Keith L. Cubic called the meeting to order. A roll call was conducted for members present.

- **Update on SORPP**

  **KLC** provided an update on SORPP events since the last meeting which was June 6, 2013. He reviewed Task 5 and Task 7 progress and the delays to progress in the interim. He explained the maps in detail (Task 5 - Non-Resource Candidate Lands and Task 7 - Non-Resource Designated Lands). **KLC** noted Douglas County progress, extension request by Jackson and Josephine Counties and staffing limitations facing Douglas County in Fiscal Year 2015/2016.

- **Program Direction & Douglas County Future Involvement**

  **KLC** provided information on the Program direction and Douglas County's future involvement in the Program. He noted that Jackson and Josephine Counties were requesting a further extension to complete their portions of the project. He noted that the Douglas County Board of Commissioners have advised that due to budget constraints, Douglas County would not be able to actively participate in the process in Fiscal Year 2015/2016. He noted that Douglas County's progress was swifter than the other counties who were still catching up in the process. He anticipated that Douglas County would participate but not lead when Task 8 is initiated. He then noted that the Planning Department had been assigned several new programs to oversee in addition to regular duties. He then noted that the focus of this TAC meeting was to review Task 7 results. Douglas County was attempting to complete as much work as possible before the May 29, 2015 grant deadline. He said he did not anticipate another TAC meeting on this task so all input received at this meeting would be included in the Task 7 report. He stated that when a Task 8 report or amendment was prepared, the County would ask for TAC input on the proposal.
Task 7 Summary and Results

RH2 provided a summary of Task 7 and the results. He provided and reviewed an updated packet which had been presented to the Douglas County Planning Commission. He spoke in detail about the steps it took to reach the outcome as follows: Task 7 Foundation (Task 4 Data Collection & Analysis and Task 5 Regional Methodology); Fire Protection; Land Use Conflict; Goal 5 Resources; Special Considerations of Animal Unit per Month (AUM), Steep Slopes, and Forest Land Productivity); Carrying Capacity Report Card; Conflict Identification; and Conclusion & Outcome. Discussion ensued concerning residential fire statistics with MT and RS asking questions about the use of fire siting covenants in resource vs. non-resource lands. JG asked about defunct fire districts and whether current data was used from the current fire districts. Discussion turned to Land Use Conflicts; Goal 5 Resources. TF asked about how the planning process would affect the Columbia White Tail Deer habitat) and conservation opportunity areas (North Bank Road). Staff responded. JG asked how cultural and historic sites were being handled. Again staff responded. AUM's received considerable discussion. Steep slope data including Geo-Hazard Overlay was reviewed. JL suggested additional data be used (land class and forest land productivity). Members discussed the Carrying Capacity Report Card, Conflict Identification and Conclusions and Outcome. JL stated he would send additional information to staff. Discussion continued concerning the percentage of real development and the existing and potential supply of developable lands. Discussion turned to Task 8 concepts for OAR or Goal changes.

Discussion and Questions of Task 7 Results

BP discussed the current coordination between the three counties and the status of the progress from Jackson and Josephine Counties. JL stated that he was optimistic that progress would be made with some compromises.

TAC Review and Consensus

KLC provided a brief review and summary of major issues raised in TAC discussion included: Cost of wildfire protection (DFPA was going to provide additional information on residential-related fires); conservation areas not conflicting with non-resource concept; the impact of future new habitat sites; regional threshold standards for AUMs and NRCS forest soils; forest productivity conversion information (BH advised he would provide information to staff); and, long-term growth in rural lands and natural resource areas. Keith L. Cubic stated the TAC review was an informational update and designed to record the TAC feedback on the Task 7 product reviewed at the meeting.
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BP stated that he was very impressed with the efforts of the Planning Staff. KLC stated that the next steps would include a Board of Commissioners review, billing to RVCOG for the Task 7 work and the wait for Task 8 involvement. The TAC will continue to get updates.

Meeting time: 2.0 hours, 4:00 - 6:00 p.m.

Meeting notes by: Gayle McKillop, Planning Technician
Douglas County
Let me know if you have any questions.

Josh

---

Ricky,
I'm resending the conversion chart we discussed at the TAC meeting last week. According to your current approach of defining the threshold between resource and non-resource (>85cf/ac/yr) you would eliminate all land with a DOR classification of FF or better. I'm going to check with the Forestry folks and I'll let you know if they have a different take.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Josh

---

Ricky,
I had a similar question of our ODF folks last week when I looked at the data set. Here's the chart they provided me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Index 100 year tbl</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Index 50 year tbl</td>
<td>160 - 136</td>
<td>134 - 122</td>
<td>120 - 110</td>
<td>108 - 102</td>
<td>100 - 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR Land Class</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>FB</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Yield Cu/ft/Ac</td>
<td>225+</td>
<td>224 - 164</td>
<td>164 - 120</td>
<td>119 - 85</td>
<td>84 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Cu/ft Prod. Class and State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Survey Class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is what the timber folks at DOR say: FX is generally not shown because this class represents smaller isolated areas that don't really represent the soil class across the entire 1/16th section. County appraisers will apply FX on a case by case or site specific basis (5 acres here, 2 acres there).

Evidently the null areas could be numerous things including the following; agriculture areas (wheat fields, orchards, etc.), USDA-Forest Service (forests, parks, etc.), BLM (forests, rangeland, etc.), State of Oregon, residential, commercial, etc...

I know this doesn't completely help at this point. I am continuing discussions with ODF as to what the appropriate steps should be and will let you know when I get a more definitive from them.
I'm curious as to how much of the original 68,575 candidate acres, has no NRCS productivity rating and either no DOR rating or an FX rating (if there are any)?

Cheers,
Josh

**Josh LeBombard | Southern Oregon Regional Representative**
Community Services Division
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation and Development
Southern Oregon Regional Solution Center
c/o Jobs Council, Southern Oregon University
100 E Main Street, Suite A | Medford, OR 97501
Cell: (541) 414-7932
josh.lebombard@state.or.us | www.oregon.gov/LCD

---

**From:** Ricky J. Hoffman [mailto:rihoffma@co.douglas.or.us]
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2015 2:56 PM
**To:** LeBombard, Josh
**Subject:** SORPP Forest Productivity

---

**Department of Revenue Forestland Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Class</th>
<th>Candidate Lands Acres</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>9988</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>10990</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FX or No data</strong></td>
<td>41,531</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josh I ran an analysis on the data from the Dept. of Revenue and the table above is what I came up with. It still is extremely flawed in the sense that it lacks a large amount of data in the subject area. Any other data I could use to supplement this?

Any thoughts? Do you know how these classifications match up to the NRCS productivity ratings?

Any other data I should be using to supplement this analysis?

Thanks

Respectfully,

Richard J. Hoffman
Planner II and GIS Specialist
Douglas County Planning Department
The Oregon Administrative Rules contain OARs filed through April 15, 2015.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONTENT OR MEANING OF THIS AGENCY’S RULES?
CLICK HERE TO ACCESS RULES COORDINATOR CONTACT INFORMATION

DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

DIVISION 6

GOAL 4 FOREST LANDS

660-006-0000

Purpose

(1) The purpose of this division is to conserve forest lands as defined by Goal 4 and to define standards for compliance with implementing statutes at ORS 215.700 through 215.799.

(2) To accomplish the purpose of conserving forest lands, the governing body shall:

(a) Designate forest lands on the comprehensive plan map as forest lands consistent with Goal 4 and OAR chapter 660, division 6;

(b) Zone forest lands for uses allowed pursuant to OAR chapter 660, division 6 on designated forest lands; and

(c) Adopt plan policies consistent with OAR chapter 660, division 6.

(3) This rule provides for a balance between the application of Goal 3 "Agricultural Lands" and Goal 4 "Forest Lands," because of the extent of lands that may be designated as either agricultural or forest land.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040, 197.230 & 197.245
Hist.: LCDC 8-1982, f. & ef. 9-1-82; LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDC 1-1994, f. & cert. ef. 3-1-94; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0003

Applicability

(1) This division applies to all forest lands as defined by Goal 4.

(2) Governing bodies shall amend their comprehensive plan and land use regulations to comply with requirements of OAR 660-006-0035(2) and 660-006-0040 by September 6, 1994.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040, 197.230 & 197.245
& cert. ef. 3-1-94; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0004

Notice of Decision in Forest Zones

Governing bodies shall provide the following types of notice:

(1) Notice of all applications for dwellings and land divisions in forest and agriculture/forest zones shall be provided to the Department of Land Conservation and Development at the Salem office. Notice shall be in accordance with the governing body's acknowledged comprehensive plan and land use regulations, and shall be mailed at least 10 calendar days prior to the hearing or decision being made.

(2) Notice of proposed actions described in section (1) of this rule shall be provided as required by procedures for notice contained in ORS 197.763 and 215.402 to 215.438.

(3) The provisions of sections (1) and (2) of this rule are repealed on September 6, 1995.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040, 197.230 & 197.245
Hist.: LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDC 1-1994, f. & cert. ef. 3-1-94; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0005

Definitions

For the purpose of this division, the following definitions apply:

(1) Definitions contained in ORS 197.015 and the Statewide Planning Goals.

(2) "Commercial Tree Species" means trees recognized for commercial production under rules adopted by the State Board of Forestry pursuant to ORS 527.715.

(3) "Cubic Foot Per Acre" means the average annual increase in cubic foot volume of wood fiber per acre for fully stocked stands at the culmination of mean annual increment as reported by the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey.

(4) "Cubic Foot Per Tract Per Year" means the average annual increase in cubic foot volume of wood fiber per tract for fully stocked stands at the culmination of mean annual increment as reported by the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey.

(5) "Date of Creation and Existence." When a lot, parcel or tract is reconfigured pursuant to applicable law after November 4, 1993, the effect of which is to qualify a lot, parcel or tract for the siting of a dwelling, the date of the reconfiguration is the date of creation or existence. Reconfigured means any change in the boundary of the lot, parcel, or tract.

(6) "Eastern Oregon" means that portion of the state lying east of a line beginning at the intersection of the northern boundary of the State of Oregon and the western boundary of Wasco County, then south along the western boundaries of the counties of Wasco, Jefferson, Deschutes and Klamath to the southern boundary of the State of Oregon.

(7) "Forest Operation" means any commercial activity relating to the growing or harvesting or any forest tree species as defined in ORS 527.620(6).

(8) "Governing Body" means a city council, county board of commissioners, or county court or its designate, including planning director, hearings officer, planning commission or as provided by Oregon law.

(9) "Lot" means a single unit of land that is created by a subdivision of land as provided in ORS
92.010.

(10) "Parcel" means a single unit of land that is created by a partition of land and as further defined in ORS 215.010(1).

(11) "Storage structures for emergency supplies" means structures to accommodate those goods, materials and equipment required to meet the essential and immediate needs of an affected population in a disaster. Such supplies include food, clothing, temporary shelter materials, durable medical goods and pharmaceuticals, electric generators, water purification gear, communication equipment, tools and other similar emergency supplies.

(12) "Tract" means one or more contiguous lots or parcels in the same ownership.

(13) "Western Oregon" means that portion of the state lying west of a line beginning at the intersection of the northern boundary of the State of Oregon and the western boundary of Wasco County, then south along the western boundaries of the counties of Wasco, Jefferson, Deschutes and Klamath to the southern boundary of the State of Oregon.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040, 197.230 & 197.245
Hist.: LCDC 8-1982, f. & ef. 9-1-82; LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDC 7-1992, f. & cert. ef. 12-10-92; LCDC 1-1994, f. & cert. ef. 3-1-94; LCDD 2-1998, f. & cert. ef. 6-1-98; LCDD 5-2000, f. & cert. ef. 4-24-00; LCDD 3-2008, f. & cert. ef. 4-18-08; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11; LCDD 1-2013, f. 1-29-13, cert. ef. 2-1-13

660-006-0010

Identifying Forest Land

(1) Governing bodies shall identify "forest lands" as defined by Goal 4 in the comprehensive plan. Lands inventoried as Goal 3 agricultural lands, lands for which an exception to Goal 4 is justified pursuant to ORS 197.732 and taken, and lands inside urban growth boundaries are not required to be planned and zoned as forest lands. Lands suitable for commercial forest uses shall be identified using a mapping of average annual wood production capability by cubic foot per acre (cf/ac) as reported by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(2) Where NRCS data are not available or are shown to be inaccurate, other site productivity data may be used to identify forest land, in the following order of priority:

(a) Oregon Department of Revenue western Oregon site class maps;

(b) USDA Forest Service plant association guides; or

(c) Other information determined by the State Forester to be of comparable quality.

(3) Where data of comparable quality under subsections (2)(a)-(c) are not available or are shown to be inaccurate, an alternative method for determining productivity may be used as described in the Oregon Department of Forestry’s Technical Bulletin entitled “Land Use Planning Notes, Number 3 April 1998, Updated for Clarity April 2010.”

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040
Hist.: LCDC 8-1982, f. & ef. 9-1-82; LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDD 3-2008, f. & cert. ef. 4-18-08; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0015

Plan Designation Outside an Urban Growth Boundary

(1) Lands inventoried as forest lands must be designated in the comprehensive plan and
implemented with a zone that conserves forest lands consistent with OAR chapter 660, division 6, unless an exception to Goal 4 is taken pursuant to ORS 197.732, the forest lands are marginal lands pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition), the land is zoned with an Exclusive Farm Use Zone pursuant to ORS chapter 215 provided the zone qualifies for special assessment under ORS 308.370, or is an "abandoned mill site" zoned for industrial use as provided for by ORS 197.719. In areas of intermingled agricultural and forest lands, an agricultural/forest lands designation may also be appropriate if it provides protection for forest lands consistent with the requirements of OAR chapter 660, division 6. The plan shall describe the zoning designation(s) applied to forest lands and its purpose and shall contain criteria that clearly indicate where the zone(s) will be applied.

(2) When lands satisfy the definition requirements of both agricultural land and forest land, an exception is not required to show why one resource designation is chosen over another. The plan need only document the factors that were used to select an agricultural, forest, agricultural/forest, or other appropriate designation.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040, 197.230 & 197.245
Hist.: LCDC 8-1982, f. & ef. 9-1-82; LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDC 7-1992, f. & cert. ef. 12-10-92; LCDC 1-1994, f. & cert. ef. 3-1-94; LCDD 3-2004, f. & cert. ef. 5-7-04; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0020

Plan Designation Within an Urban Growth Boundary

Goal 4 does not apply within urban growth boundaries and therefore, the designation of forest lands is not required.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040
Stats. Implemented: ORS 197.040, 197.230, 197.245 & Ch. 792, 1993 OL
Hist.: LCDC 8-1982, f. & ef. 9-1-82; LCDC 1-1990, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-90; LCDD 2-2011, f. & cert. ef. 2-2-11

660-006-0025

Uses Authorized in Forest Zones

(1) Goal 4 requires that forest land be conserved. Forest lands are conserved by adopting and applying comprehensive plan provisions and zoning regulations consistent with the goals and this rule. In addition to forest practices and operations and uses auxiliary to forest practices, as set forth in ORS 527.722, the Commission has determined that five general types of uses, as set forth in the goal, may be allowed in the forest environment, subject to the standards in the goal and in this rule. These general types of uses are:

(a) Uses related to and in support of forest operations;

(b) Uses to conserve soil, air and water quality and to provide for fish and wildlife resources, agriculture and recreational opportunities appropriate in a forest environment;

(c) Locationally-dependent uses, such as communication towers, mineral and aggregate resources, etc.

(d) Dwellings authorized by ORS 215.705 to 215.755; and

(e) Other dwellings under prescribed conditions.

(2) The following uses pursuant to the Forest Practices Act (ORS Chapter 527) and Goal 4 shall be allowed in forest zones:
(a) Forest operations or forest practices including, but not limited to, reforestation of forest land, road construction and maintenance, harvesting of a forest tree species, application of chemicals, and disposal of slash;

(b) Temporary on-site structures that are auxiliary to and used during the term of a particular forest operation;

(c) Physical alterations to the land auxiliary to forest practices including, but not limited to, those made for purposes of exploration, mining, commercial gravel extraction and processing, landfills, dams, reservoirs, road construction or recreational facilities; and

(d) For the purposes of section (2) of this rule "auxiliary" means a use or alteration of a structure or land that provides help or is directly associated with the conduct of a particular forest practice. An auxiliary structure is located on site, temporary in nature, and is not designed to remain for the forest's entire growth cycle from planting to harvesting. An auxiliary use is removed when a particular forest practice has concluded.

(3) The following uses may be allowed outright on forest lands:

(a) Uses to conserve soil, air and water quality and to provide for wildlife and fisheries resources;

(b) Farm use as defined in ORS 215.203;

(c) Local distribution lines (e.g., electric, telephone, natural gas) and accessory equipment (e.g., electric distribution transformers, poles, meter cabinets, terminal boxes, pedestals), or equipment that provides service hookups, including water service hookups;

(d) Temporary portable facility for the primary processing of forest products;

(e) Exploration for mineral and aggregate resources as defined in ORS chapter 517;

(f) Private hunting and fishing operations without any lodging accommodations;

(g) Towers and fire stations for forest fire protection;

(h) Widening of roads within existing rights-of-way in conformance with the transportation element of acknowledged comprehensive plans and public road and highway projects as described in ORS 215.213(1) and 215.283(1);

(i) Water intake facilities, canals and distribution lines for farm irrigation and ponds;

(j) Caretaker residences for public parks and public fish hatcheries;

(k) Uninhabitable structures accessory to fish and wildlife enhancement;

(l) Temporary forest labor camps;

(m) Exploration for and production of geothermal, gas, oil, and other associated hydrocarbons, including the placement and operation of compressors, separators and other customary production equipment for an individual well adjacent to the well head;

(n) Destination resorts reviewed and approved pursuant to ORS 197.435 to 197.467 and Goal 8;

(o) Disposal site for solid waste that has been ordered established by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission under ORS 459.049, together with the equipment, facilities or buildings necessary for its operation;

(p) Alteration, restoration or replacement of a lawfully established dwelling that:

(A) Has intact exterior walls and roof structures;
(B) Has indoor plumbing consisting of a kitchen sink, toilet and bathing facilities connected to a sanitary waste disposal system;

(C) Has interior wiring for interior lights;

(D) Has a heating system; and

(E) In the case of replacement, is removed, demolished or converted to an allowable nonresidential use within three months of the completion of the replacement dwelling;

(q) An outdoor mass gathering as defined in ORS 433.735 or other gathering of fewer than 3,000 persons that is not anticipated to continue for more than 120 hours in any three-month period is not a "land use decision" as defined in ORS 197.015(10) or subject to review under this division;

(r) Dump truck parking as provided in ORS 215.311; and

(s) An agricultural building, as defined in ORS 455.315, customarily provided in conjunction with farm use or forest use. A person may not convert an agricultural building authorized by this section to another use.

(4) The following uses may be allowed on forest lands subject to the review standards in section (5) of this rule:

(a) Permanent facility for the primary processing of forest products;

(b) Permanent logging equipment repair and storage;

(c) Log scaling and weigh stations;

(d) Disposal site for solid waste approved by the governing body of a city or county or both and for which the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality has granted a permit under ORS 459.245, together with equipment, facilities or buildings necessary for its operation;

(e)(A) Private parks and campgrounds. Campgrounds in private parks shall only be those allowed by this subsection. Except on a lot or parcel contiguous to a lake or reservoir, campgrounds shall not be allowed within three miles of an urban growth boundary unless an exception is approved pursuant to ORS 197.732 and OAR chapter 660, division 4. A campground is an area devoted to overnight temporary use for vacation, recreational or emergency purposes, but not for residential purposes and is established on a site or is contiguous to lands with a park or other outdoor natural amenity that is accessible for recreational use by the occupants of the campground. A campground shall be designed and integrated into the rural agricultural and forest environment in a manner that protects the natural amenities of the site and provides buffers of existing native trees and vegetation or other natural features between campsites. Campsites may be occupied by a tent, travel trailer or recreational vehicle. Separate sewer, water or electric service hook-ups shall not be provided to individual camp sites. Campgrounds authorized by this rule shall not include intensively developed recreational uses such as swimming pools, tennis courts, retail stores or gas stations. Overnight temporary use in the same campground by a camper or camper's vehicle shall not exceed a total of 30 days during any consecutive six-month period.

(B) Campsites may be occupied by a tent, travel trailer, yurt or recreational vehicle. Separate sewer, water or electric service hook-ups shall not be provided to individual camp sites except that electrical service may be provided to yurts allowed for by paragraph (4)(e)(C) of this rule.

(C) Subject to the approval of the county governing body or its designee, a private campground may provide yurts for overnight camping. No more than one-third or a maximum of 10 campsites, whichever is smaller, may include a yurt. The yurt shall be located on the ground or on a wood floor with no permanent foundation. Upon request of a county governing body, the Commission may provide by rule for an increase in the number of yurts allowed on all or a portion of the campgrounds in a county if the Commission determines that the increase will
Keith Cubic

From: Bob Hart <bob@bobhartconsultingllc.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2015 8:26 AM
To: Keith Cubic
Subject: Forest conversion
Attachments: forestconvert.pdf

Keith,
Here is the information on forest productivity to convert DOR ratings to site index and cuft/yr. If Ricky has any questions have him give me a call. Again good seeing you yesterday.

I don't know if I upset anything to say that non resource designation and what we can do with these lands did not require any changes to state law or administrative rules. I'm not sure if that would take away Josh's security blanket on this whole program. When we get to task 8 I would like to see some change in the laws and rules to made dwellings easier to get in go below farm lands. But that is a different battle from the designation and parameters for use of non resource lands. I'll study the handouts from yesterday and let you know if I have any comments.

One of the issues I have raised down here, and getting some traction, is that Class IV agricultural lands that do not have any irrigation are not economically viable and should be considered for removal from farm zoning and protections. I know we are a bit hotter and have less precipitation than Douglas Co and this may not apply to your program. It is something to consider.

Bob Hart
Bob Hart Consulting LLC
5126 W. Evans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537
541 582-8890
bob@bobhartconsultingllc.com
to be 2 acres in size. If it had one 2-acre area, then the remaining three areas would also qualify. A prime detail is that all areas under application are in one ownership.

2D5d. Determining Forestland Productivity

Forestland productivity is classed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Cubic Foot Productivity Class system for purposes of establishing stocking standards. Forestland productivities are estimated based upon the parcel’s potential for producing wood over a biological rotation. The biological rotation is the age where average annual growth of wood is maximized. The maximized production is measured in cubic feet per acre per year and is divided into classes that rank the relative productivity of soil types. Productivity classes I, II, and III are primarily found in northwest Oregon and represent ranges common on sites dominated by Douglas fir and western hemlock. Productivity classes IV, V, and VI are found in eastern Oregon and parts of southwest Oregon and Hood River County. They are more representative of sites on which ponderosa pine is the predominant species.

Determining the productivity of sites to determine required stocking for forestland applications can be complicated and often involves the reliance on several sources of information. The USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has completed extensive soil surveys of both eastern and western Oregon and developed estimates of productivity for major forest species by soil type that can serve as a guide to establish the productivity class of a specific property. Appraisers should first identify the major soil type(s) on a property and determine the forestland productivity of the major tree species for the soil type.

The Oregon Department of Revenue’s forestland maps that measure the productivity of forestland sites for the purpose of valuation are another source of information appraisers may use to determine forestland site productivity in western Oregon. These maps reflect measurements of forestland site index and are divided into Forestland (F) class categories that reflect a balanced distribution of the acreage for the property tax system. Table 2 below shows how the three main stocking classes are matched to the productivity class and DOR F-classes. DOR’s FE class falls in both the high and medium group productivity classes indicating that more evaluation (NRCS soil typing or onsite tree measurements) will be needed to establish the required stocking levels.

Note: A detailed relationship between DOR F-class and site index is found in the valuation section of this manual. The 50- and 100-year indexes on Table 2 relate the cubic foot productivity to the forestland productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Class</th>
<th>Cubic Foot Productivity at M.A.I.* (cubic feet)</th>
<th>Designated Forestland Stocking Requirements</th>
<th>Western Oregon Douglas Fir 50 Year Site Index** (feet)</th>
<th>Western Oregon Ponderosa Pine 100 Year Site Index** (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>&gt; 224</td>
<td>200 Seedling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>&gt; 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 Sapling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>FB, FC</td>
<td>&gt; 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 Trees &gt; 11&quot; DBH Basal Area (sq. ft/acre)</td>
<td>92 to 115</td>
<td>92 to 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>165-224</td>
<td>120 Seedling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>FB, FC</td>
<td>116 to 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 Sapling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>FC, FD, FE</td>
<td>130 to 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 Trees &gt; 11&quot; DBH Basal Area (sq. ft/acre)</td>
<td>FE, FF</td>
<td>109 to 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>120-164</td>
<td>85-119 Seedling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>74 to 91</td>
<td>90 to 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>85-119</td>
<td>125 Sapling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td>&lt; 73</td>
<td>65 to 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>50-84</td>
<td>75 Trees &gt; 11&quot; DBH Basal Area (sq. ft/acre)</td>
<td>&lt; 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>20-49</td>
<td>50 Sapling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>40 Sapling Stocking (trees/acre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Considered Forestland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Culmination of the mean annual increment (M.A.I.) of wood production for the predominant tree species on the site.

**Site Index is the height that a dominant or co-dominant tree will achieve in 50 years for Douglas-fir in western Oregon and 100 years for ponderosa pine in eastern Oregon.
Property Taxes: Timber Taxes

Western Oregon Forestland Productivity Classes

ORS 321.210

People who buy or sell large tracts of forestland in Oregon consider the productivity of the land to determine price. Higher productivity land is generally more valuable. Consequently, buyers and sellers generally appraise forestland based on the acres and value in each site class.

For the purpose of property taxation, the Department of Revenue (DOR) assigns value to forestland in western Oregon by classifying lands into eight productivity classes.

Within the forest industry, a common way of expressing site quality in western Oregon is using five classes of site ranking.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Revenue staff visited private forestland in western Oregon to classify each 40-acre block of land into a site class. The average site class was determined by using site measurements of trees, topographical features, vegetation types, and soil types. The five site classes are related to the eight DOR productivity classes as shown in the table below.

The FX class is used for non-productive (below site class V) forestland within a forested property. Examples of non-productive land valued as forestland include rock outcrops, swamps, ponds, utility easements, and some rock pits.

Eastern Oregon

Forestland in eastern Oregon is not assigned productivity classes. Consequently, there is no FX classification. However, at least 80% of the total area of a forestland application must meet minimum stocking requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Oregon Land Productivity Class</th>
<th>Site Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1+, 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>II+, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>II+, III+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>III+, IV+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>IV, IV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>Below site V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program

Task 7: Executive Summary

Prepared By: Douglas County Planning Department
1 & 2: Task 7 Foundation

- **Task 4 Data Collection & Analysis**
  - Soils & Natural
  - Resources Public Utilities & Services
  - Land Use and Parcelization
  - Natural Hazards
  - Goal 5 Inventories

- **Task 5 Regional Methodology**
  - Outside UGBs
  - Currently Resource Designated
  - Not used for growing perennial crops (ORS 215)
  - Predominantly Contain Soils other than Class I-IV
  - Are within 3 Miles of an UGB, UUA, or Rural Comm. Rural Serv. Center
3: Fire Protection

- Fire District Proximity Analysis (Low Impact)
- DFPA Statistics
- Current LUDO Standards
- CWPP
- CCA Conflict Elimination
4: Land Use Conflict

- Methodology (3 Mile Proximity)
- Parcel Size Remains Resource (10 Acres or Greater)
- Alternative Zoning will Continue to be Resource in Character
- No Subdivisions
- Current LUDO Requirements (Resource Mang. Cov.)
5: Goal 5 Resources

- Fish & Wildlife
- Big Game Habitat
- Natural Resources
- Cultural and Historic Resources
- Hunting and Fishing Opportunities
6 & 7: Special Considerations

• Animal Unit Per Month (AUM)
  – Lack of Data
  – Available Data Reflected Task 4 Soil Analysis

• Steep Slopes
  – DEM Analysis Shows Little Conflict
  – Current LUDO Requirements
  – CCA Conflict Elimination

• Forest land Productivity
  – Lacking Data
  – Dept. of Revenue Data Supplementation
  – High Amount of State Coordination
8: Carrying Capacity Report Card

- Quantifies impact on Task 7 concerns
- Grade of 31 out of 80 displays a low impact
- Site specific analysis has eliminated conflicts further

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carrying Capacity Issues</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service &amp; Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Availability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife &amp; Fish Habitat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Game Habitat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Historical Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization Conflicts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep Slopes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1-No Impact; 2-Low Effect w/Regulations; 3-Unknown; 4-High Effect w/Regulations; 5-Impacted

Total 31
9: Conflict Identification

- Sensitive Big Game Habitat
- Public Lands
- Insufficient Non-resource Lands
- Coastal Resources
- Susceptibility to Fire Protection
- Steep Slope & Accessibility
10: Conclusion & Outcome

- Task 5 Candidate Lands (68,575 Acres)
- Task 7 Designated Lands (54,784 Acres)
- Max Potential Parcels (4,627)
- Subtract 20% for site limitations (3,701)
- **Most importantly:** Consistent with the State Wide Planning Goals

### Scenario 1 (Most Probable)
- 25% real development of the 3,701 feasible NR parcels = 925 NR Parcels
- Multiply 925 by the average persons per household in Douglas County (2.4 PPH, US Census Bureau) = **2,220 persons**
- This scenario would potentially create housing for 2,220 persons within Douglas County; compared to the 4,575 forecasted for the next 20 years this only **accounts for 48% for the population forecasted for the next 20 years.**

### Scenario 2 (Less Probable)
- 50% real development of the 3,701 feasible NR parcels = 1,850 NR Parcels
- Multiply 1,850 by the average persons per household in Douglas County (2.4 PPH, US Census Bureau) = **4,440 persons**
- This scenario would potentially create housing for 4,440 persons within Douglas County; compared to the 4,575 forecasted for the next 20 years this **accounts for 97% for the population forecasted for the next 20 years.**
## SORPP TASK 7 CHECKSHEET

### GENERAL/GRANT AGREEMENT

- **G-1** Common factors or criteria
- **G-2** Governor's Executive Order
- **G-3** Appropriate level and type of land for alternate designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE ORDER</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-1</strong></td>
<td>Cost of fighting wildfires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-2</strong></td>
<td>Conflicts with farm/forest practices, pesticides, noise, trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-3</strong></td>
<td>Drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-4</strong></td>
<td>Ground water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-5</strong></td>
<td>Water pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-6</strong></td>
<td>Wildlife &amp; fish habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-7</strong></td>
<td>Big game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-8</strong></td>
<td>Hunting &amp; fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-9</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-10</strong></td>
<td>Economic, fiscal, environmental effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-11</strong></td>
<td>Will not significantly interfere with nearby farm or forest practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-12</strong></td>
<td>Will not significantly interfere with the future urbanization of nearby cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EO-13</strong></td>
<td>Are sustainable in terms of fiscal impacts to local and state government, including special districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Addressed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EO-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOUGLAS COUNTY SPECIFIC/GRANT AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-1-D</th>
<th>AUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2-D</td>
<td>ODFW Goal 5 data (big game habitat, threatened and endangered, conservation opportunity, wetland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3-D</td>
<td>Steep slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4-D</td>
<td>Maps of candidate areas and CCA analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JACKSON COUNTY SPECIFIC/GRANT AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-1-JA</th>
<th>AUM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2-JA</td>
<td>ODFW Goal 5 data and data table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3-JA</td>
<td>Spotted owl suitability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4-JA</td>
<td>Sensitive nest sites, ODFW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5-JA</td>
<td>Maps of candidate lands and CCA analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOSEPHINE COUNTY SPECIFIC/GRANT AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-1-JO</th>
<th>AUM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2-JO</td>
<td>ODFW Goal 5 data including conservation opportunity and data table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3-JO</td>
<td>Spotted owl suitability, ODFW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4-JO</td>
<td>Sensitive nest sites, ODFW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5-JO</td>
<td>Maps of candidate lands and CCA analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program (SORPP)

Task 7 Results

Draft 05/14/2015
Douglas County
CCA Conflict Removal & Results

The following table displays the lands removed from designation as part of the conflict removal process which correlate with the CCA Area Maps 1-9 within the appendix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCA Conflict Removal</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified Coastal Resources</td>
<td>6,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Big Game Habitat/Insufficient Candidate Lands</td>
<td>1,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Candidate Lands</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steep Slope/Access/Fire Protection</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steep Slope/Access/Fire Protection</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Candidate Lands</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steep Slope/Access/Fire Protection</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steep Slope/Access/Fire Protection/Insufficient Candidate Lands</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Candidate Lands</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres Removed 13,791

As a result of the CCA site analysis mapping, a “Task 7 Designated Lands” map has been produced to show the remaining lands which qualify from the Task 5 criteria and have been found to not be in conflict with any of the aforementioned Task 7 issues. The final Task 7 analysis has filtered out conflict areas and produced a final total of 54,784 acres of designated lands (See Task 7 Designated Lands map within the appendix).

Implementation Criteria

The Task 7 CCA has provided additional guidance for SORPP toward the ultimate implementation of the alternative non-resource designation process. However, the analysis which produced Task 5 Candidate Lands & Task 7 Designated Lands has designated the alternative non-resource designation process from a completely soil based approach. The following graphic displays the transition of soil based analysis to parcel based analysis:
As displayed above the transition from Task 7 designated lands to the actual implementation, will largely be based upon State Wide Planning Program provision identified in Task 8. Implementation will align designated non-resource soils with ownership and parcel boundaries. The program will include qualification criteria which will based on the percent make up of designated non-resources soils within individual parcels.

**New Non-Resource Parcels in Douglas County following the Task 7**

Douglas County is recommending a regional concept that incorporates a 70% threshold of non-resources designated lands within a lawful existing or adjusted parcel to qualify for a non-resource division and/or dwelling approval. The following table displays the 70% threshold criteria as it applies to lands within each of their respective buffer rings (1-3 miles):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer Ring</th>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>70% Required NR Soils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td>7 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mile</td>
<td>20 Acres</td>
<td>14 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mile</td>
<td>40 Acres</td>
<td>28 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion should be integrated into State Wide Planning Program standard revisions recommended in Task 8. The following table gives a broad overview of the potential
parcels that could be created based on the amount of lands identified within each buffer
ring and applying the 70% threshold to designated non-resource lands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer Ring</th>
<th>Identified Acreage</th>
<th>Max Potential of Non-Resource Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>17,991</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mile</td>
<td>20,835</td>
<td>1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mile</td>
<td>15,958</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54,784</td>
<td>4,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The totals above represent a statistical maximum of newly created non-resource (NR) parcels based on designated lands as they are applied to the 70% threshold. The ultimate development of these parcels will be greatly limited due to the following reasons:

- On-site Septic Limitations
- Slope Limitations
- Ownership Patterns and Configuration
- Economic Limitations
- Owner choice to not participate
- Other Local, State or Federal Laws that limit development

The aforementioned limitations can be approximately quantified by eliminating 20% of the total potential non-resource parcels. This leaves a total of **3,701 feasible NR parcels**.
Population and Housing Forecast

Douglas County (Outside UGBs) is forecasted for a population growth of 4,575 over the next 20 years (US Census Bureau). SORPP is expected to produce the following two scenarios:

**Scenario 1 (Most Probable)**

- 25% real development of the 3,701 feasible NR parcels = 925 NR Parcels
- Multiply 925 by the average persons per household in Douglas County (2.4 PPH, US Census Bureau) = 2,220 persons
- This scenario would potentially create housing for 2,220 persons within Douglas County; compared to the 4,575 forecasted for the next 20 years this only accounts for 48% for the population forecasted for the next 20 years.

**Scenario 2 (Less Probable)**

- 50% real development of the 3,701 feasible NR parcels = 1,850 NR Parcels
- Multiply 1,850 by the average persons per household in Douglas County (2.4 PPH, US Census Bureau) = 4,440 persons
- This scenario would potentially create housing for 4,440 persons within Douglas County; compared to the 4,575 forecasted for the next 20 years this accounts for 97% for the population forecasted for the next 20 years.
Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 6,164
Acres of Designated Lands: 0

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: LOW

Area Description:
The candidate lands identified within area 1 have been eliminated in the designation process because they are unlikely to ever have the potential of development, through this or any other alternative designation process. The reason being is that a large portion of candidate lands within area 1 fall within the Dunes National Recreation Area public land. Another large portion of these candidate lands are identified within Estuarine and Shoreland areas, as inventoried within the Coastal Resources Plan, which would ultimately limit development.
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)

Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 4,446
Acres of Designated Lands: 2,500 Approx

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: MODERATE

Area Description:
Candidate Lands identified within area 2 are characterized by gently to moderately sloping lands adjacent to riverine areas such as Smith River and Mill Creek. Some of the lands within area 2 will be constrained by access, but could still be potentially developed. Lands identified within sensitive big game habitat have been eliminated. Lands within Elkton's community boundary buffer have been eliminated because the acreage would not create any potential development.

Acres of Candidate Lands: 4,446
Acres of Designated Lands: 2,500 Approx
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

**Area Profile:**
- Acres of Candidate Lands: 2,259
- Acres of Designated Lands: 2,248

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: HIGH

Area Description:
Area 3 is made up of lands within close proximity to the I-5 corridor and a high capacity of existing road infrastructure. The lands are within areas of gentle slopes and transitional land uses from resource to committed rural residential areas. Curtin's Community buffer has been eliminated based on insufficient acres identified within it.

Acres of Candidate Lands: 2,259
Acres of Designated Lands: 2,248

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)

---

Area 3 (Curtin; Drain; Rice Hill; Yoncalla)
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 11,300 Approx
Acres of Designated Lands: 9,500 Approx
Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: HIGH

Area Description:
Area 4 is made up of lands within close proximity to the I-5 corridor and a high capacity of existing road infrastructure. The lands are within areas of gentle slopes and transitional land uses from resource to committed rural residential areas. Some lands southeast of Sutherlin were eliminated based on fire protection limitations and access limitations.

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)

Area 4 (Nonpareil; Oakland; Sutherlin; Umpqua)
Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 23,800 Approx
Acres of Designated Lands: 21,300 Approx
Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: HIGH

Area Description:
Area 5 is made up of lands within close proximity to the I-5 corridor and a high capacity of existing road infrastructure. These lands are characterized by rural residential transition and moderate to high grade slopes. Lands northeast and southeast of Roseburg have been eliminated due to access and fire protection constraints.

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 7,500 Approx
Acres of Designated Lands: 7,250 Approx

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: LOW

Area Description:
Area 6 is made up of lands along the North Umpqua drainage. These lands will be restricted by access and topographical constraints. Some lands are identified within very close proximity to committed residential areas which will be more susceptible to development. A majority of lands east of Glide have been eliminated based on insufficient lands identified within that area.

Area 6 (Glide; North Umpqua Village; Oak Valley)
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program

Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

**Area Profile:**
Acres of Candidate Lands: 13,800 Approx.
Acres of Designated Lands: 12,100 Approx.

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: HIGH

Area Description:
Area 7 is characterized similarly to that of the Roseburg area in land use. These lands are within transition areas of committed rural residential and smaller tract resource lands. These areas have a wide variety of slope patterns. These areas have a major presence of county transportation infrastructure, however some lands will have difficulty provided access. Some lands east of Winston have been eliminated based on slope constraints on access and limited fire protection services.
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 5,700 Approx
Acres of Designated Lands: 4,700 Approx

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: MODERATE

Area Description:
Area 8 has a small amount of candidate lands identified within it relative to the size of the study area. A majority of lands within area 8 are in close proximity to the Riddle Canyonville area which would provide excellent opportunity for additional growth. However, all of the lands south of Canyonville will be highly constrained by slope. A large portion of lands within east of Canyonville within the buffer area have been removed based on an insufficient amount of candidate lands identified. Lands in the south portion of this area are eliminated based on the major slope limitations.

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)

Area Profile:
Acres of Candidate Lands: 5,700 Approx
Acres of Designated Lands: 4,700 Approx

Candidate Lands
Development Capacity: MODERATE

Area Description:
Area 8 has a small amount of candidate lands identified within it relative to the size of the study area. A majority of lands within area 8 are in close proximity to the Riddle Canyonville area which would provide excellent opportunity for additional growth. However, all of the lands south of Canyonville will be highly constrained by slope. A large portion of lands within east of Canyonville within the buffer area have been removed based on an insufficient amount of candidate lands identified. Lands in the south portion of this area are eliminated based on the major slope limitations.
Southern Oregon Regional Pilot Program
Task 7: Carrying Capacity Analysis

**Area Profile:**
- Acres of Candidate Lands: 100 Approx
- Acres of Designated Lands: 0

**Candidate Lands Development Capacity: LOW**

**Area Description:**
- Area 9 is largely constrained solely by the small amount of candidate lands identified within it. All lands have been eliminated based on insufficient candidate lands identified.

**Acres of Candidate Lands:** 100 Approx
**Acres of Designated Lands:** 0

CCA Conflict Areas (Eliminated from Candidate Status)

Legend:
- Red: Non-Resource Lands/1 Mile Buffer
- Yellow: Non-Resource Lands/2 Mile Buffer
- Blue: Non-Resource Lands/3 Mile Buffer
"Designated Non Resource Lands" are privately-owned lands that:
- Are outside of urbanized areas; and
- Are currently resource designated (TR, FG, FF, and AW zones); and
- Are not used for growing perennial crops (per CRS 215); and
- Predominately contain other than Class I-IV soils; and
- Predominately contain soils with a forest productivity of less than 85 cu ft/ac/yr (Douglas Fir); and
- Are within 3 miles of an Urban Growth Boundary, Urban Unincorporated Area, Rural Community or Rural Service Center;
- Have not been found to have conflict with Task 7 issues.

Lands satisfying the above criteria are potentially eligible for a density of 1 unit per 10, 20 or 40 acres, respectively.

54,784 Acres are Identified to be Designated Lands.
"Candidate Non Resource Lands" are privately-owned lands that:
- Are outside of urbanized areas; and
- Are currently resource designated (TR, FG, FF, and AW zones); and
- Are not used for growing perennial crops (per CRS 215); and
- Predominantly contain other than Class I-V soils; and
- Predominantly contain soils with a forest productivity of less than 85 cu ft/ac/yr (Douglas Firs); and
- Are within 3 miles of an Urban Growth Boundary, Urban Unincorporated Area, Rural Community or Rural Service Center.

Lands satisfying the above criteria are potentially eligible for a density of 1 unit per 10, 20 or 40 acres, respectively.

*36,097 Acres of Non Resource Lands have been identified within a 1 mile buffer of all community boundaries.

*68,575 Acres of Non Resource Lands have been identified with a 3 mile buffer of all community boundaries.

Source: Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), Douglas County Planning.