



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2524

Phone: (503) 373-0050

First Floor/Costal Fax: (503) 378-6033

Second Floor/Director's Office: (503) 378-5518

Web Address: <http://www.oregon.gov/LCD>

March 16, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130094

Claimants: Audrey Maphet; Jack and Dorothea Liverman

Enclosed, in regard to the above-referenced claim for compensation under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352), is the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Final Order.

This Final Staff Report and Recommendation and the Final Order constitute the final decision on this claim. No further action will be taken on this matter.

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR) FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352) CLAIM NO. M130094
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Audrey Maphet and Jack and Dorothea Liverman, CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: Audrey Maphet and Jack and Dorothea Liverman (the Claimants)

Property: Township 16S, Range 16E, , Sections 10 and 15, Tax lot 1100
Crook 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 the claimants' division of the 238.49-acre subject property into 119 approximately two-acre parcels for their residential development: applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. 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 Dorothea Liverman acquired the property on February 20, 1987, Jack Liverman acquired the property on October 31, 1988, and Audrey Maphet acquired the property on June 13, 2006. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Audrey Maphet is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

Amendments to Goal 11 and its implementing rules at OAR 660, division 11, adopted after Dorothea and Jack Liverman acquired the property, will not apply only to the extent that they prohibit these claimants from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve

the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 20, 1987, for Dorothea Liverman, October 31, 1988, for Jack Liverman and June 13, 2006, for Audrey Maphet. On February 20, 1987, and October 31, 1988, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14, as implemented by Crook County's acknowledged comprehensive plan, then in effect. On June 13, 2006, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, currently 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 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



Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 16th day of March, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 16th 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 16, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M130094

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Audrey Maphet
Jack and Dorothea Liverman

MAILING ADDRESSES: Audrey Maphet
12270 SE Davis Loop
Prineville, Oregon 97754

Jack and Dorothea Liverman
2226 SE Paulina Highway
Prineville, Oregon 97754

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 16S, Range 16E,
Sections 10 and 15
Tax lot 1100
Crook County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Jeffrey M. Wilson
446 NW Third Street, Suite 203
Prineville, Oregon 97754

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: September 22, 2006

180-DAY DEADLINE: March 21, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Audrey Maphet and Jack and Dorothea Liverman, seek compensation in the amount of \$3,748,425 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide the 238.49-acre subject property into 119 approximately two-acre parcels for residential development. The subject property is located at 12270 SE Davis Loop, near Prineville, in Crook 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 the claimants' division of the 238.49-acre subject property into 119 approximately two-acre parcels for their residential development: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and 14 (Urbanization) and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. 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 Dorothea Liverman acquired the property on February 20, 1987, when Jack Liverman acquired the property on October 31, 1988, and when Audrey Maphet acquired the property on June 13, 2006. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Audrey Maphet 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 January 8, 2007, 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 September 22, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Crook County's RR(M)5 zoning; Goals 11, 12 (Transportation) and 14; and OAR 660-004-0040, 660-011-0065, 660-012-0020(3)(a)(B), 660-012-0060(1) and 660-012-0065 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 Audrey Maphet’s late husband, Al Maphet, originally acquired the subject property on May 26, 1953, as reflected by a warranty deed provided by the Crook County Planning Department. On February 20, 1987, Al Maphet conveyed the property to his daughter, claimant Dorothea Liverman, as reflected by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim. On October 31, 1988, Dorothea Liverman conveyed an interest in the subject property to her husband, claimant Jack Liverman, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. Dorothea and Jack Liverman conveyed the property to themselves and Dorothea’s mother, Audrey Maphet, as tenants in common on June 13, 2006, as evidenced by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim.¹ The Crook County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Audrey Maphet and Dorothea and Jack Liverman, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Dorothea Liverman has been an “owner” since February 20, 1987; Jack Liverman has been an “owner” since October 31, 1988; and Audrey Maphet has been an “owner” since June 13, 2006. Al Maphet is a “family member” of the claimants as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A) and acquired the subject property on May 26, 1953.

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.

¹ Claimant Audrey Maphet asserts an acquisition date of May 26, 1953, for the subject property. However, she conveyed her entire interest in the property in 1987 and did not re-establish an ownership interest in the property until her daughter re-conveyed an interest in the property to her on June 13, 2006.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide the 238.49-acre subject property into 119 approximately two-acre parcels for residential development, and that the use is not allowed under current land use regulations.²

The claim is based on the provisions of state law that regulate rural residential zoning. The claimants' property is zoned RR(M)5 by Crook County. The RR(M)5 zone is consistent with Goal 14, which generally requires that land outside of urban growth boundaries be used for rural uses. Crook County's RR(M)5 zone was adopted on October 1, 1997, and requires a minimum of five acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel.

Goal 14 was effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that local comprehensive plans identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land in order to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In 2000, as a result of a 1986 Oregon Supreme Court decision,³ the Commission amended Goal 14 and adopted OAR 660-004-0040 (Application of Goal 14 to Rural Residential Areas), which was effective on October 4, 2000.

The rule states that if a county rural residential zone in effect on October 4, 2000, specifies a minimum lot size of two acres or more, the area of any new lot or parcel shall equal or exceed the minimum lot size that is already in effect (OAR 660-004-0040(7)(c)). Some relief from this provision is available for lots or parcels having more than one permanent habitable dwelling pursuant to OAR 660-004-0040(7)(h). The rule also provides that a county's minimum lot size requirement in a rural residential zone shall not be amended to allow a smaller minimum lot size without approval of an exception to Goal 14 (OAR 660-004-0040(6)). Because Crook County's rural residential zone was in effect on October 4, 2000, and requires a minimum lot size of five acres, the minimum lot size for any new lot or parcel must equal or exceed five acres.

Goal 11, which also became effective on January 25, 1975, generally prohibits urban levels of public facilities and services on lands that are outside an urban growth boundary. Goal 11 and its implementing rules have two components: one that prohibits an owner from utilizing urban-level facilities or services to serve the property, and another that prohibits service providers from extending their facilities to serve property outside an urban growth boundary. The former can restrict a claimant's use of property. The latter is a restriction on service providers. Goal 11 and OAR 660, division 11, apply to the claimants' use of the property only to the extent that they would restrict the claimants' development of urban-level public or community sewer or water facilities on the subject property.

The claimants' family acquired the subject property in 1953, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and rules. At that time, no zoning applied to the subject property.

² 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 use of the claimants' 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 claimants' use of the subject property, based on the claimants' description of their desired use.

³ *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

Conclusions

The minimum lot size requirements for rural residential lots or parcels established by Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, were all adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimants' family acquired the property.

Those elements of Goal 11 that prohibit a public service provider from extending or establishing public facilities or services outside of an urban growth boundary restrict the actions of local government rather than the claimants' use of the property. That component of Goal 11 is not subject to ORS 197.352 and will continue to apply to those service providers. Only the general prohibition under Goal 11 on the claimants' establishment of an urban level of public facilities and services is subject to ORS 197.352 and restricts the claimants' desired use of 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 \$3,748,425 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 claimants' assessment of the subject property's value.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Audrey Maphet and Jack and Dorothea Liverman whose family acquired the subject property in 1953. 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 adopted since the claimants' family acquired the subject property restrict the claimants' desired use of the property. The claimants estimate that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$3,748,425.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, 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 the claimants' family 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, including Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, which Crook County has implemented through its current RR(M)5 zone. Both of these land use regulations were adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

It appears that none of the general goal and rule restrictions on division of rural residential land were in effect when the claimants' family acquired the property in 1953. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Laws in effect when the claimants' family acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) are also exempt and would not provide a basis for compensation.

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 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 \$3,748,425. 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 the claimants' family 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 the claimants to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time Dorothea Liverman acquired the property on February 20, 1987, at the time Jack Liverman acquired the property on October 31, 1988, and at the time Audrey Maphet acquired the property on June 13, 2006.

When Dorothea Liverman acquired the property on February 20, 1987, and Jack Liverman acquired the property on October 31, 1988, it was subject to Crook County's acknowledged comprehensive plan. At that time, the subject property was zoned by Crook County as RR(M)2, which established a two-acre minimum lot size for the creation of new lots or parcels. It was also subject to the requirements of Goal 11 then in effect. Residential development of the subject property at that time would have been subject to the provisions of the county's comprehensive plan and land use ordinances, including the provision of Goals 11 and 14 implemented by those regulations.

At the time Audrey Maphet acquired an interest in the subject property, it was zoned RR(M)5 by Crook County and subject to the current lot size requirements for lands zoned rural residential under Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 as well as the current requirements for compliance with Goal 11 and OAR 660, division 11, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14 in effect in 1987 and 1988 when Dorothea and Jack Liverman acquired the property and provisions of Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, in effect in 2006 when Audrey Maphet acquired the property, and other laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject 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. 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, and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimants' property. In addition, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) and will continue to apply to the subject property on that basis.

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 their 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.

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 the claimants' division of the 238.49-acre subject property into 119 approximately two-acre parcels for their residential development: applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, adopted after each claimant acquired the subject property. 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 Dorothea Liverman acquired the property on February 20, 1987, Jack Liverman acquired the property on October 31, 1988, and Audrey Maphet acquired the property on June 13, 2006. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Audrey Maphet is entitled

under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

Amendments to Goal 11 and its implementing rules at OAR 660, division 11, adopted after Dorothea and Jack Liverman acquired the property, will not apply only to the extent that they prohibit these claimants from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 20, 1987, for Dorothea Liverman, October 31, 1988, for Jack Liverman and June 13, 2006, for Audrey Maphet. On February 20, 1987, and October 31, 1988, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14, as implemented by Crook County's acknowledged comprehensive plan, then in effect. On June 13, 2006, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 11 and 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 11, currently 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 February 23, 2007. 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.