

**These tables compare land use regulation in Oregon with other western states**

**Table 1. The Importance of Alternative Goals of Land Use Regulations as Perceived by County Land Use Planners**

	Conserve Agricultural Land	Conserve Forestry Land	Promote Industrial Investment	Promote Commercial Investment	Promote Compact Development
OR	4.4	4.4	3.3	3.1	3.8
WA	4.7	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.5
CA	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.5
ID	4.7	4.2	3.2	3.1	3.6
NV	3.6	2.9	4.6	4.4	4.2

Note: 1 being least important and 5 being most important.

**Table 2. The Effectiveness of Land Use Regulations (% Counties Enacting Policies)**

	County Comprehensive Plan	Urban Growth Boundaries	Housing Caps
OR	4.0 (100%)	4.3 (86%)	1.0 (3%)
WA	3.5 (94%)	3.6 (91%)	2.8 (6%)
CA	4.0 (100%)	3.9 (46%)	2.6 (23%)
ID	3.8 (100%)	3.3 (40%)	N/A
NV	3.2 (100%)	3.5 (36%)	4.5 (18%)

Note: 1 being least effective and 5 being most effective.

**Table 3. The Effectiveness of Zoning Regulations (% Counties Enacting Policies)**

	Agricultural Zoning	Forestry Zoning	Rural Residential Zoning
OR	4.4 (96%)	4.4 (93%)	4.0 (89%)
WA	4.1 (82%)	3.9 (65%)	3.6 (79%)
CA	4.1 (94%)	4.4 (49%)	3.5 (86%)
ID	4.0 (96%)	4.0 (36%)	3.9 (80%)
NV	3.7 (82%)	3.3 (27%)	3.4 (91%)

Note: 1 being least effective and 5 being most effective.

**Table 4. The Likelihood of Alternative Land Use Conversions as Perceived by County Land Use Planners**

	Forestry to Agricultural Land	Agricultural to Forestry Land	Forestry to Residential Land	Agricultural to Residential Land
OR	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.3
WA	1.4	1.8	2.8	3.2
CA	1.8	1.2	1.8	3.1
ID	1.1	1.6	2.4	3.8
NV	1.2	1.5	1.9	3.9

Note: 1 being least likely and 5 being most likely.

**Table 5. The Average Number of Land Use Planners Per County, Annual Expenditure on Land Use Planning, and Percentage of County General Funds Spent on Land Use Planning**

	Average Number of Planners Per County	Average Annual Expenditure on Planning	Average Share of General Fund
OR	5.3	\$ 494,646	2%
WA	11.8	\$ 2,013,928	3%
CA	18.8	\$ 6,773,814	3%
ID	3.1	\$ 199,062	2%
NV	7	\$ 1,230,122	2%

**Table 6. The Degree of Influence of Parties in Land Use Planning**

	State Government	Private Business	Average Citizens	Professional Planners	Developers
OR	4.2	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.0
WA	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.3
CA	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.8
ID	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.1
NV	2.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.8

Note: 1 being least influence and 5 being most influence.