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 Ellen Grenz, CLAIMANT	))))	FINAL ORDER CLAIM NO. M129932

Claimant: Ellen Grenz (the Claimant)

Property: Township 9S, Range 2W, Section 33, Tax lot 100
Township 9S, Range 2W, Section 33A, Tax lots 2700 and 4500
Marion 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 Ellen Grenz's development of a dwelling on each of the three tax lots that makes up the subject property, and a replacement dwelling for the existing house on tax lot 2700: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow Ellen Grenz to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976, and tax lots 100 and 4500 on April 23, 1985.

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 August 6, 1976, for tax lot 2700 and April 23, 1985, for tax lots 100 and 4500. In 1976, tax lot 2700 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 and Goal 3 then in effect. In 1985, tax lots 100 and 4500 were subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as

implemented by Marion County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions 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 her 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 Manager for the Measure 37 Services Division 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 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

Michael Morrissey, Manager
DLCD, Measure 37 Services Division
Dated this 16th day of February, 2007.

FOR the DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:

David Hartwig, Administrator
DAS, State Services Division
Dated this 16th day of February, 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

February 16, 2007

STATE CLAIM NUMBER:	M129932
NAME OF CLAIMANT:	Ellen Grenz
PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION:	Township 9S, Range 2W, Section 33 Tax lot 100 Township 9S, Range 2W, Section 33A Tax lots 2700 and 4500 Marion County
OTHER CONTACT INFORMATION:	Jill Gelineau 1211 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 1900 Portland, Oregon 97204
DATE RECEIVED BY DAS:	August 25, 2006
180-DAY DEADLINE:	February 21, 2007

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIM

The claimant, Ellen Grenz, seeks compensation in the amount of $719,000 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 develop a dwelling on each of the three tax lots that makes up the 30.23-acre subject property, and a replacement dwelling for the existing house on tax lot 2700.[1] The subject property is located near the intersection of Rosebud Lane and B Street, south of Turner, in Marion 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 Ellen Grenz's development of a dwelling on each of the three tax lots that makes up the subject property, and a replacement dwelling for the existing house on tax lot 2700: applicable provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), ORS 215 and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after she acquired each of the

[1] The subject property includes three tax lots: 100 (9S 2W 33) consisting of 12.16 acres; 4500 (9S 2W 33A) consisting of 7.75 acres; and 2700 (9S 2W 33A) consisting of 10.32 acres.

subject tax lots. These laws will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow her to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when she acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976, and tax lots 100 and 4500 on April 23, 1985. (See the complete recommendation in Section VI. of this report.)

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On November 29, 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, no written comments were received in response to the 10-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 August 25, 2006, for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim specifically identifies ORS 187.175 and 215.283 and includes a copy of list of numerous other land use regulations 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, Ellen Grenz, acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976, as evidenced by a warranty deed included with the claim; she acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 from Grenz Farms, Inc. on April 23, 1985, also as reflected by a warranty deed included with the claim. Grenz Farms, Inc., an Oregon corporation, acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 from Ellen Grenz on January 17, 1969, as evidenced by a warranty deed included with the claim. The Marion County Assessor's Office confirms the claimant's current ownership of the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimant, Ellen Grenz, is an "owner" of the subject property as that term is defined by ORS 197.352(11)(C). She has been an owner of tax lot 2700 since August 6, 1976, and an owner of tax lots 100 and 4500 since April 23, 1985. Grenz Farms, Inc. is a "family member" of the claimant, as defined by ORS 197.352(11)(A), as to tax lots 100 and 4500 and acquired these tax lots on January 17, 1969.[2]

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 a "replacement dwelling for the existing one on tax lot 2700," and one additional dwelling on each of the three tax lots that makes up the subject property, and that current land use laws prohibit the desired use.[3]

---

[2] Under ORS 197.352(11)(A), legal entities can be "family members" of individuals who are owners of property under ORS 197.352(11)(C). However, legal entities cannot have family members under the statute. Therefore, individuals who transferred property to the corporation are not considered family members under the definition of family member in ORS 197.352(11)(A).

[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 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 the desired use.

The claim is based generally on the applicable provisions of state law that require Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoning and restrict uses on EFU-zoned land. The claimant's property is zoned EFU by Marion County 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 Goal 3 be zoned EFU pursuant to ORS 215.

Current land use regulations, particularly ORS 215.284 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted pursuant to Goal 3, establish standards for the development of dwellings on existing or any proposed parcel on EFU-zoned land.

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's family member acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 on January 17, 1969, prior to the adoption of the statewide planning goals and their implementing statutes and regulations.

The claimant acquired tax lot 2700 after the adoption of the statewide planning goals, but before the Commission acknowledged Marion County's land use regulations to be in compliance with the statewide planning goals pursuant to ORS 197.250 and 197.251. At that time, tax lot 2700 was zoned by Marion County as RA, under which dwellings were a permitted use. However, because the Commission had not acknowledged the county's plan and land use regulations when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976, the statewide planning goals, and Goal 3 in particular, applied directly to tax lot 2700 when the claimant acquired it.[5]

As adopted on January 25, 1975, Goal 3 required that agricultural land be preserved and zoned for EFU pursuant to ORS 215. Under the Goal 3 standards in effect on August 6, 1976, farm dwellings were allowed if they were determined to be "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use" under ORS 215.213(1)(e) (1973 edition). Non-farm dwellings were subject to compliance with ORS 215.213(3) (1973 edition).

---

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

[5] The statewide planning goals became effective on January 25, 1975, and were applicable to legislative land use decisions and some quasi-judicial land use decisions prior to the Commission's acknowledgment of each county's comprehensive plan and implementing regulations. *Perkins v. City of Rajneeshpuram*, 300 Or 1 (1985); *Alexanderson v. Polk County*, 289 Or 427, *rev. den* 290 Or 137 (1980); *Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn. v. Clackamas County*, 280 Or 3 (1977); *Jurgenson v. Union County*, 42 Or App 505 (1979); and *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Benton County*, 32 Or App 413 (1978). After the county's plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission, the statewide planning goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to such local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

No information has been provided in the claim to establish whether the claimant's desired development of a dwelling on tax lot 2700 satisfies the standards for farm or non-farm dwellings under ORS 215.213, in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 in 1976.

Conclusions

The current zoning requirements 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's family acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 in 1969 and after the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 in 1976 and do not allow the claimant's desired development of the subject property. However, the claim does not establish whether or the extent to which the claimant's desired use of tax lot 2700 complies with the standards for land development under the requirements of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976.

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 $719,000 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 property valuation reports included with the claim.

Conclusions

As explained in Section V.(1) of this report, the claimant is Ellen Grenz whose family member acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 in 1969 and who acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976. Under ORS 197.352, the claimant is due compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of these tax lots and have the effect of reducing their fair market value. Based on the findings and conclusions in Section V.(2) of this report, laws enacted or adopted since the claimant or her family acquired the subject property restrict the claimant's desired use of the property. The claimant estimates that the effect of the regulations on the fair market value of the entire subject property is a reduction of $719,000.

Without an appraisal or other documentation, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount by which the land use regulations have reduced the fair market value of the subject property. Nevertheless, based on the evidence in the record for this claim, the department determines that the fair market value of the subject property has been reduced to some extent as a result of land use regulations enforced by the Commission or the department since the claimant or her family acquired the property.

4. Exemptions Under ORS 197.352(3)

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

Findings of Fact

The claim is based on state land use regulations that restrict the use of the subject property, including applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, which Marion County has implemented through its current EFU zone. With the exception of provisions of Goal 3 and ORS 215 in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 in 1976, these land use regulations were enacted or adopted after the claimant's family acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 and after the claimant acquired tax lot 2700.

Conclusions

It appears that none of the general statutory, goal and rule restrictions on development of the subject property were in effect when the claimant's family acquired tax lots 100 and 4500 on January 17, 1969; and with the exception of Goals 3 and ORS 215 in effect on August 6, 1976, none of these laws were in effect when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700. As a result, these laws are not exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) to the extent they were enacted or adopted after the claimant or her family acquired the subject property. Laws in effect when the claimant or her family acquired the subject property are exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(E) and do not provide a basis for compensation. In addition, other land use laws enacted or adopted for a purpose set forth in ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) are also exempt and would not provide a basis for compensation.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

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

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission or the department restrict the 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 $719,000. 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 the claimant or her family acquired the property. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department has determined that the laws on which the claim is based have reduced the fair market value of the subject property to some extent.

No funds have been appropriated at this time for the payment of claims. In lieu of payment of compensation, ORS 197.352 authorizes the department to modify, remove or not apply all or parts of certain land use regulations to allow Ellen Grenz to use tax lot 2700 for a use permitted at the time she acquired it on August 6, 1976, and to use tax lots 100 and 4500 for a use permitted at the time she acquired these tax lots on April 23, 1985.

At the time the claimant acquired tax lots 100 and 4500, the tax lots were subject to Marion County's acknowledged EFU zone.[6] When the claimant acquired tax lots 100 and 4500, the claimant's desired use of these tax lots would have been governed by the county's acknowledged EFU zone and the applicable provisions of ORS 215 then in effect.[7] In 1985, ORS 215.283(1)(f) (1983 edition) generally allowed farm dwellings "customarily provided in conjunction with farm use." Non-farm dwellings were allowed under ORS 215.283(3) if they were determined to be compatible with farm use, not interfere seriously with accepted farm practices, not materially alter the stability of the land use pattern in the area and be situated on generally unsuitable land for the production of farm crops and livestock.

The claim does not establish whether or to what extent the claimant's desired development of tax lots 100 and 4500 was allowed under the standards in effect when she acquired these tax lots on April 23, 1985.

In addition to the applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660 in effect when the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots, there may be other laws that 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, and depending on when they were enacted or adopted, may continue to apply to the claimant's property. In addition, some of these laws may be exempt under ORS 197.352(3)(A) to (D) and will continue to apply to the subject property on that basis.

This report addresses only those state laws that are identified in the claim, or that the department is certain apply to the subject property based on the uses that the 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 she has provided to the department in her claim, the greater the possibility that there may be additional laws that will later be determined to continue to apply to her use of the subject property.

---

[6] Marion County's EFU zone was acknowledged by the Commission for compliance with Goal 3 on June 10, 1982.

[7] After the county's comprehensive plan and land use regulations were acknowledged by the Commission as complying with the statewide planning goals, the goals and implementing rules no longer applied directly to individual local land use decisions. *Byrd v. Stringer*, 295 Or 311 (1983). However, statutory requirements continue to apply, and insofar as the state and local provisions are materially the same, the local provisions must be interpreted consistent with the substance of the goals and implementing rules. *Forster v. Polk County*, 115 Or App 475 (1992) and *Kenagy v. Benton County*, 115 Or App 131 (1992).

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 Ellen Grenz's development of a dwelling on each of the three tax lots that makes up the subject property, and a replacement dwelling for the existing house on tax lot 2700: applicable provisions of Goal 3, ORS 215 and OAR 660, division 33, enacted or adopted after the claimant acquired each of the subject tax lots. These land use regulations will not apply to the claimant only to the extent necessary to allow Ellen Grenz to use the subject property for the use described in this report, and only to the extent that use was permitted when the claimant acquired tax lot 2700 on August 6, 1976, and tax lots 100 and 4500 on April 23, 1985.

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 August 6, 1976, for tax lot 2700 and April 23, 1985, for tax lots 100 and 4500. In 1976, tax lot 2700 was subject to the applicable provisions of ORS 215 and Goal 3 then in effect. In 1985, tax lots 100 and 4500 were subject to applicable provisions of Goal 3 and OAR 660, division 5, as implemented by Marion County's acknowledged EFU zone, and the applicable provisions 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 her 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 January 26, 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.