```
1
                BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
 2
                       OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 3
   DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION )
 5
   AND DEVELOPMENT,
 6
                                    )
 7
              Petitioner,
                                    )
 8
 9
         vs.
10
11
   COOS COUNTY,
12
13
              Respondent,
                                             LUBA No. 94-230
14
15
         and
16
17
    T. HARRY CHU and SCOTT W. RIDLE,
                                                    )
18
19
              Intervenors-Respondent.
20
                                             FINAL OPINION
                                      __)
21
                                    )
                                               AND ORDER
22
   LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COOS
                                    )
23
    COUNTY,
24
25
              Petitioner,
26
27
         vs.
28
                                             LUBA No. 94-235
29
   COOS COUNTY,
30
31
              Respondent,
32
33
    T. HARRY CHU and SCOTT W. RIDLE,
                                                    )
34
35
              Intervenors-Respondent.
36
37
38
        Appeal from Coos County.
39
40
         Celeste J. Doyle, Assistant Attorney General, Salem,
41
    represented petitioner Department of Land Conservation and
42
    Development; and Tod Northman, Portland,
                                                    represented
43
    petitioner League of Women Voters of Coos County.
44
45
         David R. Ris, County Counsel, Coquille, represented
```

1 respondent. 2 David B. Smith, Tigard, represented intervenors-3 4 respondent. 5 KELLINGTON, Referee participated in the decision. 6 7 02/13/95 8 REMAND 9 You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. 10 11 Judicial review is governed by the provisions of ORS 12 197.850.

- 1 Kellington, Referee.
- 2 Intervenors-respondent filed a motion to remand this
- 3 consolidated appeal proceeding and for the county to
- 4 consider issues raised in the petition for review. The
- 5 county and petitioners do not object to the motion.
- 6 Further, the motion requests that petitioners be awarded the
- 7 cost of their \$50 filing fee, to be paid by
- 8 intervenors-respondent.
- 9 Each of petitioners is awarded the cost of their filing
- 10 fee in the amount of \$50 each, to be paid by
- 11 intervenors-respondent. The Board shall return petitioners'
- 12 deposits for costs in the amount of \$150 for each appeal.
- 13 This appeal is remanded.