



# CITY OF PORTLAND

Office of City Auditor LaVonne Griffin-Valade

## Hearings Office

1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 3100

Portland, OR 97201

phone: (503) 823-7307 - fax: (503) 823-4347

web: [www.portlandoregon.gov/auditor/hearings](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/auditor/hearings)



## HEARINGS OFFICER'S FINAL ORDER

APPEAL OF DAN WENDELL, DIAMOND AND JEWELRY BUYER.COM

CASE NO. 3100401

DATE OF HEARING: November 16, 2010

### APPEARANCES:

Mr. Ken McGair, Attorney for the City

Mr. Thurl Stalnaker, Jr., Attorney for Mr. Wendell

Mr. Dan Wendell, Appellant

HEARINGS OFFICER: Mr. Gregory J. Frank

### FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

**Procedural History:** Mr. Dan Wendell, on behalf of Diamond and Jewelry Buyer.com ("Appellant") filed an appeal form requesting a hearing before the City of Portland Hearings Officer (Exhibit 2). The Hearings Officer provisionally denied Appellant's request for an appeal hearing for lack of required information (Hearings Officer's Order dated October 15, 2010). Mr. Thurl Stalnaker, Jr. ("Mr. Stalnaker"), an attorney representing Appellant, submitted a request that Appellant be granted additional time to submit information (Exhibit 14). The Hearings Officer granted Appellant additional time to submit information required to perfect its right to an appeal hearing (Hearings Officer's Supplemental Order dated October 26, 2010). Based upon the submission of additional information by Mr. Stalnaker (Exhibit 16) the Hearings Officer granted Appellant's request for an appeal hearing. The Hearing was held on November 16, 2010.

**Document Subject to This Appeal:** The City of Portland Office of Management and Finance, Revenue Bureau, Regulatory Division (the "Revenue Bureau"), on August 27, 2010, issued a letter to Appellant (Appellant referenced as DJB in the August 27, 2010 letter) stating, in part, the following:

"As authorized by PCC 14B.90.050 B, DJB's application for the renewal of the Secondhand Dealer Permit is hereby denied. The denial is effective immediately. DJB must not acquire any

regulated property.” (Exhibit 3). The August 27, 2010 letter shall hereafter be referred to as the “Determination Letter.”

Appellant appeals, for reasons set forth in this decision, the validity of the Determination Letter.

**Appeal Issues Raised by Appellant:**

1. Appellant denies that violations of Portland City Code (“PCC”) 14B.90, as made by the Revenue Bureau, occurred.
2. Even if violations of PCC 14B.90 are found to exist the Hearings Officer should find the Revenue Bureau erred in denial of Appellant’s Secondhand Dealer permit because of mitigating factors set forth specifically in PCC 14B.90.050 C.
3. Denial by the Revenue Bureau of Appellant’s Secondhand Dealer permit application is arbitrary and capricious and an abuse of discretion in violation of Appellant’s due process rights under the United States and Oregon Constitutions.

**Discussion of Appellant’s Issue 1 (City Erred in Finding Violations of PCC 14.90 Occurred):**

The Revenue Bureau, in the Determination Letter, described violations alleged to have been committed by Appellant (Exhibit 3). The Revenue Bureau asserted that Appellant violated PCC 14B.90 in 2008 by failing to properly document, in writing, acquisitions of regulated property, failed to tag acquired regulated property, and failed to adequately review customer identification. The Revenue Bureau described alleged violations of PCC 14B.90.440 C by Appellant in 2008 and 2009, and noted that the Revenue Bureau initially recommended denial of Appellant’s permit renewal application for 2009 (Exhibit 5). Subsequently, the Revenue Bureau granted Appellant a 2009 permit with conditions (Exhibit 9).

The Determination Letter further referenced alleged violations that occurred in 2010. The 2010 alleged violations included events occurring on July 6, 2010 involving Appellant’s failure to submit required written transaction reports, and failure to follow PCC 14B.90 and Administrative Rules (“LIC”) in transactions or interactions Mr. Ken McLain (“Mr. McLain”) and Mr. Al Rashidi (“Mr. Al Rashidi”). Additional allegations of violations of PCC 14B.90 were referenced during the hearing testimony of Ms. Anne Holm (“Ms. Holm”), Portland Police Sgt. Troy King (“Sgt. King”), Portland City Detective Amber Lewis (“Det. Lewis”) and City of West Linn Detective Nicholas Amendolara (“Det. Amendolara”).

In its final written submission (Exhibit 22), the Revenue Bureau focused its attention on three categories of alleged violations committed by Appellant. The Hearings Officer summarizes the Revenue Bureau alleged violations, as set forth in Exhibit 22, as follows:

- a. Improper reporting of Secondhand Dealer transactions per PCC 14B.90.080 and LIC 10.03; and
- b. Failure to tag regulated property for identification; and
- c. Failure to abide by the 2009 Revenue Bureau agreement.

**Alleged Violation of PCC 14B.90.080.**

PCC 14B.90.080 establishes an obligation upon Secondhand Dealers, holding City of Portland permits, to provide reports regarding regulated property transactions. PCC 14B.90.080 authorizes Administrative Rules to be promulgated related to reporting requirements. LIC-10.03 is the Administrative Rule setting forth detailed and specific Secondhand Dealer regulated property transaction reporting requirements.

Ms. Holm, Regulatory Program Administrator for the Revenue Bureau, and Det. Lewis, with the City of Portland Police Bureau, testified that on July 6, 2010 while conducting a site visit at Appellant's business location, they observed a number of PCC 14B.90.080 reporting requirement violations. Ms. Holm and Det. Lewis stated that the alleged violations included inaccurate transaction reports, failure to receive acceptable identification from a seller of regulated property, incomplete description of regulated property and incomplete (RAPID)<sup>1</sup> reports.

Appellant testified that he made a good faith effort to use the RAPID electronic reporting system, but he and other Secondhand Dealers were having problems with the computer program. Appellant testified that he hired Mr. Duane Osburn ("Mr. Osburn") on July 7, 2010 to perform transaction reporting tasks; including operating the RAPID system. Appellant testified that the property description issues "can be caused by a misunderstanding of the terms used in the jewelry business." Appellant denied any violation occurred with respect to Mr. Al Rashidi because no sale was ever consummated.

The Hearings Officer finds Appellant offered an explanation of why the RAPID system was not used (computer problems) and that misunderstandings can occur when describing jewelry, but did not deny the reporting violations actually occurred. The Hearings Officer, therefore, finds that it is more probable than not that Appellant did violate PCC 14B.90.080 and LIC 10.03 by failing to accurately complete transaction reports (Exhibit 11, pages 7 and 8). The Hearings Officer finds no violation of PCC 14B.90.080 and/or LIC 10.03 occurred related to Mr. Al Rashidi as no transaction was consummated.

**Alleged Failure to Submit Written Reports and Tag Regulated Property.**

Appellant argues that the transaction with Mr. McLain, on July 6, 2010, is exempt from reporting requirements under LIC 10.04 (Exhibits 16 and 23). LIC 10.04 B states:

"A Dealer is not required to obtain the seller's identification, photograph the seller, record the seller's thumbprint, or have the seller complete the Declaration of Proof of Ownership if the Dealer complies with the remaining requirements in the Administrative Rules and if the item is used, regulated property acquired from a licensed business. The Dealer must keep a receipt for the item from the licensed business that includes the licensed business name and a description of the item. The receipt must be retained at the Dealer's business location for one year or until the

---

<sup>1</sup> A computerized regional property data base program. The program is the electronic transaction reporting method prescribed by the City of Portland Police Bureau.

item is sold, whichever is longer. The Dealer must record on the transaction report the name and location of the business in the name and address fields of the transaction report form, and the date of acquisition. The item does not have to be held.”

Evidence is in the record that Mr. McLain has a “business license” in Lake Oswego, Oregon (Exhibit 16g). The Hearings Officer finds that Mr. McLain acted on behalf of a “licensed business.” Next, the Hearings Officer considers whether or not Appellant complied, in his interaction with Mr. McLain on July 6, 2010, with the “remaining requirements in the Administrative Rules” (LIC 10.04 B). The Hearings Officer interprets “remaining requirements in the Administrative Rules” to refer, at a minimum, to all Administrative Rules for Secondhand Dealers (LIC 10.01, LIC 10.02, LIC 10.03, LIC 10.04 and LIC 10.05).

LIC 10.01 defines regulated property for the purposes of Secondhand Dealer regulation. Mr. McLain, per testimony of Det. Lewis (also see Exhibit 11, pages 4 and 5), informed Det. Lewis that on July 6, 2010, he did sell items to Appellant and did not show Appellant any identification. The items purchased by Appellant from Mr. McLain on July 6, 2010 included “a few pieces of simple non-descript gold jewelry including a gold chain” (Exhibit 11, page 5). The Hearings Officer finds the items purchased by Appellant from Mr. McLain are regulated property as defined in LIC 10.01 A.

The Hearings Officer finds LIC 10.02 is not relevant to these findings.

The Hearings Officer finds that for the exception, as set forth in LIC 10.04.B to apply (Secondhand Dealer not required to obtain identification, photo, thumbprint and declaration of ownership), the reporting requirements of LIC 10.03 must be satisfied. Det. Lewis testified that Appellant told her that he did not prepare a written report and “this is the first I have heard of it” (referring to the reporting requirements for purchase of regulated property from a licensed person). The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant did not dispute Det. Lewis’ testimony regarding his failure to complete a written report for the July 6, 2010, McLain purchases. The Hearings Officer finds Appellant did not comply with Administrative Rule LIC 10.03 (reporting requirements) with respect to Appellant’s purchase of regulated property from Mr. McLain on July 6, 2010.

The City argues (Exhibit 22, page 2) that PCC 14B.90.080 and PCC 14B.90.100 should also be considered as Administrative Rules as referenced in LIC 10.04.B. The Hearings Officer finds PCC 14B.90.080 adds no additional reporting requirements in addition to those set forth in LIC 10.03. The Hearings Officer finds that PCC 14B.90.100 creates obligations not independently described in LIC 10.01, LIC 10.02, LIC 10.03, LIC 10.04 and LIC 10.05.

The City argues that Appellant violated PCC14B.90.100 in the Mr. McLain transaction on July 6, 2010. The Hearings Officer finds the City’s argument and interpretation plausible wherein PCC 14B.90.100 can be considered as a requirement of the Administrative Rules. The Hearings Officer finds that literally “Administrative Rules” means those regulations in LIC 10.01, LIC 10.02, LIC 10.03, LIC 10.04 and LIC 10.05. However, the Hearings Officer finds it common, when referring generally to “Administrative Rules,” to be referencing all relevant

laws pertaining to a particular subject matter. The Hearings Officer, although with less certainty than in the above findings related to Appellant's failure to prepare written reports (per LIC 10.03), finds that Appellant's placing of regulated property purchased from Mr. McLain in his pocket without tagging the regulated property, on July 6, 2010, is an additional failure to comply with the Administrative Rules.

The Hearings Officer finds that the Appellant cannot, in the purchase of regulated property from Mr. McLain on July 6, 2010, avail himself of the LIC 10.04.B exception. The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant, in the July 6, 2010 transaction with Mr. McLain, did not comply with the "remaining requirements of the Administrative Rules."

**Discussion of Appellant's Issue 2 (PCC 14B.90.050.C. Factors):**

The Hearings Officer considers Appellant's argument that the Revenue Bureau Determination Letter was an abuse of discretion, arbitrary and capricious in the findings for Appellant's Issue 3 below. In these findings the Hearings Officer will address Appellant's argument that the Revenue Bureau erred in applying the facts and/or evidence of this case to PCC 14B.90.050.C.

PCC 14B.90.050.B states that if an applicant for a Secondhand Dealer permit is found to have engaged in certain activities then the application shall/must be denied. PCC 14B.90.050.C provides an exception to the absolute denial requirement of PCC 14B.90.050.B.

PCC 14B.90.050.C states, in its entirety, the following:

"Notwithstanding Section 14B.90.050.B, the Director may grant a permit after consulting with the Chief of Police despite the presence of one or more of the enumerated factors if the applicant establishes to the Director's reasonable satisfaction that:

1. The behavior evidenced by such factor is not likely to recur; or,
2. The behavior evidenced by such factor is remote in time; or,
3. The behavior evidenced by such factor occurred under circumstances that diminish the seriousness of the factor as it related to the purpose of Chapter 14B.90."

Ms. Holm and Sgt. King testified that during Appellant's 2009 renewal application process certain violations of PCC 14B.90.050.B were noted. Specifically, Appellant allegedly did not complete required paperwork, did not tag purchased regulated property, did not photograph (when required) regulated property and did not complete Declarations of Proof of Ownership (when required). (See also Exhibit 5.) Appellant responded in 2009 to these allegations by stating, "I get the message!" (Exhibit 6). Appellant informed Sgt. King that Appellant's past violations of PCC 14B.90.050.B were not intentional, but rather were tied to other factors which could be addressed by changes to Appellant's business practices. Sgt. King stated that Appellant, or his son ("Chris Wendell"), indicated that Appellant's age and fatigue contributed to Appellant having difficulty in "keeping on top of the various code requirements and paperwork issues that his business generates" (Exhibit 8).

Ms. Holm and Sgt King testified that initially the Revenue Bureau recommendation, for Appellant's 2009 Secondhand Dealer permit, was denial. Eventually the Revenue Bureau granted Appellant a Secondhand Dealer permit with conditions (Exhibit 9). Exhibit 9 contained the following language:

"Diamond & Jewelry Buyers' Secondhand Dealer permit will be renewed, effective immediately, with the understanding that violations of 14B.90 will not recur, and based on the assurances by you and Chris Wendell that the following changes will be made to the way transactions are conducted at DJB.

1. Within 30 days of the date of this letter, all acquisitions will be reported into the Regional Automated Property Information Database (RAPID) at the time of acquisition.
2. Each item will be electronically photographed at the time of acquisition, as part of the SDR, for transmission of RAPID.
3. Chris Wendell will be the only person at DJB that reports acquisitions in to RAPID."

Based upon the findings for Appellant's Issue 1 above, the Hearings Officer finds that violations of PCC 14.90 did occur after the effective date of Exhibit 9 (June 11, 2009). Further, based upon the testimony of Appellant, Ms. Holm and Det. Lewis, it is clear that on July 6, 2010, Mr. Osburn, not Mr. Chris Wendell, was submitting reports, etc. into the RAPID database; contrary to the Exhibit 9 terms requiring Chris Wendell to report acquisitions. The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant offered an explanation that Chris Wendell was having personal problems and was unable to perform the reporting requirements. The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant did not have the right, per Exhibit 9, to unilaterally decide a person other than Chris Wendell would perform the reporting requirements.

The Hearings Officer finds that the underlying purposes of PCC 14B.90 are to address the risks inherent in the Secondhand Dealer business by imposing business operation requirements on permitted Secondhand Dealers. The Hearings Officer finds that PCC 14B.90.050.C grants the Revenue Bureau discretion to consider whether or not an applicant for a Secondhand Dealer permit, who has committed violations of PCC 14B.90, shall be granted. The Hearings Officer finds that factors listed in PCC 14B.90.050 C.1-3 must be considered by the Revenue Bureau when considering the granting of a Secondhand Dealer permit when there are violations of PCC 14B.90.050 B. The Hearings Officer finds that the Revenue Bureau may only grant a Secondhand Dealer permit if the Revenue Bureau finds that an applicant's violative behavior is (1) not likely to recur, or (2) was remote in time, or (3) occurred under circumstances that diminish the seriousness of the behavior.

The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant admittedly committed violations of PCC 14B.90 during 2008 and 2009. The Hearings Officer finds that the 2008 and 2009 violations are not remote in time in relation to Appellant's application for a 2010 Secondhand Dealer permit. The Hearings Officer also finds that the reporting requirement violations that occurred in 2008 and 2009 were similar to the reporting requirement violations in 2010. The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant's 2008 and 2009 behavior (satisfying reporting requirements) did recur in 2010. The Hearings Officer finds the Revenue Bureau's conclusion that such violative behavior was likely to recur if Appellant is granted a 2010 Secondhand Dealer permit is reasonable and appropriate.

The Hearings Officer finds that the Revenue Bureau did consider PCC 14B.90.050 C when granting the qualified/conditional Secondhand Dealer permit to Appellant on June 11, 2009 (Exhibit 9). The Hearings Officer finds the Revenue Bureau's conclusion, after considering PCC 14B.90.050.C, not to renew Appellant's Secondhand Dealer permit for 2010 is reasonable.

**Discussion of Appellant's Issue 3 (City's decision to deny license was arbitrary/capricious and abuse of discretion):**

Appellant, in Exhibits 16 and 23, asserts that the Revenue Bureau's denial of Appellant's application for renewal of a secondhand dealer license was:

"arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion by the City which does not identify standards or rules to curb the unconstrained discretion of the City, and in violation of Mr. WenDell's due process rights under the United States and Oregon Constitutions. None of the City's witnesses could identify any written guidelines addressing the use of discretion in the renewal process, or articulate such guidelines. Again, this is unconstrained discretion and should not be allowed. *Dickinson v. Davis* 277 Or 665, 561 P2d 1019, 1032 (1977). Counsel understands that analysis of this case will follow the analysis in *PGE v. BOLI*, 317 Or 606, 859 P2d 1143 (1993), a form of analysis confirmed in *Siporen v. City of Medford*, \_\_\_ Or \_\_\_, SC S058025, November 18, 2010. However, counsel submits that neither case directly undermines *Dickinson* and that unconstrained discretion should still not be allowed" (Exhibit 23).

The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant did not clearly identify the source of the City's abuse of discretion. The Hearings Officer finds, based upon a review of the hearing testimony/argument and Exhibits 16 and 23, that Appellant targeted PCC 14B.90.050.B and/or PCC 14B.90.050.C in its abuse of discretion argument.

PCC 14B.90.050.B states, in relevant part, that "Except as provided in Section 14B.90.050 C. the Director shall deny an application for a Dealer Permit" if a set of listed events occurs. PCC 14B.90.050.C states, in relevant part:

"notwithstanding Section 14B.90.050 B, the Director may grant a permit after consulting with the Chief of Police despite the presence of one or more of the enumerated factors if the applicant establishes to the Director's reasonable satisfaction that: 1. The behavior evidenced by such factor is not likely to recur; or, 2. The behavior evidenced by such factor is remote in time; or, 3. The behavior evidenced by such factor occurred under circumstances that diminish the seriousness of the factor as it relates to the purpose of Chapter 14B.90."

The Hearings Officer finds Appellant's abuse of discretion argument is addressed primarily towards the Revenue Bureau's discretion exercised in interpreting PCC 14B.90.050.C. The Hearings Officer shall review Appellant's abuse of discretion argument in the context of whether or not the Revenue Bureau's interpretation of PCC 14B.90.050.C is an unlawful abuse of discretion by the Revenue Bureau.

The Hearings Officer agrees with Appellant that the historical starting point for a review of a discretionary exercise by a City is the Oregon Supreme Court decision in *Dickinson v. Davis*, supra. The Hearings Officer finds that the essence of the *Dickinson* decision is that a reviewing body, such as the Hearings Officer, must evaluate the facts of the specific case in the context of the relevant statute/ordinance/code section. *Dickinson* held that a bureau's order, when dealing with a discretionary standard, will be deemed unlawful if the bureau's policy reasons are inconsistent with or outside the range of those explicit or implicit in the controlling statute/ordinance/code. The Supreme Court, in *Dickinson*, stated that a bureau's reasons "when properly articulated, are entitled to the

deference commonly accorded agency 'expertise' insofar as they reflect the commissioner's view of facts concerning the regulated industry, the causes and consequences of statutory violations, problems of enforcement...or whatever factors the commissioner considers pertinent."

Finally, the Supreme Court, in *Dickinson* stated that a reviewing body, such as a Hearings Officer, should not substitute his own judgment on the reasonableness of a bureau's order.

Appellant, during questioning of Ms. Holm, elicited testimony that there are no written guidelines expanding upon or explaining PCC 14B.90.050.C. The Hearings Officer, therefore, finds that PCC 14B.90.050.C must stand on its own.

The Hearings Officer finds that PCC 14B.90.050.C grants the Revenue Bureau the ability to grant or renew a Secondhand Dealer permit even if one or more factors listed in PCC 14B.90.050 B. exist. Without PCC 14B.90.050.C, a permit application/renewal must/shall be denied if one of the PCC 14B.90.050.B factors exist. The Hearings Officer finds that PCC 14B.90.050.C does grant the Revenue Bureau discretion.

The Hearings Officer finds that PCC 14B.90.050.C describes three evaluation standards that the Revenue Bureau may consider when determining whether or not to grant a permit when one or more of the PCC 14B.90.050.B factors exist. These evaluation standards include:

- Is it likely that PCC 14B.90.050.B factor will recur?
- When did the PCC 14B.90.050.B factor occur? Recently or at a time remote?
- Did the behavior evidenced by the PCC 14B.90.050.B factor occur under circumstances diminishing its seriousness as related to the Purpose section of PCC 14B.90?

The Hearings Officer takes note of PCC 14B.90.010. This is the Purpose section of the Secondhand Dealer code. PCC 14B.90.010 states that City Council adopted the Secondhand Dealer code because certain types of business activity presents an extraordinary risk of being used by criminals to dispose of stolen goods. PCC 14B.90.010 states that Secondhand Dealers process large volumes of goods and materials that are frequently the subject of theft. City Council concluded the Purpose section by stating that "this Chapter is intended to reduce this type of criminal activity by providing timely police awareness of such property transactions and by regulating the conduct of persons engaged in this business activity."

The Hearings Officer finds that the PCC 14B.90.050.C evaluation standards place reasonable limits on the Revenue Bureau's discretion. The Hearings Officer finds that the Revenue Bureau must, if granting an application/renewal of a Secondhand Dealer permit, articulate reasons/evidence in the context of the evaluation standards. The Hearings Officer also finds that the Revenue Bureau must, if denying an application/renewal, articulate reasons/evidence in the context of the evaluation standards.

The Hearings Officer may not substitute his judgment for that of the Revenue Bureau as to any issue of agency discretion. *Labor Ready Northwest, Inc. v. BOLI*, 208 Or App 195 (2006). The Hearings Officer finds that the PCC 14B.90.050.C evaluation standards limit the Revenue Bureau's discretion and the Bureau did articulate how the evidence in the record relates to the evaluation factors. The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant's abuse of discretion argument fails.

The Hearings Officer finds that Appellant did not adequately articulate, legally or factually, its argument that the Revenue Bureau's decision to deny Appellant's Secondhand Dealer permit violated Appellant's due process rights under the United States and Oregon Constitutions.

**Conclusion:**

The Hearings Officer, based upon the findings above, concluded that violations of PCC 14B.90 did occur after Appellant was issued a conditional Secondhand Dealer Permit in 2009. The Hearings Officer concluded that the Revenue Bureau considered evidence of Appellant's 2010 violations in the context of PCC 14B.90.050.C. The Hearings Officer concluded that Appellant's 2010 violations, in the context of the PCC 14B.90.050.C evaluation factors, support the Revenue Bureau's decision not to grant Appellant's 2010 Secondhand Dealer Permit application. The Hearings Officer concluded that the Determination Letter is valid.

**ORDER:**

1. The August 27, 2010 Determination Letter (Exhibit 3) is valid; Appellant's appeal is denied.
2. This Final Order has been mailed to the parties on January 11, 2011.
3. This Final Order may be appealed to a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to ORS 34.010 et seq.

Dated: January 11, 2011

GJF:rs/cb

Enclosure



---

Gregory J. Frank, Hearings Officer

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Disposition</b>
1	Appeal form page 2	Holm, Anne	Received
2	Appeal form page 1	Holm, Anne	Received
3	8/27/10 Letter, Holm to Wendell	Holm, Anne	Received
4	Revenue Bureau Report	Holm, Anne	Received
5	4/30/09 letter, Holm to Wendell	Holm, Anne	Received
6	5/12/09 letter, Wendell to Holm	Holm, Anne	Received
7	Addendum to letter, Wendell to Holm	Holm, Anne	Received
8	5/28/09 letter, Troy D. King to Holm	Holm, Anne	Received
9	6/11/09 letter, Holm to Wendell	Holm, Anne	Received
10	7/21/10 letter, King to Holm	Holm, Anne	Received
11	Special Report	Holm, Anne	Received
12	8/27/10 letter, Holm to Wendell	Holm, Anne	Received
13	RAPID Transactions for DJ Buyers from 12/01/09 to 09/21/10	Holm, Anne	Received
14	Letter	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
15	Duplicate of Exh. 14 received by mail	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16	10/27/10 letter with attachments	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16a	Hearings Officer's Order dated October 15, 2010	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16b	ORS 34.010 et seq	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16c	Appeal form page 1	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16d	8/27/10 letter - Status of Secondhand Dealer permit renewal, Holm to Wendell	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16e	7/21/10 letter - Recommendation of Non-renewal of Permit Application for Diamond and Jewelry Buyers, King to Holm	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16f	LIC-10.04 - Exceptions to Regulated Property Sale Limitations	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
16g	City of Lake Oswego Business Registration Certificate	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
17	Mailing List	Hearings Office	Received
18	Hearing Notice	Hearings Office	Received
19	Cover sheet w/narrative and attachments	Holm, Anne	Received
19a	Second Hand Dealer Inspection Form	Holm, Anne	Received
19b	Copy of Email from Brent Bates to Anne Holm dated 11/10/10	Holm, Anne	Received
20	Copy of email from King to 'Secondhand Dealer' dated 2/2/10	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
21	Copy of email from King to 'Pawnbrokers and Secondhand Dealers' dated 8/26/10	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received
22	Summary with attachment	McGair, Ken	Received
22a	Certificate of Service and Filing	McGair, Ken	Received
23	11/24/10 Post Hearing Supplemental Brief	Stalnaker, Thurl	Received