INTERVIEWER: Today is June 11, 2015. It is my pleasure today to be speaking this morning with Janet McLennan. Janet has held numerous roles in connection with Oregon’s land use system, including as the House counsel for the House Committee on Land Use and the Environment, and as Governor Bob Straub’s Natural Resources Assistant during the mid 1970’s when the land use system was first implemented. Janet went on to work at the Bonneville Power Administration and served as the Chair of the Oregon Board of Forestry, as well as on the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission. My name is Kevin Pozzi and I am the Program Manager for the Oregon Planning Forum, which is housed within the College of Urban and Public Affairs and Portland State University. Janet, we are honored that you would be willing sit down with us today. We’re hoping to gather as much information as we can from the people who are influential in forming and shaping Oregon’s land use system. We’re aiming to document the stories, anecdotes and experiences of people who were involved back then, as well as to get your thoughts on how the land use system evolved and where you think it is headed. We encourage you to share anything you might feel is relevant. So, I think it’s time to begin.

JANET McLENNAN: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: I was hoping we might just be able to touch on your personal and professional relationship with Oregon’s land use system.

JANET McLENNAN: Well, as you indicated, I was House Counsel for the House Environment Committee in the ’73 session when the bill was passed, but the bill was crafted in the
Senate and Senator Hallock, who was the chairman of the Senate Committee, was very, very
explicit when it came over to the House that we shouldn't change a comma and indeed we didn’t.
(Chuckling) So, the House Committee had more influence on the Senate Bill 101, which was a
companion bill relative to farmland protection, but we really couldn’t claim authorship of any part
of Senate Bill 100, and it’s been interesting to me to look at it from this perspective today. It’s an
interesting piece of legislative draftsmanship. As Natural Resources Assistant, I interacted with the
agency head, recommended the appointment of commission members to the Governor, worked on
major policy issues such as the Willamette Greenway and Coastal Goals, and resistance to repeal
efforts. In 1979, I went on the board of 1000 Friends of Oregon, which Henry Richmond founded.
Henry had been a preeminent advocate before the legislature for a land use planning statute and
conceived the idea of 1000 Friends being an advocacy and public interest law firm to promote the
development and the sustenance of Senate Bill 100 as it was implemented and applied. And so
when I left State government in ’79, I was happy to join with the group that he had assembled as a
board, and I served on that board until 1987, when I went on the Board of Forestry (much of that
time as the chair of the board). So, it was a value experience and I grew very respectful, not only
of Henry, but of Bob Stacey and Dick Benner and Robert Liberty. These young attorneys fresh out
of law school really, together were very influential in succeeding really in defining the workability
and the effectiveness of this piece of legislation as it was applied on the ground. So --

INTERVIEWER: Great. And then your further work with the Fish and Wildlife
Commission, did that tie in at all with the --

JANET McLennan: Well, I sort of dropped in and out of land use planning as you
go but during my period at Bonneville, I didn't have anything to do with, uh -- except through my
service on the board of 1000 Friends. During the period that I was on the Board of Forestry, the
Forestry goal, I understand from looking at it now, while my memory is refreshed, was amended, I think, three times, and was made much more fulsome than the original Forestry Goal. The original forestry goal had been drafted by a small committee, which I served, during the period of time that I worked Executive Secretary of the Joint Interim Committee on Agriculture, Environment, and Natural Resources between 1973 and 1975. Ward Armstrong was on that committee, and a couple other people, whom I don’t remember. Anyway, the forestry goal at that point, as it was originally drafted, which I would say maybe four short paragraphs long, was quite succinct, but now it’s much more extensive, but not -- I don’t think that there’s been a significant change in it from a policy perspective. It’s more bureaucratic and procedural, at least. It would have come before us, as the Board of Forestry, for approval in each of those three iterations and I don’t remember any great controversy about it.

INTERVIEWER: Moving onto the next question, Senate Bill 100, as you’re very familiar, created a framework for land use planning across the state. Based on this legislation the statewide planning goals were drafted to express the State’s policy interests in local land use planning.

JANET McLENNAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: So, do you believe that LCDC, the Land Conversation and Development Commission, that was created from this legislation, acted correctly to ensure that these objectives have been carried out?

JANET McLENNAN: Yes. I believe, generally, they did. If you look back at Senate Bill 10, the predecessor, that was a longer list of policy concern, but I think the goal statements as they were crafted for that initial effort in 1974, pretty much encompassed all those
concerns. Whether and to what extent we fully comprehended the implications of the goals as they might be implemented, I think is another question, and I doubt that any of us did. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) It must have been an exciting time.

JANET McLENNAN: Yeah. As I recall, L.B. Day, who was chair of LCDC, was quite arbitrary about those being the goals and the subject matters that were to be addressed within the rubric of goals but I don’t remember who was pushing for some alternative or expansion at the time but I do sort of remember his response, which was, “No way”. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) Well, I’ll move onto the next question then.

LCDC adopted 19 statewide goals, and I’m just wondering, you know, which goals do you believe have been the most important to the accomplishments of the program and maybe which ones have been the least important?

JANET McLENNAN: Um hmm. And I think the agricultural goal has been important. I think the forestry goal has been very important. Certainly the citizen involvement and land use planning goals. You can’t possibly go back to thinking of what government was like in the 1950’s, 60’s and so on, but as the law of administrative procedures developed, particularly at the federal level from the depression on, and through the war years, into the years after the war, with respect to natural resources generally the pattern in law was to give great deference to the agencies, The idea of a broad public participation and the vacuuming up of a lot of public opinion and concern and advocacy in making decisions was not at all the way things were done. So, the citizen involvement and land use planning goals, as they stated here, from our perspective today, are kind of ho hum statement. Well, of course, what else would you do, but it wasn’t that way then, and it was, uh, a pioneer effort. Today, any major issue, you’ll go on a statewide routine of presenting it
in, you know, six or eight communities around the state, and a couple in the metropolitan area and so forth and so on. That wasn’t done at all then.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: With respect, for instance, to the coastal goal, I really don’t know because I haven’t really associated with those issues since 1968, when I ran a campaign that failed with respect to the beaches. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Can you talk about that a little bit?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, no, that’s not necessary to talk about it because it really wasn’t so much a land use issue --

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: -- but, anyway, you mentioned having spoken with -- or having planned to speak with Ann Squier and she’d be a very good person to talk to about that.

INTERVIEWER: Great.

JANET McLENNAN: As would Steve Schell.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: But also Cameron LaFollette, and she is the land use person for the Oregon Coastal Alliance, located in Astoria. She’s an attorney and was in Oregon -- I don’t know whether she was here in ’73, but she was certainly here by the time I was in the Governor’s Office in 75-79. She subsequently went to law school, and came back to Oregon to practice land use law on the coast and she probably would be an interesting person to speak to on that subject.

INTERVIEWER: Any goals that you feel like haven’t measured up or that we don’t focus on enough?

JANET McLENNAN: Hmm?
INTERVIEWER: Any goals that you feel like we don’t focus on enough or that haven’t been successful?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, I don’t know that I’ve been concerned about it, but I know that Mike Houck has been concerned about it, and that’s Goal 5.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And I haven’t associated with that. I’ve heard about it primarily from Nancie Fadeley, because she was serving on the Board of 1000 Friends when he was, and he was apparently consuming a good deal of each agenda on that subject. And I don’t know that -- I don’t know exactly what his goal is. I sense that it’s a frustration at not having a handle, probably a litigative handle, on some Fish and Wildlife issues. In other words, the program and the goal, as it’s written, don’t offer opportunities for litigation. And I’m not sure, I would think that that would be a good idea, frankly.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: One of the problems with Fish and Wildlife is that absolute scientific truths are hard to come by in that area and I’ve worked with these issues long enough, to find that the popular wisdom at one point gets turned around 180 degrees, another 10 or 15 or 20 years later, and because you’re making intrusions often on private property rights, it’s kind of a dangerous area to look for relief. I mean, for instance, the Endangered Species Act operates against everybody, but primarily it operates against public lands, not the private lands. But in this circumstance, land use planning pinches at the private level, and so I’m not sure I’m a part of Mike Houck's army, if that's his goal, because I think it might be disruptive --

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.
JANET McLENNAN: -- and endanger public acceptance of the system in the long run. And, frankly, there are some goals that I don’t know whether they -- they have a very significant role in the planning process. For example, recreational needs or -- I mean that’s -- I’m all for it but I -- I don’t know -- as far as I know it’s not been a source of great controversy.

Economic development, again, now certainly, that offers the opportunity at the city and county level to identify and reserve areas for industrial and commercial development, and that’s probably, as far as I know, its function in here. Public facilities and services. I don’t know the extent to which land use planning, uh, spends a lot of time on that subject, but another person that you might want to talk to sometime is Margaret Kirkpatrick. Margaret is now the chief counsel at Northwest Natural Gas but she was a land use attorney at Stoll Rives for many years, so she might have some insights on that. Energy conservation is an all time concern but I don’t know the extent to which land use planning has been a player in that or a necessary player.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: With respect to the greenway, as I think I mentioned in our telephone conversation, that arose out of a long political struggle that began well before Senate Bill 100 was conceived and I don’t whether you want to go into the details of that or --

INTERVIEWER: Not many folks have touched on the Willamette Greenway. So, I’m wondering if you could touch on that a little bit.

JANET McLENNAN: Would you?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

JANET McLENNAN: Well, the greenway was an idea of Bob Straub's in 1966, when he was running for governor against Tom McCall, and it was a popular idea, it captured people’s imagination, it was good to talk about that stuff. Then Tom, of course, was elected and
began serving in ’67 and he thought it was a good idea too. So, he introduced a bill in the legislature capturing the idea that Oregon was going to have a Willamette Greenway. It was kind of a two paragraph affair, but it sort of identified the program. And by Executive Order, he created a Greenway Committee to study the issues and fill in the details. Among obvious issues were whether the right of eminent domain might need to be employed in such acquisitions. Rep. Norma Paulus, representing a Salem House District and sensitive to the concerns of valley farmers had become intrigued with the idea of scenic easements. Well, the problem with scenic easements is that you have to be in a boat looking out to get any scenery.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And if you don’t have any access to the land, except the dock that you came from and the dock you’re going to -- (chuckling) why your -- your opportunity for recreational activity and enjoyment is limited and that, of course, was not the idea that Bob Straub had. He had an idea there was going to be a greenway, not necessarily condemned from Eugene to Portland, but with ample opportunity for people to use it.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: So, the debate went on. As it developed, farmers along the Willamette River who did, indeed, own that land, became understandably concerned that they were going to have a bunch of people hiking in their cornfields (chuckling) and so they began to organize in opposition. Well, Bob ran again against Tom in 1970. Again, he was defeated, but the pressure was mounting on Tom to do something. Under Rep. Paulus’ leadership, by 1973, the Greenway statutes had been expanded: Greenway designation was limited to 150’ on each side of the Willamette River; provision was made for acquiring scenic easements as a means of preserving existing uses and existing scenery on those Greenway lands; and otherwise the use of eminent
domain was proscribed. At this time we didn’t have the Department of Transportation, we had a State Highway Commission, and the chairman of the State Highway Commission was Glenn Jackson, a very powerful kingmaker in Oregon. He was chairman of the board of PP&L, and chairman in the Highway Commission. Glenn got the idea that to solve this problem, or address the problem, he would use the authority in the highway law to employ eminent domain to the extent necessary to create 5 or 6 state parks along the Willamette River between Eugene and Portland. These would provide large acreages for public use, and more access to the river. At that time, the State Parks Division was a part of the Highway Department under the Highway Commission.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm. Interesting.

JANET McLENNAN: The land acquisition team was sent out to do this. Well, that really got the farmers excited. I can’t remember the details respecting the individual parks, but most if not all were established. But tempers were rising very high in the agricultural community. Of course, if the acquisition team could buy on a willing seller basis, they did that, and they bought some land that way, but I believe there was some condemnation.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And so by ’73, I can remember, that Norma Paulus, but I know she was participating in a hearing – by now, Norma was pretty well-identified with the farmer point-of-view --

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: -- and just excoriating Dave Talbot, the State Parks Director. Dave could provide a detailed history of this period of the Greenway a lot better than I if he’s still alive, but he took the heat of that real antipathy from the farming community and from Norma. In this period, L.B. Day was an interesting figure. He had been a Democratic legislator in ’67. He
changed parties and at some point in the Gerald Ford administration, I believe served as what was called the Northwest Interior Department Representative, but in 1974, in addition to being the first chairman of LCDC, he was running the Teamster’s local in Salem, that represented all the cannery workers, and the cannery workers had a natural affinity for the farmers’ point-of-view in this. So, his interest in the Greenway was not disinterested. (chuckling) Anyway, L.B., and the farmers, and Norma were organizing mass meetings in the valley complaining about the whole idea of a Willamette Greenway and the use of condemnation to intrude upon their ownership.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: So, it had become a pretty hot issue. In ’75, Tom couldn’t run for re-election, and Bob Straub was elected Governor, defeating Vic Atiyeh, and he immediately wanted to revive his idea of a greenway. So, legislation was introduced, which did include the right of eminent domain for acquisition of park land -- or of greenway land. That bill, I didn’t participate in the drafting or lobbying of that bill, that was somebody else’s assignment, but it failed in committee. Norma was on that committee and was a fierce advocate against it, and a vote against it. That was a big disappointment to Bob Straub. At that time, L.B. was still the chairman of LCDC, though Bob had become Governor. However, Bob wanted somebody at LCDC that was supportive of more of his ideas, especially the Greenway, and so he relieved L.B. from the chairmanship of the Land Conservation and Development Commission. This was not viewed as a friendly act, and replaced him with a Portland attorney by the name of John Mosser.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: Yeah. Who was -- well, John was a Republican, but had supported Bob in his campaign for Governor in 1974. John was a former legislator and very fine
attorney. I remember having lunch with him in the State Capitol and talking him into accepting the chairmanship.

INTERVIEWER: Huh.

JANET McLENNAN: (Chuckling) And he did a really splendid job.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm. Well, I’m wondering -- I mean, unless we -- go ahead.

JANET McLENNAN: And -- and so we got to the point where the bill failed. I thought that the idea of the Willamette Greenway goal came out of a luncheon that we had in Salem with Dave Talbot and Roy Hemingway and probably Ken Johnson after the failure of the bill, but I’ve since learned that the idea also was lively among the staff at DLCD. At any rate, the goal was developed in that environment. Because of this long series of extraordinary farmer protest meetings that L.B. and Norma had, we determined that support for the Greenway and a Greenway goal needed to be bolstered. When Bob came into office in ’75, Tom McCall’s Greenway Committee among other executive order committees had been abolished.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

INTERVIEWER: But to support of the greenway goal idea, Bob created the Greenway Committee by executive order more supportive of his greenway vision, and that committee was chaired Art Johnson, a prominent attorney in Eugene, and Borden Beck, a prominent conservationist and attorney in Portland, and we, in turn, had a bunch of hearings. I can remember that at that time Neil Goldschmidt was Mayor in Portland, and he had on his staff a couple of people who were very skilled in the new science of public involvement, and -- and I was impressed. They were helpful to us in setting up this new Greenway Committee, and through a series of meetings, building a level of support in the towns of the valley for the goal.
INTERVIEWER: And we actually have a whole question on this. I -- you know, it kind of leads nicely, do -- you know, in 74, LCDC and DLCD took a pretty unprecedented public outreach and involvement effort and that proceeded into the first 14 goals.

JANET McLENNAN: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: You had mentioned this earlier that that wasn’t very common back in the day --

JANET McLENNAN: No. I --

INTERVIEWER: -- and so how do you think that effort came about and do you think it’s been successful?

JANET McLENNAN: Oh -- oh, yes. I mean, it’s not peculiar to Oregon, it’s a change in the -- in the public persona nationally, I would say. When I say nationally, I don’t know whether they do it in Mississippi, you know, (chuckling) but it’s certainly common in the Northwest and -- but it always amusing me to reflect on how it was back then. I can remember, before I was at Bonneville, we had a fish issue while I was in the Governor’s office. The issue was how much spill in the river inside of drought. And so the states were lobbying Bonneville for an increase in spill and Bonneville was making one of its first effort in public involvement. There was a night hearing and I went over in the basement of the Sheraton Hotel. A small group was gathered, and a Bonneville staffer came and turned on a recording device and then left. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

JANET McLENNAN: Well, today Bonneville has a major office of public involvement and all through the period that I worked there why more and more these techniques were developed and were accommodating a wide variety of public opinion but that’s where we started.
INTERVIEWER: And throughout your career, I mean, you’ve served on various commissions, do you feel like the amount or type of public involvement that we have today is still relevant?

JANET McLENNAN: Oh, yes. I think it’s relevant. Yeah. Now, you know, Oregon has a weak governorship and part of the phenomena of that is that you devolved a lot of authority to boards and commissions, and in a sense, those historically were the vehicle for bringing some level of involvement of the public to decision-making but it wasn’t always on high power issues. I can remember going to Fish and Wildlife hearings, but when I was in the Governor’s office, that would go on until 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning, and what they were worrying about was hunting and fishing seasons and bag limits. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Interesting.

JANET McLENNAN: And at least from my perspective, one of the frustrations of being on the Fish and Wildlife Commission is that the authority of the commission was focused on those subjects, not on policy questions. The staff had the high policy questions. (chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: Anyway, those things were important to fisherman and hunters and in those days a lot more important than I think they are today because by the time I was on the commission in the late ‘90’s, we passed all those rules, regularly and annually, uh, but there was not an intense public interest in them. Certainly, we weren’t there until 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: So, important issues of public policy, it's a healthy thing.
INTERVIEWER: Well, on that note, uh, do you think that the statewide planning goals have struck the right balance between state and local control that LCDC originally intended.

JANET McLENNAN: As far as I know they have. There was afoot a fear that the State was, you know, going to become a dominant authority, and I don’t think that has happened but I’m not -- I’m not an expert in -- that sort of thing -- there’s a lot of accommodation among bureaucrats and if you have accommodating friendly bureaucrats it works well and if you have people who become egocentric it can be miserable, you know?

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: But so I -- I speak without knowledge of the extent to which personalities compromised, the success of that I don’t know, and successes in the planning process. They could but they may not have.

INTERVIEWER: I think Oregonians are pretty unique in the awareness that they have over the land use system and --

JANET McLENNAN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: -- I’m just wondering if you think any politicians, elected officials, ballot measures, you know, other actions but the legislature, have they effected or undercut the system throughout the years?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, I mean, you know the history of it and I’m not the best person, because I -- you know, I’ve been on the edge of all those efforts of repeal and efforts of amendment and the compromises that have had to be made and -- and the frustration sometimes the success of the little old lady with the appealing story in terms of shifting public opinion perhaps not to the best policy.
INTERVIEWER: You’re referring to Dorothy English?

JANET McLENNAN: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And, oh, we've experienced all that, uh, the -- in some ways it's remarkable that the law has survived so well. Senate Bill 100, I see, didn’t create LUBA and that also is a part of the story, I’m sure, but not -- not one that I’m particularly familiar with.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: But as far as I know it’s been constructive and it gets its job done.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm. Do you feel like at this moment we're at kind of a period of peace, in terms of ballot measures or attacks on the system, or is this more of a contentious time?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, I’m kind of hesitant to commit on that because I feel that currently there’s so little news in the metropolitan area on that subject that it’s hard to make a judgment even by an interested citizen.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: I simply don’t know enough. I suppose if things were very tense I’d be hearing from 1000 Friends on an email but -- (chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Uh huh.

JANET McLENNAN: I noticed you’re talking to Dick and Bob.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: I didn’t remember but I presume to Robert Liberty as well.

INTERVIEWER: And talked to Henry Richmond last week.
JANET McLENNAN: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: We did Henry Richmond's interview last week.

JANET McLENNAN: Yes. What about Mary Kyle McCurdy and Ed Sullivan? Is he on your list?

INTERVIEWER: Uh, they certainly should be considered. Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: Well, Ed was legal counsel to Bob Straub during his administration in the 70’s and then immediately went into private practice of law and land use planning -- and Mary Kyle, of course, has been at 1000 Friends for some long time now as lead attorney, and their perspective on LUBA, and on the success and temperature of the program, I think, would be informative.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Well, our system is -- it’s about 42 years old now.

JANET McLENNAN: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And you, obviously, were there at the creation and have been involved in various ways in the decades since, how do you think our land use program in 2015, compares to what was created back in the 1970’s? I mean, semantically, do you feel people are -- do they feel the same way or is it viewed differently?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, huh, I suppose, cynically, I’d be afraid that about 90 percent of the people do not feel they have been touched by the program. I don’t know whether 90 is an accurate assumption but, you know, 85 to 95 or something. In other words, they probably don’t -- they still would be supportive of the goals they were supportive of in 1973. But with respect to those who have been touched, they probably feel strongly, pro or con, depending on win or lose, but I don’t know whether that endangers the program. Again, the vulnerability that came out of that one instance of the little old lady is a little bit threatening. In other words, you know, all
people love kids and horses and if you can make a political campaign based on either, it’s possible the program might be vulnerable to that kind of unfortunate impetus. Win or lose, whatever side you are on, that’s not the way for public decisions to be made on matters of this import.

INTERVIEWER: Well, outside of the political realm, what kind of challenges do you see Oregon facing in the future?

JANET McLennan: Well, your population is going to increase and my own personal concern for the last 25 years or so, has been focused on the forestry goal and particularly, the preservation of forest land for forest uses. During the time I served on the Board of Forestry, I was a strong advocate for maintaining the forestland base, and was successful in that advocacy. I didn’t meet any resistance, particularly, to the idea that it was very important for Oregon to keep those lands in forest use. With some exceptions in Washington County, up until now we’ve been pretty successful, but there are a growing number of square miles in Oregon forestland that have now four or five houses. Any more than five changes the classification from forestland to multi-use woodland. To preserve a successful private forest products industry the intrusion of housing into forestland is quite threatening for a number of reasons. People don’t like the kinds of activities, the heavy commercial industrial activities, associated with the growing and harvest of -- of timberland and, moreover, uh, the incident of fire is aggravated and the kinds of devices that can be used to control fire in purely forestlands can’t -- aren’t suitable for domestic firefighting activity. I mean, you can’t run a cat through a house and, of course, when you have human beings in those forested areas, you have to concentrate on the rescue of those humans rather than on putting out a fire. So, that’s just not a good marriage. It happens because people want to live in the woods, then get exceptions that enable construction from county commissions, county planning commissions, sometimes from county employees, and that’s -- that’s a subject that more people need education
on at the county level because it’s not a healthy thing for anybody. It’s understandable. I can remember going down and making a speech in Grants Pass decades ago. In response to my speech on the subject, whoever was representing the county said: “All I want is for applicants is to have a smile on their face when they go out the door,” (chuckling) and -- so too many smiles on faces have gone out the door in some counties in Oregon.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And that’s incorrect and a matter of concern. I don’t know, except for the education of the elected and appointed officials, I don’t know that -- that there’s a -- a legal amendment that’s required. It would be difficult, I’m sure, to get passed.

INTERVIEWER: Well, are there any changes or additions you’d like to see to the planning laws or the statewide goals that would help us prepare for the challenges of the future, whether that be forestry or others?

JANET McLENNAN: I don’t think I see any. Maybe if I thought more about it I could write one.

INTERVIEWER: Do you think any goals were missed back in the 70’s, that whether with hindsight or just even at the time you thought, boy, we really missed this opportunity?

JANET McLENNAN: I don’t recall that. It’s possible that another kind of greenway situation that is -- not -- it might not be a river but, you know, a situation where you wanted somehow to set aside land for some kind of purpose or, at least you wanted the ability to do it for a purpose that was larger than the concern of one city or one county, and it would fail at the legislative level, and that you could craft a goal response of that kind. I don’t know that -- I don’t have my mind on that at this point and many of the lands where -- that are sensitive now are federal
lands. I think Oregon has been more successful than Washington on land use planning generally but that’s just kind of a common view, not a sophisticated assessment.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: Back in ’73 or ’74, there was an effort in California to get something like this. As far as I know it failed. There was an organization that published a magazine called “Cry California” and I remember, at Nancie Fadeley’s request, I wrote a summary of Oregon’s land use program prior to any real implementation of it. I’ve reviewed it and would say that the program has developed not greatly different from our expectations back then, except to the extent that litigation and legislation has forced changes. Anyway, I think we’ve captured something that is valuable, very valuable, in moving when we did.

INTERVIEWER: As we come to a close here, I’m just wondering if you could touch on, you know, more personally, what has inspired you to get so involved over these past few decades on land use issues? Is it trying to protect a special place or is it more just an ethic? What is it that’s inspired you?

JANET McLENNAN: Well, I -- I just -- I mean my -- my interest and orientation is as a citizen of Oregon really, you know, and I am interested in politics and political solutions and I’ve been a bureaucrat, and worked with bureaucrats for a long, long time, and I’m friendly to those processes. Some people are not, and they find it threatening, and distasteful in every way, but I find it interesting and an opportunity for creating solutions, so --

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

JANET McLENNAN: And I -- you know, I like Oregon. I was not born in Oregon, I was born in Washington, as a matter of fact, but my husband was born in Oregon, but I feel very strongly, patriotic, to the state and I’ve lived here now since 1955.
INTERVIEWER: Anything we’ve missed? Any thoughts or anecdotes additionally that you’d like to share?

JANET McLENNAN: Pardon me?

INTERVIEWER: Anything that we’ve missed?

JANET McLENNAN: No. I don’t think so.

INTERVIEWER: No? Well, we’ve been speaking today with Janet McLennan, who has served numerous roles as a public servant … House counsel for the House Committee on Land Use and Environment and as Governor Straub’s Natural Resources Assistant in the mid 1970’s, when the land use system was adopted and implemented. Janet, it’s been a pleasure. Thank you for coming by today.

(Concluded)