



# 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>

August 24, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130692*

*Claimant: Maxine DeVilbiss*

---

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. M130692
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Maxine DeVilbiss, CLAIMANT	)	

Claimant: Maxine DeVilbiss (the Claimant)

Property: Township 9S, Range 3W, Section 28D: tax lots 400, 700, 1200,  
1300, 1400 and 1600

Township 9S, Range 3W, Section 33: tax lot 300

Marion County (the Property)

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

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

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Maxine DeVilbiss' development of tax lots 300, 400 and 1600 for commercial use, and to her development of a dwelling on each remaining tax lot: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each tax lot. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on July 19,

1946, for tax lot 1200; on June 7, 1947, for tax lot 300; on May 7, 1948, for tax lots 1300 and 1400; on July 2, 1951, for tax lots 400 and 700; and on October 17, 1951, for tax lot 1600.

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 her 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 24<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 24<sup>th</sup> day of August, 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.”

**AORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION**  
**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT**  
**Final Staff Report and Recommendation**

August 24, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130692

**NAME OF CLAIMANT:** Maxine DeVilbiss

**MAILING ADDRESS:** 1765B South Ragosa Circle  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 9S, Range 3W  
Section 28D: tax lots 400, 700, 1200,  
1300, 1400 and 1600  
Section 33: tax lot 300  
Marion County<sup>1</sup>

**OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:** Ray DeVilbiss, Agent  
605 North Wolverine Road  
Palmer, Alaska 99645

**OTHER INTEREST IN PROPERTY:** Rod Chambers, Lessee  
32920 Harnisch Drive NE  
Albany, Oregon 97321

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** November 13, 2006

**DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:<sup>2</sup>** May 6, 2008

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimant, Maxine DeVilbiss, seeks compensation in the amount of \$1,212,880 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 develop tax

---

<sup>1</sup> The subject property includes seven tax lots. Tax lot 300 consists of 34.51 acres; tax lot 400 consists of 4.78 acres; tax lot 700 consists of 9.74 acres; tax lot 1200 consists of 5 acres; tax lot 1300 consists of 19.44 acres; tax lot 1400 consists of 4.56 acres; and tax lot 1600 consists of 12.27 acres.

<sup>2</sup> ORS 197.352, as originally enacted, required that final action on claims made under Measure 37 be made within 180 days of the date the claim was filed. In response to the large volume of claims filed in late 2006, the Oregon legislature passed House Bill 3546, which became effective on May 10, 2007. This legislation increased the amount of time state and local governments have to take final action on Measure 37 claims filed on or after November 1, 2006, by 360 days, to a total of 540 days.

lots 300, 400 and 1600 for commercial use, and to develop a dwelling on each remaining tax lot.<sup>3</sup> The subject property is located west of Westside Lane, south of Talbot Road and east of Spitzenberg Drive, southwest of the Interstate Highway 5 Talbot interchange, near Jefferson, in Marion 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 Maxine DeVilbiss' development of tax lots 300, 400 and 1600 for commercial use, and to her development of a dwelling on each remaining tax lot: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 14 (Urbanization), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660-004-0040 and 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after she acquired each tax lot. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

## III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

### Comments Received

On May 17, 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

---

<sup>3</sup> The claim also indicates that the claimant desires to sell or transfer the newly created parcels for development. In effect, the claimant requests that a decision of the department to "not apply" (waive) certain laws as set forth in this report be transferable with the property. ORS 197.352 only authorizes a state agency to waive a law in order to allow the current owner a use of the property permitted at the time that owner acquired the property. A determination of transferability is beyond the scope of relief that the department may grant under ORS 197.352. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised the department that "[i]f the current owner of the real property conveys the property before a new use allowed by the public entity is established, then the entitlement to relief will be lost."

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 November 13, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) and Acreage Residential (AR) 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, Maxine DeVilbiss, acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951, as reflected by indentures and a warranty deed included with the claim. The Marion County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimant’s current ownership of the subject property.<sup>4</sup>

### **Conclusions**

The claimant, Maxine DeVilbiss, is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). She has been an owner of tax lot 1200 since July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 since June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 since May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 since July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 since October 17, 1951.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although the claimant appears to have transferred the property to a revocable trust, there is not sufficient documentation in the claim to evidence such a transfer. Transfer of property to a revocable trust does not result in a change in ownership for purposes of ORS 197.352.

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

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

### **Findings of Fact**

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to develop tax lots 300, 400 and 1600 for commercial use and to develop a dwelling on each remaining tax lot, and that current land use regulations prohibit the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require EFU zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land, and the applicable provisions of state law that regulate rural residential zoning.

Tax lots 300, 700, 1200, 1300, 1400 and 1600 are zoned EFU as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because these tax lots are "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.<sup>5</sup> Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by the Goal be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.284 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, establish standards for the development of dwellings and commercial uses on existing or proposed parcels on EFU-zoned land.

OAR 660-033-0120, Table 1, identifies the commercial activities allowed on agricultural lands, which is generally restricted to commercial activities in conjunction with farm use. 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.<sup>6</sup>

Tax lot 400 is zoned as Acreage Residential 5-Acre Minimum (AR) by Marion County. The AR zone is consistent with Goal 14, which generally requires that land outside of urban growth boundaries be used for rural uses. Marion County's AR zone was in effect and applied to tax lot 400 in 2000, and requires a minimum of five acres for the creation of a new lot or parcel. It does not provide for commercial development of rural residentially zoned land.

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

---

<sup>5</sup> Tax lots 300, 700, 1200, 1300, 1400 and 1600 are "agricultural land" because they contain Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

<sup>6</sup> The Commission adopted amendments to OAR 660-033-0130 et seq. to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. These amendments clarified, but did not further restrict the OAR 660, division 33, development standards.

decision,<sup>7</sup> 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 does not provide for commercial development of lands zoned for rural residential use.

The claimant acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

### **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property in 1949, 1947, 1948 and 1951, and do not allow the desired commercial or residential development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimant acquired each tax lot.

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 \$1,212,880 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 a realtor's assessment of the subject property's value.

### **Conclusions**

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Maxine DeVilbiss who acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired

---

<sup>7</sup> *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

each tax lot restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the property is a reduction of \$1,212,880.

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.

#### **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 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 33, which Marion County has implemented through its current EFU and AR zones. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the subject property.

#### **Conclusions**

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on development of the claimant's property were in effect when the claimant acquired it in 1946, 1947, 1948 and 1951. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

Laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are 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 the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the 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 she 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 her 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 laws that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the subject property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

### **Findings of Fact**

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by \$1,212,880. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when she 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 Maxine DeVilbiss to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951.

### **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 Maxine DeVilbiss' development of tax lots 300, 400 and 1600 for commercial use, and to her development of a dwelling on each remaining tax lot: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 14, ORS 215 and OAR 660-004-0040 and 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each tax lot. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired tax lot 1200 on July 19, 1946, tax lot 300 on June 7, 1947, tax lots 1300 and 1400 on May 7, 1948, tax lots 400 and 700 on July 2, 1951, and tax lot 1600 on October 17, 1951.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on July 19, 1946, for tax lot 1200; on June 7, 1947, for tax lot 300; on May 7, 1948, for tax lots 1300 and 1400; on July 2, 1951, for tax lots 400 and 700; and on October 17, 1951, for tax lot 1600.

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 her 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 July 20, 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.