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Rural Views and Issues

• What is rural?
• What are some of the characteristics, values and attitudes we associate with rural Ohio?
• What are some of the leading threats to quality of life in rural Ohio?
Agricultural Views and Issues

• What are some of the defining characteristics of Ohio agriculture?
• What are some of the leading threats to production agriculture in Ohio?
Ohioan’s Views of Farmers and the Environment

• Selected data from a statewide Survey of Rural and Urban Ohioans
  – Data based on responses from 4,030 Ohioans
Q. Overall, farming positively contributes to the quality of life in Ohio

- 1% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
- 7% Undecided
- 92% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Q. Ohio’s economy will suffer if it continues to lose farmers

- 5% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
- 15% Undecided
- 80% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Q. Ohio’s most productive farmland should be preserved for agriculture.

- 2% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
- 6% Undecided
- 92% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Q. I trust Ohio farmers to protect the environment.

• 12% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
• 29% Undecided
• 59% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Q. Ohio farmers are generally sensitive to the concerns of nonfarm neighbors.

- 11% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
- 45% Undecided
- 44% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Q. Environmental protection laws regulating farming practices are too strict.

- 19% Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed
- 59% Undecided
- 22% Agreed or Strongly Agreed
Population Change in Ohio
Survey Findings: Current and Preferred Residence (all Ohioans)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ohio 2000 Population by Township, Village, and Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of Ohio population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>3,860,763</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages*</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>862,080</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities**</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3,642,579</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Cities***</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,987,918</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ohio Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,353,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Villages are incorporated places of 0 to 4,999 residents
**Small cities are incorporated places of 5,000 to 49,999 residents
***Large Cities are incorporated places of 50,000 or more residents
Figure 3: Population of Ohio Townships, Villages and Cities 1960-2000

EX-1: TOWNSHIP POPULATION CHANGE
VS. CITIES AND VILLAGES 1960-2000

*Small Cities categorized as cities with population less than 50,000. Large cities contain population greater than 50,000

Note: Classification of small city and large city based on 2000 population levels, classification of villages based on 2000 political classification.

Legend:
Township Population Density
People per Square Mile

- Less than 50: Low Density
- 50 to 99: Medium Density
- 100 to 499: High Density
- More than 500: Very High Density
- Cities & Villages
Factors Associated with Ohio Population Change (focus on rural-urban interface)
The Transportation Connection

– Urbanization has always followed transportation routes (and vice versa).
  • The first suburbanization occurred in the mid-1800’s as railroads and streetcar lines were built from central city to outskirts of city.

– Road building increases accessibility to outer areas
  • The largest increase in Medina County population (39%) and the largest decrease in Cuyahoga County’s population (13%) occurred in the 10-year period after the opening of I-71. *(ODOT)*
73% of all urban land cover in Ohio is located within 5 miles of a highway.

(Reece and Irwin, 2002)
But it’s not just people who follow the roads…

• Road building also spurs firms to move outward and leads to the development of “edge cities” around the central city.
• This allows people to move even further out and maintain the same commute time.
Map 13: Buffer Zones from Major Cities
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Source: US Census Bureau
Roads are not the only reason growth is occurring in rural-urban areas…

• Quality of public services and schools
  • Better services *pull* population outward
  • Perception of “urban ills” *pushes* population outward.

• Desire for bigger house, bigger yard
  • Land is cheaper in outer areas

• The rural ideal
  – Open space, more privacy, better community, “sense of place,” less government.
Population Trends: Fayette County
Population Change in Fayette County – 1960 to 2000

**PROJECTED 2015**
FAYETTE COUNTY
POPULATION IS: 31,300
Township Population Change: 1990 to 2000

- Union township: 90
- Paint township: 89
- Wayne township: 63
- Concord township: 53
- Perry township: 49
- Green township: 48
- Marion township: 45
- Jasper township: 22
- Jefferson township: -66
- Madison township: -76
II. LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL TRENDS:
Ohio and Fayette County
Maps 9 and 10
Ohio Urban Land Use Change
1982 to 1997

Map 9: Absolute Change, Acres

Map 10: Percent Change
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Source: National Resource Inventory
Land Cover in Fayette’s County: early 1990’s

Map 2: Fayette County Land Use (Early 1990's)
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Source: Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium National Land Cover Data Program
Projection: State Plane 1927, Ohio North

Prepared by:
Jason W. Reece
Dept. of AEDE
The Ohio State University
12.01.01
Number of Farms and Land in Farms: 1987 to 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farms (number)</th>
<th>Land in farms (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>244,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>235,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>242,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fayette versus State Trends in # of Farms

• From 1978 to 1997
  – # of farms decline 17.2% in Fayette, while decline of 13.1% for all of Ohio
  – Number of farms w/ sales greater than $250,000 grew from 40 farms in 1987 to 69 in 1997 (72.5% increase)
    • Statewide, # of large farms grew 62%
  – Decline in medium size farms; more modest decline in small farms (in Fayette and Ohio)
Agricultural Issues Related to Population Growth in Ohio

Compatibility of farmers and nonfarmers in the countryside
  – Livestock Issue is top headline

Issue of farmland preservation
  – Ohio ranks in the top ten in farmland loss and nearly the top of loss of prime farmland in recent decade
Top 10 States in Acres of Prime Farmland Converted to Development 1992 to 1997 (in 1,000's of Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Texas</td>
<td>332.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ohio</td>
<td>212.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Georgia</td>
<td>184.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 North Carolina</td>
<td>168.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Illinois</td>
<td>160.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pennsylvania</td>
<td>134.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Indiana</td>
<td>124.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tennessee</td>
<td>124.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Michigan</td>
<td>121.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Alabama</td>
<td>113.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Natural Resource Inventory defines “Prime Farmland” as: Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is also available for these uses.
Farmland Preservation
Objectives of Farmland Protection Programs

Respond to the effects of nonfarm development on the farmer:

– Increasing land prices
– Increasing property taxes
– Increasing number of nonfarm neighbors
– Increasing costs of doing business
Objectives of Farmland Protection Programs

Respond to the effects of nonfarm development on the community:

– Decreasing farm economy
– Increasing demand for community services
– Loss of open space
– Changing community character
Objectives of Farmland Protection Programs

Create options and opportunities for agriculture and farmers:

- Transfer farm to next generation
- Create new markets for farm products
- Improve existing farm operations
- Create new farming operations
Objectives of Farmland Protection Programs

Create an environment that supports and promotes agriculture:

– Protect land equity
– Engage the nonfarm public
– Stabilize the agriculture infrastructure
Objectives of Farmland Protection Programs

Respond to the effects of nonfarm development on the environment:

– Loss of wildlife habitat
– Negative impacts on water and air quality
Where Does Farmland Preservation Make Sense?

Limited resources require strategic and targeted approach

Possible criteria for targeting efforts:

– Soils
– Amount of development pressure
– Tenure
– Management practices
– Local planning
History of Ohio Farmland Protection

• 1997 - Governor Voinovich established Farmland Preservation (FP) Task Force
  – Created office of farmland preservation within ODA
  – Created recommendations for state agencies to consider impacts on farmland loss
  – Created grants for county governments to write their own FP plans
  – 12 recommendations, including the creation of the Agricultural Easement Purchase Program
Agricultural Easement Purchase Program

- 2000 - S.B. 223, allowed state & local gov’ts and non-profits (land trusts) to acquire, hold, and accept agricultural easements
  - Voluntary, but unfunded
- Program is administered by the Ohio Office of Farmland Preservation
The Agricultural Easement

- A legal voluntary agreement made by the landowner:
  - To retain the land predominantly in agriculture
  - And forfeit the right to develop the land for non-agricultural purposes

- Grants the “holder” a non-possessory legal right to enforce the landowner’s agreement not to develop
The Agricultural Easement

• A legal interest that “runs with the land” as it passes from one owner to the next
• For purposes of AEPP, Ohio law requires perpetual agricultural easements
Valuation of Agricultural Easements

- **Land Value Before Easement**
  - Development Value (cost of easement): $4,000
  - Agricultural Value: $2,000
  - Total Value: $6,000

- **Values After Easement**
  - Development Value: $4,000
  - Agricultural Value: $2,000
  - Total Value: $6,000
What an Agricultural Easement *Is Not*: 

- Does not grant public access to the land
- Does not remove the land from tax rolls
- Does not grant ownership of the land to the government
- Does not allow the government to dictate the type of agriculture
- Does not give government the right to develop the land
- Is not a “conservation easement”
How Does Ohio’s Agricultural Easement Purchase Program Work?

• State of Ohio provides funds through grants to counties, townships, municipalities and land trusts
• Grants are used to purchase agricultural easements
  – State’s share funds up to 75% of purchase price
  – $4,000 per acre cap for State’s share
  – $1 million per farm cap for State’s share
• Remaining 25% of purchase price must come from:
  – Cash match by county, township, municipality, or land trust
  – And/or landowner’s donation
How Is AEPP Funded?

• State Issue 1 (November 2000) created $400 million for the “Clean Ohio Fund”
• $25 million of the Clean Ohio Fund goes into the AEPP over the next 4 years
  – $6.25 million per year
• The program will also receive funds from the federal Farmland Protection Program
Results of the 2002 Application Period

• 442 applications submitted
• 63,193 total acres offered
• 49 counties represented
• ODA projection
  – Can purchase ~3,125 acres at $2,000 per acre
Other Policy Tools for Preserving Farmland and Managing Population Growth

• Comprehensive planning
• Zoning
• CAUV
• Agricultural Districts
Farm/Nonfarm Compatibility Issue

• Livestock is a headline issue
• Day-to-day difficulties exist for all types of farmers working amidst nonfarmers
  – Traffic, field work drift, unauthorized use of land, etc.
Additional Comments?