2 OF THE STATE OF OREGON 3 4 J.C. REEVES CORPORATION, 5 Petitioner, 6 7 vs. 8 9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
J.C. REEVES CORPORATION, Petitioner, vs. WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
5 Petitioner, 6 7 vs. 8 9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
6 7 vs. 8 9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
7 vs. 8 9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
8 9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
9 WASHINGTON COUNTY,	
·	
10 Respondent.	
11	
12 LUBA No. 98-130	
13	
14 FINAL OPINION	
15 AND ORDER	
16	
17 Appeal from Washington County.	
18	
William C. Cox, Portland, represented petitioner.	
20	
Allan A. Rappleyea, Sr. Assistant County Counsel, Hillsboro, repres	ented
respondent.	
23	
HOLSTUN, Board Member; BRIGGS, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member	mber.
25 participated in the decision.	,
26	
27 DISMISSED 08/01/2001	
28	
You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by	v the
30 provisions of ORS 197.850.	,
31	

1	Opinion by Holstun.
2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Washington County
3	withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on August 24, 1998. On
4	July 2, 2001, the Board received Washington County's decision on reconsideration.
5	Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until July 23, 2001 to either refile its
6	original notice of intent to appeal in this matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal.
7	The Board has not received a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice
8	of 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).