

BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

SENSIBLE TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS)
FOR PEOPLE (STOP), ELIZABETH)
(MEEKY) BLIZZARD, SUSAN PETER,)
ALDEN E. POTTER, GREG HOFFENBACKER,)
BRIAN J. MARTIN, and DAVID L.)
STEWART,)
)
Petitioners,)
)
vs.)
)
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT,)
)
Respondent,)
)
and)
)
CITY OF BEAVERTON, CITY OF FOREST)
GROVE, CITY OF HILLSBORO, CITY OF)
KING CITY, CITY OF McMinnville,)
CITY OF NEWBERG, CITY OF SHERWOOD,) LUBA
No. 89-030)
CITY OF TIGARD, CITY OF TUALATIN,)
CITY OF WILSONVILLE, BEAVERTON)
AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FOREST) FINAL OPINION
GROVE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,) AND ORDER ON REMAND
HILLSBORO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
SHERWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
TUALATIN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
WILSONVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
McMINNVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
TIGARD AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,)
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN CHAMBER OF)
COMMERCE, I-5 CORRIDOR ASSOCIATION,)
FOREST GROVE/CORNELIUS ECONOMIC)
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, SUNSET)
CORRIDOR ASSOCIATION, TUALATIN)
VALLEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT)
CORPORATION, McMinnville)
INDUSTRIAL PROMOTIONS, and HOME)
BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF)
METROPOLITAN PORTLAND,)

)
Intervenors-Respondent.)

On remand from the Court of Appeals.

HOLSTUN, Referee; SHERTON, Chief Referee; KELLINGTON,
Referee participated in the decision.

DISMISSED

08/06/90

You are entitled to judicial review of this Order.
Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS
197.850.

Holstun, Referee.

This case is before us on remand from the Court of Appeals. In Sensible Transportation v. Metro Service Dist., ___ Or LUBA ___ (LUBA No. 89-030, October 25, 1989), we remanded Metropolitan Service District Ordinance 89-282, which amends Metro's Regional Transportation Plan. On appeal, the Court of Appeals concluded that the contingent recommendation in the Regional Transportation Plan amendment challenged in this proceeding "is not a final land use decision under ORS 197.015(10) and that LUBA therefore lacked jurisdiction over the appeal under ORS 197.825." Sensible Transportation v. Metro Service Dist., 100 Or App 564, 569, ___ P2d ___ (1990). Because the court concluded LUBA lacks jurisdiction in this matter, it reversed and remanded with instructions that we dismiss the appeal.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed.