

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

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

BEAR CREEK VALLEY SANITARY)
AUTHORITY,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
vs.)
)
CITY OF MEDFORD,)
)
Respondent.)

LUBA No. 92-172

FINAL OPINION
AND ORDER

BEAR CREEK VALLEY SANITARY)
AUTHORITY,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
vs.)
)
JACKSON COUNTY,)
)
Respondent.)

LUBA No. 92-192

On remand from the Court of Appeals.

Lee A. Mills, Medford, represented petitioners.

Eugene F. Hart, City Attorney, and Arminda J. Brown,
County Counsel, Medford, represented respondents.

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

REVERSED 02/21/95

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

1 Opinion by Holstun.

2 In Bear Creek Valley San. Auth. v. City of Medford, 27
3 Or LUBA 328 (1994), LUBA affirmed the city and county
4 ordinances challenged in this appeal. In Bear Creek Valley
5 Sanitary v. City of Medford, 130 Or App 24, 880 P2d 486, rev
6 den 320 Or 493 (1994), the Court of Appeals reversed our
7 decision.

8 In accordance with the Court of Appeals' decision, the
9 city and county ordinances challenged in this appeal are
10 reversed.