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

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Darrell Brandt, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M121729

Claimant: Darrell Brandt (the Claimant)

Property: Township 8S, Range 5W, Section 28, Tax lots 700, 701, 702, 703, 1001 and 1002, Polk County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimant by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimant submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is denied as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report.

This Order is entered by the Deputy Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR chapter 125, division 145, and by the Deputy Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR chapter 125, division 145, and ORS chapter 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION:
Lane Shetterly, Director

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 16th day of June, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 16th day of June, 2006.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL OR OTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

You are entitled, or may be entitled, to the following judicial remedies:

1. Judicial review under ORS 183.484: Judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the service of this order. A petition for judicial review under ORS 183.484 may be filed in the Circuit Court for Marion County or the Circuit Court in the county in which you reside.

2. A cause of action under ORS 197.352 (Measure 37 (2004)): If a land use regulation continues to apply to the subject property more than 180 days after the present owner of the property has made written demand for compensation under ORS 197.352[1], 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)

[1] By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION UNDER ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) OF Darrell Brandt, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M121729

Claimant: Darrell Brandt (the Claimant)

Property: Township 8S, Range 5W, Section 28, Tax lot 1000, Polk County (the Property)

Claim: The demand for compensation and any supporting information received from the Claimant by the State of Oregon (the Claim).

Claimant submitted the Claim to the State of Oregon under ORS 197.352. Under OAR 125-145-0010 *et seq.*, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) referred the Claim to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as the regulating entity. This order is based on the record herein, including the Findings and Conclusions set forth in the Final Staff Report and Recommendation of DLCD (the DLCD Report) attached to and by this reference incorporated into this order.

ORDER

The Claim is approved as to laws administered by DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) for the reasons set forth in the DLCD Report, and subject to the following terms:

1. In lieu of compensation under ORS 197.352, the State of Oregon will not apply the following laws to Darrell Brandt's division of tax lot 1000 or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use tax lot 1000 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 1000 on November 18, 1969.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lot 1000 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on November 18, 1969.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that tax lot 1000 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 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 1000 imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of tax lot 1000 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 1000, 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 1000 by the claimant.

This Order is entered by the Deputy Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the Deputy Administrator for the State Services Division of the DAS as a final order of DAS under ORS 197.352, OAR 125, division 145, and ORS 293.

FOR DLCD AND THE LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:
Lane Shetterly, Director

Cora R. Parker, Deputy Director
DLCD
Dated this 16th day of June, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 16th day of June, 2006.

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[1], 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."

[1] By order of the Marion County Circuit Court, "all time lines under Measure 37 [were] suspended indefinitely" on October 25, 2005. This suspension was lifted on March 13, 2006 by the court. As a result, a period of 139 days (the number of days the time lines were suspended) has been added to the 180-day time period under ORS 197.352(6) for claims that were pending with the state on October 25, 2005.

ORS 197.352 (BALLOT MEASURE 37) CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION

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

June 16, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M121729
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Darrell Brandt
MAILING ADDRESS:	13275 Monmouth Highway Monmouth, Oregon 97361
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 8S, Range 5W, Section 28 Tax lots 700, 701, 702, 703, 1000, 1001 and 1002 Polk County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Frank D. Walker PO Box 7170 Salem, Oregon 97303
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	August 4, 2005
180-DAY DEADLINE:	June 19, 2006[1]

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Darrell Brandt, seeks compensation in the amount of $254,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimant desires compensation or the right to divide the subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The subject property is located at the locational coordinates listed above, near Monmouth, in Polk 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 for tax lot 1000 and is not valid for tax lots 700, 701, 702, 703, 1001 and 1002 . 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 Darrell Brandt's division of tax lot 1000 and to his development of a dwelling on each parcel:

[1] This date reflects 180 days from the date the claim was submitted, as extended by the 139 days that all timelines under Measure 37 were suspended during the pendency of *MacPherson v. Dept. of Admin. Srvcs.*, 340 Or 117 (2006).

applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use tax lot 1000 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 1000 on November 18, 1969.

The department has determined that the claim is not valid, and that the claimant is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 for tax lot 1002 because the claimant's desired use of tax lot 1002 was prohibited under the laws in effect when the claimant acquired that tax lot on August 8, 2000. The department has further determined that the claim is not valid for tax lots 700, 702 and 1001 because the claimant is not an owner of these tax lots and is not valid for tax lots 701 and 703 because the claimant has not submitted documentation establishing when he became an owner of these tax lots. Because the claimant is not an owner of tax lots 700, 702 and 1001 and because the claimant has not established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the claimant is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 for these tax lots. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On September 19, 2005, 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, four written comments, evidence or information were received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comments do not address whether the claim meets the criteria for relief under ORS 197.352. Comments concerning the effects a use of the subject property may have on surrounding areas are generally not something that the department is able to consider in determining whether to waive a state law. If funds do become available to pay compensation, then such effects may become relevant in determining which claims to pay compensation for instead of waive a state law. (See the comment letters in the department's claim file.)

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

ORS 197.352(5) requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date, or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or

2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of Measure 37 (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

This claim was submitted to DAS on August 4, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies provisions of current Polk County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 136 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, Darrell Brandt, acquired tax lots 1000, 1001 and 1002, on November 18, 1969, as reflected by a deed obtained from Polk County staff; however, he has not retained continuous ownership of each of these tax lots. The claimant conveyed tax lot 1002 to another party on December 14, 1995, and reacquired the tax lot on August 8, 2000, as evidenced by a contract and quitclaim deed submitted in response to the draft staff report.[2] The Polk County Assessor's Office records establish that the claimant is not a current owner of tax lot 1001, and the current owner of the tax lot acquired it in 1997. The Polk County Assessor's Office records further indicate that Darrell Brandt does not have any current ownership interest in tax lots 700 and 702. County records also indicate that the current owner of tax lot 700 acquired the tax lot in 1988, and the current owner of tax lot 702 acquired the tax lot in 1989. The Polk County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of tax lots 701, 703, 1000 and 1002. However, the claimant has not submitted any documentation establishing when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, and department efforts to obtain that documentation were not successful.[3]

Conclusions

The claimant, Darrell Brandt, is an "owner" of tax lots 701, 703 1000 and 1002, as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). He has been an owner of tax lot 1000 since November 18, 1969, and an owner of tax lot 1002 since August 8, 2000. The claimant has not

[2] A comment letter received on June 8, 2006, included copies of the contract by which the claimant conveyed tax lot 1002 in 1995 and the quitclaim deed by which he reacquired it in 2000.

[3] Claimant asserts that a personal affidavit establishes his acquisition and current ownership of the subject property. A claimant's affidavit unsupported by deeds or other documenting evidence is insufficient to establish a claimant's ownership or date of acquisition. Department staff attempted to obtain the necessary deeds or other ownership documentation from the claimant, but the claimant did not provide the necessary documentation.

established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703. The claimant is not an owner of tax lots 700, 702 and 1001.

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 divide the subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel. The claim identifies provisions of current Polk County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 136 as restricting dwellings.

The claim is based generally on Polk County's current Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone and the applicable provisions of state law that require such zoning. The claimant's property is zoned EFU as required by Goal 3, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, because the claimant's 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 the goal 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). 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 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. The Commission subsequently adopted amendments to comply with House Bill 3326 (Chapter 704, Oregon Laws 2001, effective on January 1, 2002), which were effective on May 22, 2002. (See administrative rule history for OAR 660-033-0100, -0130, and -0135.)

The claimant acquired tax lot 1000 on November 18, 1969, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

---

[4] The claimant's property is "agricultural land" because it contains Natural Resources Conservation Service Class I-IV soils.

The claimant acquired tax lot 1002 on August 8, 2000. At that time, the property was subject to the state land use laws currently in effect. Because the claimant has not established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the department cannot determine the land use regulations in effect when he acquired these tax lots.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 1000 in 1969 and do not allow the desired division or residential development of that tax lot. These laws restrict the use of tax lot 1000 relative to the uses allowed when the claimant acquired the tax lot. These current land use laws were all in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 1002, and therefore none of these laws restrict the use of tax lot 1002 relative to uses allowed when the claimant acquired that tax lot. Because the claimant has not established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the department cannot determine that any land use laws restrict the claimant's use of these tax lots relative to uses allowed when the claimant acquired tax lots 701 and 703.

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 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 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 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 $254,000 as the reduction in the subject property's fair market value due to the regulations. This amount is based on realtor evaluations and comparable sales.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Darrell Brandt who acquired tax lot 1000 on November 18, 1969, and tax lot 1002 on August 8, 2000. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property and have the effect of reducing its fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant acquired tax lot 1000 restrict the desired use of tax lot 1000, but do not restrict the desired use of tax lot 1002. Because the claimant has not established the date he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the claimant has not established that any laws enacted or adopted since he acquired these tax lots restrict the

desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the subject property's fair market value is a reduction of $254,000.

Without an appraisal or other relevant evidence establishing how the specified regulations reduce the value of tax lot 1000, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the regulations reduce the subject property's fair market value. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of tax lot 1000 has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

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

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Polk County has implemented through its current EFU zone. All of these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 1000 in 1969 and before the claimant acquired tax lot 1002 in 2000. Because the claimant has not established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the department cannot determine whether the laws were in effect when he acquired these tax lots.

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 the claimant's property were in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 1000 in 1969. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E). All of these regulations were in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 1002, and therefore, all of these regulations are exempt for tax lot 1002. Because the claimant has not established when he acquired tax lots 701 and 703, the department cannot determine whether any laws are exempt as to these tax lots.

Laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are 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 1000 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 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. 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 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 the claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to his use of the 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 claimant's desired use of the subject property. The claim asserts that existing state land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department reduce the fair market value of the subject property by $254,000. However, because the claim does not provide an appraisal or other relevant evidence demonstrating how the land use regulations described in Section V.(2) reduce the fair market value of tax lot 1000, 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 1000 was allowed under the standards in effect when he acquired it. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of tax lot 1000 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 Darrell Brandt to use tax lot 1000 for a use permitted at the time he acquired the property on November 18, 1969.

Conclusions

Based on the record, the department finds that the claimant is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 for tax lots 700, 702 and 1001 because the claimant is not a present owner of these tax lots. The department further finds that the claimant is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 for tax lot 1002 because laws enforced by the Commission or the department do not restrict the claimant's desired use of the property relative to uses permitted when he acquired tax lot 1002 on August 2, 2000. The claimant is not entitled to relief under ORS 197.352 for tax lots 701 and 703 because the claimant has not established when he acquired these tax lots, and therefore, the department cannot determine that any laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the claimant's desired use of these tax lots relative to uses permitted when he

acquired them. Therefore, the department recommends that the claim be denied for tax lots 700, 701, 702, 703, 1001 and 1002.

Based on the record, the department recommends that the claim be approved for tax lot 1000, 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 Darrell Brandt's division of tax lot 1000 or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use tax lot 1000 for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 1000 on November 18, 1969.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use tax lot 1000 for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on November 18, 1969.

3. To the extent that any law, order, deed, agreement or other legally enforceable public or private requirement provides that tax lot 1000 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 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 1000 imposed by private parties.

4. Any use of tax lot 1000 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 1000, 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 1000 by the claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on May 26, 2006. 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.