



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2524

Phone: (503) 373-0050

First Floor/Costal Fax: (503) 378-6033

Second Floor/Director's Office: (503) 378-5518

Web Address: <http://www.oregon.gov/LCD>



March 2, 2007

TO: County Planning Directors and Interested Persons

FROM: Ronald Eber, Farm and Forest Lands Specialist 

SUBJECT: **Approved 2004-2005 EFU and Forest Reports**

APPROVED FARM AND FOREST REPORTS:

On January 26, 2007, the Land Conservation and Development Commission approved the enclosed report required for submittal to the Legislature by ORS 197.065 analyzing applications for dwellings, non farm and non forest uses and land divisions in farm and forest zones. The purpose of the Farm and Forest Reports is to allow the Legislature, Commission, local officials and interested parties to evaluate how effective Goals 3 and 4 are at protecting agricultural and forestlands. The requirement to prepare the Farm Report was adopted in 1983 and 1989 for the Forest Report.

The statute requires the Commission to submit a report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Land Use before each Legislative session "analyzing applications approved and denied for" certain dwellings, nonfarm and nonforest uses and land divisions in EFU and Forest zones based on the information provided by each county and from other public comments. The report may also contain "such other matters pertaining to protection of agricultural or forest lands as the Commission deems appropriate." (ORS 197.065(1)(d)).

The current Biennial Report includes two separate reports, one for decisions on farm land and one for decisions on forest lands, for the two year period of January 1, 2004 to December 31, 2005. Information for 2006 period is just being submitted and is being readied for analysis.

Draft copies of the Farm and Forest reports were mailed to all of you previously for comment. Corrections were made to the Tables based on the comments received.

Additionally, the Commission directed the department to monitor any approvals for dwellings and other uses in farm and forest zones based on any waivers to the provisions of these zones resulting from the passage of Ballot Measure 37 and approved forms for providing information about these decisions as a regular part of these reports. These new forms are attached. Information about some land use decisions based on Measure 37 waivers approved in 2005 is included in these reports.

The Commission also directed the department to continue to explore cost effective means to map the geographic extent of the approvals of dwellings and non-farm and non-forest uses with Metro, counties and other interested parties. Further, the Commission believes such an effort can provide some very important information on the effectiveness of Oregon's land use program to protect its farm and forest land base that will be crucial to any upcoming review of these programs.

Overall, development approvals for dwellings, uses and land divisions on farm and forest lands during the 2004-05 reporting period continue to reflect the influence of changes to state laws and LCDC rules enacted since 1993.

Attachments:

- A. ORS 197.065
- B. 2004 and 2005 Farm Report
- C. 2004 and 2005 Forest Report
- D. Approved Post M 37 Reporting Forms

197.065 Biennial report analyzing uses of certain land; annual local government reports. (1) Prior to each legislative session, the Land Conservation and Development Commission shall submit to the Joint Legislative Committee on Land Use a written report analyzing applications approved and denied for:

(a) New and replacement dwellings under:

(A) ORS 215.213 (1)(e) and (g), (2)(a) and (b), (3) and (4), 215.283 (1)(e) and (f), 215.284 and 215.705; and

(B) Any land zoned for forest use under any statewide planning goal that relates to forestland;

(b) Divisions of land under:

(A) ORS 215.263 (2), (4) and (5); and

(B) Any land zoned for forest use under any statewide planning goal that relates to forestland;

(c) Dwellings and land divisions approved for marginal lands under:

(A) ORS 215.317 or 215.327; and

(B) Any land zoned for forest use under any statewide planning goal that relates to forestland; and

(d) Such other matters pertaining to protection of agricultural or forest land as the commission deems appropriate.

(2) The governing body of each county shall provide the Department of Land Conservation and Development with a report of its actions involving those dwellings, land divisions and land designations upon which the commission must report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Land Use under subsection (1) of this section. The department shall establish, after consultation with county governing bodies, an annual reporting period and may establish a schedule for receiving county reports at intervals within the reporting period. The report shall be on a standard form with a standardized explanation adopted by the commission and shall be eligible for grants by the commission. The report shall include the findings for each action except actions involving:

(a) Dwellings authorized by ORS 215.213 (1)(e) or 215.283 (1)(e); or

(b) Land divisions authorized by ORS 215.263 (2) creating parcels as large as or larger than a minimum size established by the commission under ORS 215.780.

(3) The governing body of each county shall, upon request by the department, provide the department with other information necessary to carry out subsection (1) of this section. [1983 c.826 §13; 1985 c.811 §9; 1987 c.555 §4; 1989 c.107 §1; 1993 c.792 §9; 2001 c.704 §9]

New Dwellings Approved in Farm Zones

TYPE OF DWELLING	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	TOTALS (% of Net)
Primary Farm ORS 215.283(1)(f)	372	149	94	98	68	88	77	81	76	93	88	84	'1368 (17%)
Accessory Farm Dwelling ORS 215.283(1)(f)	122	64	54	57	35	53	36	29	27	30	20	23	550 (7%)
Family Farm Help ORS 215.283(1)(e)	34	57	49	78	77	59	43	38	48	34	53	49	619 (8%)
Temporary Hardship ORS 215.283(2)(L)	105	154	122	131	126	105	105	115	104	80	73	89	1309 (17%)
Lot-of-Record ORS 215.284	68	112	123	129	131	94	80	78	89	53	64	51	1072 (14%)
Non Farm ORS 215.284	225	252	299	340	205	208	227	203	279	258	202	218	2909 (37%)
Net New Dwellings	926	788	741	833	642	607	568	544	623	548	500	514	7834
Replacement ORS 215.283(1)(s)	211	220	289	419	361	354	307	276	333	305	294	233	3604 (32%) of Total
TOTAL DWELLINGS APPROVED IN FARM ZONES	1137	1008	1030	1252	1003	961	875	820	956	853	794	747	11,438

Prepared by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)

Using data submitted by Oregon's 36 counties

Note: For 2001 only, the numbers shown are a 12 month average (16 month total ÷ 16 x 12 = 2001)

Approved 2004 & 05 FARM REPORT

January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005

Introduction

State law (ORS 197.065) requires the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission to submit a report to the Legislature "analyzing applications approved and denied" for certain land uses in exclusive farm use (EFU) and forest zones and "such other matters pertaining to protection of agricultural or forest land as the Commission deems appropriate." Land use decisions compiled in this report were made on land protected by Statewide Planning Goals 3, "Agricultural Lands" and Goal 4 "Forest Lands either in a traditional EFU, forest use or mixed farm/forest zone.

The Department of Land Conservation and Development receives a description of each local decision approved or denied in these zones along with a compilation of all decisions made during the reporting period from each county. This report summarizes the information provided by the counties for the two year period.

Usually the department prepares separate farm and forest land reports for each year. For this biennium, there will be separate farm and forest land reports for the entire two year period. Separate tables for each year are still included as the basis for the combined reports.

Reporting Period

This report includes the land use decisions made during the two year period between January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2005.

Tables A through O include information for dwelling and land division decisions, as well as information on other approved uses (for example, golf courses, home occupations, schools, etc.). Table N reports the number and size of urban growth boundary amendments. Table O summarizes the adopted rural plan map amendments submitted to the Department and will be provided to LCDC at its meeting. This report continues to include information on the number of acres planned and zoned as "non resource land" (lands that are not agricultural or forest land as defined by Goals 3 and 4) and the number of counties that have or are engaged in mapping high-value farmland as required by OAR 660-033-0080(2).

Ballot Measure 37

This report includes a new section for the land use decisions approved in farm zones based on waivers to state and local land use regulations under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352). All these decisions were made in the 2005 reporting period. These decisions are based on the Goal 3 and farm zone standards for dwellings and land divisions in effect at the time an applicant acquired the property and will be an added feature of this and future reports. A new reporting

form was approved by the Commission for use with the 2006 Farm/Forest report.

Use of Reported Information

The Department uses the collected information to monitor the type and extent of development occurring on agricultural land statewide and in individual counties in order to:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the EFU zone to implement Statewide Goal 3; and
2. Focus staff resources to assist counties and the public with the implementation of Statewide Goal 3 where needed.

The Department recognizes that many counties have processes, such as pre-application conferences, which serve to discourage applications for uses unlikely to be approved. Such local processes are not specifically addressed in this report. **For this reason, we urge readers to use caution in creating "approval rates" based on the information in this report.**

Relatively few applications (less than 10%) are actually denied. In many cases, early conferences between potential applicants and planners result in a decision by the potential applicant to not submit an application. Some counties have compared the number of client contacts or "pre-application conferences" with the actual number of approvals and denials. These comparisons show that there are many more initial contacts than actual decisions.

Oregon's Agricultural Land Protection Program

The preservation of agricultural land is one of the primary objectives of Oregon's statewide planning program. Oregon has determined that it is the state's interest to protect the land resource foundation of one of its largest industries, agriculture. According to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, in 2005, the total direct and indirect contribution to Oregon's economy by the agriculture and food processing industry was \$12 billion dollars (\$4.3 billion in farm/ranch products; \$2 billion from value-added processing; \$3.4 billion of purchased goods and services and \$2.3 billion generated in wages and salaries). This is 10% of Oregon's gross state product and the agricultural sector provides over 9% (1 in 12) of all Oregon jobs.

Oregon's agricultural lands protection program is based on several elements composed of statutory and administrative rule provisions, the agricultural lands goal, and LUBA/Court opinions and interpretations. These elements are held together in a program by Statewide Planning Goal 3, "Agricultural Lands." This goal requires the identification of agricultural land the use of an exclusive farm use zone (EFU) under ORS Chapter 215 and requires counties to review certain non farm uses according to administrative rule and the statutory (EFU) provisions. The LCDC rule (OAR 660, Division 33) and statutory EFU zone (ORS Chapter 215) set forth the farm and non farm uses allowed and also provide related tax

and other benefits to the property owner. The goal and administrative rule also incorporate the statutory minimum lot sizes and standards for all land divisions (ORS 215.263 and 215.780).

Agricultural Land Use Policy

Three policy statements set forth Oregon's "Agricultural Land Use Policy". The first was established by the Legislature in 1973 and is codified at ORS 215.243. There are four basic elements to this policy:

1. Agricultural land is a vital natural and economic asset for all the people of this state;
2. Preservation of a maximum amount of agricultural land, in large blocks, is necessary to maintain the agricultural economy of the state;
3. Expansion of urban development in rural areas is a public concern because of conflicts between farm and urban activities;
4. Incentives and privileges are justified to owners of land in exclusive farm use zones because such zoning substantially limits alternatives to the use of rural lands.

In 1993, the Oregon legislature added two more important elements to this policy (ORS 215.700). These are to:

1. Provide certain owners of less productive land an opportunity to build a dwelling on their land; and
2. Limit the future division of and the siting of dwellings on the state's more productive resource land.

Goal 3 reinforces these policies as follows:

"Agricultural lands shall be preserved and maintained for farm use, consistent with existing and future needs for agricultural products, forest and open space and the state's agricultural land use policy expressed in ORS 215.243 and 215.700."

These policy statements clearly set forth the state's interest in the preservation of agricultural lands, the means for their protection (EFU zoning), and establish that incentives and privileges (i.e., tax and other benefits) are justified because of the limits placed upon the use of the land.

Exclusive Farm Use Zones

In Oregon, agricultural lands are to be preserved by an exclusive farm use (EFU) zone. At present, about 15.5 million acres (56%) of private land in Oregon are included in the EFU zone.

The EFU zone was developed by the Oregon legislature in 1961 along with the farm tax assessment program. Farm use is encouraged and protected within the zone while also allowing a variety of farm and non farm related dwellings and other non farm uses.

Dwellings

In EFU zones, dwellings are allowed for seven (7) different reasons and include primary farm dwellings, relative farm help dwellings, non farm dwellings, temporary hardship dwellings, lot-of-record dwellings, replacement dwellings, and accessory farm dwellings. Each of the above dwelling types is discussed in this section. The total number of approved dwellings in 2004 was 794 and 749 in 2005. During the year 2003 reporting period, 853 dwellings were approved.

Overall, there have been no significant changes in the approval rates for the different types of dwellings allowed in EFU zones statewide. In general, the number of yearly approvals has been on a downward trend and all current approvals are less than their respective eleven year average since 1995. See the "New Dwellings Approved in Farm Zones" chart attached to the cover memorandum.

Primary Farm Dwellings

The total number of primary farm dwellings approved in 2004 was 88 and 84 in 2005 compared with 93 for the 2003 reporting period (Table A). Over the years, the type of primary farm dwellings approved have been fairly evenly split (45% - 55%) between those approvals based on an income standard and those approved on parcels larger than 160 acres. However, in 2005 the percentage of dwellings approved on large lot (160 acre) parcels increased to 71% of all primary farm dwellings. Seventy-one percent (73%) of these were in eastern Oregon.

Jackson and Jefferson counties continue to be the only two counties to utilize the optional potential gross farm sales approval standard in OAR 660-33-135 (2). They have prepared and received approval from the department for the capability numbers as required by OAR 660-033-0135(4).

Table B shows parcel size, distribution and the number of farm dwellings by the parcel size on which the dwellings were sited. For both reporting years about seventy (70%) percent of all the farm dwellings approved were on parcels larger than the statutory minimum lot size of 80 acres which is an increase from 56% in the 2003 reporting period.

Other Farm Related Dwellings

Farm related dwellings include accessory farm dwellings approved under ORS 215.283 (1)(f), family farm help dwellings (ORS 215.283 (1) (e)) and seasonal farm worker dwellings (ORS 215.283 (1) (p)) (Table C).

Accessory farm dwelling approvals in 2004/05 were down slightly from the previous 2003 reporting period. Accessory farm dwellings must be sited on a farm operation that earns the same gross income required for a primary farm dwelling (\$80,000/\$40,000). Forty to fifty percent of the accessory farm dwellings continue to be sited on larger parcels (> than 80 acre minimum lot size) an increase from the 33% of the last reporting period (see Table G).

Some of the dwellings that were previously counted as seasonal farm worker housing are now included with accessory farm dwellings as a result of HB 3171 (2001 Legislature) and new the rules adopted by LCDC in 2002.

The number of dwellings approved for family members whose assistance is needed on the farm is up slightly from the 34 approved in the 2003 reporting period to 53 & 49 in '04 & '05 (Table C).

Not Farm-Related Dwellings

Not farm-related dwellings include those approved under the non farm standards of ORS 215.284, lot-of-record dwellings approved under ORS 215.705, and temporary hardship dwellings allowed under ORS 215.283(2)(k) (Table D).

A comparison of the 2003 total with the 2004 and 2005 reporting periods shows that non farm dwelling approvals decreased from 258 to 202 in 2004 and then increased back to 218 in 2005; temporary hardship dwellings decreased from 80 to 73 in 2004 and then increased back to 89 in 2005 and lot-of-record dwellings increased from 53 approvals to 64 in 2004 and then decreased to 49 in 2005 (Table D). In 2004, the largest decreases in the number of non-farm dwellings occurred in Deschutes (60-37), Douglas (35-18) and Malheur (21-7) counties. Also in 2004, Klamath County increased from 17-30 and then in 2005, decreased back to 10 approvals. In 2005, Douglas County increased back from 18 to 31 approvals while Jackson went from 6 – 17 and Lake from 28-40 (Table D).

For non farm dwellings, (70 to 75%) were in eastern Oregon on parcels less than 20 acres. This distribution continues the trend begun in 1993 by HB 3661 that shifted the number of approved non farm dwellings away from the Willamette Valley to eastern and southern Oregon. This is a direct result of new approval standards that recognize Oregon's regional differences. (Tables D & F).

Almost all of the lot-of-record dwellings approved were not on high value farmland (ORS 215.705 (1)) (Table D).

Temporary hardship dwellings may be sited in conjunction with any existing dwelling, regardless of whether it is a farm or non farm dwelling and must be removed at the end of the hardship. Temporary dwellings still account for about 17% of all new dwellings approved in farm zones. (Table D).

Replacement Dwellings

The approval of replacement dwellings continued to decrease from 294 in 2004 to 233 in 2005 compared with the 305 in the 2003 reporting period.

LAND DIVISIONS

Farm Divisions

New farm parcels decreased in 2004 from 164 to 146 and increased back to 187 in 2005 (Tables J and K). Most (77-84%) of the resulting farm parcels were larger than 80 acres which is about the same as the 80% in 2003 (Table K).

Non Farm Divisions

The number of new parcels for all non farm uses continued to decrease slightly from 144 in 2003 to 135 in 2004 and 117 in 2005 (Table L). As in 2003, most of these continue to be created in eastern Oregon (Tables J and L).

Non Farm Uses

The legislature recognized that some non farm uses are generally needed in farming areas, such as schools, churches, farm related commercial activities, home occupations and some types of dwellings. In 1963, the first statutory EFU zone included just six (6) non farm uses including those dwellings customarily provided in conjunction with farm use. After the 2005 Legislative Session, there are over 50 non farm uses allowed in an EFU zone. The 2005 Legislature only added one new use to the list: a landscaping business in conjunction with a farm (HB 2069). It also recognized an existing use in Marion County: a county law enforcement facility that lawfully existed on August 20, 2002 (HB 3117).

Non farm uses are subject to local land use approval and many of the largest or more intensive must demonstrate that they will not force a significant change in or significantly increase the cost of accepted farm or forest practices on surrounding lands devoted to farm or forest use (ORS 215.296). Other approval standards favor locating such uses on less productive or non high-value farmlands, or away from urban growth boundaries. Allowing some non farm uses and dwellings is a safety valve that recognizes that within farm zones there are small areas that can accommodate a rural use or dwelling on a small lot without affecting an area's overall farm character. Small lots with such non farm uses and dwellings do not qualify for farm use tax assessment. The importance of this process is that the non farm development is sited in a way to minimize its impact on agriculture and thus protects the primary use, farming, within the zone.

However, the cumulative effect of all these new non farm uses together with the approved dwellings has never been analyzed. At best, the Department can determine the number of acres affected by the approval of these non farm uses. The Department remains concerned about the number, extent and concentration of the over 50 different uses approved in EFU zones. The Department has the data base but not the staff to map the quantity, location of and relationship between all the approved uses. The Department remains interested in pursuing this type of analysis.

Marginal Lands

Only Lane and Washington counties have designated marginal land and continue to have the authority to do so.

ORS 215.307 allows the siting of dwellings on existing lots on land designated as marginal, and requires these two counties to use the EFU requirements of ORS 215.213 on non high-value farmland rather than those in ORS 215.283 for approving farm dwellings in their EFU zones.

Data for actions on EFU-zoned land in counties with marginal lands are tallied and summarized with all other counties in this report.

Lane County did not approve any farm dwellings based on the marginal lands provisions in ORS 215.213 while Washington County approved one (1) in 2004 and five (5) in 2005.

Lane County designated 42 acres as marginal in 2004 and none in 2005. Washington County designated 78 acres in 2004 and 146 acres in 2005.

Plan Amendments

Tables N & O summarize plan amendments adopted and submitted to the Department between January 1, 1987 and December 31, 2003.

The first table (Table N) provides information on Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) amendments adopted during this time. During 2004, there were seven (7) UGB amendments that brought lands zoned for agricultural and forest uses into an urban growth boundary. Of the 3391 acres added to UGBs statewide, 2385 acres (70%) were farm and forest lands. During 2005, there were eight (8) UGB amendments that brought in 111 acres. Of this, 78 (70%) were farm and forest lands.

The second table (Table O) deals with changes in plan designations and/or zoning within rural land use categories. No significant changes have emerged.

Non Resource Lands

Seven counties have identified "non resource" lands that are not "agricultural" or "forest" lands as defined by Goals 3 and 4. These lands have been planned and zoned for other rural uses and are not subject to the provisions of Statewide Goals 3 and 4. Concerns have been raised to the Commission about the how these lands are identified, their location and extent and about the appropriate level of rural development allowed by the statewide planning goals. Included in the report is a list of the eight counties with the acres now planned and zoned as "non resource." In 2004 and 2005, only 30 additional acres in Lane County were designated as "non resource."

County	Acres Designated Non Resource
Clatsop	2,351
Crook	23,000
Douglas	3,191
Josephine	15,412
Klamath	34,718
Lane	495
Wasco	7,047
Total Acres	86,204

High-Value Farmland Mapping

Commission rule (OAR 660-033-0080(2)) requires counties to submit maps of high-value farmland along with any other amendments necessary to implement the requirements of Goal 3 and Division 33. High-value farmland maps are required to be submitted no later than the time of the first periodic review after December 31, 1994.

All counties received a free copy of the Rural Lands Database in 2001 that includes digital Geographic Information (GIS) data for high-value farmland soils. Thus, counties with GIS systems can easily print maps of their high-value farmland based on soil type, but not the lands "growing specified perennials" in counties outside the Willamette Valley or those lands in coastal counties used in conjunction with a dairy operation on January 1, 1993 (see ORS 215.710(2) and (4)).

At this time, the department is only aware that two counties have identified their high-value farmland. Hood River has identified and mapped their high-value farmland and Marion County has designated all the land within their EFU zone as high-value farmland and does not make such determinations case-by-case as part of a local site-specific land use decision.

Ballot Measure 37

At least ten counties approved land uses in EFU zones based on waivers to current land use regulations granted under Ballot Measure 37 (ORS 197.352). These included 10 dwellings on existing parcels and reclassifying an existing dwelling as non farm and a division of land with two existing dwellings. Thirty-four (34) new parcels were created with 29 in one subdivision. Also included are those counties who reported making no decisions in 2005. These submittals are summarized below.

Clackamas County: One non farm dwelling on 7.62 acre parcel as permitted by 1991 standards for a dwelling under the County's acknowledged EFU-20 zone permitted (M119086).

- Douglas County:** One building permit for a dwelling on a 20 acre parcel as permitted in 1951 (M120235).
- Deschutes County:** One farm dwelling on a 20 acre parcel as permitted by 1990 standard for a dwelling under the County's acknowledged EFU zone (M118914).
- Jackson County:** Approved non farm status to an existing dwelling on 3 acres as permitted in 1986 and denied a lot line adjustment (no state waiver).
- Lincoln County:** One non farm dwelling on 3.4 acre parcel based on the standards for a dwelling permitted in May 1993 (M119115).
- Linn County:** Partition of 30 acres into 10 and 20 acre parcels each with an existing dwelling as permitted in 1962 (no state waiver).
- Marion County:** Partition of 20 acres into 15 and 5 acre parcels as permitted in 1964. The existing and hardship dwelling remain with the 15 acre parcel. No application for a dwelling on the 5 acre parcel has been submitted as permitted in 1964 (M19704).
- Polk County:** Does not keep a record of these decisions. According to the County, several have been approved. Except for a few dwelling approvals, all the other approvals for subdivisions and dwellings are now the subject of appeals to the County Board of Commissioners.
- Union County:** 103 additional lots with dwellings have tentatively been approved pending the approval of a comparable state waiver.
- Wallowa County:** Final plat approval for ten lots of a 29 lot subdivision with preliminary plat approval as permitted in 1957 and 1969 (M18349). One lot has apparently been sold. No dwellings have been approved for these lots.
- Yamhill County:** One farm dwelling on a 42 acre parcel as permitted by 1992 standard for a dwelling under ORS 215 (M118967).
- One farm dwelling on a 20 acre parcel as permitted by 1980 standard for a dwelling under ORS 215 (M119026).
- One farm dwelling on a 59 acre parcel as permitted by 1975 standard for a dwelling under ORS 215 (M119870).

Baker, Grant, Lane, Multnomah and Umatilla counties reported not making any decisions in EFU zones in 2005.

**PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2004 Table A

County	High Value	Size / Acres	Income / Non High Value	Capability	Totals
Baker					
Benton					
Clackamas	7		1		8
Clatsop					
Columbia					
Coos					
Crook		9	2		11
Curry	1				1
Deschutes		2	1		3
Douglas	1	6			7
Gilliam					
Grant		1			1
Harney		4	1		5
Hood River					
Jackson		1		1	2
Jefferson	3	1	3		7
Josephine					
Klamath		6			6
Lake		2			2
Lane	1				1
Lincoln					
Linn	1				1
Malheur	8		1		9
Marion	2				2
Morrow					
Multnomah	1				1
Polk		1			1
Sherman			1		1
Tillamook					
Umatilla	2	3			5
Union	2	1			3
Wallowa		2			2
Wasco	1	1			2
Washington	1		1		2
Wheeler					
Yamhill	4		1		5
Totals	35	40	12	1	88

Previous Years Totals

2003	30	39	19	5	93
2002	19	45	10	2	76
*2001 Average	28	46	4	3	81

**PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2004 Table B

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker								
Benton								
Clackamas		1		1	2	3	1	8
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook			1				10	11
Curry						1		1
Deschutes				1			2	3
Douglas					1		6	7
Gilliam								
Grant							1	1
Harney						1	4	5
Hood River								
Jackson					1		1	2
Jefferson					1	1	5	7
Josephine								
Klamath							6	6
Lake							2	2
Lane					1			1
Lincoln								
Linn							1	1
Malheur		2	2		1	2	2	9
Marion							2	2
Morrow								
Multnomah				1				1
Polk							1	1
Sherman		1						1
Tillamook								
Umatilla							5	5
Union							3	3
Wallowa							2	2
Wasco							2	2
Washington				1		1		2
Wheeler							4	4
Yamhill					1			1
Totals		4	3	4	8	9	60	88

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	3	5	7	11	15	52	93
2002	0	7	2	5	3	8	51	76
*2001 Average	0	2	0	3	6	9	61	81

**FARM HELP AND
REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS**

2004 Table C

County	Seasonal	Units	Relative	Accessory	Replace	Totals
Baker			2		4	6
Benton			2	2	1	5
Clackamas	1	1	3	2		7
Clatsop					2	2
Columbia					2	2
Coos			2		4	6
Crook				1	8	9
Curry			1			1
Deschutes						
Douglas			14		71	85
Gilliam			1		1	2
Grant			1	1	12	14
Harney			1	1		2
Hood River				3	11	14
Jackson			3	2		5
Jefferson			1		5	6
Josephine						
Klamath			4		11	15
Lake						
Lane			5	1	25	31
Lincoln						
Linn						
Malheur			3	1	16	20
Marion				3	19	22
Morrow					6	6
Multnomah				1		1
Polk			4		26	30
Sherman						
Tillamook					10	10
Umatilla					22	22
Union			1	1	5	7
Wallowa			1		7	8
Wasco			1		1	2
Washington			1	1	25	27
Wheeler						
Yamhill			2			2
Totals	1	1	53	20	294	369

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	0	34	30	305	369
2002	0	0	48	27	333	416
*2001 Average	12	73	37	29	276	355

**NON FARM / LOT OF RECORD
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2004 Table D

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value			
Baker	10					10
Benton	2			2	2	6
Clackamas	2		2	2	3	9
Clatsop						
Columbia				1		1
Coos				1	1	2
Crook	5			30	3	38
Curry						
Deschutes	3			37	3	43
Douglas	2			18	10	30
Gilliam						
Grant	2			1		3
Harney	2			4		6
Hood River	1				3	4
Jackson	4			6	6	16
Jefferson						
Josephine	1			3		4
Klamath	1			30	1	32
Lake				28		28
Lane	1			2	3	6
Lincoln	1					1
Linn	2		1	5	8	16
Malheur	2	1	1	7	2	13
Marion		1		7	13	21
Morrow				1		1
Multnomah						
Polk	2				5	7
Sherman						
Tillamook					1	1
Umatilla	3			7		10
Union	4			1		5
Wallowa	5				1	6
Wasco	1			3		4
Washington				2	1	3
Wheeler				2		2
Yamhill	1	1		2	7	11
Totals	57	3	4	202	73	339

Previous Years Totals

2003	53	0	0	258	80	391
2002	84	1	4	279	104	470
*2001 Average	66	7	5	203	115	395

**LOT OF RECORD (EFU)
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2004 Table E

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage					Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	
Baker	3	2			3	2	10
Benton	1		1				2
Clackamas			1	1	2		4
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook	1	1		1		2	5
Curry							
Deschutes				1		2	3
Douglas	1					1	2
Gilliam							
Grant	1				1		2
Harney				1		1	2
Hood River		1					1
Jackson		1	2		1		4
Jefferson							
Josephine					1		1
Klamath						1	1
Lake							
Lane						1	1
Lincoln			1				1
Linn				1	1	1	3
Malheur	1	1			1	1	4
Marion		1					1
Morrow							
Multnomah							
Polk	1		1				2
Sherman							
Tillamook							
Umatilla			1	1		1	3
Union						4	4
Wallowa	1				1	3	5
Wasco	1						1
Washington							
Wheeler							
Yamhill		2					2
Totals	11	9	7	6	11	20	64

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	5	10	7	11	7	53
2002	10	13	11	15	20	22	91
*2001 Average	0	16	13	10	14	13	80

**NEW ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2004 Table G

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker								
Benton						1	1	2
Clackamas						1	1	2
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook							1	1
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas								
Gilliam								
Grant							1	1
Harney							1	1
Hood River				1	2			3
Jackson						2		2
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane					1			1
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur							1	1
Marion						1	2	3
Morrow								
Multnomah							1	1
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union							1	1
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington							1	1
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
Totals				1	3	5	11	20

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	6	1	2	3	8	10	30
2002	0	4	1	5	3	3	11	27
*2001 Average	0	0	0	2	5	7	15	29

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON EFU LAND
2000-2004**

2004 Table H

County	Primary Farm					Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
	2000	2001*	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001*	2002	2003	2004	2000	2001*	2002	2003	2004
Baker	2	4	1			8	8	4		10		1			
Benton			2			1	2			2	1		1		2
Clackamas	9	2	1	3	8	6	5	4	2	4				1	2
Clatsop				1				1			2	1		1	
Columbia								1							1
Coos						3	2	3	1						1
Crook	8	14	4	6	11	8	3	5	3	5	16	45	42	34	30
Curry					1								1	1	
Deschutes	4	1		4	3	5	8	9	2	3	52	49	62	60	37
Douglas	4	10	7	4	7	6	6	2	3	2	31	32	30	35	18
Gilliam		2	3												
Grant		4	7	1	1		4	5	3	2	1	6	5	11	1
Harney	6	8	7	11	5	1	4	2	2	2	13	6	13	3	4
Hood River	1			1		2	1		1	1	1	1		1	
Jackson	1	4	6	3	2	11	16	15	8	4	21	25	21	11	6
Jefferson	3	2	4	8	7				1	1					
Josephine										1	4	2	3	5	3
Klamath	2	3		13	6	1	1	1	3		13	8	10	17	30
Lake	5	7	4	1	2						24	32	28	26	28
Lane		1	2	4	1		3			1	4	3			2
Lincoln		1				2	2	2		1					
Linn	1	3		2	1	5	3	2		3	2	5	1	2	5
Malheur	4	3	5	6	9	2	3		3	4	10	7	18	21	7
Marion	2	5	6	2	2		5	1		1	3	2	3	2	7
Morrow	3	2		1		1	2	1	2		5	3	5	6	1
Multnomah		1		1	1			1					1		
Polk	9	12	3		1	4	6	8	7	2	3	1	1		
Sherman					1	1						1			
Tillamook											1			1	
Umatilla	3	3	5	3	5	2	2	9	2	3	7	10	9	3	6
Union	2	7	1	2	3	2	3	5	5	4		4	2	1	1
Wallowa	2	2		3	2	3	3		2	5	1		2	8	
Wasco	2	3	3	6	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	11	5	2	3
Washington	2	3	2	2	2	1					1	1	5	1	2
Wheeler											8	10	8	2	2
Yamhill	2	1	3	5	5	4	10	6	1	2		4	3	3	2
Totals	77	108	76	93	88	80	104	89	53	64	227	270	279	258	201

12 month averages 81

78

203

*For 2001 reporting year, the county totals are the 16 month reporting total. For comparison purposes the 12 month average total has been provided.

DIVISION APPROVALS ON EFU LAND 1998-2004

2004 Table I

County	Resulting Farm Parcels							Resulting NonFarm Parcels						
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Baker	7	4	8	15	10		7	3		3		2		11
Benton	6			2	3	1	2	4	2	5			1	
Clackamas				4	2		2				1			
Clatsop														
Columbia					5							5		
Coos	2								1					2
Crook	18	13	24	24	12	12	23	16	8	14	12	39	21	22
Curry	2					4							1	
Deschutes	17	4	15	14	11	17	13	20	20	4	3	45	43	24
Douglas	19	28	9	29	34	21	19	15	8	4	4	13	16	8
Gilliam		2		3	7	2		3	1		1	2	2	
Grant	2	2		17	9	17	8	10	3	1	3	2	10	6
Harney	5		15	18	7	7	6	7		2	1	2	5	4
Hood River														
Jackson		2		1						1	1			
Jefferson			6	4	3	10	4			2			1	
Josephine														
Klamath				6	14		6				4	13	1	14
Lake	10	9	6	6	16	17	8	17	8	10	34		15	20
Lane	10	4		7					5	3	3	3		
Lincoln									2					
Linn	11	20	2	6	4	7	5			3			3	1
Malheur		5		1	9	1		1	5	3	1	6	1	
Marion	6	4	2	4	2	1	1						1	1
Morrow	5	9	7	14	17	6	5	3		4	2	4	7	1
Multnomah		2												
Polk	4	2	4		3	11	3			1			1	
Sherman		2			6	1	10		1	4	4	2	1	4
Tillamook				1							2			
Umatilla		4		18	4	3	2	2	7	6	5	6	1	6
Union	13	6	2	9	5		4		1	3				
Wallowa		12	11		2	17	7		1		2		10	4
Wasco	2	7	5	1	2	5	5	1	2	2	4		1	5
Washington				4					1					2
Wheeler	4			2				3	3					
Yamhill	7		2	10	7	4								
Totals	150	141	118	220	194	164	140	105	79	75	87	144	142	135

12 month average

165

65

**FARM
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

2004 Table J

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions			Dwelling Units Approved
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	Resulting Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	NF Parcels Created	
Baker	2		7	10		11	8
Benton	1		2				
Clackamas	1		2				
Clatsop	1						
Columbia							
Coos				2		2	
Crook	5		23	13		22	20
Curry							
Deschutes	7		13	9		24	19
Douglas	6		19	5		8	5
Gilliam							
Grant	3		8	3		6	4
Harney	3		6	1		4	2
Hood River							
Jackson							
Jefferson	2		4		1		
Josephine							
Klamath			6	11		14	
Lake	3		8	11		20	12
Lane							
Lincoln							
Linn	2		5	1		1	
Malheur							
Marion			1	1		1	
Morrow	2		5	1		1	
Multnomah				1			
Polk	2		3				
Sherman	3		10	4		4	
Tillamook							
Umatilla	1		2	6		6	1
Union	2		4				
Wallowa	4		7	2		4	
Wasco	1		5	3		5	2
Washington				1		2	
Wheeler				1			
Yamhill							
Totals	51		140	86	1	135	73

Previous Years Totals

2003	80	0	164	86	2	142	48
2002	72	1	194	88	0	144	44
*2001 Average	89	1	217	63	2	89	16

FARM DIVISIONS

2004 Table K

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker						2	5	7
Benton							2	2
Clackamas							2	2
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook				1	1	2	19	23
Curry								
Deschutes					5	6	2	13
Douglas						2	17	19
Gilliam								
Grant						1	7	8
Harney							6	6
Hood River								
Jackson								
Jefferson		1					3	4
Josephine								
Klamath				1			5	6
Lake						1	7	8
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn			1			1	3	5
Malheur								
Marion					1			1
Morrow						1	4	5
Multnomah								
Polk						1	2	3
Sherman		2					8	10
Tillamook								
Umatilla							2	2
Union							4	4
Wallowa							7	7
Wasco							5	5
Washington								
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
Totals		3	1	2	7	17	110	140

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	3	0	1	8	22	129	163
2002	0	5	4	0	6	23	157	194
*2001 Average	0	2	2	4	5	14	135	162

**NON FARM DIVISIONS
BY FARM SIZE**

2004 Table L

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage					Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 And Over	
Baker		5	1	1	1	3	11
Benton							
Clackamas							
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos		1				1	2
Crook		1	1	8	3	9	22
Curry							
Deschutes		11	1	6	4	2	24
Douglas		7	1				8
Gilliam							
Grant				1		5	6
Harney			1			3	4
Hood River							
Jackson							
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath		4	1		7	2	14
Lake		4	6	4	3	3	20
Lane							
Lincoln							
Linn		1					1
Malheur				1			1
Marion		1					1
Morrow							
Multnomah							
Polk							
Sherman			3		1		4
Tillamook							
Umatilla		4	1	1			6
Union							
Wallowa		3			1		4
Wasco		2		2	1		5
Washington		1				1	2
Wheeler							
Yamhill							
Totals		45	16	24	21	29	135

Previous Years Totals

2003	0	54	19	26	24	18	142
2002	0	37	9	47	25	25	144
*2001 Average	0	19	10	6	10	22	67

**Other Uses Approved on Land Zoned
for Exclusive Farm Use**

2004 Table M

Number of Approvals

Use	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Accessory Use	68	47	63	82	84	135	25	30	34
Airstrip, Person		2	4	2	2	5	6	3	2
Bed and Breakfast	2	5	6	2	4	2	7	3	2
Church	2	3	4	1	6	2	3		3
Commercial Activity with Farm U	11	20	16	20	15	24	3	8	7
Dog Kennel	1	3	2		1	1	2	4	8
Farm Exempt Building						27	6	6	34
Farm Stand					6		6	5	5
Farm Use	7	3	11	1	14	3	14	27	1
Golf Course	3	3	4	1	1	2	3		1
Guest Ranch				3		6			
Historic Resource				1				1	
Home Occupation	32	24	25	18	23	26	14	24	18
Horse Boarding									
Mineral & Aggregate	20	22	19	31	20	25	20	21	8
NonConforming Use	4	1	5	5	5	2	5	7	6
Private Park	6	13	7	6	8	10	16	12	5
Processing Facility*							3	1	
Public Facility	6	14	5	7	2	6	1		
Roads	7	13	2	9	2	15	11	9	12
School	4	4	2	3	5	2	1		1
Utility Facility	33	33	23	40	62	69	1	34	22
Winery							14	7	6
Totals	206	210	198	232	260	362	245	277	175

2001 average

339

* New categories in 2002

PLAN AMENDMENT DATA

2004 Table N

**Farm Land Moved into
Urban Growth Boundaries by Calendar Year**

Year	Number	Acres	Use From Agriculture	Use From Forest
1987	8	1,749	624 acres	946 acres
1988	12	516	150 acres	68 acres
1989	25	1,445	259 acres	100 acres
1990	9	2,737	1,734 acres	17 acres
1991	21	1,480	177 acres	70 acres
1992	15	970	297 acres	120 acres
1993	22	2,277	1,390 acres	448 acres
1994	20	1,747	201 acres	20 acres
1995	15	624	219 acres	143 acres
1996	19	3,816	2,466 acres	16 acres
1997	12	668	508 acres	40 acres
1998	21	2,726	493 acres	2 acres
1999	10	927	587 acres	72 acres
2000	3	17	0 acres	0 acres
2001	4	21	11 acres (52.3%)	0 acres
2002*	6	203	60 acres (29.5%)	100 acres (49.2%)
2003	10	385	124 acres (26%)	85 acres (18%)
2004	7	3,391	2,290 acres (65%)	176 Acres (5%)
Totals	239	25,699	11,509 from Ag. (45%)	2,423 from Forest (9%)

<u>Metro '02</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18,843</u>	<u>3,261 acres (17%)</u>	<u>1,559 acres (8%)</u>
Totals With METRO '02	241	44,542	4,770 from Agriculture (33%)	3,982 from Forest (9%)

13,932 Total Farm / Forest (54%) Without Metro '02
18,752 Total Farm / Forest (42%) With Metro '02

*Does not include 18,843 acres added to the Metro UGB, now in litigation.

**COUNTY ACRES REPLANNED AND/OR REZONED
FROM ONE RURAL ZONE TO ANOTHER RURAL ZONE
BY TYPE OF ZONE AND YEAR**

From Agriculture	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial*	To Residential	SubTotal*	Totals
1989 - 1993 Average	232	117	104	97	242		792
1994	1,100	37		5	580		1,722
1995	5,000	140	32	40	458		5,670
1996		649	1	13	400		1,063
1997		13	27		511		551
1998	935,000	168	5	219	293		935,685
1999	2,181	271	19	547	795		3,813
2000	233	542	11	60	1,739		2,585
2001	148	67	11	31	283		540
2002	10	202	18	69	147	234	446
2003	77	90	21	2	283	306	473
2004	52	269	25	1,681	220	1,926	2,247
Totals	944,033	2,565	274	2,764	5,951	8,989	955,587

From Forestry	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	Totals
1989 - 1993 Average	1,470	7,249	1	35	428		9,183
1994	161			30	103		294
1995	467	15		6	340		828
1996	153		8		486		647
1997	353	600		39	270		1,262
1998	8			5	138		151
1999	20				80		100
2000				23	132		155
2001					232		232
2002	109				113	113	222
2003	113				520	520	633
2004	50	0		82	95	177	227
Totals	2,904	7,864	9	220	2,937	3,166	13,934

From Rural Residential	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	Totals
1989 - 1993 Average	43	2	40	11	815		911
1994			19	64	81		164
1995		10	3	6	244		263
1996	27		31	31	125		214
1997	45	2	13	14	42		116
1998			6	35	136		177
1999	3		13				16
2000			2	4	8		14
2001			17		45		62
2002		9	15	40	10	65	74
2003			15	20	42	77	77
2004			18	28	0	46	46
Totals	118	23	192	253	1,548	1,993	2,134

Shaded Area: Rezoned/converted resource to development zones

*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as industrial

**PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2005 Table A

County	High Value	Size / Acres	Income / Non High Value	Capability	Totals
Baker		5			5
Benton					
Clackamas					
Clatsop					
Columbia					
Coos					
Crook		5			5
Curry					
Deschutes					
Douglas		7			7
Gilliam					
Grant		1			1
Harney		6			6
Hood River	5				5
Jackson	1	3		1	5
Jefferson	4	1		1	6
Josephine					
Klamath					
Lake		14			14
Lane	2				2
Lincoln					
Linn	1				1
Malheur		3			3
Marion	1				1
Morrow	1	1			2
Multnomah	1				1
Polk	4	1			5
Sherman					
Tillamook					
Umatilla			1		1
Union		4			4
Wallowa					
Wasco	2	4			6
Washington		5			5
Wheeler					
Yamhill					
Totals	22	60	1	2	85

Previous Years Totals

2004	35	40	12	1	88
2003	30	39	19	5	93
2002	19	45	10	2	76

**NEW PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2005 Table B

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker							5	5
Benton								
Clackamas								
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook							5	5
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas							7	7
Gilliam								
Grant	1							1
Harney							6	6
Hood River			1	2	2			5
Jackson					1		4	5
Jefferson	1			1		2	2	6
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake						1	13	14
Lane						1	1	2
Lincoln								
Linn			1					1
Malheur		1			1		1	3
Marion			1					1
Morrow							2	2
Multnomah							1	1
Polk					1		4	5
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla						1		1
Union							4	4
Wallowa								
Wasco					1	1	4	6
Washington		1	3		1			5
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
Totals	2	2	6	3	7	6	59	85

Previous Years Totals

2004	0	4	3	4	8	9	60	88
2003	0	3	5	7	11	15	52	93
2002	0	7	2	5	3	8	51	76

**FARM HELP AND
REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS**

2005 Table C

County	Seasonal	Units	Relative	Accessory	Replace	Totals
Baker				2		2
Benton				1	1	2
Clackamas			2	2		4
Clatsop					1	1
Columbia						
Coos			2		2	4
Crook			2	2	10	14
Curry						
Deschutes				1		1
Douglas			14		38	52
Gilliam				1		1
Grant			2		5	7
Harney						
Hood River				1	12	13
Jackson			4	2		6
Jefferson			2		11	13
Josephine						
Klamath			5	2	18	25
Lake						
Lane			2		16	18
Lincoln						
Linn			2			2
Malheur			3	2	11	16
Marion				2	18	20
Morrow			1	2	2	5
Multnomah			2	1	5	8
Polk					25	25
Sherman						
Tillamook					4	4
Umatilla					21	21
Union					11	11
Wallowa						
Wasco	2		2		4	8
Washington			2	1	21	24
Wheeler						
Yamhill			2	1		3
Totals	2		49	23	236	310

Previous Years Totals

2004	1	1	53	20	294	369
2003	0	0	34	30	305	369
2002	0	0	48	27	333	416

**NON FARM / LOT OF RECORD
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2005 Table D

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value			
Baker	2			8		10
Benton	2		1		1	4
Clackamas	2		5	1	9	17
Clatsop				2		2
Columbia						
Coos						
Crook	3			19	2	24
Curry						
Deschutes	2		1	33	3	39
Douglas	2			31	2	35
Gilliam						
Grant	2			3		5
Harney				5	1	6
Hood River			1		1	2
Jackson	6			17	6	29
Jefferson						
Josephine				1		1
Klamath	3			10		13
Lake				40		40
Lane				3	5	8
Lincoln				1		1
Linn	1			4	7	12
Malheur	1			12	2	15
Marion	2		2		11	15
Morrow				2		2
Multnomah			2			2
Polk	1			3	11	15
Sherman						
Tillamook					2	2
Umatilla	2			6	4	12
Union	3			2	1	6
Wallowa	3			2		5
Wasco	1			3		4
Washington	1			3	5	9
Wheeler				5		5
Yamhill				2	16	18
Totals	39		12	218	89	358

Previous Years Totals

2004	57	3	4	202	73	339
2003	53	0	0	258	80	391
2002	84	1	4	279	104	470

**LOT OF RECORD (EFU)
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2005 Table E

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage					80 & Over	Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80		
Baker					1	1		2
Benton		1		2				3
Clackamas	7							7
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook		1			1	1		3
Curry								
Deschutes				1	2			3
Douglas	1			1				2
Gilliam								
Grant					1			1
Harney								
Hood River					1			1
Jackson	1		1		3	1		6
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath	1	1			1			3
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn						1		1
Malheur				1				1
Marion	1				1	2		4
Morrow								
Multnomah			1			1		2
Polk					1			1
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla					1	1		2
Union				1		1	2	4
Wallowa					2	1		3
Wasco						1		1
Washington					1			1
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
Totals	11	3	2	6	16	11	2	51

Previous Years Totals

2004	11	9	7	6	11	20	0	64
2003	0	5	10	7	11	7	0	53
2002	10	13	11	15	20	22	0	91

NON FARM DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE

2005 Table F

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage					Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	
Baker	1		1	2	4		8
Benton							
Clackamas		1					1
Clatsop				1	1		2
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook		4	10	3	1	1	19
Curry							
Deschutes	2	9	2	8	8	4	33
Douglas	2	15	9	4	1		31
Gilliam							
Grant					1	2	3
Harney	2			1	2		5
Hood River							
Jackson		6	3	5	1	2	17
Jefferson							
Josephine	1						1
Klamath	2	2	2	4			10
Lake	3	8	11	12	4	2	40
Lane	1	1	1				3
Lincoln		1					1
Linn	1	1		1	1		4
Malheur		8		2	2		12
Marion							
Morrow	1					1	2
Multnomah							
Polk	1	1	1				3
Sherman							
Tillamook							
Umatilla		5	1				6
Union		1				1	2
Wallowa			1	1			2
Wasco	1		1	1			3
Washington		2		1			3
Wheeler	2	1	1		1		5
Yamhill		1		1			2
Totals	20	67	44	47	27	13	218

Previous Years Totals

2004	17	54	38	44	26	22	201
2003	0	66	50	52	32	37	258
2002	28	65	45	70	39	32	279

**NEW ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2005 Table G

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker						1	1	2
Benton	1							1
Clackamas	1			1				2
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook							2	2
Curry								
Deschutes						1		1
Douglas								
Gilliam				1				1
Grant							1	1
Harney								
Hood River					1			1
Jackson			1				1	2
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath				1			1	2
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur							2	2
Marion						1	1	2
Morrow					2			2
Multnomah							1	1
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union								
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington					1			1
Wheeler								
Yamhill					1			1
Totals	2		1	3	5	3	10	24

Previous Years Totals

2004	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	20
2003	0	6	1	2	3	8	10	30
2002	0	4	1	5	3	3	11	27

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON EFU LAND
2001-2005**

2005 Table H

County	Primary Farm					Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
	2001*	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001*	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001*	2002	2003	2004	2005
Baker	4	1			5	8	4		10	2	1				8
Benton		2				2			2	3		1		2	
Clackamas	2	1	3	8		5	4	2	4	7			1	2	1
Clatsop			1				1				1		1		2
Columbia							1							1	
Coos						2	3	1						1	
Crook	14	4	6	11	5	3	5	3	5	3	45	42	34	30	19
Curry				1								1	1		
Deschutes	1		4	3		8	9	2	3	3	49	62	60	37	33
Douglas	10	7	4	7	7	6	2	3	2	2	32	30	35	18	31
Gilliam	2	3													
Grant	4	7	1	1	1	4	5	3	2	2	6	5	11	2	3
Harney	8	7	11	5	6	4	2	2	2		6	13	3	4	5
Hood River			1		5	1		1	1	1	1		1		
Jackson	4	6	3	2	5	16	15	8	4	6	25	21	11	6	17
Jefferson	2	4	8	7	6			1	1						
Josephine									1		2	3	5	3	1
Klamath	3		13	6		1	1	3		3	8	10	17	30	10
Lake	7	4	1	2	14						32	28	26	28	40
Lane	1	2	4	1	2	3			1		3			2	3
Lincoln	1					2	2		1						1
Linn	3		2	1	1	3	2		3	1	5	1	2	5	4
Malheur	3	5	6	9	3	3		3	4	1	7	18	21	7	12
Marion	5	6	2	2	1	5	1		1	4	2	3	2	6	1
Morrow	2		1		2	2	1	2			3	5	6	1	2
Multnomah	1		1	1	1		1			2		1			
Polk	12	3		1	5	6	8	7	2	1	1	1			3
Sherman				1							1				
Tillamook													1		
Umatilla	3	5	3	5	1	2	9	2	3	2	10	9	3	6	6
Union	7	1	2	3	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	2	1	1	2
Wallowa	2		3	2		3		2	5	3		2	8		2
Wasco	3	3	6	2	6	2	2	2	1	1	11	5	2	3	3
Washington	3	2	2	2	5					1	1	5	1	2	3
Wheeler											10	8	2	2	5
Yamhill	1	3	5	5		10	6	1	2		4	3	3	2	2
Totals	108	76	93	88	85	104	89	53	64	51	270	279	258	201	219

12 month averages 81

78

203

*For 2001 reporting year, the county totals are the 16 month reporting total. For comparison purposes the 12 month average total has been provided.

DIVISION APPROVALS ON EFU LAND 2000-2005

2005 Table I

County	Resulting Farm Parcels						Resulting NonFarm Parcels					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Baker	8	15	10		7	12	3		2		11	1
Benton		2	3	1	2		5			1		
Clackamas		4	2		2			1				
Clatsop												
Columbia			5						5			
Coos											2	
Crook	24	24	12	12	23	11	14	12	39	21	22	4
Curry				4						1		
Deschutes	15	14	11	17	13	6	4	3	45	43	24	15
Douglas	9	29	34	21	19	27	4	4	13	16	8	31
Gilliam		3	7	2		9		1	2	2		1
Grant		17	9	17	8	19	1	3	2	10	6	7
Harney	15	18	7	7	6	36	2	1	2	5	4	
Hood River												
Jackson		1					1	1				
Jefferson	6	4	3	10	4		2			1		
Josephine						1						2
Klamath		6	14		6	2		4	13	1	14	7
Lake	6	6	16	17	8	7	10	34		15	20	28
Lane		7				4	3	3	3			1
Lincoln												
Linn	2	6	4	7	5	7	3			3	1	3
Malheur		1	9	1			3	1	6	1		
Marion	2	4	2	1	1	3				1	1	1
Morrow	7	14	17	6	5	7	4	2	4	7	1	
Multnomah												
Polk	4		3	11	3	9	1			1		3
Sherman			6	1	10	4	4	4	2	1	4	
Tillamook		1						2				
Umatilla		18	4	3	8	13	6	5	6	1	6	6
Union	2	9	5		4	5	3					
Wallowa	11		2	17	7	4		2		10	4	2
Wasco	5	1	2	5	5	5	2	4		1	5	1
Washington		4				1					2	1
Wheeler		2				2						2
Yamhill	2	10	7	4								
Totals	118	220	194	164	146	194	75	87	144	142	135	116

12 month averages

165

65

**FARM
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

2005 Table J

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions			Dwelling Units Approved
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	Resulting Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	NF Parcels Created	
Baker	6		12			1	
Benton							
Clackamas							
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook	4		11	2		4	4
Curry							
Deschutes	6		6	2		15	11
Douglas	5		27	17		31	28
Gilliam	4		9	1		1	
Grant	4		8	4		7	
Harney	16		36				
Hood River	1						
Jackson							
Jefferson							
Josephine			1	1		2	
Klamath			2	5		7	
Lake			7	16		28	17
Lane			4	2		1	
Lincoln							
Linn	2		7	3		3	2
Malheur							
Marion	1		3	1		1	
Morrow	3		7				
Multnomah							
Polk	6		9			3	2
Sherman	1		4	2			
Tillamook							
Umatilla	8		18	5		6	
Union	2		5				
Wallowa	3		4	3		2	1
Wasco	3		5	1		1	1
Washington			1	1		1	
Wheeler	1		2	6		2	2
Yamhill							
Totals	76		188	72		116	68

Previous Years Totals

2004	51	0	140	86	1	133	73
2003	80	0	164	86	2	142	48
2002	72	1	194	88	0	144	44

FARM DIVISIONS

2005 Table K

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 80	80 & Over	
Baker						1	11	12
Benton								
Clackamas								
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook						3	8	11
Curry								
Deschutes					1	2	3	6
Douglas	3					3	21	27
Gilliam							9	9
Grant						1	7	8
Harney						1	35	36
Hood River								
Jackson								
Jefferson								
Josephine							1	1
Klamath	1					1		2
Lake							7	7
Lane				1		1	2	4
Lincoln								
Linn			1	1		1	4	7
Malheur								
Marion				1		1	1	3
Morrow	1					1	5	7
Multnomah								
Polk				1	1	1	6	9
Sherman							4	4
Tillamook								
Umatilla							18	18
Union							5	5
Wallowa							4	4
Wasco							5	5
Washington					1			1
Wheeler							2	2
Yamhill								
Totals	5		1	4	3	17	158	188

Previous Years Totals

2004	0	3	1	2	7	17	110	140
2003	0	3	0	1	8	22	129	163
2002	0	5	4	0	6	23	157	194

**NON FARM DIVISIONS
CREATED NON FARM PARCELS**

2005 Table L

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage					Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 and Over	
Baker					1		1
Benton							
Clackamas							
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook		1	1		1	1	4
Curry							
Deschutes		4	7		3	1	15
Douglas		28	1			2	31
Gilliam			1				1
Grant		3	2	1		1	7
Harney							
Hood River							
Jackson							
Jefferson							
Josephine		2					2
Klamath		6		1			7
Lake		4	12	6	1	5	28
Lane			1				1
Lincoln							
Linn		1	1			1	3
Malheur							
Marion		1					1
Morrow							
Multnomah							
Polk		1	2				3
Sherman							
Tillamook							
Umatilla		5	1				6
Union							
Wallowa		1		1			2
Wasco			1				1
Washington		1					1
Wheeler		1		1			2
Yamhill							
Totals		59	30	10	6	11	116

Previous Years Totals

2004	0	45	16	24	21	29	135
2003	0	54	19	26	24	18	142
2002	0	37	9	47	25	25	144

**Other Uses Approved on Land Zoned
for Exclusive Farm Use**

2005 Table M

Number of Approvals

Use	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Accessory Use	68	47	63	82	84	135	25	30	34	21
Airstrip, Person		2	4	2	2	5	6	3	2	6
Bed and Breakfast	2	5	6	2	4	2	7	3	2	4
Church	2	3	4	1	6	2	3		3	7
Commercial Activity with Farm U	11	20	16	20	15	24	3	8	7	10
Dog Kennel	1	3	2		1	1	2	4	8	6
Farm Exempt Building						27	6	6	34	17
Farm Stand					6		6	5	5	2
Farm Use	7	3	11	1	14	3	14	27	1	1
Golf Course	3	3	4	1	1	2	3		1	
Guest Ranch				3		6				
Historic Resource				1				1		1
Home Occupation	32	24	25	18	23	26	14	24	18	18
Horse Boarding										
Mineral & Aggregate	20	22	19	31	20	25	20	21	8	10
NonConforming Use	4	1	5	5	5	2	5	7	6	9
Private Park	6	13	7	6	8	10	16	12	5	2
Processing Facility*							3	1		1
Public Facility	6	14	5	7	2	6	1			3
Roads	7	13	2	9	2	15	11	9	12	8
School	4	4	2	3	5	2	1		1	1
Utility Facility	33	33	23	40	62	69	1	34	22	30
Winery							14	7	6	6
Totals	206	210	198	232	260	362	245	277	175	163

2001 average

339

* New categories in 2002

Farm Land Moved into
Urban Growth Boundaries by Calendar Year

Year	Number	Acres	Use From Agriculture	Use From Forest
1987	8	1,749	624 acres	946 acres
1988	12	516	150 acres	68 acres
1989	25	1,445	259 acres	100 acres
1990	9	2,737	1,734 acres	17 acres
1991	21	1,480	177 acres	70 acres
1992	15	970	297 acres	120 acres
1993	22	2,277	1,390 acres	448 acres
1994	20	1,747	201 acres	20 acres
1995	15	624	219 acres	143 acres
1996	19	3,816	2,466 acres	16 acres
1997	12	668	508 acres	40 acres
1998	21	2,726	493 acres	2 acres
1999	10	927	587 acres	72 acres
2000	3	17	0 acres	0 acres
2001	4	21	11 acres (52.3%)	0 acres
2002*	6	203	60 acres (29.5%)	100 acres (49.2%)
2003	10	385	124 acres (26%)	85 acres (18%)
2004	7	3,391	2,90 Acres (65%)	176 Acres (5%)
2005	8	111	70 acres (63%)	8 Acres (7%)
Totals	247	25,810	11,579 from Ag. (45%)	2,431 from Forest (9%)

Metro '02	3	18,843	3,261 acres (17%)	1,559 acres (8%)
Totals With METRO '02	250	44,653	4,840 from Agriculture (33%)	3,990 from Forest (9%)

14,010 Total Farm / Forest (54%) Without Metro '02
18,830 Total Farm / Forest (42%) With Metro '02

*Does not include 18,843 acres added to the Metro UGB, now in litigation.

**COUNTY ACRES REPLANNED AND/OR REZONED
FROM ONE RURAL ZONE TO ANOTHER RURAL ZONE
BY TYPE OF ZONE AND YEAR**

From Agriculture	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial*	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1993 Average	232	117	104	97	242		792
1994	1,100	37		5	580		1,722
1995	5,000	140	32	40	458		5,670
1996		649	1	13	400		1,063
1997		13	27		511		551
1998	935,000	168	5	219	293		935,685
1999	2,181	271	19	547	795		3,813
2000	233	542	11	60	1,739		2,585
2001	148	67	11	31	283		540
2002	10	202	18	69	147	234	446
2003	77	90	21	2	283	306	473
2004	52	269	25	1,681	220	1,926	2,247
2005	21	988	479	772	414	1,665	2,674
Totals	944,054	3,553	753	3,536	6,365	10,654	958,261

From Forestry	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1993 Average	1,470	7,249	1	35	428		9,183
1994	161			30	103		294
1995	467	15		6	340		828
1996	153		8		486		647
1997	353	600		39	270		1,262
1998	8			5	138		151
1999	20				80		100
2000				23	132		155
2001					232		232
2002	109				113	113	222
2003	113				520	520	633
2004	50			82	95	177	227
2005	44	50		31	101	132	226
Totals	2,948	7,914	9	251	3,038	3,298	14,160

From Rural Residential	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1993 Average	43	2	40	11	815		911
1994			19	64	81		164
1995		10	3	6	244		263
1996	27		31	31	125		214
1997	45	2	13	14	42		116
1998			6	35	136		177
1999	3		13				16
2000			2	4	8		14
2001			17		45		62
2002		9	15	40	10	65	74
2003			15	20	42	77	77
2004			18	28		46	46
2005			35	6	14	55	55
Totals	118	23	227	259	1,562	2,048	2,189

Shaded Area: Rezoned/converted resource to development zones

*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as industrial

**POST MEASURE 37 LAND USE
EXCLUSIVE FARM USE LAND**

Fill in section I for all decisions. Fill in sections II, III and IV as appropriate. Attach adopted written findings and conclusions if any.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

County Name: _____ Local File Number: _____

Applicant: _____ State Claim Number: _____

Claimant Name (if Different): _____ State Waiver Date: _____

Current Zone: _____ Location: T: _____ R: _____ S: _____ TL: _____

Qtr Section: _____ Qtr/Qtr Section: _____ (Fill in NE, NW, SE OR SW; or A, B, C or D.)

Zone, if any on State Waiver Date: _____

Farm Tax Deferral: Yes No High Value Soils: Yes No

Date of Final Decision: _____

II. USES OTHER THAN DWELLINGS

Approved Denied

Specific Use: _____

Total Parcel Size: _____ Acres Portion of Parcel Involved: _____ Acres

III. DWELLING DECISIONS

Approved Denied

Dwelling Type (i.e Farm, Non-Farm, Other: Specify Approved Standard Applied, if any)

Size of Parcel: _____ Size of Ownership/Tract Involved: _____ # of Parcels Involved: _____

IV. DIVISIONS AND LOT LINE ADJUSTMENTS

Approved Denied Farm Division Non-Farm Division Lot Line Adjustment

Size of Parent Parcel(s): _____ acres _____ acres _____ acres

For each resulting parcel, fill in the size, whether the parcel is forest or non-forest, and the number of existing dwellings on each parcel. To report additional parcels use a separate piece of paper.

	Size	Forest/ Non-Forest	# of Existing Dwellings	New Dwelling/ Other Use
Parcel 1	_____ acres	_____	_____	_____
Parcel 2	_____ acres	_____	_____	_____
Parcel 3	_____ acres	_____	_____	_____