



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 17, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Lane Shetterly, Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M130929

Claimants: Dennis F. and Martha A. Glaser

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. M130929
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Martha A. Glaser, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Martha A. Glaser (the Claimant)

Property: Township 2N, Range 1W, Section 16C, Tax lot 600, Multnomah 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 Martha Glaser's development of a dwelling and accessory structures on the 2.01-acre subject property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after October 14, 1975. These land use regulations will not apply to Martha Glaser 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 October 14, 1975.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Martha Glaser to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 14, 1975. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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.


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 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 17th day of August, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:


Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 17th 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.”

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. M130929
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Dennis F. Glase, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Dennis F. Glase (the Claimant)

Property: Township 2N, Range 1W, Section 16C, Tax lot 600
Multnomah 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 17th day of August, 2007.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:


Janice K. Dean, SSD Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 17th day of August, 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**

August 17, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M130929

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: Martha A. Glaser
Dennis F. Glaser

MAILING ADDRESS: 31915 Seven Mile Lane
Tangent, Oregon 97389

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 2N, Range 1W, Section 16C
Tax lot 600
Multnomah County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 20, 2006

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ November 13, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Martha and Dennis Glaser, seek compensation in the amount of \$225,000 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 develop a dwelling and accessory structures on the 2.01-acre subject property. The subject property is located at the coordinates listed above on NW Charlton Road, on Sauvie Island, in Multnomah 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 Martha Glaser's development of a dwelling and accessory structures on this 2.01-acre subject property: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after

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.

October 14, 1975. These laws will not apply to Martha Glaser 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 October 14, 1975.

The department has further determined that the claim is not valid as to Dennis Glaser because he has not established his ownership of the subject property. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On June 6, 2006, 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 November 20, 2006 for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies the statewide planning goals, ORS 197 and 215 and all administrative rules 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 Martha Glaser acquired the subject property on October 14, 1975, as reflected by a deed of gift included with the claim. Claimant Dennis Glaser states in the claim that he acquired an ownership interest in the property on March 15, 1974. However, the claim does not include any documentation to establish that Dennis Glaser is an owner of the subject property. The Multnomah County Assessor’s Office confirms Martha Glaser’s current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

Claimant Martha Glaser is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of October 14, 1975. Claimant Dennis Glaser 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 acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimants desire to develop a dwelling and accessory structures on the 2.01-acre subject property, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.²

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 subject property is zoned EFU by Multnomah County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the subject property is “agricultural land” as defined by Goal 3.³ Goal 3

² The claimants summarily list numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but do not establish how the laws either apply to the claimants’ desired use of the subject property or restrict its use with the effect of reducing its fair market value. On their face, most of the regulations either do not apply to the subject property or do not restrict the use of the subject property with the effect of reducing its fair market value. This report addresses only those regulations that the department finds are applicable to and restrict the desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants’ description of their desired use.

³ The subject property is “agricultural land” because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

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 215.284 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on EFU-zoned land.

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, 1994.⁴

Claimant Martha Glaser acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Multnomah County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251.⁵ At that time, the property was zoned F2 by Multnomah County. However, because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when Martha Glaser acquired the subject property on October 14, 1975, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to Martha Glaser's property when she acquired it.⁶ As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on October 14, 1975, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use" under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1973 edition). Non-farm dwellings were subject to compliance with ORS 215.213(3) (1973 edition).

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired development of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when Martha Glaser acquired the property on October 14, 1975.

⁴ 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.

⁵ Multnomah County's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on November 6, 1980.

⁶ The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's comprehensive plan and implementing regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, rev. den 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to such 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).

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements and dwelling standards established by Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, do not allow Martha Glaser's desired development of the subject property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the her desired use of the subject property complies with the standards for development under the requirements of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Martha Glaser acquired the subject property on October 14, 1975.

As explained in Section V.(1) above, the claimant, Dennis Glaser, is not an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Therefore, no laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict his use of the subject real property with the effect of reducing the fair market value of the 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 Martha Glaser's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to Martha Glaser'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 Martha Glaser 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 \$225,000 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 comparative market analysis.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Martha Glaser, who acquired the subject property on October 14, 1975, and Dennis Glaser. As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, claimant Dennis Glaser, is not an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined in ORS 197.352(11)(C). Therefore, no laws restrict his use of the subject property with the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property.

Under ORS 197.352, Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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 \$225,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which Martha Glaser's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when she acquired the property, 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 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 Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Multnomah County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Martha Glaser acquired the subject property on October 14, 1975, these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after she acquired the 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 with the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect in 1975, the statutory, goal and rule restrictions on division and development of the subject property were not in effect when Martha Glaser acquired it, and therefore, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when Martha Glaser acquired the subject property in 1975 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, Dennis Glaser is not an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). Therefore, the issue of whether any laws are exempt from ORS 197.352 is not relevant to him.

Other laws in effect when Martha Glaser acquired the subject property are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to her use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to her 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 property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When Martha Glaser 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 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 Martha Glaser'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 findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department do not restrict Dennis Glaser's desired use of the subject property because he is not an owner of the subject property. The department has further determined that laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict Martha Glaser'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 \$225,000. 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 Martha Glaser'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 Martha Glaser to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on October 14, 1975.

Conclusions

Based on the record before the department, Dennis Glaser 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 because he is not an owner of the subject property. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied as to Dennis Glaser.

The department otherwise 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 Martha Glaser's development of a dwelling and accessory structures on the 2.01-acre subject property: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after October 14, 1975. These land use regulations will not apply to Martha Glaser 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 October 14, 1975.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to Martha Glaser to use the property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on October 14, 1975. On that date, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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 Martha Glaser 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.
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 July 20, 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.