

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OREGON

HOOD RIVER VALLEY RESIDENTS' COMMITTEE, INC., an Oregon non-profit corporation, and **MIKE MCCARTHY**, an individual resident of the State of Oregon and Hood River County,

Petitioners-Appellants,

v.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF HOOD RIVER COUNTY, an Oregon Municipal Corporation, and **MT. HOOD MEADOWS OREGON, LTD.**, an Oregon limited partnership.

Respondents-Respondents.

CA No. A118889

Hood River County Circuit
TC. 020029 CC

APPELLANTS' HOOD RIVER VALLEY RESIDENTS'
COMMITTEE, INC. AND MIKE MCCARTHY'S
BRIEF AND EXCERPT OF RECORD

Appeal from a Judgment entered on July 10, 2002 in the
Circuit Court for Hood River County,
Honorable Donald H. Hull, Circuit Judge

Wilford K. Carey OSB No. 72047
Annala Carey Baker & Thompson, P.C.
PO Box 325
Hood River, Oregon 97031
Telephone: (541) 386-1811

Teunis J. Wyers, OSB No. 76387
PO Box 417
Hood River, Oregon 97031
Telephone (541) 386-2221
Attorneys for Respondent-Respondent
Board of County Commissioners of Hood
River County

Jonathan M. Radmacher OSB No. 92431
McEwen Gisvold, 1600 Standard Plaza
1100 SW Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
Telephone: (503) 412-3522
Attorney for Respondent-Respondent Mt.
Hood Meadows Oreg., Ltd.

Ralph O. Bloemers, OSB No. 98417
Telephone: (503) 525-2724
Christopher G. Winter, OSB No. 98435
Telephone: (503) 525-2725

Cascade Resources Advocacy Group
917 SW Oak, Suite 417
Portland, OR 97205
Facsimile: (503) 296-5454

Attorneys for Petitioners-Appellants
Hood River Valley Residents Committee
and Mike McCarthy

FILED: JANUARY 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
A. Nature of the Action	1
B. Nature of the Judgment	1
C. Basis for Appellate Jurisdiction.....	1
D. Date of Judgment and Notice of Appeal.....	1
E. Questions Presented on Appeal	1
F. Summary of Arguments.....	2
G. Statement of Facts.....	4
II. FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR	
The Circuit Court committed reversible error by ruling that the decision to exchange land was a legislative decision not subject to the writ of review	6
A. Preservation of Error.....	6
B. Standard of Review.....	7
III. ARGUMENT ON FIRST ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR.....	7
A. Discussion.....	7
1. The Land Exchange was a quasi-judicial action of the County	7
a. Oregon courts use a three-part test to determine whether a county's decision is quasi-judicial.....	8
b. The County in this case made a quasi-judicial decision, because it was required to apply the statutory "equal value" requirement to the discrete facts of a land exchange between two property owners.	9
c. ORS 275.335 and ORS 275.100 provide a quasi-judicial process.....	12
i. ORS 275.100 applies to the Land Exchange	12
ii. ORS 275.100 and ORS 275.335 each establish a quasi-judicial process	16
IV. SECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR	

The Circuit Court committed reversible error by ruling that neither the Hood River Valley Residents Committee nor Mr. McCarthy have standing to challenge the decision to exchange land	18
A. Preservation of Error.....	18
B. Standard of Review.....	20
V. ARGUMENT ON SECOND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR.....	21
A. Discussion.....	21
1. Circuit Court's Rulings on May 23, 2002 and July 10, 2002.....	21
2. Applicable Law on Standing.....	21
3. The Land Exchange injures Mr. McCarthy's legally protected rights.....	27
a. Mr. McCarthy meets the constitutional minimum for standing.....	28
i. Mr. McCarthy has demonstrated particularized injury to his protected recreational rights necessary to support standing.....	29
ii. The loss of Mr. McCarthy's use of the selected lands is fairly traceable to the defective valuation and process, and it is substantially likely that setting aside the County's decision will redress that injury	30
iii. Courts do not demand more than Mr. McCarthy has shown to satisfy the causation and redressability requirements for standing.....	31
b. Mr. McCarthy's distinct injury is not subsumed or eliminated by the fact that others in the County may share the same interests or injuries.....	32
c. The Circuit Court misapplied the appropriate legal standard on causation in finding that Mr. McCarthy's additional injuries, beyond the injury to his recreational interest, was insufficient to establish a justiciable controversy.....	34
4. The Land Exchange injures HRVRC's legally protected rights.....	37
a. HRVRC meets the constitutional minimum and statutory requirements necessary to establish a justiciable controversy because of the injury to HRVRC's members' substantial interests.....	38

i.	HRVRC's members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right.....	40
ii.	HRVRC is representing its members' interests and the interests HRVRC seeks to protect are germane to its purpose.....	41
iii.	Neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires participation of individual members in the lawsuit.....	43
b.	The fact that others in the County may be injured similarly does not operate to subsume HRVRC's distinct injury.....	44
c.	The Circuit Court misapplied the appropriate legal standard on causation in finding that HRVRC's direct injuries, beyond the injury to its members' interests, were not sufficient to establish a justiciable controversy.	46
5.	The Circuit Court failed to assume the veracity of the allegations.	47
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	48

APPENDIX

Excerpt of Record and Index:	ER – 1-41
------------------------------------	-----------

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>1000 Friends of Oregon v. Multnomah Co.</i> 39 Or App 917, 923, 593 P2d 1171 (1979).....	25,39-41
<i>Allen v. Wright</i> , 468 US 737, 754 (1984).....	44
<i>American Insurance Association v. Selby</i> , 624 F Supp 267 (D.D.C. 1985).....	42
<i>Bergford v. Clack. Co./Trans. Serv.</i> , 15 Or App 362, 515 P2d 1345 (1973).....	23
<i>Brandt v. Marion County</i> , 6 Or App 617, 488 P2d 1391 (1971).....	23
<i>Brooks v. Dierker</i> , 275 Or 619, 625, 552 P2d 533 (1976)	7
<i>Desert Citizens Against Pollution v. Bisson</i> , 231 F3d 1172 (9th. Cir. 2000).....	26,31-32,34-35
<i>Drummond v. Miami Lumber Co.</i> , 56 Or 575 (1910).....	26,31,47
<i>Duddles v. City Council of West Linn</i> , 21 Or App 310, 535 P2d 583 (Or App 1975).....	22-23,26,29,31,47
<i>Erwin v. Oregon State Bar</i> , 149 Or App 99, 941 P2d 1094 (1997).....	24
<i>Estate of Gold v. City of Portland</i> , 87 Or App 45, 740 P2d 812 (1987).....	8
<i>Fairbanks v. Bureau of Labor and Industries</i> , 323 Or 88, 913 P2d 703 (1996)	14
<i>Federal Election Com'n v. Akins</i> , 524 US 11, 118 SCt 1777, 141 LEd 2d 10 (1998).....	33
<i>Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw</i> , 528 US 167, 120 S Ct 693, 145 L Ed2d 610 (2000).....	36-37
<i>Hall v. Norton</i> , 266 F3d 969, 976 (9 th Cir. 2001).....	28,35-37
<i>Humane Society of the United States v. Hodel</i> , 840 F2d 45 (D.C.Cir. 1988).....	42-43
<i>Hunt v. Washington Apple Advertising Comm'n</i> , 432 US 333, 97 S Ct 2434 (1977).....	25,39-40
<i>International Union, UAW v. Brock</i> , 477 US 274, 106 SCt 2532 (1986).....	42
<i>Jaqua v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 125 Or App 294, 296, 865 P2d 442 (1993).....	20
<i>Jefferson Landfill Comm. v. Marion Co.</i> , 297 Or 280, 686 P2d 310 (1984).....	24

<i>Lane v. City of Prineville</i> , 49 Or App 385, 619 P2d 940 (1980).....	7,17
<i>League of Oregon Cities v. State of Oregon</i> , 334 Or 645, 56 P3d 892 (2002)...	24-25,31,35,46
<i>Local No. 290, Plumbers and Pipefitters v. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality</i> , 136 Or App 213, 901 P2d 921 (1995) (“ <i>Local No. 290 I</i> ”).....	25,39-41,46
<i>Local No. 290, Plumbers and Pipefitters v. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality</i> , 323 Or 559, 919 P2d 1168 (Or. 1996) (“ <i>Local No. 290 II</i> ”).....	40-41
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 US 555, 112 S Ct 2130, 119 L Ed 2d 351 (1992).....	21
<i>Matter of Marriage of Horn</i> , 97 Or App 177, 775 P2d 338, <i>rev den</i> 308 Or 465, 781 P2d 1214 (1989).....	7,20
<i>Magar v. City of Portland</i> , 179 Or App 104, 39 P3d 234 (2002).....	7
<i>Medical Association of Alabama v. Schweiker</i> , 554 F Supp 955 (M.D.Ala. 1983).....	42
<i>National Constructors Association v. National Electrical Contractors Association</i> , 498 F Supp 510 (D.Md. 1980).....	42
<i>National Forest Preservation Group v. Butz</i> , 485 F2d 408 (9th Cir. 1973).....	32
<i>People for Ethical Treatment v. Inst. Animal Care</i> , 312 Or 95, 817 P2d 1299 (1991).....	23,33,45,46
<i>PGE v. Bureau of Labor and Industries</i> , 317 Or 606, 859 P2d 1143 (1993).....	13
<i>Piatt v. Medford Highlands, LLC</i> , 173 Or App 409, 22 P3d 767 (2001).....	14
<i>Rendler v. Lincoln Co.</i> , 302 Or 177, 728 P2d 21 (1986).....	25,39
<i>Schlesinger v. Reservists Committee to Stop the War</i> , 418 US 208 (1974).....	44
<i>Sierra Club v. Morton</i> , 405 US 727 (1972).....	29,32
<i>State v. Guzek</i> , 322 Or 245, 906 P2d 272 (1993).....	14
<i>State v. Vandepoll</i> , 118 Or App 193, 846 P2d 1174 (1993).....	15
<i>Strawberry Hill 4 Wheelers v. Benton County Board of Commissioners</i> , 287 Or 591, 601 P2d 769 (1979)	7,8,9,10,17-18
<i>US v. Students Challenging Regulatory Agency Procedures</i> , 412 US 669 (1973).....	29
<i>Utsey and League of Women Voters of Coos County v. Coos County</i> , 176 Or App 524, 32 P3d 933 (Or App 2001).....	21-23,26,45

Rules and Statutes

ORS 19.205(1).....1-18

ORS 20.220..... 1

ORS 34.010 *et seq*..... 7,21,43

ORS 34.040.....21-22

ORS 34.100 7

ORS 271.310.....17

ORS 275.100.....2,10,12-17,22,27

ORS 275.335..... 2,10-17,22,27

ORS 457.230.....11

Other

Opinion No. 7734, 39 Or Op Atty Gen 597 (March 15, 1979).....13

Opinion No. 8070, November 16, 1981, Mr. Hugh Garrabrant,
42 Or. Op. Atty. Gen. 140 29

Webster's Third New Int'l Dictionary 13

