

1 Gustafson, Board Chair.

2 The petition for review in this appeal was due April 8,
3 1998. On April 6, 1998, the Board received a letter from
4 petitioner, which petitioner referred to as a "21 Day
5 Response." That letter did not meet the specifications of a
6 petition for review, as listed in OAR 661-10-030(2). In
7 response, on April 9, 1998, the Board issued a letter
8 informing petitioner that we construed his letter as a
9 petition for review, but that it was deficient in numerous
10 respects. Accordingly, pursuant to OAR 661-10-030(3), we
11 allowed petitioner three days to correct the deficiencies.

12 In response to our letter, on April 12, 1998, petitioner
13 submitted another letter, requesting that we excuse the
14 deficiencies in his initial letter and consider that initial
15 letter as a complete petition for review. The city and county
16 now move to dismiss this appeal on the basis that petitioner
17 has not timely filed a petition for review that meets the
18 requirements of OAR 661-10-030(2).

19 We grant respondents' motion. Petitioner's "21 Day
20 Response" fails to meet the requirements for a petition for
21 review in numerous respects. For instance, it follows none of
22 the specifications for the format of a petition for review as
23 listed in OAR 661-10-030(2). Nor does it comply with the
24 requirements for the content of a petition for review, as
25 specified in OAR 661-10-030(4). Petitioner was provided the
26 opportunity and chose not to attempt to submit a petition in

1 conformance with our rules.

2 This appeal is dismissed.