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 Carl W. Hopp Jr., CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M122882

Claimant: Carl W. Hopp Jr. (the Claimant)

Property: Township 17S, Range 11E, Section 14, Tax lots 301, 2713 and 2715, Deschutes 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 Carl Hopp Jr.'s division of the 120-acre subject property or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on June 1, 1970, for tax lot 301, October 24, 1979, for tax lot 2713 and December 17, 1984, for tax lot 2715. On October 24, 1979, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4. On December 17, 1984, the property was subject to compliance with the applicable provisions of Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, as implemented by Deschutes County's acknowledged forest zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

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

4. Any use of the subject property 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 the subject property, 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 the subject property by the claimant.

This Order is entered by the Director of the DLCD as a final order of DLCD and the Land Conservation and Development Commission under ORS 197.352, OAR 660-002-0010(8), and OAR 125, division 145, and by the 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
DLCD
Dated this 28th day of August, 2006.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

Dugan Petty, Deputy Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 28th day of August, 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

August 28, 2006

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M122882
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Carl W. Hopp Jr.
MAILING ADDRESS:	63421 Saddleback Drive Bend, Oregon 97701
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 17S, Range 11E, Section 14 Tax lots 301, 2713 and 2715 Deschutes County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Edward P. Fitch PO Box 457 Redmond, Oregon 97756
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	October 20, 2005
180-DAY DEADLINE:	September 4, 2006[1]

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Carl Hopp Jr., seeks compensation in the amount of $1.9 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 divide the 120-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel.[2] The subject property is located at 63421 and 63495 Saddleback Drive, near Bend, in Deschutes 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 Carl Hopp Jr.'s division of the 120-acre subject property and to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest Lands),

[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).
[2] The subject property includes three tax lots: 301, 2713 and 2715. Each tax lot consists of 40 acres.

ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 6. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On July 7, 2006, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, five written comments were received in response to the 10-day notice.

The comments does 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 October 20, 2005, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim identifies "all statewide regulations and ordinances restricting the ability of the application to divide the land" 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, Carl Hopp Jr., acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. He first acquired tax lots 2713 and 2715 on October 24, 1979, as reflected by a promissory note and a December 11, 1979, fulfillment bargain and sale deed included with the claim. However, he conveyed tax lot 2715 to Howard and Christy Fowler and Bruce and Carol Valentine on January 7, 1980, as reflected by a memorandum of contract provided by Deschutes County's Planning Department. The Fowlers defaulted on the agreement and conveyed their interest in the subject property to the Bank of California, which then conveyed that interest to Carl Hopp Jr. on December 17, 1984, as reflected by a warranty deed provided by Deschutes County's Planning Department. The Deschutes County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of tax lots 301, 2713 and 2715.

Conclusions

The claimant, Carl Hopp Jr., is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C) as of June 1, 1970, for tax lot 301, as of October 24, 1979, for tax lot 2713 and as of December 17, 1984, for tax lot 2715.

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 acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim indicates that the claimant desires to divide the 120-acre subject property and to develop a dwelling on each parcel, and that the use is not allowed under current land use regulations.[3]

---

[3] The claimant summarily cites 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

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require forest zoning and restrict uses on forest-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned Forest Use (F2) and Wildlife Area Combining (WA) as required by Goal 4, in accordance with ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, because the claimant's property is "forest land" under Goal 4. Goal 4 became effective on January 25, 1975, and requires that forest land be zoned for forest use (see statutory and rule history under OAR 660-015-0000(4)). The forest land administrative rules (OAR 660, division 6) became effective on September 1, 1982, and ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 became effective on November 4, 1993 (Chapter 792, Oregon Laws 1993). OAR 660-006-0026 and 660-006-0027 were amended on March 1, 1994, to implement those statutes.

Together, ORS 215.705 to 215.755 and 215.780 and OAR 660, division 6, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 4, prohibit the division of forest land into parcels less than 80 acres and establish standards for development of dwellings on existing or proposed parcels on those lands.

The claimant acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

The claimant acquired tax lot 2713 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals but before the Commission acknowledged Deschutes County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. Because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 4 in particular, applied directly to the tax lot when he acquired it.[4]

Goal 4 went into effect on January 25, 1975, "to conserve forest lands for forest uses" and required, "Lands suitable for forest uses shall be inventoried and designated as forest lands. Existing forest land uses shall be protected unless proposed changes are in conformance with the comprehensive plan." Those forest uses were defined as follows: "(1) the production of trees and the processing of forest products; (2) open space, buffers from noise, and visual separation of conflicting uses; (3) watershed protection and wildlife and fisheries habitat; (4) soil protection from wind and water; (5) maintenance of clean air and water; (6) outdoor recreational activities and related support services and wilderness values compatible with these uses; and (7) grazing land for livestock."

---

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 use of the subject property, based on the claimant's asserted desired use.

[4] 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 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 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).

No information has been presented in the claim to establish that the claimant's desired division of tax lot 2713 and his development of a dwelling on each parcel comply with the Goal 4 standards in effect when the claimant acquired the tax lot in 1979.

When the claimant acquired tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984, the property was subject to Deschutes County's acknowledged forest zone.[5] At that time, the property was zoned by Deschutes County as FU-2, which established a 40-acre minimum for new lots and parcels. When the claimant acquired tax lot 2715, the desired division and development of the property would have been governed by the county's forest zone and the applicable provisions of Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, then in effect.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements, minimum lot size and dwelling standards established by Goal 4 and provisions applicable to land zoned for forest use in ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, were all enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984, and do not allow the desired division or development of the property. However, the claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired use of tax lots 2713 and 2715 complies with the standards in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984.

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 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 $1.9 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.

[5] Deschutes County's forest zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 4 on May 11, 1981.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Carl Hopp Jr. who acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984. 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 the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations(s) on the fair market value of the subject property is a reduction of $1.9 million.

Without an appraisal or other documentation and without verification of whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of the subject property was allowed under the standards in effect when the claimant acquired the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

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

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6, which Deschutes County has implemented through its current F2 and WA zones. With the exception of provisions of Goal 4 adopted before the claimant acquired tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and the provisions of Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, adopted before the claimant acquired tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984, these state land use regulations were not in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property.

Conclusions

Without a specific development proposal for the subject property, it is not possible for the department to determine all the laws that may apply to a particular use of the property, or whether those laws may fall under one or more of the exemptions under ORS 197.352. It appears that the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on residential division and development of the subject property are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) only to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired the property. Provisions of Goal 4 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2713 in 1979 and provisions of Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2715 in 1984 are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will continue to apply to the property.

Other laws in effect when the claimant acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and will also continue to apply to the claimant's use of the property. In

addition, the department notes that ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, include standards for siting dwellings in forest zones. These provisions include fire protection standards for dwellings and for surrounding forest lands. ORS 197.352(3)(B) specifically exempts regulations "restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building codes. . . ." Accordingly, siting standards for dwellings in forest zones in ORS 215.730 and OAR 660, division 6, are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(B).

There may be other laws that 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 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 subject property.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

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

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department 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 have the effect of reducing the fair market value of the subject property by $1.9 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 the subject property 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 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 Carl Hopp Jr. to use the subject property for a use permitted at the time he acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984.

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 Carl Hopp Jr.'s division of the 120-acre subject property or to his development of a dwelling on each parcel: applicable provisions of Goal 4, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 6. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow him to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when he acquired tax lot 301 on June 1, 1970, tax lot 2713 on October 24, 1979, and tax lot 2715 on December 17, 1984.

2. The action by the State of Oregon provides the state's authorization to the claimant to use the subject property for the use described in this report, subject to the standards in effect on June 1, 1970, for tax lot 301, October 24, 1979, for tax lot 2713 and December 17, 1984, for tax lot 2715. On October 24, 1979, the property was subject to compliance with Goal 4. On December 17, 1984, the property was subject to compliance with the applicable provisions of Goal 4 and OAR 660, division 6, as implemented by Deschutes County's acknowledged forest zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.

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

4. Any use of the subject property 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 the subject property, 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 the subject property by the claimant.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on August 14, 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.