

# 2008-09 FARM & FOREST REPORT

## January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2009

### 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.” The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) receives a description of each local land use decision in EFU and forest zones as part of a submittal of decisions made for the reporting period from each county.

#### ***County Reporting of Land Use Decisions***

This report summarizes the information provided by the counties for the two-year period from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2009. For each of the two years, tables A through Z include information on dwelling and land division approvals as well as other approved uses on farm and forest land. In addition, these tables report on the acreage rezoned out of farm and forest uses to urban and rural uses in this time period. Table Z is new and reports on rezonings out of farm and forest use by county. For 2009, two additional new tables are included. Table Z-1 shows actual land conversion, by county, of farm and forest land to other uses over a 25-year period, while Table Z-2 identifies Measure 37/49 authorizations.

The department uses the collected information to monitor the type, extent and location of development, parcelization, rezoning and land conversion occurring on farm and forest land statewide and in individual

counties. This information is used to continually assess the effectiveness of farm and forest zones to implement Statewide Planning Goals 3 and 4 and to focus staff resources to assist counties and the public where needed.

This report also includes data on county land use decisions in farm 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. These waivers and approvals were based on the standards for dwellings and land divisions that were in effect at the time that applicants acquired their properties.

Traditionally, the Farm and Forest Reports have focused only on local land use decisions made by Oregon counties. However, this report has been expanded to provide additional information on other matters pertaining to the protection of farm and forest land, using data from the U.S. Census of Agriculture and the Oregon Department of Forestry, as well as information on growing trends affecting farm and forest land.

# 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.

## ***Oregon Agriculture***

Roughly 27 percent of Oregon's land base – 17.1 million acres – is in non-federal agricultural use, according to the 2007 Census 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 is directly responsible for over nine percent of all Oregon jobs. Agriculture is a key traded sector industry in Oregon, ranking third in the value of exported products.

Oregon is one of the most agriculturally-diverse states in the nation, boasting the production of more than 225 different commodities, and leading in the production of 14 crops. A full 85 percent of the state's farms are family or individual farms.

## ***Agricultural Land Use Policy***

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 tied 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, statute and administrative rule also incorporate statutory minimum lot sizes and standards for all land divisions.

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 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 on the use of these lands.

### ***Exclusive Farm Use Zones***

In Oregon, agricultural lands are conserved for agricultural uses and certain non-farm uses that are compatible with farming through the application of EFU zones. At present, about 15.5 million acres (56% of private lands 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 non-farm related uses that have evolved over the years. Large minimum lot standards and rigorous dwelling approval standards limit the conversion of farmland to other uses.

EFU zoning has been instrumental in maintaining working farms in Oregon. U.S. Census of Agriculture data show that between 1978 and 2007, the rate of loss of both large (500+ acres) and mid-sized (50-499 acres) farms in Oregon was less than one-third the rate of loss for the nation as a whole. According to an OSU study, what agricultural loss is occurring is primarily in non-EFU zoned areas that are planned for development.



*The rate of loss of farms in Oregon is less than one-third the rate for the nation as a whole.*

## ***Recent Statutory and Rule Changes***

In the last few years, several changes were made to statutes and rules for lands in farm and forest zones, as follows:


### **Statutory Changes to ORS chapter 215 and Elsewhere**

- HB 763 (2009): Authorizes inter-municipal transfer of development rights programs.
- HB 2229 (2009): Provides a path for counties to review farm and forest mapping, and designate “non-resource” lands.
- HB 3099 (2009): Deletes or changes the review standards for several uses in EFU zones.
- SB 1036 (2010): Reauthorizes guest ranches on EFU land in eastern Oregon.
- SB 1055 (2010): Permits wineries to conduct events and activities that generate no more than 25 percent of gross retail sales of wine on the premises.
- HB 3647: (2010) Authorizes DLCD to arrange for professional soils scientists to evaluate lands.

- HB 3153: (2009) Authorizes owners of high-value farmland to provide input into siting major transmission lines through their property.

### **Rule Changes to OAR 660, Division 33**

- Section 0130 (37) (2009): Creates a streamlined process for the review of commercial wind generating facilities.
- Section 0130 (2010): Amends language to implement the provisions of HB 3099.
- Section 0130 (2) (2010): Amends language to limit the occupancy of certain structures in EFU zones, for consistency with a recent RLUIPA ruling.
- Section 0130 (16, 17, 22 and 37) (2010): Allows for temporary workforce housing for workers constructing utilities or commercial power generating facilities.
- Division 27 (2010): Clarifies limitations on uses in rural reserves.
- Section 0130 (proposed 2010): Creates a streamlined process for the review of commercial solar generating facilities.
- Section 0130 (proposed 2010): Clarifies review process for irrigation reservoirs on EFU land.



# Trends in Agriculture

The conservation of Oregon's working farm landscape through EFU zoning over the last 30 years has created unanticipated benefits for communities and the state, as well as some challenges. Besides protecting the farmland base against conversion pressures experienced by other states, farmland protection has facilitated the rise of the viticulture and winery industries, agri-tourism opportunities, local food systems and renewable energy production.

## ***Viticulture***

Over the last 30 years there has been substantial growth in the viticultural industry in Oregon. Vineyards now number 856; while there are 395 wineries in the state (*Oregon Agripedia 2009, ODA*). A significant number of vineyards have been sited on capability class III-VI soils, ratings that are particularly conducive to growing grapes. Some of this land was claimed to be non-farm land in the past. Had the Goal 3 definition of agricultural land adopted in 1975 not included "other lands suitable for" agricultural use, much of this class V land would likely have been developed for other uses.



At the same time, the success of Oregon vineyards and wineries has led to a proliferation of activities, events and food service at growing numbers of

these facilities located in EFU zones that raise questions about their scale and impact on nearby farm operations. Counties currently have concerns about how to review such uses, and some farmers want assurances that these uses will not create unreasonable conflicts for their operations.

## ***Agri-Tourism***

There also has been a growing trend and interest in recent years in a wide variety of types of agri-tourism as well as other non-farm related events and activities on farmland. Agri-tourism activities can provide an important supplementary stream of income that helps to keep farmers on the land, and people connected to their food sources. However, there are questions about the degree to which such uses need to be in conjunction with and/or subordinate to farm use. A wide variety of uses are currently occurring in EFU zones, including weddings and ATV racing events. These uses can create conflicts for neighbors and farm operations. In addition, businesses in cities and UGBs argue that some of these uses divert existing business from urban areas and into farm areas. These issues may require legislation or rulemaking to resolve.

## ***Local Food Systems***

There is growing interest nationwide in the development of local and regional food systems that help ensure the public's access to healthy, local, sustainable food sources. Oregon's urban growth boundaries facilitate ready access to u-picks, community supported agriculture and farm stands close in to cities. Exclusive farm use zoning has kept the price of farmland more affordable to new farmers than it otherwise would be. Farmers markets and community gardens are more popular than ever, while communities are taking steps to facilitate the use of unused public spaces, schoolgrounds and sidewalk strips for edible landscapes. All these efforts help connect people to their food sources, whether inside or outside urban growth boundaries.

Some local food system proponents favor small farms, and for this reason support the creation of smaller farm minimum lot sizes than exist now. However, research shows that smaller minimum lot sizes are more likely to result in rural residential uses or hobby farms. There are numerous small farms in Oregon. According to the U.S. Census of Agriculture, 23,688 or 61 percent of Oregon's existing farms are between one and 49 acres in size. In addition, there are many thousands of acres of small parcels in rural residential zones that could be made available for small farm use, without the need to further parcelize land in exclusive farm use zones.

## ***Renewable Energy***

In the last decade, more than 2,000 megawatts of wind energy generation capacity have been installed in Oregon in farm zones. The state now ranks fourth in the nation in installed wind energy capability, with additional facilities now in the permitting process. Part of the attraction of wind energy to the state are the large open farm landscapes free from conflicting uses that are made possible by EFU zoning. Now that Oregon is beginning to attract large commercial solar arrays, the open farm landscapes may provide similarly suitable opportunities for this renewable energy source.




The rise in renewable energy production on farmland, together with new major transmission line corridors to bring energy to market, has raised questions and concerns about potential impacts to farm operations, wildlife habitat, scenic viewsheds and tourism. Other concerns have been raised about the need for a state energy policy and more proactive state and regional roles in the siting of major transmission line corridors and energy facilities that may have regional impacts.

# Reported County Data

The data in this report are for all local land use decisions on farmland, whether in EFU or mixed farm-forest zones.

## *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 771 dwellings in EFU zones in 2008 and 550 dwellings in 2009, numbers that are lower than for previous years. It is likely that the low numbers reflect the current economic recession, and depressed housing starts nationally.



**Primary Farm Dwellings.** The total number of primary farm dwellings approved statewide was 74 in 2008 and 59 in 2009 (Table A), numbers that are lower than in previous years. There are four ways in which primary farm dwellings may be approved. In most years, approvals have been fairly evenly split between those based on an income standard and those approved on parcels of 160 acres or greater. Typically, only a couple of primary farm dwellings are approved each year based on the potential gross farm sales (capability)


test, a test that involves prior approval of the department director. In 2008 and 2009, more than two-thirds of all primary farm dwelling approvals were based on one of the income tests, while most of the remainder were based on the parcel size test.

In 2008 and 2009, more than two-thirds of all farm dwelling approvals were on parcels of 80 or more acres (Table B). 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.

**Other Farm-Related Dwellings.** Farm-related dwellings include accessory farm dwellings (for year-round or seasonal farm workers) approved under ORS 215.283(1)(e) and family farm help dwellings under ORS 215.283(1)(d) (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 or \$40,000). Accessory farm dwelling approvals occasionally involve more than one dwelling unit. These numbers fluctuate each year. In 2008, counties approved 59 accessory farm dwelling units, while in 2009, the figure was 31. A little over half the approvals in both years were for parcels of 80 acres or more (Table G).

The number of dwellings approved for family members whose assistance is needed on the farm was 36 in 2008, and

20 in 2009, numbers that are down from previous years. (Table C).



### **Dwellings Not Related to Farming.**

These include those dwellings 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) and replacement dwellings allowed under ORS 215.283(1)(m) (Table D). In 2008 and 2009, dwellings that were not related to farm use accounted for more than three-quarters of all approved dwellings in farm zones.

*Non-Farm dwellings* may be approved where they are on parcels or portions of parcels that are unsuitable for farm use. There were 184 non-farm dwelling approvals in 2008 and 118 in 2009, numbers that are significantly down from previous years. About one-third of all approvals in both years took place in Deschutes or Douglas Counties, with Crook and Lake Counties also showing relatively high numbers of approvals. This distribution continues the trend begun in 1993 by HB 3661 that shifted the number of non-farm dwelling approvals away from the Willamette Valley to eastern and southern Oregon in an effort to recognize Oregon's regional differences.

About two-thirds of all non-farm dwelling approvals occurred on parcels of 20 acres or less in both years. Large parcel (over 40 acres) approvals of non-farm dwellings nearly always take place in eastern or southern Oregon counties (Table F). Just over one-third of all non-farm dwellings approved in the reporting period were for newly-created parcels.




*Lot-of-Record dwellings* may be approved on parcels that have been in the same ownership since 1985 and, with some exceptions, are not on high-value farmland. In 2008, 50 such dwellings were approved, and in 2009, 32 were approved. Nearly all of these approvals were on non-high value farmland. These numbers, especially those for 2009, are lower than for previous years, as might be expected as existing lots-of-record are slowly built out. Lot-or-record approvals are spread fairly evenly across the state and are for parcels of all sizes that reflect existing lot configurations.

*A Temporary hardship dwelling* is usually a manufactured home placed on a parcel temporarily for reasons of a specific hardship (usually medical) and must be removed at the end of the hardship. A temporary hardship dwelling may be sited in conjunction with any existing dwelling, regardless of whether


it is farm or non-farm. This is one type of dwelling that occurs in the Willamette Valley as readily as it does in other parts of the state. The number of approved temporary hardship dwellings was 57 for 2008 and 61 for 2009 (Table D), numbers that are down from previous years.

*A Replacement dwelling* is a new home that replaces an older dwelling on a parcel. There were 251 approvals in 2008 and 229 in 2009, nearly one-quarter of which took place in Douglas County (Table D). These numbers are consistent with numbers in previous years. Established dwellings that are replaced must be removed, demolished or converted within three months of completion of the replacement dwelling.

**Historic Dwelling Approvals.** Between 1997 and 2009, a cumulative total of 11,156 dwellings of all types were approved in farm zones across the state, as shown in the chart below. About one-third were replacement dwellings and another quarter were non-farm dwellings.



The cumulative number of dwelling approvals in farm zones in this 12-year time span is reflected in the following graph:



### Other Uses

The Legislature has recognized that some farm-related as well as non-farm uses are appropriate 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.

In this biennial report, several uses that were reported on in the past are no longer tracked, while several other uses are now being tracked. In 2008-09, the most commonly-approved uses other than dwellings were farm-related buildings, accessory uses, utility

**Issue: Removal of dwellings to be replaced.** One concern is whether dwellings being replaced are in fact being demolished, moved or converted to non-residential uses within the required timeframe. The department has begun to request this information from counties as part of annual reporting of local land use decisions, and will report on it in the next biennial report. This is also a concern in forest areas.

facilities, home occupations and telecommunication facilities, in that order. Total numbers of these uses were 414 in 2008 and 331 in 2009, numbers that are up over previous years primarily because of the new reporting categories (Table M). Approved uses that are rising in number include telecommunication facilities, utility facilities and commercial wind energy facilities.

Non-farm uses are subject to local land use approval and 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). 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 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.

### ***Land Divisions***

As is true for dwellings, the number of land divisions and new parcels, both farm and non-farm, is down for the two-year reporting period, most likely due to the current economic recession.

**Farm Divisions.** In 2008, 106 new farm parcels were created, while in 2009, 56 new farm parcels were created, not

counting the remainders from the parent tracts (Table J). The 2009 number is significantly lower than in past years. Nearly all of the farm divisions were for new parcels of at least 80 acres, reflecting the statutory minimum lot size for most farmland divisions, while a few were for counties that have approved "go-below" parcel minimums (Table K). A large majority of new farm parcels occurred in eastern Oregon; the county with the highest number of new farm parcels in the two-year period was Harney County, followed by Umatilla County.

**Non-Farm Divisions.** In 2008, 95 new non-farm parcels were created, while in 2009, 83 new non-farm parcels were created, not counting the remainders from the parent tracts (Table J). These numbers are down significantly from past years. A full 44% of the new non-farm parcels created were in Deschutes and Douglas Counties.

About half of all new non-farm parcels in the reporting period were five acres or smaller in size, while just under one-third were between six and 20 acres; the rest were 21 acres and over in size (Table L). Because in eastern Oregon the only way to create new non-farm parcels from parent tracts that are less than the minimum lot size is to find that both the new parcel and the remainder are non-farm parcels, relatively large non-farm parcels often result.

***Issue: Farm and ranchland divisions.*** There are concerns about the slow break-up of large farm and ranch properties that can make it increasingly difficult to generate reasonable economic returns from agriculture on these properties. Increasingly, the department is seeing post-acknowledgment plan amendments for rezoning of properties as "nonresource" lands, in part based on claims that they are non-viable as commercial farm or ranch operations due to their relatively small size.

# Oregon's Forest Land Protection Program

The conservation of forest 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 largest industries - forestry.

Oregon is the nation's #1 producer of softwood lumber and the forest products sector is Oregon's second largest industry. Forestry services and wood products manufacturing together generate almost \$13 billion annually in sales or about 11 percent of the state's economic output. Forestry products and services employ over 85,000 people directly in Oregon and are critical to Oregon's rural communities. Annual wage income adds up to \$3.5 billion.

Oregon's forest lands protection program is based on several elements composed of statutory and administrative rule provisions, the forest lands goal, and LUBA/Court opinions and interpretations. These elements are held together in a program by Statewide Planning Goal 4, "Forest Lands." This goal requires the identification and zoning of forest lands and requires counties to review forest and non-forest uses according to statutory (ORS 215.700 to 215.755) and administrative rule (OAR 660, division 6) provisions. The goal and administrative rule also incorporate statutory minimum lot sizes and standards for all land divisions (ORS 215.780).

## ***Forest and Mixed Farm/Forest Zones***

In Oregon, forest lands are protected from conversion to rural or urban uses or other conflicting non-forest uses by the use of forest and mixed farm/forest zoning. At present, about 8.2 million acres (30%) of private land in Oregon are included in forest zones under Statewide Planning Goal 4. An additional 2.2 million acres (7.9%) of private land is included in mixed farm/forest zones under OAR 660-006-0050.

Forest uses are encouraged and protected within forest and mixed farm-forest zones, while these zones also allow a variety of non-forest related uses. Large minimum lot standards and rigorous dwelling approval standards are intended to limit the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses.

Forest zoning has been instrumental in maintaining working forests in Oregon. The Oregon Department of Forestry reports that western Washington's annual loss of wildland forest between 1994 and 2005 was 10 times that of Oregon.



## Trends in Forest Use

The protection of Oregon’s working forest landscape through forest zoning had unanticipated benefits for landowners, rural communities and the state, as well as some challenges that need to be addressed. Besides protecting the forest land base against conversion pressures experienced by other states, forest land protection has provided new recreation and tourism opportunities, yielded significant carbon sequestration, positioned landowners to gain credit for continued carbon sequestration and other environmental benefits forest land provides, and facilitated opportunities in harnessing energy from woody biomass.

### ***Forest Land Conversion***

Global competition, environmental controls and rising forest management costs over the past three decades are creating serious challenges to the continued economic viability of Oregon’s working forests. Large areas of industrial forest land have changed hands in recent years and there is growing pressure to divide and convert forest land to other, developed, land uses, as forest landowners seek current as well as long-term returns. Many mills across the state have closed.

Growing numbers of dwellings in forested areas have increased conflicts for forest management and have increased fire hazard. As less federal and industrial forest land is available to harvest, more privately-owned woodlots are being harvested, creating special challenges and impacts associated with harvesting smaller properties at lower elevations in closer proximity to settled populations.



In 2010 the Board of Forestry adopted a “no net loss” policy regarding non-federal Wildland Forest (forest land with fewer than five structures per square mile). While Oregon’s large minimum lot sizes for forest land divisions and dwellings have significantly reduced the potential fragmentation and conversion of the forest land base compared to conversion rates in other states, it is not enough in itself to stem the continued loss of working forests. There will always be buyers for 160-acre lots for dwellings who do not wish to manage the land as a working forest.

For this reason, the Department has created a transfer of development rights pilot program (HB 2228, 2009 Legislative session) as an incentive for forest landowners to transfer the right to develop forest land to other, more appropriate locations. Other potential streams of income that can help to maintain the forest land base are described below.

### ***Recreation and Tourism***

Both public and private forest lands have long provided a variety of recreational opportunities for the public, and interest in outdoor activities continues to grow across the state. Recreation and tourism

in and around forest areas provides personal and societal benefits as well as generates significant economic activity. A 2009 study for Travel Oregon and the Department of Fish and Wildlife found that in 2008, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, and shellfish harvesting participation and related expenditures generated \$2.5 billion for Oregon's regions and counties. Many locations within Oregon, including those near forests, serve as appealing day and overnight destinations for both Oregon residents and out-of-state visitors who participate in outdoor activities. Forest zones allow a variety of recreation and tourism pursuits appropriate to a forest environment. Recreation and tourism opportunities in and near forest areas can be expected to continue to grow in the future.

### ***Carbon Sequestration and Ecosystem Markets***

Oregon's forests make an enormous contribution to carbon sequestration that will likely be increasingly tapped for ecosystem crediting purposes, providing a small stream of revenue for forest landowners. In 2009, the Pacific Northwest Research Station reported that, without Oregon's farm and forest land protection program, an estimated 1.2 million acres of forest and agricultural land in western Oregon would have been converted to more developed uses and that by maintaining these lands, the gains in carbon storage are equivalent to avoiding 1.7 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions annually.

As ecosystem markets develop for other environmental benefits, such as

*Without the program, 1.2 million acres of farm & forest land in western Oregon would have been converted & 1.7 million tons of carbon storage lost.*

restoration or enhancement of riparian, in-stream or other habitats, wetlands, and so on, landowners should be able to realize small streams of income for these benefits.



### ***Renewable Energy***

Currently, much of the slash remaining from forest harvests is burned at the site and any potential energy lost. There is growing interest in capturing energy from forest biomass both through on-site pyrolysis and from the development of biofuel processing facilities. In addition, according to the Oregon Forest Resources Institute, about 15 percent of Oregon's forest land has the potential to provide useful woody biomass through thinning. All of these sources of renewable energy represent potential opportunities for forest landowners to realize a supplemental stream of income while harnessing a new renewable energy source.


## Reported County Data

The data in this report are for all local land use decisions on forest land, either in forest zones or mixed farm-forest zones.

### *Dwellings*


In forest zones, dwellings are allowed in five different circumstances and include large-lot dwellings, lot-of record dwellings, template dwellings, replacement dwellings and temporary hardship dwellings. The total number of dwellings approved in forest and mixed farm/forest zones in 2008 was 353 and in 2009 it was 275, numbers that are lower than for previous years. It is likely that the low numbers reflect the current economic recession and low numbers for new housing starts nationally.

**Dwellings Approved in Forest Zones  
1997 - 2009**



A little over one-half of approvals in the reporting period were for template dwellings, while one-quarter were for replacement dwellings.

**Dwelling Types in Forest Zones  
2008 - 2009**



**Large-Lot Dwellings** – Regional approval standards for dwellings on ownerships of different sizes are provided for in ORS 215.740. In western Oregon, large-tract dwellings must be on ownerships of at least 160 contiguous or 200 non-contiguous acres. In eastern Oregon, they must be on ownerships of 240 or more contiguous or 320 or more non-contiguous acres. In 2008, 19 large-tract forest dwellings were approved and in 2009, 32 such dwellings were approved, a significant increase over previous years (Table N). The approvals are spread fairly evenly among the counties. Large-tract dwellings made up eight percent of all dwelling approvals in forest zones in the two years combined.

**Lot-of-record Dwellings** – “Lot-of-record” dwellings may be approved on parcels that have been in the same ownership since 1985 and have a low capability for growing merchantable tree species. In 2008, 27 such dwellings were approved and in 2009, 11 were approved (Table N). These numbers, especially those for 2009, are lower than for previous years, as might be expected as existing lots-of-record are slowly built out. Lot-of-record approvals are spread fairly evenly across the state and are for parcels of all sizes that reflect existing lot configurations (Table P). Lot-of-record dwellings made up just six percent of all dwelling approvals in forest zones in the two years combined.

**Template Dwellings** – “Template” dwellings may be approved where there is a certain amount of existing development and parcelization within a 160-acre “template” centered on the parcel. In 2008, 197 template dwellings were approved, while in 2009 the number of approvals dropped to 135 (Table N). As with lots-of-record, the number of template dwelling approvals is expected to slowly drop as qualifying parcels are slowly built out. About 85 percent of the dwellings that were approved for both years were on the most productive forest soils. About two-thirds of both years’ approvals were for parcels smaller than 21 acres (Table O). The highest level of activity was in the Willamette Valley and the county with the highest number of approvals for both years was Lane County (77). Template dwellings made up just over half of all dwelling approvals in forest zones in the two years combined.

*Adjacent Land Ownership* – The department has reviewed template and lot-of-record dwelling approvals to learn whether they are adjacent to public or

private industrial timber ownerships, where they could have the potential to pose conflicts with adjacent forest operations (Table Q). Just under one-quarter of template and lot-of-record dwellings approved in both years were adjacent to U.S. Forest Service, BLM, state or private industrial forest land.

**Temporary Hardship Dwellings** – A temporary hardship dwelling is usually a manufactured home placed on a parcel temporarily for reasons of a specific hardship (usually medical) and must be removed at the end of the hardship. A temporary hardship dwelling may be sited in conjunction with any existing dwelling, regardless of whether it is farm or non-farm related. In 2008, 22 temporary hardship dwellings were approved, while in 2009 the number was 32, numbers that are consistent with previous years (Table R). These approvals are occurring primarily in western Oregon. Temporary hardship dwellings made up nine percent of all dwelling approvals in forest zones in the two years combined.


***Issue: Multiple template dwellings per tract.** Statutory language permits one template dwelling per qualifying “tract.” Because “tract” is not tied to a specific date of creation, multiple parcels that comprise single tracts are being sold or otherwise conveyed to others and approved for template dwellings. This issue could be resolved by tying “tract” to a specific date of creation.*

***Issue: Rezoning for template dwellings.** It can be easier to gain template dwelling approval than non-farm dwelling approval in the Valley, leading to the rezoning of land from farm zones to forest zones with sometimes inadequate justification. This effectively permits the expansion of the original footprint of land areas that potentially qualify for template dwellings. These expanded footprints expose growing areas of designated Wildland Forest to unanticipated template dwelling development. For this reason, department staff has recommended that designated Rural Reserves not be permitted to be subject to zone change while in reserve status. Department staff is also carefully reviewing proposed rezonings in the Valley from farm to forest for adequate justification.*


### Replacement Dwellings – A

replacement dwelling is a new home that replaces an older dwelling on a parcel. In 2008, 88 replacement dwellings were approved, while in 2009 the number was 65, figures that are lower than for previous years (Table R). Replacement dwellings made up one-quarter of all dwelling approvals in forest zones in the two years combined. Established dwellings that are replaced must be removed, demolished or converted within three months of completion of the replacement dwelling.

**Historic Dwelling Approvals.** Between 1997 and 2009, 5,644 dwellings of all types were approved in forest zones across the state, as shown in the chart below. A little over one-half were template dwellings, while just under one-quarter were replacement dwellings.



The cumulative number of dwelling approvals in forest zones in this period is reflected in the following graph:



### Other Uses

In addition to a range of traditional forest-related uses, the commission has recognized that some non-forest uses are acceptable in forest areas, such as utility distribution facilities, home occupations and some types of dwellings. These uses are set forth in OAR 660-006-0025; all together, nearly 50 uses are allowed in forest and mixed farm/forest zones. In this biennial report, several uses that were reported on in the past are no longer tracked, while several other uses are now being tracked. The most commonly-approved uses in 2008 and 2009, other than dwellings, were farm-related buildings, accessory uses, telecommunication facilities and mineral and aggregate uses, in that order. Total numbers of these uses were 140 in 2008 and 110 in 2009, numbers that are up over previous reporting years primarily because of the new reporting categories (Table W).

## ***Land Divisions***

**Forest Land Divisions.** In 2008, 45 new forest parcels were created, while 23 new forest parcels were created in 2009, a number that is lower than for previous years (Table T). Forest land divisions occurred fairly evenly across the state, with the highest numbers in Wallowa and Jackson Counties. Nearly all of the new forest land divisions were for new parcels of at least 80 acres, reflecting the statutory minimum lot size for forest land divisions (Table U).

**Non-forest Land Divisions.** Non-forest land divisions are allowed in only a few circumstances, including the creation of a parcel or parcels to separate one or more existing dwellings on a property (ORS 215.780 (2)(b) and (e)). In 2008, 15 new non-forest parcels were created,

and in 2009, 23 new non-forest parcels were created, numbers that are down over previous years. The great majority of these parcels were 10 acres or smaller in size, consistent with statutory requirements (Table V).



***Issue: Forest land fragmentation.*** Because subdivisions are not prohibited in forest zones as they are in farm zones, large forest properties may be subdivided into multiple large lots at a time and there is no upper limit on the number of new forest parcels that may be subdivided off a parent tract in a calendar year. While the large minimum parcel size in forest zones reduces the potential for such land fragmentation, the ability to subdivide without limit facilitates the continued break-up and sell-off of forest land for non-forest purposes. This issue could be resolved through statutory changes that prohibit subdivisions on forest-zoned lands.

## Changes in Designation & Land Use

There are several ways in which designated agricultural and forest lands can be 1) re-inventoried as higher- or lower-quality land, 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; marginal lands dwelling approvals are counted as non-farm dwellings. In 2008-09, Washington County reported that it added 79 acres to its marginal lands base, while Lane County reported that it added no acres to its marginal lands base.

## ***Ballot Measures 37 and 49 Claims***

In November 2007, Oregon voters approved Measure 49, which modified Measure 37 and authorized the department to evaluate existing Measure 37 claims submitted to the state on or before June 28, 2007. DLCDC received approximately 4,600 Measure 49 Election Returns and completed review of these elections by the June 30, 2010 statutory deadline.

House Bill 3225 (2009) modified Measure 49, allowing previously ineligible claimants to pursue relief under Measure 49. The department received approximately 225 additional elections as a result of House Bill 3225, which were reviewed prior to December 31, 2010. Finally, Senate Bill 1049 (2010) further modified the requirements of Measure 49 to allow approximately 600 additional claims to become eligible for supplemental review under Measure 49. The department must finish processing these claims by June 30, 2011. Once DLCDC authorizes a specific number of homesites, the property owner may then obtain necessary local permits.

Table Z-2 shows the number of Measure 49 approvals to date by county for home site authorizations, new dwellings and new parcels. A total of 8,671 home site authorizations have been made, involving 6,123 new dwellings and 3,871 new parcels. While the great majority of approvals were for land in farm and forest zones, a small number

were for land in rural residential zones. These figures represent three to four times as many dwelling approvals as typically occur within farm and forest zones in a two-year period and about nine times as many land divisions as typically occur in farm and forest zones in the same time period.


## ***Rezoning***

**Rezoning to Urban Uses.** Tables X, Y and Z summarize adopted plan and zone amendments to EFU, forest and mixed farm-forest zones for the two-year planning period. Land in mixed farm-forest zones is considered together with land in forest zones. These data provide an important historic picture of rezonings to accommodate planned development in urban and rural areas. Table X provides information on urban growth boundary (UGB) amendments adopted during this time period. During 2008 and 2009, there were 13 UGB amendments that brought 1,754 acres into UGBs. Of this, 1,635 acres, or 93 percent, were zoned for farm use and four acres, or less than one percent, was zoned for forest use.

Over the 21-year period from 1988 through 2009, 46,680 acres of land were added to UGBs statewide, 35 percent (16,467 acres) originating from farm zones and one percent (3,140 acres) from forest zones. As UGBs continue to expand, particularly onto high-value farmland and productive forest land in the Willamette Valley, fewer non-resource lands will be available to bring

***Issue: Thousands of M49 dwelling approvals.*** The introduction of new non-farm and non-forest parcels and dwellings into working farm and forest landscapes is of significant concern. At least one county is exploring a local transfer of development rights program that would enable willing landowners to transfer their rights to develop to other, more appropriate locations.

### Land Rezoned to Urban Uses 1988 - 2009





into the boundaries, and more farm and forest land will come under pressure to include in UGBs. The bar graph above illustrates the annual rezoning of farm, forest and other land to urban uses in this time period.

be supported by an exception to Goal 3 or 4, except where lands can be demonstrated to be “nonresource” lands not subject to Goals 3 or 4.

**Rezoning to Rural and Resource Uses.** Table Y provides data on changes from farm and forest plan designations and/or zoning to rural land uses. In 2008, 1,100 acres of EFU land and 220 acres of forest land were rezoned for rural development, while in 2009, 777 acres of EFU land and 2,507 acres of forest land were rezoned for rural development. Rezoning are required to

In 2008 and 2009, 532 acres of EFU land were rezoned to forest, while 536 acres of forest land were rezoned to EFU. In many cases, these rezonings are intended to facilitate development that is allowed in one resource zone, but not another. For instance, it is easier to get template dwelling approval than non-farm dwelling approval in the Valley, prompting rezonings to forest use in this area, while it can be easier to get non-farm dwelling approvals over template



dwelling approvals outside the Valley.

Table Z identifies rezonings by county. As there are only two years of data available, it is not yet clear if there is a pattern to rezonings among counties.

**Historic Rezonings.** Over a 20-year timeframe, 18,389 acres of EFU land and 9,455 acres of forest land have been rezoned for rural development, totaling 27,844 acres. Add the 19,607 acres of farm and forest land included in UGBs over a similar time period, and the cumulative total of land rezoned out of farm and forest use is 47,451 acres. While about 40 percent of this acreage was incorporated into UGBs, almost 60 percent of it was designated for rural development uses.

*Nonresource Lands.* Nonresource land designations are a subset of lands rezoned from farm and forest to rural and urban development. In 2008-09, about half of all such farm and forest land rezonings were based on claims that the land involved was not “agricultural” or “forest” land as defined by Statewide Goals 3 and 4.

The table to the right identifies eight counties that have identified “nonresource” lands over the years that have been planned and zoned for other rural uses and are no longer subject to the provisions of Goals 3 and 4.

Lands that are identified as nonresource are not required to be supported by an exception to either of these goals. However, appropriate data documenting the nonresource nature of the land must be provided as part of a post-acknowledgment plan amendment.

Typically, soil scientists contracted by landowners provide counties with new data. However, counties often do not know which sources of data to rely on. For this reason, the legislature passed HB 3647 in 2010 that authorizes the department to arrange for professional soils classifiers experienced in field work to evaluate farmland that is claimed to be “nonresource.” While some counties have provisions in their comprehensive plans that guide the identification of nonresource lands, others do not. Some counties consider Goal 5 values in selecting appropriate minimum lot sizes for nonresource designated lands, while others do not. Below is a list of the eight counties with acreage planned and zoned as “nonresource.”

County	Acres Designated Non-Resource
Clatsop	2,351
Crook	23,000
Douglas	3,470
Jackson	342
Josephine	15,570
Klamath	36,742
Linn	29
Lane	495
Wasco	7,047
<b>Total</b>	<b>86,204</b>

Nonresource lands were addressed by the legislature in 2009, when it adopted House Bill 2229. This bill outlined a clearer path for counties to take in designating nonresource lands on a legislative, rather than case-by-case basis. The department plans to begin rulemaking in 2011 to detail a process for implementing HB 2229.

***Issue: Sustainable resource protection.*** In the long run, the continued inclusion of more of the state's most productive farm and forest land in UGBs risks undermining the state's agricultural and forest economies and other social and environmental values. The Portland Metro area urban and rural reserves effort is one means of balancing competing urbanization and resource uses over the long term.

***Issue: Identifying nonresource lands.*** Concerns have been raised about how nonresource lands are identified by counties, their location and extent and about the appropriate level of rural development.


## Changes in Land Use

Every few years, the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) publishes *Forest, Farms & People: Land Use Change on Non-Federal Land in Oregon*, which uses digital imagery based on 37,003 points across the state to calculate changes in land cover over time of a variety of land use classes. This data is valuable because it measures actual changes in land use, not just changes to plan or zone designations. Changes to plan and zone designations are not always followed by changes to land use, or changes to land use may follow only years later. For this reason, data on changes in land use represent a more accurate, timely and direct measure of land conversion from farm and forest uses to other uses than do changes to planning or zoning. This data provides another means to evaluate the effectiveness of Oregon's farm and forest land protection efforts.

The ODF has tracked land use change in Oregon from 1974 to 2009 in a series of periodic reports. The reports identify several land use classes, among them: wildland forest, wildland range, intensive agriculture, mixed forest/agriculture and mixed range/agriculture. These land use classes reflect both land cover and density of

existing structures, which consist primarily of dwellings. Wildland forest and wildland range are those forest and range lands with densities of fewer than five structures per square mile, while the other three resource categories reflect resource land with densities of fewer than nine structures per square mile. These densities roughly reflect the densities of permitted farm dwellings and large track forest dwellings in

exclusive farm use and forest zones, standards that were intended by ODF to reflect those used by DLCD.



For instance, when the density of development in wildland forest and wildrange areas increases to more than one dwelling per 160 acres, the land is reclassified to another land use class that reflects its new density. Usually, this will be one of the other three resource zones. When the density of development in the other three resource zones exceeds one dwelling per 80 acres, the land is reclassified by ODF as low-density residential, urban or other.


ODF data on land use change capture not only converted farm and forest land that may have followed rezonings, but also the land that is converted within farm and forest zones. While DLCD data reports the number of approvals of dwellings, other uses and land divisions in these zones, these data do not capture the acreage converted within the zones.

Table Z-1 identifies changes in farm and forest land cover between 1984 and 2009, using ODF data. These data reflect values for non-Federal lands only. 1984 was used because it compares closely to the 1988 and 1989 dates that were used by DLCD to track plan and zone

changes from farm and forest zones, and because all county comprehensive plans were acknowledged by the end of 1984. Data are rounded to the nearest 500 acres.

**State Trends in Farm and Forest Land Conversion.** ODF data show that, in the 25-year period between 1984 and 2009, approximately 147,000 acres of land used for farming or range moved to more developed land classes (mostly low density residential). Almost half of all this conversion occurred in Central Oregon, while nearly one-quarter took place in the Portland Metro area and another quarter in the Willamette Valley.


Farmland Conversion to Other Uses  
1984 - 2009



Similarly, in this time frame, 121,000 acres of land used for forest and farm-forest uses moved from these classes to more developed classes, with about one-quarter of this conversion occurring in Southern Oregon and one-quarter in Central Oregon. The remainder of conversion split fairly evenly among the Metro area, Valley and Coast.


The 147,000 acres of land that moved from ODF's farm use classification during the study period is approximately *four times* the acreage (34,856) that was rezoned from farm to other rural and urban zones in a similar time frame. In short, a significant amount of land is experiencing low-density residential development.

Forest Land Conversion to Other Uses  
1984 - 2009



The 121,000 acres of forest land that moved from forest use during the study period is approximately *twelve times* the acreage (12,000) that was rezoned from forest to other rural and urban zones in a similar time frame. ODF research shows that lands with low-density residential uses typically are not managed for timber production. The greater proportion of forest land being converted to residential uses *within* forest zones is a significant concern for the department.

Farm & Forest Land Rezoning Verses Conversion 1984 - 2009



There is an important caveat to these comparisons, and that is that the ODF definitions of conversion of farm and forest land reflect much lower development densities than typically follow rezonings to rural or urban uses. Land is no longer considered in forest use by ODF when development densities exceed one dwelling per 80 acres, while rezonings from forest zones typically result in development densities of one dwelling per 10 acres.

The ODF data suggest two conclusions: (a) that there continues to be significant flexibility within resource zones to accommodate dwellings; and (b) that the cumulative increase in numbers of dwellings within resource zones raises concerns about de facto conversion of these lands to low density residential use – particularly for forest lands where low density residential uses signal an end to active timber management.

**County Trends in Farm and Forest Land Conversion.** Several counties stand out as experiencing particularly high levels of low density residential development of farm and forest land classes. These include Deschutes County, which lost 10 percent of its farmland base and 11 percent of its forest land base to low-density development in the 25-year time period. The Portland Metro counties were similarly affected, Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties losing 28, 11 and seven percent, respectively, of their farmland bases, and between three and four percent of each of their forest land bases. Much of the conversion in these counties was due to the outward expansion of urban growth boundaries. Other counties experiencing significant conversion trends include Jackson, which lost seven percent of its farmland base and Coos and Lane Counties, which each lost five percent of their farmland bases.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, Oregon's farm and forest land protection program has provided a significant level of protection to the state's working landscapes over the last three decades, generating important support for state and local economies and providing additional recreational, environmental and cultural benefits for Oregonians. Over the years, and in response to changing conditions, new trends and regional variation, the department and legislature have continued to fine-tune the program to make it as effective as possible, while being sensitive to landowner interests and county resources. In this spirit, this report identifies several areas of concern that the department would like to pursue in the next biennium, through legislation, rulemaking and technical assistance to counties.

## New Dwellings Approved in Farm Zones

<b>TYPE OF DWELLING</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>TOTALS (% of Net)</b>
<b>Primary Farm</b> ORS 215.283(1)(f)	98	68	88	77	81	76	93	88	84	105	89	74	59	1,080 (10%)
<b>Accessory Farm</b> ORS 215.283(1)(f)	57	35	53	36	29	27	30	20	23	24	55	59	31	479 (4%)
<b>Family Farm Help</b> ORS 215.283(1)(e)	78	77	59	43	38	48	34	53	49	35	55	36	20	625 (6%)
<b>Temporary Hardship</b> ORS 215.283(2)(L)	131	126	105	105	115	104	80	73	89	74	70	57	61	1,190 (11%)
<b>Lot-of-Record</b> ORS 215.705	129	131	94	80	78	89	53	64	51	53	64	50	32	968 (9%)
<b>Non-Farm</b> ORS 215.284	340	205	208	227	203	279	258	202	218	236	246	184	118	2,924 (26%)
<b>Net New Dwellings</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>607</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>7,266</b>
<b>Replacement</b> ORS 215.283(1)(s)	419	361	354	307	276	333	305	294	233	301	227	251	229	3,890 (35%)
<b>TOTAL DWELLINGS APPROVED IN FARM ZONES</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>1003</b>	<b>961</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>11,156</b>

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)**

## New Dwellings Approved in Forest Zones

<b>TYPE OF DWELLING</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>TOTALS (% of Net)</b>
<b>Forest Template</b> ORS 215.750	276	264	277	281	237	218	232	278	275	273	250	197	135	3,193 (57%)
<b>Large Lot</b> ORS 215.740	13	13	16	19	21	15	28	31	16	16	22	19	32	261 (5%)
<b>Lot-of-Record</b> ORS 215.720	52	78	46	41	47	33	43	55	41	34	46	27	11	554 (10%)
<b>Temporary Hardship</b> ORS 215.755(2)	45*	40	52	37	35	41	24	19	29	20	32	22	32	428 (8%)
<b>Net New Dwellings</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>4,436</b>
<b>Replacement</b> ORS 215.755(1)	95	90	85	81	91	93	97	98	114	121	90	88	65	1,208 (21%)
<b>TOTAL DWELLINGS APPROVED IN FOREST ZONES</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>5,644</b>

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

Using data submitted by Oregon's 36 counties.

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

The 1997 number is an average for the approvals of temporary hardship dwellings from 1994 to 2002 because the actual number approved in 1997 is not available.

**PRIMARY FARM  
DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2008 Table A**

<b>County</b>	<b>Income / High Value</b>	<b>Income / Non High Value</b>	<b>Size / Non High Value</b>	<b>Capability</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Baker		1			1
Benton	2				2
Clackamas	3				3
Clatsop					
Columbia					
Coos	1				1
Crook			4		4
Curry					
Deschutes			2	1	3
Douglas	2		3		5
Gilliam		1			1
Grant	1	2			3
Harney		7			7
Hood River					
Jackson			3		3
Jefferson			2		2
Josephine					
Klamath		3		2	5
Lake		2			2
Lane	1				1
Lincoln		1			1
Linn					
Malheur					
Marion	1				1
Morrow		1			1
Multnomah					
Polk	1				1
Sherman					
Tillamook				1	1
Umatilla	1	1	1		3
Union			2		2
Wallowa		2			2
Wasco		1			1
Washington	9	1			10
Wheeler		5			5
Yamhill	3				3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>74</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	24	16	40	9	89
2006	24	16	49	16	105
2005	22	1	60	2	85

**PRIMARY FARM  
DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 Table B**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage					160 & Over	Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 & 159		
Baker							1	1
Benton				1			1	2
Clackamas	1	1	1					3
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos							1	1
Crook						3	1	4
Curry								
Deschutes	1					1	1	3
Douglas					2		3	5
Gilliam							1	1
Grant				1			2	3
Harney							7	7
Hood River								
Jackson							3	3
Jefferson					2			2
Josephine								
Klamath				1		2	2	5
Lake							2	2
Lane						1		1
Lincoln							1	1
Linn								
Malheur								
Marion			1					1
Morrow							1	1
Multnomah								
Polk						1		1
Sherman								
Tillamook				1				1
Umatilla				1	1		1	3
Union							2	2
Wallowa							2	2
Wasco							1	1
Washington		4	1	1	2	1	1	10
Wheeler	2						3	5
Yamhill				1		2		3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>74</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	1	6	4	10	14	54		89
2006	0	10	8	11	20	56		105
2005	2	8	3	7	6	59		85

**FARM HELP DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2008 Table C**

County	Accessory	Dwelling Approvals		Totals
		Units	Relative	
Baker	1	1		1
Benton			5	5
Clackamas	4	4		4
Clatsop				
Columbia				
Coos	2	4	2	6
Crook	4	4		4
Curry				
Deschutes	1	1	1	2
Douglas	1	1	8	9
Gilliam				
Grant	1	1		1
Harney	7	7		7
Hood River	13	13	2	15
Jackson	2	2	2	4
Jefferson	2	2		2
Josephine			1	1
Klamath	1	1	1	2
Lake	2	2	1	3
Lane			3	3
Lincoln				
Linn	4	4	1	5
Malheur			1	1
Marion	3	3	1	4
Morrow	2	2		2
Multnomah				
Polk	2	2	1	3
Sherman				
Tillamook	1	1		1
Umatilla	1	1	1	2
Union			2	2
Wallowa	1	1		1
Wasco				
Washington				
Wheeler	1	1		1
Yamhill	1	1	3	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>95</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	55	55	55	337
2006	25	25	35	361
2005	25	25	49	310

**NON FARM / LOT-OF-RECORD / TEMPORARY /  
REPLACEMENT DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2008 Table D**

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Replace	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value				
Baker	4			3		10	17
Benton					1	2	3
Clackamas		1		2	6		9
Clatsop				1	1	2	4
Columbia							
Coos					2	10	12
Crook	1			18		6	25
Curry				2			2
Deschutes				35	2	2	39
Douglas	3			26	8	51	88
Gilliam						2	2
Grant	1			1		9	11
Harney	2			11	1		14
Hood River	2		1	1	4	12	20
Jackson	8			9	1		18
Jefferson			1	1		7	9
Josephine				2			2
Klamath				5		7	12
Lake				21			21
Lane				4	3	3	10
Lincoln	1			2			3
Linn	2				5	1	8
Malheur	5		1	8	2	15	31
Marion			3	1	11	15	30
Morrow				6		3	9
Multnomah						1	1
Polk						32	32
Sherman							
Tillamook						13	13
Umatilla	3			9		10	22
Union	4				1	8	13
Wallowa	3			3		4	10
Wasco	1						1
Washington	1			8	4	23	36
Wheeler				5		3	8
Yamhill	1		1		5		7
<b>Totals</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>542</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	57	5	6	246	70	207	384
2006	46	3	4	236	74	301	363
2005	39	0	12	218	89	236	358

**FARM LOT-OF-RECORD DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 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 79		
Baker		1		1	1	1		4
Benton								
Clackamas		1						1
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook		1						1
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas		1	1		1			3
Gilliam								
Grant						1		1
Harney						2		2
Hood River		1	2					3
Jackson	1	1		1	1	3	1	8
Jefferson						1		1
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln						1		1
Linn		2						2
Malheur		2				2	2	6
Marion		1		1	1			3
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla		1		1	1			3
Union		1	1			2		4
Wallowa		1				2		3
Wasco						1		1
Washington		1						1
Wheeler								
Yamhill				2				2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>50</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	1	15	9	4	16	13	6	64
2006	0	9	10	10	6	6	11	53
2005	11	3	2	6	16	11	2	51

**NON-FARM DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 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	2				1			3
Benton								
Clackamas		1		1				2
Clatsop					1			1
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook	1	2	13	1			1	18
Curry	1						1	2
Deschutes	1	11	2	14	4	2	1	35
Douglas		20	3	1		1	1	26
Gilliam								
Grant			1					1
Harney			1	2	4	2	2	11
Hood River		1						1
Jackson	1	4		2	2			9
Jefferson						1		1
Josephine				1	1			2
Klamath				5				5
Lake		3	6	7	3	1	1	21
Lane				2	2			4
Lincoln		2						2
Linn								
Malheur		2		1	2	2	1	8
Marion						1		1
Morrow		2		3		1		6
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla		6	2	1				9
Union								
Wallowa						3		3
Wasco								
Washington		4	3	1				8
Wheeler	2				2	1		5
Yamhill								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>184</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	22	67	51	25	33	31	17	246
2006	9	44	43	44	48	17	31	236
2005	20	67	44	47	27	13	0	218

**ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 Table G**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 to 159	160 & Over	
Baker							1	1
Benton								
Clackamas					2	1	1	4
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos							4	4
Crook						2	2	4
Curry								
Deschutes				1				1
Douglas							1	1
Gilliam								
Grant							1	1
Harney						1	6	7
Hood River		1	5	3	2	2		13
Jackson			1	1				2
Jefferson						2		2
Josephine								
Klamath						1		1
Lake						1	1	2
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn						2	2	4
Malheur								
Marion				2			1	3
Morrow		1					1	2
Multnomah								
Polk					1	1		2
Sherman								
Tillamook				1				1
Umatilla					1			1
Union								
Wallowa				1				1
Wasco								
Washington								
Wheeler	1							1
Yamhill						1		1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>59</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	1	14	5	8	3	24	0	55
2006	0	4	3	3	5	9	0	24
2005	2	1	3	5	3	10	0	24

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON FARM LAND  
TOTALS BY YEAR**

**2008 Table H**

Primary Farm						Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
County	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Baker		5	3	3	1	10	2	9	3	4		8	9	2	3
Benton					2	2	3	2			2		3		
Clackamas	8		2	3	3	4	7	3	2	1	2	1	3		2
Clatsop									2			2	1	3	1
Columbia			1								1				
Coos			2	2	1				2		1				
Crook	11	5	10	1	4	5	3	1		1	30	19	25	34	18
Curry	1			3											2
Deschutes	3		2		3	3	3	3	1		37	33	57	45	35
Douglas	7	7	3	5	5	2	2	3	3	3	18	31	18	54	26
Gilliam				1	1				1						
Grant	1	1		2	3	2	2		2	1	2	3	2		1
Harney	5	6	8	10	7	2		10	6	2	4	5	13	17	11
Hood River		5	3			1	1	2	3	3				11	1
Jackson	2	5	3	3	3	4	6	5	2	8	6	17	20	18	9
Jefferson	7	6	1	4	2	1			9	1				3	1
Josephine						1					3	1		1	2
Klamath	6		17	13	5		3				30	10	13	5	5
Lake	2	14	8		2						28	40	31		21
Lane	1	2			1	1		1			2	3	1	1	4
Lincoln					1	1				1		1		1	2
Linn	1	1	1	1		3	1		2	2	5	4	1	3	
Malheur	9	3	1	9		4	1	1	3	6	7	12	14	11	8
Marion	2	1	4	2	1	1	4	2		3	6	1	7	4	1
Morrow		2	1	1	1				1		1	2	2	3	6
Multnomah	1	1					2		3						
Polk	1	5	3	7	1	2	1		2			3	1		
Sherman	1														2
Tillamook				1	1									1	
Umatilla	5	1		5	3	3	2	3	5	3	6	6	2	4	9
Union	3	4	4	2	2	4	3		2	4	1	2		6	
Wallowa	2		2	3	2	5	3	3	4	3		2	2	3	3
Wasco	2	6	2	2	1	1	1	1		1	3	3	3	3	
Washington	2	5	11	3	10		1		3	1	2	3	1	5	8
Wheeler					5				1		2	5	5	4	5
Yamhill	5		13	3	3	2		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>184</b>

**FARM AND NON-FARM  
LAND DIVISION APPROVALS**

**2008 Table I**

Resulting Farm Parcels							Resulting Non-Farm Parcels					
County	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Baker		7	12	10	2	2		11	1	2	4	
Benton	1	2		3	1		1			4	5	
Clackamas		2		2								
Clatsop						1				1	3	
Columbia												
Coos								2			13	
Crook	12	23	11	10	5	7	21	22	4	13	27	3
Curry	4						1				1	1
Deschutes	17	13	6		1	2	43	24	15	22	28	21
Douglas	21	19	27	8	5	8	16	8	31	40	43	22
Gilliam	2		9	2		3	2		1	2		4
Grant	17	8	19	4	10	6	10	6	7	3	14	1
Harney	7	6	36	4	13	25	5	4		5	11	3
Hood River												
Jackson				1		2				2	5	1
Jefferson	10	4		1	14		1			3		
Josephine			1						2			
Klamath		6	2	7	7	8	1	14	7	10	3	3
Lake	17	8	7	3		2	15	20	28	24		5
Lane			4						1	3		4
Lincoln												
Linn	7	5	7	3	7	3	3	1	3		6	1
Malheur	1			1		1	1			9		
Marion	1	1	3	3	2		1	1	1	1	4	1
Morrow	6	5	7	3	4	2	7	1		8	3	6
Multnomah						1				1	1	
Polk	11	3	9	7	6	4	1		3	11	10	
Sherman	1	10	4	1		2	1	4		3	5	
Tillamook						1						2
Umatilla	3	8	13	6	7	10	1	6	6	7	13	7
Union		4	5	5	8	3				5	3	2
Wallowa	17	7	4	2	2	5	10	4	2	7	1	3
Wasco	5	5	5	7	2		1	5	1	6	2	1
Washington			1	2				2	1			
Wheeler			2	2	8	4			2	6	3	4
Yamhill	4			4	2	4						
<b>Totals</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>95</b>

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

**2008 Table J**

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker	2		2			
Benton						
Clackamas						
Clatsop	1		1			
Columbia						
Coos						
Crook	6		7	2		3
Curry				1		1
Deschutes	2		2	16		21
Douglas	6		8	14		22
Gilliam	2		3	3		4
Grant	4	1	6	1		1
Harney	16		25	2		3
Hood River						
Jackson	1		2	1		1
Jefferson						
Josephine						
Klamath	6		8	2		3
Lake	2		2	3		5
Lane				3		4
Lincoln						
Linn	2		3	1		1
Malheur	1		1			
Marion				1		1
Morrow	2		2	5		6
Multnomah	1		1			
Polk	3		4			
Sherman	2		2			
Tillamook	1		1	2		2
Umatilla	8		10	5		7
Union	3		3	2		2
Wallowa	4		5	2		3
Wasco				1		1
Washington						
Wheeler	3		4	4		4
Yamhill	3		4			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	77	0	106	142	11	208
2006	84	1	101	148	6	198
2005	76	0	188	72	0	116

**NEW FARM PARCELS BY SIZE**

**2008 Table K**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 to 159	160 & Over	
Baker						2		2
Benton								
Clackamas								
Clatsop						1		1
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook					1	2	4	7
Curry								
Deschutes				1	1			2
Douglas						8		8
Gilliam							3	3
Grant						1	5	6
Harney						2	23	25
Hood River								
Jackson	1				1			2
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath						3	5	8
Lake							2	2
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn							3	3
Malheur							1	1
Marion								
Morrow							2	2
Multnomah			1					1
Polk						4		4
Sherman						1	1	2
Tillamook		1						1
Umatilla					1	2	7	10
Union							3	3
Wallowa							5	5
Wasco								
Washington								
Wheeler						1	3	4
Yamhill			1		1	2		4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>106</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	0	0	1	4	5	96	0	100
2006	0	1	0	0	1	98	0	101
2005	5	1	4	3	17	158	0	188

**NEW NON-FARM PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2008 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							
Benton							
Clackamas							
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook			2		1		3
Curry					1		1
Deschutes		9	2	6	4		21
Douglas		20	1	1			22
Gilliam		1		1	1	1	4
Grant				1			1
Harney		2				1	3
Hood River							
Jackson				1			1
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath		1		2			3
Lake		1	2			2	5
Lane					3	1	4
Lincoln							
Linn		1					1
Malheur							
Marion			1				1
Morrow		2		4			6
Multnomah							
Polk							
Sherman							
Tillamook		2					2
Umatilla		5	1			1	7
Union		2					2
Wallowa			2	1			3
Wasco					1		1
Washington							
Wheeler		1		2	1		4
Yamhill							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>95</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	0	131	28	22	13	14	208
2006	0	90	52	26	18	12	198
2005	0	59	30	10	6	11	116

**OTHER USES APPROVED ON LAND ZONED  
FOR FARM USE**

**2008 Table M**

Use	Number of Approvals						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Accessory Use	25	30	34	21	38	91	68
Airstrip	6	3	2	6	3	7	2
Bed and Breakfast	7	3	2	4			2
Church	3		3	7	1	3	2
Commercial Activity w/ Farm Use	3	8	7	10	14	17	8
Commercial Power Generating**							1
Destination Resort							1
Dog Kennel	2	4	8	6	4	2	5
Farm Processing Facility**							8
Farm Related Building**							92
Farm Stand	6	5	5	2	3	1	4
Golf Course	3		1				1
Guest Ranch					2	1	1
Home Occupation	14	24	18	18	19	18	27
Mineral & Aggregate	20	21	8	10	6	12	19
Other Use	2						55
Private Park	16	12	5	2	2	2	7
Public Park**							3
Roads and Improvements	11	9	12	8	17	10	13
School	1		1	1	1		2
Telecommunication Facility*					14	13	22
Transmission Towers over 200 Ft							3
Utility Facility	1	34	22	30	25	17	50
Wind Energy Facility (Commercial)**							11
Winery	14	7	6	6	5	9	7
<b>Totals</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>414</b>

New categories in 2006\*, 2008\*\*

**DWELLING APPROVALS  
ON FOREST LAND**

**2008 Table N**

<b>County</b>	<b>Low Production</b>	<b>Medium Production</b>	<b>High Production</b>	<b>Public Road</b>	<b>Sixty Plus Acres</b>	<b>Template Totals</b>	<b>Large Tract</b>	<b>Lot of Record</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Baker							1		1
Benton			1	1		1	1	3	5
Clackamas		1	16		1	17		2	19
Clatsop				1		1			1
Columbia			16			16		1	17
Coos			14			14	1		15
Crook									
Curry	2		5	4	2	7	1		8
Deschutes		1	1	2		2	1		3
Douglas	1	4	6	6	2	11		4	15
Gilliam									
Grant							1	1	2
Harney									
Hood River							5		5
Jackson	3		12	13	1	17		5	22
Jefferson							2		2
Josephine		2	6	5		8			8
Klamath				6	1	7		1	8
Lake									
Lane	2	3	36	40	4	44	1	4	49
Lincoln			7	7		7		2	9
Linn	2	4	3			9		2	11
Malheur									
Marion									
Morrow									
Multnomah			4			4			4
Polk	1	2	8	1	1	13			13
Sherman									
Tillamook			3	1		3			3
Umatilla							1		1
Union			1			1	2	2	5
Wallowa	2			2		2	1		3
Wasco									
Washington			2			2			2
Wheeler									
Yamhill	1		10	5		11	1		12
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>243</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	13	10	175	40	12	250	22	46	318
2006	22	15	184	41	11	273	16	34	323
2005	16	17	191	27	24	275	16	41	332

**FOREST TEMPLATE DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 Table O**

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								
Benton		1						1
Clackamas		3	2	5	4	2	1	17
Clatsop					1			1
Columbia		8	3	4	1			16
Coos		3	5	3	2	1		14
Crook								
Curry			2	1	1	1	2	7
Deschutes		1	1					2
Douglas		2	4	4	1			11
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney								
Hood River								
Jackson	1	9	1	2	1	2	1	17
Jefferson								
Josephine		1		4	2	1		8
Klamath				3	2	2		7
Lake								
Lane	1	10	7	11	10	5		44
Lincoln		3		3		1		7
Linn		3	3	1	2			9
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah		2	1			1		4
Polk	1	1	2	7	1	1		13
Sherman								
Tillamook		2		1				3
Umatilla								
Union					1			1
Wallowa				2				2
Wasco								
Washington		2						2
Wheeler								
Yamhill		3	1	4	3			11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>197</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	0	76	45	57	46	18	8	250
2006	0	74	54	66	44	26	9	273
2005	22	64	49	55	47	24	13	274

**LOT-OF-RECORD FOREST DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2008 Table P**

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								
Benton				1		2		3
Clackamas	2							2
Clatsop								
Columbia			1					1
Coos								
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas	1		1			2		4
Gilliam								
Grant							1	1
Harney								
Hood River								
Jackson			2	2			1	5
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath			1					1
Lake								
Lane		2	1		1			4
Lincoln		1		1				2
Linn		1			1			2
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union		1	1					2
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington								
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	0	7	10	13	6	7	3	46
2006	0	9	7	6	7	1	4	34
2005	1	6	10	9	12	2	1	41

**FOREST OWNERSHIPS  
ADJACENT TO DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2008 Table Q**

County	Total Template and Lot of Record Dwellings	Adjacent Ownerships			Private Industrial
		USFS	BLM	State	
Baker					
Benton	4			1	3
Clackamas	19				
Clatsop	1				
Columbia	17				
Coos	14				
Crook					
Curry	7				
Deschutes	2	1			
Douglas	15		2		
Gilliam					
Grant	1				
Harney					
Hood River					
Jackson	22	1	12	1	2
Jefferson					
Josephine	8		4		
Klamath	8				
Lake					
Lane	48	1			4
Lincoln	9		2		2
Linn	11				3
Malheur					
Marion					
Morrow					
Multnomah	4				
Polk	13				
Sherman					
Tillamook	3			1	1
Umatilla					
Union	3				
Wallowa	2				
Wasco					
Washington	2				1
Wheeler					
Yamhill	11				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	296	7	5	3	24
2006	307	5	10	0	22
2005	315	3	15	2	31

**FOREST  
HARDSHIP AND REPLACEMENT DWELLING  
APPROVALS**

**2008 Table R**

County	Temporary Hardship	Replacement Dwellings
Baker		1
Benton		
Clackamas	5	
Clatsop		
Columbia	1	1
Coos	1	16
Crook		
Curry		1
Deschutes		2
Douglas		28
Gilliam		
Grant		2
Harney		
Hood River		
Jackson	8	5
Jefferson		1
Josephine		
Klamath		5
Lake		
Lane		10
Lincoln		
Linn	3	
Malheur		
Marion		
Morrow		
Multnomah		3
Polk		3
Sherman		
Tillamook		1
Umatilla		
Union		1
Wallowa		
Wasco		
Washington		8
Wheeler		
Yamhill	4	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>88</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	32	90
2006	20	121
2005	29	114

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON FOREST LAND  
TOTALS BY YEAR**

**2008 Table S**

<b>New Permanent Dwellings (Excludes Replacement and Hardship)</b>											
<b>County</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Baker		1	5	2						3	1
Benton	4	2	5	2	4	3	1	2	3	1	5
Clackamas	51	50	41	50	16	30	51	30	35	34	19
Clatsop	2	6	5	6	5	4	7	4	4	9	1
Columbia	18	33	35	32	40	16	12	24	25	16	17
Coos	16	10	14	17	15	23	31	19	14	33	15
Crook	1					1	1	1			
Curry	4	2	5	14	9	13	40	18	7	6	8
Deschutes	8	9	13	6	3	1	2	3	5	6	3
Douglas	7	2	6	10	5	7	4	15	39	23	15
Gilliam							1				
Grant	9	6	6	10	4	8		4	1	5	2
Harney											
Hood River	2	7	7	8	4	2	1	1	2	3	5
Jackson	37	78	45	57	42	52	52	40	32	24	22
Jefferson											2
Josephine	17	13	12	28	14	18	22	29	8	18	8
Klamath	22	14	9	20	9	15	15	16	10	9	8
Lake											
Lane	38	45	48	67	39	40	24	38	33	17	49
Lincoln	10	12	7	15	12	8	11	14	11	11	9
Linn	12	12	7	8	5	11	14	10	11	23	11
Malheur											
Marion	17	5	6	8	2	7	5	3	5	3	
Morrow	2	4	3	1	1	1	1		4	6	
Multnomah	8	4	2	1	8	1		5	3	1	4
Polk	29	2	22	20	12	13	15	16	20	28	13
Sherman											
Tillamook	3	2	3	5	1	3	4	3	2	5	3
Umatilla				2	1	1		2	1	6	1
Union	1	5	4	3	2	9	7	3	6	2	5
Wallowa		2	5	3	3	1	4	2	5	1	3
Wasco				1						1	
Washington	12	10	4	6	8	8	23	13	19	12	2
Wheeler				1							
Yamhill	25	3	22	4	2	7	13	16	18	12	12
<b>Totals</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>243</b>

**FOREST AND NON-FOREST  
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

**2008 Table T**

County	Forest Divisions			Non Forest Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker						
Benton	1		2	1		1
Clackamas	3		3	1		1
Clatsop						
Columbia				1		1
Coos				3		5
Crook						
Curry						
Deschutes						
Douglas	2		2			
Gilliam						
Grant	1		1			
Harney						
Hood River				1		1
Jackson	3		5	1		2
Jefferson						
Josephine						
Klamath	3		5			
Lake	1		2			
Lane	2		3	3		2
Lincoln				2		2
Linn						
Malheur						
Marion						
Morrow						
Multnomah						
Polk	2		2			
Sherman						
Tillamook						
Umatilla						
Union	4		6			
Wallowa	8		11			
Wasco						
Washington						
Wheeler						
Yamhill	2		3			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	24	2	32	45	7	60
2006	32	0	49	43	1	54
2005	30	0	50	10	0	21

**NEW FOREST PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2008 Table U**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 & 159	160 & Over	
Baker								
Benton							2	2
Clackamas		1				2		3
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas						2		2
Gilliam								
Grant							1	1
Harney								
Hood River								
Jackson						3	2	5
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath						1	4	5
Lake							2	2
Lane		1	2					3
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk					1	1		2
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union							6	6
Wallowa							11	11
Wasco								
Washington								
Wheeler								
Yamhill			1			2		3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>45</b>

2007	0	1	3	3	1	24	0	32
2006	0	0	0	2	2	45	0	49
2005	0	11	5	6	3	25	0	50

**NEW NON-FOREST PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2008 Table V**

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							
Benton		1					1
Clackamas		1					1
Clatsop							
Columbia						1	1
Coos		4			1		5
Crook							
Curry							
Deschutes							
Douglas							
Gilliam							
Grant							
Harney							
Hood River				1			1
Jackson					2		2
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath							
Lake							
Lane		2					2
Lincoln		2					2
Linn							
Malheur							
Marion							
Morrow							
Multnomah							
Polk							
Sherman							
Tillamook							
Umatilla							
Union							
Wallowa							
Wasco							
Washington							
Wheeler							
Yamhill							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>

Previous Years Totals

2007	0	41	10	5	1	3	60
2006	0	37	4	4	6	3	54
2005	0	12	5	2	0	2	21

**OTHER USES  
APPROVED ON LAND ZONED  
FOR FOREST USE**

**2008 Table W**

Use	Number of Approvals						
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Accessory Use	11	16	9	8	22	33	11
Bed and Breakfast	1						1
Church				1			
Commercial Activity with Forest					1	4	3
Dog Kennel					1	5	
Commercial Power Generating Facility**							
Destination Resort							
Farm Exempt Building		2	1	9	14	6	
Farm Related Building**							17
Farm Use		1		9	2	13	
Fishing and Hunting Accommodations							
Forest Processing Facility							
Home Occupation	1	2	7	6	7	4	12
Mineral & Aggregate	4	6	12	2	9	9	7
Natural Gas Facility					1	1	
NonConforming Use	2	1	9		14	1	
Other Uses							44
Private Park	2	5	6	2	2	4	3
Public Facility				1	4	10	
Public Park**							1
Roads and Improvements	2	2	1	3	7	8	8
Telecommunication Facility*					18	12	18
School	1		1	2			
Transmission Tower Over 200 Feet							
Utility Facility	15	19	21	25	10	1	13
Youth Camp	1		1	2	2		2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>140</b>

New Categories in 2006\*, 2008\*\*

**PLAN AMENDMENT DATA**

**2008 Table X**

**Farm and Forest Land moved into  
Urban Growth Boundaries by Calendar Year**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Use From Agriculture</b>	<b>Use From Forest</b>
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	55	17,545	3,281 acres (19.0%)	1,659 acres (9.5%)
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%)
2008	6	972	949 acres (98.0%)	0 acres (0.0%)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>45,898</b>	<b>15,781 from Ag. (34.0%)</b>	<b>3,136 from Forest (1.0%)</b>

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

**2008 Table Y**

<b>From Agriculture</b>	<b>To EFU</b>	<b>To Forest</b>	<b>To Commercial</b>	<b>To Industrial*</b>	<b>To Residential</b>	<b>SubTotal*</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
<b>1989 - 1996</b>	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
2008		73	79	10	1,011	1,100	1,173
<b>Totals</b>	941,426	4,286	797	4,340	9,199	14,336	960,048

<b>From Forestry</b>	<b>To EFU</b>	<b>To Forest</b>	<b>To Commercial</b>	<b>To Industrial*</b>	<b>To Residential</b>	<b>SubTotal*</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
<b>1989 - 1996</b>	8,136	36,264	16	208	3,072	3,296	47,696
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
2008	131	509	3	212	5	220	860
<b>Totals</b>	8,964	37,676	21	608	6,319	6,948	53,588

Shaded Area: rezoned resource to development zones

\*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as Industrial

**FARM AND FOREST LAND  
REZONED TO OTHER USES**

**2008 Table Z**

County	Exclusive Farm Use				Forest & Farm-Forest				Total Rural/ Urban
	To Forest	To Rural	To Urban	Sub Total	To EFU	To Rural	To Urban	Sub Total	
Baker		86		86					86
Benton									
Clackamas									
Clatsop						112		112	112
Columbia									
Coos	73					3		3	3
Crook		381		381					381
Curry									
Deschutes									
Douglas		259		259					259
Gilliam									
Grant			4	4					4
Harney									
Hood River									
Jackson									
Jefferson									
Josephine		158		158					158
Klamath		77		77					77
Lake									
Lane					111				
Lincoln									
Linn									
Malheur		57	239	296					296
Marion			44	44					44
Morrow									
Multnomah									
Polk									
Sherman									
Tillamook		2		2		5		5	7
Umatilla			662	662					662
Union						100		100	100
Wallowa									
Wasco									
Washington									
Wheeler		3		3					3
Yamhill		77		77	20				77
<b>Totals</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>2,049</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>2,269</b>

**PRIMARY FARM  
DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2009 Table A**

<b>County</b>	<b>Income / High Value</b>	<b>Income / Non High Value</b>	<b>Size / Non High Value</b>	<b>Capability</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Baker		1			1
Benton					
Clackamas	2				2
Clatsop		2			2
Columbia					
Coos					
Crook		1	2	2	5
Curry					
Deschutes			1		1
Douglas		2		1	3
Gilliam					
Grant					
Harney		7			7
Hood River					
Jackson	3	1	1		5
Jefferson	1		2		3
Josephine					
Klamath					
Lake					
Lane					
Lincoln					
Linn					
Malheur		2	2		4
Marion	3				3
Morrow		1			1
Multnomah					
Polk			1	1	2
Sherman		1			1
Tillamook	1				1
Umatilla	1	1	1		3
Union	2				2
Wallowa		2			2
Wasco		3	1		4
Washington	1				1
Wheeler			2		2
Yamhill	3		1		4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>59</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	24	28	17	5	74
2007	24	16	40	9	89
2006	24	16	49	16	105

**PRIMARY FARM  
DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 Table B**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 to 159	160 & Over	
Baker							1	1
Benton								
Clackamas				1	1			2
Clatsop				1	1			2
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook	3				1		1	5
Curry								
Deschutes							1	1
Douglas						1	2	3
Gilliam								
Grant							7	7
Harney								
Hood River								
Jackson	2	1		1			1	5
Jefferson					2	1		3
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur					2		2	4
Marion					2		1	3
Morrow							1	1
Multnomah								
Polk					1	1		2
Sherman							1	1
Tillamook			1					1
Umatilla				1		1	1	3
Union							2	2
Wallowa							2	2
Wasco		1		1	1		1	4
Washington				1				1
Wheeler						1	1	2
Yamhill					2	1	1	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>59</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	4	5	3	7	8	11	35	74
2007	1	6	4	10	14	54	0	89
2006	0	10	8	11	20	56	0	105
2005	2	8	3	7	6	59	0	85

FARM HELP DWELLING APPROVALS

2009 Table C

County	Dwelling Approvals			Totals
	Accessory	Units	Relative	
Baker	2	2		2
Benton				
Clackamas	1	1	1	2
Clatsop				
Columbia				
Coos			1	1
Crook	1	1		1
Curry				
Deschutes			1	1
Douglas			3	3
Gilliam	1	1		1
Grant				
Harney	1	1		1
Hood River	4	4		4
Jackson	1	1	1	2
Jefferson				
Josephine	1	1		1
Klamath			6	6
Lake	6	6		6
Lane			3	3
Lincoln				
Linn	1	1	1	2
Malheur	3	3		3
Marion				
Morrow				
Multnomah				
Polk			1	1
Sherman				
Tillamook	1	3		3
Umatilla			1	1
Union			1	1
Wallowa				
Wasco	1	1		1
Washington	2	2		2
Wheeler	2	2		2
Yamhill	1	1		1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>51</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	57	59	36	95
2007	55	55	55	337
2006	25	25	35	361

**NON FARM / LOT-OF-RECORD / TEMPORARY /  
REPLACEMENT DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2009 Table D**

County	Lot of Record			Non-Farm	Temporary Hardship	Replace	Totals
	Not High Value	Perimeter	High Value				
Baker	3					9	12
Benton	1				2	1	4
Clackamas	1				2		3
Clatsop	3						3
Columbia							
Coos					1	3	4
Crook	2			12		9	23
Curry							
Deschutes				28	5	1	34
Douglas	3			18	3	59	83
Gilliam						1	1
Grant	1			2		9	12
Harney	1			4			5
Hood River				1	1	15	17
Jackson	4			6	5		15
Jefferson	1			2	3	3	9
Josephine				1			1
Klamath	1			2		5	8
Lake				10	3		13
Lane				7	1	1	9
Lincoln	1						1
Linn				1	4	1	6
Malheur	2			5		13	20
Marion				1	9	9	19
Morrow				2		2	4
Multnomah						5	5
Polk	3				10	12	25
Sherman							
Tillamook	1			1		4	6
Umatilla				7		12	19
Union	1			1	1	9	12
Wallowa				1		1	2
Wasco	1			2	1	7	11
Washington	1			1	4	12	18
Wheeler	1			2			3
Yamhill				1	6	26	33
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>440</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	42	1	7	184	57	251	542
2007	57	5	6	246	70	227	384
2006	46	3	4	236	74	301	363

**FARM LOT-OF-RECORD DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 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 79		
Baker				1	1		1	3
Benton						1		1
Clackamas			1					1
Clatsop		2		1				3
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook	2							2
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas					1	2		3
Gilliam								
Grant				1				1
Harney						1		1
Hood River								
Jackson		3	1					4
Jefferson	1							1
Josephine								
Klamath						1		1
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln		1						1
Linn								
Malheur		1			1			2
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk	1				1		1	3
Sherman								
Tillamook		1						1
Umatilla								
Union						1		1
Wallowa								
Wasco						1		1
Washington	1							1
Wheeler						1		1
Yamhill								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	1	15	4	6	5	16	3	50
2007	1	15	9	4	16	13	6	64
2006	0	9	10	10	6	6	11	53

**NON-FARM DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 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								
Benton								
Clackamas								
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook	12							12
Curry								
Deschutes		6	7	4	8	1	2	28
Douglas		16	2					18
Gilliam								
Grant			2					2
Harney		1		2	1			4
Hood River		1						1
Jackson		2	1		2		1	6
Jefferson					2			2
Josephine							1	1
Klamath		1				1		2
Lake		2	2	2	3		1	10
Lane		3	3		1			7
Lincoln								
Linn		1						1
Malheur		2		2			1	5
Marion						1		1
Morrow						2		2
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook					1			1
Umatilla	2	3	1				1	7
Union		1						1
Wallowa					1			1
Wasco			1	1				2
Washington		1						1
Wheeler				1			1	2
Yamhill		1						1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>118</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	8	58	31	42	22	15	8	184
2007	22	67	51	25	33	31	17	246
2006	9	44	43	44	48	17	31	236

**ACCESSORY FARM DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 Table G**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Sizes by Acreage					160 & Over	Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 to 159		
Baker							2	2
Benton								
Clackamas					1			1
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook								
Curry	1							1
Deschutes								
Douglas								
Gilliam	1							1
Grant								
Harney							1	1
Hood River		1		2		1		4
Jackson	1							1
Jefferson								
Josephine						1		1
Klamath								
Lake							6	6
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn							1	1
Malheur					2		1	3
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook						3		3
Umatilla								
Union								
Wallowa								
Wasco				1				1
Washington				1		1		2
Wheeler							2	2
Yamhill				1				1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	1	2	6	9	6	14	21	59
2007	1	14	5	8	3	24	0	55
2006	0	4	3	3	5	9	0	24

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON FARM LAND  
TOTALS BY YEAR**

**2009 Table H**

Primary Farm						Lot of Record					Non - Farm Dwellings				
County	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Baker	5	3	3	1	1	2	9	3	4	3	8	9	2	3	
Benton				2		3	2			1		3			
Clackamas		2	3	3	2	7	3	2	1	1	1	3		2	
Clatsop					2			2		3	2	1	3	1	
Columbia		1													
Coos		2	2	1				2							
Crook	5	10	1	4	5	3	1		1	2	19	25	34	18	12
Curry			3											2	
Deschutes		2		3	1	3	3	1			33	57	45	35	28
Douglas	7	3	5	5	3	2	3	3	3	3	31	18	54	26	18
Gilliam			1	1				1							
Grant	1		2	3		2		2	1	1	3	2		1	2
Harney	6	8	10	7	7		10	6	2	1	5	13	17	11	4
Hood River	5	3				1	2	3	3				11	1	1
Jackson	5	3	3	3	5	6	5	2	8	4	17	20	18	9	6
Jefferson	6	1	4	2	3			9	1	1			3	1	2
Josephine											1		1	2	1
Klamath		17	13	5		3				1	10	13	5	5	2
Lake	14	8		2							40	31		21	10
Lane	2			1			1				3	1	1	4	7
Lincoln				1					1	1	1		1	2	
Linn	1	1	1			1		2	2		4	1	3		1
Malheur	3	1	9		4	1	1	3	6	2	12	14	11	8	5
Marion	1	4	2	1	3	4	2		3		1	7	4	1	1
Morrow	2	1	1	1	1			1			2	2	3	6	2
Multnomah	1					2		3							
Polk	5	3	7	1	2	1		2		3	3	1			
Sherman					1								2		
Tillamook			1	1	1					1			1		1
Umatilla	1		5	3	3	2	3	5	3		6	2	4	9	7
Union	4	4	2	2	2	3		2	4	1	2		6		1
Wallowa		2	3	2	2	3	3	4	3		2	2	3	3	1
Wasco	6	2	2	1	4	1	1		1	1	3	3	3		2
Washington	5	11	3	10	1	1		3	1	1	3	1	5	8	1
Wheeler				5	2			1		1	5	5	4	5	2
Yamhill		13	3	3	4		4	2	2		2	2	2		1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>118</b>

**FARM AND NON-FARM  
LAND DIVISION APPROVALS**

**2009 Table I**

County	Resulting Farm Parcels							Resulting Non-Farm Parcels						
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Baker		7	12	10	2	2	1		11	1	2	4		
Benton	1	2		3	1		1	1			4	5		1
Clackamas		2		2										1
Clatsop						1					1	3		
Columbia														
Coos									2			13		
Crook	12	23	11	10	5	7	1	21	22	4	13	27	3	1
Curry	4							1				1	1	
Deschutes	17	13	6		1	2	1	43	24	15	22	28	21	16
Douglas	21	19	27	8	5	8	4	16	8	31	40	43	22	18
Gilliam	2		9	2		3	2	2		1	2		4	
Grant	17	8	19	4	10	6	1	10	6	7	3	14	1	
Harney	7	6	36	4	13	25	6	5	4		5	11	3	
Hood River														
Jackson				1		1	1				2	5	1	4
Jefferson	10	4		1	14		3	1			3			
Josephine			1				1			2				
Klamath		6	2	7	7	8	1	1	14	7	10	3	3	1
Lake	17	8	7	3		2	2	15	20	28	24		5	3
Lane			4							1	3		4	3
Lincoln														
Linn	7	5	7	3	7	3		3	1	3		6	1	1
Malheur	1			1		1		1			9			2
Marion	1	1	3	3	2		2	1	1	1	1	4	1	
Morrow	6	5	7	3	4	2	5	7	1		8	3	6	6
Multnomah						1					1	1		
Polk	11	3	9	7	6	4	3	1		3	11	10		3
Sherman	1	10	4	1		2	2	1	4		3	5		1
Tillamook						1							2	1
Umatilla	3	8	13	6	7	10	6	1	6	6	7	13	7	11
Union		4	5	5	8	4	2				5	3	2	
Wallowa	17	7	4	2	2	5	1	10	4	2	7	1	3	4
Wasco	5	5	5	7	2		5	1	5	1	6	2	1	2
Washington			1	2					2	1				
Wheeler			2	2	8	4	4			2	6	3	4	4
Yamhill	4			4	2	4	1							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>83</b>

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

**2009 Table J**

County	Farm Divisions			Non Farm Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker	1		1			
Benton	1		1	1		1
Clackamas				1		1
Clatsop						
Columbia						
Coos						
Crook	1		1	1		1
Curry						
Deschutes	1		1	12		16
Douglas	4		4	10		18
Gilliam	2		2			
Grant	1		1			
Harney	4		6			
Hood River						
Jackson	1		1	3		4
Jefferson	2		3			
Josephine	1		1			
Klamath	1		1	1		1
Lake	2	2	2	3	1	3
Lane				2		3
Lincoln						
Linn				1		1
Malheur				2		2
Marion	2		2			
Morrow	4		5	4		6
Multnomah						
Polk	2		3	2		3
Sherman	1		2	1		1
Tillamook				1		1
Umatilla	4		6	8		11
Union	2		2			
Wallowa	1		1	4		4
Wasco	4		5	1		2
Washington						
Wheeler	3		4	4		4
Yamhill	1	1	1			
<b>Totals</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>83</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	82	1	106	71	0	95
2007	77	0	106	142	11	208
2006	84	1	101	148	6	198

**NEW FARM PARCELS BY SIZE**

**2009 Table K**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 to 159	160 & Over	
Baker						1		1
Benton						1		1
Clackamas								
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook						1		1
Curry								
Deschutes						1		1
Douglas						2	2	4
Gilliam						1	1	2
Grant					1			1
Harney						1	5	6
Hood River								
Jackson							1	1
Jefferson							3	3
Josephine						1		1
Klamath						1		1
Lake						1	1	2
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur								
Marion						1	1	2
Morrow						1	4	5
Multnomah								
Polk						3		3
Sherman							2	2
Tillamook								
Umatilla						4	2	6
Union							2	2
Wallowa							1	1
Wasco							5	5
Washington								
Wheeler						1	3	4
Yamhill							1	1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>56</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	1	1	2	1	5	29	67	106
2007	0	0	1	4	5	96	0	100
2006	0	1	0	0	1	98	0	101

**NEW NON-FARM PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2009 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							
Benton				1			1
Clackamas			1				1
Clatsop							
Columbia							
Coos							
Crook						1	1
Curry							
Deschutes		5	4	3	4		16
Douglas		16	2				18
Gilliam							
Grant							
Harney							
Hood River							
Jackson		4					4
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath		1					1
Lake		3					3
Lane		3					3
Lincoln							
Linn		1					1
Malheur		1		1			2
Marion							
Morrow		2	3	1			6
Multnomah							
Polk		1			2		3
Sherman		1					1
Tillamook		1					1
Umatilla		6	1	2	1	1	11
Union							
Wallowa		2		1	1		4
Wasco				2			2
Washington							
Wheeler				2	1	1	4
Yamhill							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>83</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	0	47	11	19	12	6	95
2007	0	131	28	22	13	14	208
2006	0	90	52	26	18	12	198

**OTHER USES APPROVED ON LAND ZONED  
FOR FARM USE**

**2009 Table M**

Use	Number of Approvals							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Accessory Use	25	30	34	21	38	91	68	35
Airstrip	6	3	2	6	3	7	2	1
Bed and Breakfast	7	3	2	4			2	6
Church	3		3	7	1	3	2	2
Commercial Activity w/ Farm Use	3	8	7	10	14	17	8	14
Commercial Power Generating**							1	8
Destination Resort							1	
Dog Kennel	2	4	8	6	4	2	5	1
Farm Processing Facility**							8	5
Farm Related Building**							92	108
Farm Stand	6	5	5	2	3	1	4	8
Golf Course	3		1				1	
Guest Ranch					2	1	1	2
Home Occupation	14	24	18	18	19	18	27	20
Mineral & Aggregate	20	21	8	10	6	12	19	19
Other Use							55	24
Private Park	16	12	5	2	2	2	7	5
Public Park**							3	
Roads and Improvements	11	9	12	8	17	10	13	5
School	1		1	1	1		2	1
Telecommunication Facility*					14	13	22	23
Transmission Towers over 200 Ft							3	
Utility Facility	1	34	22	30	25	17	50	30
Wind Energy Facility (Commercial)**							11	6
Winery	14	7	6	6	5	9	7	8
<b>Totals</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>331</b>

New categories in 2006\*, 2008\*\*

**DWELLING APPROVALS  
ON FOREST LAND**

**2009 Table N**

<b>County</b>	<b>Low Production</b>	<b>Medium Production</b>	<b>High Production</b>	<b>Public Road</b>	<b>Sixty Plus Acres</b>	<b>Template Totals</b>	<b>Large Tract</b>	<b>Lot of Record</b>	<b>Grand Totals</b>
Baker									
Benton		1	2	2		3			3
Clackamas	1	1	11	1	1	13	1	1	15
Clatsop					1	1		6	7
Columbia			13	10		13			13
Coos			4	1		4			4
Crook									
Curry							7		7
Deschutes			2	2		2	1		3
Douglas	2		5	7		7	4		11
Gilliam									
Grant							1		1
Harney									
Hood River			3	2	1	3		1	4
Jackson	2	3	4	8	1	9	6	1	16
Jefferson									
Josephine		1	2	3		3			3
Klamath	2		1	1	2	3	2		5
Lake									
Lane	1	2	30	31		33			33
Lincoln			1	1	1	2		1	3
Linn		1	2	1		3			3
Malheur									
Marion									
Morrow			1	1		1	1		2
Multnomah			3	3		3			3
Polk			10	7	2	10	2		12
Sherman									
Tillamook			2			2			2
Umatilla									
Union			1	1		1	1		2
Wallowa							2		2
Wasco									
Washington			6	5		6		1	7
Wheeler									
Yamhill			13	12	1	13	4		17
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>178</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	14	17	151	94	12	197	19	27	243
2007	13	10	175	40	12	250	22	46	318
2006	22	15	184	41	11	273	16	34	323

**FOREST TEMPLATE DWELLINGS BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 Table O**

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								
Benton			2		1			3
Clackamas			1	5	3	3	1	13
Clatsop			1					1
Columbia		3	3	6	1			13
Coos		1	2				1	4
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes			1		1			2
Douglas		2	2	1	1		1	7
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney								
Hood River		2	1					3
Jackson		2	2	1	2	1	1	9
Jefferson								
Josephine			1	1	1			3
Klamath						2	1	3
Lake								
Lane		6	15	4	2	4	2	33
Lincoln				1			1	2
Linn			1	1	1			3
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow		1						1
Multnomah		1			2			3
Polk		3	1	2	2	2		10
Sherman								
Tillamook					2			2
Umatilla								
Union			1					1
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington			2	1	1	2		6
Wheeler								
Yamhill			1	6	4	2		13
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>135</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	3	54	32	55	32	17	4	197
2007	0	76	45	57	46	18	8	250
2006	0	74	54	66	44	26	9	273

**LOT-OF-RECORD FOREST DWELLINGS  
BY PARCEL SIZE**

**2009 Table P**

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								
Benton								
Clackamas					1			1
Clatsop		3		2	1			6
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes								
Douglas								
Gilliam								
Grant								
Harney								
Hood River						1		1
Jackson			1					1
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath								
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln			1					1
Linn								
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk								
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union								
Wallowa								
Wasco								
Washington			1					1
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	3	5	7	4	2	4	2	27
2007	0	7	10	13	6	7	3	46
2006	0	9	7	6	7	1	4	34

**FOREST OWNERSHIPS  
ADJACENT TO DWELLING APPROVALS**

**2009 Table Q**

County	Total Template and Lot of Record Dwellings	Adjacent Ownerships			Private Industrial
		USFS	BLM	State	
Baker					
Benton	3				1
Clackamas	14				
Clatsop	7			1	4
Columbia	13				3
Coos	4				
Crook					
Curry					
Deschutes	2		1		
Douglas	7		1		1
Gilliam					
Grant					
Harney					
Hood River	4				
Jackson	10		5		2
Jefferson					
Josephine	3		2		
Klamath	3	1			
Lake					
Lane	33	4			2
Lincoln	3				2
Linn	3				
Malheur					
Marion					
Morrow	1				
Multnomah	3				1
Polk	10				
Sherman					
Tillamook	2	1			2
Umatilla					
Union	1				
Wallowa					
Wasco					
Washington	7				1
Wheeler					
Yamhill	13				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	224	3	20	3	16
2007	296	7	5	3	24
2006	307	5	10	0	22

**FOREST  
HARDSHIP AND REPLACEMENT DWELLING  
APPROVALS**

**2009 Table R**

County	Temporary Hardship	Replacement Dwellings
Baker		
Benton	1	
Clackamas	5	
Clatsop	1	4
Columbia	2	7
Coos	1	2
Crook		
Curry		
Deschutes		2
Douglas	4	13
Gilliam		
Grant		1
Harney		
Hood River		3
Jackson	3	3
Jefferson		
Josephine		
Klamath		3
Lake		
Lane	4	4
Lincoln		
Linn	4	
Malheur		
Marion	1	1
Morrow		1
Multnomah	2	1
Polk	2	3
Sherman		
Tillamook	1	1
Umatilla		2
Union		2
Wallowa		2
Wasco		
Washington		8
Wheeler		
Yamhill	1	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>65</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	22	88
2007	32	90
2006	20	121

**DWELLING APPROVALS ON FOREST LAND  
TOTALS BY YEAR**

**2009 Table S**

<b>New Permanent Dwellings (Excludes Replacement and Hardship)</b>											
<b>County</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
Baker	1	5	2						3	1	
Benton	2	5	2	4	3	1	2	3	1	5	3
Clackamas	50	41	50	16	30	51	30	35	34	19	15
Clatsop	6	5	6	5	4	7	4	4	9	1	7
Columbia	33	35	32	40	16	12	24	25	16	17	13
Coos	10	14	17	15	23	31	19	14	33	15	4
Crook					1	1	1				
Curry	2	5	14	9	13	40	18	7	6	8	7
Deschutes	9	13	6	3	1	2	3	5	6	3	3
Douglas	2	6	10	5	7	4	15	39	23	15	11
Gilliam						1					
Grant	6	6	10	4	8		4	1	5	2	1
Harney											
Hood River	7	7	8	4	2	1	1	2	3	5	4
Jackson	78	45	57	42	52	52	40	32	24	22	16
Jefferson										2	
Josephine	13	12	28	14	18	22	29	8	18	8	3
Klamath	14	9	20	9	15	15	16	10	9	8	5
Lake											
Lane	45	48	67	39	40	24	38	33	17	49	33
Lincoln	12	7	15	12	8	11	14	11	11	9	3
Linn	12	7	8	5	11	14	10	11	23	11	3
Malheur											
Marion	5	6	8	2	7	5	3	5	3		
Morrow	4	3	1	1	1	1		4	6		2
Multnomah	4	2	1	8	1		5	3	1	4	3
Polk	2	22	20	12	13	15	16	20	28	13	12
Sherman											
Tillamook	2	3	5	1	3	4	3	2	5	3	2
Umatilla			2	1	1		2	1	6	1	
Union	5	4	3	2	9	7	3	6	2	5	2
Wallowa	2	5	3	3	1	4	2	5	1	3	2
Wasco			1						1		
Washington	10	4	6	8	8	23	13	19	12	2	7
Wheeler			1								
Yamhill	3	22	4	2	7	13	16	18	12	12	17
<b>Totals</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>178</b>

**FOREST AND NON-FOREST  
LAND DIVISION ACTIONS**

**2009 Table T**

County	Forest Divisions			Non Forest Divisions		
	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels	Decisions Approved	Decisions Denied	New Parcels
Baker						
Benton	1		1			
Clackamas	1		2	4		5
Clatsop				2		3
Columbia				2		2
Coos						
Crook						
Curry						
Deschutes	1		2			
Douglas	5		5	2		3
Gilliam						
Grant	1		1			
Harney						
Hood River						
Jackson	2		3			
Jefferson						
Josephine						
Klamath	2		2			
Lake						
Lane				2		3
Lincoln				1		1
Linn				1		1
Malheur						
Marion						
Morrow						
Multnomah						
Polk	2		2			
Sherman						
Tillamook				3		4
Umatilla						
Union	2		3			
Wallowa	1		1			
Wasco				1		1
Washington	1		1			
Wheeler						
Yamhill						
<b>Totals</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	32	0	45	13	0	15
2007	24	2	32	45	7	60
2006	32	0	49	43	1	54

**NEW FOREST PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2009 Table U**

County	Size Not Reported	Parcel Size by Acreage						Totals
		0 to 10	11 to 20	21 to 40	41 to 79	80 & 159	160 & Over	
Baker								
Benton							1	1
Clackamas							2	2
Clatsop								
Columbia								
Coos								
Crook								
Curry								
Deschutes						1	1	2
Douglas						1	4	5
Gilliam								
Grant						1		1
Harney								
Hood River								
Jackson						1	2	3
Jefferson								
Josephine								
Klamath		1					1	2
Lake								
Lane								
Lincoln								
Linn								
Malheur								
Marion								
Morrow								
Multnomah								
Polk						1	1	2
Sherman								
Tillamook								
Umatilla								
Union							3	3
Wallowa							1	1
Wasco								
Washington						1		1
Wheeler								
Yamhill								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23</b>

2008	0	2	3	0	1	11	28	45
2007	0	1	3	3	1	24	0	32
2006	0	0	0	2	2	45	0	49

**NEW NON-FOREST PARCELS  
BY SIZE**

**2009 Table V**

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							
Benton							
Clackamas		4			1		5
Clatsop		3					3
Columbia		1	1				2
Coos							
Crook							
Curry							
Deschutes							
Douglas		1	1		1		3
Gilliam							
Grant							
Harney							
Hood River							
Jackson							
Jefferson							
Josephine							
Klamath							
Lake							
Lane		3					3
Lincoln		1					1
Linn		1					1
Malheur							
Marion							
Morrow							
Multnomah							
Polk							
Sherman							
Tillamook		3	1				4
Umatilla							
Union							
Wallowa							
Wasco			1				1
Washington							
Wheeler							
Yamhill							
<b>Totals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>

Previous Years Totals

2008	0	10	0	1	3	1	15
2007	0	41	10	5	1	3	60
2006	0	37	4	4	6	3	54

**OTHER USES  
APPROVED ON LAND ZONED  
FOR FOREST USE**

**2009 Table W**

Use	Number of Approvals							
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Accessory Use	11	16	9	8	22	33	11	19
Bed and Breakfast	1						1	
Church				1				
Commercial Activity with Forest					1	4	3	
Dog Kennel					1	5		
Commercial Power Generating Facility**								2
Destination Resort								
Farm Exempt Building		2	1	9	14	6		
Farm Related Building**							17	24
Farm Use		1		9	2	13		
Fishing and Hunting Accommodations								3
Forest Processing Facility								
Home Occupation	1	2	7	6	7	4	12	8
Mineral & Aggregate	4	6	12	2	9	9	7	18
Natural Gas Facility					1	1		
NonConforming Use	2	1	9		14	1		
Other Uses							44	9
Private Park	2	5	6	2	2	4	3	3
Public Facility				1	4	10		
Public Park**							1	2
Roads and Improvements	2	2	1	3	7	8	8	1
Telecommunication Facility*					18	12	18	12
School	1		1	2				
Transmission Tower Over 200 Feet								
Utility Facility	15	19	21	25	10	1	13	9
Youth Camp	1		1	2	2		2	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>110</b>

New Categories in 2006\*, 2008\*\*

**PLAN AMENDMENT DATA**

**2009 Table X**

**Farm and Forest Land moved into  
Urban Growth Boundaries by Calendar Year**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Use From Agriculture</b>	<b>Use From Forest</b>
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	55	17,545	3,281 acres (19.0%)	1,659 acres (9.5%)
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%)
2008	6	972	949 acres (98.0%)	0 acres (0.0%)
2009	7	782	686 acres (88.0%)	4 acres (10.0%)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>46,680</b>	<b>16,467 from Ag. (35.0%)</b>	<b>3,140 from Forest (1.0%)</b>

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

**2009 Table Y**

<b>From Agriculture</b>	<b>To EFU</b>	<b>To Forest</b>	<b>To Commercial</b>	<b>To Industrial*</b>	<b>To Residential</b>	<b>SubTotal*</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
<b>1989 - 1996</b>	7,256	1,416	552	544	2,648	3,744	12,416
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
2008		73	79	10	1,011	1,100	1,173
2009	53	459	6	375	396	777	1,289
<b>Totals</b>	<b>947,828</b>	<b>5,984</b>	<b>1,286</b>	<b>5,191</b>	<b>11,912</b>	<b>18,389</b>	<b>972,201</b>

<b>From Forestry</b>	<b>To EFU</b>	<b>To Forest</b>	<b>To Commercial</b>	<b>To Industrial*</b>	<b>To Residential</b>	<b>SubTotal*</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
<b>1989 - 1996</b>	8,136	36,254	16	208	3,072	3,296	47,686
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
2008	131	509	3	212	5	220	860
2009		27		56	2,451	2,507	2,534
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>37,693</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>8,770</b>	<b>9,455</b>	<b>56,112</b>

Shaded Area: rezoned resource to development zones

\*Mineral and Aggregate designations are counted as Industrial

**FARM AND FOREST LAND  
REZONED TO OTHER USES**

**2009 Table Z**

County	Exclusive Farm Use				Forest & Farm-Forest				Total Rural/ Urban
	To Forest	To Rural	To Urban	Sub Total	To EFU	To Rural	To Urban	Sub Total	
Baker									
Benton		34		34					34
Clackamas		6		6					6
Clatsop		5		5		17		17	22
Columbia						28		28	28
Coos						36		36	36
Crook		275		275					275
Curry									
Deschutes							4	4	4
Douglas									
Gilliam									
Grant									
Harney									
Hood River									
Jackson						342		342	342
Jefferson		92		92					92
Josephine									
Klamath		14		14		2,010		2,010	2,024
Lake									
Lane									
Lincoln	30								
Linn		216		216		43		43	259
Malheur			68	68					68
Marion		6		6					6
Morrow		49		49					49
Multnomah									
Polk			353	353					353
Sherman									
Tillamook									
Umatilla		80		80					80
Union									
Wallowa			244	244					244
Wasco						8		8	8
Washington	429								
Wheeler									
Yamhill			21	21		23		23	44
<b>Totals</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>777</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>1,463</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,507</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2,511</b>	<b>3,974</b>

**CHANGES IN FARM AND FOREST LAND COVER**

**2009 Table Z-1**

County	Farm and Range			Forest & Farm-Forest		
	1984*	2009*	Converted Acres	1984*	2009*	Converted Acres
Baker	748	748	<500 (0%)	122	122	<500 (0%)
Benton	112	111	1000 (1%)	211	209	2000 (1%)
Clackamas	123	115	8000 (7%)	313	304	9000 (3%)
Clatsop	15	15	<500 (0%)	486	484	2000 (0%)
Columbia	44	44	<500 (0%)	343	342	1000 (0%)
Coos	42	40	2000 (5%)	675	669	6000 (1%)
Crook	785	768	17000 (2%)	106	106	<500 (0%)
Curry	14	14	<500 (0%)	319	317	2000 (1%)
Deschutes	249	224	25000 (10%)	98	87	11000 (11%)
Douglas	116	115	1000 (1%)	1,380	1,367	13000 (1%)
Gilliam	622	622	<500 (0%)	-	-	-
Grant	845	845	<500 (0%)	313	313	<500 (0%)
Harney	1,660	1,659	1000 (0%)	30	30	<500 (0%)
Hood River	28	28	<500 (0%)	81	80	1000 (1%)
Jackson	75	70	5000 (7%)	733	724	9000 (1%)
Jefferson	576	573	3000 (1%)	230	227	3000 (1%)
Josephine	17	17	<500 (0%)	247	239	8000 (3%)
Klamath	693	677	16000 (2%)	745	730	16000 (3%)
Lake	894	894	<500 (0%)	376	376	<500 (0%)
Lane	153	145	8000 (5%)	870	861	8000 (1%)
Lincoln	2	2	<500 (0%)	398	393	5000 (1%)
Linn	360	358	2000 (1%)	503	502	1000 (0%)
Malheur	1,489	1,488	1000 (0%)	5	5	<500 (0%)
Marion	299	286	13000 (4%)	170	168	2000 (1%)
Morrow	950	948	2000 (0%)	90	87	3000 (3%)
Multnomah	25	18	7000 (28%)	64	62	2000 (3%)
Polk	172	168	4000 (2%)	237	236	1000 (0%)
Sherman	473	473	<500 (0%)	-	-	-
Tillamook	32	32	<500 (0%)	516	514	2000 (0%)
Umatilla	1,324	1,318	6000 (0%)	261	261	<500 (0%)
Union	416	414	2000 (0%)	282	282	<500 (0%)
Wallowa	503	503	2000 (0%)	331	331	<500 (0%)
Wasco	904	904	<500 (0%)	285	285	<500 (0%)
Washington	134	119	15000 (11%)	256	246	10000 (4%)
Wheeler	553	553	<500 (0%)	199	199	<500 (0%)
Yamhill	184	178	6000 (3%)	197	193	4000 (2%)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>15,631.00</b>	<b>15,486.00</b>	<b>147,000+</b>	<b>11,472.00</b>	<b>11,351.00</b>	<b>121,000+</b>

\*by Thousand acres

Source: Oregon Department of Forestry

Note: Data applies to Non-Federal lands only

**MEASURE 37- 49  
AUTHORIZATION**

**2009 Table Z-2**

<b>County</b>	<b>Home Site Authorizations</b>	<b>New Dwellings</b>	<b>New Parcels</b>
Baker	145	112	54
Benton	125	90	53
Clackamas	1,687	1,145	802
Clatsop	74	51	33
Columbia	123	87	60
Coos	246	180	103
Crook	57	42	26
Curry	123	96	46
Deschutes	210	135	96
Douglas	306	201	142
Gilliam	0	0	0
Grant	9	5	5
Harney	0	0	0
Hood River	287	163	112
Jackson	650	434	298
Jefferson	215	182	111
Josephine	183	132	98
Klamath	234	193	76
Lake	3	1	1
Lane	627	447	277
Lincoln	142	109	49
Linn	463	327	214
Malheur	25	17	10
Marion	503	355	220
Morrow	0	0	0
Multnomah	105	79	36
Polk	424	305	184
Sherman	0	0	0
Tillamook	90	70	41
Umatilla	68	55	30
Union	41	27	19
Wallowa	76	61	37
Wasco	59	44	21
Washington	820	589	379
Wheeler	0	0	0
Yamhill	551	389	238
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8,671</b>	<b>6,123</b>	<b>3,871</b>