

7.2.2 Goal 3 - Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule - Agricultural Land Definition - Soil Classes. *Flury v. Land Use Board*, 50 Or App 263, 623 P2d 671 (1981) cited and relied on *Meyer v. Lord*, 37 Or App 59, 586 P2d 367 (1978) in holding that the “predominant soils class” prong of the Goal 3 definition of agricultural lands may be applied to a portion of a parcel. *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 50 Or LUBA 71 (2005).

7.2.2 Goal 3 - Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule - Agricultural Land Definition - Soil Classes. OAR 660-033-0030(2), which describes how the predominant soils class prong of the Goal 3 agricultural land definition is to be applied when inventorying agricultural land, assumes that the inventories will consider whole lots and parcels rather than portions of lots or parcels. *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 50 Or LUBA 71 (2005).

7.2.2 Goal 3 - Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule - Agricultural Land Definition - Soil Classes. At the time LCDC adopted OAR 660-033-0030(2), which describes how the predominant soils class prong of the Goal 3 agricultural land definition is to be applied when inventorying agricultural land, it also adopted OAR 660-033-0030(4)(c)(B)(i) to expressly state that the “generally unsuitable lands” nonfarm dwelling standard may be applied to a “lot or parcel or portion of a lot or parcel.” Because LCDC did not also make it clear that the inventory required by OAR 660-033-0030(2) could apply the predominant soils class prong of the Goal 3 agricultural land definition to portions of existing parcels, that prong must be applied to entire parcels and may not be applied to a portion of a parcel. *Wetherell v. Douglas County*, 50 Or LUBA 71 (2005).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. A local government may rely on portions of two conflicting expert studies of soil classifications, although explanatory findings may be necessary to identify what portions are relied upon, and to resolve any differences or contradictions between the studies relied upon, so that LUBA may perform its review function. *Doob v. Josephine County*, 48 Or LUBA 227 (2004).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. Land that qualifies as “agricultural land” based on soil classification cannot be classified as something other than agricultural land based on existing land use patterns or other factors listed in the definition of “agricultural land” that serve to include lands within the definition of agricultural land that do not otherwise qualify based on the soils classifications. *Friends of Yamhill County v. Yamhill County*, 47 Or LUBA 508 (2004).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. Common ownership with adjacent agricultural lands is an indication that the parcel is part of a farm unit, as that term is used in OAR 660-033-0020(1); however, it is not determinative. *Riggs v. Douglas County*, 37 Or LUBA 432 (1999).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. LUBA will not conclude that the statutory definition of high-value soils excludes soil complexes in which listed soils form the predominant part, where petitioner fails to establish a sufficient basis to form that conclusion. *Tri-River Investment Co. v. Clatsop County*, 37 Or LUBA 195 (1999).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. LUBA must affirm a decision denying a permit to site a dog kennel prohibited on high-value farmland, where petitioner fails to challenge the county's alternative finding that the subject property is high-value farmland because it is predominantly composed of a combination of two high-value soils. *Tri-River Investment Co. v. Clatsop County*, 37 Or LUBA 195 (1999).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. Under the agricultural lands definition, in western Oregon, Class V soils, when intermingled with Class IV soils, are not presumed to be nonagricultural, nor is the presence of Class V soils determinative, in itself, as to whether land is generally unsuitable for farm use. *Evenson v. Jackson County*, 36 Or LUBA 251 (1999).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. Where a county finds that the subject property's soils constitute "high-value farmland" as that concept is defined by statute, but there is no evidence in the record that supports that ultimate conclusion, the decision must be remanded. *Corp. of Presiding Bishop v. Klamath County*, 34 Or LUBA 131 (1998).

7.2.2 Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands/ Goal 3 Rule – Agricultural Land Definition – Soil Classes. In determining whether land subject to a proposed comprehensive plan and zone map change is composed of predominantly Class I-IV soils, as required by OAR 660-33-020(1)(a)(A), it is permissible for a local government to examine only the acreage under consideration. *DLCD v. Curry County*, 28 Or LUBA 205 (1994).