern in the area and be situated on generally unsuitable land for the production of farm crops and livestock.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent Dianna Sheirbon's desired division and development of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when she acquired the property on December 31, 1991.

In addition to the applicable provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect on December 31, 1991, when Dianna Sheirbon acquired the property, there may be other laws that 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 the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use.

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.

---

[3] Hood River County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on January 11, 1985.

[4] After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the statewide planning goals, the goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

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 1) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of 16.87-acre tax lot 800 into 80 parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and 2) Joseph and Dianna Sheirbon's division of 10.25-acre tax lot 1900 into two approximately five-acre parcels and their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. 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 Joseph Sheirbon acquired the property on December 29, 1971, and when Dianna Sheirbon acquired the property on December 31, 1991. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Joseph Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 may not allow him to use tax lot 800 in the manner set forth in the claim. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Dianna Sheirbon is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization Joseph Sheirbon to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 29, 1971, and to Dianna Sheirbon to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 31, 1991. On December 29, 1971, the property was zoned A-1 farm zone and subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 (1971 edition) then in effect. On December 31, 1991, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Hood River County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the 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.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 17, 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.