How Oregon Does It: The Oregon Land Use Act

It will be open season on Act 250’s criterion 9(B) when the General Assembly reconvenes in January, according to some legislators. At a conference in May at Vermont Law School, Senator John Howland and others predicted a major effort to amend or repeal the subsection of Vermont’s statewide land use and development control law that gives protection to primary agricultural uses.

Act 250 critics say the 11-year-old land use and development control law is the wrong vehicle for protecting Vermont farmland, that enforcement is poor, that the law doesn’t control piecemeal development, that it has no real effect on large-scale developments of regional impact, and that administration is at times inconsistent and lacks overall direction.

Act 250, however, was never intended to be the sole means of controlling land use and development in Vermont. The statute originally had three parts: a regulatory section requiring State permission for large-scale development or subdivision of land, a Land Capability and Development Plan establishing standards and criteria for local and regional planning and for evaluating applications for development, and a Land Use Plan. The final component of Act 250—a statewide land use plan—was never adopted by the Vermont General Assembly.

In the absence of statewide planning, Act 250 has been administered on a case-by-case, site-by-site basis. It should come as no surprise if the result has been a perplexing maze of sometimes inconsistent and ineffective land use law.

There are many Act 250 watchers who feel that it’s time to stop applying band-aids and schedule major surgery. Among the surgical options that deserve consideration is comprehensive land use planning.

In 1973, the state of Oregon adopted a novel statewide land use management program aimed primarily at the protection of productive agricultural land. The Oregon program provides for a state-local partnership in land-use decision-making. Land use planning there originates at the local level, but must conform to statewide standards.

In the following article, excerpted from the Summer 1982 issue of the American Planning Association Journal, Greg Dus tefan, Tom Daniels and Rosalyn Shinach describe the Oregon program and evaluate its success in improving rural land use management at a modest cost to the public sector.

The American experience in farmland protection, though still in its infancy, has become increasingly more vocal, visible and complex. In recent years an estimated three million acres of rural land has been converted to non-agricultural uses each year—up to one-third of this total may from the cropland base.

State and local governments deal with the situation in different ways. The U.S. experience in rural land policy is slowly being enriched with a variety of innovative policy instruments.

In 1973, Oregon became a legislative pioneer in land use policy by adopting what may be the most comprehensive statewide land use management program in the nation. The Oregon program (1) makes local comprehensive land use planning mandatory, (2) requires that local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances be reviewed at the state level for compliance with the statewide land use goals, (4) requires that local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances be reviewed at the state level for compliance with the statewide land use goals.

WHY A STATE LAND USE ACT?

As has been the case in most states until recently, nearly all land use control authority in Oregon had been delegated to local governments. In the 1950s and 1960s, however, Oregon’s population began to grow at rates exceeding the national average. Most of the increase in population has occurred in the fertile Willamette Valley, an area of about 5,000 square miles which contains 70 percent of the state’s 2.6 million people. Agriculture is Oregon’s number (Continued on Page 4)
Little River Reclassification

(Continued from page 1)

case of a municipal sewage treatment plant) and has limited the use of Class C zones to specific discharges. More recently, however, that policy has come under attack, and many State agencies now feel that the Water Resources Board does not have the authority to impose such conditions in a classification order.

The Mansfield-Luce Hill Company proposes to create a new discharge within which the Water Resources Department maintains is an existing Class C zone. The Class C zone was created in 1963 to accommodate treated wastewater from the Stowe municipal sewage treatment plant. It begins at the Route 108 bridge in Stowe and extends to an indeterminate point approximately four-and-a-half miles downstream on the Waterbury River. While researching an article for the Vermont Environmental Report, VNRC uncovered evidence that, in fact, the waters in the vicinity of the proposed outfall are Class B, not Class C. Under Vermont law, treated sewage may not be discharged to Class B waters.

On April 28, VNRC petitioned the Water Resources Board for a declaratory ruling on the classification of the Waterbury River at the point of the proposed discharge. The Board held a hearing on the petition at the New Town Hall on May 13th.

VNRC's chief witness was William Montpellier, now retired, who was the first engineer hired by the Water Resources Department in 1967, and who was Director of Classifications for the Water Resources Department. Albert testified that the Mansfield-Luce Hill effluent would not be within the Waterbury Reservoir, which is Class B water. He explained that the Water Resources Board had classified the reservoir to its "full spillway elevation" at 617.5 feet, instead of the normal maximum or "conservation pool," and that the elevation of the spillway is 617.5, the conservation pool is at 592 feet, and the proposed outfall is at 603.

Martin Johnson, a consultant for the Mansfield-Luce Hill Company and former Secretary of the Agency of Environmental Conservation, was the principal witness for the Mansfield-Luce Hill Company. Johnson contended that the Department's position has always been that the Waterbury River is Class C to an elevation below the proposed outfall, and cited as evidence a 1970-71 study, approved by Bill Albright, of the feasibility of the Mansfield-Luce Hill municipal sewage treatment plant in Mos- cow.

Both sides posited numerous errors in the 1963 classification order and accompanying documents in defense of their positions.

The Water Resources Board ruled on June 6, 1983, that the 1963 order contains "such inconsistencies that the Board can not conclusively determine the effect of its May 14, 1963, Classificaton Order with regard to that stretch of water between the Mansfield-Luce Hill Company dam (elevation 617.5) at Moscow and the conservation pool of the Waterbury Reservoir (elevation 592). The Board therefore concludes that this stretch of water has not been classified by Board action."

Since all waters not otherwise classified are Class B, the Board determined that the disputed section is Class B, and then initiated proceedings to determine whether it should be changed from B to C. The public hearing on the proposed reclassification will be held at the Arkel Memorial Building on Main Street in Stowe on July 12, beginning at 10:00 a.m. This is a rule-making proceeding — not a contested case — so anybody can comment. You don't have to be a legal party to testify and you don't have to be represented by an attorney.

In ruling on the classification of the Waterbury River, the Water Resources Board will consider water quality, public and private pollution sources, existing and potential uses of the river for public water supply, agriculture, recreational and industrial uses, suitability of the river as habitat for fish, aquatic life and wildlife, and "any other factors relevant to determining the maximum benefits for human health and enjoyment of waters." If you can comment on any of these considerations based on personal or professional experience, you should make plans to testify at the July 12 hearing. You don't have to register in advance in order to testify, but the Board asks that you file your comments by July 5, 1983, if you wish to present testimony orally or in writing. For more information about the July 12 hearing, call Bill Billert, Executive Officer of the Water Resources Board, 328-2871, or VNRC, 223-3239.
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WILDERNESS WORKSHOPS

Stumped by the timber impacts of wilderness designation? Swooned by conflicts between cross-country skiers and snowmobilers?

Come to a workshop on Vermont wilderness, and learn how you can play a larger role in securing protective legislation for roadless areas in the Green Mountain National Forest.

The workshop will be led by Susan Alexander and Chris Coffin from the Washington office of the Wilderness Society along with Linda Hay and Hugh Henry from the Vermont Wilderness Association. New Bill designs and strategies will be discussed. Learn about the status of the Vermont Wilderness Bill, and help you prepare and act in Manchester on July 9th.

The workshops will be held on the following consecutive evenings at 7:30 p.m.: Monday, June 27, at the Vermont Institute of Natural Science in Woodstock; Tuesday, June 28, at the Methodists Church in Main Street; Wednesday, June 29, at the Zion Episcopal Church parish house on Route 7 north of Manchester Center; and Thursday, June 30, at the Brooks Memorial Library in Brattleboro.

Tuesday-Thursdays, June 28-30
The Vermont Institute of Natural Science hosts a Water Ecology Workshop for teachers at their headquarters in Woodstock. Beginning at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, 10th and Josephine Bettell will lead workshops on wetlands and open water bodies, with emphasis on ideas for elementary level activities. $5.00 includes room and board, and college credit is available. For more information, call VINS, 457-2770.

Wednesday, June 29, 8:00-5:30
The Second Annual New England Resource Recovery Conference and Expo at the University of New Hampshire in Durham includes tours of local wastewater treatment, energy recovery, and recycling facilities, workshops on urban and rural recycling, innovations in the resource recovery field, sewage treatment technology, and lotting sewage materials. Registration is only $12.00, including lunch, workshops and guided tours. To register, call the New Hampshire Resource Recovery Association, (603) 224-7447.

Friday, July 29-31
The 9th Annual Conference & Celebration of Rural Life at Johnson State College, Johnson, Vermont, is sponsored by the Vermont Organic Farmers Association. This year's NOFA conference features more than 50 workshops, demonstrations and panel discussions, keynote speeches by Jerry Peck, Sennaor Patrick Leahy, Murray Bookchin, and a Saturday evening performance by Bread & Puppet Theater. The ever-popular NOFA Conference fills up quickly, so register early by writing: NOFA Conference, P.O. Box 101, West Charlies, VT 05772, or calling (902) 785-2832. Registration is $25.00 for NOFA members and $30.00 for non-members before July 1st, and $30.00 and $40.00 thereafter.

Saturday, September 10
VNRC Annual Meeting at Johnson State College in John- son, Vermont. See the next VFR for details.

Thursday, July 12, 10:00 a.m.
Public Hearing before the Vermont Water Resources Board on the proposed reclassification of the Little River, in Stowe, at the Arkel Memorial Building. See page one and two for details.

Wednesday-Friday, July 13-15
Shelburne Farms in Shelburne, Vermont, will be the setting for a workshop for junior and senior high school teachers on Natural Resources of New England. The workshop will emphasize New England resource bases and the conservation issues surrounding them. College credit is available. For more information, call Dave Barash at 985-3229.

Friday-Sunday, July 29-31
The 9th Annual Conference & Celebration of Rural Life at Johnson State College, Johnson, Vermont, is sponsored by the Vermont Organic Farmers Association. This year's NOFA conference features more than 50 workshops, demonstrations and panel discussions, keynote speeches by Jerry Peck, Sennaor Patrick Leahy, Murray Bookchin, and a Saturday evening performance by Bread & Puppet Theater. The ever-popular NOFA Conference fills up quickly, so register early by writing: NOFA Conference, P.O. Box 101, West Charlies, VT 05772, or calling (902) 785-2832. Registration is $25.00 for NOFA members and $30.00 for non-members before July 1st, and $30.00 and $40.00 thereafter.

Saturday, July 9, 9:00 a.m.

Wednesday, June 29, at the Zion Episcopal Church parish house on Route 7 north of Manchester Center; and Thursday, June 30, at the Brooks Memorial Library in Brattleboro.
Vermont Wilderness

Local and Regional News

The use of herbicides to maintain railroad and powerline rights-of-way has been a thorough examination these days because of recent actions by the Vermont Public Interest Research Group and a Waitsfield group known as Citizens Against Toxic Sprays (CATS). Waitsfield landowners were in the news last fall, when they organized to oppose spraying along a Green Mountain Power corridor. The issue has been considered over the winter in the Vermont General Assembly after Representatives Mary Just-Skinner, Peter Welch and Doug Racine introduced a bill to improve landowner notification requirements.

On May 9, 1983, VTIPD petitioned the Vermont Agricultural Department, which regulates the sale and use of herbicides in Vermont, to:

- ban the use of all herbicides containing the chemicals 2,4-D and Picloram, citing wide application of 2,4-D for agricultural, commercial and private uses, but asked for a voluntary 30-day moratorium on the use of 2,4-D and Picloram.
- require personal notification of homeowners living along or adjacent to railroad or utility rights-of-way in advance of herbicide application, and
- require that non-spray alternatives such as manual cutting or vegetative management be made available to adjacent landowners upon request.

Agriculture Commissioner Dunnmore responded to the petition June 8th. Dunnmore denied the ban on 2,4-D and Picloram, citing wide application of 2,4-D for agricultural, commercial and private uses, and asked for a voluntary 30-day moratorium on the use of 2,4-D and Picloram, which contain the two suspected carcinogens. He also denied the request for personal notification in advance of herbicide spraying, though he admitted that it was advisable in some situations and suggested that Vermont's notification regulations need to be updated. He deferred on the call for mandatory non-spray alternatives, saying that the Department has no jurisdiction in this area, but he said he will propose regulations requiring all utilities to develop vegetative management plans for rights-of-way maintenance.

Meanwhile, the Citizens Against Toxic Sprays remains opposed to herbicide application along the Green Mountain Power rights-of-way in Waitsfield, but there's a chance the conflict can be resolved through negotiation. Sally Sweitzer, President of the Mad River Valley Audubon Society, deserves much of the credit for arranging an initial meeting between Green Mountain Power representatives and Waitsfield landowners and easement-holders. GMP will observe a moratorium on herbicide application in Waitsfield while negotiations are in progress.

There appears to be some movement toward compromise on Vermont wilderness legislation. A bill to set aside about 64,000 acres in the Green Mountain National Forest, sponsored by all three members of Vermont's Congressional delegation, now appears to be serving its sponsors' intended purpose: as a point of departure for discussions leading to a negotiated settlement.

U.S. Representative James Jeffords is spearheading the drive for a compromise bill. In a recent phone conversation, David Wilson from his staff reported that both sides now seem willing to talk, but the legality of snowmobile corridors remains a major stumbling block. Some wilderness advocates have offered exceptions from the motorized travel ban for a few key snowmobile trails within the boundaries of the proposed wilderness areas. But the U.S. House Interior Subcommittee which reviews all wilderness proposals feels that this is not in keeping with the original intention of the Wilderness Act and that it would establish a dangerous national precedent.

Meanwhile, Senator Patrick Leahy is working on incorporating an appropriate amendment for snowmobile trail relocation into the Vermont wilderness bill. He feels confident that the bill with the support of the majority of Vermonters stands a fair chance of prompt Congressional approval.

that steep slope and lack of access to public transportation to harvest much of the timber in the proposed wilderness areas, and setting aside some of the few thousand acres that would make very little difference in the amount of timber harvested in Vermont. Carl Reidel, past President of the American Forestry Association and forester Chairmen of VNRG, noted that Vermont harvests only about half the timber per year, and that the "three Ms" - markets, management and money - are the prime determinants of the health of Vermont's forest products industry.

Effects on wildlife were also discussed by several speakers. Mark Stanwood, Burlington County Farm Bureau was concerned about reduced food and shelter for the deer herd, since brush-cutting and habitat manipulation are prohibited in a wilderness area. Steve Farren and Alan Pistorius, on the other hand, felt that wilderness benefits from increased opportunities to study mature forest ecosystems.

Sellers explained that concern about permissible activities in Congressionally-designated wilderness areas is not unique. In Waitsfield, a Wallingford selectman, predicted "a beaver population explosion" as a result of "increased flooding of a magnitude never seen before" because of a prescribed ban on trapping. Senator Leahy explained that trapping is allowed in wilderness areas, along with hunting, fishing, hiking, cross-country skiing and other traditional forms of outdoor recreation.

Motorized travel, however, including snowmobiles and dirt bikes is prohibited, and this is the source of most of the opposition to additional wilderness in Vermont.

Carmi Duvo says there are over 100 miles of multiple-use trails within the boundaries of the four proposed wilderness areas, constructed and maintained largely with volunteer labor. They may be a fraction of the VAST network, but they're the neighborhood trails to snowmobilers in the southern Green Mountains.

Snowmobilers clearly have the most to lose from wilderness designation, and any resolution of this conflict should recognize and accommodate their concerns. Tom Seibering's House Interior Subcommittee, will be held on Saturday, June 11, in Montpelier, Vermont, at Burr & Burton Seminar, beginning at 9:00 a.m. If you'd like to comment, Representative Jefferds' office right away (1-800-835-5500).
(Continued from page 1) two industry (after timber) and, although the Willamette Valley comprises only 10 percent of the state's farmland, it accounts for 40 percent of the state's agricultural revenue.

A statewide farmland property tax relief program was adopted before the 1960s, but the results were at best a piecemeal approach to rural land use management. However, growth outside incorporated areas was largely unplanned and unregulated, and the public costs of servicing the resultant random patterns of residential development were borne by the general taxpayer.

Table 1. Land use data, Northern Willamette Valley, by county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Land in farms' acres</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>169,830</td>
<td>174,891</td>
<td>210,055</td>
<td>26,185</td>
<td>133,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>307,743</td>
<td>395,783</td>
<td>302,063</td>
<td>333,428</td>
<td>241,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>42,894</td>
<td>37,571</td>
<td>70,792</td>
<td>66,278</td>
<td>24,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>194,858</td>
<td>200,632</td>
<td>213,108</td>
<td>215,053</td>
<td>134,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>15,442</td>
<td>16,435</td>
<td>17,052</td>
<td>20,434</td>
<td>12,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill</td>
<td>194,941</td>
<td>199,266</td>
<td>227,555</td>
<td>254,795</td>
<td>268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Willamette</td>
<td>3,062,767</td>
<td>1,068,638</td>
<td>1,195,630</td>
<td>1,322,543</td>
<td>1,090,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>18,414,481</td>
<td>18,241,445</td>
<td>18,017,850</td>
<td>20,509,500</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Estimated private land zoned EFU (April 1987)</th>
<th>Predominant minimum lot size in county' acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136,600</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Dissatisfaction with the results of this piecemeal approach was a major factor behind the adoption of Oregon's landmark statewide land use management program in 1973. The Oregon Land Use Act established a joint state-local role in land use planning and management throughout Oregon by requiring local governments to adopt and implement land use plans consistent with statewide standards.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE OREGON PROGRAM

To carry out the state role, the Oregon Land Use Act created the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). The seven-appointed Commission members are responsible for establishing and interpreting statewide land use goals (which have the force of law), reviewing local comprehensive plans for compliance with the goals, assuring broad citizen involvement in the planning process, and reviewing appeals of alleged violations of the statewide goals.

The nineteen statewide land use goals are the heart of the Oregon program. The goals identify the state's interests and establish minimum standards for locally administered land use planning and regulation. However, the legislature made an effort to assure that basic land use decision making responsibilities remain at the local level. The success of this local-state partnership is an issue of continuing debate.

Originally, Oregon's 278 planning jurisdictions (36 counties, 241 cities and towns, and 1 metropolitan service district) were to have completed their comprehensive plans and adopted existing commercial agriculture. The zone also provides for limitations on restrictions of farm structures or accepted farming practices, property inheritance taxation on the basis of the value of the land in farm use, and exemption from special district (sewer and water) tax assessment.

PERFORMANCE — AN INTERIM ASSESSMENT

It will be some time before there is sufficient evidence to fully assess the overall performance of the Oregon program as a means of maintaining land in agricultural use. Nevertheless, the official law of the current situation in the northern Willamette Valley provides some useful insights. The county area of the northern Willamette Valley has the highest population concentration of any region in Oregon. During the 1970s, the population of the six counties grew by 23 percent. Meanwhile, data from the U.S. Census indicate that land in farms de- clined by over 20 percent (nearly 270,000 acres) between 1964 and 1978. Evidence on the effectiveness of the Oregon program in moderating the loss of farmland from commercial agriculture is inconclusive. A very high proportion of all the farmland in the county is zoned for exclusive farm use. However, the fact that land is zoned EFU does not necessarily imply that the land is now in, or will remain in, commercial agricultural use. The effectiveness of EFU zoning will depend primarily on how well minimum lot size restrictions work in retaining farmland in commercial agricultural production. To a great extent, this will be determined by the level of demand for the minimum size parcel for non-farm (rural residential) or "hobby farm" uses.

On one hand, it appears that the influence of nonagricultural demands for land in EFU zones has been reduced. Assessors in the northern Willamette Valley indicate that minimum lot size restrictions have reduced the rate of conversion of farmland to nonfarm uses. Census data show only a slight decline since 1974 in "land in farms" in the northern Willamette Valley.

On the other hand, there is some indication that the reduction in farmland conversions may not be uniform among counties. In Washington County, where a thirty-eight acre minimum lot size is used, the smallest allowable EFU parcel sells for $140,000 to $160,000. Largely as a result of this high price, recent market activity for small EFU parcels has been negligible. By contrast, the Clackamas County assessor states that Clackamas County's twenty-acre minimum lot size has only slowed the rate of acceleration in the growth in the market for hobby farm parcels — a substantial number of households seem willing to pay $70,000
The Oregon Land Use Act

to $80,000 for a twenty-acre site in an EFU zone. Another indicator of the perform ance of the land use controls is the record of counties in the administration of EUF zoning. Con sciences in the state have shown that land use control is necessary to promote and maintain the state’s commercial and agricultural development. The only evidence available is the survey of county decisions on zoning matters. A recent survey showed that of the county decisions on zoning matters, only 50% of the decisions were approved, and 50% were denied. This is a significant decrease in the number of decisions that are approved, and it is not consistent with the goal of promoting commercial and agricultural development.

Table 2. Price of three residential location alternatives, Clackamas and Marion Counties, Oregon, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/4 acre with city services</th>
<th>1/2 acre with city services</th>
<th>1 acre with city services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County (urban)</td>
<td>Clackamas County (rural)</td>
<td>Clackamas County (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32,000-25,000</td>
<td>$14,000-7,000</td>
<td>$24,000-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County (rural)</td>
<td>Clackamas County (rural)</td>
<td>Clackamas County (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28,000-21,000</td>
<td>$18,000-11,000</td>
<td>$24,000-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County (urban)</td>
<td>Marion County (rural)</td>
<td>Marion County (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$28,000-21,000</td>
<td>$18,000-11,000</td>
<td>$24,000-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County (rural)</td>
<td>Marion County (rural)</td>
<td>Marion County (rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,000-12,000</td>
<td>$18,000-11,000</td>
<td>$24,000-12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nineteen Goals

In Oregon, comprehensive land use planning occurs at the local level and must conform to statewide planning standards, or goals. The 19 statewide planning goals are, in a nutshell:

1. To develop a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

2. To establish a land use planning program and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to planning of land so that an adequate basis for such decisions and actions is established, and land use planning programs are developed.

3. To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.

4. To conserve forest lands for forest uses.

5. To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.

6. To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.

7. To protect life and property from natural and man-made hazards.

8. To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors.

9. To diversify and improve the economy of the state.

10. To provide for the housing needs of the citizens of the state.

11. To plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

12. To provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system.

13. To conserve energy.

14. To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use patterns.

15. To protect, conserve, enhance and maintain the natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, economic and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River greenway.

16. To recognize and protect the unique environmental, economic and social values of each estuary and associated wetlands; and protect, maintain, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate protect the long-term environmental, aesthetic, and social values, and preserve Oregon's estuaries.

17. To protect, conserve, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate develop the resources and benefits of all coastal shorelands, recognizing their value for protection and maintenance of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, water-dependent uses, economic resources and recreation and aesthetics.

18. To conserve, protect, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate develop the resources and benefits of beach and coastal lands.

19. To preserve the long-term values, benefits and natural resources of the nearshore areas and continental shelf.

In Oregon, the early adoption of land use controls has probably helped minimize the magnitude of adverse land use impacts. Once urban sprawl and parcelization are well along, overly optimistic expectations about future capital gains may be untenable. This would explains why the early adoption of land use controls has helped minimize the magnitude of adverse land use impacts. Once urban sprawl and parcelization are well along, overly optimistic expectations about future capital gains may be untenable.
VERMONT HERITAGE FESTIVAL  Saturday, Aug. 6  11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Waitsfield, on the common of historic Bent Hill Settlement

NOON: AUCTION of contributed art, crafts, merchandise and services
Displays and demonstrations of early American crafts and tools
Music, entertainment, lunch and beverages befitting a FESTIVAL!
The Council

CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HERITAGE, which has become VNRC's major fundraising event of the year.

With the meticulously-restored colonial homes of New Hill as a backdrop, spinnakers, weavers, Windsor chair-makers, blacksmiths and jugglers will demonstrate their crafts. The day's festivities also include carriage rides, traditional music, fine food served all afternoon by the Black Forest Cafe, and a lively auction with virtuoso auctioneer Dick Hathaway.

VNRC still needs donations for supplies which will cover about 70% of the proceeds from this event. If you haven't done so already, we hope you will rummage through the attic and see if you have a few "buried treasures" — things you no longer have a use for but which might be of great value to someone else.

If you'd like to donate to the Vermont Heritage Festival Auction, please call Margie solución at VNRC, 222-5232, before August 15th. Your gift will be a significant contribution to the success of this event. Hope to see you there!

We're reasonably certain that Alexander Montgomery Fisher, born April 24th, 1963, is the youngest member of the Vermont Natural Resources Council. Alex became a fully-fledged member to his own right at age three weeks and five days. He comes by his environmental commitment honestly; he's the son of R. Montgomery (Monty) Fisher and Cheryl Fisher of Montpelier. Cheryl Fisher (formerly Cheryl King) has been Executive Director of Connecticut ZPG, a public participation coordinator for the Vermont Department of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering, and a long-time active member of VNRC. She developed

VENRC's ground water protection strategy, worked on the Lake Champlain Basin Study, and is the current Chairwoman of the Board of Directors of the Lake Champlain Islands Trust.

Please welcome to VNRC the following new members, who joined us in March and April of this year: W.G. Howling, Marvin Morris, Marion Mason, G. Savoy Theater, John D. and Anne Muddell, Gordon Carlson, H. Avison Blackway, John J. Stoddard, Judge Sterry M. Waterman, Joanne B. Feldman, John Asid, and Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Hawe; Sarah R. Adams; Bud & Dianne Silhoby; Jean Machin; Sidney Thomas, Jim B. Seabourn; Michael J. Stier, M.J. Philippson Ransiger, Dr. & Mrs. Donald Kintley, Robert B. Higgins, LaCorte, Inc.; Karen M. Roy; Wilma H. Frey; Robert C. and Claire Traut; Elliott & Polly Haymes; Mr. & Mrs. Paul N. Olson; John Bryan; Priscilla Schlosser; Roger & Phyllis Pierce; David Bruce; Hazel J. Anderson; Mr. & Mrs. George Sappo; Mr. & Mrs. Gerard C. Shewsbury; Robert Rose; Daniel J. Barlow; C.D. Bratley, Sr.; Kenneth Southworth; Robert D. Yoder; Anthony F. Petrollio; Fred H. Taylor; Mr. & Mrs. Bruce Brown; M. Pauline Rowe; Mother Husband; James F. McKinnon; William LeBanash; Lyn Kinney; Constance E. Stor; Sylvia Laurinck; Tim Beaman; Constance E. Stor; David Schreuer; Cia & Joan Root; Paul Johnis; Peter Morese; Raymond Pomer-Stewart; Susan Johnson; Mark Wollins, M.D.; Beatrice Badke; Jolee L. Lamott; Frederick N. Anderson, Jr.; Mrs. Cormelline H. Stain; Janet M. Jackson; Diid Fitzhugh; Robert T. Johnson; Robert A. Miller, Jr.; Walter S. Silken; Ernest & Susan McClain; Jack C. Jenning; Dorothy F. Stirn; Robert James; Donald Bryan; Mr. Mildred Lyons; Gordon Cumney; Mrs. Louise N. Sevin; Christopher Persson; Mrs. Patricia Burley; Ms. Ruth K. Adams; Edwin A. Patton; Shirley P. Clark; Rex E. Dean; United Farm Agency c/o Robert Myerson; Mrs. William B. Herrick; Doug H. Elliott; Janet P. McAleod; Paola & Ed Kirschhoff; Gus, Mary, Al and Effie Riff; Norman Skiptol; Michell W. Kihka; K. Martin Simon; Mr. & Mrs. Donald Drury; Polly Hamilton; Carol & Peter Vandervant; Oliver A. Veater; Naconda LaPorret; Stephen J. Green; Richard L. Wooten; Eric & Lyn LeWhite; Mrs. Gwendolyn C. Davies; Dr. Thomas G. Howit; Mrs. William S. Preston; Mr. Griss Grimnell; Dena Bagg; Mary L. McGuire; Sylvia Walker; Ellsworth Banker; Lisa Tddy; Mrs. John Higgins; Mr. & Mrs. Charles W. White; James & Deb Cocker; Peter Emily; Jean Pierre Larrievex; Frank & Margaret Goodman; Kenneth Wild; Mrs. C.W. LaClair, John S. Warren; Harold Basham; Dr. Mark Adair; Mrs. George A. Wood; Mac & Mary Barger; Sonny P. Weimer; Dennis & Susan Kalman; John W. Lyons; Michael J. Brown; Pamela K. Johnson; Anila Bower; Mr. & Mrs. David B. Wheeler; Lewis E. Smith; Bruce Cullen; Mrs. Doris C. Gildor; Albert C. Smith; Albert Reay; Marion Greer; Robin Ameden; Jonathan H. Hendrix; Mr. & Mrs. Terry Bachman; Mrs. Karwene M. Lamson; Mrs. Vernon R. Huot; John Bates; George Coby; Robert Mittenruher; Jan Lesanski; Rhona Leclerc; Francois W. O'Neill; John Hildred; David Brandus; Lymee Hilt; Charles Leight三层; Universal Path- ways; Knox Commun; Charles Benton; Bryan J. Lynch; Mary Ellen O'Donnell; Mr. & Mrs. R.S. Coday; James Tobor; Lee & Sue Gardiner; Jan Wright; Chiho Lavalle; Jacob gslum; Steven Rodewald; Raymond Jacoby; Gretchen Sakselski; Richard W. Jerome; Robert C. Morris; Margaret G. Ottis; Jack Long; Roy Young; Garre Reynolds; J. Arthur Lavinse; Charles Thompson & Sarah Boy; John A. Wrenn; Ann Missy; John W. Morris; Duncan & Ann Campbell; Ms. Elizabeth Capp; Mrs. Anita Flanagan; Judith X. Bowden; Lori Skuton; Jerome J. Morgan; George & Ann Clay; Paul A. Kingsley; Ben Washburn; Morris Eater; Jaycse Borden; Deinck Lary; Mine Travel Agency, Inc; Steve Craddock; Marshal Webb; Anne L. Cook; Roy & Wendy Haupt & Carroll M. Ochsen.

IT'S HARD WORK

But anything worth doing is worth doing well. VNRC prides itself on doing it right the first time. We're not always the first to respond, but when we do, it's because we've given a lot of thought to the consequences of our actions. And you can count on us to tough it out until the job is done. That's why we're still here, 20 years later, representing the needs and concerns of Vermonters who are committed to the conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

If you've joined VNRC, we hope you'll do so during this, the beginning of our 50th year of service to the environment and the state of Vermont. If you're already a member, please take a moment to jot down the names and addresses of friends and associates who share your concerns.

Name
Address
City
State
Zip
May we use your name in contacting these prospective members?
Yes
No
Name
A Walk on the Wild Side

VNRC "Big Branch" Tour

In mid-May, before the leaves and before the black flies, VNRC sponsored tours of two of the areas in the Green Mountain National Forest that have been proposed for Congressional wilderness designation. Steve Harper and Wolf Schumann of the U.S. Forest Service led the tour of the so-called "Big Branch" area, which includes the Griffith Lake, Devil's Den and Wilder Mountain RARN II areas and totals nearly 33,000 acres (see map).

The Big Branch tour included such noted conservationists as Dick Andrews and Peter Smith of the Vermont Wilderness Association, Warner and Edie Shedd from the National Wildlife Federation, Roger Sternberg from the Appalachian Trail Conference, Don Hooper, VNRC Operations Director, and three hicks from the sticks — John Wies, Greg Finn and me — who tagged along just to see for our-