

**From:** [Jeffrey Delapena](#)  
**To:** "Gerald Jones"  
**Cc:** [Oliver Oriako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Rebecca Messinger](#)  
**Subject:** RE: County Council, Planning Commission To Hold Joint Hearing On Preferred Land Use Alternative For Comprehensive Plan Update - Jan 8 2026 Meeting Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 3:03:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2025LandStatusA.docx](#)  
[Jones Property Full Report\[25931\]Final1.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Good day, Gerald,

Thank you for providing this feedback ahead of the Joint Hearing to select the Preferred Land Use Alternative for the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

I am forwarding to additional members of Staff. Your comments will be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission ahead of the Hearing and be added to the Index of Record.

Best,



**Jeff Delapena**  
Program Assistant  
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Gerald Jones <zocaloranch1484@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 2:50 PM  
**To:** Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>  
**Cc:** Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Wil Fuentes <Wil.Fuentes@clark.wa.gov>; Matt Little <Matt.Little@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; steve.stuart <steve.stuart@ridgefieldwa.us>; Claire Lust

<claire.lust@ridgefieldwa.us>; Bremer, LeAnne M. <leanne.bremer@millernash.com>

**Subject:** County Council, Planning Commission To Hold Joint Hearing On Preferred Land Use Alternative For Comprehensive Plan Update - Jan 8 2026 Meeting Comments

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [zocaloranch1484@outlook.com](mailto:zocaloranch1484@outlook.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL:** This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mr. Delapena, please refer to the enclosed memo for our comments on land that we own at 412 N.W. 279<sup>th</sup> Street, Ridgefield, WA 98642.

Also, enclosed is a copy of the Agricultural Resource Land Analysis For Determination of De-Designation in Clark County, Washington. This report was previously submitted to the City of Ridgefield, and to Clark County.

**We bought parcel 2125666000 38.24 acres on 7/14/1989 - 36 years ago.** The agricultural income that we earned year by year has never come close to paying the property tax. Yet, we have farmed it and leased it to others for farming. Parcel 986047199 0.24 acres was always part of our original land purchase on parcel 2125666000. Due to a previous incorrect land survey (that we were never aware of); we had a boundary line correction before the construction started on the next-door McCormick Creek housing development . The current use classification on this parcel is Farm and Ag Land, but it is zoned as Commercial Neighborhood Business.

We bought parcel 212590000 6.44 acres on 12/19/2019 after we sold 27 acres to the Ridgefield School District for the new elementary school currently being constructed.

My wife (Beverly) and I would like to thank all of you for the hard work supported by the City, and County council members, and planning staff. We need more affordable housing and jobs in Ridgefield, and we feel this land will benefit the new elementary school.

Thanks In Advance

Gerald and Beverly Jones

Gerald Jones

MAIL ADDRESS: 1087 Lewis River Road PMB 313, Woodland, WA 98674

Phone: 360-601-5764

Email: [zocaloranch1484@outlook.com](mailto:zocaloranch1484@outlook.com)

**TO:** Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov

DATE: 1/7/26

**SUBJECT:** Ridgefield Land – 412 N.W. 279<sup>th</sup> Street, Ridgefield, WA 98642

In 2024, we hired Johnson Economics, LLC to prepare the **Agricultural Resource Land Analysis For Determination of De-Designation in Clark County, Washington**. The document was finalized in July 2024 and delivered to both the City of Ridgefield and Clark County. Our property is situated beside the McCormick Creek residential development and directly across from the new Ridgefield elementary school currently under construction.

We will not be able to attend the county council planning commission meeting on Thursday, Jan 8, 2026 at 6:30 p.m. I have poor night vision, and I don't like to drive at night. My wife will not be able to attend due to health issues. Therefore, we are submitting the following comments regarding our land on the following parcels.

- |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| - 212566000 38.24 acres County       | 2025 Property Tax = \$6,198.86      |
| - 986047199 0.24 acres City          | 2025 Property Tax = 0.99            |
| - <u>212590000</u> 6.44 acres County | 2025 Property tax = <u>4,445.39</u> |
| - Contiguous 44.92 acres             | Total Tax = \$10,645.24             |

**FARM USAGE:**

**THORNLESS BLACK BERRIES:** We lease 20 acres on **parcel 212566000** to Brett Jones. Brett bought his grandparents land in Ridgefield; he farms black berries on some of his land; but he earns his main income from his landscape business. He pays \$150 per acre; so we receive \$3,000 income. For the 2026 plants - he will not prune the old vines or train the new growth along the wire. Instead, due to the condition of the plants, all above-ground growth will be cut back to ground level, with the aim of improving the plants for the 2027 season. He will not have any berries to sell for 2026 from this 20 acres.

**HAY:** For 2025, I have a verbal agreement with Tom Kane to farm the remaining portion of **parcel 212566000** for hay. Tom has the hay equipment *but he will be retiring soon*. He was born on our place. He cuts the hay on the Peacehealth parcels on N 65<sup>th</sup> Ave. When I asked Tom if he would be interested in farming the remaining portion of this parcel, he said the grass had too much thistle and weeds for cattle and horse hay. It was previously planted in clover for seed and hay while leased to Kevin Dobbins. Tom said it would take too long to

recover the cost of fertilizer and weed spray. etc. So, I told him that I would pay for the fertilizer and chemicals if he would farm the hay. On 11/1/24, I paid Tom \$225.00 for the chemical weed spray; he paid for the tractor fuel and labor. He later applied fertilizer which was deducted from my share of his sale proceeds. His customers pick the hay up in the field. On 10/31/25, Tom paid us \$1,368.00; I received a net profit of \$1,143 from the hay.

**Parcel 212566000 Profit/(Loss):** For 2025, we received \$3,000 from the berry lease, and a net of \$1,143 from the hay portion, or a total of \$4,143 income. After paying \$10,645.24 in property taxes, we had a loss of (\$6,727.24). This loss does not include other cost incurred.

**Parcel 212590000 6.44 acres.** In 2021, Brett Jones installed post and wire but never had any berry sales from this parcel. This year, he will be removing the post and wire since he has no plans to expand the berry crop.

**CLARK COUNTY FARM AUDIT:** The county audits farmland owners regarding their **Profit and Loss From Farming**. In 2007, the county would not accept my Federal tax - Schedule E for the farm income we received from the land lease to Jerry Dobbins. Jerry farmed around 300 to 400 acres of land in WA and OR. I had to obtain a copy of **Jerry Dobbins 2007 Schedule F – Profit or Loss From Farming and provide it to the county; he reported sales of \$1,399,938, and a LOSS of (\$144,358)**. He provided housing for workers, had all the equipment necessary to farm 300 to 400 acres of raspberries, strawberries, blackberries, oats, wheat, fescue grass seed/hay in WA and OR. When Jerry stopped farming our land, Brett Jones bought the Dobbins plants, post, and wire from Jerry Dobbins.

**HAY EQUIPMENT COST:** I ask several retired farmers “if you were to start farming, what type of farming requires the least cost”. They said hay farming, but the customers pick up the hay in the field. Since I do not have any hay equipment - I ask Clark County Lawn & Equipment to give me a written cost quote to purchase hay equipment that I would need. Their quote # 925555 on Jan 17, 2025 was for \$122,044.45. Hay sales from 44 acres, minus the equipment cost, fuel, fertilizer, labor, maintenance/repairs, taxes, insurance...equals no return on investment.

**IN SUMMARY:** It's possible to grow food on an acre or even in a backyard, but is it enough to make a living? It requires an economy of scale to earn a profit in farming. Large farms now use costly, laser-guided equipment to apply chemicals and fertilizer precisely, as well as autonomous tractors, trailers, and grain storage machinery with no human on board. We need more affordable housing, and jobs that pay a living wage.


My wife and I are in our early 80's. We operated the farm ourselves or leased out the land, while also earning income from full-time off-farm jobs. Very few people are interested in

Ridgefield farming due to the cost and economy of scale required to earn a living wage.  
Ridgefield needs more affordable housing, and jobs that pay a living wage.

We are grateful to the council members of both the City of Ridgefield and Clark County for their collaboration on our request. **Thanks In Advance.**



JOHNSON  
ECONOMICS



# AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE LAND ANALYSIS FOR DETERMINATION OF DE-DESIGNATION IN CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

PREPARED FOR  
GERALD AND BEVERLY JONES  
JULY 2024

**JOHNSON ECONOMICS, LLC**  
621 SW Alder St, Suite 506  
Portland, Oregon 97205



**JOHNSON  
ECONOMICS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>SITE ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
	PROPERTY BACKGROUND .....	2
<b>IV.</b>	<b>CHARACTERIZATION OF URBAN GROWTH .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>CURRENT AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR AGRICULTURE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
	LAND CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION & WATER RESOURCES .....	9
	AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES.....	10
	AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES .....	10
	TAX STATUS .....	10
	PROXIMITY TO URBAN GROWTH AREAS .....	11
	PARCEL SIZE.....	12
	LAND USE PATTERNS & INTENSITY OF SURROUNDING LAND USE .....	12
	HISTORY OF PERMITS ISSUED NEARBY .....	12
	LAND VALUES UNDER ALTERNATIVE USES.....	13
	PROXIMITY OF MARKETS.....	13
	HAY/LIVESTOCK PRODUCTIVITY.....	13
<b>VII.</b>	<b>THE STATE OF AGRICULTURE IN CLARK COUNTY.....</b>	<b>14</b>
	POPULATION & DEVELOPMENT TRENDS.....	16
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>18</b>



## I. INTRODUCTION

JOHNSON ECONOMICS was retained by GERALD AND BEVERLY JONES to evaluate a cluster of parcels in Clark County (referenced throughout as the “subject property”) under the Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) to determine if they meet the criteria of agricultural resource lands. These criteria are:

- (a) *The land is not already characterized by urban growth.*
- (b) *The land is used or capable of being used for agricultural production (based on physical characteristics).*
- (c) *The land has long-term commercial significance for agriculture (WA 365-190-050).*

The analysis will consider site-specific and broader local trends in land use, urban growth, and future potential for agricultural use as detailed in WA 365-190-050. The main components of this study are:

- *Characterization of urban growth around the subject property.*
- *Determining if the subject property is primarily devoted to commercial agriculture production.*
- *Analysis of the long-term commercial significance of agricultural production at the subject property.*
- *Review of the criteria for agricultural resource lands in the context of the subject property.*
- *Assessment of the state of agriculture in Clark County, including agricultural and urban trends.*
- *Recommendations for de-designation of the subject property.*

## II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The property is characterized by urban growth. It joins the Ridgefield urban growth boundary (UGB), and almost 650 new homes have been built within two miles of the property since 2018. Developed land close to the property is primarily residential, commercial, or industrial, though immediately surrounding parcels are mostly agricultural.

The availability of public facilities and services is mixed at the subject property. It is outside the City of Ridgefield utility service areas, though Clark Public Utilities recently updated adjacent power and wastewater lines. Schools and emergency services are within four miles and the nearest hospital is about nine miles away.

The soils on the subject property are within a range of classifications and are suitable for most crops, including berries, which are currently grown on the property. The site holds consumptive irrigation rights that allow for farming this variety of crops. However, the productivity of farm operations is below a profitable level.

The property is designated as agricultural land under the Current Use program, a tax deferral that reduces the taxable value of each parcel. The total assessed fair market value of land in the parcels is over \$1.8 million, much higher than the current taxable use, rendering them infeasible to purchase for anything other than development.

Land in Clark County is trending towards more residential use and less agricultural use. From 2017 to 2022, land in farms decreased by 38%. Over that same period, Clark County’s population increased by 48,000 (a 10% increase) and almost 27,000 new residential units (16,000 single-family homes) were permitted.

Ridgefield is also trending towards more residential and commercial use and less agricultural use. From 2017 to 2022, Ridgefield’s population increased by over 200%, and over 3,000 new residential units (2,500 single-family homes) were permitted. Furthermore, over 430,000 square feet of commercial and industrial space is in planning or under construction within a mile of the subject property.


**We find that the subject property does not meet the criteria of agricultural resource land as defined by the Washington Growth Management Act, and therefore, we recommend de-designation.**



### III. SITE ANALYSIS

The subject property is comprised of three parcels that total 44.6 acres. The parcels are mapped with their ID numbers below. The two larger parcels (212590000 and 212566000) are zoned for agricultural use, and the small parcel (986047199) is zoned Commercial – Neighborhood Business (CNB).

FIGURE 3.1: PARCELS CONTAINED IN THE SUBJECT PROPERTY



SOURCE: Clark County, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

#### PROPERTY BACKGROUND

Before 1989, the farm was owned by the Garland Pittman family and produced pole beans and hay. Gerald and Beverly Jones bought the property in 1989, continuing to grow hay. They also purchased cows from local dairy farmers and resold the cows after their first calf.

About 20 years ago, Gerald and Beverly Jones began leasing the farm to Jerry Dobbins. He rotated crops of strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, and fescue grass. The Jones farm was only 37 acres of 300-400 acres throughout Washington and Oregon that Dobbins farmed. In 2018, Brett Jones took over 17 acres of blackberry farming and has continued that operation. In 2019, Kevin Dobbins grew clover on the remaining 20 acres of the agricultural parcel, but that area is not being farmed now.



There are four buildings on the largest parcel. The main home and farm buildings were built between 1930 and 1940 and the smaller house was added prior to 1951; the exact construction years are unknown. According to the Clark County Assessor, the farm buildings are in fair to badly worn condition. There are no buildings on the other parcels.

**FIGURE 3.2: BUILDINGS ON LARGEST PARCEL, 2021**



*SOURCE: Google Earth, JOHNSON ECONOMICS*


Two out of the three parcels are within the Current Use program and have been since the development of Clark County's comprehensive plan, adopted in the 1990s. Current Use allows open space, timber, agricultural, and forest lands to be taxed at the value of their current use, rather than at their assessed value. This program is a tax deferral, so if the lands are withdrawn, the owner must pay at least seven years of back taxes at the assessed value, plus interest in some cases. This is detailed later in the report. Clark County does not use the Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs), which is a tax deferral program similar to current use.



#### IV. CHARACTERIZATION OF URBAN GROWTH

The subject property is adjacent to the Ridgefield Urban Growth Boundary to the west and south. The parcels on the inside edges of these boundaries are primarily residential or agricultural. These boundaries were last updated in 2022, according to Clark County’s GIS system.

FIGURE 4.1: RIDGEFIELD URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY, 2022




SOURCE: Clark County, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

The subject property is primarily zoned for agricultural use. Agricultural zoning continues to the north and east of the property. The land to the west and south of the subject property is zoned for commercial, business, and employment uses.



FIGURE 4.2: CLARK COUNTY ZONING, SUBJECT AND SURROUNDING PROPERTIES



SOURCE: Clark County, JOHNSON ECONOMICS


Within about a mile of the subject property, five subdivisions have been built out since 2018. McCormick Creek, immediately to the left of the subject site, was completed in late 2023 and includes 90 homes. About half a mile to the south is The Crossing, a 132-unit townhome development completed in 2023, and south of that is Pioneer East, completed in 2022 with 209 units. Greely Farms to the southeast was built starting in 2019 with 185 units in its first two phases. The third phase, which has 179 units, is still under construction. The last recent subdivision is Urban Downs, located just south of Greely Farms with 27 homes.

There are also several commercial, educational, and industrial developments within the same radius. Union Ridge Town Center to the west is expected to be completed by early 2025. It will have 14 small commercial sites anchored by Costco. Tri-Mountain Station, a nine-building commercial center, is still waiting on permits. Clark College at Boschma Farms, opening in 2025, will specialize in advanced manufacturing technologies, reflecting Ridgefield's large



industrial sector. The remainder are small to large warehouse buildings. These developments are mapped below: blue points are residential, and red points are commercial/industrial/educational buildings.

FIGURE 4.3: NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN PROXIMITY, 2024




SOURCE: Clark County, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

Eight parcels near the subject site were recently listed for sale (clusters 1-3, shown below). There are also twelve parcels that will be listed for sale soon (cluster 4, shown below). These parcels are advertised as zoned for commercial, employment, and industrial uses, though the parcels in clusters 2 and 4 are currently designated as agricultural land under Current Use, according to Clark County land records.



FIGURE 4.4: LAND FOR SALE IN PROXIMITY, 2024



SOURCE: Clark County, local brokers, local media, JOHNSON ECONOMICS



## V. CURRENT AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

About 17 acres of the subject property are currently being farmed with blackberries. Over the last 20-30 years, a variety of berries and grasses have been grown on this portion – parcels 212566000 and 986047199.

**FIGURE 5.1: STREET VIEW OF BLACKBERRY FARMING, 2019**



*SOURCE: Google Earth, JOHNSON ECONOMICS*

The remainder of parcel 212566000 (about 20 acres) is not being farmed, and the grass and weeds currently growing there are unsuitable for haying. There is no satellite imagery available.

Within half a mile of the subject site, there are several other small farms. To the east, there are three other blackberry farms; these have operated since at least 2015. A large agricultural property immediately to the southeast that produced corn in the mid-2010s is being developed for residential homes. This development seems to be in its final stages. An agricultural property to the northwest was a Christmas tree farm at some point, but does not currently appear to be farmed, and was recently listed for sale as employment land.




## VI. COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR AGRICULTURE

### LAND CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION & WATER RESOURCES

Land capability classification refers to the suitability of soils for growing field crops. Class I soils are the most versatile soils and Class VIII the least. Generally, land with soil classified at IV or higher is unsuitable for most crops but may be appropriate for pasture/grazing use.

The subject property is made up of a mix of soils and land capability classifications. Most of the property area, especially on the north and east sides, is Gee silt loam (GeB and GeD), both 0-8 percent slopes and 8-20 percent slopes. These are Class II and IV soils, which, according to the Clark County Assessor, are suitable for most crops and pasture. The southwest corner is Hillsboro silt loam (HoA) and Class I, suitable for any crops. There are also a few small areas of Odne silt loam (OdB). This soil type is Class VI and generally not suitable for most crops.

FIGURE 6.1: USDA SOIL CLASSIFICATION, 2019



SOURCE: USDA Web Soil Survey, JOHNSON ECONOMICS



Additionally, the subject property has good access to water resources to support agricultural use. The largest parcel holds a consumptive irrigation right claim from the East Fork of the Lewis River, allowing for farming of water-intensive crops such as berries. Consumptive water use, which can include consumptive use of groundwater or consumptive use of surface water, describes water use that removes water from a supply without returning to the supply. The other parcels do not hold claims to water rights.

## AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

To the south of the subject property is North 10<sup>th</sup> Street/Northwest 279<sup>th</sup> Street, which has two travel lanes, each about 15 feet wide. These are separated by a double yellow line. There are no bike lanes or sidewalks. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour, and the closest intersection, North 10<sup>th</sup> Street and North 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the west, is controlled with stop signs on North 10<sup>th</sup> Street. North 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue is included in the Ridgefield Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan (2024-2029) as a development-funded project; it will be completed by a private developer, as part of a larger project, rather than by the city. An additional road just south of the subject property is expected to be added within this time frame as well.

The subject property is currently under the jurisdiction of the Rural/Resource Sewer District. However, it is adjacent to the City of Ridgefield Wastewater Service Area on the south boundary of the site. The jurisdiction recently extended the sewer line east from the planned Ridgefield Elementary School site on North 10<sup>th</sup> Street/Northwest 279<sup>th</sup> Street to North 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There is also a new pumping station for the residential homes in development on North 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Similarly, the Clark Public Utility District (CPU) installed new power lines and poles around the subject property.

Water is also provided by Clark Public Utilities. There is a CPU well just south of the property. The City of Ridgefield is in the process of updating their Water System Plan, which is expected to be completed by fall 2024. This update could provide more information about where to look for water system expansions in the future.

## AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES

The subject property is less than half a mile northeast of the Clark-Cowlitz Fire Rescue Station 21, within the Clark-Cowlitz Fire District. It is about four miles east of the Ridgefield Police Department. The nearest medical center with an emergency department is Legacy Salmon Creek Medical Center, about nine miles to the south of the subject property. There is a primary and urgent care clinic about a mile southwest of the subject property, on Pioneer Street.


The subject property is in the Ridgefield School District, about four miles west of Union Ridge Elementary School. However, the district is set to begin construction on a new elementary school on the large lot directly south of the subject property, if voters approve the construction cost. The property is just over three miles from Ridgefield High School and View Ridge Middle School.

## TAX STATUS

Two of the three parcels that make up the subject property are designated under the Current Use program as agricultural lands, so they are taxed at a reduced value from their assessed market value. The graph below illustrates the difference between the assessed value and the taxable value under this program.



FIGURE 6.2: ASSESSED VALUE AND TAXABLE VALUE OF SUBJECT PARCELS, 2024



SOURCE: Clark County Assessor, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

The basic definition of farm and agricultural land under Current Use is:

“any parcel of land or contiguous parcels of land that are 20 or more acres: (i) devoted primarily to the production of livestock or agricultural commodities, for commercial purposes; (ii) enrolled in the federal conservation reserve program or its successor administered by the United States Department of Agriculture; or (iii) other similar commercial activities as may be established by rule... ‘Commercial agricultural purposes’ means the use of land on a continuous and regular basis, prior to and subsequent to application for classification or reclassification that demonstrates that the owner or lessee is engaged in and intends to obtain through lawful means, a monetary profit from cash income by producing an agricultural product” (RCW Chapter 84.34 and 84.33).

While the parcels currently meet these requirements, if the parcels are sold for non-agricultural use, they will need to be withdrawn from the program. According to Clark County Assessor records, the parcels have been designated under Current Use since at least 2006, so removing them from the program would incur only back taxes and interest and no additional penalties. Upon withdrawal from Current Use, we estimate the additional back taxes plus interest to be around \$85,415.

### PROXIMITY TO URBAN GROWTH AREAS

The subject property is adjacent to the Ridgefield Urban Growth Boundary. It is within one mile of six residential projects that were recently built or that are under construction, with a total of over 800 new homes. Additionally, there are multiple commercial and industrial developments within a mile of the subject property. It is also adjacent to a lot planned for a new elementary school. This demonstrates proximity to urban growth areas.



## PARCEL SIZE

The largest parcel, which is the only one used for farming, is 38 acres. Less than half of the parcel (17 acres) is currently being farmed. The smaller parcel to the north of it is 6.44 acres, and the smallest parcel is 0.24 acres. These are significantly larger residential parcels in subdivisions around the site, which range from 0.06 to 0.17 acres. Industrial parcels slightly farther south range from 6 -40 acres; these are similar in size to the parcels within the subject property.

## LAND USE PATTERNS & INTENSITY OF SURROUNDING LAND USE

To the east of the subject property are more blackberry farms. To the north and south is Current Use-designated agricultural land, including a few parcels that have been farmed in the past but do not appear to be farmed currently. Immediately to the west is a 90-lot subdivision, McCormick Creek, which was built in 2021. Farther to the west and south are commercial and industrial centers – many permitted and built within the last 5 years.

New residential development is taking place primarily to the west and south, inside the Ridgefield UGA. As those cities grow, new residential subdivisions will move towards the current UGA boundary and potentially even adjoin the subject property, as is the case with the McCormick Creek subdivision. Agricultural use of the subject property would stand in contrast to anticipated land use patterns of surrounding areas.

## HISTORY OF PERMITS ISSUED NEARBY

Since 2017, six subdivision permits have been issued within one mile of the subject property. These have added 643 new homes to the area, not including 179 homes under construction. Nine commercial and industrial building permits, plus one permit for a new Clark College building and one for an elementary school, have been issued since 2017, leading to over 1,320,000 completed square feet of commercial and industrial space. There are still 380,000 square feet under construction, and 130,000 SF in permit review. Permits issued nearby indicate strongly that the subject property is characterized by urban growth.

FIGURE 6.2: RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED SINCE 2017

#	Project Name	Address	Status	Permit Year	Units	
1	Greely Farms Ph. 3	S of Russet Pl	U.C.	2019	179	
2	Pioneer East	7143 S 11th St	Complete	2017	209	
3	McCormick Creek Ph. 2	N 10th Ave & N Fairhope Pl	Complete	2019	90	
4	Greely Farms Ph. 1 & 2	N 4th St & N Russet Pl	Complete	2019	185	
5	Urban Downs	S Goose Loop & S 88th Ave	Complete	2019	27	
6	The Crossing	441 S 69th Pl	Complete	2020	132	
<b>Total Residential Units</b>					<b>822</b>	
#	Project Name	Address	Type	Status	Permit Year	SF
7	Tri-Mountain Station	Pioneer St & S 65th Ave	Commercial	Permit Review	N/A	130,205
8	Union Ridge Town Center	Pioneer St & S 56th Pl	Commercial	U.C.	2023	255,850
9	Clark College	Pioneer ST & NE 259th St	Education	U.C.	2023	49,000
10	New Ridge Elementary	7025 N 10th St	Education	U.C.	2024	75,000
11	Grocery Outlet Distribution Ctr	7000 S 10th St	Industrial	Complete	2018	112,526
12	BedTech Ridgefield	7200 S 10th St	Industrial	Complete	2018	106,167
13	UNFI Dist. Ctr. Expansion	7909 S Union Ridge Pkwy	Industrial	Complete	2018	577,000
14	Keller Supply Company	1200 N 65th Ave	Commercial	Complete	2019	55,868
15	Child Logistics	7001 S Union Ridge Pkwy	Industrial	Complete	2021	468,810
<b>Total SF</b>					<b>1,830,426</b>	


SOURCE: CoStar, Ridgefield Planning Department, Google Earth, local media, JOHNSON ECONOMICS



## LAND VALUES UNDER ALTERNATIVE USES

Under the Current Use program, the largest parcel has a taxable value of \$651,474, about half its assessed market value. This includes the value of a home and several other buildings assessed at \$575,192, which is most of that taxable value. The other Current Use parcel has a taxable value of \$115. These values would be maintained if the parcels continued their current agricultural use. At fair market value, the land in the Current Use parcels is assessed at \$749,049 and \$18,241 respectively. The second largest parcel, which is not under Current Use, is valued at \$440,411. The assessed prices reflect residential development values and are much higher than what a farmer would reasonably pay to use the land for agricultural production. Assessed land values have also increased significantly over the last few years. The graph below shows the assessed value over time for each parcel. From 2018 to 2024, assessed values increased by 50-100%.

FIGURE 6.3: ASSESSED LAND VALUE OF SUBJECT PARCELS, 2018-2024



SOURCE: Clark County Assessor, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

## PROXIMITY OF MARKETS

The subject property currently produces blackberries, though a variety of berries have been grown over the last 20-40 years. These were sold to Willamette Valley Fruit Company in Salem, Oregon. Ridgefield and Salem are about 70 miles apart. Prior to 2019, there were a few years in which clover, wheat, and fescue grass were grown, but the market proximity for these is not known.

## CROP PRODUCTIVITY

The farm currently produces blackberries. Blackberry productivity tables were discontinued by the USDA in 2018, so the following are rough estimates only. Average berry yield per acre in 2017 was about 6,400 pounds, and the average grower price is 77 cents per pound. According to Brett Jones, 6,400 pounds per acre is about the maximum yield at the subject property, in the areas with the highest quality soils. Seventeen acres of berries at this yield and price would result in maximum revenue of about \$83,800. This figure only includes sales and does not take into account any costs.

While yield and price estimates have remained about the same since 2017, the costs of growing blackberries have increased substantially, as stated by Brett Jones. These increased costs include inflation on labor cost and labor insurance, farm insurance, fuel, chemicals, equipment maintenance cost, and depreciation, all dependent on farm



and weather conditions as well as market supply and demand, according to Gerald Jones. Labor costs are particularly high for berries compared to hay (detailed below) as the plants need quite a bit of maintenance and the berries require more careful handling. The small scale of this farming operation implies high per-unit equipment and transaction costs.

We consider hay to be another possible option for farming at the subject property. In Washington State, the average hay crop in 2022 yielded 3.1 to 5.2 tons per acre. County level data is not available, but a 2015 report to de-designate a property in Clark County estimated a yield of 2.0 tons per acre, so we estimate that actual productivity is at the lower end of the state average. The USDA Washington-Oregon Hay Report for early July 2024 estimates sale prices of \$250-300 per ton for good to premium quality hays. From these we estimate maximum hay crop revenue to be \$1,300-1,560 per acre. If we assume exclusive hay production, selling all that is produced, and that there are about 30 acres usable for farming, maximum revenue is \$39,000 to \$46,800 yearly. The costs of growing hay include labor, equipment, and fertilizer as well as transaction costs, though these costs are lower than they are for blackberry production.

The most significant cost associated with farming the subject properties, however, is the cost of buying or renting the land. The assessed market value of the subject property is almost \$1.8 million. While there are no comparable farm sales in the area, it is very unlikely that a farmer would pay that much for a small-scale farming operation.

Prior to 2018, the subject property was one of many properties farmed commercially by one farmer. Since then, Gerald Jones, the current owner of the subject property, has rented the 17 acres of berry crop to Brett Jones. Brett Jones disclosed to us that the berry crop has not been profitable. At best, he has made 20% of the revenue in profit (about \$17,000 from our estimates), though in many other years, he broke even or incurred a loss. Additionally, the berry picking equipment available at the subject property has deteriorated in recent years, according to Gerald Jones. With these current market conditions, there is no profit margin available to purchase new equipment for berries or for hay. Alone, the area designated for agricultural use is small and not viable for commercial farming. As it is not economically feasible to conduct agricultural operations on the subject property, it does not have long-term commercial significance for agriculture.

## VII. THE STATE OF AGRICULTURE IN CLARK COUNTY

The Washington GMA specifies that a countywide analysis must be conducted in order for cities and counties to de-designate natural resource lands (including agricultural lands) within the county. This Comprehensive Plan is required by the Washington GMA to be updated by the end of 2025, after its last update in 2016. In lieu of this full countywide analysis, we include a summary of the state of agriculture and urban development in Clark County.


As of 2022, there were just over 1,900 farms in Clark County, according to the USDA. This includes 56,000 total acres, down 38% from 2017, when there were over 90,000 acres of land in farms. However, the number of farms in the county only decreased by 3%, suggesting that either a few large farms have ceased operations or that many farms have decreased in size.

On average, farms in Clark County are primarily small in size and scale: almost 70% of farms make less than \$5,000 in sales, and almost 90% of farms are smaller than 50 acres. Average farm-related income increased 132% from 2017 to 2022, but average net cash farm income is still negative at -\$230. The most produced crops in Clark County, by acreage, are hay (13,500 acres), Christmas trees (910 acres) and berries (855 acres).

Natural resource lands in Clark County are designated under the Current Use program, as described earlier in this report. About 36% of the county's land by area is classified under this program. Of the total land in Current Use, 25% is agricultural land (yellow), and the rest is open space (teal), designated forest land (purple), or timber land (brown). The subject property makes up about 0.1% of the total agricultural land area in Clark County.



FIGURE 7.1: CLARK COUNTY LAND UNDER CURRENT USE, 2024




SOURCE: Clark County, JOHNSON ECONOMICS



## POPULATION & DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

The county has seen population growth of almost 25% since 2010, which is equivalent to just over 100,000 people. Over that same period, Ridgefield saw a 219% increase in population, or just over 10,000 people. This is exceptionally fast compared to larger geographies, illustrated in the graphs below.

FIGURE 7.2: POPULATION GROWTH SINCE 2010, GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISON




SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, Portland State University, WA Office of Financial Management, JOHNSON ECONOMICS

The increasing population in the county indicates a need for more housing, especially in fast-growing areas such as Ridgefield. Recent housing construction in Clark County has roughly been on par with the 1990s, when the county experienced a suburban boom. However, the share of multifamily units has increased considerably, while single-family construction is below the 1990s level.



The pattern is different in Ridgefield, which saw little development until the early 2000s. At that point, it began to reflect the larger county trend, though residential development is mostly in single-family homes. The city has seen a few larger multifamily projects since 2018, reflecting its increased density.

**FIGURE 5.15: RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS, CLARK COUNTY & RIDGEFIELD (1990-2024)**



SOURCE: U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development, Johnson Economics

As Ridgefield continues to develop, and as the city’s population continues to grow at rates significantly above Portland and the broader metro area, more land will be needed for residential and commercial use. The city will not be able to plan for large new subdivisions or commercial centers without de-designating some of its agricultural land.



## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our findings, it is our opinion that the subject property does not meet the criteria of agricultural land as laid out in the Washington Growth Management Act. It is therefore recommended for de-designation:

- The property has characteristics conducive to urban growth. It is adjacent to the Ridgefield UGB and in proximity to multiple new subdivisions and commercial/industrial sites. Parcels nearby that were previously designated as agricultural land are now selling as commercial or industrial land. Ridgefield is a fast-growing city characterized by a lack of residential and commercial land; its population has grown by over 200% since 2010. The GMA requirement for designation as agricultural land is that “the land is not already characterized by urban growth;” the property fails to meet this requirement.
- While the property is currently being farmed, meeting the second GMA requirement of “the land is used or capable of being used for agricultural production,” farming has been greatly reduced in recent years. Only about 35% of the land area designated for agriculture is used for growing crops. Several agricultural parcels around the subject site have also slowed or ceased farming altogether in recent years.
- The property no longer has “long-term commercial significance for agriculture,” which is the third requirement in the GMA. The market value of this land for residential or commercial use is far higher than its assessed value for agricultural use. The values of these parcels reflect residential development values and are much higher than what a farmer would reasonably pay to use the land for farming. Additionally, the current berry crop does not turn a profit due to high equipment and labor costs for a relatively small farm area. Continuing farming at the subject property would require new investments in equipment, which would not be financially feasible.