1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3 4 5 6	SOUTHERN OREGON PIPELINE INFORMATION PROJECT, OREGON SHORES CONSERVATION
7 8 9 10	COALITION, NUTE NEMETH, CITIZENS AGAINST LNG and JODY McCAFFREE, Petitioners,
11 12 13	VS.
14 15	COOS COUNTY,  Respondent,
16 17	and
18 19 20	OREGON INTERNATIONAL PORT OF COOS BAY,
21 22	Intervenor-Respondent.
23	LUBA No. 2008-016
24	ORDER
25	On February 12, 2008, LUBA received a letter from the county attorney advising
26	LUBA that the "county declines to participate" in this appeal. On February 25, 2008,
27	petitioners filed objections to the record that the county filed in this appeal. On March 3,
28	2008, LUBA received a letter from the county planning department. Along with that letter,
29	LUBA received labels, replacement pages, a "Supplemental Volume 12" and a copy of a
30	February 27, 2008 letter from the county planning department to petitioner's attorney
31	responding to the record objections. For the reasons explained below, we have set all of
32	those documents aside for the time being.
33	Under OAR 661-010-0075(6) the county may only appear in this appeal through an
34	attorney. Under OAR 661-010-0026 "[a] party may, within 14 days from the date of service
35	of a record objection, file a response." Any such response to petitioners' record objections
36	must be filed by the county's attorney. The county's attorney has not filed a response to
	Page 1

petitioners' record objection, and based on the county attorney's February 12, 2008 letter we
assume the county does not intend to do so. We do not treat the planning department's
February 27, 2008 letter as a response to the record objection under OAR 661-010-0026. If
the county attorney wishes to file a response to petitioner's record objection, it may have
until March 12, 2008 to do so.

If the county wishes to limit its participation in this appeal to submitting the record that is required by OAR 661-010-0025, and the county does not wish to appear in this appeal to challenge petitioners' record objection, the county may so limit its participation. We also do not see any reason why the planning department cannot consult with petitioners' attorney and attempt to resolve those record objections by agreement. If that consultation convinces petitioners to withdraw or modify their record objections, petitioners can advise LUBA of any such withdrawals or modifications. But unless petitioners request that LUBA proceed otherwise, sometime after the deadline for filing a response to petitioners' record objection expires, we will issue an order to resolve petitioner's record objections. In issuing that order, we will not consider the February 27, 2008 letter from the county planning department to petitioner's attorney as a response to petitioner's record objection.

The county planning department should not transmit or serve any additional documents for inclusion in the record unless it first reaches an agreement with all parties that such additional documents should be submitted as a supplemental record or unless LUBA issues an order that requires the county to do so.

Dated this 5th day of March, 2008.

28 Michael A. Holstun

29 Board Chair