1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS	
2	OF THE STATE OF OREGON	
3		
4	NORMAN McDOUGAL,	
5	Petitioner,	K SHTUPS
6	11/26/18 Amil 0:05 i	_1.8-51-8
7	VS.	
8		
9	LANE COUNTY,	
10	Respondent,	
11		
12	and	
13		
14	LANDWATCH LANE COUNTY,	
15	Intervenor-Respondent.	
16		
17	LUBA No. 2018-025	
18		
19	FINAL OPINION	
20	AND ORDER	
21		
22	Appeal from Lane County.	
23		
24	Bill Kloos, Eugene, represented petitioner.	
25		
26	H. Andrew Clark, Lane County Counsel, Eugene, represented respondent.	
27		
28	Andrew Mulkey, Eugene, represented intervenor-respondent.	
29		
30	RYAN, Board Chair; BASSHAM, Board Member; ZAMUDIO, Board	
31	Member, participated in the decision.	
32	DIGI (IGGED 11/07/2010	
33	DISMISSED 11/26/2018	
34		
35	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is	
36	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.	

13

14

LUBA 557 (1993).

2 Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Lane County 3 withdrew the decision challenged in this appeal for reconsideration on April 4, 2018. On October 23, 2018, the Board received the County's decision on 4 5 reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a), petitioner had until 6 November 11, 2018, to either refile its original notice of intent to appeal in this 7 matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal. The Board has not received 8 a refiled original notice of intent to appeal or an amended notice of intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).<sup>1</sup> 9 OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides "[i]f no amended notice of intent to 10 11 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." 12

This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Landwatch Lane County appealed the county's decision on reconsideration, and that appeal is LUBA No. 2018-134.