



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>

November 1, 2007

To: Interested Persons

From: Cora R. Parker, Acting Director



Re: Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352) Claim Number M131298

Claimant: Maurice Brooks

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. M131298
(BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF)
Maurice Brooks, CLAIMANT)

Claimant: Maurice Brooks (the Claimant)

Property: Township 20S, Range 3W, Section 3, Tax lots 600 and 700
Lane 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 for tax lot 700 as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

The Claim is approved for tax lot 600 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 Maurice Brooks' development of storage facilities on tax lot 600: the applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, adopted after February 20, 1978. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant's development of tax lot 600 only to the extent necessary to allow him to use that tax lot as described in this report, and only to the extent that the use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lot 600 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 20, 1978. On that date, tax lot 600 was subject to the applicable provisions of the statewide planning goals, and in particular, the provisions of Goal 14 in effect at that time.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that tax lot 600 may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of that tax lot unless the

claimant 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 tax lot 600 imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of tax lot 600 by the claimant 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 claimant to use tax lot 600, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 tax lot 600 by the claimant.

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 1st day of November, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:



Carla Ploederer, Manager
DAS, Measure 37 Services Unit

Dated this 1st day of November, 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**

November 1, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M131298

NAME OF CLAIMANT: Maurice Brooks

MAILING ADDRESS: 3331 Franklin Boulevard
Eugene, Oregon 97403

PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION: Township 20S, Range 3W, Section 3
Tax lots 600 and 700
Lane County

OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION: Frank Walker & Associates
PO Box 7170
Salem, Oregon 97301

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: November 27, 2006

DEADLINE FOR FINAL ACTION:¹ May 20, 2008

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Maurice Brooks, seeks compensation in the amount of \$2 million for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to develop storage facilities on the 13.64-acre subject property.² The subject property is located near Highway 99 and Walker Road, near Creswell, in Lane 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

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 contiguous tax lots. Tax lot 600 consists of 4.63 acres and tax lot 700 consists of 9.01 acres.

not apply to Maurice Brooks' development of storage facilities on tax lot 600: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-004-0040, adopted after February 20, 1978. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use tax lot 600 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978.

The department has further determined that the claim is not valid as to tax lot 700 because the claimant's desired use of that tax lot was prohibited under the laws in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 700 in 2002. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 12, 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 ORS 197.175(1) and 197.280 (1973) 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 claimant, Maurice Brooks, acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978, as reflected by an assignment of contract and deed included with the claim. The claimant asserts he acquired tax lot 700 on February 20, 1978; however, he has not submitted any documentation to support that acquisition date. According to warranty deeds included with the claim, Maurice Brooks acquired an ownership interest in tax lot 700 on May 2, 2002, as trustee of the Brooks Joint Trust.³ The Lane County Assessor’s Office confirms the claimant’s current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Maurice Brooks, is an “owner” of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C), as of November 20, 1978, for tax lot 600 and as of May 2, 2002, for tax lot 700.

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 claimant’s 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 claimant or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to develop storage facilities on the 13.64-acre subject property and that current land use regulations prevent the desired use.⁴

The claim is based on the provisions of state law that regulate rural residential zoning. Tax lot 600 is zoned Rural Residential (RR-5) and tax lot 700 is zoned Rural Industrial (RI) by Lane County.

³ Absent documentation from the claimant to establish that he acquired tax lot 700 on February 20, 1978, the department must rely on the available documentation to establish the date of acquisition.

⁴ The claimant summarily lists numerous state land use laws as applicable to this claim, but does not establish how the laws either apply to the claimant’s 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 claimant’s property or do not restrict the claimant’s desired use of the 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 claimant’s desired use of the subject property, based on the claimant’s description of his desired use.

The RR-5 zone is a rural residential zone, in accordance with Goal 14, which prohibits urban use of rural lands. The county's RR-5 zone requires five acres for the creation of any new lot or parcel and was in effect and applied to the subject property on or before October 4, 2000.

Goal 14 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that local comprehensive plans identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land in order to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In 2000, as a result of a 1986 Oregon Supreme Court decision,⁵ the Commission amended Goal 14 and adopted OAR 660-004-0040 (Application of Goal 14 to Rural Residential Areas), which was effective on October 4, 2000.

The rule states that if a county rural residential zone in effect on October 4, 2000, specifies a minimum lot size of two acres or more, the area of any new lot or parcel shall equal or exceed the minimum lot size then in effect (OAR 660-004-0040(7)(c)).⁶ Because Lane County's RR-5 zone was in effect on October 4, 2000, and requires a minimum lot size of five acres, the minimum lot size for all new lots or parcels must equal or exceed five acres.

The RI zone is a rural industrial zone in accordance with Goal 14. That zone establishes standards to allow industrial and development uses that include areas for small scale industrial uses and for industries that rely on rural location in order to process rural resources. The RI zone does not require a minimum lot size.

The claimant acquired tax lot 600 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Lane County's land use regulations to be in compliance with statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, tax lot 600 was zoned General Rural District (GR10). However, because the county's plan had not been acknowledged at that time, tax lot 600 was recognized as resource land when the claimant acquired it in 1978. The statewide planning goals, and particularly Goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands), in addition to Goal 14, would have applied directly to tax lot 600 had he sought the desired use at the time he acquired that tax lot.⁷ Alternatively, the claimant would have been required to establish a basis for an exception to compliance with those goals pursuant to the Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) exceptions process. However, through the county's acknowledgement process, tax lot 600 was ultimately acknowledged as exceptions land pursuant to Goal 2, and zoned by the county for rural residential use. Therefore, while the county could now require that tax lot 600 be evaluated as resource land, as would have been required in 1978,

⁵ *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

⁶ Some relief from this provision is available for lots or parcels having more than one permanent habitable dwelling pursuant to OAR 660-004-0040(7)(h). The rule also provides that a county's minimum lot size requirement in a rural residential zone shall not be amended to allow a smaller minimum lot size without approval of an exception to Goal 14 (OAR 660-004-0040(6)).

⁷ 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 land use 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 569 (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 directly applied 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. *Foster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992); *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

because of its ultimate designation as rural residential exceptions land, the county could also require that the claimant's desired use be subject to compliance directly with Goal 14.

As adopted in 1975, Goal 14 was, as it is today, "to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural or urban land use." The claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired development of tax lot 600 could have satisfied Goal 14 had he sought that use when he acquired that tax lot in 1978.⁸

The claimant acquired tax lot 700 on May 2, 2002, after the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations, as identified above.

Conclusions

The minimum lot size requirements for rural residential lots or parcels established by Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040 were adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 600 in 1978 and do not allow the desired division of the property. However, when the claimant acquired tax lot 600 in 1978, the statewide planning goals, and in particular, the general requirements of Goal 14, applied directly to that tax lot. The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired level of development would have been permitted under the laws in effect in 1978 when the claimant acquired tax lot 600. Laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tax lot 700 in 2002 do not restrict the claimant's desired use of that tax lot relative to when the claimant acquired it in 2002.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the use that the claimant has identified. There may be other laws that currently apply to the claimant's use of the subject property, and that may continue to apply to the claimant's 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 claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

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

Findings of Fact

The claim includes an estimate of \$2 million as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. This amount is based on the claimant's assessment of the subject property's value.

⁸ Lane County's plan was acknowledged for compliance with Goal 14 on June 16, 1983.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Maurice Brooks who acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978, and acquired tax lot 700 on May 2, 2002. No state laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tax lot 700 restrict the use of that tax lot relative to the uses allowed in 2002. Therefore, the fair market value of tax lot 700 has not been reduced as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of tax lot 600 and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws adopted since the claimant acquired tax lot 600 restrict the claimant's desired use of that tax lot. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of \$2 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lot 600 was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired it, 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 tax lot 600 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 Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, which Lane County has implemented through its RR-5 and RI zones. With the exception of provisions of Goal 14, adopted before the claimant acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978, these state land use regulations were not in effect when the claimant acquired that tax lot. As set forth in Section V.(2) of this report, all of the state land use regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of tax lot 700 were in effect when the claimant acquired that tax lot in 2002.

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 the goal and rule restrictions on development of tax lot 600 are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 600. Provisions of Goal 14 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 600 in 1978 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

All of the state land use regulations that restrict the claimant's desired use of tax lot 700 were in effect when the claimant acquired it. Therefore, these state land use regulations are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E), which exempts laws in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 700.

Other laws in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 600, including direct application of the applicable provisions of the statewide planning goals, are also exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. There may be other laws that continue to apply to the claimant's use of tax lot 600 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 tax lot 600 until there is a specific proposal for that use. When the claimant seeks a building or development permit to carry out a specific use, it may become evident that other state laws apply to that use. In some cases, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D).

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the use that the claimant has 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 claimant should be aware that the less information he has provided to the department in his claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of tax lot 600.

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 the claimant's desired use of tax lot 700 relative to what was permitted when the claimant acquired it in 2002 and do not reduce the fair market value of tax lot 700. All state laws restricting the use of tax lot 700 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). The department further finds laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of tax lot 600. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by \$2 million. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating that the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of the subject property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. In order to determine a specific amount of compensation due for this claim, it would also be necessary to verify whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lot 600 was allowed under the standards in effect when he 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 tax lot 600 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 Maurice Brooks to use tax lot 600 for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on February 20, 1978.

Conclusions

Based on the record and the foregoing findings and conclusions, the claimant 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 as to tax lot 700 because no state land use regulations restrict the claimant's desired use of tax lot 700 relative to uses permitted when he acquired it, with the effect of reducing the property's fair market value. Therefore, the department recommends that this claim be denied as to tax lot 700.

The department otherwise recommends that the claim be approved for tax lot 600, 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 Maurice Brooks' development of storage facilities on tax lot 600: the applicable provisions of Goal 14 and OAR 660-004-0040, adopted after February 20, 1978. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant's development of tax lot 600 only to the extent necessary to allow him to use that tax lot as described in this report, and only to the extent that the use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 600 on February 20, 1978.
2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lot 600 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on February 20, 1978. On that date, tax lot 600 was subject to the applicable provisions of the statewide planning goals, and in particular, the provisions of Goal 14 in effect at that time.
3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that tax lot 600 may not be used without a permit, license or other form of authorization or consent, the order will not authorize the use of that tax lot unless the claimant 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 tax lot 600 imposed by private parties.
4. Any use of tax lot 600 by the claimant 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 claimant to use tax lot 600, it may be necessary for him 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 claimant 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 tax lot 600 by the claimant.

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 27, 2007. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant's 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.