1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS		
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON		
3			
4	DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION		
5	AND DEVELOPMENT,		
6	Petitioner,		
7	1 cuitotici,		
8	and		
9	and		
10	CITY OF LOWELL		
11	Intervenor-Petitioner,		
12	miervenor-remioner,		
	•••		
13	VS.		
14	I AND COLINEY		
15	LANE COUNTY,		
16	Respondent.		
17	1 LID A N. 2000 075		
18	LUBA No. 2008-075		
19			
20	CITY OF CRESWELL, CITY OF JUNCTION CITY,		
21	CITY OF OAKRIDGE and CITY OF VENETA,		
22	Petitioners,		
23			
24	and		
25			
26	CITY OF LOWELL		
27	Intervenor-Petitioner,		
28			
29	VS.		
30			
31	LANE COUNTY,		
32	Respondent.		
33			
34	LUBA No. 2008-078		
35			
36	FINAL OPINION		
37	AND ORDER		
38			
39	Appeal from Lane County.		
40	•		
41	Danielle Aglipay, Assistant Attorney General, Salem, represented petitioner		
42	Department of Land Conservation and Development.		
43			
44	Carolyn H. Connelly, Eugene, represented petitioners City of Creswell, City of		
45	Junction City, City of Oakridge and City of Veneta.		

1	John H. Beckfield, Salem, represented intervenor-petitioner.	
2		
3	Stephen L. Vorhes, Assistant County Counsel, Eugene, represented respondent.	
4	-	
5	HOLSTUN, Board Member; BASSHAM, Board Chair, participated in the decision.	
6		
7	RYAN, Board Member, did not participate in the decision.	
8	-	-
9	DISMISSED	12/08/2008
10		
11	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is governed by the	
12	provisions of ORS 197.850.	

Opinion by Holstun.

## MOTION TO INTERVENE

- 3 The City of Lowell moves to intervene on the side of petitioners. No party opposes
- 4 the motion, and it is granted.

## **DECISION**

1

2

5

- Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Lane County withdrew the
- 7 decision challenged in these appeals for reconsideration on May 29, 2008. On June 27,
- 8 2008, the Board received Lane County's decision on reconsideration. Pursuant to
- 9 OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioners had until July 18, 2008, to either refile their original
- 10 notices of intent to appeal in this matter, or file amended notices of intent to appeal. The
- 11 Board has not received refiled original notices of intent to appeal or amended notices of
- intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
- OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to appeal is filed
- or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in [OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)],
- the appeal will be dismissed."
- These appeals are dismissed. *Matrix Development v. City of Tigard*, 25 Or LUBA
- 17 557 (1993).