

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. M129822
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Royal Fraser, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Royal Fraser (the Claimant)

Property: Township 36S, Range 10E, Section 20, Tax lot 1900, Klamath 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 Royal Fraser's division of the 20-acre subject property into four 5-acre parcels or to his 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 September 27, 1977. 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 use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on September 27, 1977.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 27, 1977. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 or 4 and 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 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 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.

This Order is entered by the Manager for the Measure 37 Services Division of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION:
Lane Shetterly, Director


Michael Morrissey, Manager
DLCD, Measure 37 Services Division
Dated this 31st day of January, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:


David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 31st day of January, 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

January 31, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M129822

NAME OF CLAIMANT: Royal Fraser

MAILING ADDRESS: 660 Mt. View Dr. # 47
Richfield, Utah 84701

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 36S, Range 10E, Section 20
Tax lot 1900
Klamath County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Michael Spencer
419 Main Street
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: August 8, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: February 4, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Royal Fraser, seeks compensation in the amount of \$50,000 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 claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the 20-acre property into four 5-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel.¹ The subject property is located in Klamath 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

¹ The claim also indicates that the claimant desires to sell or transfer the newly created parcels for development. In effect, the claimant requests that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Royal Fraser's division of the 20-acre subject property into four 5-acre parcels and to his 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 September 27, 1977. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property in 1977. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On November 9, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

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

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

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on August 8, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goals 3, 4, and 14 (Urbanization) and OAR 660, divisions 4, and 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 claimant, Royal Fraser, acquired the subject property on September 27, 1977, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. The Klamath County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Royal Fraser, is an "owner" of the subject property, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of September 27, 1977.

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.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 20-acre subject property into four 5-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.²

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require mixed farm-forest zoning and restrict uses on land zoned mixed farm-forest. The claimant's property is zoned by Klamath County as Forestry/Range (FR), which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone, as required by 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).

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

² The claimant summarily lists numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but does not assert how the laws are relevant to his claim or otherwise establish how they either apply to the claimant's desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of these regulations either do not appear to apply to the claimant's property or do not restrict the claimant's desired use of the property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property, based on the claimant's description of his desired use.

applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.³ Depending on the predominant use on January 1, 1993, the property is subject 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 Klamath County's FR zone is 80 acres. The claimant's property cannot be divided into parcels smaller than 80 acres.

The claimant acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Klamath County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251.⁴ Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired the subject property on September 27, 1977, the applicable statewide planning goals would have applied directly to any development application for the claimant's property.⁵

As adopted in 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural lands be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. Goal 4, as adopted in 1975, required that forest lands be designated for forest uses. Depending on the nature of the property, when the claimant acquired it, the property would have been subject to Goal 3 or 4 and either EFU zoning pursuant to ORS 215 or forest zoning adequate to retain forest lands for forest uses.

Under 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." 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 the subject property when acquired by the claimant on September 27, 1977, 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

³ No information was provided to the department regarding the predominant use of the subject property on January 1, 1993.

⁴ Klamath County's comprehensive plan was acknowledged on August 6, 1984.

⁵ 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).

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

ORS 215.213(3) (1975 edition).⁷ Other uses were authorized and governed by the applicable provisions under Goal 3 and ORS 215.213.

Under Goal 4, the state standards required uses to “conserve forest lands for forest uses.” Specifically, Goal 4 only allowed land divisions that would protect 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 4.⁸

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established under Goal 4 for lands zoned for mixed farm-forest use and the statutory, goal and rule restrictions under applicable provisions of Goal 3 ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1977, and do not allow the claimant’s desired division and development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant’s desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for land division and development under Goal 3 or 4 applicable and in effect when the claimant acquired the property on September 27, 1977.

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.

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.”

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 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)*.

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of \$50,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value 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 value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Royal Fraser who acquired the subject property on September 27, 1977. 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 \$50,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when he 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 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 applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, which Klamath County has implemented through its current FR zone. With the exception of provisions of Goals 3 and 4 and ORS 215 in effect on September 27, 1977, these laws were not in effect when the claimant 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 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 claimant acquired the property on September 27, 1977. Provisions of Goals 3 and 4 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property in 1977 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

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. In addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, particularly OAR 660-006-0029, 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 claimant's 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)(B).

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 the 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 value of the subject property by \$50,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which 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 Royal Fraser to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on September 27, 1977.

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 Royal Fraser's division of the 20-acre subject property into four 5-acre parcels or to his 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 September 27, 1977. 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 use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired the property on September 27, 1977.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on September 27, 1977. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 or 4 and 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 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 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.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on January 9, 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.