1	BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD OF APPEALS
2 3	OF THE STATE OF OREGON
4	1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON,
5	Petitioner,
6	1 etitioner,
7	and
8	
9	CENTRAL OREGON LANDWATCH,
10	Intervenor-Petitioner,
11	
12	inchem and vs.
13	
14	UMATILLA COUNTY,
15	Respondent,
16	
17	and a more than the second to
18	
19	JIM WHITNEY,
20	Intervenor-Respondent.
21	an ennebd no judiciet coview of újis Clater. Hadiclor, relava t
22	LUBA No. 2025-028
23	
24	1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON,
25	Petitioner,
26	
27	VS.
28	
29	UMATILLA COUNTY,
30	Respondent,
31	an d
32 33	and
33 34	IIM WHITNEY
3 <del>4</del> 35	JIM WHITNEY, Intervenor-Respondent.
36	inier venor-Kesponaem.
30 37	LUBA No. 2025-029
3 <i>1</i> 38	LODA 140. 2023-027

1	FINAL OPINION
2	AND ORDER
3	
4	Appeal from Umatilla County.
5	
6	Eve Goldman represented petitioner.
7	
8	Robin Hayakawa represented intervenor-petitioner.
9	
10	Douglas R. Olsen represented respondent.
11	
12	Wendie L. Kellington represented intervenor-respondent.
13	
14	BASSHAM, Board Member; ZAMUDIO, Board Chair, participated in the
15	decision.
16	
17	WILSON, Board Member, did not participate in the decision.
18	
19	DISMISSED 08/07/2025
20	
21	You are entitled to judicial review of this Order. Judicial review is
22	governed by the provisions of ORS 197.850.

## Opinion by Bassham.

2	Pursuant to ORS 197.830(13)(b) and OAR 661-010-0021, Umatilla
3	County withdrew the decisions challenged in these consolidated appeals for
4	reconsideration on May 1, 2025. On June 30, 2025, the Board received the
5	county's decision on reconsideration. Pursuant to OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a),
6	petitioner had until July 21, 2025, to either refile its original notices of intent to
7	appeal in this matter, or file an amended notice of intent to appeal. The Board has
8	not received refiled original notices of intent to appeal or an amended notice of
9	intent to appeal in accordance with OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a).
10	OAR 661-010-0021(5)(e) provides that "[i]f no amended notice of intent
11	to appeal is filed or no original notice of intent to appeal is refiled, as provided in
12	[OAR 661-010-0021(5)(a)], the appeal will be dismissed."
13	This appeal is dismissed. Matrix Development v. City of Tigard, 25 Or
14	LUBA 557 (1993).

1