



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

DESCHUTES COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

5:30 PM, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

Barnes Sawyer Rooms - Deschutes Services Bldg - 1300 NW Wall St – Bend

(541) 388-6575 | www.deschutes.org

AGENDA

MEETING FORMAT

The Planning Commission will conduct this meeting in person, electronically, and by phone.

Members of the public may view the Planning Commission meeting in real time via the Public Meeting Portal at www.deschutes.org/meetings.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom. Using Zoom is free of charge. To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, copy this link:

<https://bit.ly/dcpczoom>

Passcode: 764609

Using this option may require you to download the Zoom app to your device.

Members of the public can access the meeting via telephone, dial: 1-312-626-6799. When prompted, enter the following Webinar ID: 824 8646 7893 and Passcode: 764609. Written comments can also be provided for the public comment section to planningcommission@deschutes.org by 5:00 p.m. on September 11. They will be entered into the record.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 24

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

IV. ACTION ITEMS

- [1.](#) Housing Panel Discussion (*Nicole Mardell, Senior Planner*)
- [2.](#) Request to Review Hearings Officer Decisions /247-23-000302-DR & 247-25-000093-A (*Will Groves, Planning Manager*)

V. PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

VI. ADJOURN



Deschutes County encourages persons with disabilities to participate in all programs and activities. This event/location is accessible to people with disabilities. If you need accommodations to make participation possible, please call (541) 617-4747.

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Deschutes County Planning Commission

FROM: Nicole Mardell, AICP, Senior Planner

DATE: August 21, 2025

SUBJECT: Panel Discussion: Housing Planning in Oregon

I. BACKGROUND

On September 11, 2025, the Planning Commission will host a Housing Panel to discuss regional housing planning in Deschutes County. This panel will serve as an introduction to the topic. Presentations will be informational, allowing for an open-ended conversation about current housing conditions and trends.

The Planning Commission requested panel discussions during its review of the FY 2025-2026 Community Development Department Work Plan, to better understand planning issues facing Deschutes County. An additional panel discussion focused on the unincorporated community of Terrebonne is planned for Fall 2025.

II. PANEL AGENDA AND PARTICIPATION

The panel presentation will be in the following format:


- Brief introduction by staff (5 min)
- Brent Bybee, Community Development Director, City of La Pine (15 min)
 - Discussion of trends, opportunities, challenges, and constraints in housing planning and development for the youngest city in Oregon.
- Brian Rankin, Senior Strategist, City of Bend and Matt Stuart, Director of Real Estate Facilities, City of Bend (25 min)
 - Discussion of trends, opportunities, challenges, and constraints in housing planning and development in the largest city in Deschutes County. Strategies

for addressing houselessness, use of city-owned property for affordable housing, and one-time urban growth boundary amendment processes.

- Morgan Greenwood, VP, Government Affairs, Central Oregon Builders Association (15 min)
 - Overview of key state directives for housing. Discussion of challenges, opportunities, and constraints from the builders' perspective regarding housing development in cities and rural area of the county.
- Q&A with panelists (20 min)

III. NEXT STEPS

The Planning Commission will host the Housing Panel on September 11, 2025.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deschutes County Planning Commissioners

FROM: Will Groves, Planning Manager
Peter Gutowsky, AICP, Director
Stephanie Marshall, Senior Assistant Legal Counsel

DATE: September 4, 2025

SUBJECT: Request to Review Hearings Officer Decisions /247-23-000302-DR & 247-25-000093-A

I. REQUEST

Randy Windlinx (Windlinx) is respectfully asking the Planning Commission to review 2024 and 2025 Hearing Officer decisions, File Numbers: 247-23-000302-DR and 247-25-000093-A (Attachment).

Deschutes County Code (DCC) Chapter 2.52.100, Powers and Duties, grants the Planning Commission discretion for review of Hearing Officer Decisions, in accordance Deschutes County ordinances.¹ However, this quasi-judicial review was converted, under Ordinance 2000-003, to the ability to recommend a quasi-judicial review to the Board of County Commissioners. The current code is included below:

22.28.050 Review By Board

Review of an administrative action or a Hearings Body's decision may be initiated by the Board of County Commissioners. The Board shall consider calling up for review any administrative decision that a majority of the Planning Commission recommends be reviewed.

As such, quasi-judicial Planning Commission review of Hearings Officer decisions is precluded under Title 22, the Deschutes County Development Procedures Ordinance for this and other reasons, as described in detail below.

If the Planning Commission agrees to review 247-23-000302-DR and 247-25-000093-A, it would be a non-binding, informal review of the case and process, to be scheduled as a separate agenda item at a meeting likely in October. During that time, staff will be available to answer questions.

¹ https://deschutescounty.municipalcodeonline.com/book?type=ordinances#name=2.52.100_Powers_And_Duties.

A. The [planning] commission shall have the following duties:

2. To review at its discretion land use decisions of the Hearings Officer within its jurisdiction under Deschutes County ordinances.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

Background

In 2023, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) applied for a declaratory ruling, 247-23-000302-DR, to determine multiple issues, including the zoning designation of one parcel of property (Parcel 1) is Rural Residential 10 (RR-10) or Forest Use 2 (F-2), whether a proposed multiuse path qualifies as a Class III road and street project, and whether such projects are allowed by right in the RR-10 and Open Space and Conservation (OS&C) zones. ODOT also made multiple alternative requests, including whether the proposed path is an outright permitted use in the F-2 zone, or a use permitted conditionally in that zone without the need for an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4 pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0065. ODOT and Windlinx offered competing arguments in the record, casting doubt and a dispute over the correct zoning of Parcel 1. Hearings Officer Tommy Brooks issued a decision in 2003, determining that the subject property is zoned RR-10. This decision was appealed by Mr. Windlinx to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), LUBA No. 2024-010.

LUBA denied each of the assignments of error raised in that appeal, with one exception. LUBA remanded the matter to the County for further decision-making to address Mr. Windlinx's argument that the doctrine of collateral attack precludes the hearings officer from determining in a declaratory ruling that the zoning of the Trail Area is other than F-2 are inadequate." LUBA specifically noted that "[t]he doctrine of issue preclusion is related to, but distinct from, the collateral attack doctrine. We agree with petitioner that remand is required for the hearings officer to adopt adequate findings addressing petitioner's argument that the application is a collateral attack on the final and unappealed Weigh Station Decision.

ODOT initiated the LUBA Remand on February 12, 2025. As noted above, the scope of the remand was narrow. The County was required to adopt new findings to address Mr. Windlinx's argument that the application is a collateral attack on the Weigh Station Decision. After reviewing the submitted information, Tommy Brooks, Hearings Officer, issued a decision with additional findings on April 11, 2025, concluding the Declaratory Ruling decision does not amount to a collateral attack on the Weigh Station decision. Therefore, the Parcel 1 portion of the subject properties is zoned RR-10. The Board declined to hear Windlinx's appeal of that decision thus making it the final decision of the County.[1] Their decision was not appealed to LUBA. It is therefore acknowledged and not subject to further legal challenges.

Planning Commission Authority

DCC 2.52.100(A)(2) states that the Planning Commission has, as one of its duties, "To review *at its discretion* land use decisions of the Hearings Officer *within its jurisdiction* under Deschutes County ordinances." (emphasis added). The Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction to review the subject Hearings Officer's decisions in this matter for two reasons.

First, under DCC 2.52.010, "jurisdiction under Deschutes County ordinances" to *review* hearings officer's decisions was changed (with unanimous concurrence from PC's) under Ord. 2000-003 and replaced with the Planning Commission's ability to *recommend* that such decisions be reviewed by the Board.

[1] Order 2025-016.

Second, the Hearings Officer's decisions for which Mr. Windlinx requests Planning Commission review are final under state law and local code; the appeal period(s) have run. DCC 22.28.010(C); DCC 22.20.040(1); and DCC 22.28.010(3). There is no action that the Planning Commission can take with respect to final land use decisions of the County. It is now too late for the Planning Commission even to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners review the Hearings Officer's decisions.

While the Planning Commission is included in the definition of "Hearings Body" in DCC 22.24.020(1), there is nothing in County Code or state law that allows review by the Planning Commission (or more precisely, any "action" by the Planning Commission) with respect to a *final* land use decision, and certainly not a decision that has already been appealed beyond the County. This is further confirmed by Ord. 2000-003, which replaced the Planning Commission's authority to review hearings officer's decisions with authority only to recommend that such decisions be reviewed by the Board.

Finally, under DCC 22.32.015(2), the request for Planning Commission review of the Hearings Officer's decision is not a timely appeal. "Unless a request for reconsideration has been filed, the notice of appeal and appeal fee must be received at the offices of the Deschutes County Community Development Department no later than 4:00 PM *on the twelfth day following mailing of the decision*. If a decision has been modified on reconsideration, an appeal must be filed no later than 4:00 PM on the twelfth day following mailing of the decision as modified. Therefore, for the same reason, the scope of review provisions in DCC 22.32.027 are inapplicable because no timely appeal was filed to the Planning Commission.

Conclusion

Review of the Hearings Officer's decisions is not within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction because, under Ord. 2000-003, the Planning Commission is limited to recommending that the Board review a hearings officer's decision. Under the circumstances here, the Planning Commission does have that authority because the Hearings Officer's decisions for which Mr. Windlinx requests review by the Commission are final. There is no means by which an attempt to invoke the Planning Commission's jurisdiction could be based because the Hearings Officer's decisions are now final. In short, there is no meaningful action the Planning Commission could take with respect to the Hearings Officer's decisions at this late date and under the circumstances.

Attachments:

2025-08-29 - Request for Review / Hearings Officer Decisions / 247-23-000302-DR & 247-25-000093-A
2025-08-31 – Windlinx Email and Attached Materials

From: [rwindlinx](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Peter Gutowsky](#)
Subject: Hearings Officer's Decision 247-23-000302-DR & 247-25-000093-A
Date: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:02:18 PM
Attachments: [Deschutes County Appeal Application w Appeal Statement 247-25-000093-A \(Remand\).pdf](#)
[A01000013366799CPQU0ZOVYDZV73G.pdf](#)
[planning_commission_manual_final.pdf](#)

Caution: External email to Deschutes County: If unexpected or unfamiliar, be cautious with links and attachments. Contact your IT Dept if unsure.

Dear Chair Matt Cyrus,

As you know part of the duties of the Deschutes County Planning Commission is to review decisions of the Hearings Officer as sated in the below excerpt from the "Planning Commission Manual." I formally request that The Planning Commission review the attached Hearing Officer's decisions for direct conflicts with Deschutes County ordinances. Attached is my Deschutes County Board of Commissioners appeal, which was not accepted due to time constraints, outlining where I believe the Hearing Officer disregarded Deschutes County Code. Please contact me If you require additional supporting documentation regarding this matter.

Thank you,

Randy Windlinx
541-410-0191

The purpose of this policy and procedures manual is to put into one document a list of the current activities, procedures and basic policies of the Deschutes County Planning Commission. Below are excerpts from Deschutes County Code and the Comprehensive Plan that expressly describe the Planning Commission's priorities. The Deschutes County Comprehensive Plan Section 1.2 Community Involvement establishes the legal basis for the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission, along with other advisory committees, provide a vital link between County government and its citizenry. The Planning Commission operates as the County's Goal 1 committee for community involvement, and is established pursuant to ORS 215.020 and 215.030 and governed by Deschutes County Code 2.52 (DCC Chapter 2.52). Deschutes County Code The Planning Commission represents the unincorporated area of the county outside of the Bend, La Pine, Redmond and Sisters Urban Growth Boundaries, but within Urban Reserve Areas. Per DCC Chapter 2.52, the Planning Commission has the following duties: 1. To carry out a comprehensive planning program, using citizen input and public hearings when appropriate, within its area of jurisdiction and to coordinate its activities with other jurisdictions, planning bodies and districts. 2. To review at its discretion land use decisions of the Hearings Officer within its jurisdiction under Deschutes County ordinances. 3. To act as the citizen involvement committee under the Deschutes

County Comprehensive Plan and advise the Board of County Commissioners (“Board”) on citizen involvement programs; to study and propose such measures as are advisable for promotion of the public interest, health, safety, comfort, convenience and welfare within the geographic area of the Commission’s jurisdiction. The three duties mentioned above enable the Planning Commission to concentrate on land use policy. A summary of recent Planning Commission accomplishments can be found in the annual Community Development Department (CDD) Citizen Involvement Report. Hearings Officer decisions can be made available at the Planning Commission’s request. These updates describe how Deschutes County Code is being applied and contested. They also provide context for future Comprehensive Plan and/or zoning code amendments.

**DECISION AND FINDINGS OF
THE DESCHUTES COUNTY HEARINGS OFFICER**

FILE NUMBER: 247-23-000302-DR

HEARING DATE: December 6, 2023

HEARING LOCATION: Videoconference and
Barnes & Sawyer Rooms
Deschutes Services Center
1300 NW Wall Street
Bend, OR 97708

SUBJECT PROPERTIES: **Parcel 1** - A portion of Oregon Department of Transportation Right-of-Way for Highway 97 in Township 18S, Range 12E, Sections 19, 30, and 31, and in Township 18S, Range 11E, Section 36

Parcel 2 - 59800 Highway 97, Bend, OR 97702
Map and Taxlot 181100001900

OWNERS: **Parcel 1** - Oregon Department of Transportation
Parcel 2 - Oregon High Desert Museum

APPLICANT: Oregon Department of Transportation

REQUEST: The Applicant requests a Declaratory Ruling to determine multiple issues, including the zoning designation of Parcel 1, whether the proposed path qualifies as a Class III road and street project, and whether such projects are allowed by right in the RR-10 and OS&C zones. The Applicant also makes multiple alternative requests to the foregoing, including whether the proposed path is an outright permitted use in the F-2 zone, or a use permitted conditionally in that zone without the need for an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4 pursuant to OAR 660-012-0065.

HEARINGS OFFICER: Tommy A. Brooks

STAFF CONTACT: Caroline House, Senior Planner
Caroline.House@deschutes.org / (541) 388-6667

I. APPLICABLE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

Participants to this proceeding identified the following as potentially applicable to the requested Declaratory Ruling:

Deschutes County Code (“DCC” or “Code”) Title 17, Subdivisions
 Chapter 17.04, General Provisions
 Chapter 17.08, Definitions and Interpretations of Language
 Chapter 17.12, Administration and Enforcement
 Chapter 17.40, Improvements
 Chapter 17.48, Design and Construction Specifications
 Chapter 17.56, Variances

DCC Title 18, Deschutes County Zoning Ordinance
 Chapter 18.04, Title, Purpose, and Definitions
 Chapter 18.12, Establishment of Zones
 Chapter 18.40, Forest Use Zone (F2)
 Chapter 18.60, Rural Residential Zone (RR10)

DCC Title 22, Deschutes County Development Procedures Ordinance
 Chapter 22.40, Declaratory Ruling

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)
 Chapter 215, County Land Use Planning; Resource Lands

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)
 Chapter 660, Land Conservation and Development Department
 Division 12, Transportation Planning

II. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL FINDINGS

A. Nature of Applicant’s Request

The Applicant plans to construct a path on the Subject Properties. The path would parallel Highway 97 and provide bicycle and pedestrian access between the City of Bend and areas south of the city, portions of which are on federally-owned lands. When completed the path will tie into the existing Sun Lava Trail, which connects to the Sunriver community and to other recreational areas and attractions in the same vicinity. This Decision will refer to the proposed path as the “Project.”

The entirety of the Project runs through multiple zones and into areas in which the County does not regulate land use. The Applicant seeks a Declaratory Ruling with respect to the portion of the Project that is within the County’s jurisdiction. The specific request the Applicant makes are set forth in later findings.

///

B. Notices and Hearing

On May 5, 2023, the County mailed a Notice of Application (“Application Notice”), after which the County began receiving comments on the Application. On October 27, 2023, the County issued a Notice of Public Hearing (“Hearing Notice”). Pursuant to the Hearing Notice, I presided over an evidentiary hearing as the Hearings Officer on December 6, 2023, which began at 6:01 p.m. The Hearing was held via videoconference, with Staff from the Deschutes County Planning Division (“Staff”), the Applicant’s representatives, and other participants present in the hearing room. The Hearings Officer and other participants participated remotely.

At the beginning of the Hearing, I provided an overview of the quasi-judicial process and instructed participants to direct comments to the approval criteria and standards, and to raise any issues a participant wanted to preserve for appeal. I stated I had no *ex parte* contacts to disclose or bias to declare. I asked for but received no objections to the County’s jurisdiction over the matter or to my participation as the Hearings Officer presiding over the Hearing.

The Hearing concluded at 7:29 p.m., before which time I also announced that the written record would remain open as follows: (1) any participant could submit additional materials until December 13, 2023 (“Open Record Period”); (2) any participant could submit materials rebutting information provided during the Open Record Period until December 20, 2023 (“Rebuttal Period”); and (3) the Applicant could submit a final legal argument no later than December 27, 2023. At that time, Staff also provided instructions for how to submit materials within the required timelines.

C. 150-day Clock

The Applicant submitted the Application on April 24, 2023. Staff reviewed the Application and, on May 24, 2023, notified Applicant that the Application was not complete (“Notice of Incomplete Application”). Following an additional submittal from the Applicant, Staff deemed the Application complete on October 19, 2023.

Using October 19, 2023, as the date of completeness, the original deadline for a final County decision under ORS 215.427 – “the 150-day clock” – was March 17, 2024. As of the date of the Hearing, the Applicant requested a 21-day extension of the 150-day clock, which would have extended the deadline for a final County decision until April 7, 2024. As noted above, however, the record was held open for an additional 21 days following the Hearing. The extended record period was agreed to by the Applicant.

Pursuant to DCC 22.24.140(E), a continuance or record extension is subject to the 150-day clock, unless the Applicant requests or otherwise agrees to the extension. Here, the Applicant agreed to the extension. Under the Code, therefore, the additional 21 days the record was left open do not count toward the 150-day clock. Adding that time period to the modified deadline, the new deadline for the County to make a final decision is April 28, 2024.

///

///

III. SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Declaratory Ruling Standards

The subject Application is presented as a request for a Declaratory Ruling, pursuant to DCC Chapter 22.40. The Applicable provisions of that Code section are set forth below.

Section 22.44.010, Availability of Declaratory Ruling

- A. *Subject to the other provisions of DCC 22.40.010, there shall be available for the County's comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances, the subdivision and partition ordinance and DCC Title 22 a process for:*
1. *Interpreting a provision of a comprehensive plan or ordinance (and other documents incorporated by reference) in which there is doubt or a dispute as to its meaning or application;*

The Applicant presents multiple issues in which it asserts there is doubt or a dispute over the meaning or application of the County's Comprehensive Plan ("Plan") or Code. Based on my review of the record, the best articulation of those issues and how they relate to the Plan and Code is as follows:

1. Is Parcel 1¹ zoned RR-10 or F-2? The County's Zoning Map, which identifies the zoning for all property in the County, is a component of the Plan and Code. As evidenced by the competing arguments in the record, there is both a doubt and a dispute over the correct zoning of Parcel 1.
2. Is the portion of the project the Applicant seeks to construct a Type III road or street project allowed outright in the RR-10 and OS&C zones? DCC 18.04.030 defines various classes of "road and street projects". As evidenced by the competing arguments in the record, there is a dispute over whether the Applicant's Project is a road or street project under that Code provision at all and, if so, what class of road or street project it is or whether such projects are allowed in the RR-10 and OS&C zones.
3. In the alternative, does the County's F-2 zone allow a bicycle and pedestrian path, like the Project proposed by the Applicant, as a use permitted outright in that zone? While the Applicant asserts that the Project is a use permitted outright in the F-2 zone, opposing testimony asserts the Project is not allowed at all in that zone. A dispute therefore exists over the meaning and application of the F-2 zone provisions.
4. Does the County's F-2 zone allow a bicycle and pedestrian path, like the Project proposed by the Applicant, as a conditional use without the need for an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4?

¹ As noted on the cover page, the Subject Properties consist of two areas, one of which is within ODOT's right-of-way, and one of which is on private property. Although the participants do not use these designations, for ease of reference this Decision will refer to the ODOT property as "Parcel 1" and to the private property as "Parcel 2".

Similar to the third request, and as an alternative to its other requests, the Applicant asserts that the Project is a use permitted conditionally in the F-2 zone, while opposing testimony asserts the Project is not allowed at all in that zone. The Applicant's alternative requests therefore presents a dispute over the meaning and application of the F-2 zone provisions.

Participants Windlinx Ranch Trust and Randy Windlinx (collectively, "Windlinx") assert that a Declaratory Ruling is not permitted in this matter because the Applicant "is not seeking an interpretation" of the Plan or the Code, and that a Declaratory Ruling "can only be used to interpret ambiguous language." The express language of this Code provision, however, applies where there is "doubt or a dispute over the meaning or application" of the Plan or Code, and it does not require that there be ambiguous language to interpret. The Zoning Map is a good example of a part of the Plan or Code that contains no "language" to interpret, but that nevertheless has meaning and is applied to a factual scenario. Other aspects of the requested Declaratory Ruling are grounded in Code language, such as the meaning of "road and street project", which the parties interpret differently and, therefore, is arguably ambiguous.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Applicant's request is consistent with DCC 22.44.010(A)(1) and presents the kinds of requests that are contemplated by this Code provision.

- B. A declaratory ruling shall be available only in instances involving a fact-specific controversy and to resolve and determine the particular rights and obligations of particular parties to the controversy. Declaratory proceedings shall not be used to grant an advisory opinion. Declaratory proceedings shall not be used as a substitute for seeking an amendment of general applicability to a legislative enactment.*

As described above, the Applicant's request for a Declaratory Ruling essentially seeks to determine the land use review requirements, if any, required to construct and maintain the Project on the Subject Properties. As presented to the Hearings Officer, these requests do not seek actual approval of the Project and, instead, seek to establish the Applicant's rights and obligations if it proceeds with the Project. Depending on the outcome of each request, additional review of the Project may be required, and this proceeding only responds to the requests presented in the Application. Each of the requests involves a fact-specific inquiry, based primarily on the location of the Subject Properties and the configuration and purpose of the Project.

No participant has asserted that the Declaratory Ruling would be advisory in nature, but Windlinx does argue that the Applicant's request is precluded by this Code provision because it is "used to review and reverse the prior County Board decision." The prior decision Windlinx refers to is the County's 1999 denial of the Applicant's request to site a weigh station in the same or similar portion of the right-of-way comprising Parcel 1 (the "Weigh Station Decision").² That decision applied the F-2 zone to that portion of the Subject Property, which Windlinx asserts is dispositive of the zoning issue. The binding nature of the Weigh Station Decision is addressed in more detail below in findings addressing the zoning of Parcel 1. Regardless of the outcome of that issue, however, I find that Windlinx's argument is not applicable to this specific Code provision, which prevents Declaratory Rulings from serving as "a substitute for seeking

² *In re Application of the Oregon Department of Transportation for a Conditional Use Permit and Variance*, County File Nos. CU-98-109 and V-98-15, Findings and Decision (June 28, 1999).

an amendment of general applicability to a legislative enactment.” The Weigh Station Decision Windlinx asserts the Applicant is trying to “amend” was not a legislative enactment and, instead, denied the issuance of a conditional use permit. Nor would that decision or any later “amendment” of that decision be of general applicability, as they would apply only to the Applicant.

Based on the foregoing, I find that this Code provision does not limit the Applicant’s ability to make the requests presented in the Application for a Declaratory Ruling.

- C. *Declaratory rulings shall not be used as a substitute for an appeal of a decision in a land use action or for a modification of an approval. In the case of a ruling on a land use action a declaratory ruling shall not be available until six months after a decision in the land use action is final.*

Windlinx asserts that this Code provision prohibits the Applicant from requesting a Declaratory Ruling because, according to Windlinx, the request serves as an appeal of the Weigh Station Decision by seeking to overturn that decision. The binding nature of the Weigh Station Decision is addressed in more detail below in findings addressing the zoning of Parcel 1.

The only thing that Applicant’s request in this proceeding has in common with the Weigh Station Decision is that they both involve Parcel 1. The two proceedings do not involve the same use (a weigh station for trucks versus a path for bicycles and pedestrians). The two proceedings also do not appear to involve the same properties other than Parcel 1, as Parcel 2 was not part of the proposal in the Weigh Station Decision. To the extent that the two proceedings may invoke a common issue (the zoning of Parcel 1), that issue is relevant only to a portion of the Applicant’s request in this proceeding, as the Applicant makes alternative requests, some of which assume Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10, and some of which assume Parcel 1 is zoned F-2.

The argument Windlinx presents relies on a faulty assumption. Windlinx asserts that “[i]f the Hearings Officer declares the subject property RR-10, that decision reverses the 1999 Board decision.” (Emphasis added). The Board’s prior decision was to deny a conditional use permit. As discussed in more detail below, the Board’s denial was not based on the zoning of the property and, instead, was based on the Applicant’s failure to satisfy certain approval standards. If this Decision determines Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10, that will have no effect on the County’s prior decision. The Applicant would not be able to, for example, argue that it now has a conditional use permit for a weigh station. I find it is more accurate to address Windlinx’s argument as one of “issue preclusion”. That argument is addressed in more detail below.

Based on the foregoing, I find that this Code provision does not limit the Applicant’s ability to requests presented in the Application for a Declaratory Ruling.

///

///

D. The Planning Director may refuse to accept and the Hearings Officer may deny an application for a declaratory ruling if:

- 1. The Planning Director or Hearings Officer determines that the question presented can be decided in conjunction with approving or denying a pending land use application or if in the Planning Director or Hearing Officer's judgment the requested determination should be made as part of a decision on an application for a quasi-judicial plan amendment or zone change or a land use permit not yet filed;*

This Code provision provides the Hearings Officer with some discretion to deny an application for a Declaratory Ruling if, in the Hearings Officer's judgment, the request is better addressed as part of a pending or future land use permit application. As noted above, the requests presented to the Hearings Officer do not seek actual approval of the Project and, instead, seek to establish the Applicant's rights and obligations if it proceeds with the Project. I therefore exercise the discretion provided to me by the Code to consider the Application and not deny it on the basis that some other permitting process is more appropriate.

Section 22.40.020, Persons Who May Apply

A. DCC 22.08.010(B) notwithstanding, the following persons may initiate a declaratory ruling under DCC 22.40:

- 1. The owner of a property requesting a declaratory ruling relating to the use of the owner's property.*
- 2. In cases where the request is to interpret a previously issued quasi-judicial plan amendment, zone change or land use permit, the holder of the permit; or*
- 3. In all cases arising under DCC 22.40.010, the Planning Director.*

As explained in the Staff Report, the record indicates that the Applicant is the owner of Parcel 1, and that the owner of Parcel 2 has consented to the Application. No participant asserts otherwise, and I find that this Code provision is satisfied.

B. A request for a declaratory ruling shall be initiated by filing an application with the planning division and, except for applications initiated by the Planning Director, shall be accompanied by such fees as have been set by the Planning Division. Each application for a declaratory ruling shall include the precise question on which a ruling is sought. The applicant shall set forth whatever facts are relevant and necessary for making the determination and such other information as may be required by the Planning Division.

The only component of this Code section potentially in dispute is the requirement for an applicant to include the precise question on which a ruling is sought. The Staff Report indicates that the Application is sometimes less than clear with respect to the precise question being presented, as do comments provided by Windlinx. Notwithstanding the fact that the Applicant describes its requests in different ways, I find that the Applicant does present precise questions on which a ruling is sought. Those four questions are set forth in the preceding section. The testimony of the Applicant and other participants addresses those

questions, and I do not find any basis to reject or deny the Application based on the level of precision the Applicant used in presenting the questions for which it seeks a ruling.³

B. Parcel 1 Zoning Designation

Applicant's first request relates to the zoning designation that applies to Parcel 1, all of which is within the right-of-way of Highway 97. The Applicant specifically requests a ruling that Parcel 1 is designated as part of the RR-10 zone. In support of that request, the Applicant provides evidence of the RR-10 zone as depicted in the County's Zoning Map, as well as the manner in which that zone is depicted in the County's geographic information system ("GIS"), which contains an electronic version of the Zoning Map. Windlinx disputes the Applicant's characterization of the Zoning Map. The participants also disagree whether the County's prior Weigh Station Decision resolves this issue.

1. Zoning Map Designations

The County maintains two types of maps that depict the location of all zones in the County. The first map is an "analog" version of the Zoning Map, prepared on mylar sheets and adopted by County ordinance. As explained in the Staff Report, those mylar sheets include hand-taped lines to identify adopted or amended zoning boundaries, and cartographers originally used varying tape widths that lacked the accuracy of modern GIS software applications. The County also maintains an electronic map layer within its GIS database. Pursuant to DCC 18.12.030, the GIS version of the Zoning Map is the "official replica" of the Zoning Map.

DCC 18.12.040 states that if there is a dispute regarding the zoning classification of a property, "the original ordinance with map exhibit contained in the official county records will control." Thus, because the analog version of the Zoning Map (i.e. the maps prepared on mylar sheets) are exhibits to the County's ordinances adopting the Zoning Map, the analog version of the map will control if there is a difference between that version and the "official replica" of the Zoning Map maintained in an electronic format.

Windlinx relies on that distinction and focuses its arguments on a version of the Zoning Map that includes the mylar sheets, asserting that those maps are different than the electronic version of the map, that they depict Parcel 1 as being in the F-2 zone, and, therefore, are determinative of the F-2 zone applying to all of Parcel 1. Windlinx roots that argument in the County's version of the Zoning Map adopted in 1979.

In 1992, through Ordinance No. 92-060, the County updated the 1979 Zoning Map with the express purpose of making it more accurate. Further, as explained by the technical analysis in the record submitted by Staff, which included information from a County Application Systems Analyst ("Systems Analyst"), the 1992 version of the Zoning Map was itself based on a digitized version of the 1979 Zoning Map. That is, the County hired an outside expert to prepare an electronic version of the Zoning Map, and the County then prepared new mylar sheets based on the electronic version of the map to include with the ordinance

³ The Code contains other procedural and policy elements relating to a request for a Declaratory Ruling in DCC 22.40.030 through DCC 22.40.050. No participant has raised any issues with respect to those Code provisions. I hereby adopt the findings in the Staff Report relating to those Code provisions as my findings and incorporate them here into this Decision.

for adoption. The 1992 version of the Zoning Map did not change the zoning of Parcel 1. As part of the adopting ordinance, the County's Board of Commissioners ("Board") expressly confirmed that the 1992 Zoning Map, which was based on an electronic version of the original map, would ensure consistency with the original map.

Based on the foregoing, although the analog version of the Zoning Map takes precedence over the County's "digital replica" of the map, in this case there is not a distinction between the two. The electronic version of the Zoning Map was built on the original version of the Zoning Map, which was then updated to reflect the electronic version, and the Board confirmed that the two are the same. This conclusion is further supported by the Systems Analyst, who compared the original mylar-based Zoning Map to the "digital replica", measuring fixed points such as the location of the Highway 97 centerline and the closest section line, to then analyze the location of the zone boundaries. Based on that comparison, the Systems Analyst concluded that the zone boundaries on the original mylar sheets is the same as the boundaries on the digital version of the Zoning Map.

Windlinx does not offer its own technical information to refute the technical analysis provided by the County's Systems Analyst, instead arguing that the information provided by that analyst has "no probative value" because: (1) the analyst is not "qualified for interpreting the official zoning map"; (2) has no authority to make zoning determinations; and (3) does not describe how they were able to scale measurements off the 1979 mylars.⁴ Despite Windlinx's criticism, I find that the information provided by the Systems Analyst is relevant to determining the correct zoning. First, the record demonstrates that the Systems Analyst holds a senior-level position with technical expertise relating to the County's electronic data systems, the purpose of which is to provide professional systems analysis to other County departments. Second, the information provided by the Systems Analyst does not require them to have authority to make zoning determinations and, instead, is information on which such a determination can be based by someone with that authority. Third, contrary to Windlinx's statement, the information provided by Staff details the methodology the Systems Analyst used to scale the measurements from the 1979 mylars.

Based on the foregoing, which also demonstrates an intent by the County's Board that the analog and electronic versions of the Zoning Map are to be read as being the same, I find that the preponderance of the evidence indicates Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10 on the Zoning Map. In the alternative, and assuming there is a discrepancy between the two versions of the Zoning Map, I find that the original mylars also depict Parcel 1 as being in the RR-10 zone. The basis for that alternative conclusion is set forth below.

As an initial matter, it should be noted that the record does not reveal a major discrepancy between the two versions of the Zoning Map. The electronic version, the applicable portion of which appears in the Staff Report and other places in the record, depicts the RR-10 zone as encompassing the actual roadway that forms Highway 97, as well as the area to the east of the roadway, which the Applicant asserts, and no participant disputes, is still part of the Highway 97 right-of-way. The adjacent F-2 and Open Space and

⁴ Windlinx also asserts the Systems Analyst did not take into account a later decision by the Board that addressed the zoning of Parcel 1. That assertion is addressed in findings below, is a legal argument, and is not relevant to the technical information the Systems Analyst provided. I therefore do not address that argument here.

Conservation (“OS&C”) zones on private property to the east appear on the map as being separated from the Highway 97 roadway or centerline, and they coincide with the property lines that separate the Applicant’s ownership from those private ownerships. Multiple versions of the original Zoning Map depict a similar configuration. For example, the black and white version of the 1979 Zoning Map included in the Applicant’s hearing presentation shows a white strip between the Highway 97 centerline and the adjacent parcels to the east, indicating the presence of the RR-10 zone on the east side of the Highway 97 centerline. The high-resolution version of the mylar maps, provided by Windlinx and the Applicant in post-hearing submittals, shows that same strip.

Although the two versions of the Zoning Map largely depict the same zoning configuration with the RR-10 zone showing on the east side of Highway 97, they do appear to depart in one small area. Specifically, at the north end of the subject area, where the northwest corner of the F-2-zoned Windlinx property intersects with the Highway 97 right-of way, the taped line on the mylar sheets crosses over to the west side of the line depicting the highway centerline, whereas the electronic version of the Zoning Map continues to show the F-2 zone completely to the east of the highway centerline.

The differing positions in this proceeding assert that the Highway 97 right-of-way that comprises Parcel 1 is either fully in the RR-10 zone (the Applicant’s position), or fully in the F-2 zone (Windlinx’s position). I find that this issue is resolved by looking at the text and context of the Code.

The Applicant and other participants in this proceeding acknowledge that the original Zoning Map lacks precision and that, due to various factors (width of the tape used, scale of the map), the mylars can be difficult to interpret. The Code contemplates this difficulty, however, and provides guidance on how to determine the location of a particular zone. Specifically, DCC 18.12.040 states that “[u]nless otherwise specified, zone boundaries are section lines, subdivision lines, lot lines, center lines of street or railroad rights of way, water courses, ridges or rimrocks, other readily recognizable or identifiable natural features, or the extension of such lines” (emphasis added). No participant has submitted any information to the record describing the zone boundaries using a metes or bounds description, or submitted evidence indicating that the zone boundaries in this area are “otherwise specified” to follow a feature that is not listed in the Code. I further note the presence of other features the Code contemplates as zone boundaries, such as section lines and railroad rights of way, but which the zoning boundary does not appear to follow, and which the participants do not rely on to support their arguments. Thus, the question to resolve is whether the line between the RR-10 zone and the F-2 zone in this area on the Zoning Map is intended to follow lot lines (the Applicant’s position) or is intended to follow the center line of Highway 97 (Windlinx’s position).

The 1979 Zoning Map depicts the centerline of Highway 97 as a dark, curved line. The tape on the mylar sheets does not appear to have a direct relationship to that line. Instead, except for the northern portion where the tape crosses the right-of-way line, the tape appears to follow property boundaries as described by the participants. In other areas on the exhibits in the record, the tape appears to follow section lines. Understanding that the width and location of the tape is not always consistent, but looking to the entirety of the zoning boundary as it is depicted on this portion of the Zoning Map, I find it more likely than not that the zoning boundary, as indicated by the tape, was intended to follow lot lines rather than the centerline of the highway. If the County intended to follow the centerline of the highway, one might expect to see the tape adhered closer to the black right-of-way line, or even cover that line since it is the centerline

of that street. I also note that no other zone boundary in this area of the Zoning Map appears to key off of the Highway 97 centerline. Of all the features the Code contemplates as a boundary line, the lot lines to the east of the highway right-of-way, rather than the centerline of the highway or any other feature, offer the most likely explanation for the boundary's location.

Windlinx asserts that if the boundary line does not follow the centerline of Highway 97 that the result would be multiple unusable strips of land between Highway 97 and private property to the east of the highway. As the Applicant notes, however, those areas are not unusable if they are zoned RR-10. The evidence in the record indicates that the entire area between the Highway 97 centerline and the private property to the east is part of the Highway 97 right-of-way. As such, that area can be used for right-of-way purposes as long as it is consistent with the applicable provision of the Code. Indeed, the participants appear to agree that there are more uses possible for such areas if they are zoned RR-10 than if they are zoned F-2. It is therefore just as likely that the County intended to have only one zone apply to the Highway 97 right-of-way as it is that it intended to have two different zones, and therefore allow different sets of uses, apply to the same right of way. Regardless of the intent, the bulk of the right-of-way comprising Parcel 1 contains the RR-10 designation, and the line between that zone and the F-2 zone adheres to property boundaries more closely than it does to the Highway 97 centerline.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Zoning Map, both the analog version and the electronic version, depicts Parcel 1 as being zoned RR-10.

2. Impacts of the Weigh Station Decision

As noted in previous findings, the County's 1999 Weigh Station Decision denied an application for a conditional use permit for a weigh station on a portion of the Highway 97 right-of-way comprising Parcel 1. The Weigh Station Decision expressly concludes that Parcel 1 is zoned F-2. Windlinx argues that the County's prior decision is final and binding on the present Application. The Applicant disagrees and asserts that the Hearings Officer can review the zoning issue without being bound by the language of the Weigh Station Decision.

As presented by the participants, this issue invokes the idea of "issue preclusion." The Land Use Board of Appeals ("LUBA") has consistently described issues preclusion as follows:

When an issue has been decided in a prior proceeding, the prior decision on that issue may preclude relitigation of the issue if five requirements are met: (1) the issue in the two proceedings is identical; (2) the issue was actually litigated and was essential to a final decision on the merits in the prior proceeding; (3) the party sought to be precluded had a full and fair opportunity to be heard on that issue; (4) the party sought to be precluded was a party or was in privity with a party to the prior proceeding; and (5) the prior proceeding was the type of proceeding to which preclusive effect will be given.⁵

⁵ See, most recently, *Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council v. City of Portland*, -- Or LUBA --

LUBA refers to the foregoing as the “*Nelson* factors.” LUBA also distinguishes issue preclusion from the “law of the case”, which bars relitigation of the same issue in different phases of a proceeding, for example after remand by LUBA.⁶ Although LUBA regularly entertains arguments relating to issue preclusion, it has also held that:

The nature of successive land use applications and land use decisions is such that it will be a rare circumstance, if ever, that a prior land use proceeding precludes the ability of the applicant to file a new land use application, based on different evidence or a different legal theory, and obtain a new land use decision on the new application.⁷

Applying the *Nelson* factors to this case, I find that the County’s prior Weigh Station Decision does not preclude the Applicant from seeking a declaration that Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10.

For related reasons, the issue in the two proceedings is not identical, and the issue over the zoning of Parcel 1 was not actually litigated in the prior decision. Taking a broader view of the two cases, the “issue” in the Weigh Station Decision was whether the Applicant had demonstrated compliance with the County’s conditional use criteria, whereas the issue in this proceeding includes a precise question about the applicable zoning and whether Applicant’s bicycle and pedestrian path is a “Class III” project permitted outright in either the RR-10 or F-2 zone. Taking a narrower view of the cases, the Board did address the zoning of the Highway 97 right-of-way in the prior decision, but that issue was not actually litigated. Rather, the evidence in this record includes a letter from the Applicant’s representative who reviewed the Zoning Map in 1994 and concluded that “this area appears to be zoned F-2.” Shortly thereafter, Staff responded that it was Staff’s “understanding” that the F-2 zoning was correct, but that response does not indicate if that understanding was based on a zoning analysis or based on the Applicant’s representation. Further, it is not clear that the zoning issue was essential to the outcome in the earlier case. Indeed, the Weigh Station Decision also expressly determined that a portion of the subject property in that case (an acceleration lane existing the facility) was zoned RR-10.⁸ The essential components of that earlier decision were therefore the criteria the Board addressed that it determined were not met rather than any specific findings about the zoning.

The Board’s Weigh Station Decision does describe Highway 97 as dividing “the RR-10 zoning to the west and the F-2 zoning to the east in the vicinity of the proposed weigh station facility.” That description also refers to DCC 18.12.040 and its reference to street centerlines. Despite that language, there is no evidence in the Weigh Station Decision that there was a dispute over the zoning of the right-of-way, much less any indication that the Board addressed the portion of DCC 18.12.040 that states a zone boundary can also

(LUBA No. 2020-009) (Oct. 30, 2020), *quoting Lawrence v. Clackamas County*, 40 Or LUBA 507, 519 (2001) and *citing Nelson v. Emerald People's Utility Dist.*, 318 Or 99, 104 (1993)).

⁶ See *Widgi Creek Homeowners Association v. Deschutes County*, -- Or LUBA -- (LUBA No. 2014-109) (June 2, 2015).

⁷ See *Central Oregon LandWatch v. Deschutes County*, -- Or LUBA -- (LUBA No. 2018-095) (Dec. 14, 2018) (emphasis added).

⁸ See Weigh Station Decision at p.9.

follow lot lines. Indeed, the decision expressly notes that it was the Applicant that provided the location and map information the Board relied on. Further, that decision followed a decision by a hearings officer and a staff report, neither of which indicates the zoning of the property was an issue in dispute. Windlinx's own characterization of the earlier proceeding undercuts its position, and Windlinx submitted comments in this proceeding that "[t]he County Board's 1998 [sic] decision simply confirmed what ODOT represented."

For a separate and independent reason, I also find that applying issue preclusion in this proceeding would be inconsistent with the fifth *Nelson* factor. In a different case involving the County, LUBA considered a prior decision in which the Board denied a land use application relating to the creation of two reservoirs, but later approved applications allowing the reservoirs.⁹ Addressing an argument that issue preclusion prohibited the County from approving the reservoirs, LUBA upheld the County's decision, agreeing in part that applicants are allowed under the Code to re-apply for a use previously denied as a means of encouraging an applicant to address problems identified in the denial decision rather than appealing the decision.

That same logic holds here. If the Applicant would have been authorized to reapply for a conditional use permit for the denied weigh station, it follows that the Applicant should also be authorized to seek approval for a different use. Under Windlinx's argument, in contrast, which asserts the Applicant should have appealed the Weigh Station Decision even though the Applicant accepted the denial, the appeal would have been solely of the Board's finding relating to the zoning, which would not have changed the outcome of that decision.¹⁰ That approach would have also required the Applicant to appeal an issue that was not in dispute in the proceeding. Such an approach is counter to the goal of applying issues preclusion, resulting in additional, more complex proceedings rather than fewer, simpler proceedings.

In this proceeding, the Applicant is making a different request, based on different facts, and different arguments. The Application should therefore be judged on its own merits rather than on a prior decision in which the same issue was not even in dispute. Based on the foregoing, I find that issue preclusion does not bind the outcome of this proceeding.

C. Type III Road and Street Project

For its second request in the Application, the Applicant seeks a determination that its Project is a "road and street project" and, more specifically, a "Class III" road and street project.

1. Road and Street Project

DCC 18.04.030 defines a "road and street project" as "the construction and maintenance of the roadway, bicycle lane, sidewalk or other facility related to a road or street." In the Application, the Applicant states that the "proposed bicycle path is considered a facility related to a road or street", and the Applicant states that the Project is also a "Bicycle Route."

⁹ *Bishop v. Deschutes County*, -- Or LUBA -- (LUBA Nos. 2018-111 and 2018-112) (May 1, 2019).

¹⁰ The Board denied the permit for the weigh station based on multiple substantive approval criteria and not because of the zoning of the property.

The Code language is less than clear with respect to the implication of the Applicant referring to the Project as a Bicycle Route. The Code has two definitions for “Bicycle Route”. A stand-alone definition in DCC 18.04.030 defines it as a “a segment of a bikeway¹¹ system designated with appropriate directional and information markers by the jurisdiction having authority.” A separate definition for that same phrase also appears beneath the definition of “road or street” in that same Code section, defining Bicycle Route more broadly as a “right of way for bicycle traffic.”

In the absence of an interpretation of this language by the County’s Board, I must determine the meaning of this language from the text and context of the Code in which it appears. As it relates to a road or street, the text of the Code states simply that a Bicycle Route is a right-of-way for bicycle traffic. The record clearly indicates that the Project includes a right-of-way (the area along Highway 97 controlled by the Applicant), and that the right-of-way will have a path for bicycles. Looking to the other, stand-alone definition of “Bicycle Route”, the Project meets that definition as well, as it is a path that will be a segment of a bikeway, specially designated as open to bicycle traffic. I therefore agree with the Applicant that the Project is appropriately referred to as a “Bicycle Route” as contemplated by the Code.

Turning to the context in which this phrase is used, a Bicycle Route that is a right of way for bicycle traffic is one type of “road or street.” This conclusion is based in part on the implication arising from the definition of “Bicycle Route” appearing as a subpart of the definition of “road or street”. That is, the Code appears to define certain facilities, including a Bicycle Route, that is an example of a road or street. This conclusion is further evidenced by the other definitions appearing under the definition of “road or street”, such as “arterial” and “collector”, all of which are examples of streets.

In light of those definitions, there are two bases on which to conclude that the Project is some type of “road and street project” as defined by the Code. First, because a Bicycle Route itself is listed as an example of a “road or street”, then the construction of the Bicycle Route is the construction of a “facility related to a road or street.” Second, even if the Bicycle Route itself is not a “road or street”, the record reveals that the Project relates to Highway 97, which is a street.¹² Specifically, the Applicant intends the Project as a modification and improvement of Highway 97, in part by removing bicycle traffic from the current Highway 97 facility and having bicycle traffic use the new path instead.

Windlinx presents several arguments to support its conclusion that the Project cannot be classified as any type of “road or street project.”¹³ Windlinx primarily asserts that the Project is a “multi-use path” and that the definition of “road and street project” does not include a reference to multi-use paths. According to

¹¹ CDC 18.04.030 defines “bikeway” as a “road, path or way which in some manner is specially designated as being open to bicycle travel, regardless of whether such facility is designated for the exclusive use of bicycles or is shared with other transportation modes.

¹² CDC 18.40.030 defines “street” as “the entire width between the right of way lines of every public way for vehicular and pedestrian traffic” and includes a “highway” or other similar designation, which describes Highway 97.

¹³ Windlinx also presents arguments asserting that the Project is not a “Class III” road and street project. Separate findings in a later section of this Decision address those arguments.

Windlinx, the absence of such a reference means the County intended to exclude multi-use paths from that definition.

Windlinx is correct that the Project appears to fall within the definition of a multi-use path. DCC 18.04.030 defines “multi-use path” as “a path physically separated from motor vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier and either within a highway right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way. The multi-use path is used by bicyclists, pedestrians, joggers, skaters and other non-motorized travelers.” Using the description of the Project provided by the Applicant, the Project is a multi-use path under this definition: (1) it will be a path; (2) it will be physically separated from motor vehicle traffic; (3) it will be within a highway right-of-way; and (4) it will be used by bicycles and other non-motorized travelers.

Whether or not the Project can be characterized as a multi-use path, however, is not the end of the inquiry. Windlinx’s specific argument is that the definition of “road or street project” must be interpreted to exclude multi-use paths from that definition, which logically means that the definition also does not include multi-use paths. Specifically, Windlinx makes the following statements in support of its interpretation:

- “[T]he definition of a road and street project in DCC 18.04.030 includes only a bike lane which is part of the actual road or street”
- “The only bike facility included in the definition [of road or street project] is a bicycle lane.”
- “Intuitively, a road or street project can only involve something that is defined as a road or street”
- The definition of road or street “does include a bicycle route and that use is exclusive to bicycle use”

Windlinx’s interpretation of the definitions of “road and street project” is narrower than and inconsistent with, the text and context of the Code. First, while the definition of “road and street project” expressly includes a “bike lane”, a bike lane is only one type of bike facility, and that is not the only language in this Code provision that can apply to other bike facilities. As noted above, a “road and street project” expressly includes any “other facility related to a road or street.” Thus, a bike facility that is not a “bike lane” can still qualify as a “road or street project” as long as it relates to a road or street. For the same reason, Windlinx’s statement that a “road or street project” can only involve something that is itself a road or street is inconsistent with the Code language. That is, Windlinx’s interpretation would have the effect of removing the phrase “related to” from the definition and replacing it with new language, such that the Code would read, as revised by Windlinx, “...or other facility ~~related to~~ that is a road or street.”

Windlinx’s characterization of the definition of “road or street” is also counter to the plain text of the Code. Windlinx acknowledges that the definition of “road or street” includes a Bicycle Route as an example, but incorrectly states that a Bicycle Route must be exclusive to bicycle use, which the Project is not. Neither definition of “Bicycle Route” in the Code requires such a facility to be exclusive for bicycles. To the contrary, the stand-alone definition of that phrase describes it as part of a “bikeway” system, and the definition of a “bikeway” expressly states that such a facility does not need to be used exclusively by bicycles.

Finally, the mere absence of “multi-use path” in the definition of “road and street project”, in this case, does not serve to exclude multi-use paths from that definition. The Code separately defines many other road or street facilities (e.g., alley, arterial, bicycle route, collector, cul-de-sac, and local street), none of which are expressly included in the definition of “road and street project”. Under Windlinx’s interpretation, the separate definitions of those facilities, coupled with their absence in the definition of “road and street project”, would serve to prevent those facilities from being included in a “road or street project”. The only facilities that would qualify as a “road and street project” would be a “roadway”, “bicycle lane”, or a “sidewalk”. In the absence of an interpretation by the County’s Board that the Code is intended that way, I find Windlinx’s interpretation to be unreasonable. Even if that interpretation is reasonable, a more reasonable interpretation is that the phrase “other facility related to a road or street” includes all facilities related to a road or street whether or not they are defined elsewhere in the Code. In summary, the Project involves the construction of a facility that is related to a road or street. As such the Project is a “road or street project” under the Code regardless of whether it is characterized as a bicycle route, a bikeway, or a multi-use path.

2. Class III Road and Street Project

The definition of “road and street project” in DCC 18.04.030 states that all road and street projects shall be classified as a “Class I, Class II, or Class III project.” The Applicant’s request for a Declaratory Ruling seeks to establish only that the Project is a Class III project.¹⁴

The definition of a Class III project is straightforward. DCC 18.04.030 states that a “‘Class III Project’ is a modernization, traffic safety improvement, maintenance, repair or preservation of a road or street.” According to the Applicant, the Project modernizes and improves the traffic safety on Highway 97. The Applicant specifically asserts that constructing a separated facility for bicycles and pedestrians within the same right-of-way of an existing facility is a “defining element” of modernization. The Applicant also asserts that separating modes of traffic improves safety for all users.

Windlinx counters that the Project is not a Class III project, based primarily on its argument that the Project is not a “road and street project” at all. As explained in more detail above, this Decision rejects that argument and finds that the Project is a “road and street project” as defined in the Code.

With respect to the classification of a “road and street project”, Windlinx asserts that the Project “is not a modernization, traffic safety improvement, maintenance, or preservation of a road or street.” As Windlinx notes, the Code appears to require that a Class III project that is for modernization or traffic safety be the modernization of an existing road or street, or a traffic safety improvement to an existing road or street. Windlinx asserts the Project fails to meet that definition because “[a] proposed new multi-use path is not a modernization of an existing road or street” and that “[c]onstructing a new facility may provide a safe facility for bikes and other uses, but that does not make that facility part of an existing road.” Windlinx also states that “[t]he fact that [Applicant] claims its path provides a safer facility does not make it an

¹⁴ In later submittals, the Applicant presents arguments, in the alternative, that the Project could be considered a Class II project. Because the Application and subsequent materials do not state a clear request for a declaratory ruling on that issue, and because this Decision concludes the Project is a Class III project, this Decision will not address that alternative argument.

improvement to the existing highway,” and asserts that the Applicant has not demonstrated there is a bicycle or pedestrian safety issue on Highway 97 that needs to be addressed. At the heart of Windlinx’s comments in this regard is a theme that the Project was conceived as a recreational facility, largely separated from Highway 97 where it is not part of the Subject Properties.

I have considered and weighed all of the comments provided by the participants. I find that the Applicant has demonstrated the Project modernizes and improves the safety of Highway 97 even though it may also serve other purposes in areas other than the Subject Properties.

First, I note that one of Windlinx’s arguments – that the Project is not part of an existing road – ignores the full language of the Code, which refers to a road or street. As noted above, the Code defines “street” broadly to include “the entire width between the right of way lines of every public way for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.” Thus, the entire Highway 97 right-of-way is part of that “street”, and any modernization or safety improvements in that area are therefore part of that street.

Second, the Applicant is an expert at developing transportation facilities. Thus, its comment that creating separated paths in the same right-of-way is a defining element of modernization carries more weight than the opposing Windlinx comment that simply disagrees with the Applicant.

Third, the Applicant shows that the County’s Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) identifies Highway 97 as a bikeway and that the TSP contemplates the use of Highway 97 as a bikeway will be improved over time for bicycle safety.” Further all participants appear to agree that new arterials are intended to have such facilities. Thus, the Project is modernizing this portion of Highway 97 by making it more in line with the County’s stated future vision and with how new facilities would be designed.

Fourth, the Applicant shows that the money it will use for the Project comes from funds designated for transportation purposes. The Applicant cannot use such funds for recreational facilities. Thus, while the Project may serve recreational purposes, that does not detract from the fact that the Project is a transportation facility.

With respect to safety improvements, Windlinx does not explain why the Applicant must establish that there is a “safety problem”. The express language of the Code states that a Class III project is one that makes a traffic safety improvement to an existing road or street. The evidence provided by the Applicant indicates that crash risk factors and crash history indicate that there are safety risks associated with walking and bicycling on Highway 97 and that the Project will reduce those risks. I do not find any credible argument or information in the record that refutes the notion that the Project will reduce these risks and thereby make safety improvements, even if others may subjectively conclude that current conditions are not unsafe.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Project, as proposed by the Applicant, is a Class III project.

D. Uses Permitted Outright in the RR-10 and OS&C Zones

As part of its second request for a Declaratory Ruling, the Applicant seeks to establish that a Type III road or street project is allowed outright in the RR-10 and OS&C zones.

DCC 18.60.020 provides a list of uses that are permitted outright in the RR-10 Zone. Among those uses, DCC 18.60.020(F) lists “Class III road or street project”. Similarly, DCC 18.48.020 provides a list of uses that are permitted outright in the OS&C Zone. Among those uses, DCC 18.48.020(E) lists “Class III road or street project”. Based on the earlier findings in this Decision that the Project is a Class III road or street project, the Project is a use permitted outright in the RR-10 and OS&C Zones.

Windlinx argues that the Project is not allowed in either of these zones. Windlinx bases this argument primarily on its assertion that the Project is not a road and street project at all, and that it does not otherwise fit any of other uses permitted outright in these zones. The findings above reject that portion of Windlinx’s argument and conclude the Project is a Class III road or street project.¹⁵

Windlinx makes the additional argument, similar to its arguments addressed above, that the County’s definition of “multi-use path”, and the absence of that use in DCC 18.60.020 and DCC 18.48.020, means that the County intended that use to be excluded from the list of uses permitted outright. Under Windlinx’s argument, the definition of “Class III project” and “multi use path” are mutually exclusive and that the multi-use path is a “distinct and separate” use from all other uses that are Class III projects.

The best evidence Windlinx provides in support of this argument is the manner in which the County uses similar language in the La Pine Neighborhood Planning Area (“La Pine NPA”). Specifically, DCC 18.61.050(D)(1) lists as uses permitted outright both a multi-use path and a Class III road and street project. As Windlinx notes, this separate listing of those uses implies that they are distinct from one another. According to Windlinx, if the County does not treat those as separate uses, the reference to multi-use paths in that Code provision is superfluous (because Class III road project would already include a multi-use path). Further, according to Windlinx, that structure, coupled with the County’s choice to omit multi-use paths in other zones, evidences an intent to prohibit the multi-use path in any zone where it is not listed. Put differently, Windlinx suggests that when the County wants to allow multi-use paths in a zone, it knows how to do that.

I agree that the Code language is ambiguous and requires interpretation. The Project falls within the definition of multi-use path and within the definition of Class III project. The ambiguity arises in determining if those definitions are mutually exclusive and, if so, which one controls the present situation. In the absence of an interpretation by the County’s Board, I must resolve this ambiguity based on the text and context of the Code.

The fact that the Code defines “multi-use path” is not dispositive, because it carries multiple, contrary implications. As Windlinx notes, the use of “multi-use path” can evidence the County’s intent to identify

¹⁵ I note that the Code contains a minor discrepancy in wording: DCC 18.04.030 provides a definition for “road and street project” and then has a sub-definition for “Class III project”, whereas the Code language in the RR-10 and OS&C zone regulations refers to a “Class III road or street project” rather than to either of the defined terms. No participant to this proceeding asserts that the difference in language has any significance, and it is clear from the text and context of the Code language that the phrase “Class III road or street project” in the zoning regulations refers to “Class III project” in the definitions.

that use and to list that use only where that use will be allowed. By implication, the absence of that phrase in other Code language could therefore be meaningful. But as noted in earlier findings, the Code contains other provisions that may apply to a multi-use path even if that phrase is excluded. The best example is the definition of “road and street project”, which refers to any facility related to a road or street, which may include a multi-use path. Indeed, because the County has a definition of multi-use path, the County would have been able to exclude that type of facility from road and street project if it intended to. In other words, because multi-use path is defined, the County, if it wanted to exclude that use from “road and street project” could have had that definition read “...other facility, except a multi-use path, related to a road or street.”

A more reasonable reading of the Code is that “multi-use path” and “Class III project” have some overlap, with the former being a potential subset of the latter, and that they are not mutually exclusive. First, other Code provisions follow this same structure. For example, the Code contains a definition for “utility facility” and for “land disposal site.” Further, a land disposal site is a type of utility facility. Some zone regulations, for example DCC 18.66.020(C), allow a “utility facility” as a conditional use. DCC 18.48.030, in contrast lists as a conditional use in the OS&C zone a “utility facility except land disposal sites.”

Second, the Code has other examples of overlapping definitions that create subsets of categories. Under the County’s Exclusive Farm Use (“EFU”) zone, DCC 18.16.025(F) allows some wineries, provided they meet certain statutory criteria. DCC 18.16.030(E) also allows wineries as a conditional use in the EFU zone under the separately-listed use of “commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use” even if they do not meet those same statutory criteria.¹⁶ In other words, the Code establishes a broad category for all types of commercial uses, and then establishes regulations for specific uses in that broad category. Moreover, the specific regulations do not appear to impact the broader category. For example, the Multiple Use Agriculture (“MUA”) zone allows only commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use but does not separately list “winery” as the EFU zone does. The absence of “winery” in the MUA regulations does not prohibit approving a winery in that zone. Rather, it simply means that the winery must meet the MUA zone requirements for commercial activities that are in conjunction with farm use.

Third, even Windlinx acknowledges that the Code can use different terms synonymously. In its initial comments, Windlinx identified portions of the Code that it asserts use “bikeway” and “bike lane” synonymously even though those terms are separately defined.

Ultimately, however, it is the definition of these terms and the fact that a ‘multi-use path’ is not synonymous with “Class III project” that informs how the former term is used. A multi-use path may be a type of road and street project, depending on the specific facts relating to the multi-use path. That is, if the multi-use path is a “facility that relates to a road or street,” then it qualifies a “road and street project.” If the multi-use path does not relate to a road or street, however, or does not meet the other factors that determine what a “road and street project” is, then it would not qualify as such a facility. Similarly, it is possible that a multi-use path, depending on the facts, does not qualify as a Class III project because it does not involve modernization, traffic safety improvements, maintenance, repair or preservation of an existing road or street.

¹⁶ LUBA has confirmed that a winery can be permitted under either of these uses. See, e.g., *Friends of Yamhill County v. Yamhill County*, 66 Or LUBA 212 (2012).

Those precise definitions in the Code language offer a reasonable explanation for why the County lists both “multi-use path” and “Class III project” in the La Pine NPA. That is, all Class III projects are allowed under that La Pine NPA provision, as are multi-use paths that do not qualify as road and street projects generally or as Class III projects specifically. In the RR-10 and OS&C zones, by contrast, all Class III projects are allowed under those Code provisions, but multi-use paths that do not qualify specifically as a Class III project (or qualify as a Class I or Class II project as part of a partition or subdivision) would not be allowed, because they are not separately listed.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the absence of “multi-use path” in the RR-10 and OS&C provisions does not limit the Project in those zones even though it is a multi-use path, as long as the Project is also a Class III project. The Project is therefore a use permitted outright in those Zones.

E. Uses Permitted Outright or Conditionally in the F-2 Zone

As an alternative to the foregoing requests, the Applicant makes separate requests seeking a Declaratory Ruling that the Project is a use permitted outright or conditionally in the F-2 Zone. Because those requests were made in the alternative, and because this Decision concludes that the Subject Properties are not in the F-2 zone, I find that it is not necessary to address the alternative arguments, and to do so could create more confusion than clarity.

F. Applicability of DCC 17

The record contains multiple references to DCC Title 17, including discussion of whether any provision in DCC Title 17 directly applies to this proceeding. These references and the related discussion were offered by the Applicant, Staff, and Windlinx.

The Applicant asserts that the provisions of DCC Title 17 are not directly applicable, but the Applicant also cites to provisions in DCC Title 17 as context for demonstrating the meaning of certain bicycle-related terms. Windlinx, like the Applicant, argues that DCC Title 17 is not directly applicable, and it asserts that the requests for Declaratory Ruling are answered by the Code language in DCC Title 18 without the need to resort to the language in DCC Title 17.

The Staff Report requests that the Hearings Officer determine if the requirements of DCC Title 17 apply to this proceeding. The Staff Report and the Notice of Incomplete Application specifically refer to DCC 17.04.020, DCC 17.08.030, DCC 17.48.140, and DCC 17.48.490 as potentially applicable.

The Application does not present a specific request for a Declaratory Ruling relating to DCC Title 17. Instead, the Applicant’s initial mention of DCC Title 17 appears to be in response to the Notice of Incomplete Application. In that submittal, the Applicant states its belief that DCC Title 17 does not directly apply. The Applicant went on to state “[a]lternatively, and to respond to Staff’s notice of incompleteness,” its Project complies with DCC Title 17 requirements.

The Oregon Court of Appeals recently opined on the scope of a Declaratory Ruling under the County’s Code:

A declaratory action is not an expansive proceeding that covers any and all issues related to a land use permit. Instead, it is narrowly confined to answering the “precise question” presented by the applicant. DCC 22.40.020(B); *see also* DCC 22.40.010(B) (stating that a declaratory ruling is “available only in instances involving a fact-specific controversy and to resolve and determine the particular rights and obligations of particular parties to the controversy” (emphasis added)). Further limiting the scope of the proceeding are the restrictions on who can seek a declaratory ruling and for what purposes. *See* DCC 22.40.020(A) (limiting the applicants to the owner of property on questions of use of the property, to the holder of a permit on questions of interpretation of a quasi-judicial plan amendment, zoning change or land use permit, or the Planning Director). We also note that under DCC 22.40.040, the effect of a declaratory ruling is conclusive, binds the parties, and prevents the parties from reapplying for a ruling on the same question. The binding and preclusive nature of a declaratory ruling supports our conclusion that the county intended declaratory actions to have a limited scope.¹⁷ (Emphases added).

The precise questions presented in this proceeding are set forth above in earlier findings. Applicant’s first question relates to the zoning of Parcel 1, which has no relationship to DCC Title 17. Applicant’s second question asks whether the Project is a Class III project, but specifically presents that question in light of the definitions that appear in DCC Title 18. Thus, while DCC Title 17 has nearly identical definitions and may have some bearing on a project that fits those definitions, the issue in this proceeding relates only to DCC Title 18. The Applicant’s third and fourth questions relate specifically to uses that are allowed in the F-2 zone, which this Decision does not address, but which also invoke only DCC Title 18 provisions (and state administrative rules) as presented.

To the extent that DCC Title 17 is relevant to this proceeding, it provides some context which may inform the meaning of the Code language in DCC Title 18. While such context may be useful, the findings in this Decision relating to the Applicant’s precise questions are based on the text and context of DCC Title 18 and, except where I have described the comments of the participants, I do not find a need to resort to a different title as further context to address the Applicant’s requests.

In consideration of the Court’s description of the limited scope of this type of proceeding, and in light of the Applicant’s requests as presented in the Application, I respectfully decline to extend the scope of this proceeding to address the extent to which DCC Title 17 applies.

///

///

///

¹⁷ *Central Oregon LandWatch v Deschutes County*, 326 Or App 439, 449-50 (2023).

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the above findings, this Decision concludes the following:

- 1 – The Parcel 1 portion of the Subject Properties is zoned RR-10.
- 2 – The Project as described by the Applicant is a “road and street project” and, more specifically, a Class III project.
- 3 – As a Class III project, the Project described by the Applicant is a use permitted outright in the RR-10 zone, and in the OS&C zone.

Dated this 26th day of January 2024.



Tommy A. Brooks
Deschutes County Hearings Officer

owner	agent	inCareof	address	cityStZip	type	cdd id	email
ODOT Region 4 Planning	David Amiton		63055 N. Highway 97, Bldg M	Bend, OR 97703	Hoff Decision	23-302-DR	David.Amiton@odot.oregon.gov
Stacy C. Posegate	Oregon DOJ Counsel				Hoff Decision	23-302-DR	stacy.c.posegate@doj.state.or.us
Ken Shonkwiler			63055 N. Hwy 97, Bldg M	Bend OR 97703	Hoff Decision	23-302-DR	Kenneth.d.shonkwiler@odot.oregon.gov



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OFFICER'S DECISION

The Deschutes County Hearings Officer has completed the reviewed the land use application described below:

FILE NUMBER: 247-23-000302-DR

LOCATION: **Parcel 1** - A portion of Oregon Department of Transportation Right-of-Way for Highway 97 in Township 18S, Range 12E, Sections 19, 30, and 31, and in Township 18S, Range 11E, Section 36

Parcel 2 - 59800 Highway 97, Bend, OR 97702 Map and Taxlot 181100001900

OWNER: **Parcel 1** - Oregon Department of Transportation
Parcel 2 - Oregon High Desert Museum

APPLICANT: Oregon Department of Transportation

PROPOSAL: The applicant requests interpretations of the County's Zoning Code, Zoning Maps, and Comprehensive Plan to determine if a future multi-use path, to be located within the ODOT right-of-way and lands owned by the High Desert Museum, is a use permitted outright.

STAFF PLANNER: Caroline House, Senior Planner
Caroline.House@deschutes.org / 541-388-6667

RECORD: Record items can be viewed and downloaded from:
<https://www.deschutes.org/cd/page/247-23-000302-dr-odot-lava-butte-trail>

STANDARDS AND APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

Participants to this proceeding identified the following as potentially applicable to the requested Declaratory Ruling:

Deschutes County Code ("DCC" or "Code") Title 17, Subdivisions
Chapter 17.04, General Provisions
Chapter 17.08, Definitions and Interpretations of Language

Chapter 17.12, Administration and Enforcement
 Chapter 17.40, Improvements
 Chapter 17.48, Design and Construction Specifications
 Chapter 17.56, Variances
 DCC Title 18, Deschutes County Zoning Ordinance
 Chapter 18.04, Title, Purpose, and Definitions
 Chapter 18.12, Establishment of Zones
 Chapter 18.40, Forest Use Zone (F2)
 Chapter 18.60, Rural Residential Zone (RR10)
 DCC Title 22, Deschutes County Development Procedures Ordinance
 Chapter 22.40, Declaratory Ruling

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)
 Chapter 215, County Land Use Planning; Resource Lands

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)
 Chapter 660, Land Conservation and Development Department
 Division 12, Transportation Planning

DECISION: Based on the Decision and Findings of the Deschutes County Hearings Officer, the Hearings Officer concludes the following:


1. The Parcel 1 portion of the Subject Properties is zoned RR-10.
2. The Project as described by the Applicant is a “road and street project” and, more specifically, a Class III project.
3. As a Class III project, the Project described by the Applicant is a use permitted outright in the RR-10 zone, and in the OS&C zone.

This decision becomes final twelve (12) days after the date mailed, unless appealed by a party of interest. To appeal, it is necessary to submit a Notice of Appeal, the base appeal deposit plus 20% of the original application fee(s), and a statement raising any issue relied upon for appeal with sufficient specificity to afford the Board of County Commissioners an adequate opportunity to respond to and resolve each issue.

Copies of the decision, application, all documents and evidence submitted by or on behalf of the applicant and applicable criteria are available for inspection at no cost. Copies can be purchased for 25 cents per page.

NOTICE TO MORTGAGEE, LIEN HOLDER, VENDOR OR SELLER: ORS CHAPTER 215 REQUIRES THAT IF YOU RECEIVE THIS NOTICE, IT MUST BE PROMPTLY FORWARDED TO THE PURCHASER.

US-97 LAVA BUTTE TRAIL



FEATURES

- Lava Butte Trail
-  Tax Lot Boundary
-  Township & Range Grid
-  Section Grid
-  Roads & Highways

ZONING

-  Forest Use 1
-  Forest Use 2
-  Flood Plain
-  Open Space & Conservation
-  Rural Commercial
-  Rural Residential
-  Bend Residential
-  Surface Mining
-  Widgi Crk Seventh Mtn Residential
-  Widgi Creek Residential

0 Miles 1

 PRODUCED BY ODOT GIS UNIT
GIS No. 23-62 | FEBRUARY 2023
ODOTMaps@odot.oregon.gov

This product is for informational purposes and may not be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. Users of this product should review and consult the primary data sources to determine the usability of the information. Conclusions drawn from this information are the responsibility of the user.

owner	agent	inCareof	address	citySTZip	type	cdd id	email
ARNOLD IRRIGATION DISTRICT			19604 BUCK CANYON RD.	Bend, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BNSF RAILWAY - ASSISTANT DIR., PUBLIC PROJECTS			740 CARNEGIE DRIVE	San Bernadino, CA 92408	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
DEPT. OF FORESTRY			P.O. BOX 670	Prineville, OR 97754	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
DEPT. OF LAND CONSERV. & DEVEL.			1011 SW EMKAY DR., SUITE 108	Bend, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
DEPT. OF LAND CONSERV. & DEVEL.			635 CAPITOL ST. NE, #150	Salem, OR 97301-2540	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
DESCHUTES CO. BUILDING SAFETY	Randy Scheid		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Randy.Scheid@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES CO. FIRE ADAPTED COMMUNITIES COORDINATOR	Corinne Heiner		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Corinne.Heiner@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES CO. FORESTER	Kevin Moriarty		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Kevin.Moriarty@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES CO. PROPERTY MGMT.	Ryan Dunning / Emily Pyle		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Ryan.Dunning@deschutes.org / emily.pyle@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES CO. ROAD DEPT.	Cody Smith		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Cody.Smith@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES CO. SR. TRANS. PLANNER	Tarik Rawlings		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Tarik.Rawlings@deschutes.org
DESCHUTES NAT. FOREST	Cynthia Anderson		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Cynthia.Anderson@usda.gov
DEPT. OF STATE LANDS (DSL-OWNED PROPERTY)	Shawn Zumwalt		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Shawn.ZUMWALT@dsl.oregon.gov
OREGON DEPT OF FISH & WILDLIFE	Jessica Clark/ Andrew Walch		ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	Jessica.S.CLARK@odfw.oregon.gov; Andrew.J.Walch@odfw.oregon.gov
ODOT REGION 4 PLANNING			ELECTRONIC		Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	ODOTR4PLANMGR@odot.state.or.us
ODOT Region 4 Planning	David Amiton		63055 N. Highway 97, Bldg M	Bend, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	David.Amiton@odot.oregon.gov
ABRAHAMS, MICHAEL & JODY			59647 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ACOSTA, NYDIA A			60294 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ADAIR, DANIEL R			60296 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ALEXANDRE TRUST ET AL	ALEXANDRE, YVONNE TTEE		19505 CHEROKEE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ANDERSON, DONALD B & FE L			60399 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ARNDT, TOBIAS R & ARNDT, ANGELA R			59990 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ARNOLD,STEPHEN J & TRESA J			59888 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
ARZOLA, ANAITIS IBANEZ ET AL			60319 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
AVION WATER COMPANY INC			60813 PARRELL RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BALDWIN, SEAN E			60091 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BANCROFT, LORANA TTEE ET AL	WILL OF ALLAN G TON		7760 E STATE ROUTE 69 #C5-356	PRESCOTT VALLEY, AZ 86314	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BARBARA MOORE TRUST	MOORE, BARBARA J TTEE		59966 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BAXTER, EMILIA & CORNELIUS, JETT			60299 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BEARD, JONATHAN SCOTT			19881 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BEND CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP			19831 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BENNETT, MORGAN			59781 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BERNHARDT, ALLISON RAE & RYAN S			20067 SHADY PINE PL	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BERRY, RICHARD G & KARON A			59798 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BETHANY R HILLIER TRUST	HILLIER, BETHANY R TTEE		59960 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BEVERLY A GREEN REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST	GREEN, BEVERLY A TTEE ET AL	C/O KYLE GREEN	530 LIVE OAK DR	BERTRAM , TX 78605	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BFL INVESTMENTS LLC			761 SELDON DR	WINCHESTER, VA 22601	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BILLINGTON,ROBERT C & VALERIE			60255 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BILYEU, THERESA ET AL			PO BOX 8103	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BISHOP, BRYAN C			59881 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BIXLER LIVING TRUST	BIXLER, TIMOTHY J & VIRGINIA J TTEES		5338 W 138TH PL	HAWTHORNE, CA 90250	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BLACKWELDER,ANTHONY L			60323 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BLAKE, AMBER M			60105 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BLAKLEY, RICHARD W JR ET AL			19219 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BLAYLOCK, SCOTT M & CAROL A			60668 ROCKING HORSE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOBBY & ROSELEE OSTRANDER LIV TRUST	OSTRANDER, BOBBY D & ROSELEE J TTEES		59852 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOGGESS, DORALEE R			60887 MCMULLIN DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOHREN,ANTHONY C			60189 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BONNIE J BOEHM REVOCABLE TRUST	BOEHM, BONNIE J TTEE		60281 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOROWINSKI, FRANK M & GEORGIA C			60818 GRANITE DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOYD, STEVEN T & VALADEZ-BOYD, ANITA			19887 ROCKING HORSE	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BOYER, MATTHEW			59774 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BRANSON, GAIL			59905 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BRAVO, GEORGE H III			59789 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BRENT JORDAN BOHLKEN LIVING TRUST	BOHLKEN, BRENT JORDAN TTEE		1649 VISTA DE MONTEMAR	EL CAJON, CA 92021	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BRITTAIN, KEVIN DANIEL ET AL			19877 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BROADHEAD,GARY L & DENISE L			59830 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BROCKWAY, PATRICK R & KAREN F			19645 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BROTHERS LIVING TRUST	BROTHERS, BRUCE J & CAROL L TTEES	C/O BRUCE J BROTHERS (A)	242 STILLWATER CT	MARCO ISLAND, FL 34145	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BROWNING, DALE A JR & CHARMAIN E M			59948 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BUCKLEY, JASON & DARCY L			59617 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BULLOCK, KAREN E			60256 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
BURNSON, ISAAC D & BRIANA A			59743 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CAMERON M KERR REV LIV TRUST	KERR, CAMERON M TRUSTEE		59700 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CAMPBELL, BOBBY & LISA			60255 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CAPASSO, DANIEL			60276 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CARTER, RONALD PAUL			59676 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CARTWRIGHT, BRIAN J & MARGO LYNN			59664 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CECIL,PETER			19840 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CHAMBERS LIVING TRUST	CHAMBERS, JAMES & JANET TTEES		19860 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CHAVEZ, WAYNE			60233 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CHRISTENSEN,JEFF & KOSS, LAUREN BROOKE			59683 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CJ DENS LACAMAS I LLC			PO BOX 2239	KALAMA, WA 98625	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CLARK,DANIEL KEVIN			PO BOX 6131	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CLARK,VICKI A			60030 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CLEMENS, BRUCE D & JEAN M			59736 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CLOUD, RICHARD & ANDREWS, KATHLEEN			PO BOX 7737	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
COLEMAN, LOIS R			60843 EMIGRANT CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
COLLINS 2008 REVOCABLE TRUST	COLLINS, NORMAN C & CLAUDIA B TTEES		432 EASTWOOD DR	PETALUMA, CA 94954	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
COSMOS COMPUTING INC			60365 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	
CRESS, DANA & KIMBERLE			60213 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR	

CRONIN, AUSTIN & ANDREA		59757 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
CRUM, DONALD D & SUSAN A		19872 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
CURTIS, CHRISTOPHER W		60203 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
CYMBALA,JOHN W		1110 CATALINA DR #102	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ 86403	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DAMMEN, DEREK L & GRANT, BRIANNA		59959 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DANIELS, DAVID HARLEY		65611 HIGHWAY 20	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DARDENNE, JORDAN M		20058 GRAND TETON DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DAVID CHARLES NUTTING REV TRUST	NUTTING, DAVID CHARLES TRUSTEE	60124 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702-8991	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DAVIES, RICHARD J ET AL		67221 AZALEA WAY SE	SNOQUALMIE, WA 98065	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DAWSON, ELLEN ELIZABETH & DANIEL SCOTT		59773 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DEFOE FAMILY TRUST	DEFOE, DONALD R & THERESA G TTEES	63310 OB RILEY RD	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DESCHUTES COUNTY	C/O PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	PO BOX 6005	BEND, OR 97708-6005	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DORIS E DILDAY REVOCABLE TRUST	DILDAY, DORIS E TTEE	60271 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DRW I LLC		8611 NE OCHOCO HWY	PRINEVILLE, OR 97754	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DUNMIRE, MARK B & ERIN C ET AL		378 WALNUT DR S	MONMOUTH, OR 97361	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
DYLLA,RICHARD P & CANDYCE R		59767 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ECKSTEIN, BENJAMIN ET AL		59705 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EDDIE W OWENS TRUST	OWENS, EDDIE W TTEE	60298 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EDMONSTON, MARCIA A		60251 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EDWARDS, KRISTIN D		59728 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EGGENSPERGER,NEIL P		60238 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EGGERT, JEREMY D & JESSICA L		1528 SE RIVERA DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ERVIN, MAX W		19976 WAGON TREE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EVERHART, SYDNEY E		60287 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
EVERSAUL, SCOTT		60207 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FERULLO, TODD W & NICHOLLE A		59849 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FIRKUS,CONRAD G & TAMMY L		60150 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FOLLETT, MARK L		60265 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FORSEY, JENNIFER		60286 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FOSTER HAYES LIVING TRUST	HAYES, DALE KEVIN TTEE ET AL	60305 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FRANCES W MILLS REV LIV TRUST	MILLS, FRANCES W & MICHAEL CO TTEES	5660 SW HELMHOLTZ	REDMOND, OR 97756	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FREEMAN, LEE J & KIMBERLY A		59810 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
FRY,DEBORAH MINOR		19668 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GARCIA, MARCELO ENRIQUE CUEVAS ET AL		59981 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GARZA, BRIAN		59965 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GILLESPIE JEFFRIES LIVING TRUST	JEFFRIES, SHERIDAN GM TTEE	59625 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 90272	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GO FORTH MINISTRIES		60377 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GONZALES, HARVEY JR & LYDAY, KYLA F		59720 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GONZALEZ,MARIA D		19967 DOUBLE TREE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GORMLEY, DANIEL A & JENNIFER M		60113 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GREGORY & SANDRA BEHRENS TRUST	BEHRENS, GREGORY J TTEE ETAL	59806 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GREGORY, TIMOTHY D		59641 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GRUBE, CHERYL A	WAINSCOAT, RENESH (CB)	136339 W FRIENDLY LN	CRESCENT, OR 97733	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
GULNAC, STACY N		60271 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HALL,MICHAEL A		19735 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HAMILTON, CHRISTOPHER K & HEATHER M		60237 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HAMILTON, JORDAN K & LISA A		60050 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HAMMER, TINA M		59674 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HARPOLE, JOSHUA & BARBARA J		19830 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HAUN, CARTER RYAN & WAWERS, SARAH		19748 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HEAVIRLAND, LORENE ET AL		59884 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HEDEMAN, JO ANNE		2329 E BEATRICE DR	MERIDIAN, ID 83642	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HENDRIXSON, CHARLES SCOTT		60650 ROCKING HORSE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HENSLEY, BILLY		19699 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HENSON, CALVIN D		60215 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HERMAN,DONNA	C/O DONNA LEON	786 NE TIERRA RD	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HERNANDEZ,JOSE A		60023 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HERRERA,THOMAS		19698 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HICKEY, DEBRA (BOBBIE) V ET AL		108 BIRCH ST	LAKEVIEW, OR 97630	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HIGGINS, ERIN L		59971 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HILLERICH, MICHAEL R & LISA D		60072 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HOLMES, JOSHUA L		59812 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
HOUNSHELL, GERALD JR & AVA D		60129 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
IACOVETTA REVOCABLE TRUST	IACOVETTA, GLENN T & VONDA L TTEES	60320 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JACOBS, NANCY D		20050 GRAND TETON DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JANET KAYE ASAY REVOCABLE TRUST	ASAY, JANET KAYE TTEE	60854 EMIGRANT DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JARRETTE, GABRIELA N & AMOS D		60146 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JEANTROUT,RICHARD F JR		59947 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JENSVOLD, JACOB SHELTON		19747 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JERRY & YVONNE PAXTON REVOCABLE TRUST	PAXTON, JERRY R TTEE	61141 S HWY 97 ## 602	BEND, OR 97702-2523	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JIMENEZ, JAIRO		59800 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JOHN A KOBLE TRUST	KOBLE, JOHN A TTEE	60311 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JOHNSON, GEORGE L		19766 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JOHNSON, KENA & KARL, SCOTT		59870 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JONES, GARY M & SANDRA A		2650 W 6TH ST	WASHOUGAL, WA 98671	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JONES, GREGORY J & JULIA V		2660 NE HWY 20 #610-413	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
JONES, KATHLEEN & RALPH, DANIEL		55375 BIG RIVER DR	BEND, OR 97707	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
K B-3 LLC		59935 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KALOKE, RICHARD P & BRANDEE M		19742 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KATHLEEN F DONOHUE REVOCABLE TRUST	DONOHUE, KATHLEEN F TTEE	60319 ADDIE TRIPLETT LP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KEEPERS ,ROBERT S & LINDA B		59998 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KENTNER, MICHAEL D		59691 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR

KERR, HODGE & DEBORA NORENE		21345 SW EDY RD	SHERWOOD, OR 97140	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KEYSER,JOHN M & PAMELA A		60393 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KINCANNON, PAUL & MEGHAN		60339 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KINNARD JOINT LIVING TRUST	KINNARD, JEFFERY L & ROSEMARY E TTEES	60333 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KOLANDER, KIM JANEEN		60267 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KOOK, KEEGAN		19737 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97701-7961	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
KRUEGER,EILEEN A		60196 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LAIRSON, ROSEANN		59797 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LANG, MARTIN J & PAULETTE M		60475 ZUNI RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LANGENHUYSEN, ELLIOT K		60197 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LARA,MICHAEL M II		59766 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LARSEN FAMILY TRUST	LARSEN, DARRYL A & MELINDA J TTEES	PO BOX 8268	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LARSEN, TROY DARROLL		59828 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LASSILA, DAVID H & RENE M		19789 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LEBART, JUSTIN M ET AL		60108 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LEDFORD, THOMAS L & DONNA J		59968 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LEIGHTY, MICHELLE C & REEVES, ASHLIN		60426 POCAHONTAS LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LINDSLEY, ROBERT S		19700 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LINSTAD, RYAN PATRICK		60330 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LIU, DAVID		3383 NW FAIRWAY HEIGHTS DR	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LOCKE, WALTER CRAIG ET AL		19685 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LOCKLING, MICHAEL ET AL		19720 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LOEKS FAMILY LIVING TRUST		16368 EMERALD GREEN LN	JEFFERSON, OR 97352	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LOVERSO, PETER R & ACOSTA, MONIKA M		19508 CHEROKEE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
LUCERO, CHRISTINE A & HILL, JOHN		19722 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MACHACEK, GARY & PATRICIA		1359 32ND AVE S	SEATTLE, WA 98114-3926	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MAQUET, JOSHUA		PO BOX 2142	BEND, OR 97709-4131	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MARIE CELESTINO TRUST	CELESTINO, MARIE MARINA TRUSTEE	9608 OAKDALE AVE	CHATSWORTH, CA 91311	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MARTIN, NOEL MAKENA & TRAVIS PATRICK		59610 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MASINGALE, DARIEN & CHRISTINE		60061 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MASTERS, DANIEL T & HILBURN, MELANIE A		59735 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MAYO,CURTIS E & MICHELLE D		59865 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MCKEIRNAN, ROBIN R & MAURICE A		60248 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MCNAUGHTON-VANOVER LIVING TRUST	MCNAUGHTON, DAVID K TTEE ET AL	65230 94TH ST	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MCWILLIAMS, TRACY A		60373 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MEALEY, JOAN E		PO BOX 6653	BEND, OR 97708-6653	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MEEKS, JAMES NACY & TERA ROXAN		59665 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MENDEZ, LUIS ALBERTO VILLANUEVA		60020 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MICHAEL KOZAK REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST	KOZAK, MICHAEL TRUSTEE	PO BOX 271	BEND, OR 97709	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MILLER, PATRICIA A		59811 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MITTAN, KYLE GLENN & CHELSEA ANNE		59712 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MONE, ERIC A & SAMANTHA E		59637 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MONROE, BRANDON & KYMBERLY		59707 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MONTGOMERY, GARRETT ET AL		59823 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORALES, REYES NAVA		59951 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORGAN WILLIAM SMITH FAM REV LIV TRUST	SMITH, MORGAN W TTEE	19805 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORGAN, VINCENT J & AMANDA		59609 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORISETTE, LANCE & KRISTINA R		19483 COMANCHE LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORITZ, JOSEPH E & PAMELA A		59930 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORNING STAR CHRISTIAN SCHOOL		19741 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MORRISON, COLIN & STEPHANIE		60308 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MOUNTAIN PINES PUD OWNERS' ASSOCIATION	C/O MILE HIGH MANAGEMENT	PO BOX 1048	BEND, OR 97709	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MURRAY, ALEXANDRE & HANNAH Z		60083 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
MUSSER FAMILY TRUST	MUSSER, GEORGE CALVERT TTEE ET AL	16404 S MOORE RD	OREGON CITY, OR 97045	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NAIRN, SAMANTHA		59774 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NICKLAW, JOHN O		59706 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NICKLAW,DAVID A & TINA M		59700 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NORRIS, CHRISTOPHER D & JANET W		60312 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NORRIS,MICHAEL J		59644 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
NORRIS,WILLIAM D & BONNIE T		59790 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OATHES, DELORIS MAE		19692 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
O'CONNELL, CRYSTAL M ET AL		61382 GEARY DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OLEACHEA,GARRY & JENNIFER		59895 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OLSEN, SANDRA P		59820 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OLSEN, SANDRA P		59820 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OREGON HIGH DESERT MUSEUM		59800 S HWY 97	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ORRICO, NICHOLAS A		60287 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ORTIZ, JOSE MANUEL ET AL		59920 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
OVERTON, AVERY		59871 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PACIFICORP		825 NE MULTNOMAH #STE 1900	PORTLAND, OR 97232	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PAHLISCH, DENNIS & BEVERLY		210 SW WILSON AVE #100	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PALMER, MICHAEL W & TERESA A		60345 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PALMESE, WILLIAM S		59819 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PANICO FAMILY TRUST	PANICO, PAUL JOHN TTEE ETAL	8 HILTON HEAD	RANCHO MIRAGE, CA 92270	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PAT & CINDY BAGHDIKIAN 2011 REV LIV TR	BAGHDIKIAN, CYNTHIA MARIE TTEE ET AL	PO BOX 8952	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96158	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PATE, TINA LOUISE		1906 BRAINERD CT	LUTZ, FL 33549	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PAULSON FAMILY TRUST	PAULSON, KARL A & MARY A TTEES	3194 NW FAIRWAY HEIGHTS DR	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PECK, ANDREW D		59620 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PEETERS, CHRISTIAN & RACHAEL ET AL		60260 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PEFFERLE LIVING TRUST	PEFFERLE, RANDALL TTEE	59656 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PEIL,RICHARD R & CYNTHIA M		60680 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PENNY DARLENE ALCORN LIVING TRUST	ALCORN, PENNY DARLENE TTEE	2856 DOS LOMAS	FALLBROOK, CA 92028	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR

PERKINS, CARL W		60060 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PERRINE,BRIAN S		59626 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PETERSON,WILLIAM N		PO BOX 1923	BEAVERTON, OR 97075	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PHELPS FAMILY TRUST	PHELPS, BARTON P II & LINDA J TTEES	60395 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PHELPS, MATTHEW & DANIELLE		60182 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PINEDA,JORGE LUIS & ARMINDA		60292 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PONDEROSA PINE ESTATES LLC		475 NE BELLEVUE AVE #210	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PONDEROSA TRUST	SET SAIL LLC, TTEE	3225 MCLEOD DR #777	LAS VEGAS, NV 89121	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PRIDAY, COURTNEY RYAN ET AL		19745 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PURCELL, MARK S & ROSEMARY Y		3554 CHINOOK ST	LONGVIEW, WA 98632	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
PUTNAM JOINT REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST	PUTNAM, DIANA M & LAWRENCE J TTEES	59988 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
QUARREL, JOHNATHON & COOLEY, LAUREN		60264 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RADCLIFF,ROY ALAN & TERRI L		60310 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RALEY, NICKLES J		59730 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RAY, VALERIE A		59937 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RAYMOND, MICHAEL		60444 POCAHONTAS LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RAZO, JUAN C & ROSAURA		60405 POCAHONTAS LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
REBECCA ANDERSON REVOCABLE TRUST	ANDERSON, REBECCA TTEE	60279 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
REBTEB LLC		2157 NE KIM LN	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RED BARN INVESTMENTS LLC		PO BOX 2234	BEND, OR 97709	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RHOADES,DANIEL S L & SHARON GAYE		19683 PLATINUM WAY	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RICHARDS, JEFF & LISA G		60116 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RICHARDSON, JENNIFER A ET AL		19358 MOHAWK RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RICKETSON, RUSSELL R		60179 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RIGGS FAMILY TRUST	RIGGS, ROBERT GRANT TTEE ET AL	19552 E CAMPBELL RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RIGNEY, MARK L		60812 GRANITE DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROBERTSON, BLAKE & SPANI, JESANN		11 E ALLISON ST #2	SEATTLE, WA 98102	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROBERTSON, KELLY M & PETER L		59754 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROBERTSON,PETE L & HAMILTON,KELLY M		59754 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RODGERS, SHERRY A		66230 BARR RD	BEND, OR 97703	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROGER A KADEL TRUST ET AL	KADEL, ROGER A & JANET S TTEES	22415 SW 65TH AVE	TUALATIN, OR 97062	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROGERS, BARRY D		59892 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROGERS, DAMON J		PO BOX 295	LOMITA, CA 90717-9998	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROGERS,LYDIA A		23043 MAPLE AVE #B-625	TORRANCE, CA 90505	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROGERS,VIRGINIA J & DAMON A		PO BOX 295	LOMITA, CA 90717-9998	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROLANDSON, SHELLY ANN		59922 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROSE, CATHLEEN		PO BOX 265	MT VERNON, OR 97865	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
ROSS, CAMERON & BETH		59697 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RUIZ, ANDREW M & OSBERG, ERIN C		59898 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RUSH, MICHAEL A		59744 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RUSSELL,STEPHEN G & DENA M		19850 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702-8942	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RUSSENBERGER, MARCEL		60483 UMATILLA CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RUTH ANN HERZER FAMILY TRUST	HERZER, RUTH ANN TTEE	PO BOX 7762	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
RV TRUST	HILDEBRANDT, WARREN R & VICTORIA B TTEES	8180 MANITOBA ST #320	PLAYA DEL REY, CA 90293	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SALISBURY, ANTHONY RAY ET AL		60121 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SAMS, RAYMOND D & CINDY M		19873 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SANTANA, EDUARDO D & SANTANA, MAYRA A		59860 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SCHNEIDER, VIRGINIA L		61535 S HWY 97 #174	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SELLERS, ASHLEY K	BOTTEN, MELISSA (CB)	4808 MILL CREEK TRL	FORT WORTH, TX 76092	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SHIIKI, BETH A		9512 NE 56TH CT	VANCOUVER, WA 98665-8253	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SHONKA, PAUL J & CINDY B		19776 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SIEG,AVEL G		55 EL CID PL	SPARKS, NV 89441	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SILVEY, GUY WILLIAM ET AL		60175 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SIMPSON,DANIEL B & SUSAN L		60302 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SKELTON, PATRICK R & BRENDA J		59904 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SMITH, DANIEL S & NATASHA M		20071 SHADY PINE PL	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SMITH, ELIZABETH		59657 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SMITH, FREDRICK S & ETHEL M		3249 SUMMER BREEZE AVE	ROSAMOND, CA 93560	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SMITH,JAMES L & CINDY L		60245 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SNELL, THOMAS D & SHANNA L		19825 ROCKING HORSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SOUTH 97 LLC		20335 FAIRWAY DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SPATRISANO, KATRINA & DENTON, CHAD		59925 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST FBO KAY O GREER	JOHN S & BARBARA C OTTONE FAM TRUST	20631 MARY WAY	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
SPERLING LIVING TRUST	SPERLING, DAVID J & PATRICIA M TTEES	20524 BRIGHTENWOOD CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STALEY, MATHEW T & RANAE M		59990 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STANLEY,JAMIE		60526 CHICKASAW WAY	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STATE OF OREGON DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION		4040 FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL DR SE #MS 2	SALEM, OR 97302-1142	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEED, WILLIAM JOSEPH & JESSICA CHERI		19730 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEELEY, DAVID A & LINDA KAY		60029 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEPHAN, GEORGE & PATRICIA		60259 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEPHEN MARSH REV TRUST	MARSH, STEPHEN TTEE	60315 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEPHEN W ROBERTS TRUST	ROBERTS, STEPHEN W TTEE	19502 COMMANCHE LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STEVENS, WILLIAM KENT & ROSE MARIE		19505 COMANCHE LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STIFF, BRYAN W & DONNA F		19772 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STILLWATER MANAGERS LLC		131 S HIGGENS #STE P-1	MISSOULA, MT 59802	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STOCKAMP, MARK C		60204 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STOLBERG, RYAN & WOOD, MEGUMI		60295 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STONEGATE OWNERS ASSOCIATION	C/O CRYSTAL LAKE PROP MGMT (A)	PO BOX 7384	REDMOND, OR 97708-7384	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STORLIE, CHRISTOPHER		1051 SW CROSSCUT	BEND, OR 97701	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STROHECKER,SHAWN W		19672 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STRONG, STANLEY M & JOYCE A		19966 WAGON TREE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR
STUART, HENRY C III & MILLER, MICHELLE A		60225 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD	23-302-DR

SURVIVORS TRUST	ROGERS, SCOTT V TTEES	27024 WOODBROOK RD	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA 90275	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
SWEET, NATHANIEL DAVID		14925 S CLAIM RD	MOLLALA, OR 97038	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
SZIGETI, RYDER		61386 GEARY DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
TERRY L & CANDICE E ANDERSON LIV TRUST	ANDERSON, TERRY L & CANDICE E TTEES	PO BOX 2185	SISTERS, OR 97759	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
TEXEIRA, JOHN		59956 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
THOMPSON, JEFF S & HEATHER L		59862 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
THORN, ANDREW		5020 HIDDEN CREEK LN	FAIR OAKS, CA 95628-4111	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
THORSTROM, MICHELLE A		60169 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
THUMB LLC		20505 MURPHY RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
TRACIE LORAIN LAYMAN LIV TRUST	LAYMAN, TRACIE LORAIN TTEE	60254 ADDIE TRIPLETT LOOP	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
UEHLIN, TROY N & BRANDEE		19955 WAGON TREE CT	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
URIZ, DANIEL J & TAMERA A		19770 BUCK CANYON RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
URTON, BRIAN D		59822 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
VAN VLIET,MARTIN T & DEBBIE D		60155 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
VANDERPOOL, JON K		60174 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
VEEK FAMILY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST	VEEK, JEFFREY ARTHUR TTEE ET AL	60148 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WAISNER,CLARA B		19700 BAKER RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WAITE, BRIAN		60811 GRANITE DR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WALLACE, JERRY J		59936 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WALLACE, STEPHANIE L		19696 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WARREN, JAMES R		60313 CINDER BUTTE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WATNE, RYAN P		60100 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WEIGAND, GREGORY LOUIS		59842 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WESTFALL, BRENT C		60224 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WHITE, IAN & CURRIE, JACQUELINE		60193 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WHITE, TERRY L		60060 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WHITNEY, DENISE		61149 S HWY 97 #178	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WHITWORTH, GREGORY A & AMY DARLYNE		59633 NAVAJO CIR	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WILLIAM & KARLIN CONKLIN TRUST ET AL	CONKLIN, WILLIAM P & KARLIN M TTEES	59935 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WILLIAM R & SHERYLE Y HOFFMAN TRUST	HOFFMAN, WILLIAM R & SHERYLE Y TTEES	60181 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WILLIAMS, JOHN S & EMILY N		19715 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WINDLINX RANCH TRUST	WINDLINX, ROBERT H JR TTEE	59850 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WINDLINX, FREDERICK R		59895 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	rwindlinx@empnet.com
WINDLINX, FREDRICK R		59885 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WINDLINX, RICHARD S & KARIN A		60025 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WOLFINGER,DWIGHT		60221 CHEYENNE RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WOLTER, KRISTIN K		19738 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WOOD, BRUCE A & ERTHA MAE		20063 SHADY PINE PL	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
WUERTHNER, GEORGE		PO BOX 8359	BEND, OR 97708	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
ZIVNEY, BRYAN CHRISTOPHER & CADY		19736 MANZANITA LN	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
ZOEPHEL, CARL		59878 NAVAJO RD	BEND, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	
Christopher P. Koback		1331 NW Lovejoy Street, Suite 950	Portland, OR 97209	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	chris@hathawaylarson.com
Dana Whitelaw	Oregon DOJ Counsel			Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	dwhitelaw@highdesertmuseum.org
Stacy C. Posegate				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	stacy.c.posegate@doj.state.or.us
Ken Shonkwiler		63055 N. Hwy 97, Bldg M	Bend OR 97703	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	Kenneth.d.shonkwiler@odot.oregon.gov
April Cleary				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	acleary@highdesertmuseum.org
David Roth				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	roth7001@gmail.com
Rob Garrott				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	rob@bendingpixels.com
Lisa Kieraldo				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	lisa.m.kieraldo@gmail.com
Brian Harris				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	bharrisks@hotmail.com
Jim Elliott				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	jelliott024@gmail.com
Cassie Doll				Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	cassandradowll@gmail.com
Laura Craska Cooper	Brix Law LLP	15 SW Colorado Ave., Suite 3	Bend, OR 97702	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	lcooper@brixlaw.com
Randy Akacich		1670 NW City View Dr	Bend, OR 97703	Hoff NOD 23-302-DR	randy.akacich@gmail.com



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

NOTICE OF HEARINGS OFFICER'S DECISION

The Deschutes County Hearings Officer has approved the land use application described below:

FILE NUMBER: 247-25-000093-A (Remand)

RELATED FILE NUMBERS: 247-23-000302-DR

SUBJECT PROPERTIES: Parcel 1 - A portion of Oregon Department of Transportation Right-of-Way for Highway 97 in Township 18S, Range 12E, Sections 19, 30, and 31, and in Township 18S, Range 11E, Section 36

Parcel 2 - 59800 Highway 97, Bend, OR 97702 /
Map and Taxlot 181100001900

OWNERS: Parcel 1 - Oregon Department of Transportation
Parcel 2 - Oregon High Desert Museum

APPLICANT: Oregon Department of Transportation ("Applicant")

REQUEST: The County previously issued a Declaratory Ruling addressing multiple issues presented by the Applicant in County File 247-23-000302-DR, including the zoning designation of Parcel 1, whether a proposed path qualifies as a Class III road and street project, and whether such projects are allowed by right in the RR-10 and OS&C zones. On appeal, the Land Use Board of Appeals ("LUBA") remanded the County's prior decision based on its conclusion that the County's findings were not adequate with respect to an issue raised in the County's initial proceedings. The Applicant requests that the County conduct remand proceedings to adopt new findings on that issue and to address the deficiency in the findings LUBA identified.

HEARINGS OFFICER: Tommy A. Brooks

STAFF CONTACT: Caroline House, Senior Planner
Phone: 541-388-6667
Email: Caroline.House@deschutes.org

RECORD:

Record items can be viewed and downloaded from:

<https://www.deschutes.org/cd/page/247-25-000093-odot-lava-butte-trail-remand>

DECISION:


Based on the findings in the Hearings Officer's decision, the Hearings Officer finds the Applicant's request for a Declaratory Ruling that Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10 does not amount to a collateral attack on the Weigh Station Decision and, therefore, that the finding in the Weigh Station Decision that Parcel 1 is zoned F-2 is not binding in this proceeding.

The above findings and conclusion address only the issue on remand as described in LUBA's decision and are not intended to modify the findings relating to any other standard or issue raised or addressed in the Initial Decision.

This decision becomes final twelve (12) days after the date mailed, unless appealed by a party of interest. To appeal, it is necessary to submit a Notice of Appeal, the base appeal deposit plus 20% of the original application fee(s), and a statement raising any issue relied upon for appeal with sufficient specificity to afford the Board of County Commissioners an adequate opportunity to respond to and resolve each issue.

Copies of the decision, application, all documents and evidence submitted by or on behalf of the applicant and applicable criteria are available for inspection at no cost. Copies can be purchased for 25 cents per page.

NOTICE TO MORTGAGEE, LIEN HOLDER, VENDOR OR SELLER: ORS CHAPTER 215 REQUIRES THAT IF YOU RECEIVE THIS NOTICE, IT MUST BE PROMPTLY FORWARDED TO THE PURCHASER.



owner	agent	inCareof	address	cityStZip	type	cdd id	email
ODOT Region 4 Planning	David Amiton		63055 N. Highway 97, Bldg M	Bend, OR 97703	NHOD	25-093-A	David.Amiton@odot.oregon.gov
WINDLINX RANCH TRUST	WINDLINX, ROBERT H JR TTEE		59850 SCALE HOUSE RD	BEND, OR 97702	NHOD	25-093-A	
Windlinx Ranch Trust	Randy Windlinx		59895 Scale House Rd	Bend, OR 97702	NHOD	25-093-A	rwindlinx@empnet.com
Christopher P. Koback			937 NW Newport Avenue, Suite 220	Bend, OR 97703	NHOD	25-093-A	chris@hathawaylarson.com
Dana Whitelaw					NHOD	25-093-A	dwhitelaw@highdesertmuseum.org
Stacy C. Posegate	Oregon DOJ Counsel				NHOD	25-093-A	stacy.c.posegate@doj.state.or.us
Ken Shonkwiler			63055 N. Hwy 97, Bldg M	Bend OR 97703	NHOD	25-093-A	Kenneth.d.shonkwiler@odot.oregon.gov
April Cleary					NHOD	25-093-A	acleary@highdesertmuseum.org
David Roth					NHOD	25-093-A	roth7001@gmail.com
Rob Garrott					NHOD	25-093-A	rob@bendingpixels.com
Lisa Kieraldo					NHOD	25-093-A	lisa.m.kieraldo@gmail.com
Brian Harris					NHOD	25-093-A	bharrisks@hotmail.com
Jim Elliott					NHOD	25-093-A	jelliott024@gmail.com
Cassie Doll					NHOD	25-093-A	cassandradoll@gmail.com
Laura Craska Cooper	Brix Law LLP		15 SW Colorado Ave., Suite 3	Bend, OR 97702	NHOD	25-093-A	lcooper@brixlaw.com
Randy Akacich			1670 NW City View Dr	Bend, OR 97703	NHOD	25-093-A	randy.akacich@gmail.com

**DECISION AND FINDINGS OF
THE DESCHUTES COUNTY HEARINGS OFFICER**

FILE NUMBER: 247-25-000093-A (Remand)

RELATED FILE NUMBERS: 247-23-000302-DR

HEARING DATE: March 18, 2025

HEARING LOCATION: Videoconference and
Barnes & Sawyer Rooms
Deschutes Services Center
1300 NW Wall Street
Bend, OR 97708

SUBJECT PROPERTIES: **Parcel 1** - A portion of Oregon Department of Transportation Right-of-Way for Highway 97 in Township 18S, Range 12E, Sections 19, 30, and 31, and in Township 18S, Range 11E, Section 36

Parcel 2 - 59800 Highway 97, Bend, OR 97702
Map and Taxlot 181100001900

OWNERS: **Parcel 1** - Oregon Department of Transportation
Parcel 2 - Oregon High Desert Museum

APPLICANT: Oregon Department of Transportation (“Applicant”)

REQUEST: The County previously issued a Declaratory Ruling addressing multiple issues presented by the Applicant in County File 247-23-000302-DR, including the zoning designation of Parcel 1, whether a proposed path qualifies as a Class III road and street project, and whether such projects are allowed by right in the RR-10 and OS&C zones. On appeal, the Land Use Board of Appeals (“LUBA”) remanded the County’s prior decision based on its conclusion that the County’s findings were not adequate with respect to an issue raised in the County’s initial proceedings. The Applicant requests that the County conduct remand proceedings to adopt new findings on that issue and to address the deficiency in the findings LUBA identified.

HEARINGS OFFICER: Tommy A. Brooks

STAFF CONTACT: Caroline House, Senior Planner
Caroline.House@deschutes.org / (541) 388-6667

I. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL FINDINGS

A. Applicant's Request; Scope of Remand Proceedings

The Applicant plans to construct a path on the Subject Properties ("Project"). The path would parallel Highway 97 and provide bicycle and pedestrian access between the City of Bend and areas south of the city, portions of which are on federally-owned lands. If completed, the path would tie into the existing Sun Lava Trail, which connects to the Sunriver community and to other recreational areas and attractions in the same vicinity.

As proposed, the entirety of the Project runs through multiple zones and into areas in which the County does not regulate land use. Through County File 242-23-000302-DR, the Applicant sought a Declaratory Ruling with respect to the portion of the Project that is within the County's jurisdiction. In a decision dated January 26, 2024 ("Initial Decision"), this Hearings Officer issued a Declaratory Ruling concluding, in part, that Parcel 1 of the Subject Properties is zoned RR-10. The County's Board of Commissioners declined to hear an appeal of that decision, thus making the Initial Decision the final decision of the County.

Windlinx Ranch Trust ("Windlinx") appeared during the County's proceedings leading up to the Initial Decision. As part of its participation, Windlinx and its representatives argued that the portion of the Applicant's request for a Declaratory Ruling relating to the zoning of Parcel 1 was precluded by the Deschutes County Code ("Code" or "DCC") because, according to Windlinx, the Declaratory Ruling was being "used to review and reverse [a] prior County Board decision." The prior decision Windlinx was referring to is the County's 1999 denial of the Applicant's request to site a weigh station in a portion of the right-of-way comprising Parcel 1 (the "Weigh Station Decision").¹ That decision contained findings that Parcel 1 was zoned F-2, and it applied the F-2 zone to that portion of the Subject Properties.

In support of this issue raised during the initial proceedings, Windlinx specifically argued that the finding in the Weigh Station Decision that Parcel 1 is zoned F-2 is binding on the present Application – both because of "issue preclusion" and because of the "collateral attack doctrine." The Initial Decision rejected Windlinx's arguments, concluding that the Weigh Station Decision was not binding on the present Application.

Windlinx appealed the Initial Decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals ("LUBA"). On June 24, 2024, LUBA issued a Final Opinion and Order ("LUBA Decision") resolving the issues raised in that appeal.² With one exception, LUBA denied each of the assignments of error raised in that appeal. The one exception was that LUBA sustained a portion of Windlinx's First Assignment of Error. Specifically, LUBA sustained Windlinx's first subassignment of error, which LUBA described as follows:

The first subassignment of error argues that the hearings officer's findings are inadequate to address petitioner's argument below that the hearings

¹ *In re Application of the Oregon Department of Transportation for a Conditional Use Permit and Variance*, County File Nos. CU-98-109 and V-98-15, Findings and Decision (June 28, 1999).

² *Windlinx Ranch Trust v. Deschutes County*, __ Or LUBA __ (LUBA No. 2024-010, June 24, 2024).

officer was bound by the board of commissioners' Weigh Station Decision that concluded that the zoning of the Trail Area was F-2, and consequently that determination could not be collaterally attacked in the proceeding on ODOT's application for a declaratory ruling regarding the Trail Area's zoning.³

After reviewing the findings in the Initial Decision, LUBA concluded "that the hearings officer's findings addressing petitioner's argument that the doctrine of collateral attack precludes the hearings officer from determining in a declaratory ruling that the zoning of the Trail Area is other than F-2 are inadequate."⁴ Although the Initial Decision addressed "issue preclusion" and LUBA denied a subassignment of error challenging that component of the decision, LUBA specifically noted that "[t]he doctrine of issue preclusion is related to, but distinct from, the collateral attack doctrine. We agree with petitioner that remand is required for the hearings officer to adopt adequate findings addressing petitioner's argument that the application is a collateral attack on the final and unappealed Weigh Station Decision."⁵

Based on the foregoing, the scope of this remand is narrow, and the County must adopt new findings that are adequate to address Windlinx's argument that the Application is a collateral attack on the Weigh Station Decision.

B. Notices and Hearing

On February 14, 2025, the County mailed a Notice of Public Hearing ("Hearing Notice"). Pursuant to the Hearing Notice, I presided over the hearing as the Hearings Officer on March 18, 2025, which began at 1:00 p.m. The Hearing was held via videoconference, with Staff from the Deschutes County Planning Division ("Staff"), the Applicant's representatives, and other participants present in the hearing room. The Hearings Officer and other participants participated remotely.

At the beginning of the Hearing, I provided an overview of the quasi-judicial process and the scope of the remand hearing, and I instructed participants to direct comments to the approval criteria and standards applicable to the scope of remand, and to raise any issues a participant wanted to preserve for appeal. I stated I had no *ex parte* contacts to disclose or bias to declare. I asked for but received no objections to the County's jurisdiction over the matter or to my participation as the Hearings Officer presiding over the Hearing.

The Hearing concluded at 1:47 p.m., at which time I announced that the record was closed.

C. Review Period

The Applicant submitted its request to initiate remand proceedings on February 12, 2025. Pursuant to DCC 22.34.030, the County will make a final decision on the request within 120 days of that date, which is June 12, 2025.

³ LUBA's Decision at p.4, line 16.

⁴ LUBA's Decision at p.8, line 9.

⁵ LUBA's Decision at p.10, line 11.

D. Record Issues

The Hearing Notice stated that, absent an order from the Hearings Officer reopening the record, no new evidence or testimony could be submitted to the record. Pursuant to DCC 22.34.040, the Hearings Officer has the discretion to reopen the record when appropriate during a remand proceeding. At the beginning of the Hearing, I announced that I was opening the record only to hear testimony or information relating to arguments regarding the issues within the scope of this remand proceeding, but that I would consider a request to open the evidentiary record.

Windlinx submitted a letter addressing the issue on remand, dated March 17, 2025. In that letter, and during the Hearing, Windlinx requested that the evidentiary record be reopened for the purpose of accepting new information Windlinx attached to that letter. The new evidence Windlinx wanted to include in the record is in the form of: (1) an email, dated February 18, 2021, from Peter Russell; (2) a memorandum, dated March 4, 2021, from Peter Russell; and (3) a memorandum, dated August 13, 2021, from David Amiton.

Based on the description provided by Windlinx during the Hearing, these new materials support Windlinx's argument that the Application is a collateral attack on the Weigh Station Decision. The new materials therefore address the same issue Windlinx raised in this proceeding, just in more detail, and given the date of the materials, they existed at the time of the initial Hearing and could have been submitted at that time. Because the scope of this remand as described by LUBA relates solely to the adequacy of findings, and Windlinx had a full and fair opportunity to develop the record in the prior proceedings, I find that it is not necessary or appropriate to reopen the record for these materials to be included. The items listed above are therefore excluded from this record and I am not considering any of the arguments in Windlinx's March 17th letter relating to those materials.

II. SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

As noted above and in the LUBA Decision, Windlinx asserts that the County's Weigh Station Decision determined that Parcel 1 is zoned F-2, that the Applicant could have, but did not appeal that decision, and that any determination in this proceeding that Parcel 1 is zoned other than F-2 is therefore prohibited by the collateral attack doctrine.

As set forth in the LUBA Decision, quoting from the Court of Appeals:

"A collateral attack 'is an attempt to impeach the decree in a proceeding not instituted for the express purpose of annulling, correcting, or modifying the decree' or enjoining its execution. *Morrill v. Morrill and Killen*, 20 Or 96, 101, 25 P 362 (1890). Collateral attacks are not permitted because the court or other tribunal having jurisdiction over parties and subject matter 'has a right to decide every question arising in the case, and, however erroneous its decision may be, it is binding on the parties until reversed or annulled.'

Id. at 102, 25 P 362." *Johnson v. Landwatch Lane County*, 327 Or App 485, 490 n 8, 536 P3d 12 (2023).⁶

In describing how the collateral attack doctrine works in the land use context, Windlinx and LUBA both point to *Gansen v. Lane County*, __ Or LUBA __ (LUBA No. 2020-074, Feb. 22, 2021). In that case, an applicant obtained a building permit in 2001, which itself expressly relied on a legal lot verification the applicant obtained through a separate process. Later, in 2020, the applicant again requested a legal lot verification for the same property, but that request was denied. The hearings officer denying that request did so on the basis of their conclusion that the 2001 building permit and lot verification were not final decisions, and their conclusion that the 2001 lot verification was erroneously decided. LUBA rejected both of those conclusions. In doing so, LUBA stated:

“We have held that, in challenging a development approval that depends upon a prior, unappealed land use decision, LUBA will not review arguments that the prior, unappealed decision was procedurally flawed or substantively incorrect, because such a challenge would constitute an impermissible collateral attack on a decision not before LUBA.”

In support of that statement, LUBA cited to other decisions in which it addressed potential collateral attacks on prior land use decisions:

- In *Landwatch Lane County v. Lane County*, 79 Or LUBA 65 (2019), the applicant for a forest template dwelling relied on units of land created by a previously approved land division. The petitioner challenging the forest template dwelling argued that the prior land division was flawed, but LUBA determined that the applicant could rely on that prior decision and that the petitioner was attempting to impermissibly bring a collateral attack on that prior decision.
- In *Lockwood v. City of Salem*, 51 Or LUBA 334 (2006), the applicant had previously received a “preliminary declaration” from the city, the first step in obtaining a tentative subdivision plan approval. The petitioner in that case then challenged the city’s approval of the tentative subdivision plan that was based on the preliminary declaration. LUBA rejected the portion of the petitioner’s challenge asserting that the preliminary declaration was flawed.
- Although LUBA did not expressly analyze the collateral attack doctrine in *Perry v. Yamhill County*, 26 Or LUBA 73 (1993), in that case it rejected a challenge based on similar facts as the *Lockwood* case. The petitioner there sought to challenge a county’s decision that an applicant had complied with conditions of approval by, in part, challenging the underlying decision that imposed those conditions, which LUBA determined was improper.

Other cases rejecting challenges based on the collateral attack doctrine have similar fact patterns. For example, in *Bergmann v. Brookings*, __ Or LUBA __ (LUBA No. 2020-096, Aug. 2, 2021), a petitioner challenged a city’s approval of a conditional use permit on a flag lot. The permit, for a residential facility,

⁶ LUBA Decision at p.5, line 5.

relied on the use of the “flagpole” portion of a lot created as part of a prior land partition for access to a public road. LUBA rejected a challenge to the adequacy of the flagpole area for that use, because its adequacy was established in the prior land partition.

The common theme in each of the cases where LUBA rejected an argument as an improper collateral attack is just as described in the *Gansen* case – LUBA will not review arguments that a prior decision is flawed when it considers a challenge to a new approval that depends on that prior decision. In contrast, new approvals that do not depend on a prior decision are not subject to the collateral attack doctrine. To that end, I find the case *Widgi Creek Homeowners Ass’n v. Deschutes County*, __ Or LUBA __ (LUBA No. 2014-109, June 2, 2015), to be instructive. There, LUBA addressed a challenge to a 2014 site plan approval and a tentative subdivision plan for a 24-lot subdivision. The hearings officer in the local proceeding in that case rejected an argument by the petitioner that the approval of the subdivision was inconsistent with an adopted master plan. The hearings officer rejected the argument as an impermissible collateral attack on prior decisions, noting that the consistency with the master plan was decided in earlier decisions in 2006 and 2009 approving development on the site. LUBA explained how the collateral attack doctrine works, concluding that the hearings officer’s reliance on that doctrine was “misplaced”:

“The 2006 decision did two things. First, it granted tentative plan approval (first stage tentative subdivision approval) for 64 lots. Second, it granted approval for a 42-unit condominium project. Later, a final plat was approved and recorded (second stage final subdivision approval). That final plat reflects the 2006 approval of a 42-unit condominium project, but it does not approve the 42-unit condominium project. It was the 2006 site plan decision that granted approval for the 42-unit condominium proposal. If petitioners were challenging the final plat approval for the 64 lots that were granted tentative plan approval or permits necessary to carry out the 42-unit condominium project, it might be accurate to say petitioners are collaterally attacking the 2006 decision. However, the final plat for 64 lots was recorded and is not the subject of this appeal. The 2006 site plan approval for the 42-unit condominium project has expired, and is not the subject of this appeal. The subject of this appeal is the 2014 application for approval of a 24-lot subdivision in place of the 42-unit condominium proposal. While intervenor-respondent characterized that application for tentative plan approval for a 24-unit townhouse subdivision as a second phase of the 2006 proposal, Record 385, it is not. It is a proposal for a development that is very different from the 42-unit condominium proposal that was approved in 2006. It also is a proposal for a development that is different from the subdivision that was approved in 2009. Petitioners’ challenge to the 2014 proposed subdivision proposal is not a collateral attack on the 2006 or 2009 decisions.” (Emphasis added).

I find that the present matter is distinguishable from the cases that apply the collateral attack doctrine to reject challenges to prior land use decisions. The Application here does not depend on the prior Weigh Station Decision. Unlike the facts in *Gansen*, *Landwatch Lane County v. Lane County*, *Lockwood v. City of Salem*, and *Bergmann v. Brookings*, where the challenged decision was essentially a second phase to

the prior decision being “attacked” (i.e. implementing a site plan, relying on tentative or final land division approval, or implementing conditions of approval), the present Application is a stand-alone approval that is not relying on any prior land use decisions, much less the Weigh Station Decision. It is therefore more like the scenario in *Widgi Creek Homeowners Ass’n v. Deschutes County* – “a proposal for a development that is very different from” the prior decision. As explained in the findings in the Initial Decision, “the only thing that Applicant’s request in this proceeding has in common with the Weigh Station Decision is that they both involve Parcel 1. The two proceedings do not involve the same use (a weigh station for trucks versus a path for bicycles and pedestrians). The two proceedings also do not appear to involve the same properties other than Parcel 1, as Parcel 2 was not part of the proposal in the Weigh Station Decision.”

To the extent there is any prior County decision related to this Application, it was the County’s decisions adopting the Zoning Map for the Subject Properties. As determined in the Initial Decision, affirmed by LUBA, that zoning decision resulted in the RR-10 zoning of Parcel 1.

I also note that the collateral attack doctrine appears to protect only those prior land use decisions that resulted in an approval. Windlinx argues that there is nothing different about an approval and a denial, and that a final land use decision is a final land use decision safe from collateral attacks regardless of the outcome. At the same time, Windlinx has not cited to any cases where a prior denial was subject to the collateral attack doctrine and binding on future decisions. This makes sense in light of how LUBA has described the doctrine, because a future land use action is unlikely to “depend on” a prior denial.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, I find that the Applicant’s request for a Declaratory Ruling that Parcel 1 is zoned RR-10 does not amount to a collateral attack on the Weigh Station Decision and, therefore, that the finding in the Weigh Station Decision that Parcel 1 is zoned F-2 is not binding in this proceeding.

The above findings and conclusion address only the issue on remand as described in LUBA’s decision and are not intended to modify the findings relating to any other standard or issue raised or addressed in the Initial Decision.

Dated this 10th day of April 2025.



Tommy A. Brooks
Deschutes County Hearings Officer

owner	agent	inCareof	address	cityStZip	type	cdd id	email
ODOT Region 4 Planning	David Amiton		63055 N. Highway 97, Bldg M	Bend, OR 97703	HOD	25-093-A	David.Amiton@odot.oregon.gov
Stacy C. Posegate	Oregon DOJ Counsel				HOD	25-093-A	stacy.c.posegate@doj.state.or.us
Ken Shonkwiler			63055 N. Hwy 97, Bldg M	Bend OR 97703	HOD	25-093-A	Kenneth.d.shonkwiler@odot.oregon.gov

From: rwindlinx <rwindlinx@empnet.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 12:39 PM

To: Peter Gutowsky <Peter.Gutowsky@deschutes.org>

Subject: Interpretation of the DCC and the 1999 DC Board Decision

Caution: External email to Deschutes County: If unexpected or unfamiliar, be cautious with links and attachments. Contact your IT Dept if unsure.

Dear Peter,

The attached first two documents are very significant regarding the underlying zone called into question by the Declaratory Ruling. Peter Russell's memo is very detailed on why the zone is F2, specifically citing the where and how the 1999 Board of Commissioners affirmed the zone. Mr. Russell further finds that "F-2 is the applicable zoning for the US 97 ROW east of the centerline, which is where the agency (ODOT) would prefer to locate the paved path."

The Second document is ODOT's acceptance of Mr. Russell's determination. These documents were omitted from the record and only discovered after I requested from ODOT all its correspondence related to the path after the record was closed.

Clearly, the Declaratory Ruling was categorically wrong to include the F2 Zone boundary, this was determined by the 1999 Deschutes County Board of Commissioners by means of applying proper Deschutes County Code standards, not some vague interpretation and "**BELIEF**" (Emphasis added) by Tim Berg (Except from attached memo).

DCC 18.12.040(A) states:

"Where a boundary line is indicated as following a **street**, alley, canal or railroad **right of way**, it shall be construed as following the centerline of such right of way." (**Emphasis added.**) (Excerpt from Peter Russell's Memo)

Deschutes County Code does not state or allow:

“Decisions that were made in the past (20+ years ago) were also made by decision-makers that did not have a very effective toolset. Often times [sic] those decision makers did not have computers or programs that allowed them to zoom, pan, scale or make interpretations from images or maps like we can more easily do today.” (Excerpt from Tim Berg attachment)

Deschutes County Code is very specific regarding zone boundaries, none of which requires the governing body to rely on some sort of toolset that allows one to “zoom, pan, scale or make interpretations.” The Official Deschutes County Mylar Zoning Map, in conjunction with DCC 18.12040, is the ultimate control and “effective toolset” on determining where zone boundaries lie within Deschutes County. If Mr. Berg was versed in Deschutes County Land Use, he would have known that the Official Deschutes County Mylar Map is backstopped by Deschutes County Code to prevent just such misinterpretations from individuals such as Mr. Berg and misguided Hearings Officers. This is a very dangerous situation if this practice is allowed as the new standard for zone boundary determination. It undermines the official Deschutes County process, not to mention the affirmation of a zone boundary by a Deschutes County Board properly applying Deschutes County Code.

The Hearings Officer has no authority to overturn the Deschutes County Board’s 1999 F2 Zone boundary determination. If Peter Russell’s memo, which explained in detail Deschutes County Code and how it applied to this matter, was part of the official record the Hearings Officer would have had no alternative other than to reaffirm the 1999 Board’s zone boundary determination.

I respectfully request that these attached documents along with this email be presented to the Planning Commission to help in their review of this matter.

Sincerely,

Randy Windlinx



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

To: David Amiton, ODOT Region 4 Planning & Programs Manager

From: Peter Russell, Senior Transportation Planner

Date: March 4, 2021

Re: Paved multi-use path and Forest Use (F-2) zone

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is planning to construct a paved multi-use path in ODOT right of way (ROW) between the Baker Road interchange and the High Desert Museum. County staff has been asked by agency staff and an adjoining property owner about the land use implications of placing the path in the ROW on the east side of the highway. Staff provides comments below as this is a matter of first impressions regarding zoning, zoning boundaries, Deschutes County Code (DCC), and any applicable state statute.

What is the applicable zoning?

The County's GIS system, aka DIAL, indicates that the US 97 ROW between Baker Road and the Deschutes National Forest (DNF) going north to south is zoned a mixture of Rural Residential (RR-10), Forest (F-2), Open Space and Conservation (OS&C), Surface Mining (SM) and Forest (F-1), which is the DNF. The County does not have any zoning authority on federal lands. In the figures below the zoning appears in the following colors:

- RR-10 (red)
- SM (pink)
- F-2 (dark green)
- OS&C (light blue)
- F-1 (light green)

The other zones on the map are not germane to this discussion.

Is a paved multi-use path allowed in the zone?

ODOT argues, and staff agrees, that a paved multi-use path is a transportation facility. Federal, state, and local governments have increasingly recognized the need to accommodate other modes besides motor vehicles; these emerging views are not always reflected in older development codes and state statutes.



Fig. 1 Zoning and potential multi-use path on E side of 97




Fig. 2 Detail of RR-10, F-2 zoning, and eastern ROW of 97

The applicable zones are RR-10, F-2, and OS&C. These are implemented through DCC 18.60, DCC 18.40, and DCC 18.48, respectively. The F-1 lands (DCC 18.36) in the project area are under federal jurisdiction. For the SM zone there is a tax lot between the SM zone and the US 97 ROW, the significance of which is explained below under the zoning boundaries discussion.

To answer the zoning questions, it is first necessary to understand that County code at DCC 18.04.030 classifies road and street projects into three categories.¹ Staff has reviewed the definitions and finds the paved path is clearly not a Class I Project. A reasonable argument could be made that the paved path could be viewed as a Class II Project under (B)(2) as currently bike/ped traffic either does not, or rarely, utilizes US 97 to go north-south. The paved path would therefore constitute a change in local traffic patterns. A Class II project requires a land use permit. An equally reasonable interpretation could be made that this is a Class III Project as a paved bike/ped path physically separated from the highway's travel lanes and shoulders is a safety improvement for bicyclists and pedestrians. A Class III project does not require a land use permit.

Staff believe the Class III definition more closely resembles the project, but the distinction is a matter of interpretation as both Class II and Class III reference a traffic safety component. Staff notes bicycle lanes are considered road and street projects under DCC 18.04.030. Staff would defer to a hearings officer on whether the paved path is a Class II or Class III project and whether it meets or can meet the requirements of a bike lane or bike path set forth by Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 801.155 (bicycle lane) and 801.160 (bicycle path).

RR-10:

DCC 18.60.020(E) lists Class I and Class II road and street projects as uses allowed outright, provided the projects are subject to approval as part of a land partition, subdivision, or subject to

¹ Road and street project" means the construction and maintenance of the roadway, bicycle lane, sidewalk or other facility related to a road or street. Road and street projects shall be a Class I, Class II or Class III project.

- A. Class I Project. Land use permit required. "Class I Project" is a major project such as:
 - 1. A new controlled-access freeway;
 - 2. A road or street project of four or more lanes on a new location; and
 - 3. A major project involving the acquisition of more than minor amounts of rights of way, substantial changes in access control, a large amount of demolition, displacement of a large number of residences or businesses or substantial changes in local traffic patterns.
- B. Class II Project. Land use permit required. "Class II Project" is a:
 - 1. Modernization where a road or street is widened by more than one lane;
 - 2. Traffic safety or intersection improvement which changes local traffic patterns;
 - 3. System change which has significant land use implications; or
 - 4. The construction of a new County road or street within a dedicated public right-of-way, where none existed before.
- C. Class III Project. No land use permit required. "Class III Project" is a modernization, traffic safety improvement, maintenance, repair or preservation of a road or street.

the standards of DCC 18.116.230.² DCC 18.60.020(F) lists a Class III road or street project as an outright permitted use. Thus, regardless if it is determined whether the paved path is a Class II or Class III road or street project, the paved path is an outright permitted use in the RR-10 zone.

F-2

While the other zones in the project area reference Class I, II, and III road or street projects, the F-2 zone does not. Instead the F-2 zone references broad descriptions of transportation projects and ORS 215.283, which deals with uses in the Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone, which like the Forest zone, is a resource zone.

DCC 18.40.020(J) lists as an outright permitted use the widening of existing roads within existing ROW, provided the project is consistent with the transportation element of the comprehensive plan and ORS 215.283(1). The paved path is not a climbing lane nor a passing lane so the paved path does not satisfy ORS 215.283(1)(h). The highway is not being reconstructed or modified as the number of travel lanes and highway width will remain the same, so the paved path does not satisfy ORS 215.283(1)(i). Nor is the paved path a minor betterment as described at ORS 215.283(1)(k). The paved path does not appear on the County's Transportation System Plan (TSP) map nor is there any TSP text specifically describing this paved path. The TSP does have Goals and Policies supportive of having bike facilities that allow interconnectivity between urban and rural areas of the County, which would support the paved path. Based on this analysis, staff believes the paved path is not an outright permitted used in the F-2 zone.

DCC 18.40.030(U) lists as a conditional use public road and highway projects as described in ORS 215.283(2) and (3), which will be analyzed in order. ORS 215.283(2)(q) cites additional passing or climbing lanes which require additional ROW, but do not create a new land parcel. The paved path is neither a passing lane nor a climbing lane and will occur in existing ROW, thus it does not meet ORS 215.283(2)(q). ORS 215.283(2)(r) is a reconstruction or modification of public roads and highways that also includes removal or displacement of buildings, but does not create new land parcels. Again, the paved path is neither a reconstruction of the highway or modification as number of travel lanes, lane widths, shoulder widths, access, etc. will remain the same post-project as pre-project. Thus the paved path does not meet ORS 215.283(2)(r). ORS 215.283(2)(s)

² Class I and II road or street projects shall be reviewed against the applicable Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan element, shall be consistent with applicable road standards and shall meet the following criteria:

- A. Compatibility with existing land use and social patterns, including noise generation, safety hazards (e.g. children in a residential area), and zoning.
- B. Environmental impacts, including hazards imposed to and by wildlife (e.g. migration or water use patterns).
- C. Retention of scenic quality, including tree preservation.
- D. Means to improve the safety and function of the facility, including surrounding zoning, access control and terrain modifications.
- E. In the case of roadways where modification results in a change of traffic types or density, impacts on route safety, route land use patterns, and route nonmotorized/pedestrian traffic.
- F. Consideration of the potential developmental impact created by the facility.
- G. Cost effectiveness.

concerns improvements of public road and highway related facilities, such as maintenance yards, weigh stations and rest areas, where additional property or ROW is required, but does not result in new parcels. The paved path is neither of these described elements and would be placed in existing US 97 ROW. Thus, the paved path does not meet ORS 215.283(2)(s).

ORS 215.283(3) states roads, highways, and other transportation facilities and improvements not allowed by ORS 215.283(1) and (2) may be allowed subject to the approval of the governing body or its designee in areas zoned EFU. (Again, the code directs to this section and applies it to Forest, another resource zone.) ORS 215.283(3)(a) requires the County to approve an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 4 (Forest) and any other applicable goals. Based on this analysis, staff finds the paved path can be a conditional use in the F-2 zone.

Staff believes as a matter of first impression that ORS 215.283(3) does offer the paved path a way forward through the local land use process by having ODOT apply to the County for a Goal 4 Exception in the F-2 zone.

Open Space and Conservation

DCC 18.48.020(D) lists a Class I and II road or street project as allowed outright, provided the projects are a subject to approval as part of a land partition, subdivision, or subject to the standards of DCC 18.116.230. DCC 18.48.020(E) lists a Class III road or street project as an outright permitted use. Thus, regardless if it is determined whether the paved multi-use path is a Class II or Class III road or street project, it is an outright permitted use in the OS&C zone.

Where are the boundaries of the zone(s)?

Figure 2 shows the RR-10 zone extending to the eastern edge of the US 97 ROW and the F-2 zone beginning on the west edge of the Windlix properties. These properties are at 59895 Scale House Rd, aka 18-12-31, Tax Lot 200 and 59885 Scale House Rd., aka 18-12-31, TL 300. However, DCC 18.12.040 states “[U]nless otherwise specified, zone boundaries are section lines, lot lines, **centerlines of street or railroad rights of way**, water courses, ridgelines...” **(Emphasis added)**. Additionally, DCC 18.12.040(A) states:

“Where a boundary line is indicated as following a **street**, alley, canal or railroad **right of way**, it shall be construed as following the centerline of such right of way.” **(Emphasis added.)**

Therefore, west of the centerline the US 97 ROW is RR-10 and east of the centerline the ROW of US 97 is F-2. DCC 18.12.040 does state if there is an error, the original ordinance and its map exhibit in the official county records will control. Staff is unaware of any error.

The Board of County Commissioners affirmed the 97 ROW east of the centerline was F-2 in its findings and decision rejecting the ODOT weigh station application, CU-98-43/V-98-6, on June 28, 1999. This was for a weigh station on the east side of the US 97 ROW north of the High Desert Museum entrance. Specifically, on Page 9 under Section 6.1 of its findings, the Board addressed the issue of zoning boundaries, finding the applicable zoning was F-2.

Based on the explicit language in DCC 18.12.040 and the Board's decision on CU-98-43/V-6, staff finds F-2 is the applicable zoning for the US 97 ROW east of the centerline, which is where the agency would prefer to locate the paved path.

Is a Goal 4 (Forest) exception required?

County code, state statute, and administrative rule appear to be in conflict or at least contradict on this question. This is not an unusual situation in planning.

In the F-2 zone, DCC 18.040.030(U) refers to ORS 215.283(2) and (3) of which the latter refers to the need for an exception to applicable statewide planning goals. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-012, aka the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) lists at OAR 660-012-0065 transportation uses on rural lands that do not need a goal exception. OAR 660-012-0065(3)(h) states:

“Bikeways, footpaths and recreational trails not otherwise allowed as a modification or part of an existing road.”

Staff believes the intent of OAR 660-012-0065(3)(h) was to allow these uses as stand-alone projects in resource zones, but does note the qualifier of “modification or part of an existing road.” The question for a hearings officer would be: is staff's interpretation correct or is a physically separated paved path not a modification of an existing road. In other words, does “road” mean the larger transportation corridor within the ROW or is “road” limited to the specific physical elements (median, travel lanes, shoulders, etc.). OAR 660-012-0005(27) simply defines roads as “means streets, roads, and highways.” Staff believes the correct approach is “road” should include the broader interpretation of including the ROW as that land is intended for current and future transportation uses.

Another wrinkle is ORS 215.296. Both ODOT staff and DLCD's “Guide to Trails in EFU and Forest Zones” dated December 10, 2015, reference a review process involving ORS 215.296. The guide indicates the ORS 215.296 review process:

“...could occur as part of a quasi-judicial or legislative review. A legislative review involving a Transportation System Plan would be the preferred approach, although individual landowners along a proposed route should in this case be notified, within the standard notification distance.”

Yet, based on the language at ORS 215.296(1) this process apparently only applies to land uses allowed under ORS 215.213(2) or (11) or 215.283(2) or (4). ORS 215.213 does not apply to Deschutes County as this statute is for counties that adopted marginal lands prior to 1993 and Deschutes County did not. As explained above in the F-2 zoning section, the County does not believe ORS 215.283(2) applies to the proposed paved path. ORS 215.283(4) concerns agri-tourism events and thus is not applicable.

Staff finds it ambiguous at best whether ORS 215.296 applies in this instance. Opponents could also argue whether the paved path is a trail or a bike path. Staff does note a public hearing for a

declaratory ruling, a conditional use permit, a text amendment, or a plan amendment would be consistent with ORS 215.296.

Next steps

The County would encourage ODOT to schedule a pre-application meeting; County staff would include at minimum the Senior Lead Planner from Current Planning and the Senior Transportation Planner. As the paved path in the F-2 zone is a matter of first impressions, any land use application would be sent to a hearings officer. Plan amendments go before the Planning Commission and then the Board of County Commissioners.

There are several potential avenues, but the County does not imply any of these will necessarily result in an automatic approval of the paved path; rather these are options for ODOT to address the land use question(s). The options are not presented in any order of preference, but are presented in order of the land use process from shortest to longest. Another option is to move the paved path to the western half of the ROW where there are no land use ambiguities.

- Apply for a Declaratory Ruling if a Goal 4 Exception is needed (150 days)
- Apply for a Conditional Use Permit to build the paved path (150 days)
- Apply for a text amendment to add a bicycle path and/or trail as an outright permitted use in the F-2 zone (no set time, but 12 months is not uncommon)
- Apply for a text amendment to allow a Class II or III projects an outright permitted use in the F-2 zone (no set time, but 12 months is not uncommon)
- Apply for a map amendment to place the paved path on the TSP map (no set time, but 12 months is not uncommon)
- Submit comments in the TSP Update process to add language specific to the Baker Road-High Desert Museum paved path in the Bike/Ped section's Goals and Policies (probably 15-18 months until update is completed)
- Submit comments in the TSP Update process to add the paved path to the TSP map (probably 15-18 months until update is completed)



Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

Department of Transportation
Region 4 Planning & Programming

To: Peter Russell, Deschutes County Senior Transportation Planner

From: David Amiton, ODOT Region 4 Planning & Programming Manager

Date: August 13, 2021

Subject: Baker Road to Lava Butte Multi-Use Path and Forest Use (F-2) Zone

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is currently leading a planning process to determine the best possible alignment for a multi-use path to connect the existing Sun-Lava Paved Path at the Lava Lands Visitor Center to a proposed trailhead in the vicinity of the US 97/Baker Road interchange. During this planning process ODOT is coordinating with Deschutes County Planning staff to evaluate three proposed path alignment alternatives north of the Forest Service boundary: two alignments on the west side of US 97 and one on the east side of US 97. Based on a technical feasibility analysis and subsequent public involvement process, ODOT views the proposed east side option as the likely preferred path alignment.

In the course of the planning process, ODOT discovered that a small segment of the proposed east side alignment (~2,400') that is entirely within ODOT right-of-way would pass through lands zoned F-2 (Forest Use). ODOT considers multi-use paths to be essential transportation facilities similar to a travel lane, shoulder, sidewalk, or bicycle lane; however, under County Code a multi-use path is not considered an outright permitted use in the F-2 zone.

ODOT proposes to work with the County to ensure that a multi-use path is explicitly described as an outright permitted use in County Code. ODOT will request a pre-application meeting with Deschutes County Planning in the near future, following completion of the current public involvement phase. In preparation for that discussion we have outlined our preferred options to ensure an east side multi-use path alignment would be considered an allowed use. ODOT requests County review and feedback related to the proposed options prior to a future pre-application meeting.

Options in order of ODOT preliminary preference:

1. Text amendment to add the following language to DCC 18.40.020 – Uses Permitted Outright:
 - a. O. Transportation improvements on rural lands allowed by OAR 660-012-0065.
2. Text amendment to add the following section and language to DCC 18.08 – Basic Provisions (and any needed amendments to Definitions in 18.04):
 - a. 18.08.050. Transportation-Related Uses:

- i. The following transportation-related improvements and activities are considered “Essential Services” uses and are permitted outright in all County zones, unless otherwise specified in individual zones.
 - 1. Normal operation, maintenance, repair, and preservation activities of existing transportation facilities.
 - 2. Installation of culverts, multi-use paths, medians, fencing, guardrails, lighting, and similar types of improvements.
 - 3. Projects specifically identified in the Deschutes County Transportation System Plan.
 - 4. Landscaping as part of a transportation facility.
 - 5. Emergency measures necessary for the safety and protection of property.
 - 6. Acquisition of right-of-way for public roads, highways, multi-use paths, and other transportation improvements designated in the Deschutes County Transportation System Plan.
- 3. Zone change (change the zoning of ODOT right-of-way on the east side of US 97 to match the zoning on the west side of US 97).
- 4. Apply for a CUP for the proposed path under DCC 18.40.030 – Conditional Uses Permitted:
 - a. U. Public road and highway projects as described as ORS 215.283(2) and 215.283(3).
- 5. Amend the existing Deschutes County TSP text and map to include the proposed path. Include the proposed path in the current TSP Update.

Caroline House

From: Tim Berg
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:55 PM
To: Caroline House
Subject: Zoning in T.18 R. 12 S. 30-31

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Caroline,

I am unaware of any zone changes that have occurred in sections 30 or 31 within Township 18, Range 12 after 1997. The Geographic Information System (GIS) data pertaining to zoning was digitized from the official mylar zoning maps by W&H Pacific in the early 1990's. Tracking zone changes within the zoning GIS data began in 1997.

From a historical perspective, the mylar maps have always been somewhat cumbersome to interpret and were maintained by CDD staff who were not specifically trained in cartographic principles. Decisions that were made in the past (20+ years ago) were also made by decision-makers that did not have a very effective toolset. Often times those decision makers did not have computers or programs that allowed them to zoom, pan, scale or make interpretations from images or maps like we can more easily do today. It is my belief that the zoning boundary that extends along the eastern edge of Highway 97 south of Bend is accurately depicted based on measurements that I have compared from the original mylar zoning maps.

Hopefully this is somewhat helpful. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you,



Tim Berg | Applications / Systems Analyst
Deschutes County Community Development
117 NW Lafayette Ave | Bend, Oregon 97703
Tel: (541) 330-4648
  