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/Coastal Fax: (503) 378-6033
Second Floor/Director's Office Fax: (503) 378-5518
Third Floor/Measure 37 Fax: (503) 378-5318
Web Address: http://www.oregon.gov/LCD

March 23, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130151*

*Claimants:* Anton and Betty Koch; Robert D. Koch; Ronald, G. Koch; Mary Ann Koch; and Craig A. Koch

---

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<br>COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352<br>(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF<br>Anton Koch and Betty J. Koch, CLAIMANTS | )<br>)<br>)<br>) | FINAL ORDER A<br>CLAIM NO. M130151 |

Claimants: Anton Koch and Betty J. Koch (the Claimants)

Property: Township 9S, Range 1E, Section 18, Tax lots 100 and 200
Linn 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 Anton and Betty Koch's division of four approximately 10-acre parcels and two approximately 8-acre parcels from the 218.13-acre subject property or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Anton and Betty Koch only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on January 5, 1955.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Anton and Betty Koch to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 5, 1955.

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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 their use of the subject property.

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

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 23rd day of March, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 23rd 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."

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<br>COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352<br>(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF<br>Robert D. Koch, Ronald G. Koch, Mary Ann Koch<br>Craig A. Koch, CLAIMANTS | )<br>)<br>)<br>)<br>) | FINAL ORDER B<br>CLAIM NO. M130151 |

Claimants: Robert D. Koch, Ronald G. Koch, Mary Ann Koch Craig A. Koch (the Claimants)

Property: Township 9S, Range 1E, Section 18, Tax lots 100 and 200 Linn 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 denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

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 chapter 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 chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

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

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 23rd day of March, 2007.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 23rd day of March, 2007.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF**

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

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)

## ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

## OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
**Final Staff Report and Recommendation**

March 23, 2007

| | |
|---|---|
| **STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** | M130151 |
| **NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** | Anton Koch<br>Betty J. Koch<br>Robert D. Koch<br>Ronald G. Koch<br>Mary Ann Koch<br>Craig A. Koch |
| **MAILING ADDRESSES:** | Anton and Betty Koch<br>41795 Kingston Lyons Drive SE<br>Stayton, Oregon 97383<br><br>Robert D. Koch<br>5785 Macleay Road SE<br>Salem, Oregon 97317<br><br>Ronald Koch<br>1374 W. Linn Road<br>Eagle Point, Oregon 97524<br><br>Mary Ann Koch<br>1994 Lancaster Drive SE<br>Salem, Oregon 97317<br><br>Craig Koch<br>1050 Hoyt Street SE<br>Salem, Oregon 97302 |
| **PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** | Township 9S, Range 1E, Section 18<br>Tax lots 100 and 200<br>Linn County |
| **DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** | September 29, 2006 |
| **180-DAY DEADLINE:** | March 28, 2007 |

## I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Anton, Betty, Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch, seek compensation in the amount of $850,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to divide four approximately 10-acre parcels and two approximately 8-acre parcels from the 218.13-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at 41795 Kingston Lyons Drive, near Stayton, in Linn 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 by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Anton and Betty Koch's division of four approximately 10-acre parcels and two approximately 8-acre parcels from the 218.13-acre subject property and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 6, and 33. These laws will not apply to Anton and Betty Koch only to the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property in 1955. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

The department has also determined that the claim is not valid as to Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch because these claimants are not "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C).

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

### Comments Received

On January 23, 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 29, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the state's "80-acre minimum division size" as restricting the claimants' desired use of the property. 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**

Claimants Anton and Betty Koch acquired the subject property on January 5, 1955, as reflected by a contract included with the claim. On July 11, 2002, Anton and Betty Koch transferred the subject property to a revocable trust, the Anton and Betty J. Koch Living Trust, as reflected by a certification of trust included with the claim. The Linn County Assessor's Office confirms Anton and Betty Koch's current ownership of the subject property.

The claimants also assert that Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch acquired interest in the subject property on January 6, 1955, based on their capacity as "future executor" and/or "member" of the Koch Family Trust. However, such future contingent interests do not give Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann or Craig Koch a present ownership interest with a right to use the subject property.

**Conclusions**

Claimants Anton and Betty Koch are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of January 5, 1955. Claimants Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch are not "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C).

## 2. The Laws That are the Basis for This Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimants' use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimants or a family member acquired the property.

## Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to divide four approximately 10-acre parcels and two approximately 8-acre parcels from the 218.13-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel and that current land use regulations prohibit the desired use.

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 subject property is zoned by Linn County Farm/Forest (F/F), which is a mixed agricultural and forest land zone, as required by Goal 4 and permitted by the implementing provisions of OAR 660-006-0050 (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 applicable based on the predominant use of the tract on January 1, 1993.[1] Depending on the predominant use on that date, the property is subject to either the requirements for dwellings applicable under exclusive farm use 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 80-acre minimum lot size specified in ORS 215.780. Under ORS 215.780(2)(a), the minimum lot size in Linn County's F/F zone is 80 acres. The subject property cannot be divided into parcels smaller than 80 acres.

Claimants Anton and Betty Koch acquired the subject property on January 5, 1955, prior to the adoption of statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

## 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 and rule restrictions under applicable provisions of ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33, were enacted or adopted after Anton and Betty Koch acquired the subject property in 1955, and do not allow the desired division and development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when these claimants acquired the property.

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

As explained in Section V.(1), claimants Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch are not are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Therefore, no land use regulations restrict their use of the subject property.

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

**3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value**

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that 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 $850,000 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 a real estate broker's comparative market analysis submitted with the claim.

**Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Anton and Betty Koch, who acquired the subject property on January 5, 1955, and Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch. Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch are not owners of the subject property and therefore, are not entitled to compensation under ORS 197.352. Under ORS 197.352, Anton and Betty Koch are 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 Anton and Betty Koch acquired the subject property restrict their 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 $850,000.

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 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 Linn County has implemented through its F/F zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Anton and Betty Koch 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 none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property were in effect when Anton and Betty Koch acquired it in 1955. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when Anton and Betty Koch acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to their 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. The provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest zones. 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 subject 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 Anton and Betty Koch'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 Anton and Betty Koch seek a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

As explained in Section V.(1), claimants Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch are not "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Therefore, the issue of whether any laws are exempt from ORS 197.352 is not relevant as to them.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. Similarly, this report only addresses the exemptions provided for under ORS 197.352(3) that are clearly applicable, given the information provided to the department in the claim. The claimants should be aware that the less information they have provided to the department in the claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to Anton and Betty Koch's 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 record, the department finds no laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch's use of the property because these claimants are not "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Anton and Betty Koch'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 $850,000. 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 Anton and Betty Koch's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they 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 Anton and Betty Koch to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired the property on January 5, 1955.

**Conclusions**

Based on the record before the department, Robert, Ronald, Mary Ann and Craig Koch have not established that they are entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department because they are not present owners of the subject property. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied. The department further recommends that the claim be approved as to Anton and Betty Koch, 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 Anton and Betty Koch's division of four approximately 10-acre parcels and two approximately 8-acre parcels from the 218.13-acre subject property or to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 6, and 33. These land use regulations will not apply to Anton and Betty Koch only to

the extent necessary to allow them to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when they acquired the property on January 5, 1955.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Anton and Betty Koch to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on January 5, 1955.

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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 Anton and Betty Koch 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 their use of the subject property.

## VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on March 2, 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.