INTERVIEWER:  Good morning, Roger.

ROGER KIRCHNER:  Good morning.

INTERVIEWER:  I'll lead off with a few opening remarks, and I've done this with my other interviews, as it sort of sets the stage for our discussion this morning and a few little personal things thrown in as well.

ROGER KIRCHNER:  Okay.

INTERVIEWER:  So, I’ll begin.  I better put my glasses on.  It helps as I'm showing my age plus I don't wear them.  Greetings.  My name is Jim Knight.  I served for 29 years on the staff of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, otherwise known as DLCD.  I retired in 2003.  Today is Wednesday August 12, 2015.  It is my good fortune to speak with Roger Kirchner, who has agreed to be interviewed as part of Portland State University's Oral History Project of Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program.  It was my special privilege to work with Roger at DLCD.  As a close friend he is and might be one of DLCD’s most talented colleagues coming to the department with an extensive knowledge of Oregon geography, politics and state and local government.  Roger possessed a wide range of talents and skills, including public speaking, outreach and informational services, intergovernmental affairs and technical and lay writing about land use, particularly Oregon’s planning program.  It was my good fortune to work with Roger in partnership with other department staff on a variety of agency tasks and projects.  Roger contributed in so many critical area -- ways to the early start-up in advancing the
efforts of DLCD and Land Conservation and Development Commission, known as LCDC. The assistance he provided to LCDC’s first chair, L.B. Day, and the other members of the first Commission and the Department’s first Director, Arnold Cogan, was particularly vital. Today’s interview is taking place at PSU’s College of Urban Public Affairs in Portland, Oregon. Before starting the review – interview, excuse me, I’d like to take this opportunity to offer several brief remarks. First, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Roger as one of many Oregonians whose hard work and leadership on the DLCD staff did so much to help further the successful implementation of SB100 and the statewide planning goals. Second, for those of you who may not know, you may ask what is an oral history project? In terms of this project, the overall goal is to document and preserve a record of Oregon’s Land Use Program, through the collecting and archiving of personal oral histories. To achieve this goal, the project’s principle objectives are to generate new relevant primary source material and historical records for research projects, publications and articles on Oregon land use planning. To identify and further understand the views, opinions, and interests of the many organizations, agencies, officials and citizens who actively participated in the drafting, adoption and implementation of Oregon’s land use statutes, statewide planning goals and the administrative rules. To make available historical records and materials of specific interests to various local, state and federal agencies, tribal governments, public and private interest groups and organizations, academic institutions and the general public. To enable a comparison of the current state of Oregon’s land use program, with the views, opinions and recollections of various participants regarded their visions and intentions behind the passage of SB100 and its implementation. Third, we interviewers, and the individuals being interviewed, referred to as narrators, in this first group, and those that will follow, are the project's most visible participants. However, much is owed to those behind the scene at PSU’s College of Urban and
Public Affairs working in close collaboration with LCDC and DLCD overseeing a project's many
details of organization, management and funding. Four, reserve special thanks, to Sy Adler and
Kevin Pozzi at PSU, and Jim Rue and Rob Halliburton at DLCD. Finally, in May of 2013, DLCD
held a special gathering to mark the 40th anniversary of the enactment of SB100 and the start of
Oregon’s land use program. I was asked along with others to offers some remarks to
commemorate this historic occasion. No, don’t worry, I’m not going to delay today’s starting of
the interview by repeating my May of 2013 remarks. However, here are quotes from two of the
Land Use Program's most famous champions, whose words I feel are very relevant as we start this
oral history project. First, listen to Governor Tom McCall’s stirring thoughts in 1973 speaking
about the people, the environment and livability of the state he loved and what I’m sure he believed
is a continuing challenge of land use planning in Oregon. “We’re talking more about the
preserving and the -- we are talking more -- about more than preserving the beauty of Oregon.
We’re talking about the growth of Oregon and how that growth can be accomplished in the same
manner. We are talking about economy and environment. We are talking about balance. In short,
we are talking about the people and the land.” You remember that phrase don't you, Roger? And
the other quote is from the person I feel, and many others, is the land use program's true patriarch.
This of course is Hector MacPherson. Here are his inspiring words expressed in 1982 about the
birth of the Land Use Program and its importance for Oregon’s future. "No, I did not know what I
was creating. I think the most remarkable thing is that we are here 20 years later after the
enactment of SB100 in 1973, and that it’s has been enough of a success to last at least this long. I
knew that land use was a tremendously divisive type of thing. When I got under this thing, none of
the other legislatures, except for Ted Hallock, wanted to join me because they didn’t feel it was
anything that would enhance their political statute. And, of course, we’ve had a number of times
since then when I wondered if it was going to last through the next election. So, I would guess the most delightful thing is that it really it is still here and its gotten some national recognition and is recognized at least by some people in the state of Oregon has having been desirable. I just hope with all the uncertainty that I see out there in the future that we can progress at least as well in the future as we have in the past. I really have some confidence that the voters are sensible to recognize the strength of a program like this." Thank you, again, Tom and Hector, for those very moving comments. Now let’s get on to today's interview.

Roger, you’ve seen the questions we’re gonna talk about this morning and I’ll just begin with number one. Why don’t we begin by having you give us a brief personal background of you and your family's arrival, settlement and life in Oregon?

ROGER KIRCHNER: I moved here as a young boy with my family in 1954. We moved from western Nebraska and I entered the 6th grade at Hosford Elementary School in Portland and graduated Cleveland High School in 1961. My father was a minister and a public school teacher, teaching math and social studies and my mother taught kindergarten for Portland public schools for 40 years. I graduated Willamette University in 1965, where I majored in Political Science and Public Administration. I hold a Bachelor's Degree, studying Latin, French and German. I attended Willamette College of Law for one year before entering the US Army in 1966. I was commissioned as an officer, infantry officer, and stationed in Berlin, Germany. I served as a battalion adjutant in the 2nd Battalion, 6th Infantry with C Battery attached. That comprised about 800 men. The adjutant is the personnel officer and is the only officer who is -- can sign on behalf of the commander. Therefore I am a Vietnam era veteran, serving in Berlin when Germany was still divided, Berlin being 120 miles behind the Iron Curtain, and with the wall dividing the city. Czechoslovakia was invaded by the USSR while I was serving in Berlin. I
attended Portland State University, upon getting out of the Army and studied in the Urban Studies Department and Ron Cease was my Master’s advisor. I was then the Alumni Director at Willamette University for two years, whereby I came -- became personally acquainted with L.B. Day and Norma Paulus, both Willamette alumni. In the spring of 1974, I joined the staff at the Department of Land Conservation and Development, the administrative arm of the LCDC. In 1974, the commission conducted 127 public meetings and hearings adopted for the -- to adopt the first 14 goals and guidelines. We were a staff of 11 at that time, and we were dedicated, amassing huge numbers of hours of overtime. So --

INTERVIEWER: That’s -- that’s wonderful. I don’t have any questions, other than maybe just a little bit more about the 11 staff people, and how did we all mesh together and sometimes we had some arguments occasionally and oranges were thrown on one particular occasion. But --

ROGER KIRCHNER: (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: -- that was later on, but --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, that came quite a bit later.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ROGER KIRCHNER: We were a larger staff then but --

INTERVIEWER: Yes, we were.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- the -- in those days, necessarily, we all wore several hats. I was hired as a Citizen Involvement Specialist. The commission was then engaged in conducting its second round of 28 workshops scattered throughout the state and that was really a -- a way of getting around the legislature, which had clipped the so called the wings of the commission by deleting any public information roles. But it was clear from the onset that I would work with deputy director, John Gustafson, and that I would be responsible for crafting news releases, public
service announcements, all those sorts of things, but also helping with the conduct of citizen involvement projects and so on. And as it went on in my career at LCDC, I was only there for the eight formative years of the commission, I was responsible for publications, editing of a newsletter that we developed, called Oregon Lands, I did public speaking, I did speech writing, I did gubernatorial correspondence. I later went on to be the staff support to hearings, officers before the Land Use Court of Appeals was established. And -- so, anyway, that kind of gives you the breadth of -- of the kinds of tasks I was assigned.

INTERVIEWER: We worked -- particularly you worked, with the first commission appointed by the governor.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Tell us a little bit more about how you interacted with not just L.B., but the other commissioners as well?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, they were a very interesting group. I owned a 12-passenger van, which was utilized by the commission for transport for going to their meetings and we had went all around the state in my van. And -- and so as I would be transporting individual commissioners I got to know them well, and I, you know, each had their strengths. L.B. Day was the chair. He, in a public hearing setting, would allow anybody to testify at whatever length. It wasn’t anything like going before the Portland City Council, or the Portland School Board, or some place where you're invited to give three minutes of testimony and then the clock rings and you’re done, and that was the case. The final hearing that was conducted, prior to adopting the first 14 goals, was kicked off in the State Capitol Building. The first two to testify was outgoing Governor McCall, incoming Governor Straub. That hearing didn’t -- it began at 9:00 a.m., did not conclude until 1:00 a.m. the next day.
INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And -- now L.B. was not adverse to shuffling the deck in terms of cards of who -- who would be next to testify, but nevertheless, periodically I would be asked to, you know, well, “Am I next?” Then I’d go up and ask to see where they were in the deck and so on. And sometimes you’d move one further down when I inquired (chuckling), but anyway. Jim Smart was the -- the farmer on the -- on the commission. He was a very quiet individual. He -- he would listen carefully and -- but you always knew when he really had something to say, because he’d start out with, ugh, ugh, grff, grff, ugh, and then he’d say what he wanted to say. And he basically would probe anybody who was coming from the agriculture sector as to how they farmed, how they planned, how -- you know and so on, but would chastise anybody who felt that they had the right to -- to have their last row of crop be a row of houses. So, Dorothy Anderson came out of Eugene. She was very active with the League of Women Voters and a very outspoken member of -- on -- on the commission. Al Bullier represented real estate interests, he was fairly quiet, but brought a business sense to -- to the commission. Initially we had Paul Rudy on the commission who -- who came from down around Coos Bay area. His expertise was -- was coastal estuary types of expertise and he later stepped down and -- and was replaced. Steve Schell was the vice chair. Steve is a lawyer. He was a wildly versed in -- in the history of land use planning and the prevailing techniques espoused by urban planners, from an academic sense. He had been a student body president when he was at the University of Oregon. He was also involved with representing some clients that were involved in the celebrated case of Baker vs. Milwaukee and as a result of that when -- when consideration was being given to the comprehensive planning in Clackamas County that ultimately resulted in the Clackamas town center, he had to --

INTERVIEWER: Recuse himself.
ROGER KIRCHNER: -- recuse himself from participating in that. Who have I left out?

INTERVIEWER: The mayor of -- the mayor of Bend.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Oh, okay. Yeah. The mayor of Bend was Dick Gervais, and he, uh --

INTERVIEWER: Was he sitting mayor at that time or was he --

ROGER KIRCHNER: No, I don’t believe so.

INTERVIEWER: I think he was past that. Former mayor?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. And he brought a -- a business in timber. A development background. He had been involved with Brooks Resources, which developed Black Butte Ranch and so on. Each -- each person was a delight to work with, really.

INTERVIEWER: They worked hard.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. And -- yeah, and like I said, for a lay commission, uncompensated, say for only collecting a per diem, which covered meals and lodging, that they put in 127 days of work in one year. There is no local government governing body that could match that record today.

INTERVIEWER: And the scope of what we were listening for and to and --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: -- in terms of the goals, all the way from citizen involvement in Goal 2 and then onto the urban stuff and the rural -- and the rural natural resource issues.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, as -- we’ll get into --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Okay.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- some other -- the questions --
INTERVIEWER:  Okay.

ROGER KIRCHNER:  I’ll speak to how -- how well we did with citizen involvement and --

INTERVIEWER:  I think you answered quite eloquently the -- your whole relationship with the program.  I mean, you know, in a very few minutes, it’s a wonderful thing, Kevin, to have us sit here and review and go back in time of the events and the relationships we had and the accomplishments we -- we were able to realize, and -- and worked with some people that were just, both on the commission as well as on the staff, and we had strong arguments about policy and so forth, but --

ROGER KIRCHNER:  Well, and I was less involved with those arguments, but -- because, you know, the planning expertise came from people like Jim and -- and his colleagues and under the supervision of Herb Riley, who was the deputy director in --

INTERVIEWER:  You had three deputy directors?

ROGER KIRCHNER:  Yeah.  Yeah, we did.  Initially we met -- Arnold Cogan was the head.  And then we had John Gustafson, and then Herb Riley, and then we -- as we brought the coastal folks over, we had Jim Ross as a deputy.  So, we were well-deputized.

INTERVIEWER:  (Chuckling)  Well, we were just such a small team.  We weren’t braggers about it.  I think we just all knew that we had a very important job to do.  We were hoping to make Tom McCall’s vision, if you want to call it that, to help realize that, not that he was a unique guardian of that, but he was one that was right at the top there and that’s why, as Roger mentioned, the final goal hearing in December of ’73, were so -- and I mentioned this to you also, vividly stirring to have the two, you know --

ROGER KIRCHNER:  Well, that goal hearing was in ’74.
INTERVIEWER: ’74, pardon me. Thank you.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Okay. And, uh -- but remarking about the staff, you know, we each brought our expertise and skills and so on. We each were assigned multiple hats to wear, but we also all gathered into the trenches when you needed to load the van. (Chuckling) I mean, in those days we were transporting sound equipment. We were transporting coffee urns. We -- you name it.

INTERVIEWER: Making copies.

ROGER KIRCHNER: All those kinds of things, collating, because the copy machines didn’t have collators on them -- in those days. All sorts of common things like that and even the -- in the final hearing that I spoke of, you know, held over at the State Capitol, I had to haul screens over to -- to that hearing room, in the basement of the Capitol. All that stuff had to be lugged back to our offices and so on. And, you know, I didn’t do it all by myself. I mean, I had people like Jim who pitched in to, so, you know.

INTERVIEWER: We all did, yeah. Okay. Let’s go on to number three. And I’ll just sort of get to the heart of it. Looking back over the last 40 years, which of the state’s natural resources do you believe that the state planning program has been most successful in protecting? And also, if you wish, please identify any area, sites, or resources, in your view, that the planning program has not done enough in?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, LCDC's state planning goals and guidelines seek to protect agriculture and forest lands by requiring coordinated comprehensive land use plans. These plans established urban growth boundaries and established the means to protect and utilize natural resources sensibly. Oregon’s hallmark program is undoubtedly the envy of state’s throughout the nation the world really. We got inquiries from countries in Europe.
INTERVIEWER: Which you helped answer, I suspect?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah, I did. The 40 years success of the program, I believe, is based on its establishment by a strong citizen involvement effort. LCDC successfully involved over 100,000 people in 1974 alone, developing those first 14 goals. The first goal, of course, is citizen involvement and it is now a well-entrenched process for comprehensive land use planning, it -- with all local governments. Undoubtedly, citizen involvement is -- has allowed governing bodies at all levels to make decisions that provide reliance and withstand the buffeting of conflicting interests. As I often say, everybody is entitled to share their opinions and they’re invited to do so. Governing bodies are tasked with making decisions. They may or may not incorporate what you have testified, or given as your input, but nevertheless you are more apt to embrace the ultimate decisions made by having had that opportunity to participate in the process. And I believe that is the saving grace of the program and of comprehensive planning, really. And, so as Oregon’s economy has shifted from heavy reliance on agriculture and forestry, to high tech and service industry and tourism, the commission will need to bolster its efforts to ensure Oregon’s natural beauties, sites and resources are maintained. Greater attention to water resources, non-point source pollution and elements affecting climate change require increased focus. In the late ‘70’s, SB100 was amended to delete some provisions addressing critical areas of state concern and the activities of statewide significance. This was done for political expediency, perhaps necessary, but with huge consequences, controversies over the siting of solid waste landfills, prisons, schools, universities, highway interchanges, recreational resorts, et cetera, abide to this day. Most important of the goals, I feel, are as; Goal 1, Citizen Involvement; Goal 2, Land Use Planning; that spells out the guts of how you go about planning. Goal 3; protecting agriculture lands; Goal 4, Protecting Forest Lands, those vital elements of Oregon’s land use are natural resources and urbanization,
which spells out urban growth boundaries, now destination resorts, and what have you, and so on. So I’ll shut up for a moment.

INTERVIEWER: Are there some things we should have done at that time or maybe time allows us to look back and say, well, we’re doing them now, but weren't necessary then. What are your thoughts about that, if any?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I suppose that in the -- in the best of all worlds, to borrow a line out of Candide--

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- the -- you would map out a program and spell it out in its entirety and -- and go from there, that’s just not the real world. And Senate Bill 100 was enacted with some controversy in 1973. I happened to be a legislative aide at the time. The legislature only had eight legislative assistants at the time. I was assigned to Representative Keith Skelton, who was in the House, who was married then to Betty Roberts, who was in the Senate. But also in the suite of offices where I was located outside the door of Keith Skelton, as was Phil Lang, who later went on to become Speaker of the House, Stafford Hansell who was a key republican legislator who served on Ways and Means. Norma Paulus was in that suite of offices, as was Earl Blumenauer, Wally Priestly, and there were a few others and I can’t remember them all, but it was an interesting session. There was a companion bill, and I can’t remember its number, to Senate Bill 100, that spelled out transfer of development rights and so on. And that was promptly repealed and -- early in the Straub administration. And if you wanted to learn more about that you probably need to talk to Ed Sullivan, because he was working in the Straub administration at that time. But early on, especially when -- when some of the staff from OCCDC joined LCDC or DLCD, there was a desire to start beginning to develop policies and so on. And I know, having worked closely
with L.B., he -- he felt that that wasn’t gonna go down well. And -- and, in fact, in one of my tasks as publications person in the agency, we developed a publication with multiple tabs. The first tab represented the goals, and then provisions for subsequent goals, and for policies, and so on and -- and we shrink-wrapped that and we mailed that out to -- to local governments and we promptly got -- we -- it hit the fan, you know, local officials were complaining, oh, look at the -- this commission is giving us a whole bible and so on and so on and we -- the commission eventually just said, well, check it if you don’t want to use it and have someone to -- someone who you're working with and learn but it -- it would -- my -- ideally might have been -- well but we've flushed out more policies and so on but from a political practicality, probably would not have been wise to have done so.

INTERVIEWER: So, do you have any thoughts going back to the commissioners, the relationship between Steve and L.B. Day in terms of those kind of issues, in terms of topics to be addressed in the goals or --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I --

INTERVIEWER: -- cause Steve was -- had a very active mind about the goals. In fact, he --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Well and he --

INTERVIEWER: And he helped us --

ROGER KIRCHNER: He had a conceptual vision --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- as to -- and -- and he was widely versed in, you know, all the concepts of -- of urban planning and so on. And he and L.B. would enter -- engage in -- thoughtful but some -- sometimes, uh --

INTERVIEWER: Forceful?
ROGER KIRCHNER: -- forceful debate, I guess.
INTERVIEWER: And he --
ROGER KIRCHNER: And I can’t say that I witnessed too many of those, but, uh -- but those that I did it was always L.B. coming down from a -- a political practicality stand point, not necessarily rejecting, uh -- uh, what state was accomplished or wishing to accomplish and sometimes it was -- L.B. and Steve had working in collaboration as to how best to go about bringing about something, but --
INTERVIEWER: I think -- well, we’ve got sort of high-centered in the -- that fall of ’74 about the goals.
ROGER KIRCHNER: Um hmm.
INTERVIEWER: And the future didn’t look all that bright at that point. He and L.B., Steve and L.B. worked out an arrangement where Steve was given the assignment -- the responsibility to create the -- the famous committees of not necessarily public officials, but interest group representatives.
ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.
INTERVIEWER: Around each of the topics. Of course, we didn’t have one for Goal 1 and 2, I don’t think, maybe -- no --
ROGER KIRCHNER: I don’t recall.
INTERVIEWER: -- but the other 12 we did. And --
ROGER KIRCHNER: And did -- refresh my memory, I can’t recall -- we started out in -- in the draft goals with more than 14.
INTERVIEWER: I think we had more subjects there but --
ROGER KIRCHNER: And eventually they were distilled into 14.
INTERVIEWER: Well, like -- yeah.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And those individuals task groups or -- I’ve forgotten what we called them, but --

INTERVIEWER: Well, I think they were called, like goal committees or something like that.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Technical Advisory Committees. TAC's. Remember that term?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Oh, yeah. Oh, that’s right. Okay. And -- and each staff member was tasked with staffing those.

INTERVIEWER: Well, Brent Lake was assigned six committees --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: -- to staff and I was assigned six other committees to staff.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And, boy, we -- we worked our [asses] off. So, it was a -- both exhausting, but also exciting time, if you can combine those two together, because we knew we were onto something big and we had a deadline that wasn’t -- it couldn’t be altered.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Either we were gonna make it or not.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Senate Bill 100 tasked the commission. They had to report to the '75 session's adopted goals and guidelines. So, we marched right up to December to -- to get them adopted. And it about killed us (chuckling) I mean, I kid you not, but I -- at my age, I know I couldn’t put in those kinds of hours that -- I mean, like I previously shared a week or so ago that many of us were averaging -- averaging 100 hours overtime a month.
INTERVIEWER: Huh.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And so --

INTERVIEWER: We were producing babies around that time too.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) And families.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, some -- some of you were, I was -- I was a bachelor.

(Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: We won’t pursue that right now, so --

ROGER KIRCHNER: (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) Okay. Let’s move on. I think you’ve done a good job of giving us your views on the goals. I’m looking at question five and -- SB100 passed and so you created a framework for land use planning and overseeing the program, describe the steps and actions which you are familiar with that LCDC and DLCD took to ensure that every city and county’s plan and ordinances fully complied with the goals and SB100. Have any thoughts about that at all about the steps we took?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, to expand a little bit on your introductory remarks, you know, Senate Bill 100 was enacted in the ’73 session, legislative assembly, as it's called technically. The bill was co-sponsored by Senators Hector MacPherson and Ted Hallock. MacPherson is a -- is credited as being the father of -- of Oregon’s land use program. And he was a farmer for -- a dairy farmer primarily.

INTERVIEWER: Benton County wasn't he (unintelligible)?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Down in --

INTERVIEWER: Benton County?
ROGER KIRCHNER: Linn.

INTERVIEWER: Linn County. I thought it was Benton.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Linn County. And Hallock owned a public relations firm in Portland and, uh -- uh, and a lay committee was appointed or tasked to help with the development of Senate Bill 100 and that was headed up by L.B. Day. Fred VanNatta, who was a -- a lobbyist, representing housing interests, and a few others that -- and they worked with legislative counsels, Kathleen Beaufait and Steve Hawes at the time. And so there are lots of people that would say, well, I drafted or I’m the father of --

INTERVIEWER: Father of --

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- Senate Bill 100 and so on. It was very much a collaborative effort. But once it was successfully passed in the senate, L.B. Day later told me that Hallock instructed representative Nancy Fadley, who was -- and was chairing the House committee, that would -- that Senate Bill 100 was assigned to, to keep their hands off it.

INTERVIEWER: They had to because otherwise it would of gone back to a --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. It had to go to a --

INTERVIEWER: Reconciling --

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- a conference committee.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. A conference.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And it’s a -- that wouldn’t have happened. It would have fallen apart.

INTERVIEWER: This is well described in Sy’s book, by the way, that whole episode, yeah.
ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. So, then I mentioned the companion bill that did with a -- dealt with the transfer of development rights was also enacted, but it was promptly repealed in a special session in the early stages of the Straub administration. Ed Sullivan would be an expert on that.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: In short, the real estate community developer’s successfully brought -- brought about that repeal and those same interests, by the way, finally successfully promoted an amendment to Oregon’s constitution to prevent local governments and state agencies from enacting transfer of development of rights, ordinances, rules and regulations.

INTERVIEWER: Wow.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And special interests prevail yet to this day. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: That’s a whole other discussion, isn’t it, for other interviews and just topics, yeah.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. And look at congress.

INTERVIEWER: We won’t pursue that one today. No. 6, I think you’ve talked a lot about Goal 1 already. Is there anything else you would add to that question in terms of the relevancy of Goal 1 today and how it’s working or not?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I think were it not for citizen involvement, uh, and our successful engagement of -- of 100,000 plus citizens in the -- adopting those first goals, the program would not have withstood the buffeting it took by twice appearing on the ballot -- uh, ballot measure seeking its repeal. And so --

INTERVIEWER: Of course, Goal 1 wasn’t just obviously applicable to the commission.
ROGER KIRCHNER: Oh, it’s --

INTERVIEWER: But it was obviously -- it was largely focused on cities and counties and setting up their committees for citizen involvement. Remember the phrase or the term CCI?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Mmm hmm.

INTERVIEWER: And -- and you said of the committees were involved in developing jurisdictions, you know, public involvement program, CIP.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, you know, and the commission has an advisory committee, CIAC, --

INTERVIEWER: Oh. Today.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- that advises it, you know, on citizen involvement issues.

But I -- I can’t -- can’t stress -- I’m heavily involved with public schools. I’m on the State Board of the Oregon PTA and -- and so I attend Portland Public School board meetings all the time.

Governing bodies are tasked with making decisions, but the more that they give opportunities for citizens to be involved, to provide their input, the more they’re -- likely they are to embrace decisions that are ultimately made. Ultimately, the commission serves very much of buffeting role and as a backstop. So, a local official can make a decision and he can cop out and say, well, that state commission is requiring us to do this, and so on, where -- where the actual fact it was the proper decision based on sound comprehensive land use planning.

INTERVIEWER: And L.B.’s -- one of his famous, among many, quotes was, "The program is really best and it’s going to survive if we’re building from the bottom up, not being forced from the top down."

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.
INTERVIEWER: And I think what that meant was that, local governments had responsibilities, and they had to take the goals and involve those goals and those requirements in putting their plans together. We weren’t just going to instruct them how to do it with any great specificity or exactness. When they were given an assignment, we had grants and technical assistance from our staff and interest group (phonetic) involvement and so forth, but everything came from below and, uh --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. And in the early days, of course, we had some local officials that said, oh, I’m not gonna do that. And, you know, we had --

INTERVIEWER: Some poor sports and --

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- a mayor from Lakeview who sent a --

INTERVIEWER: A famous mouse.

ROGER KIRCHNER: A picture of a mouse flipping the commission off, and so on, and L.B. later accepted that mayor’s challenge to come down and speak to the local --

INTERVIEWER: Didn't you go along with that trip?

ROGER KIRCHNER: I did. I flew down there with him, and so on, and it was very interesting. I can describe them if you want me to but --

INTERVIEWER: We ought to move on, probably, today, but --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: Number seven. Is there anything else you would like to speak about in terms of policies that were missing or overlooked in the goals?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, originally the Senate Bill 100 did contain sections dealing with critical areas of state concern and the activities of statewide significance. The commission elected to essentially defer addressing those areas by proceeding to adopt the first 14
goals and would come back to them. Early in the Straub administration and Straub -- you know, Governor Straub had been instrumental and was very interested in -- in the Willamette Greenway and that goal was to -- to be developed and he -- I think at the urging of Janet McLennan, his assistant for Natural Resources, asked that L.B. just step down as chair and he appointed John Mosser, an attorney out of Portland. Interestingly enough, there’s an interesting bit of history about Mosser and L.B. Mosser headed up the -- the predecessor agency to DEQ and -- and L.B. was the first director of DEQ. So, he succeeded Mosser in that situation. So, anyway, Mosser followed L.B. on LCDC -- Mosser felt -- and I think with the -- assent of McLennan, decided to trade off those sections of Senate Bill 100 in the ’75 session, and I think that’s a huge mistake. That was a huge mistake, particularly as you have seen over the years, I mean, we had legislators, like -- coming out of Wilsonville that wanted to site a prison in their area and, you know, and so went to special lengths to -- to violate the urban growth boundary to -- accomplish that. You had sitings of landfills that had been issued. In more recent years, the destination resort interests have prevailed upon on getting Goal 14 amended. We had a little old lady who owned some forested lands up in Columbia County who, lo and behold, woke up to the fact that, oh, she’s not gonna be able to subdivide it like she had planned to, you know. And so, lo and behold, that hit the ballot and it was passed and so changes had to be made along those lines. So, all these things could have been well addressed had those -- those sections not been repealed, but anyway.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And -- and getting them reinserted would -- I would be --

INTERVIEWER: We do have one critical area today.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Metolious.
ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: So, what comes around goes around, I guess a little bit --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: -- but we do have one that declaration over there.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Interestingly enough I remember my comment about the Metolious. The headwaters of the Metolious, you know, the Metolious River just comes up out of the ground. And the headwaters of the Metolious were owned by Sam Johnson who was serving in the legislature at the time. He was also in that suite of offices and he was a very interesting character. His daughter, Betsy --

INTERVIEWER: Johnson.

ROGER KIRCHNER: --Johnson, who serves in the opposite party, than Sam was in, but they’re very much alike. She now represents Columbia County and -- and Clatsop County and others, uh -- uh, but Sam -- I used to sit at -- next -- because Keith Skelton while in office and would have his secretary with him at -- at his desk on the floor of the house. So, I would sit next to Sam, because he always had his secretary down -- down in his office working down there, and -- and every now and then Sam would vote against something that would best serve Portland, for example, you know, and I’d say, well, Sam, Why did you vote against that? And he says, well, Rog, it’s a -- it's a good thing, but I gotta vote no on some things, just tell my folks back home that I’m not letting those urban people dictate what was (chuckling) so, you know, on and on. But that’s the kind of urban/rural politics that one encounters in every state, anyway.

INTERVIEWER: I think you’ve answered question eight pretty well here, in terms of outreach in the first 14 particularly. Why don’t we jump down to number nine, which asks you to talk a little bit, in terms of your philosophy or whatever, about state interests and local interests?
Have we struck, do you think now, and maybe you can let me back up, balance that's right, appropriate, or is it weighted too much versus one or the other? This is a complicated set of issues, I’m sure, in terms of topics, you might say. I mean, we have to draw a line around our city for 20 years, you know, that’s -- we don’t want to do that. That would be somebody saying --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, UGB's are very controversial --

INTERVIEWER: Still.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- as you know. And --

INTERVIEWER: There's 242 of them too.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And -- and being a resident of Port --

INTERVIEWER: Plus one up here. A big one.

ROGER KIRCHNER: But being a resident of Portland where Metro is the, uh, -- first it was called CRAG and now it’s Metro, is the coordinating body for comprehensive plans in the -- in the Portland metropolitan area. UGB’s are constantly subjected to pressures from largely development interests, that -- seeking to expand here or there or whatever, and I would have to say, given the fact that Metro is headed by the former mayor of Hillsboro, and so on, that I would kind of feel that some of the decisions that Metro has made with regard to its UGB have been highly favorable to Washington County, and cities like Hillsboro and so on, uh, expanding into agricultural areas and so on and --

INTERVIEWER: But the fact that we have a boundary around the metropolitan area, encompassing parts of many of the cities, all of the cities, frankly, and some of the counties, isn't that a remarkable achievement?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Oh, yeah. It’s huge --

INTERVIEWER: It is controversial but it also is a huge --
ROGER KIRCHNER: Very -- very controversial when -- but very -- I think it’s -- it’s serving us well. One big question on this, do we -- should we allow to punch out of here or there and so on? You had some rather celebrated things happen out in the Clackamas County, involving an incorporation/unincorporation efforts in the city of Damascus, and so on and on, and I don’t presume to know all those details. My whole role at LCDC, incidentally, and I’ll just say briefly, was that I was the -- hired to help translate and inform the public.

INTERVIEWER: Among other things you did.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And I -- it was my role to take the planner-ese and try to put it into the lay vernacular, so the common layman-like person could understand what the hell they were talking about. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: You -- you struck a marvelous balance, I think, in your work, between the technical and the lay audiences. I mean, I think, you would come around and talk to us and say, we’ve gotten a letter, or the governors gotten a letter, about this or that, what are the facts? And you’d take those down, but you would then come back with a -- a wonderful piece, artful top -- language and so forth that would explain why this was or wasn’t done. And I think that’s a -- it was a very critical need at that time to have that, because we were getting hit pretty hard almost regularly by people who were asking these questions and --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, my file of governor's letters --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- was huge. I mean I had to develop second files, because there were -- I remember -- it was with carbon copies. Do you understand in those days?

INTERVIEWER: Well.
ROGER KIRCHNER: We didn’t have computers in those days, incidentally. It was all done on an electric typewriter. We didn't even have mag card machines at first. So anyway.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Where are we? Uh --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, you asked me --

INTERVIEWER: Oh, go ahead. State and local interests.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- about the -- my role and -- and where we might go. I’m in no position to opine whether goal amendments are good or bad, that’s not my level of expertise, but I am firmly convinced that the Oregon land use program must remain and we must remain vigilant to maintain the goals and the program and employ a vision regarding the future course the -- the state must navigate to encounter new challenges resulting in expanding population.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: At present, I see no politician of stature to champion Oregon’s hallmark land use program. There’s no Tom McCall, L.B. Day, Ted Hallock, Hector MacPherson, Norma Paulus on the horizon to this day, and -- and I’m hopeful that somebody comes forward very soon.

INTERVIEWER: Would you say congressman Blumenauer comes close in that respect? I understand his constituency is not the state as a whole.

ROGER KIRCHNER: No. No, Earl -- Earl has good urban knowledge and his -- his interests lay in transportation, the types of -- mass transit type of -- bicycling kinds of issues. And he might become more well versed. Portland’s mayor brings certain skills to the forefront. As those -- the outgoing state treasurer, Wheeler, who incidentally comes -- he has independent wealth that comes largely produced through timber holdings, as I understand, and so on. So, maybe there’s somebody who’s going to come to the forefront that I’m not aware. Bear in mind that, you
know, I left the agency after its first eight goals and so I’m not -- spend 29 years in the trenches, like Jim, and --

INTERVIEWER: And others.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And I’m -- I went from LCDC into the workers comp field and then ended up in the State Treasurer's office. So, my State's public service is diverse in that way, but I’ve not been in the day-to-day trenches of land use planning and so on. (Phone Chiming in Background) And that’s my phone and I better turn it off. Ha.

INTERVIEWER: I don’t know how to turn this off myself. Maybe you could just put it off until (inaudible).

ROGER KIRCHNER: Just keep going. It won’t take long.

INTERVIEWER: All right. As you look back over the four decades, and this isn’t a test or a quiz, but I how would you compare the program today, in general terms, with what we adopted in basically ’73 and then later with the goals of course. And what we’ve accomplished too. How would you compare?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I look upon those 14 goals kind of like a constitution. (Chuckling) The US Constitution has got what 26 or 27 amendments to it? And it has survived over 200 years. I don’t know how many times the goals have actually been amended that -- 19, but -- but they’re -- and relatively speaking there have been very few. I have some concerns about what those amendments might be, but again that’s not my area of expertise. Some of the people that I heavily relied upon for analyzing those kinds of things might have been somebody like Mike Fleschner, Neal Coenen, Jim Knight and --

INTERVIEWER: Eldon -- Eldon Hout.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Eldon Hout. So, might --
INTERVIEWER: Ron Eber. Don't forget Ron.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Yeah, I wouldn’t hesitate to talk to anybody on staff that I know --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- but I -- I’m not really well-versed as to knowing who has some of these assignments nowadays.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Okay. So, would you think that overall the program stands today pretty much on a solid foundation in terms of where we began or would you say that --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I think the foundation is strong.

INTERVIEWER: Mmm hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And the -- what kind of structure we continue to build on that foundation is -- requires vision and leadership and champions. And there’s nothing that replaces a governor who is well-versed in the program. For example, when L.B. Day was -- was chair of the commission, he strongly felt that coordinated comprehensive land use plans applied not only to State but also federal agencies.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And he heavily relied upon an executive order issued by President Nixon at that time, requiring federal agencies to comply with state comprehensive plans. And again L.B.'s successor as chair, John Mosser, thought that was a bunch of baloney, and so on. So, did Janet McLennan; Janet McLennan went on to work for BPA after she left Straub. So --

INTERVIEWER: Do you think today that SB 100 would be approved by the Oregon legislature?

ROGER KIRCHNER: No, I do not.
INTERVIEWER: And why is that? Why do you say that?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, unfortunately, Jim, I feel we’re living in a climate of political polarization.

INTERVIEWER: Partisanship.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And, yeah, where parties block one another rather than seeking bipartisan compromise and now "compromise" has become a dirty word, especially as seen in Congress. And it’s -- it’s -- it’s seeped into the Oregon legislature. The Oregon legislature, back in 1973, was a much more collaborative body. For example, as I mentioned, I was one of eight legislative aids, I was the -- democrats controlled both the house and the senate in those days. And but the governor was Governor McCall. And Senate Bill 100 was his baby and it was through bipartisan efforts that -- that the bill was passed.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And -- but, you know, I mentioned Sam Johnson, for example. Well, during the ’73 session, for example, there was a McCall tax plan enacted that would -- would have gotten the State away from its heavy reliance on the income tax and that you would expanded its adding a third stool -- leg to the stool, as has been spoken of, and -- and it was opposed by his own party. Sam Johnson called me into his office and he says, Rog, do you know anybody who can help us staff this campaign to oppose the McCall tax plan? Which had been referred to the ballot, incidentally, in May, so -- and -- before the session would be adjourned and -- and I said, well, Sam you’re kind of asking me to aid and abet the enemy aren’t ya? And he said, oh, well, you don’t need to look at it that way. And so I gave him a name of a young attorney that I knew who -- who’s will I knew was written out in favor of the Republican Party and not to his own
family. So, I -- and that guy ended up staffing the -- that campaign and they were successful in repealing it. So, anyway, I got a -- a 5th of scotch as a reward for doing that. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) Hopefully it's been consumed since then?

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yes. Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: But do you think that the bill would not survive today?

ROGER KIRCHNER: No. Well, I don’t think it’s likely to be able to get passed. I mean, this most recent session of the Oregon legislature, for example, I mean it -- there are critical needs in transportation, you know, our highways, bridges --

INTERVIEWER: I experienced that this morning coming up here to Salem.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Did you hit a pothole?

INTERVIEWER: Well, no, I hit traffic, is what I hit.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Okay. All right. Well, anyway, there -- there -- but the session got kicked off by -- by passage of some bills that they -- the Republican Party had indicated that it -- that was a -- a deal breaker and they wouldn’t cooperate on anything else and, lo and behold, they held to their word and they didn’t cooperate on -- on even a last ditch effort that the governor had held it -- headed it up with eight legislators of both parties, trying to work out a compromise. And, so we’ll look to the next short session to see whether they can craft something that --

INTERVIEWER: Of course, this question 11 also sort of begs the question, what’s needed then to bring us back together? Is it more outreach? Is it better outreach? Is it -- it’s a raft of things I would think, but I don’t get a sense that there’s -- the visibility of the program is that good these days, but I could be wrong in that, I don't know.
ROGER KIRCHNER: From a political science perspective, you know, the study of political science is to -- the bringing together of divergent interests for common purpose and -- and Congress and legislature’s around the county have lost sight of that.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm?

ROGER KIRCHNER: And I think you -- you see that frustration blowing up and -- I mean, this long primary season that we have in the United States, but -- but you see a Donald Trump, for example, resonating with -- with elements of people that are -- are frustrated about what’s not happening, but you see a Bernie Sanders representing a -- the other elements that -- that on the other side and it’s all -- distills down to about 98 percent of the population feels like the commonweal isn’t -- is no longer being represented.

INTERVIEWER: Number 12, Question 12, talks about factors that were in effect or at least influenced the approval of Senate Bill 100. Do you still concur with those and are there other -- other, what do I want to call them, factors, in addition to these that maybe would be necessary to carry on in terms of the program and in terms of support and it’s an improvement.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I believe your overall statement is -- is sound.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ROGER KIRCHNER: And they -- during its formative years the commission relied heavily on federal funds.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Particularly in establishing the coastal zone management program.

INTERVIEWER: Coastal goals. Yes. And the grants.
ROGER KIRCHNER: And being able to provide planning grants to local governments. Those -- those local planning grants incidentally were a helpful plum, I feel for many local government officials to embrace the program. They weren’t necessarily distributed in an equal fashion. For example, Coos/Curry counties, if you look on a per capita basis, they got five or six times to one of what Multnomah County got, for example, in terms of planning this isn’t -- is that somebody [inaudible]. He’s using a key, I guess.

INTERVIEWER: Are there any other factors that you want to add to that list today?

ROGER KIRCHNER: The other factors, uh, let’s see. Let me look --

INTERVIEWER: That was number 12.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well --

INTERVIEWER: Like the issue of vision. Do we have a vision anymore or the one that we could point to or?

ROGER KIRCHNER: I’m not sure we have a visionary right at the moment. I -- like when -- when I spoke to -- to the fact that I don’t see a champion at the present time for land use planning or, frankly, for the state's whole overall focus at the moment. I would -- I would have to make this observation. You had a Governor McCall. He served two terms. His first term there was some significant things that took place. One of the celebrated things was the -- having a -- a gathering out in a state park rather than have them cluster and demonstrating against the American Legion who was convening in Portland and that worked out very well. His chief of staff at that time was Ed Westerdahl. And -- but it really was in his second term that McCall’s vision began to get translated into legislation and that was largely due to the fact that he had a former state legislature who had been appointed a judge, but then stepped down from the bench to become his chief of staff and his name was Bob Davis. And so Davis ran a very tight ship. They had excellent
staff people and they were tasked to do certain things. McCall was the vision and he was kept in the bee hive to be visionary and go out and be an exponent and -- and sell things, but he wasn’t involved in the day-to-day operations or the machinations of getting something through the legislature, Bob Davis did that. And so it takes strong gubernatorial leadership. You had coming out of Portland another strong leader in Neil Goldschmidt. Goldschmidt, I felt, made the mistake of -- of coming in and more less just bringing in his crop of people from Portland and that didn’t -- didn’t work particularly well. But I would say both Goldschmidt and John Kitzhaber, they were both individuals that you could take and put them in a room with, say nuclear physicists, which were -- neither one were nuclear physicists and brief them for now and both would have the skill of going and appearing before a convention of those -- those people and wowing them with their sagacity on their subject matter. They were just that kind of quick study. And we don’t have that kind of leadership in Oregon today.

INTERVIEWER: So, we're lacking in -- in maybe a personification of leadership, but also the issue of vision, I don’t get a sense that we have a good picture of where we’re trying to get to.

ROGER KIRCHNER: No, no and I don’t -- I don’t know that we do and -- and -- and I -- I -- I do think we’ve got issues that -- that center around Goal 14 and -- but -- but water issues, climate change issues and so on that -- that are -- are gonna need to be addressed and they are certainly a catalyst and so on. L.B. would have chastised governors for not taking up the fact the LCDC had the -- the capability of really being the coordinating agency for a lot of state policy had they had they elected to do so, but Straub didn’t have that vision and none --

INTERVIEWER: No.
ROGER KIRCHNER: -- none of his successors have had -- had that vision. And so you have various agencies that still compete with one another; economic development people and, you know, the DEQ people or, you know, Forestry doesn’t -- it chaffs at being told what to do and so on, you know. Division of State Lands has its own issues, you know, so.

INTERVIEWER: Kevin, we have about 10 minutes left. Is that about right?

KEVIN POZZI: Yeah. Thank you.

INTERVIEWER: Roger, do you want to sort of take this opportunity to add anything else to our discussion? It’s been very, very interesting, frankly, and it’s great to revisit some of the good ole’ days, quote/unquote, in terms of what we went through and what we’ve accomplished, but you may have some thoughts about the programs future that maybe we haven’t touched on so far or other things relating to the past if you want to at least bring up.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, throughout my career, both at LCDC and -- and subsequent state agencies that I worked for, I was in public information and publications and SD and speech writing and that kind of stuff. And I’m convinced successful communication is an art and -- and it’s ever-changing. To successfully communicate is to be able to impart to a receiver information that that -- that receiver understands fully what the intent of the transmitter is -- is giving and -- and often times in the transmission it fails in some way. It might be a verb. It might be we didn’t publicize in this way or that way, and so on. I’m convinced that working with Portland Public Schools, for example, that you can send out emails, you can send out newsletters, you can send out mailings, you can send -- you can be on TV, you can be on radio, you can literally go out in the middle of the street and stand on your head and they will still be told, oh we didn’t know, oh, you didn’t invite us, oh, you didn’t give us opportunity, yakity yakity yak. It’s an ongoing struggle to always -- for any governing body, to deal with transmitting information that is
transparent and invites public understanding and participation. As I’ve already said in -- previously, I firmly embrace the concept of citizen involvement. I believe it -- it is -- it plays a foundational role in -- in any successful decision making --

INTERVIEWER: Could you comment on maybe the roles or responsibilities or at least the opportunities that journalists and academic institutions, this is -- these are broad themes, but I remember in -- in our time with the agency, you know, journalism -- journalist covered this pretty closely and --

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well I --

INTERVIEWER: -- then academic institutions, we sort of had some involvement with the U of O and Portland State some, I don’t recall much there, but I’m just wondering whether they have a role to play in -- in maybe helping to craft and carry out the vision of the program.

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, certainly the agency and commission, if we’re just talking about LCDC --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ROGER KIRCHNER: -- but any government body ought to spend time working with journalists on background as this --

INTERVIEWER: Good point.

ROGER KIRCHNER: I used to receive -- when I was at LCDC, for example, I'd field phone calls, you know, and -- and -- even though this was illegal but, you know, I gotta to pay for them, and dah, dah, dah, oh, well, why is LCDC doing this and this and this and so on. And -- and I said, well, I understand you’ve gotta tape rolling, if you want to spend a moment on background, let me give you some background, and then you can formulate whatever questions you want to ask and I’ll be glad to be taped and journalists appreciated that. I did that with newspaper
journalists and so on. I often spoke to them on background. I used to go -- be in the Capitol building and have a -- be approached by somebody from Associated Press and say, well, What the hell is this? Can you tell me what this is? And so on.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that was the (unintelligible).

ROGER KIRCHNER: Yeah. So on. That was my role and so agency needs people to do that always. Any agency needs that.

INTERVIEWER: Well, do you have anything else? Just concluding thoughts?

ROGER KIRCHNER: No, this was really fun.

INTERVIEWER: We really appreciate the --

ROGER KIRCHNER: We could talk for hours.

INTERVIEWER: -- the opportunity. We could and who knows we may call you again to give us the -- the rest of the story. (Chuckling)

ROGER KIRCHNER: Well, I trust we haven’t broken Kevin's machine.

KEVIN POZZI: Thank you.

INTERVIEWER: Thanks.

(Concluded)