



# 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>

July 11, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



*Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130725*

*Claimants: Constance L. Reynolds and Allen C. Reynolds*

---

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 A
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352	)	CLAIM NO. M130725
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Constance L. Reynolds, CLAIMANT	)	

Claimant: Constance L. Reynolds (the Claimant)

Property: Township 2S, Range 4E, Section 17, Tax lot 408, Clackamas 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 Constance Reynolds' division of the 30.02-acre subject property into twelve 2-acre parcels and one 6-acre parcel or her development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to Constance Reynolds 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 the property on May 6, 1967.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Constance Reynolds to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on May 6, 1967.
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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 her use of the subject property.

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 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 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 ) FINAL ORDER B  
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 ) CLAIM NO. M130725  
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF )  
Allen C. Reynolds, CLAIMANT )

Claimant: Allen C. Reynolds (the Claimant)

Property: Township 2S, Range 4E, Section 17, Tax lot 408, Clackamas 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) 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  
DLCD  
Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

  
Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator  
DAS, State Services Division  
Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 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**

July 10, 2007

**STATE CLAIM NUMBER:** M130725

**NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:** Constance L. Reynolds  
Allen C. Reynolds

**MAILING ADDRESS:** 17515 SE Fosberg Road  
Boring, Oregon 97009

**PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:** Township 2S, Range 4E, Section 17  
Tax lot 408  
Clackamas County

**DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:** November 14, 2006

**DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:<sup>1</sup>** May 6, 2008

**I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM**

The claimants, Constance and Allen Reynolds, seek compensation in the amount of \$2 million 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 30.02-acre subject property into twelve 2-acre parcels and one 6-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel. The subject property is located at 17515 SE Fosberg Road, near Boring, in Clackamas 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 Constance Reynolds' division of the 30.02-acre subject property into twelve 2-acre parcels and one 6-acre parcel and to her development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands),

---

<sup>1</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.

ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6. These laws will not apply to Constance Reynolds 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 the property on May 6, 1967.

The department has further determined that the claim is not valid as to Allen Reynolds because the claimants have not established his ownership in the subject property. (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, three written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comments do 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 letters 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 November 14, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Clackamas County's Timber (TBR) zone 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 Constance Reynolds (formerly known as Constance Engelking), acquired the subject property on May 6, 1967, as reflected by a contract and a March 8, 1972, fulfillment warranty deed included with the claim. The claim does not include copies of any deeds or otherwise establish that claimant Allen Reynolds is an owner of the subject property. The Clackamas County Assessor’s Office confirms Constance Reynolds’ current ownership of the subject property.

### **Conclusions**

Claimant Constance Reynolds is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of May 6, 1967. Claimant Allen Reynolds has not established that he is an “owner” 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 the 30.02-acre subject property into twelve 2-acre parcels and one 6-acre parcel and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel, and that the current zoning prohibits the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require forest zoning and restrict uses on forest-zoned land. The subject property is zoned TBR by Clackamas County as required by Goal 4, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the property is “forest land” under Goal 4. Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest land be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on

September 1, 1982, and ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

Together, ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, prohibit the division of forest land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on those lands.

Claimant Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property on May 6, 1967, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

### **Conclusions**

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 4 and provisions applicable to land zoned for forest use in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were all enacted or adopted after Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property in 1967 and do not allow her desired division or development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the property relative to the uses allowed when Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property.

As explained in Section V.(1) above, Allen Reynolds has not established that he is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Without such demonstration, it is not possible to determine that any laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Allen Reynolds' use of the subject property with the effect of reducing its fair market value.

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 claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to Constance Reynolds' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to her 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 Constance Reynolds 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 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 \$2 million 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 Constance and Allen Reynolds. Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property on May 6, 1967. As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, Allen Reynolds has not established his ownership of the subject property. Without such demonstration, the department can make no determination on the effect of any land use regulations on the fair market value of the subject property. Under ORS 197.352, Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property restrict her 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 \$2 million.

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 Constance Reynolds 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 applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Clackamas County has implemented through its current TBR zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds acquired the property in 1967. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E).

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, Allen Reynolds has not established that he is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Without such demonstration, the department can make no determination as to whether any land use laws are exempt from ORS 197.352 as to him.

Laws in effect when Constance Reynolds acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will also continue to apply to her 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. Those provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings. 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....” Accordingly, 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 Constance Reynolds’ 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 Constance Reynolds 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 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 Constance Reynolds’ 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 that the claim is not valid as to Allen Reynolds because the claimants have not demonstrated his ownership of the subject property or the date he acquired the property. The department further finds laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Constance Reynolds’ 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 \$2 million. 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 Constance Reynolds’ 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 Constance Reynolds to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on May 6, 1967.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the record before the department, Allen Reynolds has not established that he is entitled to relief under ORS 197.352(1) as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department. Therefore, the department recommends that Allen Reynolds' claim be denied.

The department otherwise recommends that Constance Reynolds' 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 Constance Reynolds' division of the 30.02-acre subject property into twelve 2-acre parcels and one 6-acre parcel or her development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to Constance Reynolds 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 the property on May 6, 1967.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Constance Reynolds to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on May 6, 1967.
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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 Constance Reynolds 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 her use of the subject property.

## **VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT**

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on June 6, 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.