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. M130007
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Laurance Orchards, Inc., CLAIMANT	)	

Claimant: Laurance Orchards, Inc. (the Claimant)

Property: Township 1S, Range 10E, Section 5, Tax lots 1100, 1200, 1300 and 1700 Hood River County (the Property)

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

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

ORDER

The Claim is denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) as to tract 2 of tax lot 1300 (located east of Cooper Spur Road and along the west bank of Griswell Creek) and tract 2 of tax lot 1700 (located northeast of the intersection of Cooper Spur Road and Culbertson Drive) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 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 Laurance Orchard, Inc.'s partition of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 into five-acre parcels or to its development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 5, 1975. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired this portion of the subject property on December 5, 1975.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 5, 1975. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 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 subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for it 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 Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Lane Shetterly, Director
DLCD
Dated this 2nd day of March, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 2nd day of March, 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

March 2, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130007
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Laurance Orchards, Inc.
MAILING ADDRESS:	c/o Spencer E. Laurance, Corporate Officer PO Box 261 Mt. Hood-Parkdale, Oregon 97041
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 1S, Range 10E, Section 5 Tax lots 1100, 1200, 1300 and 1700 Hood River County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Steven B. Andersen PO Box 135 Mosier, Oregon 97040
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	September 8, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	March 7, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Laurance Orchards, Inc.,[1] seeks compensation in the amount of $11,840,371 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 237.9-acre subject property[2] into 45 five-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel.[3] The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Baseline Drive and Cooper Spur Road, near Mt. Hood-Parkdale, 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 in part. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced

[1] Laurance Orchards, Inc. is a domestic business corporation registered with the Oregon Secretary of State.
[2] The subject property includes four tax lots. Tax lot 1100 consists of 43.93 acres; tax lot 1200 consists of 21.50 acres; tax lot 1300 consists of 159.69 acres; and tax lot 1700 consists of 12.75 acres.
[3] The state claim form does not clearly establish the number of parcels the claimant desires. Hood River County's staff report for a county claim filed under ORS 197.352 for the same property indicates that the claimant desires to divide the subject property into 45 five-acre parcels. This report relies on the information in the county report.

by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Laurance Orchard, Inc.'s partition of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 into five-acre parcels and to its development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 5, 1975. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired this portion of the subject property on December 5, 1975.

The department has determined that the claim is not valid as to tract 2 of tax lot 1300 (located east of Cooper Spur Road and along the west bank of Griswell Creek) and tract 2 of tax lot 1700 (located northeast of the intersection of Cooper Spur Road and Culbertson Drive) because the claimant's desired use of the subject property was prohibited under the laws in effect when it acquired tract 2 of tax lot 1300 on August 24, 1995, and tract 2 of tax lot 1700 on October 26, 1995. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On December 12, 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, one written comment was received in response to the 10-day notice.

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

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

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

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

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

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on September 8, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies ORS 197 and 215; provisions of OAR 660; and Hood River County's Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) and High Value Farmland (HVF) zoning 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, Laurance Orchards, Inc., acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 on December 5, 1975, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. The claimant acquired tract 2 of tax lot 1300 on August 24, 1995, as reflected by a quitclaim deed included with the claim, and tract 2 of tax lot 1700 on October 26, 1995, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. The Hood River County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Laurance Orchards, Inc., is an "owner" of the subject property, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). It has been an owner of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 as of December 5, 1995; tract 2 of tax lot 1300 as of August 24, 1995; and tract 2 of 1700 as of October 26, 1995.[4]

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

[4] The claimant acquired a portion of the property from Dorothy Laurance. Under ORS 197.352(11)(A), legal entities can be "family members" of individuals who are owners of property under ORS 197.352(11)(C). However, legal entities cannot have family members under the statute. Therefore, Dorothy Laurance, who transferred a portion of the property to Laurance Orchards, Inc., is not a family member as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(A).

property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimant acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 237.9-acre subject property into 45 five-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that the desired use is not allowed under current land use regulations.[5]

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require EFU zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned by Hood River County as EFU-HVF (with Stream Protection Overlay zoning on tax lots 1100, 1300 and 1700) as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant's property is "agricultural land," as defined by Goal 3.[6] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands, as defined by Goal 3, be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.263, 215.284 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for the 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.)

The claimant acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Hood River County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, the property was zoned by Hood River County as A-1 Farm Zone, which allowed for the creation of five-acre parcels. Because the Commission had

[5] The claimant summarily cites numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but does not establish how the laws 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 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 that desired use.

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

not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 on December 5, 1975, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to the claimant's property when it acquired this portion of the subject property.[7]

As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. The Goal 3 standard for land divisions involving property where the local zoning was not acknowledged required that the resulting parcels must be of a size that is "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area." Further, ORS 215.263 (1973 edition) only authorized the partition of land subject to EFU zoning, and required that all divisions of land subject to EFU zoning comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.243 (Agricultural Land Use Policy). Thus, the claimant's opportunity to divide tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 when it acquired this portion of the subject property in 1975 was limited to land divisions that were consistent with Goal 3, which required that the resulting parcels be (1) appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise in the area and (2) shown to comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.

Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on December 5, 1975, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use" under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1973 edition). Non-farm dwellings were subject to compliance with ORS 215.213(3) (1973 edition).

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimant's desired division of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 into 45 five-acre parcels complies with the "commercial" standard for farm parcels under Goal 3 or the standards for non-farm parcels under ORS 215.263 (1973 edition), nor is there any information to establish that the claimant's desired development of approximately 45 dwellings satisfies the standards for farm or non-farm dwellings under ORS 215.213 (1973 edition).

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700, and before the claimant acquired tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 on August 24, 1995, and October 26, 1995. These land use regulations do not allow the claimant's desired division or development on the subject property. Laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 in 1995 do not

[7] 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 comprehensive plan and implementing 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 3 (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 applied directly 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) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

restrict the claimant's desired use of this portion of the property relative to when the claimant acquired it in 1995. The claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 complies with the standards for land divisions and development under the requirements of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired this portion of the subject property on December 5, 1975.

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 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."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $11,840,371 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 land use consultant's assessment of the property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Laurance Orchards, Inc., who acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 on December 5, 1975; tract 2 of tax lot 1300 on August 24, 1995; and tract 2 of tax lot 1700 on October 26, 1995. 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.

No state laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 restrict the use of the property relative to the uses allowed in 1995. Therefore, the fair market value of tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 has not been reduced as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tracts 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 restrict the claimant's desired use of this portion of the subject property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $11,840,371.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lots 1100 and 1200, and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 was allowed under the standards in effect when it 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 this portion 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 Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Hood River County has implemented through its current EFU-HVF zone. All of these regulations were in effect when the claimant acquired tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 in 1995. With the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 on December 5, 1975, these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired this portion of 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 with the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect in 1975, the statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 were not in effect when the claimant acquired this portion of the subject property, and therefore, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired that portion of the subject property in 1975 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property. All of the state land use regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 were in effect when the claimant acquired this portion of the subject property and therefore, are all are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), which exempts laws in effect when the claimant acquired this portion.

Other laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of 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 use 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 it 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 its 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 do not restrict the claimant's desired use of tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 relative to what was permitted when the claimant acquired this portion of the subject property in 1995 and do not reduce its fair market value. All state laws restricting the use of tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Based on the record, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700. 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 $11,840,371. 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 tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700, 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 tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 was allowed under the standards in effect when it acquired this portion of the subject 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 that portion 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 Laurance Orchards, Inc. to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for a use permitted at the time it acquired this portion of the subject property on December 5, 1975.

Conclusions

Based on the record and the foregoing findings and conclusions, the claimant has not established that it is entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) for tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied as to tract 2 of tax lots 1300 and 1700. The department otherwise recommends that the claim be approved, subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Laurance Orchard, Inc.'s partition of tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 into five-acre parcels or to its development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after December 5, 1975. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow it to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when it acquired this portion of the subject property on December 5, 1975.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lots 1100 and 1200 and tract 1 of tax lots 1300 and 1700 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on December 5, 1975. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 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 subject property by the claimant under the terms of the order will remain subject to the following laws: (a) those laws not specified in (1) above; (b) any laws enacted or enforced by a public entity other than the Commission or the department; and (c) those laws not subject to ORS 197.352 including, without limitation, those laws exempted under ORS 197.352(3).

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing terms and conditions, in order for the claimant to use the subject property, it may be necessary for it 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 February 8, 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.