



Sustaining Quality of Life in the Southern Willamette Valley

Region 2050 Alternative Growth Scenarios Evaluation: Farm and Forest Lands Draft June 14, 2005

This summary evaluates the extent to which each scenario meets the Regional Objectives for the commercial farm and forest industries.

Background

This evaluation of the alternative scenarios was performed in order to help decision-makers in the Region 2050 process develop and agree on a Preferred Growth Scenario.

On January 3, 2005, the Lane County Board of Commissioners appointed a Farm and Forest Lands Task Force to: (1) evaluate the alternative growth scenarios and, (2) to identify any lands that are part of the commercial farm and forest base in the Preferred Growth Scenario. The evaluation in this report pertains to the first charge of the Task Force – to evaluate the potential impacts of the three alternative growth scenarios on the commercial farm and forest base.

Once the Draft Preferred Growth Scenario is prepared in early 2006, the Task Force will be reconvened to perform the second part of its charge, i.e., the more formal function of identifying impacts to any lands in the commercial farm or forest base that are identified in the scenario as future growth areas. This part of the Task Force's charge is a required component of Collaborative Regional Problem Solving if these lands are included in the future growth areas, as spelled out in Oregon Revised Statute 197.652-658.¹ Consistent with this process, the Regional Growth Management Strategy will

¹ *Oregon Revised Statutes 197.656*

(6) *If, in order to resolve regional land use problems, the participants in a collaborative regional problem-solving process decide to devote agricultural land or forestland, as defined in the statewide planning goals, to uses not authorized by those goals, the participants shall choose land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, or take an exception to those goals pursuant to ORS 197.732. To identify land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, the participants shall consider the recommendation of a committee of persons appointed by the affected county, with expertise in appropriate fields, including but not limited to farmers, ranchers, foresters and soils scientists and representatives of the State Department of Agriculture, the State Department of Forestry and the Department of Land Conservation and Development.*

contain findings to support exceptions to Statewide Planning Goals 3 and/or 4 in order to include lands in the commercial farm or forest base in UGB expansion areas, Urban Reserves, or in other areas targeted for new development. After the Strategy is adopted by the local governments and the Land Conservation and Development Commission, no further goal exceptions will be needed for city or county comprehensive plan amendments that demonstrate consistency with the adopted Strategy.

Summary of Findings

- Lands north of the Eugene UGB are prime agricultural lands and need to be the highest priority for preserving the region's agriculture commercial base. The Pleasant Hill area was ranked as second most important, the McKenzie valley as third, and the Mohawk valley as fourth. The floodplain is relatively narrow in the Mohawk Valley.
- The Alvadore and Goshen areas are good places to locate new urban development.
- Increases in the wildland-urban land interface are likely to increase the cost for fire protection services. It is extremely important to consider the fire condition class in the analysis. The ability of land to resist fire contributes to its ability to produce. Conflicts between limited resources and priority of crop and timber over buildings in a wildfire becomes a greater issue when more people live adjacent to farm and forest lands.
- Water availability is a key concern for commercial farm and forest lands.
- The most difficult and significant factor affecting commercial farm and forest lands is neighbors. More people equates to:
 - more fires;
 - more vandalism;
 - more impact to wildlife;
 - more noxious weeds;
 - more complaints about farm and forest management practices.
- Much of the lower classed lands switch back and forth between farm and forest use depending on property owners and marketplace.
- There are no incentives for maintaining agricultural productivity on the land for the long term once residential development occurs.
- There is a difference between the agricultural lands that constitute the region's commercial base and small-scale agriculture. Small-scale agriculture should not be overlooked simply because it is not as profitable as large-scale, mechanized agriculture.

- Include a substantial resource land use education component to the Region 2050 process.

Methodology

The Task Force met for a three hour meeting on June 6 to evaluate the scenarios. A general presentation/question and answer session was followed by small group exercises using an expert panel process. The Task Force split into two groups – one to evaluate the farm impacts of the scenarios and one to evaluate the forest impacts.

The interactive map overlay process began with two sets of overlays and resource maps showing the farm lands and forest lands. The maps displayed soil classes on currently zoned agricultural lands and forest lands, and the three Alternative Growth Scenarios printed on Mylar overlays. The overlays showed where Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansions would take place and where rural residential development would occur outside of the UGBs for each of the three Alternative Growth Scenarios.

Assumptions

- Soil quality, parcel size, fire risk, compatibility with adjacent uses, and potential (rather than existing) use of the resource lands were considered in the evaluation of the value of farm and forest lands to the commercial base.

Criteria

The evaluation measures the extent to which each scenario satisfies the following applicable Regional Objectives.

Objectives

Land Use and Development Objective #5:

5. Maintain rural community identities and protect productive farm and forest lands.

Natural Resources and the Environment Objective #1:

1. Develop and implement a vision for regional natural resources and open space that protects and connects valuable farm and forest lands, wetlands, surface and ground water resources, wildlife habitat, and opportunities for recreation.

Jobs and the Economy Objective #6:

6. Promote management of resource lands, including agriculture and forest, in a manner that maximizes the long-term return for the local economy and maintains the long-term health of the resource lands.

Farm Industry: Alternative Scenarios Analysis

Compact Urban Growth would have the least impacts on the farm base, the Satellite Communities would be second, and the Rural Growth Scenario would have the greatest impacts on commercially-viable agricultural lands in the region.

Compact Urban Growth

- Goshen was indicated as a good spot to locate growth because it is already heavily impacted. The area to the south and west of Pleasant Hill could include more development, especially along the Highway 58 Corridor.
- The primary Willamette Valley agricultural industrial land begins north of Eugene and it is absolutely critical to contain growth and prevent it from spreading northward. The group indicated that some of the land east of Coburg could be developed without negative impacts to the agricultural industry.
- Most of the producers in the Mohawk Valley are small-scale ranchers and the land is already divided into many smaller parcels. There is not enough water up the Mohawk Valley to support large-scale agricultural operations and large, contiguous single ownership lands do not exist to support commercial agriculture. The floodplain is relatively narrow in the Mohawk Valley. The finger valleys in the region are already highly parcelized and growth is constrained by steep slopes, lessening the viability of large-scale agriculture in these areas.

Satellite Communities Scenario

- The edge effect could marginalize agricultural land when small communities incorporate and residential areas expand into previously productive farmlands.
- The land north of Eugene is not greatly impacted by the Satellite Growth Scenario. This area currently contains the most productive soils in the Southern Willamette Valley and should be a top priority for preservation as agricultural land.
- Land northwest of Fern Ridge Reservoir is an area where development should be directed, although the issue of water availability is a major concern in the area. It would be desirable to locate residential growth near Alvadore because the impact on the agriculture commercial base is minimal.

- Growth east of Springfield would have minimal impact on agricultural lands as well, due to the parcelization and marginality of that land for farms. The fringes separating residential land from agricultural should be industrial or low-density housing to minimize the 'edge effect' on large-scale agriculture.
- Compatibility between neighboring land uses is as big of a concern as conversion of land uses due to edge effect that creates conflicts.
- Goshen was indicated as a good spot to locate growth because it is already heavily impacted. The area to the south and west of Pleasant Hill could include more development, especially along the Highway 58 Corridor.

Rural Growth Scenario

- The group generally agreed that the Rural Growth Scenario would have a large impact on the agriculture commercial base in the region due to parcelization and farmland being converted to low-density rural residential growth.
- Parcelization and low-density rural development result in many domestic wells being drilled that are exempt from the water rights process. As residential areas develop wells and use groundwater, municipal, industrial and agricultural water rights are negatively impacted.
- There is not much overlap of rural residential development and prime agricultural lands, but much of the agricultural land would be affected by the edges created by new, low-density residential development.
- Land around the Eugene Airport is currently zoned agriculture and should be preserved because airports and industrial lands make better neighbors for farmers than residential development, although one farmer indicated a preference for housing over the airport adjacent to their farm.
- Land north of Coburg is being heavily impacted by residential development.
- Lands north of the Eugene UGB are prime agricultural lands and need to be a high priority for preserving the region's agriculture commercial base.
- There is productivity at some level for all lands in the region. For example, land not considered productive in the past because of soil quality is planted and harvested today. Water rights are a bigger issue for productivity than soil quality in some cases.
- Small-scale agriculture should not be overlooked simply because it is not as profitable as large-scale, mechanized agriculture. There is benefit in reconnecting people with the land to minimize harmful practices. Zoning that allows smaller acreages often succumbs to upscale residential development that

presents itself as small scale farming, which, in turn, increases property prices beyond what a true small-scale farm producer can afford.

- The floodplain is relatively narrow in the Mohawk Valley. The finger valleys in the region are already highly parcelized and growth is constrained by steep slopes, lessening the viability of large-scale agriculture in these areas.
- Subsistence farm lands could be situated on the fringes of more dense residential areas as a strategy to buffer large-scale agricultural operations from encroaching residential development. The two land use classifications, medium-density residential and/or small-scale subsistence agriculture land use classifications do not have to be mutually exclusive in order to maintain larger-scale commercial agriculture operations. The Mohawk River valley, the lower McKenzie River valley along Highway 126, and the lower Middle Fork Willamette River valley along Highway 58 would be appropriate areas to zone for and encourage subsistence and/or direct-marketing agricultural operations. There are no restrictions in the current laws or zoning that would prohibit this from happening today.
- The farm group came to consensus that the land north of Eugene is the highest contributor to the commercial base of the region. The Pleasant Hill area was ranked as second most important, the McKenzie valley is third, and the Mohawk valley is fourth. The Alvadore and Goshen areas are good places to locate new urban development.
- The group recommended focusing attention on areas where large tracts of land, more than 20 acres, exist. This land should be protected from parcelization.
- The split between urban and rural lands should be distinct. Stringent buffers are very important in maintaining commercial agriculture lands and protecting them from encroaching residential development.
- Consider revising the tax laws to ensure that landowners claiming to be agricultural producers for tax purposes are indeed maintaining agricultural use of the land.

Forest Industry: Alternative Scenarios Analysis

As wildland-urban land interface areas increase, the risk of fire to commercial forest lands increases; this would be a spectrum of impact from lower in the compact growth scenario to higher in the rural growth scenario.

Compact Growth Scenario

- Few impacts to F1/F2 were noted in this scenario.

Satellite Communities Scenario

- The Compact Growth and Satellite Communities Scenarios differ basically only by where UGB expansion occurs.
- The Satellite Growth Scenario was preferred over the Rural Growth Scenario because:
 - lower potential for wildfires
 - less people in the rural area so less complaints about forest practices (silviculture, burning, use of helicopters, spray, fertilization, trucking).
 - number of people per square mile is related to the number of fires and cost for fire services.
- Water availability is a limiting factor to the Satellite Growth Scenario.
- It could be an issue of concern if a small city were hemmed in by commercial forest land.
- The impact of certain UGB expansions would add complications to timber harvesting practices, e.g., Weyerhaeuser forest land resources in the Metro UGB.

Rural Growth Scenario

- Higher potential for wildfires.
- More people in the rural area so more complaints about forest practices (silviculture, burning, use of helicopters, spray, fertilization, trucking).
- Number of people per square mile is related to the number of fires and cost for fire services.
- F1 adjacent to RR would be an adverse impact. Some form of buffer would be needed between the uses.
- Could increase the potential for strip commercial development.
- Fire is a significant issue in this scenario especially south of Veneta near Crow. Pine/Oak forests will burn fast and there is limited fire response in the area.
- Dense (urban) development is much better than one to five acre lots for reducing fire impacts. Full utilization of the Lane Community College basin would be a lesser impact to forest lands than sprawling development in this rural area.
- Another potential impact would be the distance of the commercial forest lands from mills; costs such as trucking would grow as distance increases.

Appendix A

List of Farm and Forest Task Force Participants

Participants:

Rob Hallyburton, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)
Marguerite Nabeta, DLCD
Ross Penhallegon, Oregon State University Extension Service
Kevin Jones, Full Circle Farms
Andy Stahl Wellborn, Dancing Sheep Farm & Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics
Jim Johnson, Oregon Department of Agriculture
Rick Rogers, Oregon Department of Forestry
Jeanne L. Hunt, Weyerhaeuser
Stephen P. Mealey, Mealey Timber Company & Boise Cascade (retired)
Steve Woodard, Society of American Foresters
William L. Wynkoop, Seneca Jones Timber Co.

Staff:

Stephanie Schulz, Planner, Lane County Land Management Division
Carol Heinkel, LCOG, Region 2050 Project Manager
Bill Clingman, Senior GIS Analyst, LCOG
Scott Shine, LCOG Planner
Denise Walters, LCOG Planner



Appendix B: AGENDA FARM AND FOREST TASK FORCE

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE GROWTH SCENARIO'S and COMMERCIAL FARM AND FOREST LANDS

LOCATION: LCOG 4th floor conference room, Wells Fargo Building,
99 E. Broadway Avenue, Eugene

DATE: June 6, 2005

TIME: 12:00–4:30

AGENDA

12:00 –12:30	Lunch/Orientation Introductions Timeline for Task Force	All
12:30–12:35	Review/Revise Agenda	All
12:35–1:15	Background Regional Goals and Objectives Task Force Charge & Role	Marguerite and Carol
	GIS Orientation Resource Base Maps Alternative Growth Scenario's	Bill

	Assumptions for Analysis 'Coarse Screen' Review Products & Deliverables	Stephanie
1:15–2:00	Definitions	Farm Group Forest Group
2:00–2:15	Break	
2:15–3:30	Map Overlay Process to Determine 'Coarse Screen' Impacts	Farm Group Forest Group
3:30–4:15	Present Overlay Results to Other Task Force Group	All
4:15–4:30	Logistics for Presentation RTAC Regional Technical Assistance Committee (June 15, 2005; 1:30–3:00 pm LCOG 4th flr.) Region 2050 Policy Advisory Board (June 22, 2005; 5:30–8:30 pm EWEB N. Bldg.)	
4:30	Adjourn	

Next Meeting: Spring 2006; 'Preferred Alternative Analysis'

**Contacts: Marguerite Nabeta, Department of Land Conservation & Development, (541)682–3132; FAX (541)682–3947, marguerite.nabeta@DLCD.or.us.
Stephanie Schulz, Lane County Land Management Division, (541)682–3958, FAX (541) 682–3947, stephanie.schulz@co.lane.or.us;
Carol Heinkel, Senior Planner, Region 2050 Project Manager, LCOG (541)682–4107, FAX (541) 682–2635, cheinkel@lane.cog.or.us.**

Appendix C

Farm and Forest Task Force Meeting Notes

PRESENT:

Farm and Forest Task Force Members: Rob Hallyburton, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); Marguerite Nabeta, DLCD; Ross Penhallegon, Oregon State University Extension Service; Kevin Jones, Full Circle Farms; Andy Stahl Wellborn, Dancing Sheep Farm & Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics; Jim Johnson, Oregon Department of Agriculture; Rick Rogers, Oregon Department of Forestry; Jeanne L. Hunt, Weyerhaeuser; Stephen P. Mealey, Mealey Timber Company & Boise Cascade (retired); Steve Woodard, Society of American Foresters; William L. Wynkoop, Seneca Jones Timber Co.

Staff: Carol Heinkel, Project Manager; Bill Clingman, LCOG; Stephanie Schulz, Lane County Land Management Division; Scott Shine, LCOG, Denise Walters, LCOG.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting began at approximately 12:15 p.m. Ms. Schulz welcomed all to the meeting and asked for a round of introductions.

II. REVIEW/REVISE AGENDA

Ms. Schulz and Ms. Heinkel asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda. No revisions were requested.

III. BACKGROUND

Regional Goals and Objectives

Ms. Nabeta explained the Regional Problem Solving Process as outlined in the Oregon Revised Statute 197.652-658 and read the most relevant section to the group's mission:

Oregon Revised Statute 197.656

(6) If, in order to resolve regional land use problems, the participants in a collaborative regional problem-solving process decide to devote agricultural land or forestland, as defined in the statewide planning goals, to uses not authorized by those goals, the participants shall choose land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, or take an exception to those goals pursuant to ORS 197.732. To identify land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, the participants shall consider the recommendation of a committee of persons appointed by the affected county, with expertise in appropriate fields, including but not limited to farmers, ranchers, foresters and soils scientists and representatives of the State Department of Agriculture, the State Department of Forestry and the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

The Farm and Forest Task Force provides technical assistance to the Region 2050 Technical Advisory Committee and the Region 2050 Policy Board. Ms. Nabeta explained that state agencies are considered stakeholders in the process as witnessed by their representation on the task force. Ms. Nabeta also listed other key stakeholders such as the local jurisdictions who are also the implementing entities and are the members of the Policy Board.

Mr. Stahl asked why there are no school districts on the Policy Board. Ms. Nabeta responded that the school districts have provided input as a technical team which developed the evaluation of the alternative growth scenarios' impacts on education.

Mr. Stahl asked for clarification of the discrete problem the task force is to address. Ms. Nabeta replied that Ms. Heinkel will address the issue in her presentation. Ms. Nabeta went on to explain that the regional problem solving process was first initiated as a pilot project. Deschutes County was the only project to complete the entire process. Region 2050 is the first project utilizing the regional problem solving process that is not a pilot project; as such there are not many models from which to work.

Ms. Heinkel addressed the main issue with which Region 2050 is concerned: The region will grow. Where and how this growth will occur is yet to be determined. Region 2050 has been in process for five (5) years. Staff first developed a base case scenario which projected current growth patterns out to the year 2050. This base model was presented to the policy board and staff was directed to develop alternative scenarios for growth because the base model was felt to be only one way to view the future of growth in the area. To develop the alternative growth scenarios a panel of 70 experts from seven (7) specific fields of analysis were pulled together and asked to develop a vision for the region based on each of their individual concerns (for example, the school districts were represented in one group and established a vision for education). The seven maps were synthesized into the current three alternative growth scenarios by combining like elements and constraints into discreet alternatives. Ms. Heinkel then reviewed the basic differences among the three scenarios, the Rural, Satellite, and Compact Alternative Growth Scenarios.

Mr. Rogers asked if the groups which participated in the development of these alternative scenario's were constrained by existing land use zoning and designations. Mr. Clingman responded that some were; and some, like the school districts that evaluated education, for example, were not. Ms. Heinkel also commented they were not because basically the rural growth scenario would not be allowed under current land use laws.

Task Force Charge & Role

Ms. Heinkel explained the charge of the Farm and Forest Task Force is to identify the impacts to the commercial farm and forest base of each alternative growth scenario. This is a two step process:

1. Identify the values/priorities of the commercial farm and forest base and identify how each alternative growth scenario impacts these values and priorities.
2. Once a preferred growth scenario is identified, identify in detail the impacts of the preferred growth scenario on the farm and forest commercial base.

Mr. Mealey asked which of the alternative growth scenarios is closest to the base case scenario. Ms. Heinkel said the compact growth scenario is most likely the most similar, however the base case had a much larger area of urban growth boundary (UGB) extensions.

Mr. Wynkoop expressed confusion about the task put to the group: is our short term task to develop a definition of commercial farm and forest lands or to produce an analysis of impacts?

Mr. Stahl said he thought they were tasked only with developing a definition.

Mr. Rogers expressed his belief that the definition once established could function as an overlay for each of the alternative growth scenarios to then identify where and how much farm and forest lands would be impacted by each scenario.

Mr. Mealey asked if the F1 and F2 zone overlay could be utilized as a base for the analysis. Mr. Clingman responded this would be very plausible, however, the Policy Board would like the analysis to be based on more of the 'on the ground' conditions than a paper exercise. For example, if only the geographic information system (GIS) layer for soils was utilized, the impact and/or importance to the wine industry might be missed; because wine grapes grow on soils that have previously been considered of lesser value. There could be other important commercial resource factors that are not shown on existing GIS layers.

Mr. Stahl commented that the group is looking for the commercial base of the resource not necessarily the highest quality resource lands. Mr. Stahl then asked about the difficulty for jurisdictions to take an exception for commercial farm and forest lands. Mr. Hallyburton responded that the exceptions process is outlined in state law; and if the facts are well documented, the process is relatively easy. However, if the documentation does not exist, it could be extremely difficult. Mr. Johnson said that it is key to remember that it is still an exception process and a jurisdiction must: 1) show the need; 2) provide an analysis of alternative means to meet the need. The regional problem solving process basically provides the analysis of alternative means to meet the need.

Mr. Mealey commented that even if this group didn't do any work, the area of impact could still be shown based on existing zoning; and asked if he was correct in understanding that what staff is asking for is qualitative input from this group. Ms. Heinkel confirmed his understanding. Mr. Penhallegon recalled a similar process undertaken by Lane County approximately 14 years ago, the LESA Plan. Ms. Heinkel said she would look into this plan.

Mr. Wynkoop expressed concern about the short time the group had to complete their charge. Ms. Heinkel responded there could be a second meeting.

Mr. Johnson explained the importance of this step to help policymakers by providing a definition of commercial farm and forest lands. Mr. Clingman pointed out that even when defined some impacts from the kind and extent of development on adjacent properties could actually impact which lands are most affected.

Mr. Stahl asked for clarification if the definition were to be based on current use or potential use? Mr. Johnson commented that he has always considered the potential use to be critical in this type of analysis to consider, and that would be part of the definition.

Mr. Stahl stated that he was reluctant to classify any of the land in the region as not a part of the commercial base. Ms. Heinkel stated that the task force is charged with giving recommendations on where development should take place to minimize the negative impact on the prime farm and forest lands in the region. She stated that growth is going to happen and the task force has a big opportunity through this process to direct it in the best way. Mr. Stahl asked if the task force should look at this exercise as ranking the commercially viable farm and forest lands in the region from highest value to lower value. Ms. Heinkel and the rest of the group agreed to take that approach for this meeting.

Mr. Jones emphasized the importance of education and its impacts in lifestyle choices. He commented that more people, more densely located can still have as much of an impact on

natural resources as sprawl because their consumption patterns could remain the same. However, in another scenario, people that live a more sustainable lifestyle spread out on small acreages around the county could have a lower overall impact on natural resources. Ms. Heinkel affirmed that a key component of the Region 2050 project is that it be a sustainable effort; and one which should be reevaluated every four-five years.

Mr. Mealey commented that with the wildland-urban land interface likely to increase, the cost for fire protection services is likely to increase. It is extremely important to consider the fire condition class in the analysis. Mr. Stahl asked how fire is directly related to the definition of commercial farm and forest lands. Mr. Johnson explained the ability of land to resist fire contributes to its ability to produce. Also conflicts between limited resources and priority of crop and timber over buildings in a wildfire becomes a greater issue when more people live adjacent to farm and forest lands.

The interactive map overlay process began with two sets of overlays and resource maps showing the farm lands and forest lands. Mr. Clingman explained the data layers and development that went into these final GIS maps, and explained the goals of this process using the maps. Ms. Heinkel indicated that this is an initial broad level analysis of the scenarios and commercial farm and forest lands to provide general direction to the Policy Advisory Board. Mr. Clingman brought out the agricultural lands map and the forest productivity map that displays soil classes on currently zoned agricultural lands and forest lands, and the three Alternative Growth Scenarios printed on Mylar overlays. The overlays show where Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansions would take place and where rural residential development would occur outside of the UGBs for each of the three Alternative Growth Scenarios.

IV. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS

Forest Group

The group began with the Rural Development overlay on top of the Forest Soils Map. Mr. Rogers asked if site productivity would be the only criterion for commercial forest land. This would provide a skewed look because parks could show up under this criterion, so perhaps another criterion to consider could be surrounding uses.

Mr. Wynkoop commented that it could be an issue of concern if a small city were hemmed in by commercial forest land.

Mr. Mealey commented that as wildland-urban land interface areas increase, the risk of fire to commercial forest lands increases; this would be a spectrum of impact from lower in the compact growth scenario to higher in the rural growth scenario.

Mr. Wynkoop asked where jurisdictions in the satellite growth scenario were going to get water. Water availability is a key concern for commercial forest lands.

Few impacts to F1/F2 were noted in the compact growth scenario. The group commented that the satellite growth scenario was preferred over the rural growth scenario because:

- lower potential for wildfires
- less people in the rural area so less complaints about forest practices (silviculture, burning, use of helicopters, spray, fertilization, trucking).
- number of people per square mile is related to the number of fires and cost for fire services.

Water availability is a limiting factor to the satellite growth scenario.

Mr. Rogers commented that the compact and satellite growth scenarios differ basically only by where UGB expansion occurs. He said he would like to know specifically where on county lands growth would occur, but recognizes the difficulty of defining a method for this task. Mr. Rogers also commented that much of the lower classed lands switch back and forth between farm and forest use depending on property owners and marketplace.

Mr. Woodard stated the most difficult and significant factor affecting commercial forest lands is neighbors. More people equates to:

- more fires;
- more vandalism;
- more impact to wildlife;
- more noxious weeds;
- more complaints.

Ms. Hunt said Weyerhaeuser has sold some F1 lands as the result of impacts from neighbors. Measure 37 is another factor influencing commercial forest lands as it could result in more people in the area. Ms. Hunt commented that moving UGBs is an impact. Weyerhaeuser currently owns land in the Springfield UGB but outside City limits. As such, there is no set process for them to harvest those lands so they have to go through a special review process. Normally, they follow practices set forth in the Forest Practices Act for timber harvest. Each city could have a different process. Some cities have taken over the management of the Forest Practices Act. The impact of certain UGB expansion would add complications to timber harvesting practices.

In looking at the rural growth scenario, Mr. Woodard said it looks like the rural version of strip malls.

Ms. Hunt commented having F1 adjacent to RR would be an adverse impact. Some form of buffer would be needed between the uses.

Mr. Rogers said the fire issue is huge in this scenario especially south of Veneta near Crow. Pine/Oak forests will burn fast and there is limited fire response in the area.

Mr. Mealey volunteered to help develop an analysis of fire risk for the alternative growth scenarios.

Mr. Rogers and Mr. Stahl commented that dense development is much better than one to five acre lots for reducing fire impacts. Mr. Rogers went on to comment that he much rather see the Lane Community College basin fully utilized than sprawling development into rural areas.

Ms. Hunt pointed another potential impact would be the distance of the commercial forest lands from mills; costs such as trucking would grow as distance increases.

Farm Group

Mr. Stahl pointed out his property, Dancing Sheep Farms, and began the discussion with the Rural Growth Scenario overlay on top of the base agricultural lands map. Mr. Johnson pointed out that there is not much overlap of rural residential development and prime agricultural lands, but much of the agricultural land would be affected by the edges created by new, low-density residential development. Mr. Johnson pointed out that land around the Eugene Airport is currently zoned agriculture and should be preserved because airports and industrial lands make better neighbors for farmers than residential development.

Mr. Jones, Full Circle Community Farms, stated that he would prefer housing rather than an airport next to his farm.

Mr. Stahl noted that landowners along Fox Hollow Road have been embroiled in a conflict over pesticide use on forest land owned by Guistina Land and Timber as an example of the incompatibility between commercial farm or forest lands and residential development.

Mr. Johnson pointed out the land north of Coburg is being heavily impacted by residential development. Mr. Johnson indicated, along with the majority of the group, that the lands north of the Eugene UGB are prime agricultural lands and need to be a high priority for preserving the region's agriculture commercial base.

Mr. Stahl again commented on land near Fox Hollow and Territorial Road. He stated that there was productivity at some level for all lands in the region, further stating that he felt all lands in the region could be considered as a part of the commercial base. Mr. Stahl stated that 10 years ago his land was not considered productive even though it was on great soil. His property did not have water rights, which is the major farming limitation, not soil productivity. Mr. Stahl went on to say that even very unlikely and marginal lands are being planted and harvested today.

Mr. Penhallegon, OSU Extension, pointed out that there is a difference between the agricultural lands that constitute the region's commercial base and small-scale agriculture.

Mr. Jones stated that small-scale agriculture should not be overlooked simply because it is not as profitable as large-scale, mechanized agriculture. He pointed out the benefit of reconnecting people with the land to minimize harmful practices. Mr. Johnson responded by pointing out that zoning that allows smaller acreages often succumbs to upscale residential development that presents itself as small scale farming, which, in turn, increases property prices beyond what a true small-scale farm producer can afford.

Mr. Jones marked an area on the map north of Eugene on Highway 99 that is prone to flooding. The group generally agreed that the Rural Growth scenario would have a large impact on the agriculture commercial base in the region due to parcelization and farmland being converted to low-density rural residential growth.

The Satellite Communities scenario overlay was then considered. Mr. Johnson asked if the rural development portrayed on the satellite overlay is according to current zoning ordinances or if zoning changes had been incorporated. Ms. Heinkel clarified that the rural development is displayed according to existing zoning. Mr. Johnson pointed out the edge effect that marginalizes agricultural land when small communities incorporate and residential areas expand into previously productive farmlands.

Mr. Penhallegon noted that the land north of Eugene is not greatly impacted by the Satellite Growth Scenario. He stated that this area is currently the most productive soils we have in the Southern Willamette Valley and should be a top priority for preservation as agricultural land. Ms. Heinkel asked if that was consensus among the group and Mr. Penhallegon, Mr. Hallyburton, and Mr. Johnson all agreed.

Mr. Johnson pointed out the land northwest of Fern Ridge Reservoir as an area where development should be directed. He noted that the issue of water availability is a major concern in the area. The group agreed that it would be desirable to locate residential growth near Alvadore because the impact on the agriculture commercial base is minimal.

Mr. Penhallegon indicated that growth east of Springfield would have minimal impact on agricultural lands as well, due to the parcelization and marginality of that land for farms. Mr. Johnson noted that the fringes separating residential land from agricultural should be industrial or low-density housing to minimize the 'edge effect' on large-scale agriculture. Mr. Penhallegon noted that parcelization and low-density rural development result in many domestic wells being drilled that are exempt from the water rights process. As residential areas develop wells and use groundwater, municipal, industrial and agricultural water rights are negatively impacted.

Mr. Johnson stated his opinion that compatibility between neighboring land uses is as big of a concern as conversion of land uses due to edge effect that creates conflicts. He stated that the Compact Urban growth is the best scenario, Satellite Communities is the second best, and Rural growth is a poor option in regards to preserving the commercially-viable agricultural lands in the region.

Ms. Heinkel directed the group's attention to the Goshen area and the area on Highway 58 around Pleasant Hill. She asked if the UGB expansions and development around these areas will have a big impact on the region's agriculture commercial base. Goshen was indicated by Mr. Penhallegon and Mr. Johnson as a good spot to locate growth because it is already heavily impacted. Mr. Penhallegon noted that the area to the south and west of Pleasant Hill could include more development, especially along the Highway 58 corridor.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Penhallegon reiterated that the primary Willamette Valley agricultural industrial land begins north of Eugene and it is absolutely critical to contain growth and prevent it from spreading northward. The group indicated that some of the land east of Coburg could be developed without negative impacts to the agricultural industry.

Ms. Heinkel asked about the productivity of the Mohawk Valley. Mr. Johnson stated that most of the producers in the valley are small-scale ranchers and the land is already divided into many smaller parcels. He stated that there is not enough water up the Mohawk Valley to support large-scale, high water need agricultural operations and large, contiguous single ownership lands do not exist to support large commercial agriculture. Mr. Penhallegon said that the floodplain is relatively narrow in the Mohawk Valley. The group agreed that because the finger valleys in the region are already highly parcelized, and growth is constrained by steep slopes, the viability of large-scale agriculture in these areas is reduced. There are examples of commercial agriculture including two commercial hazelnut orchards off Sunderland Road and Goat Road, and a commercial Blueberry farm off Marcola Road before Mohawk.

Mr. Jones brought up the idea that the group should not consider this process as definitive in nature, but rather utilize it as a way to see how different land uses can be compatible. He brought up the possibility of re-populating the agricultural lands with small farms in order to

encourage community and land stewardship. Ms. Heinkel asked for clarification on what he meant by re-populating. Mr. Jones said that it was important to get people back on the land to learn the skills necessary to produce food. He suggested land use policies could encourage small-scale production and subsistence farming.

Mr. Hallyburton said that when lands are parceled into two, five, or ten acre lots, people often buy the land, claim to be agricultural producers, build a big house and plant a few crops for tax purposes, and then fail to maintain agricultural activity on the land. This, in turn, increases neighboring land prices to a point that exceeds what subsistence and small-scale farm operators can afford. Mr. Jones said that the laws must be more strict and better enforced to discourage that activity. He suggested raising the back taxes required if a parcel is converted from agricultural use to residential. Mr. Penhallegon stated that the current tax laws only require a landowner to maintain agricultural activity for two years to receive tax credits. He said that many landowners plant a vineyard when they move in and fail to maintain it after the required two years. Mr. Jones suggested lengthening that time requirement and enforcing that tax law more rigorously. Mr. Johnson stated that the resources do not exist today to review and validate all agricultural tax credit claims.

Mr. Jones stated that it would be beneficial to maintain agricultural land use classifications while increasing population density on those lands. He suggested experimenting with land use combinations to find what works and what doesn't. Mixing residential and small-scale agriculture land use classifications would offer more opportunities for subsistence, community farming. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Penhallegon expressed concern about losing large-scale agricultural operations to two and five acre lot developments. Ms. Heinkel asked if the subsistence farm lands would be appropriately situated on the fringes of more dense residential areas. Mr. Jones indicated that would be a good situation. Mr. Penhallegon, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Hallyburton also acknowledged that strategy as a good way to buffer large-scale agricultural operations from encroaching residential development. Ms. Heinkel pointed out that these two land use classifications, medium-density residential and/or small-scale subsistence agriculture land use classifications are not mutually exclusive of maintaining larger-scale commercial agriculture operations. The group agreed and pointed to the Mohawk River Valley, the lower McKenzie River Valley along Highway 126, and the lower Middle Fork Willamette River Valley along Highway 58 would be appropriate areas to zone for and encourage subsistence and/or direct-marketing agricultural operations. Mr. Hallyburton pointed out there are no restrictions in the current laws or zoning that would prohibit this scenario from happening today.

The farm group came to consensus that the land north of Eugene is the highest contributor to the commercial base of the region. The Pleasant Hill area was ranked as second most important, the McKenzie Valley is third, and the Mohawk Valley is fourth. The group indicated lands in the Alvadore and Goshen areas as good places to locate new urban development. The group recommended focusing attention on areas where large tracts of land, more than 20 acres, exist. This land should be protected from parcelization.

As the discussion wound down, the group reiterated some key points. Mr. Johnson wanted the split between urban and rural lands to be distinct. He felt that stringent buffers are very important in maintaining commercial agriculture lands and protecting them from encroaching residential development.

Mr. Jones stated that the tax laws must be revised to ensure that landowners claiming to be agricultural producers for tax purposes are indeed maintaining agricultural use of the land. He

also suggested that there be a substantial land use education component to the Region 2050 process.

V. NEXT STEPS/OTHER/ADJOURN

Ms. Heinkel explained the next steps would be to distribute minutes to the group for review; present the analysis to the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC); and then present the analysis to the Policy Board.

Ms. Heinkel asked for volunteers from the task force to present to the RTAC and to the Policy Board. Mr. Penhallegon and Mr. Johnson said one of them will attend the June 15 RTAC meeting. Mr. Mealey and Mr. Wynkoop said one of them will attend the June 22 Policy Board meeting.

The meeting ended at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Minutes taken by Scott Shine and Denise Walters.