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

September 28, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director

Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M131169

Claimants: Eldon and Hope Buckner

Enclosed, in regard to the above-referenced claim for compensation under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352), is the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Final Order.

This Final Staff Report and Recommendation and the Final Order constitute the final decision on this claim. No further action will be taken on this matter.

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES,
THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF
THE STATE OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR	)	FINAL ORDER
COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352	)	CLAIM NO. M131169
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF	)	
Eldon and Hope Buckner, CLAIMANTS	)	

Claimants: Eldon and Hope Buckner (the Claimants)

Property: Township 8S, Range 38E, Section 24, Tax lot 200
Township 8S, Range 39E, Section 19, Tax lot 300
Baker 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 Eldon and Hope Buckner's division of the approximately 40-acre southern portion of tax lot 200 into eight parcels and tax lot 300 into eight parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired each tax lot. These land use regulations 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 they acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, and when they acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973.

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 August 1, 1972, for tax lot 200 and on October 31, 1973, for tax lot 300. On October 31, 1973, tax lot 300 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect, including the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

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 Manager for the Measure 37 Services Division 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 Manager of the Measure 37 Services Unit 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:
Cora R. Parker, Acting Director

Michael Morrissey, Manager
DLCD, Measure 37 Division
Dated this 28th day of September, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Carla Ploederer, Manager
DAS, Measure 37 Services Unit
Dated this 28th day of September, 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."

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

September 28, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M131169
NAMES OF CLAIMANTS:	Eldon and Hope Buckner
MAILING ADDRESS:	13967 Hunt Mountain Lane Baker City, Oregon 97814
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 8S, Range 38 E, Section 24 Tax lot 200 Township 8S, Range 39E, Section 19 Tax lot 300 Baker County
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	November 24, 2006
DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:[1]	May 17, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, Eldon and Hope Buckner, seek compensation in the amount of $1,345,575 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 approximately 40-acre southern portion of tax lot 200 into eight parcels and tax lot 300 into eight parcels, and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel.[2] The subject property is located near Haines, in Baker County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is valid. Department staff recommends that, in lieu of compensation, the requirements of the following state laws enforced by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (the Commission) or the department not apply to Eldon and Hope Buckner's division of the approximately 40-acre southern portion

[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.

[2] The subject property includes two tax lots. Tax lot 200 consists of 175.45 acres and tax lot 300 consists of 36.74 acres.

of tax lot 200 into eight parcels, and tax lot 300 into eight parcels, or to their development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired each tax lot. 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 they acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, and tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 6, 2007, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, no written comments were received in response to the 15-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 24, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 3, ORS 215, OAR 660 and "any other laws enacted since date of ownership" as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), based on land use regulations enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

ORS 197.352 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for "owners" as that term is defined in ORS 197.352. ORS 197.352(11)(C) defines "owner" as "the present owner of the property, or any interest therein."

Findings of Fact

The claimants, Eldon and Hope Buckner, acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, as reflected by a land sale contract (entitled escrow agreement) and a fulfillment deed recorded January 31, 1975, included with the claim; and tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973, as reflected by a land sale contract (entitled escrow agreement) and a fulfillment deed recorded March 6, 1978, included with the claim. The Baker County Assessor's Office confirms the claimants' current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, Eldon and Hope Buckner, are "owners" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of August 1, 1972, for tax lot 200, and as of October 31, 1973, for tax lot 300.

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 approximately 40-acre southern portion of tax lot 200 into eight parcels and tax lot 300 into eight parcels and to develop a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel, and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.[3]

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 EFU by Baker County as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660,

[3] 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 claimants' property or do not restrict the use of the claimants' 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 claimants' desired use of the subject property, based on the claimants' description of their desired use.

division 33, because the claimants' property is "agricultural land" as defined by Goal 3.[4] 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 development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels 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). Baker County's EFU zone generally requires a minimum of 80 acres for the creation of new lots or parcels if the property has valid primary water rights, 160 acres for non-irrigated land or two acres for each dry acre less than 80 acres for land partially covered by valid primary water rights. ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone. Tax lot 200 is irrigated with water rights and would require a minimum of 80 acres for the creation of a new parcel. Because the eastern half of tax lot 300 is irrigated with water rights, the property would require a minimum of approximately 124 acres for the creation of a new parcel.

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.[5]

Tax lot 200 is also subject to Baker County's Big Game Habitat Overlay zone. Property that is zoned EFU and in the Big Game Habitat Overlay zone generally requires a minimum of 40 acres for a non-farm or lot of record dwelling. Baker County's Big Game Habitat Overlay zone was adopted in 1986 and acknowledged to implement Goal 5.[6] Under Goal 5, as adopted and effective on January 25, 1975, local governments were required to inventory land and adopt programs to protect natural resources and to conserve scenic, historic and open space resources. Prior to the adoption of local government programs, the requirements of Goal 5 were directly applicable to individual properties through the land use application process. Specifically, Goal 5 required applicants to establish how the natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open space resources on individual properties would be protected through the proposed development. Under OAR 660, division 16, requirements and application procedures for complying with Goal 5 became effective on June 29, 1981. OAR 660, division 23, replaced division 16, established additional procedures and requirements for complying with Goal 5, and became effective on September 1, 1996.

---

[4] The claimants' property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I–VI soils.

[5] 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.

[6] The Baker County Big Game and Habitat Overlay zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 5 on May 16, 1986.

The claimants acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

The claimants acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973, after the adoption of Senate Bill 100 (Chapter 80, Oregon Laws 1973) effective on October 5, 1973, but before the adoption of the statewide planning goals, effective on January 25, 1975. At that time, the subject property was not zoned by Baker County.

During the period between October 5, 1973, and January 25, 1975, ORS 197.175(1) and 197.280 (1973 editions) required, in addition to any local plan or zoning provisions, that cities and counties exercise their planning responsibilities in accordance with the interim land use planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition). *Petersen v. Klamath Falls*, 279 Or 249 (1977); *see also*, *Meeker v. Board of Comm'rs*, 287 Or 665 (1979) (review of a subdivision is an exercise of planning responsibilities requiring application of the goals); *State Housing Council v. Lake Oswego*, 48 Or App. 525 (1981) (noting that while "[l]and use planning responsibility is not defined in ORS ch 197, the Supreme Court has interpreted that term as including annexation approvals, *subdivision approvals* [emphasis added] and partition approvals") citing *Petersen*, *Meeker* and *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 285 Or 427 (1980). The claimants' desired use includes subdivision of their land. If the claimants had sought to create that use in 1973, as a matter of law, the use would have been subject to the interim planning goals at ORS 215.515.[7]

The following interim goals are directly applicable to this claim: "To preserve the quality of the air, water and *land* [emphasis added] resources of the state"; "To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops"; "To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use"; "To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters"; "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system including all modes of transportation: Air, water, rail, highway and mass transit and recognizing differences in the social costs in the various modes of transportation"; and "To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development." ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

One of the interim goals was to "conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops." Soil types are a determinant of prime farm land. Eighty-eight percent (approximately 32 acres) of the soils on the 36.74-acre tax lot 300 are rated as "prime" by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS).[8]

---

[7] The "interim" land use goals are set forth in ORS 215.515(1)(a) to (j) (1973 edition) as follows: (a) "To preserve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state," (b) "To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources," (c) "To provide for the recreational needs of citizens of the state and visitors," (d) "To conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops," (e) "To provide for the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use," (f) "To protect life and property in areas subject to floods, landslides and other natural disasters," (g) "To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system including all modes of transportation: Air, water, rail, highway and mass transit and recognizing differences in the social costs in the various modes of transportation," (h) "To develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development," (i) "To diversify and improve the economy of the state" and (j) "To ensure that the development of properties within the state is commensurate with the character and the physical limitations of the land." ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

[8] NRCS soil survey for Baker County.

No information has been provided establishing whether or to what extent the claimants' desired division of tax lot 300 for residential development complies with the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition) in effect at the time the claimants acquired the property on October 31, 1973. In particular, it is unclear whether division and development of the prime farm land portion of that tax lot could satisfy the interim goal requirement to "conserve prime farm lands for the production of crops."

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired tax lot 200 in 1972 and tax lot 300 on October 31,1973, and do not allow the claimants' desired division or development of the property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimants acquired the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimants' desired use of tax lot 300 complies with the interim planning goals in effect when they acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the claimants have identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimants' use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property, that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When 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.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, ORS 197.352(1) requires that the land use regulations (described in Section V.(2) of this report) must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of $1,345,575 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, included with the claim.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimants are Eldon and Hope Buckner who acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, and tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973. 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 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 property is a reduction of $1,345,575.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when the claimants 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 subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

ORS 197.352 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under ORS 197.352(3), certain types of laws are exempt from ORS 197.352.

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, which Baker County has implemented through its current EFU and Big Game Habitat Overlay zones. With the exception of applicable provisions of ORS 215, including the interim land use planning goals, in effect on October 31, 1973, all of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants 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 division and development of tax lot 200 were in effect when the claimants acquired it in 1972. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). Provisions of ORS 215, including the interim statewide planning goals in effect when the claimants acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to that tax lot.

Laws in effect when the claimants acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimants' use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimants' use of the subject property that have not been identified in the claim. In some cases, it will not be possible to know which laws apply to a use of the subject property until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the 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. 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 their use of the subject property.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

ORS 197.352(1) provides for payment of compensation to an owner of private real property if the Commission or the department has enforced laws that restrict the use of the subject property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply the law in order to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the subject property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director of the department must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the 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 $1,345,575. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimants' desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when they acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Eldon and Hope Buckner to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time they acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, and at the time they acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973.

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 Eldon and Hope Buckner's division of the approximately 40-acre southern portion of tax lot 200 into eight parcels and tax lot 300 into eight parcels or to their development of a dwelling on each resulting undeveloped parcel: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 5, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 16, 23, and 33, enacted or adopted after the claimants acquired each tax lot. These land use regulations 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 they acquired tax lot 200 on August 1, 1972, and when they acquired tax lot 300 on October 31, 1973.

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 August 1, 1972, for tax lot 200 and on October 31, 1973, for tax lot 300. On October 31, 1973, tax lot 300 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect, including the interim planning goals set forth in ORS 215.515 (1973 edition).

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 August 28, 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. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.