1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
3	
4	FRED STAUFFER
5	and CRYSTAL STAUFFER,
6	Petitioners,
7	
8	VS.
9	
10	LANE COUNTY,
11	Respondent.
12	·
13	LUBA No. 2000-161
14	
15	FINAL OPINION
16	AND ORDER
17	
18	Appeal from Lane County.
19	
20	Steve Cornacchia, Eugene, represented petitioner.
21	
22	Stephen L. Vorhes, Eugene, represented respondent.
23	
24	HOLSTUN, Board Member; BRIGGS, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member,
25	participated in the decision.
26	
27	DISMISSED 04/24/2001
28	
29	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the
30	provisions of ORS 197.850.
31	

1	Opinion by Holstun.
2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(12)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Lane County withdrew the
3	decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on December 15, 2000. On March 19
4	2001, the Board received Lane County's decision on reconsideration. Pursuant to
5	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioners had until April 9, 2001 to either refile their original
6	notice of intent to appeal in this matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal. The
7	Board has not received a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice or
8	intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
9	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to appeal is filed
10	or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)]
11	the appeal will be dismissed."
12	This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or LUBA 557
13	(1993).