



1 Opinion by Holstun.

2 Pursuant to ORS 197.830(12)(b) and OAR 661-10-021, the  
3 county withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for  
4 reconsideration on November 24, 1993. On March 14, 1994,  
5 the Board received the county's decision on reconsideration.  
6 Pursuant to OAR 661-10-021(5)(a), petitioner had until April  
7 4, 1994 to (1) refile its original notice of intent to  
8 appeal in this matter, or (2) file an amended notice of  
9 intent to appeal. The Board has not received a refiled  
10 original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of  
11 intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-10-021(5)(a).

12 OAR 661-10-021(5)(d) provides "[i]f no amended notice  
13 of intent to appeal is filed or no original notice of intent  
14 to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-10-021(5)(a)],  
15 the appeal will be dismissed."

16 This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City  
17 of Tigard, 25 Or LUBA 557 (1993).