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 2, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130885

Claimants: Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger, Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long

---

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 COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger and Wayne Clevenger Margaret Long, CLAIMANTS	)))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M130885

Claimants: Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger and Wayne Clevenger Margaret Long (the Claimants)

Property: Township 4S, Range 4W, Section 31, Tax lot 1900, Yamhill 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 108.58-acre subject property into 5-acre parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or 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 Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the property on April 9, 1987, and when Marjorie Clevenger acquired the property on January 6, 1993.

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 April 9, 1987, and January 6, 1993. On those dates, the property was subject to Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through Yamhill County's acknowledged EF-40 zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the 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.

6. Nothing in this report or the state's final order for this claim constitutes any determination of ownership by the State of Oregon as to submerged or submersible lands, or as to public rights to the use of waters of the state.

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 2nd day of August, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 2nd 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."

BALLOT MEASURE 37 (ORS 197.352) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

August 2, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M130885
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger Wayne Clevenger Margaret Long
MAILING ADDRESSES:	Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger 748 NW Jefferson Way McMinnville, Oregon 97128 Wayne Clevenger & Margaret Long 11301 SW Peavine Road McMinnville, Oregon 97128
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 4S, Range 4W, Section 31 Tax lot 1900 Yamhill County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	November 20, 2006
DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:[1]	May 13, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Dwayne, Marjorie and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long, seek compensation in the amount of $3.5 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 108.58-acre subject property into 5-acre parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at 11301 SW Peavine Road, near McMinnville, in Yamhill County.

[1] 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.

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 108.58-acre subject property into 5-acre parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after 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 Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the property on April 9, 1987, and when Marjorie Clevenger acquired the property on January 6, 1993. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On May 31, 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, two 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 20, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 3, ORS 197 and OAR 660, division 33, 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

Claimants Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long assert that they acquired an ownership interest in the subject property on June 17, 1965, as reflected by a deed included with the claim.[2] However, the deed by which these claimants acquired the subject property was subject to a life estate in favor of their family members, Ray and Rosa Clevenger. That life estate reserved in Ray and Rosa Clevenger the exclusive right to use the subject property during their lifetimes. Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger's and Margaret Long's interests did not provide them with any present right to use the subject property during the term of Ray and Rosa Clevenger's lives. Under the terms of the deed, the three claimants acquired their present interest and a right to use the subject property, an interest which can be restricted by land use regulations, upon the death of Ray Clevenger on April 9, 1987, as evidenced by a death certificate provided by Yamhill County's Planning Department.[3] On January 6, 1993, Dwayne Clevenger conveyed an interest in the subject property to his wife, claimant Marjorie Clevenger, as evidenced by a bargain and sale deed included with the claim.

On February 19, 1997, Wayne Clevenger transferred his interest in the subject property to a revocable trust, the Clevenger Family Trust dated February 13, 1997, with himself as trustee, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. On October 3, 2002, Dwayne and Marjorie Clevenger transferred their interest in the subject property to a revocable trust, the Clevenger Family Trust dated October 3, 2002, with themselves as trustees, as reflected by a warranty deed and certification of trust included with the claim.[4]

---

[2] Margaret Long conveyed her initial remainder interest back to Ray and Rosa Clevenger on January 3, 1972, when they re-conveyed that interest back to her on August 23, 1972.
[3] Rosa Clevenger passed away on August 1, 1986.
[4] Transfer of property to a revocable trust does not result in change of ownership for purposes of ORS 197.352.

The Yamhill County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Dwayne, Marjorie and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long have been an owner since April 9, 1987. Marjorie Clevenger has been an owner since January 6, 1993. Ray and Rosa Clevenger are "family members" of the claimants as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), as of June 17, 1965.[5]

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 108.58-acre subject property into 5-acre-parcels and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimants' property is zoned EF-80 by Yamhill County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[6] Goal 3 became effective on January 25, 1975, and required that agricultural lands as defined by Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

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

ORS 215.780 establishes an 80-acre minimum size for the creation of new lots or parcels in EFU zones and became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

---

[5] The claim does not establish when Ray and Rosa Clevenger acquired the property. Therefore, for purposes of the claim for compensation, the department must rely on the earliest date on which documentation establishes family ownership of the property, which is the 1965 deed by which Ray and Rosa Clevenger conveyed the property to Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long, subject to their life estate.

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

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.[7]

The claimants' family acquired the property on or before June 17, 1965, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. On June 17, 1965, the property was not zoned by Yamhill County.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property in 1965. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimants' family acquired 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 $3.5 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 Dwayne, Wayne and Marjorie Clevenger and Margaret Long, whose family members acquired the property on June 17, 1965. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants 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 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 $3.5 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 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

[7] The Commission adopted amendments to OAR 660-033-0100, -0130 and -0135 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 dwelling standards for EFU-zoned 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 applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Yamhill County has implemented through its current EF-80 zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property in 1965.

Conclusions

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 the claimants' family acquired the property on June 17, 1965. 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 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 current 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 $3.5 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 claimants' desired use of the property was allowed under the standards in effect when their family acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim,

the department acknowledges 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 when Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the property on April 9, 1987, and when Marjorie Clevenger acquired the property on January 6, 1993.

At the time Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the subject property in April 1987 and Marjorie Clevenger acquired the subject property in January 1993, it was subject to Yamhill County's acknowledged comprehensive plan and EF-40 zone.[8] That zone generally required a 40-acre minimum lot size for the creation of new lots or parcels in conjunction with farm use, and allowed smaller parcels, subject to compliance with specified criteria. The claimants' desired use of the property would have been subject to compliance with Goal 3, and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through the County's acknowledged EF-40 zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.[9] In April 1987 and January 1993, ORS 215.263 (1985 and 1991 editions) required that divisions of land in EFU zones be "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area" or not smaller than the minimum size in the county's acknowledged plan. ORS 215.283(1)(f) (1985 and 1991 editions) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they were determined to be compatible with farm use, not interfere seriously with accepted farm practices, not materially alter the stability of the land use pattern in the area and be situated on generally unsuitable land for the production of farm crops and livestock.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired division and development of the subject property were allowed under the standards in effect when Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the subject property on April 9, 1987, and when Marjorie Clevenger acquired the property on January 6, 1993.

In addition to the applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 5, in effect on April 9, 1987, and January 6, 1993, 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.

---

[8] Yamhill County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on June 12, 1980.

[9] After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the statewide planning goals, the goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

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 their claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply 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 108.58-acre subject property into 5-acre parcels and to their development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or 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 Dwayne and Wayne Clevenger and Margaret Long acquired the property on April 9, 1987, and when Marjorie Clevenger acquired the property on January 6, 1993.

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 April 9, 1987, and January 6, 1993. On those dates, the property was subject to Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented through Yamhill County's acknowledged EF-40 zone, and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that the subject property may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of the property unless the 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.

6. Nothing in this report or the state's final order for this claim constitutes any determination of ownership by the State of Oregon as to submerged or submersible lands, or as to public rights to the use of waters of the state.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on June 29, 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.