

APPROVED 2006-07 FARM REPORT

January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2007

Introduction

State law (ORS 197.065) requires the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) 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 Goal 3, “Agricultural Land” in EFU zones.

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) receives a description of each local decision and supporting information in these zones along with a compilation of all decisions made during the reporting period from each county. All counties except Lake County submitted this information.

Reporting Period and Content

This report summarizes the information provided by the counties for the two-year period from January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2007. Usually, the department prepares separate farm and forest land reports for each year. For this biennium, the report covers the entire two-year period. Separate tables for each year are still included as the basis for the combined reports.

Tables A through P include information for dwelling and land division decisions, as well as information on other approved uses (for example, commercial activities in conjunction with farm use, mineral and aggregate operations, home occupations, etc.). Table N reports the number and size of urban growth boundary amendments. Table O summarizes the adopted rural plan and zone map amendments. This report continues to include information on the acreage that is inventoried as “non-resource land” (rural lands that are not agricultural or forest lands as defined by Goals 3 and 4) and the number of counties that have mapped high-value farmland as required by OAR 660-033-0080(2).

Ballot Measures 37 & 49

This report includes a section for county land use decisions in EFU and forest zones that are based on waivers to state and local land use regulations under Ballot Measure 37, as subsequently modified by Ballot Measure 49 (Table P). These waivers and approvals were based on the zone standards for dwellings and land divisions that were in effect in counties at the time that applicants acquired their properties.

Use of Reported Information

The department uses the collected information to monitor the type and extent of development and parcelization occurring on agricultural land statewide and in individual counties and 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. 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 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 in the state’s interest to protect the land resource foundation of one of its leading industries – agriculture. According to the Oregon Department of Agriculture, in 2007 the total direct and indirect contribution to Oregon’s economy by the agriculture and food processing industry was more than \$12 billion dollars (\$4.3 billion in farm/ranch products; \$2 billion from value-added processing; \$3.4 billion in 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 nine percent of all Oregon jobs.

Oregon’s agricultural lands protection program is based on several elements composed of statutory and administrative rules provisions, the agricultural lands goal, and opinions and interpretations from the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and the courts. 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 EFU zones under statute (ORS Chapter 215) and the review of farm and non-farm uses according to statute and administrative rule (OAR 660, Division 33) provisions. The goal and administrative rule also incorporate statutory minimum lot sizes and standards for all land divisions.

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 and 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 protected from conversion to rural or urban uses and other conflicting nonfarm uses through the use of EFU zones. At present, about 15.5 million acres (56%) of private land in Oregon are included in EFU zones. 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.

Reported Data

Dwellings

In EFU zones, dwellings are allowed in seven different circumstances and include primary farm dwellings, accessory farm dwellings, relative farm help dwellings, non-farm dwellings, lot-of-record dwellings, replacement dwellings and temporary hardship dwellings. Counties approved 828 dwellings in EFU zones in 2006 and 806 in 2007. These numbers are a little higher than for previous years. However, they include some dwellings approved under Measure 37.

Primary Farm Dwellings. The total number of primary farm dwellings approved statewide in 2006 was 105, while the figure for 2007 was 89 (Table A). The 2007 figure is more consistent with previous years, while the 2006 figure is somewhat high. Most farm dwelling approvals were in eastern and southern Oregon (64% in 2006 and 77% in 2007).

There are four different ways in which primary farm dwellings may be approved. In most years, the types of primary farm dwelling approvals have been fairly evenly split between those based on an income standard and those approved on parcels of 160 acres and greater. Typically, only a couple of primary farm dwellings are approved each year based on the potential gross farm sales (capability) test. However, in 2006 and 2007, the numbers of dwellings approved in this manner was significantly higher, at 16 and nine, respectively. All but one of these approvals was in Klamath County.

Table B shows the parcel sizes on which primary farm dwellings were approved. In 2006, 53% of all farm dwellings approved were on parcels that met or exceeded the minimum lot size of 80 acres, while in 2007 the figure was 61%. These percentages are a little lower than those for 2004 and 2005, when about 70% of all farm dwellings were on parcels that met or exceeded the 80-acre minimum. If tract size were considered, these percentages would be higher as in some cases farm dwellings are approved on smaller parcels that are part of larger tracts. Even so, of some concern are the farm dwellings approved on parcels between 0 and 20 acres that may not be part of larger tracts; the figures for these were 17% in 2006 and 11% in 2007.

Other Farm-Related Dwellings. Farm-related dwellings include accessory farm dwellings (for year-round or seasonal farm workers) approved under ORS 215.283(1)(f) and family farm help dwellings under ORS 215.283(1)(e) (Table C).

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). In 2006, counties approved 24 accessory dwellings, a figure that is consistent with previous years. However, in 2007 the number jumped to 55, most of the increase is due to 15 accessory dwelling approvals in Hood River County. Just over one-third of the approvals in 2006 were for parcels over 80 acres, while in 2007 the figure was higher at 44% (Table G).

However, in 2007, more than one-third of the approvals were for parcels between 0 and 20 acres, most of them in Hood River County.

The number of dwellings approved for family members whose assistance is needed on the farm was 35 in 2006, jumping to 55 in 2007. Nearly one-third of the 2007 approvals were in Douglas County (Table C).

Non-Farm-Related Dwellings. Non-farm-related dwellings include those approved under the non-farm standards of ORS 215.284, lot-of-record dwellings approved under ORS 215.705, temporary hardship dwellings allowed under ORS 215.283(2)(k) (Table D) and replacement dwellings allowed under ORS 215.283(1)(s) (Table C). In 2006 and 2007, non-farm-related dwellings accounted for more than three-quarters of all approved dwellings in EFU zones.

Approval numbers for non-farm dwellings were nearly identical in 2006 and 2007, at 236 and 246, respectively. These numbers represent an increase over the two previous years. Seventy-six percent of the 2006 non-farm dwelling approvals took place in eastern Oregon and 16% in southern Oregon. In 2007, 58% of non-farm dwelling approvals took place in eastern Oregon and 30% in southern Oregon in 2007. The highest approval numbers for 2006 were for Deschutes County (57), while the highest numbers for 2007 were for Douglas County (54). 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 approval standards that recognize Oregon's regional differences.

Non-farm dwelling approvals occur on parcels of all sizes, but somewhat over half are for parcels of 20 acres or less. Large parcel (over 40 acres) approvals of non-farm dwellings nearly always take place in eastern or southern Oregon counties (Table F).

The number of approvals for lot-of-record dwellings in 2006 and 2007 were 53 and 64, respectively, numbers that are consistent with past trends. Only about nine percent of these approvals were on high-value farmland. The highest level of activity in 2006 was in Deschutes County (54) and in 2007 was Douglas County (62). Lot-of-record dwellings are sited on parcels of all sizes that reflect existing lot configurations.

Temporary hardship dwellings may be sited in conjunction with any existing dwelling, regardless of whether they are farm or non-farm dwellings, but must be removed at the end of the hardship. The number of approved temporary hardship dwellings was 75 for 2006 and 69 for 2007, figures that are consistent with past numbers (Table D).

The number of approvals for replacement dwellings was 301 in 2006 and 227 in 2007, the former figure representing an increase over the previous year. The highest numbers of replacement dwellings for both years were for Douglas County. Established dwellings that are replaced must be removed, demolished or converted within three months of issuance of a replacement permit.

Non-Farm Uses

The Legislature has recognized that some non-farm uses are generally needed in farming areas, such as farm-related commercial activities, utilities necessary for public service, home occupations and some types of dwellings. In 1963, the first statutory EFU zone included just six non-farm uses; today over 50 uses are allowed in an EFU zone.

The most commonly approved non-farm uses, excluding dwellings, in 2006 and 2007 were telecommunication facilities, home occupations, commercial activities in conjunction with farm use, and accessory uses (some farm and some non-farm). Total numbers of these uses were 201 in 2006 and 254 in 2007, the latter representing a substantial jump in numbers over previous years due in large part to a spike in accessory use approvals (Table M). Significantly more dwellings not related to farming were approved in 2006 and 2007 (358/365) than were other non-farm uses.

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 uses (ORS 215.296). Other approval standards direct such uses to 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. It is important that non-farm development is sited to minimize its impact on agriculture and thus protect the primary use – farming – within the zone.

However, the cumulative effect of non-farm uses, together with approved dwellings, has not been analyzed. At best, the department can determine the number of acres affected by the approval of these uses. The department remains concerned about the cumulative effects of non-farm uses approved in EFU zones.

Land Divisions

Farm Divisions. The number of new farm parcels decreased by about half from previous years to 101 and 106 in 2006 and 2007. The drop was due primarily to the department's correction of county data on divisions that were incorrectly labeled farm divisions. In addition, the new figures exclude lot-line adjustments and remainder parcels, which were sometimes previously included in the calculations. The number of "new" parcels includes only additional parcels created, not counting the remainder from the parent tract. This change allows for more meaningful tracking of the actual creation of new parcels (Table J).

Nearly all of the farm divisions were for new parcels of at least 80 acres, thus meeting the statutory minimum lot size for land divisions, while a few were for counties that have approved "go-below" lot minimums. A large majority of farm divisions occurred in

eastern and southern Oregon (75% in 2006 and 83% in 2007). As a note, no Measure 37 land divisions were included in Table J.

Non-Farm Divisions. The number of new non-farm parcels jumped substantially in 2006, more than doubling from years previous. However, it must be remembered that in correcting for the mislabeled farm divisions (see above), the department had to increase the numbers in the non-farm division column. As for farm divisions, the department excluded lot-line adjustments and remainder parcels from these figures. The number of “new” parcels includes only additional parcels created, not counting the remainder from the parent tract. Even so, the resulting figures of 198 new non-farm parcels for 2006 and 208 for 2007 are high compared to previous years.

The highest number of new non-farm parcels for both 2006 and 2007 by a substantial margin was in Douglas County, with 40 approvals in one year and 43 in the next. The great majority of non-farm divisions occurred in eastern and southern Oregon (89% in 2006 and 86% in 2007). The data on non-farm parcel sizes is revealing (Table L). Whereas one might expect the great majority of new non-farm parcels to be small, in fact, they occur in all size ranges. About 13% of all new parcels are over 20 acres, with about half of these over 40 acres. It may be that large parcels are being created to accommodate non-farm uses when a smaller parcel might accommodate the use just as well and result in fewer acres lost to farming.

The fact that the greatest number of land divisions (both farm and non-farm) are occurring in the same counties creates concern that farm divisions in these places are being pursued more for purposes of breaking up large farm and ranch properties rather than to facilitate existing or accommodate new farm or ranch uses. As a note, no Measure 37 land divisions were included in Table J.

Changes in Designation

There are several ways in which designated agricultural land can be 1) re-inventoried as higher- or lower-quality farmland, 2) replanned and/or rezoned for other uses or 3) identified as qualified for waivers of resource zone requirements. Each option involves a specific process for identification of appropriate lands as described below.

High-Value Farmland Mapping. Oregon Administrative 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 were 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, which 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 five counties have identified their high-value farmland. Hood River, Linn, Umatilla and Yamhill Counties have identified and mapped their high-value farmland. Marion County has designated all the land within its EFU zone as high-value farmland and does not make such determinations case-by-case as part of land use decisions.

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 and other uses in their EFU zones. The use lists for the two sections are almost the same.

Data for actions on EFU-zoned land in counties with marginal lands are tallied and summarized with that for 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 11 in 2006 and three in 2007. Lane County reported that it added 316 acres to its marginal lands base in 2007. Washington County reported that it added 10 acres to its marginal land base in 2006 and 39 acres in 2007; however, Washington County's designations are conditional on the approval of a dwelling within a four year period.

Plan Amendments. Tables N and O summarize plan and zone amendments adopted and submitted to the department for the period between January 1, 1987 and December 31, 2007. These data provide an important historic picture of rezonings to accommodate planned development in urban and rural areas. Table N provides information on urban growth boundary (UGB) amendments adopted during this time. During 2006, there were 15 UGB amendments that brought 3,231 acres into UGBs. Of this, 697 acres, or 22%, were farm and forest lands. During 2007, there were 19 UGB amendments that brought 292 acres into UGBs. Of this, 170 acres or 58% were farm and forest lands. Acreage added to UGBs and the percent that is farm and forest land has historically varied significantly from year to year.

Table O provides information on changes from farm and forest plan designations and/or zoning to rural land use categories. In 2006, 2,038 acres of farmland were redesignated for rural development uses, while 295 acres of forest land went into rural use. In 2007, 2,048 acres of farmland were redesignated for rural development uses, while 1,276 acres of forest land went into such uses. Each of these plan or zone designation changes was required to be supported by an exception to Goal 3 or 4. The conversions figures for 2006 and 2007 were higher than for many previous years.

Non-Resource Lands. Seven counties have identified "non-resource" lands that are not "agricultural" or "forest" lands as defined by Statewide Goals 3 and 4. These lands have been planned and zoned for other rural uses and are not subject to the provisions of Goals 3 and 4. Lands that in the future are re-inventoried as non-resource lands are not required to be supported by an exception to either of these goals. However, appropriate data

documenting the non resource nature of the land must be provided as part of a plan amendment. Concerns have been raised to the Commission about how non-resource lands are identified, their location and extent and about the appropriate level of rural development allowed by the goals. Included below is a list of the eight counties with acreage planned and zoned as “non-resource.” In 2006 and 2007 Douglas County added 20 acres to its non-resource land base and Linn County designated 29 acres as non-resource land.

County	Acres Designated Non-Resource
Clatsop	2,351
Crook	23,000
Douglas	3,211
Josephine	15,412
Klamath	34,718
Linn	29
Lane	495
Wasco	7,047
Total	86,204

Ballot Measures 37 and 49. In November 2007, Oregon voters approved Measure 49, which modified Measure 37. The department is authorized under Measure 49 to evaluate existing Measure 37 claims submitted to the state on or before June 28, 2007. Claims received after this date will be treated as new Measure 49 claims and must be based on new land use regulations adopted after January 1, 2007. DLCD received approximately 4,600 Measure 49 Election Returns by the end of June 2008 and began issuing preliminary evaluations at the end of July. Final authorizations are now in progress, based on supplemental reviews of Measure 37 claims as provided under Measure 49. Once LCDC authorizes a specific number of homesites, the property owner may then obtain local permits necessary to develop or sell a homesite.

Counties are required to submit records of local approvals under Measure 37 on a special form, along with their other farm and forest reporting forms. Only 21 of the 36 counties submitted the required Measure 37 forms for 2006-2007 decisions (although most non-responding counties had Measure 37 authorizations from DLCD) and so the numbers in Table P under-represent the number of actual county Measure 37 approvals. At the same time, some counties reported Measure 37 approvals of claims for applicants who apparently did not seek or obtain state authorization.

Table P shows the number of Measure 37 approvals that were reported by each county for 2006 and 2007 for EFU and forest zones, all other approvals made in EFU and forest zones and total approvals for these zones. In 2006, six percent of all land use decisions in EFU zones were reported to be Measure 37 approvals, while the approvals jumped to 17% by 2007. In 2006, five percent of all land use decisions in forest zones were Measure 37 approvals, and these approvals increased to 11% by 2007. Because many of these

approvals involve subdivisions with multiple lots, the impact of Measure 37 approvals likely is greater than for other land use decisions in EFU and forest zones.

A more comprehensive picture of Measure 37 activity can be obtained by reviewing county reports of preliminary approvals. While these preliminary approvals have not always resulted in final approvals, they include all counties in which there has been activity based on state Measure 37 waivers. The majority of activity has been for the creation of new parcels and lots for dwellings; only 73 preliminary approvals have been for dwellings on existing lots in the reporting period. Significantly greater numbers of new parcels and lots have been preliminarily approved through Measure 37 claims than through ordinary land division approvals in EFU and forest zones in 2006 and 2007. In this period, two-thirds (1,178) of all new lots authorized in EFU zones were created through Measure 37, as compared to through the customary land division process (613). In forest zones, more than three-quarters (664) of all new authorized lots were created through Measure 37, in contrast to through the customary approach (195). These numbers include approvals for vested claims but not vested decisions on appeal. The department does not know at this time what percent of these preliminary approvals have obtained final approval, nor how many parcels and lots are eligible for dwellings.

New Dwellings Approved in Farm Zones

TYPE OF DWELLING	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTALS (% of Net)
Primary Farm ORS 215.283(1)(f)	98	68	88	77	81	76	93	88	84	105	89	947 (10%)
Accessory Farm ORS 215.283(1)(f)	57	35	53	36	29	27	30	20	23	24	55	389 (4%)
Family Farm Help ORS 215.283(1)(e)	78	77	59	43	38	48	34	53	49	35	55	569 (6%)
Temporary Hardship ORS 215.283(2)(L)	131	126	105	105	115	104	80	73	89	74	70	1072 (11%)
Lot-of-Record ORS 215.705	129	131	94	80	78	89	53	64	51	53	64	886 (9%)
Non Farm ORS 215.284	340	205	208	227	203	279	258	202	218	236	246	2622 (26%)
Net New Dwellings	833	642	607	568	544	623	548	500	514	527	579	6485
Replacement ORS 215.283(1)(s)	419	361	354	307	276	333	305	294	233	301	227	3410 (34% of Total)
TOTAL DWELLINGS APPROVED IN FARM ZONES	1252	1003	961	875	820	956	853	794	747	828	806	9895

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)

**PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2006 Table A

County	High Value	Size / Acres	Income / Non High Value	Capability	Totals
Baker		3			3
Benton					
Clackamas	1		1		2
Clatsop					
Columbia	1				1
Coos	1		1		2
Crook		4	6		10
Curry					
Deschutes		2			2
Douglas		3			3
Gilliam					
Grant					
Harney		8			8
Hood River	1	1	1		3
Jackson	1	1	1		3
Jefferson		1			1
Josephine					
Klamath		1		16	17
Lake		8			8
Lane					
Lincoln					
Linn	1				1
Malheur		1			1
Marion	3	1			4
Morrow		1			1
Multnomah					
Polk	1	1	1		3
Sherman					
Tillamook					
Umatilla					
Union		4			4
Wallowa		2			2
Wasco		2			2
Washington	6		5		11
Wheeler					
Yamhill	8	5			13
Totals	24	49	16	16	105

Previous Years Totals

2005	22	60	1	2	85
2004	35	40	12	1	88
2003	30	39	19	5	93

**NEW PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2006 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker							3	3
Benton								
Clackamas		1			1			2
Clatsop								
Columbia							1	1
Coos		1					1	2
Crook				1		3	6	10
Curry								
Deschutes							2	2
Douglas							3	3
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney						1	7	8
Hood River		1		1	1			3
Jackson		1	1				1	3
Jefferson							1	1
Josephine								
Klamath			2	3		5	7	17
Lake							8	8
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn							1	1
Malheur							1	1
Marion				1		2	1	4
Morrow							1	1
Multnomah								
Polk					1	1	1	3
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union							4	4
Wallowa							2	2
Wasco						1	1	2
Washington			3	2	3	2	1	11
Wheeler								
Yamhill					5	5	3	13
Totals	0	4	6	8	11	20	56	105

Previous Years Totals

2005	2	2	6	3	7	6	59	85
2004	0	4	3	4	8	9	60	88
2003	0	3	5	7	11	15	52	93

**FARM HELP AND
REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS**

2006 Table C

County	Seasonal	Units	Relative	Accessory	Replace	Totals
Baker			3		7	10
Benton			2		4	6
Clackamas			1	5		6
Clatsop						
Columbia				1		1
Coos			1		10	11
Crook				1	7	8
Curry						
Deschutes			4		27	31
Douglas			9	1	51	61
Gilliam						
Grant					4	4
Harney	1			1		2
Hood River				5	12	17
Jackson			2	1	1	4
Jefferson			1	1	10	12
Josephine						
Klamath			2	1	13	16
Lake						
Lane					13	13
Lincoln						
Linn				1		1
Malheur				1	22	23
Marion				2	19	21
Morrow					4	4
Multnomah					1	1
Polk				2	16	18
Sherman						
Tillamook					5	5
Umatilla			1		17	18
Union			2		6	8
Wallowa					7	7
Wasco			1		4	5
Washington				1	41	42
Wheeler						
Yamhill			6			6
Totals	1	0	35	24	301	361

Previous Years Totals

2005	2	0	49	23	236	310
2004	1	1	53	20	294	369
2003	0	0	34	30	305	369

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

2006 Table D

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value			
Baker	9			9	1	19
Benton	2			3	1	6
Clackamas	2		1	3	6	12
Clatsop				1		1
Columbia						
Coos					2	2
Crook	1			25	1	27
Curry						
Deschutes	3			57	4	64
Douglas	2		1	18	7	28
Gilliam						
Grant				2		2
Harney	10			13		23
Hood River	1		1		2	4
Jackson	5			20	5	30
Jefferson					2	2
Josephine						
Klamath				13	3	16
Lake				31	1	32
Lane	1			1		2
Lincoln						
Linn				1	10	11
Malheur		1		14	4	19
Marion	1		1	7	11	20
Morrow				2		2
Multnomah						
Polk				1	4	5
Sherman						
Tillamook					1	1
Umatilla	3			2		5
Union						
Wallowa	3			2		5
Wasco	1			3		4
Washington				1	1	2
Wheeler				5		5
Yamhill	2	2		2	8	14
Totals	46	3	4	236	74	363

Previous Years Totals

2005	39	0	12	218	89	358
2004	57	3	4	202	73	339
2003	53	0	0	258	80	391

**LOT OF RECORD FARM DWELLING ACTIONS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2006 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker		1	3		1	1	3	9
Benton				1		1		2
Clackamas		2					1	3
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook			1					1
Curry								
Deschutes	1				1		1	3
Douglas				1			2	3
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney			2	4		2	2	10
Hood River		1		1				2
Jackson		2	1	1		1		5
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane						1		1
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur					1			1
Marion				1			1	2
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla			2	1				3
Union								
Wallowa					2		1	3
Wasco					1			1
Washington								
Wheeler								
Yamhill		3	1					4
Totals	0	9	10	10	6	6	11	53

Previous Years Totals

2005	11	3	2	6	16	11	2	51
2004	11	9	7	6	11	20	0	64
2003	0	5	10	7	11	7	0	53

NON-FARM DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE

2006 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker		1	2		1	2	3	9
Benton		2		1				3
Clackamas		2		1				3
Clatsop		1						1
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook		4	16	4	1			25
Curry								
Deschutes	9	6	5	8	14	5	10	57
Douglas		3	5	4	3	1	2	18
Gilliam								
Grant						1	1	2
Harney				4	5		4	13
Hood River								
Jackson		7	2	1	6	1	3	20
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath		3	3	3	3	1		13
Lake		5	4	14	4	2	2	31
Lane				1				1
Lincoln								
Linn		1						1
Malheur		3	2		5	2	2	14
Marion		3	1		3			7
Morrow		1	1					2
Multnomah								
Polk				1				1
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla		2						2
Union								
Wallowa					1	1		2
Wasco			2				1	3
Washington					1			1
Wheeler				1	1		3	5
Yamhill				1		1		2
Totals	9	44	43	44	48	17	31	236

Previous Years Totals

2005	20	67	44	47	27	13	0	218
2004	17	54	38	44	26	22	0	201
2003	0	66	50	52	32	37	0	258

**NEW ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2006 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker								
Benton								
Clackamas			1		1	2	1	5
Clatsop								
Columbia				1				1
Coos								
Crook							1	1
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas							1	1
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney							1	1
Hood River		2		1	1	1		5
Jackson					1			1
Jefferson							1	1
Josephine								
Klamath			1					1
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn							1	1
Malheur							1	1
Marion				1		1		2
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk						1	1	2
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union								
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington							1	1
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
Totals	0	2	2	3	3	5	9	24

Previous Years Totals

2005	2	0	1	3	5	3	10	24
2004	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	20
2003	0	6	1	2	3	8	10	30

DWELLING APPROVALS ON FARM LAND

2006 Table H

County	Primary Farm					Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Baker	1			5	3	4		10	2	9				8	9
Benton	2							2	3	2	1		2		3
Clackamas	1	3	8		2	4	2	4	7	3		1	2	1	3
Clatsop		1				1						1		2	1
Columbia					1	1							1		
Coos					2	3	1						1		
Crook	4	6	11	5	10	5	3	5	3	1	42	34	30	19	25
Curry			1								1	1			
Deschutes		4	3		2	9	2	3	3	3	62	60	37	33	57
Douglas	7	4	7	7	3	2	3	2	2	3	30	35	18	31	18
Gilliam	3														
Grant	7	1	1	1		5	3	2	2		5	11	2	3	2
Harney	7	11	5	6	8	2	2	2		10	13	3	4	5	13
Hood River		1		5	3		1	1	1	2		1			
Jackson	6	3	2	5	3	15	8	4	6	5	21	11	6	17	20
Jefferson	4	8	7	6	1		1	1							
Josephine								1			3	5	3	1	
Klamath		13	6		17	1	3		3		10	17	30	10	13
Lake	4	1	2	14	8						28	26	28	40	31
Lane	2	4	1	2				1		1			2	3	1
Lincoln						2		1						1	
Linn		2	1	1	1	2		3	1		1	2	5	4	1
Malheur	5	6	9	3	1		3	4	1	1	18	21	7	12	14
Marion	6	2	2	1	4	1		1	4	2	3	2	6	1	7
Morrow		1		2	1	1	2				5	6	1	2	2
Multnomah		1	1	1		1			2		1				
Polk	3		1	5	3	8	7	2	1		1			3	1
Sherman			1												
Tillamook												1			
Umatilla	5	3	5	1		9	2	3	2	3	9	3	6	6	2
Union	1	2	3	4	4	5	5	4	3		2	1	1	2	
Wallowa		3	2		2		2	5	3	3	2	8		2	2
Wasco	3	6	2	6	2	2	2	1	1	1	5	2	3	3	3
Washington	2	2	2	5	11				1		5	1	2	3	1
Wheeler											8	2	2	5	5
Yamhill	3	5	5		13	6	1	2		4	3	3	2	2	2
Totals	76	93	88	85	105	89	53	64	51	53	279	258	201	219	236

**FARM
LAND DIVISION APPROVALS**

2006 Table I

County	Resulting Farm Parcels						Resulting Non Farm Parcels					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Baker	15	10		7	12	10		2		11	1	2
Benton	2	3	1	2		3			1			4
Clackamas	4	2		2		2	1					
Clatsop												1
Columbia		5						5				
Coos										2		
Crook	24	12	12	23	11	10	12	39	21	22	4	13
Curry			4						1			
Deschutes	14	11	17	13	6		3	45	43	24	15	22
Douglas	29	34	21	19	27	8	4	13	16	8	31	40
Gilliam	3	7	2		9	2	1	2	2		1	2
Grant	17	9	17	8	19	4	3	2	10	6	7	3
Harney	18	7	7	6	36	4	1	2	5	4		5
Hood River												
Jackson	1					1	1					2
Jefferson	4	3	10	4		1			1			3
Josephine					1						2	
Klamath	6	14		6	2	7	4	13	1	14	7	10
Lake	6	16	17	8	7	3	34		15	20	28	24
Lane	7				4		3	3			1	3
Lincoln												
Linn	6	4	7	5	7	3			3	1	3	
Malheur	1	9	1			1	1	6	1			9
Marion	4	2	1	1	3	3			1	1	1	1
Morrow	14	17	6	5	7	3	2	4	7	1		8
Multnomah												1
Polk		3	11	3	9	7			1		3	11
Sherman		6	1	10	4	1	4	2	1	4		3
Tillamook	1						2					
Umatilla	18	4	3	8	13	6	5	6	1	6	6	7
Union	9	5		4	5	5						5
Wallowa		2	17	7	4	2	2		10	4	2	7
Wasco	1	2	5	5	5	7	4		1	5	1	6
Washington	4				1	2				2	1	
Wheeler	2				2	2					2	6
Yamhill	10	7	4			4						
Totals	220	194	164	146	194	101	87	144	142	135	116	198

12 month
averages

165

65

**FARM AND NON-FARM
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

2006 Table J

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker	9		10	2		2
Benton	1		3	2		4
Clackamas	2		2			
Clatsop				1		1
Columbia						
Coos						
Crook	9		10	9		13
Curry						
Deschutes				19		22
Douglas	7		8	25		40
Gilliam	1		2	1		2
Grant	3		4	2		3
Harney	3		4	4	2	5
Hood River						
Jackson	1		1	1	1	2
Jefferson	1		1	2		3
Josephine						
Klamath	5		7	7		10
Lake	3		3	19		24
Lane				2		3
Lincoln						
Linn	3		3			
Malheur	1	1	1	9	2	9
Marion	3		3	1		1
Morrow	3		3	5		8
Multnomah				1		1
Polk	5		7	7		11
Sherman	1		1	2		3
Tillamook						
Umatilla	5		6	7		7
Union	5		5	4		5
Wallowa	2		2	4	1	7
Wasco	5		7	6		6
Washington	2		2			
Wheeler	1		2	6		6
Yamhill	3		4			
Totals	84	1	101	148	6	198

Previous Years Totals

2005	76	0	188	72	0	116
2004	51	0	140	86	1	135
2003	80	0	164	86	2	142

FARM DIVISIONS

2006 Table K

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						80 & Over	Totals
		0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79			
Baker							10	10	
Benton							3	3	
Clackamas							2	2	
Clatsop									
Columbia									
Coos									
Crook						1	9	10	
Curry									
Deschutes									
Douglas							8	8	
Gilliam							2	2	
Grant							4	4	
Harney							4	4	
Hood River									
Jackson							1	1	
Jefferson							1	1	
Josephine									
Klamath							7	7	
Lake	1						2	3	
Lane									
Lincoln									
Linn							3	3	
Malheur							1	1	
Marion							3	3	
Morrow							3	3	
Multnomah		1						1	
Polk							7	7	
Sherman							1	1	
Tillamook									
Umatilla							6	6	
Union							5	5	
Wallowa							2	2	
Wasco							7	7	
Washington							2	2	
Wheeler							2	2	
Yamhill							3	3	
Totals	1	1	0	0	0	1	98	101	

Previous Years Totals

2005	5	0	1	4	3	17	158	188
2004	0	3	1	2	7	17	110	140
2003	0	3	0	1	8	22	129	163

**NON-FARM DIVISIONS
CREATED NON-FARM PARCELS**

2006 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		2
Benton		1				3	4
Clackamas							
Clatsop		1					1
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook		2	11				13
Curry							
Deschutes		14	3	2	3		22
Douglas		30	8	2			40
Gilliam		2					2
Grant			1	2			3
Harney			1	3	1		5
Hood River							
Jackson		2					2
Jefferson		2		1			3
Josephine							
Klamath		5	1	3	1		10
Lake		9	10	2	1	2	24
Lane					3		3
Lincoln							
Linn							
Malheur		6	3				9
Marion			1				1
Morrow		3	1	3	1		8
Multnomah		1					1
Polk			2	2	3	4	11
Sherman		1	1			1	3
Tillamook							
Umatilla		4	2	1			7
Union		2	1	1	1		5
Wallowa		2	1	1	1	2	7
Wasco		1	5				6
Washington							
Wheeler		2		2	2		6
Yamhill							
Totals	0	90	52	26	18	12	198

Previous Years Totals

2005	0	59	30	10	6	11	116
2004	0	45	16	24	21	29	135
2003	0	54	19	26	24	18	142

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

2006 Table M

Number of Approvals

Use	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Accessory Use	47	63	82	84	135	25	30	34	21	38
Airstrip, Person	2	4	2	2	5	6	3	2	6	3
Bed and Breakfast	5	6	2	4	2	7	3	2	4	
Church	3	4	1	6	2	3		3	7	1
Commercial Activity w/ Farm Use	20	16	20	15	24	3	8	7	10	14
Dog Kennel	3	2		1	1	2	4	8	6	4
Farm Exempt Building					27	6	6	34	17	36
Farm Stand				6		6	5	5	2	3
Farm Use	3	11	1	14	3	14	27	1	1	28
Golf Course	3	4	1	1	2	3		1		
Guest Ranch			3		6					2
Historic Resource			1				1		1	
Home Occupation	24	25	18	23	26	14	24	18	18	19
Horse Boarding										
Mineral & Aggregate	22	19	31	20	25	20	21	8	10	6
NonConforming Use	1	5	5	5	2	5	7	6	9	1
Private Park	13	7	6	8	10	16	12	5	2	2
Processing Facility*						3	1		1	1
Public Facility	14	5	7	2	6	1			3	9
Roads	13	2	9	2	15	11	9	12	8	17
School	4	2	3	5	2	1		1	1	1
Telecommunication Facility **										14
Utility Facility	33	23	40	62	69	1	34	22	30	25
Winery						14	7	6	6	5
Totals	210	198	232	260	362	245	277	175	163	229

2001 average

339

* New categories in 2002 and 2006**

PLAN AMENDMENT DATA

2006 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 (26.0%)	85 acres (18.0%)
2004	7	3,391	2,090 acres (65.0%)	176 acres (5.0%)
2005	8	111	70 acres (63.0%)	8 acres (7.0%)
2006	15	3,231	670 acres (20.0%)	27 acres (7.0%)
Totals	262	29,041	12,130 from Ag. (42.0%)	2,458 from Forest (8.0%)

Metro '02	3	18,843	3,261 acres (17%)	1,559 acres (8%)
Totals With	250	44,653	14,840 from Ag (33%)	3,990 from Forest (9%)

METRO '02 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.

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

2006 Table O

From Agriculture	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial*	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1995 Average	1,037	109	79	76	321	476	1,622
1996		649	1	13	400	414	1,063
1997		13	27		511	538	551
1998	935,000	168	5	219	293	517	935,685
1999	2,181	271	19	547	795	1,361	3,813
2000	233	542	11	60	1,739	1,810	2,585
2001	148	67	11	31	283	325	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
2006	777	311	31	539	1,468	2,038	3,126
Totals **	939,536	3,679	727	4,009	6,874	11,610	954,825

From Forestry	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1995 Average	1,140	5,180	1	30	369	400	6,720
1996	153		8		486	494	647
1997	353	600		39	270	309	1,262
1998	8			5	138	143	151
1999	20				80	80	100
2000				23	132	155	155
2001					232	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
2006		163		3	292	295	458
Totals **	1,990	5,993	9	213	2,828	3,050	11,033

From Rural Residential	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1995 Average	30	3	32	18	629	679	712
1996	27		31	31	125	187	214
1997	45	2	13	14	42	69	116
1998			6	35	136	177	177
1999	3		13			13	16
2000			2	4	8	14	14
2001			17		45	62	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
2006	200	5				0	205
Totals **	305	19	197	196	1,051	1,444	1,768

Shaded Area: Rezoned/converted resource to development zones

*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as industrial

** 1996-2006 Only

**2006 COUNTY FARM FOREST
MEASURE 37 REPORT APPROVALS RECEIVED**

2006 Table P

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>Number of EFU Decisions</u>	<u>Number of EFU Decisions Related to 37</u>	<u>EFU Total Decisions</u>	<u>Number of Forest Decisions</u>	<u>Number of Forest Decisions Related to 37</u>	<u>Forest Total Decisions</u>
BAKER	49	6	55	0	0	0
BENTON	41	3	44	14	1	15
CLACKAMAS	32	11	43	55	8	63
CLATSOP	10	5	15	25	14	39
COLUMBIA	2	0	2	33	1	34
COOS	58	2	60	87	0	87
CROOK	95	0	95	0	0	0
CURRY	0	0	0	18	3	21
DESCHUTES	90	3	93	7	0	7
DOUGLAS	165	9	174	116	5	121
GILLIAM	19	0	19	0	0	0
GRANT	56	0	56	11	0	11
HARNEY	60	0	60	0	0	0
HOOD RIVER	34	8	42	2	0	2
JACKSON	71	1	72	76	0	76
JEFFERSON	31	2	33	0	0	0
JOSEPHINE	0	0	0	16	0	16
KLAMATH	114	2	115	63	0	63
LAKE	74	0	74	0	0	0
LANE	21	0	21	60	0	60
LINCOLN	8	1	9	33	0	33
LINN	43	0	43	36	0	36
MALHEUR	79	10	89	0	0	0
MARION	89	9	98	8	0	8
MORROW	29	0	29	9	0	9
MULTNOMAH	37	2	39	21	1	22
POLK	75	0	75	47	0	47
SHERMAN	7	0	7	0	0	0
TILLAMOOK	11	0	11	3	0	3
UMATILLA	99	6	105	9	0	9
UNION	31	0	31	20	0	20
WALLOWA	44	0	44	17	0	17
WASCO	44	1	45	4	0	4
WASHINGTON	65	3	68	39	0	39
WHEELER	12	0	12	0	0	0
YAMHILL	97	32	129	51	9	60
TOTALS	1792	116	1907	880	42	922

Percentages

(94%)

(6%)

(95%)

(5%)

**PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2007 Table A

County	High Value	Size / Acres	Income / Non High Value	Capability	Totals
Baker	1	2			3
Benton					
Clackamas	2		1		3
Clatsop					
Columbia					
Coos			2		2
Crook	1				1
Curry	3				3
Deschutes					
Douglas	1	4			5
Gilliam			1		1
Grant		2			2
Harney		10			10
Hood River					
Jackson		3			3
Jefferson		2	2		4
Josephine					
Klamath		4	1	8	13
Lake					
Lane					
Lincoln					
Linn	1				1
Malheur	4	2	3		9
Marion	2				2
Morrow		1			1
Multnomah					
Polk	2	2	3		7
Sherman					
Tillamook	1				1
Umatilla	2	3			5
Union	2				2
Wallowa		3			3
Wasco		2			2
Washington	1		2		3
Wheeler					
Yamhill	1		1	1	3
Totals	24	40	16	9	89

Previous Years Totals

2006	24	49	16	16	105
2005	22	60	1	2	85
2004	35	40	12	1	88

**NEW PRIMARY FARM
DWELLING ACTIONS**

2007 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker						1	2	3
Benton								
Clackamas				1	1	1		3
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos					2			2
Crook	1							1
Curry		1	1		1			3
Deschutes								
Douglas				1			4	5
Gilliam							1	1
Grant							2	2
Harney							10	10
Hood River								
Jackson					1		2	3
Jefferson						1	3	4
Josephine								
Klamath					2	2	9	13
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn							1	1
Malheur		1				5	3	9
Marion				1			1	2
Morrow							1	1
Multnomah								
Polk		1			2	2	2	7
Sherman								
Tillamook				1				1
Umatilla						1	4	5
Union						1	1	2
Wallowa							3	3
Wasco							2	2
Washington			2		1			3
Wheeler								
Yamhill							3	3
Totals	1	3	3	4	10	14	54	89

Previous Years Totals

2006	0	4	6	8	11	20	56	105
2005	2	2	6	3	7	6	59	85
2004	0	4	3	4	8	9	60	88

**FARM HELP AND
REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS**

2007 Table C

County	Seasonal	Units	Relative	Accessory	Replace	Totals
Baker			5	1	6	12
Benton				4	2	6
Clackamas			1	3		4
Clatsop				1		1
Columbia						
Coos			1		9	10
Crook				2	13	15
Curry						
Deschutes				1	16	17
Douglas			17		29	46
Gilliam					1	1
Grant			1		7	8
Harney				5		5
Hood River				15	15	30
Jackson			3	1	1	5
Jefferson				1	9	10
Josephine						
Klamath			1		12	13
Lake						
Lane			1		4	5
Lincoln						
Linn				3		3
Malheur			1	3	23	27
Marion			2	1	11	14
Morrow				2	3	5
Multnomah					2	2
Polk			1		25	26
Sherman						
Tillamook				2	4	6
Umatilla			3	1	18	22
Union			1	1	6	8
Wallowa			1			1
Wasco			1		4	5
Washington			1	5	2	8
Wheeler				3	5	8
Yamhill			14			14
Totals	0	0	55	55	227	337

Previous Years Totals

2006	1	0	35	24	301	361
2005	2	0	49	23	236	310
2004	1	1	53	20	294	369

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

2007 Table D

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value			
Baker	3			2	1	6
Benton					1	1
Clackamas		1	2		10	13
Clatsop	1		1	3		5
Columbia						
Coos	2				2	4
Crook				34		34
Curry					1	1
Deschutes	1			45	5	51
Douglas	3			54	5	62
Gilliam	1					1
Grant	2					2
Harney	6			17		23
Hood River	3			11	3	17
Jackson	2			18	3	23
Jefferson	9			3	2	14
Josephine				1		1
Klamath				5	2	7
Lake						
Lane				1	1	2
Lincoln				1		1
Linn	2			3	6	11
Malheur	3	3		11	1	18
Marion				4	10	14
Morrow				3		3
Multnomah	1					1
Polk	3				4	7
Sherman	2			2		4
Tillamook				1	1	2
Umatilla	4		1	4	4	13
Union	2			6	1	9
Wallowa	4			3		7
Wasco				3		3
Washington		1	2	5		8
Wheeler	1			4		5
Yamhill	2			2	7	11
Totals	57	5	6	246	70	384

Previous Years Totals

2006	46	3	4	236	74	363
2005	39	0	12	218	89	358
2004	57	3	4	202	73	339

**LOT OF RECORD FARM DWELLING ACTIONS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2007 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker						1	2	3
Benton								
Clackamas		1				1		2
Clatsop		1			1			2
Columbia								
Coos		1				1		2
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes			1					1
Douglas		1	1		1			3
Gilliam						1		1
Grant					1	1		2
Harney		1	1		1	2	1	6
Hood River		2	1					3
Jackson				1	1			2
Jefferson		1	1		6		1	9
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn						1	1	2
Malheur			1	1		1		3
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah		1						1
Polk		2	1					3
Sherman						2		2
Tillamook								
Umatilla		1	1	1	1	1		5
Union		1				1		2
Wallowa	1			1	1		1	4
Wasco								
Washington			1		2			3
Wheeler		1						1
Yamhill		1			1			2
Totals	1	15	9	4	16	13	6	64

Previous Years Totals

2006	0	9	10	10	6	6	11	53
2005	11	3	2	6	16	11	2	51
2004	11	9	7	6	11	20	0	64

NON-FARM DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE

2007 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker				1			1	2
Benton								
Clackamas								
Clatsop		2		1				3
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook	1	14	12		5	1	1	34
Curry								
Deschutes	21	5	2	1	8	3	5	45
Douglas		18	18	6	3	8	1	54
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney			2	3	7	2	3	17
Hood River		6	2	3				11
Jackson		7	3	4	1	1	2	18
Jefferson					2		1	3
Josephine		1						1
Klamath		1	1	1		1	1	5
Lake								
Lane		1						1
Lincoln		1						1
Linn			1		1		1	3
Malheur		3	1		1	6		11
Marion		2	1				1	4
Morrow			1			2		3
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman						2		2
Tillamook			1					1
Umatilla		2		1		1		4
Union			1	1	2	2		6
Wallowa		1	1			1		3
Wasco		1	1			1		3
Washington		1	1	1	2			5
Wheeler			1	2	1			4
Yamhill		1	1					2
Totals	22	67	51	25	33	31	17	246

Previous Years Totals

2006	9	44	43	44	48	17	31	236
2005	20	67	44	47	27	13	0	218
2004	17	54	38	44	26	22	0	201

**NEW ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS
BY PARCEL SIZE**

2007 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker							1	1
Benton			1				3	4
Clackamas						2	1	3
Clatsop				1				1
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook							2	2
Curry								
Deschutes				1				1
Douglas								
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney							5	5
Hood River	1	7	1	2	3		1	15
Jackson		1						1
Jefferson							1	1
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn				1			2	3
Malheur							3	3
Marion					1			1
Morrow							2	2
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook					1	1		2
Umatilla					1			1
Union							1	1
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington		1	1		2		1	5
Wheeler		2					1	3
Yamhill								
Totals	1	11	3	5	8	3	24	55

Previous Years Totals

2006	0	2	2	3	3	5	9	24
2005	2	0	1	3	5	3	10	24
2004	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	20

DWELLING APPROVALS ON FARM LAND

2007 Table H

County	Primary Farm					Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Baker			5	3	3		10	2	9	3			8	9	2
Benton							2	3	2			2		3	
Clackamas	3	8		2	3	2	4	7	3	2	1	2	1	3	
Clatsop	1									2	1		2	1	3
Columbia				1								1			
Coos				2	2	1				2		1			
Crook	6	11	5	10	1	3	5	3	1		34	30	19	25	34
Curry		1			3						1				
Deschutes	4	3		2		2	3	3	3	1	60	37	33	57	45
Douglas	4	7	7	3	5	3	2	2	3	3	35	18	31	18	54
Gilliam					1					1					
Grant	1	1	1		2	3	2	2		2	11	2	3	2	
Harney	11	5	6	8	10	2	2		10	6	3	4	5	13	17
Hood River	1		5	3		1	1	1	2	3	1				11
Jackson	3	2	5	3	3	8	4	6	5	2	11	6	17	20	18
Jefferson	8	7	6	1	4	1	1			9					3
Josephine							1				5	3	1		1
Klamath	13	6		17	13	3		3			17	30	10	13	5
Lake	1	2	14	8							26	28	40	31	
Lane	4	1	2				1		1			2	3	1	1
Lincoln							1						1		1
Linn	2	1	1	1	1		3	1		2	2	5	4	1	3
Malheur	6	9	3	1	9	3	4	1	1	3	21	7	12	14	11
Marion	2	2	1	4	2		1	4	2		2	6	1	7	4
Morrow	1		2	1	1	2				1	6	1	2	2	3
Multnomah	1	1	1					2		3					
Polk		1	5	3	7	7	2	1		2			3	1	
Sherman		1													2
Tillamook					1						1				1
Umatilla	3	5	1		5	2	3	2	3	5	3	6	6	2	4
Union	2	3	4	4	2	5	4	3		2	1	1	2		6
Wallowa	3	2		2	3	2	5	3	3	4	8		2	2	3
Wasco	6	2	6	2	2	2	1	1	1		2	3	3	3	3
Washington	2	2	5	11	3			1		3	1	2	3	1	5
Wheeler										1	2	2	5	5	4
Yamhill	5	5		13	3	1	2		4	2	3	2	2	2	2
Totals	93	88	85	105	89	53	64	51	53	64	258	201	219	236	246

**FARM
LAND DIVISION APPROVALS**

2007 Table I

County	Resulting Farm Parcels						Resulting Non Farm Parcels					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Baker	10		7	12	10	2	2		11	1	2	4
Benton	3	1	2		3	1		1			4	5
Clackamas	2		2		2							
Clatsop											1	3
Columbia	5						5					
Coos									2			13
Crook	12	12	23	11	10	5	39	21	22	4	13	27
Curry		4						1				1
Deschutes	11	17	13	6		1	45	43	24	15	22	28
Douglas	34	21	19	27	8	5	13	16	8	31	40	43
Gilliam	7	2		9	2		2	2		1	2	
Grant	9	17	8	19	4	10	2	10	6	7	3	14
Harney	7	7	6	36	4	13	2	5	4		5	11
Hood River												
Jackson					1						2	5
Jefferson	3	10	4		1	14		1			3	
Josephine				1						2		
Klamath	14		6	2	7	7	13	1	14	7	10	3
Lake	16	17	8	7	3			15	20	28	24	
Lane				4			3			1	3	
Lincoln												
Linn	4	7	5	7	3	7		3	1	3		6
Malheur	9	1			1		6	1			9	
Marion	2	1	1	3	3	2		1	1	1	1	4
Morrow	17	6	5	7	3	4	4	7	1		8	3
Multnomah											1	1
Polk	3	11	3	9	7	6		1		3	11	10
Sherman	6	1	10	4	1		2	1	4		3	5
Tillamook												
Umatilla	4	3	8	13	6	7	6	1	6	6	7	13
Union	5		4	5	5	8					5	3
Wallowa	2	17	7	4	2	2		10	4	2	7	1
Wasco	2	5	5	5	7	2		1	5	1	6	2
Washington				1	2				2	1		
Wheeler				2	2	8				2	6	3
Yamhill	7	4			4	2						
Totals	194	164	146	194	101	106	144	142	135	116	198	208

**FARM and NON-FARM
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

2007 Table J

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker	2		2	2		4
Benton	1		1	3		5
Clackamas					2	
Clatsop				3		3
Columbia						
Coos				8		13
Crook	4		5	13		27
Curry				1		1
Deschutes	1		1	22		28
Douglas	4		5	23		43
Gilliam						
Grant	7		10	10	1	14
Harney	12		13	9		11
Hood River						
Jackson				3	1	5
Jefferson	10		14			
Josephine					3	
Klamath	5		7	2		3
Lake						
Lane						
Lincoln						
Linn	5		7	5	1	6
Malheur						
Marion	2		2	4	2	4
Morrow	2		4	3		3
Multnomah				1		1
Polk	3		6	7	1	10
Sherman				4		5
Tillamook						
Umatilla	5		7	11		13
Union	5		8	3		3
Wallowa	2		2	1		1
Wasco	1		2	2		2
Washington						
Wheeler	5		8	2		3
Yamhill	1		2			
Totals	77	0	106	142	11	208

Previous Years Totals

2006	84	1	101	148	6	198
2005	76	0	188	72	0	116
2004	51	0	140	86	1	135

FARM DIVISIONS

2007 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 79	80 & Over	
Baker							2	2
Benton							1	1
Clackamas								
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook						1	4	5
Curry								
Deschutes					1			1
Douglas							5	5
Gilliam								
Grant							10	10
Harney							13	13
Hood River								
Jackson								
Jefferson							14	14
Josephine								
Klamath							7	7
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn					3		4	7
Malheur								
Marion							2	2
Morrow							4	4
Multnomah								
Polk				1		3	2	6
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla						1	6	7
Union							8	8
Wallowa							2	2
Wasco							2	2
Washington								
Wheeler							8	8
Yamhill							2	2
Totals	0	0	0	1	4	5	96	106

Previous Years Totals

2006	0	1	0	0	0	1	98	101
2005	5	0	1	4	3	17	158	188
2004	0	3	1	2	7	17	110	140

**NON FARM DIVISIONS
CREATED NON FARM PARCELS**

2007 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					4		4
Benton		4	1				5
Clackamas							
Clatsop						3	3
Columbia							
Coos		9	4				13
Crook		12	5	8		2	27
Curry		1					1
Deschutes		17	3	6	1	1	28
Douglas		39	3	1			43
Gilliam							
Grant		10		3	1		14
Harney		3			2	6	11
Hood River							
Jackson		5					5
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath		1	1	1			3
Lake							
Lane							
Lincoln							
Linn		2	3		1		6
Malheur							
Marion		2	1		1		4
Morrow		1	2				3
Multnomah		1					1
Polk		7	1		2		10
Sherman		2		2		1	5
Tillamook							
Umatilla		12				1	13
Union		1	1		1		3
Wallowa		1					1
Wasco		1		1			2
Washington							
Wheeler			3				3
Yamhill							
Totals	0	131	28	22	13	14	208

Previous Years Totals

2006	0	90	52	26	18	12	198
2005	0	59	30	10	6	11	116
2004	0	45	16	24	21	29	135

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

2007 Table M

Number of Approvals

Use	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Accessory Use	63	82	84	135	25	30	34	21	38	91
Airstrip, Person	4	2	2	5	6	3	2	6	3	7
Bed and Breakfast	6	2	4	2	7	3	2	4		
Church	4	1	6	2	3		3	7	1	3
Commercial Activity w/ Farm Use	16	20	15	24	3	8	7	10	14	17
Dog Kennel	2		1	1	2	4	8	6	4	2
Farm Exempt Building				27	6	6	34	17	36	31
Farm Stand			6		6	5	5	2	3	1
Farm Use	11	1	14	3	14	27	1	1	28	50
Golf Course	4	1	1	2	3		1			
Guest Ranch		3		6					2	1
Historic Resource		1				1		1		
Home Occupation	25	18	23	26	14	24	18	18	19	18
Horse Boarding										
Mineral & Aggregate	19	31	20	25	20	21	8	10	6	12
NonConforming Use	5	5	5	2	5	7	6	9	1	7
Private Park	7	6	8	10	16	12	5	2	2	2
Processing Facility*					3	1		1	1	1
Public Facility	5	7	2	6	1			3	9	12
Roads	2	9	2	15	11	9	12	8	17	10
School	2	3	5	2	1		1	1	1	
Telecommunication Facility **									14	13
Utility Facility	23	40	62	69	1	34	22	30	25	17
Winery					14	7	6	6	5	9
Totals	198	232	260	362	245	277	175	163	229	304

2001 average

339

New categories in 2002* and 2006 **

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 (26.0%)	85 acres (18.0%)
2004	7	3,391	2,090 acres (65.0%)	176 acres (5.0%)
2005	8	111	70 acres (63.0%)	8 acres (7.0%)
2006	15	3,231	670 acres (20.0%)	27 acres (7.0%)
2007**	19	292	105 acres (20.0%)	65 acres (22.0%)
Totals	281	29,333	12,235 from Ag. (41.0%)	2,523 from Forest (9.0%)

Metro '02	3	18,843	3,261 acres (17%)	1,559 acres (8%)
Totals With	250	44,653	14,840 from Ag (33%)	3,990 from Forest (9%)

METRO '02 **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.

** Newport 2007 UGB Swap		All other UGB expansions before swap totaled 333 acres
	308 acres	Removed from UGB and placed in County
	268 acres	Added to UGB from County
Net Change	(41 acres)	Removed from UGB and placed in County

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

2007 Table O

From Agriculture	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial*	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1996 Average	907	177	69	68	331	468	1,552
1997		13	27		511	538	551
1998	935,000	168	5	219	293	517	935,685
1999	2,181	271	19	547	795	1,361	3,813
2000	233	542	11	60	1,739	1,810	2,585
2001	148	67	11	31	283	325	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
2006	777	311	31	539	1,468	2,038	3,126
2007	2,020	1,115	2	342	1,704	2,048	5,183
Totals	941,426	4,213	718	4,330	8,188	13,236	958,875

From Forestry	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1996 Average	1,017	4,533	2	26	384	412	5,962
1997	353	600		39	270	309	1,262
1998	8			5	138	143	151
1999	20				80	80	100
2000				23	132	155	155
2001					232	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
2006		163		3	292	295	458
2007		90	2	5	1,269	1,276	1,366
Totals	1,714	5,436	4	214	3,626	3,844	10,994

From Rural Residential	To EFU	To Forest	To Commercial	To Industrial	To Residential	SubTotal*	TOTALS
1989 - 1996 Average	30	3	32	20	566	618	651
1997	45	2	13	14	42	69	116
1998			6	35	136	177	177
1999	3		13			13	16
2000			2	4	8	14	14
2001			17		45	62	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
2006	200	5				0	205
2007		6	1			1	7
Totals	278	25	167	167	863	1,197	1,500

Shaded Area: Rezoned/converted resource to development zones

*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as industrial

**1997-2007 only

**2007 COUNTY FARM FOREST
MEASURE 37 REPORT APPROVALS RECEIVED**

2007 Table P

COUNTY	Number of EFU Decisions	Number of EFU Decisions Related to 37	EFU Total Decisions	Number of Forest Decisions	Number of Forest Decisions Related to 37	Forest Total Decisions
BAKER	45	6	51	9	0	9
BENTON	22	3	25	5	1	6
CLACKAMAS	25	4	29	52	2	54
CLATSOP	14	5	19	36	30	66
COLUMBIA	0	0	0	28	5	33
COOS	57	6	63	91	10	101
CROOK	127	6	133	0	0	0
CURRY	5	0	5	14	0	14
DESCHUTES	61	13	74	6	0	6
DOUGLAS	153	58	211	98	19	117
GILLIAM	10	0	10	0	0	0
GRANT	69	1	70	22	0	22
HARNEY	69	0	69	0	0	0
HOOD RIVER	36	27	63	7	0	7
JACKSON	70	14	84	68	4	72
JEFFERSON	48	1	49	0	0	0
JOSEPHINE	1	0	1	15	0	15
KLAMATH	107	0	107	67	0	67
LAKE	0	0	0	0	0	0
LANE	10	1	11	26	1	27
LINCOLN	9	2	11	23	1	24
LINN	52	0	52	40	0	40
MALHEUR	64	0	64	0	0	0
MARION	94	48	142	14	4	18
MORROW	32	0	32	10	0	10
MULTNOMAH	7	0	7	10	0	10
POLK	67	7	74	53	7	60
SHERMAN	7	0	7	0	0	0
TILLAMOOK	14	4	18	9	0	9
UMATILLA	113	38	151	19	0	19
UNION	44	5	49	12	0	12
WALLOWA	0	5	5	26	0	26
WASCO	32	1	33	5	0	5
WASHINGTON	56	29	85	30	6	36
WHEELER	27	0	27	0	0	0
YAMHILL	71	57	128	32	12	44
TOTALS	1618	341	1959	827	102	929

Percentages

(83%)

(17%)

(89%)

(11%)