1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	THOMAS M. BURKE, BRENDA BLAKENSHIP,
5	MIKE BRIDGES, PATRICIA B. BURRELL, H. CURTISS
6	BURRELL, JORENE BYERS, MARION S. de POLO, TERRY
7	DORVINEN, L. SUSAN DUNN, J. MICHAEL DUNN,
8	JEANNE FRENCH, DONALD L. HANNA, NANCY
9	KNOCHE, KEITH KNOCHE, DOROTHY MCCALL,
10	LAWRENCE MCCALL, BEVERLY A. PARRISH, JANET
11	ROBERTS, PHILIP ROBERTS, LANCE STEINMETZ,
12	MARY KAY WALKER, J.R. WENDT, BECKY WRIGHT,
13	and BRUCE WRIGHT,
14	Petitioners,
15	
16	VS.
17	
18	CROOK COUNTY,
19	Respondent,
20	
21	and
22	
23	JUDITH E. PRINCEHOUSE, ROBERT PRINCEHOUSE,
24	MIKE UMBARGER, DIETER KOEHLER,
25	and DUANE BALCOM,
26	Intervenors-Respondent.
27	
28	LUBA Nos. 98-220, 98-221 and 98-222
29	
30	OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION
31	AND DEVELOPMENT,
32	Petitioner,
33	
34	VS.
35	
36	CROOK COUNTY,
37	Respondent,
38	
39	JUDITH E. PRINCEHOUSE, ROBERT PRINCEHOUSE,
40	MIKE UMBARGER, DIETER KOEHLER
41	and DUANE BALCOM,
42	Intervenors-Respondent.
43	
44	LUBA Nos. 98-223, 98-224 and 98-225
45	

1	FINAL OPINION					
2	AND ORDER					
3						
4	Appeal from Crook County.					
5						
6	Gary Abbott Parks, Lake Oswego, represented petitioners Thomas M. Burke, Brenda					
7	Blankenship, Mike Bridges, Patricia B. Burrell, H. Curtiss Burrell, JoRene Byers, Marion S.					
8	de Polo, Terry Dorvinen, L. Susan Dunn, J. Michael Dunn, Jeanne French, Donald L. Hanna,					
9	Nancy Knoche, Keith Knoche, Dorothy McCall, Lawrence McCall, Beverly A. Parrish, Janet					
10	Roberts, Philip Roberts, Lance Steinmetz, Mary Kay Walker, J.R. Wendt, Becky Wright and					
11	Bruce Wright.					
12						
13	Richard M. Whitman, Assistant Attorney General, Salem, represented petitioner					
14	Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.					
15	Detay M. Cahamayan Deinavilla namasanta duran andant					
16 17	Peter M. Schannauer, Prineville, represented respondent.					
18	Intervanore respondent Judith E. Dringshouse Dowell Putte Debart Dringshouse					
19	Intervenors-respondent Judith E. Princehouse, Powell Butte, Robert Princehouse,					
20	Powell Butte, Mike Umbarger, Powell Butte, Dieter Koehler, Powell Butte and Duane Balcom, Powell Butte, represented themselves.					
21	Barcom, I owen Butte, represented themserves.					
22	HOLSTUN, Board Member; BASSHAM, Board Chair; BRIGGS, Board Member,					
23	participated in the decision.					
24	participated in the decision.					
25	REMANDED 06/20/2000					
26						
27	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the					
28	provisions of ORS 197.850.					
29						

2	ORS	197.860	provides:

"All parties to an appeal may at any time prior to a final decision by the Court of Appeals under ORS 197.855 stipulate that the appeal proceeding be stayed for any period of time agreeable to the parties and the board or court to allow the parties to enter mediation. Following mediation, the board or the court may, at the request of the parties, dismiss the appeal or remand the decision to the board or the local government with specific instructions for entry of a final decision on remand. * * *"

In this consolidated appeal, petitioners challenge Crook County Ordinance Nos. 126, 127 and 128. The parties to this appeal entered mediation pursuant to ORS 197.860. On June 1, 2000, LUBA received from the parties a stipulated motion requesting that LUBA remand the ordinances challenged in this appeal with specific instructions that certain amendments to the challenged ordinances be adopted by the county. The amendments to be adopted by the county on remand are attached as "Attachment 1" to the parties' stipulated motion. Petitioners in LUBA Nos. 98-220, 98-221 and 98-222 request that LUBA refund their filing fees. All petitioners request that their deposits for costs be refunded.

In accordance with the parties' stipulated motion and ORS 197.860, the ordinances challenged in this consolidated appeal are remanded to the county and the county is instructed to adopt the amendments set out in Attachment 1 to the parties' stipulated motion.

A copy of that attachment is appended to this final opinion and order.

Petitioners in LUBA Nos. 98-220, 98-221 and 98-222 request that LUBA refund their filing fees is denied. *Totman v. City of Grants Pass*, 24 Or LUBA 46 (1992). LUBA will return petitioners' deposits for costs.