



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>

October 5, 2007

To: Interested Persons
From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M131269

Claimant: John and Theresa Nakai

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. M131269
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
John and Theresa Nakai, CLAIMANTS)

Claimants: John and Theresa Nakai (the Claimants)

Property: Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 17, Tax lot 1100, Washington 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 John and Theresa Nakai's division of the 79.97-acre subject property into seven parcels, to their development of a dwelling on each parcel or to their development of a community water system: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 11, and 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 John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 24, 1995. Goal 11 will not apply only to the extent that it prohibits the claimants from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Theresa Nakai is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect when John

Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 24, 1995. On June 26, 1981, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11 and ORS 215 then in effect. On June 24, 1995, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215, OAR 660, divisions 11, and 33, 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 Acting 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 Manager for 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
DLCD

Dated this 5th day of October, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



Carla Ploederer, Manager
DAS, Measure 37 Services Unit

Dated this 5th day of October, 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**

October 5, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M131269

NAMES OF CLAIMANTS: John and Theresa Nakai

MAILING ADDRESS: 6582 Corrine Circle
Huntington Beach, California 92647

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 1S, Range 3W, Section 17
Tax lot 1100
Washington County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 24, 2007

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ May 17, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimants, John and Theresa Nakai, seek compensation in the amount of \$3,338,823 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 79.97-acre subject property into seven parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop a community water system. The subject property is located at the geographic coordinates listed above, near Cornelius, in Washington 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 John and Theresa Nakai's division of the 79.97-acre subject property into seven parcels, to their development of a dwelling on each parcel and to their development of a community water system: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 11 (Public Facilities and Services), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules

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.

(OAR) 660, divisions 11, and 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 John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 24, 1995. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Theresa Nakai is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 10, 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 27, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies Goal 3, ORS 215, House Bill 3661 and provisions of Washington County zoning as the basis for the claim. Only laws that were enacted or adopted prior to December 2, 2004, are the basis for this claim.

Conclusions

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

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

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

Findings of Fact

Claimant John Nakai acquired an interest in the subject property from his mother, Minnie Nakai, on June 26, 1981, as reflected by a decree of final distribution for the estate of Minnie Nakai, included with the claim. John Nakai conveyed an interest in the property to his wife, claimant Theresa Nakai, on August 24, 1995, as reflected by a quitclaim deed included with the claim. John Nakai’s parents, John M. and Minnie Nakai, acquired the subject property on July 20, 1956, as evidenced by warranty deed included with the claim. The Washington County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimants’ current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, John and Theresa Nakai, are “owners” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). John Nakai has been an owner since June 26, 1981, and Theresa Nakai has been an owner since August 24, 1995. John M. and Minnie Nakai are “family members” as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A) and acquired the subject property on July 20, 1956.

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 79.97-acre subject property into seven parcels, to develop a dwelling on each parcel and to develop a community water system, 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 Agriculture and Forest (AF-20) by Washington 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 3.² 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.

² The claimants’ property is “agricultural land” because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.213, 215.263 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, prohibit the division of EFU-zoned land in marginal lands counties 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). ORS 215.263 (2005 edition) establishes standards for the creation of new parcels for non-farm uses and dwellings allowed in an EFU zone.

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 in marginal lands county under ORS 215.213. OAR 660-033-0130(4)(e) (applicable to non-farm dwellings in marginal lands counties) became effective on August 7, 1993, and was amended to comply with ORS 215.284(4) on March 1, 1994.³

Goal 11, relating to public facilities and services, which also became effective on January 25, 1975, generally prohibits urban levels of public facilities and services on lands that are outside an urban growth boundary. Goal 11 has two components. The first component of the goal restricts an owner's use of land outside of an urban growth boundary by prohibiting the owner from utilizing urban levels of public services or facilities. The second component restricts service providers from extending urban facilities to serve property outside an urban growth boundary. The former can restrict a claimant's use of property. The latter is a restriction on service providers. Goal 11 and OAR 660, division 11, (adopted in 1984 and amended in 1998) would apply to the claimants' use of the subject property only to the extent that they would restrict the claimants' development of urban-level public or community sewer or water facilities on the subject property.

The claimants' family acquired the subject property in 1956, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations. No county zoning applied to the subject property in 1956.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 11, and 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property. These laws restrict the use of the subject property relative to the uses allowed when the claimants' family acquired the property.

Those elements of Goal 11 that prohibit a public service provider from extending or establishing public facilities or services outside of a UGB restrict the actions of local government rather than the claimants' use of the property. That component of Goal 11 is not subject to ORS 197.352 and will continue to apply to those service providers. Only the general prohibition under Goal

³ 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.

11 on the claimants' establishment of an urban level of public facilities and services is subject to ORS 197.352 and restricts the claimants' desired use of his 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 \$3,338,823 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 John and Theresa Nakai whose family members acquired the subject property in 1956. Under ORS 197.352, the claimants are due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the 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 \$3,338,823.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department since 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 Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 11, and 33, which Washington County has implemented through its current AF-20 zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimants' family acquired the subject property.

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 July 20, 1956. 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 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 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 \$3,338,823. 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 the claimants' family 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 John Nakai to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and to allow Theresa Nakai to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time she acquired the property on August 24, 1995.

John Nakai acquired the subject property after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Washington County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251.⁴ At that time, the property was zoned AF-10 by Washington County, which established a 10-acre minimum lot size for the creation of new lots or parcels. However, because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when John Nakai acquired the

⁴ Washington County's comprehensive plan was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goals 3 and 4 on July 30, 1984.

subject property on June 26, 1981, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to the claimants' property when he acquired it.⁵

As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. The Goal 3 standard for land divisions involving property where the local zoning was not acknowledged required that the resulting parcels must be of a size that is "appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise within the area." Further, ORS 215.263 (1973 edition) only authorized the partition of land subject to EFU zoning, and required that all divisions of land subject to EFU zoning comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.243 (Agricultural Land Use Policy). Thus, John Nakai's opportunity to divide the subject property when he acquired it in 1981 was limited to land divisions that were consistent with Goal 3, which required that the resulting parcels be (1) appropriate for the continuation of the existing commercial agricultural enterprise in the area and (2) shown to comply with the legislative intent set forth in ORS 215.

Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on June 26, 1981, 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).

Goal 11, as adopted in 1975, was "to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development. It provided that "public facilities and services for rural areas should be provided at levels appropriate for rural use only and should not support urban uses."

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 John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981.

At the time Theresa Nakai acquired the subject property, it was zoned AF-20 by Washington County and subject to the current lot size and dwelling standards under Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, and as described in Section V.(2) of this report.

In addition to the provisions of Goals 3 and 11 and ORS 215 in effect when John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and the provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 11, and 33, in effect when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 25, 1995, there may be other laws that continue to apply to their use of the property that have not been

⁵ 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).

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.

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 their 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.

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 John and Theresa Nakai's division of the 79.97-acre subject property into seven parcels, to their development of a dwelling on each parcel or to their development of a community water system: applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215 and OAR 660, divisions 11, and 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 John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 24, 1995. Goal 11 will not apply only to the extent that it prohibits the claimants from establishing an urban level of public facilities and services to serve the development of the property. Goal 11 will continue to apply to public service providers seeking to extend or establish public facilities to serve the subject property. The department acknowledges that the relief to which Theresa Nakai is entitled under ORS 197.352 will not allow her to use the subject property in the manner set forth in the claim.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to claimants to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect when John Nakai acquired the property on June 26, 1981, and when Theresa Nakai acquired the property on August 24, 1995. On June 26, 1981, the property was subject to applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11 and ORS 215 then in effect. On June 24, 1995, the property was subject to the applicable provisions of Goals 3 and 11, ORS 215, OAR 660, divisions 11, and 33, 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 September 5, 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.