2017

Interview with Ted Lorensen

Ted Lorensen

Lloyd Chapman

James B. Knight

Michael Rupp

A transcript of the 2017 interview with Ted Lorensen, former Assistant State Forester with the Oregon Department of Forestry. Also participating in this interview were Lloyd Chapman, formerly the Goal 4 Forest Lands Specialist with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); James Knight, formerly DLCD State Agency Coordination Specialist; and Michael Rupp, who followed Lloyd as the DLCD Forest Land Specialist. This transcript was created from the video interview of Ted Lorensen for Portland State University's People and the Land: An Oral History of Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program. **Note**: After certain sentences, **[brackets with numbers]** contain time that corresponds to the time on the video.

MICHAEL RUPP speaking:

The Portland State oral history project focuses on Oregon's land use planning program. It provides the opportunity for key participants to recount stories and anecdotes regarding how this unique program was developed, implemented and evolved over its more than four decades in existence.

It's November 20, 2017. My name is Michael Rupp. I'm a former member of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and before that, a staff member with Douglas County, Oregon's Planning Department.

Also here are former colleagues at the Department of Land Conservation and Development, **Lloyd Chapman and Jim Knight**.

We are here to discuss the creation and implementation of regulations to achieve compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 4, Forest Lands.

We are happy to have with us **Ted Lorensen**, formerly [an Assistant State Forester] with the Oregon Department of Forestry, and a key participant in helping shape regulations that protect Oregon's forest lands.

Welcome Ted.

TED: Thank you, Mike.

MIKE: And I think we will start with you just talking about your background.

TED: Okay, well I started working for the Oregon Department of Forestry in 1977 in Forest Grove … in the fire program, and then became a Forest Practices Forester two years later … which was in its infancy. So, it was interesting to see that program go in place which was a very strong correlation.

MIKE: When did that start?

TED: [19]76 was when it was adopted if I remember right.

LLOYD: [19]71

TED: 71, that's right. And then it was implemented … It didn't really didn't get to rule adoption, which was done on a regional basis until 76 -77. They hired a bunch of folks, including myself, and actually a bunch of Department of Revenue folks also came over and started working for the [Forestry]

Department. It was a taxation program that was changed about the same time. Which was an important factor in all this as well.

I went to Astoria in the Fire Program, in the management Fire Program and the Forest Practices Program. A lot of relationships were built with the local fire departments. There interface issue was just being discussed at that point in time. It wasn't that big of a deal in Astoria except in the dune area which was a big issue in the summer. Then I moved to Salem in 1984 in Fire Program and then after the fire season in 87, I went to the Resource Planning Program. I did become the Land Use Coordinator. So, I was mostly engaged in the forest practices - fire stuff up until [19]84. And then in 84, I became more oa policy person dealing with broad forest policy … It was called the Forestry Program for Oregon. Where the Board of Forestry in their strategic document, they work very diligently to identify one of their primary goals was to protect forest land for forest uses … very consistent with the efforts of DLCD.

From there I got with Jim Knight on his state agency coordination effort. From there, I eventually became Assistant State Forester where I was engaged in overall forest policy and legislation.

I did grow up in the Seattle area. So, like we were talking earlier, I saw the megalopolis development and relate to the loss of quality of life from just growth.

MIKE: And the impacts dwellings have on forest lands?

TED: Absolutely … and all sorts of resources. In fact, I grew up on the east hill above the Green River Valley which at one time was an awesome fishing stream and now it's a trench where they got to pump water up out of the valley to get it into the river because they have elevated its base. So that is kind of my background. I got my degree in Forestry from the University of Washington.

MIKE: Lloyd do you want to talk about the beginning of Goal 4 to us as it relates to the Forest Practices Act was starting almost the same time the land use program. Both of them were in their infancy and it was interesting to see how they kind of started I mean we didn't have everything ready to go; it was trial and error so to speak, I guess?

LLOYD: Well, I think Forestry had the law in 71, and our statute [SB 100] came in 73. But they still hadn't figured out exactly and there was still some uneasiness I think on the part of Forestry about the Forest Practices Program of the forest industry about how this was going to work and how it was going to plan and so adding in land use was which was a total unknown to them I think may have just added a level of uncertainty to the times related to forest lands in the state that didn't help either process probably.

TED: Well, I think, as I discussed earlier when you look at the other things going, the Clean Water Act had been adopted earlier; then NEPA [National Environmental Protection Act] and the state of Oregon and OSU had just completed a study of the Alsea River looking at the effect of forest operations on water qualify and fish and it showed it was a very harsh, tended to be a very harsh timber harvest followed by a very hard slash burn, and it really showed some practices of the day could be very devasting to water quality and fish and so clearly with the Clean Water Act looking at them in the eye and they had seen both California and Washington both adopt SEPAs and where you really a program that was permit based – EIS-based and I think they wanted to avoid that. And I get that from Janet McClendon who was the Chair of the Boad of Forestry and was on Tom McCall's staff. So, I think somewhere there was vision came out of all this I don't where it was created; but I think there was uneasiness, but I think it was; I think there was a desire to create something that was different that was

going on in other states. Now Washington adopted their FPA like a year or two later and California followed with theirs.

But I think the vision for Oregon while uncertain was certainly more desirable to a lot of those folks than what they had seen happen in other states. And that an impression I had from the folks that preceded me. But I think that is an important element where we never really did and still don't have an EIS-based system; it's a much broader scale plan, and I think that's I think Oregon has been more efficient and has ultimately been more effective in land use because it hasn't been project-by-project on that system.

The other thing clearly the economy was booming at the time. So, McCall had a real positive population you know like things were good particularly in the forest sector.

MIKE: Back in the 70s.

TED: In the early 70s

LLOYD: Early 70s.

TED: And then certainly there was a concern at that time about needing to have more timber to mills opposed to less but that was a concern how do we maintain and promote increased timber volume to be harvested so that aligned us up well with the land use planning program. And by the time I started in 77, the economy had tanked. And so, you had that going on with all these new rules at least for the Forest Practices Act had been adopted. They were in place. And they had some real controversial elements around them.

MIKE: Were they blaming the Forest Practices Act for any of the problems.

TED: No not at all. It was definitely economic.

MIKE: That was different for us because we got blamed.

TED: Right, well at least the impression I had is that they weren't. There weren't any real rules in place at the time. They were pretty, like the riparian protection rules in 77 were fundamentally leave enough vegetation to provide 70 percent or 80 percent of the pre-operation shade so it didn't require that you leave timber particularly. It was also a very hard metric to enforce because you didn't know how much shade was there before, and it was hard to measure after. So, it wasn't having that much of an impact but I think voluntarily land owners had gotten the message from the Alsea Study that

MIKE: It set the tone. **[9:45]**

TED: It set the tone; you can't keep doing what you are doing. You had better back off; no more tractors in the creek, water bar, you know less ground-based stuff. And so, I think generally it was pretty well accepted. I, the only conflicts I saw in Forest Grove were more of the small landowners; gippos, I mean you had the gippo mill owners that would go out; and this was actually my first experience I had with the land use program was on reforestation. And the Forest Practices Act was amended because of this; but you had a bunch of folks in those developing areas around Forest Grove, they would go out and buy 80 acres or 120 acres clearcut it, not reforest it and then sell it. And the way the rules were written at the time is that the new owner had to pay for the reforestation. And so, they bought this stuff

unaware and the next thing is you knock on their door and say you got to reforest. And you know it has been brushed up for five years, and it is going to cost you five-hundred dollars per acre by the way. And that was my first exposure to the land use issue, conflict with development and forestry. That was a real eye opener. It was a huge problem.

MIKE: A lot of conversions.

TED: A lot of conversions

Mike: And you had people trying to play between the rules.

TED: They were playing games and that was actually the first vineyards were coming in then; so, you had some legitimate conversions, and you had a lot of them that weren't. You had a lot of folks thinking they were going to subdivide down to something smaller, and they couldn't. So, it was a pretty big deal. So, it was kind of an interesting exposure to that. I think I in Forest Grove, one year they were almost half probably half of them were reforestation violations. I wrote half the citations in the state. Because of the reforestation issues. They were pretty much all kind of what you call the gippo mill owners – small mills, they would go in there and violate stuff and come out big fat happy campers and sell to some dupe and off they would go.

JIM: Ted, were you folks in close coordination and partnership with DEQ and Fish and Wildlife or not at all?

TED: No, not really. Part of the Forest Practices Act had, interesting enough, a requirement to coordinate in protecting with other agencies water quality.

JIM: They had something in the law?

TED: In the law, and then by rule they adopted these annual meeting provisions. Once a year we were supposed to sit down with fellow agencies and offer a meeting to talk about

JIM: Who would chair those, the Governor's Office?

TED: No, it was the department that would chair those. The State Forester would invite other agency directors. The first meetings were actually kind of all agency meetings like the first four or five and nobody was willing to say anything. And, so they became individual meetings.

JIM: Were we [Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)] there?

MIKE: Yah, eventually. You and I [talking to Jim]. Did you get to attend [asking Lloyd]? It might have happened after 1982. That's when I came to the Department [DLCD]. **[13:15]**

TED: But it was something we still do. But it, I remember later on the reforestation issues and actually land use conversions then became a pretty big deal, I can't remember when it was. Probably in the mid 90's under the Oregon Plan for Salmon Watersheds because people were playing the system; going in there and doing a timber harvest and saying we are going to do a land use conversion therefore we don't have to leave or we are going to take the buffer under the land use conversion. And we eventually built an agreement with DEQ saying that if they are going to touch the buffer, they got to get DEQ's approval that what they are going to do meets water quality standards. And that kind of tempered that,

but that coordination is very difficult. And it required local government to want to participate; some of them didn't want to.

JIM: Did you have some pretty close staff-to-staff collaboration? I don't mean at the director level.

TED: Certainly, with DLCD I think during my tenure we always did, and I think there was always a common set of goals that we wanted to achieve. One of the contested issues around the early implementation of state agency coordination how do go about doing that. And then again, how does the Forest Practices Act meet the other goals in its implementation as well as other agency programs. And how do we provide a program to help local governments when we are not funded to do that and all sorts of things. But nonetheless I think we worked through it. Then House Bill 3396 exempted the Forest Practices Act from SAC [state agency coordination] requirements.

MIKE: Goal 5 requirements.

TED: No, I think it specifically exempted it from state agency coordination, it didn't, I think it … I am pretty sure it said …

MIKE: My recollection was that you [Jim] wrote your big paper on whether Goal 4, sorry, whether the FPA met Goal 5.

TED: Right

MIKE: And in doing so, I think the industry was in particular concerned that you would have 36, you know, different Goal 5 applications to their forest practices.

TED: And I am pretty sure the solution was to exempt the FPA from SAC requirements but then it required it the adoption of a set of protections similar …

MIKE: That basically met Goal 5. The idea …

TED: Similar**,** similar. I think that is one of the areas where the land use program was particularly weak and less so on forest lands. I'd say certainly on hazard protection and water quality standards; those sorts of things. It's been pretty uneven. But and that again created some gaming where you had either big conversion or the problem really hit the fan in southern Oregon along the Applegate River; a tributary was totally nuked by a guy with some vineyard …

Mike: yeh, I remember that.

TED: And a, it was you know I mean; I don't think vineyards were ever planted there. You know you look at the value I mean down there of riparian timber, it's just not that much. And yet, he just nuked it and made a mess.

So, I think on staff-by-staff basis actually probably I would say with DLCD and the Department of Forestry had very good relationships because of that common goal. And we struggled through certain things, but it eventually worked out pretty well. I think one of the strengths of the forest land issues was the Board of Forestry, particularly under Janet McClendon but with Jim Brown the State Forester had the strategic planning process and always had as one of their key goals was to maintain the forest land base for this broad set of forest uses. Not just, and actually when I was there most of the Board Forestry would say job number one was to maintain the forest land base. And that's pretty, you don't hear most

other agencies don't get to that point. Even, I would say Agriculture made sure of that, but it's a much more narrow point of view and probably don't see the uses as broadly as the Forest Board did. And certainly, never had a mechanism to implement Goal 5 water quality standards in a way that was meaningful. And then the fire issues … go ahead.

Mike: Question for Lloyd Chapman: Did the interface issue come up in the early developments of Goal 4? Do you remember talking about the implication of having house out in there or was it just more along the lines of what we were doing with Goal 3? **[18:30]**

Lloyd: Well, it was, I don't think in the development of the goal, first of all it wasn't one of the 10 goals in SB 10 and it wasn't listed in SB 100. So, it got listed when staff went out to around the state in workshops, and people said you've got to have a forest lands goal. And then there was in the course of developing the goal there was movement between is this a commercial forest land resource or is it a broader forest land resource. It ended up being the broader set of forest uses without any priority ascribed to commercial use over other uses. And, I don't think the idea of the interface and the implications were on much of anybody's …

Mike: Didn't rise to the surface.

LLOYD: I mean because this was in 74, sort of before the Beuter Report had come out. And before some other things got people thinking a little different way.

MIKE: From my perspective, I was working for local government at the time, and Goal 4 was somewhat unclear. It was Dave Stere in particular, and we kind of go around and around about what is it exactly you want us to do. And so okay and coming from Douglas County, quote unquote, it was the timber capital of the world at the time. And when I was down there, it really was. I mean we had 24-hour log trucks going on 42 and 38 to Coos Bay all the time. So, it was really booming. And so, the county wanted to protect forest lands in general. So, we could do broad brush, but then you got into the interface areas and of course we had a lot of contention there; no surprise. People wanting to do other things; the woodlot owners would come out and say you know were not the commercial timber people so you can't treat us like that; we have to be treated differently. And so, it was fuzzy I guess is a way to describe it.

LLOYD: Uh-uh

TED: And I don't think, my first experience with the interface issue was when I move to the Fire Program in 74, and I was in charge of their think tank and planning division and guy named, Dick Rondaeu, was the main staff person there. You at that point in time it was just getting on the national radar and he'd gone to a number of meetings about it. And he actually was came-up with this cartoon showing the complex interface. I think it's still used today. It was very well done. And uh, you know he'd done a lot of analysis looking at where fires were occurring. At least from the Department of Forestry perspective. And it is fair to say, the land protected by the Department of Forestry, tend to be lower elevation, a lot of interface. And so, the fire season starts early; and they were already noticing an increase in costs. He did reports every year on the costs per acre, and yada, yada; As we were seeing fire costs were going up. We had thought looking at the combination of slash burning, prescribed burning and fires in combination and that was staying pretty even. But the actual number of wildfires was going down as the prescribed acres was going up, and then all of sudden it flipped. And he was the

first guy; you know, I thought we were going out of the wildfire business. But now look, we are burning a lot less slash, and we are seeing a lot more starts and fires in these interface areas. And so, between 84 and 86, we were starting to sound the horn that this was going to be a problem. And of course, California was starting to have some issues; Florida and some of the southern states. And, then we had a bad fire season in 86 which was mostly not interface it was over in eastern Oregon. And then 87 hit which was mostly southern Oregon interface. A number of FEMA declarations, and a, as Mike knows with FEMA, they don't count the value of timber as being part of disaster measurement. Its gotta have homes there. Which again like in Douglas County is ironic. The one fire that was in 87 declared first was the Bland Mountain Fire; the average assessed value of the homes that were at risk was like $8000. Double wide trailers and I mean, folk gardens and stuff. And the timber was in the millions and millions. And yet because you have houses there, you get this declaration there that FEMA basically reimburses for a lot of your fire suppression costs. As a result of that, we did a mitigation plan and then a study looking very specifically at the Department's data around the cost and loss and the risk and hazards of the interface. Kevin Birch of the Department of Forestry, you know the data were very definitive, and it showed the probably of the fire start was greater as the density of dwellings went up, and the cost of fire suppression went up as the density of dwellings went up. And of course, the Department of Forestry's protection not the Forest Service protection. **[24:17]**

But clearly you also had the issue coming up in central Oregon. Federal fires coming off in the interface. So, I was kind of the first big hit on that, just by the legislature. For some in the legislature that pushed back, they didn't want to believe the data you know; well like gee whiz, could we start recommending changes to the land use program. I can' remember one. The goal revisions started, was that about 87 or 88.

MIKE: Yup, yup. **[25:01]**

TED: So that was the driver in part of the conversation around that but we did get some push back from legislators. Oh, gee whiz, you can't abuse these poor private land owners and make them do fire protection stuff that's not nice. And basically we don't believe your data …

MIKE: We were having issues with the woodlot owners mostly because they have multiple objectives. And I mean they want to grow timber for their own use, for profit, but they also want to divide their holding later to give it their kids or sell it.

TED: A lot of the interface though is not that. Again, I think that is one of the issues around the goals. Is they … certainly you had a landscape that was in place when the land use program was adopted, but you had a lot using Forest Grove as an example, all these little subdivision out in the forest lands. You had west of McMinnville up on a ridge, I can't remember the name now. Beautiful homes on 5-acre lots; they weren't up there to grow trees. They were up there to live. But that was the hazard. There was, I forgot how many acres; probably like two to three million acres of that kind of stuff out there. And that was, so it wasn't under Goal 4. And that was one of the loopholes was that even if the fire standards that were eventually adopted those people were out of that requirement.

They eventually got that through a forest fire law set of rules that they adopted them, Chapter 407. But a, that was a huge donut hole to deal with. Was this neither farm nor forest …

MIKE: These are what we call residential … rural residential exception areas.

TED: Yes and there are lots of them and there are lots of them in the hottest, driest places. They tend to be the lower value forest lands by nature. Industrial landowners had the opportunity to get rid of them; so, they subdivided them in the 70s probably. A lot of them were platted earlier than that.

MIKE: We have a lot of that.

TED: So that was kind of … those things were popping up. And certainly, the issue around timber supply became a driver with the federal lands becoming a problem. And so you know, I think Board always, the Board of Forestry always pretty visionary. But I think that alignment between LCDC and the land use program goals and the Forestry Program for Oregon was very powerful. I mean we might disagree about the some of little stuff, we would always agree about maintaining forest land for forest uses. And then the conceptual ideas that there is a basically the transference if you allow rural residential zones to be built out in wildlife winter range there is going to be an effort to transfer that use back on the forest land where it wouldn't traditionally occur.

In fact, the Forest Service actually went out and tried making winter range. It was like okay …

MIKE: They are going to take commercial forest land and covert it to winter range.

TED: Yes, because of that. **[28:41]**

MIKE: Because of the habitat displacement that occurred.

TED: Mainly in central and eastern Oregon, but certainly in southern Oregon as well. So that was the first time we really, we did a white paper around [19]87- 88 process. I can't remember who helped, that you and I [Ted looking at Mike] or maybe you and I [Ted looking at Jim]. Remember the white paper we talked about all the … 1000 Friends of Oregon has used that for years as evidence in their cases. We talked about … that's when the concept of the template test came up and that.

MIKE: We had two things going on in 88. I think it was; we started, we had court cases that were - this goes back to your days [Mike looking at Lloyd] when the 025 section [of the forest lands rule] that never got adopted. There is a history there. The Commission was having problems; 1000 Friends was on one side and counties were coming primarily on the other side. What do we do with forest dwellings?

First of all is there such a thing? I remember Robert [Liberty from 1000 Friends of Oregon] came into one of the [LCDC] hearings with a Lucian Picard study, Lucian… I forgot his last name … Alexander, Lucian Alexander study that said you had to have almost 160 acres to even have any reason to have a dwelling, and it might have been even more. And of course, that wasn't acceptable to anybody. And so, you know there was a lot of push and shove going on as to when can you have a dwelling. So, we used the term it had to be necessary and accessory to forest uses for years. Because we didn't have a rule.

We had this one-page rule for everything.

Lloyd: Except uses.

Mike: Pardon?

Lloyd: Except uses.

MIKE: Except uses. And ah, it ended up that we ran that for, boy from 82 to 87 probably. And we finally got a Court of Appeals case out of Coos County that had justified a dwelling on a woodlot

ownership on 20 or 40-acres. And we, I remember Craig Greenleaf and I and a few others looked at each other we got a go in and open the Goal and get rule established and try and get the Commission to go back and do what we didn't do in 82 to try and stabilize it. Because we had no way of controlling it base on that court case. And so, after that we opened it up. It took us two years to get to 1990 to finally adopt the [Goal 4 and] rule. That's when you and I and Kevin, Craig, I was trying to think of the others but we spent a lot of hours trying to get justification. It might be one of the only records that we put together because we were fearing a court challenge. And so, we went through and itemized everything.

TED: That should be available somewhere. **[31:39]**

MIKE: That is the thing I sent you in an email. It's about a 40 to 50-page document that had quotes from the Governor …

TED: Probably working on that for months.

MIKE: Ya, ya, we had quotes from you and Ann Hanus, Jim Brown. I mean just literally we had every … and we took all of the objections; we had a … I remember going to the fairgrounds and having a, boy just some really raucous, rock and roll sessions before the Commission. I felt bad because before we adopted the Goal amendment and the rule, Greg Wolf and I went out to see if we could get Governor Straub to come to the hearing. And it was at the fairgrounds. He graciously consented to come and he got up there and had a real good statement which is something you can find in the record about why you need to protect forest lands.

The people in the audience were just giving him the hardest time. Just total disrespect. I kind of felt you know really sorry for him in that we coaxed him in to coming out of retirement for one last statement before the Commission. But the good thing for him is that it doesn't phase him. He is kind of used to that for good public policy. He came through and the Commission finally adopted the amendments, and if they hadn't it was going to be … **[33:00]**

TED: That was and Gail Achterman was intimately involved which I think that was in my experience when you had a Governor where you had a natural resource advisor like her that was intimately involved in the issues. And she was also intimately involved in [House Bill] 3396 and that and I think she again she had a grand visions that she may have not communicated it all that well to everybody involved but I think she always had it and communicated it to the Governor so you had this political cover in my opinion that you didn't have … Barbara Roberts was next right?

MIKE: Yah

TED: And things went downhill from …

MIKE: Well she had Anne who had Anne Squire?

TED: Barbara Roberts but it was a different level of involvement

MIKE: And well, we might have upset the cart a little bit then because we came in with a secondary lands proposal. Dick Benner and we were getting pressure. We knew these lands didn't fit just saying they were ag and forest lands and we needed to treat them differently. So, we came in with a proposal that said okay we can relax certain things in the areas where the development is already relatively dense

that just having 80-acre minimums didn't fit the situation. You couldn't find enough 80-acres to make sense out it. So that's when the template test came in under Anne. **[34:28]**

TED: And the interesting thing about with regard to water quality and state agency coordination and that sort of thing. We were running into and I can't even remember who even made the proposal, but the Governor's - - Anne Squire was very supportive of this. Clear and Collard Lakes they were water-quality impaired and it was due to septic tanks. And the county had proposed; landowners had proposed regulating forest practices to a greater degree by limiting harvest under the hypothesis that it would reduce phosphorus inputs from forest lands soils, right, so they could build. Take the moratorium off of that. We fought that really hard. The Governor's office was totally supportive of the people there. We got to quit logging and that will solve the problem so they can build all these houses there. No, we are not going to do that. The Board [of Forestry] was totally behind our department on that. DEQ [Oregon Department of Environmental Quality] didn't stand up. Go ahead and let them build. Get us out of the problem. We are viewed as the evil party there.

MIKE: Coos County wasn't it?

TED: Douglas County.

MIKE: I think it was Coos.

TED: No, I think it's Douglas; No, it's Clear and Collard Lake

MIKE: I remember Collard. Clear?

TED: I think it was Douglas, but it could be Coos; one of those counties; one of those evil counties down there. But it was fascinating to see again with – [former Governor] Goldschmidt's staff. They had a very consistent vision of you know we are not going to impair forest land. You know I can't remember when we were dealing with some of the updates with water quality. We tried to be really consistent. So, if under the land use program at the time, if a dwelling would be sited and it would result in the upgrading of a creek to a domestic water use; they couldn't do that. I don't remember that part, but those were the very consistent things. And Goldsmidt's office was, actually Gail Achterman was totally behind us on that. Then we went to Anne Squire and Barbara Roberts, who was much more of populist, and it was like make an exception here. We can't do that! That was very; we had this little undermining all the time.

And ah, I can't remember, Jim, how much either one of you guys were involved in the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Water. Land use became a pretty big issue around that process as well and the failure of consistency on riparian protection those sorts of things. The Department of Forestry saw that both Ag and DEQ needed to step-up on water quality standards and particularly on land use conversion issues. More broadly, and again you had [Governor] Kitzhaber's energy on that. And when he was moved out of office, it just kind of petered out. I don't know where it's at now. But I don't see any energy for that effort any more.

So those were some of the interesting benchmarks. But the fire thing, you know again, the Department, I forgot what statutory change that it occurred. It was fairly late, it was like probably 94. When they actually required landowners maintain defensible space or their property assessment goes up. And that kind of stuff. Each county has to adopt a program.

MIKE: We did put that in the [Goal 4] rule as far as fire siting standards.

TED: In Goal 4. Ya, but I am talking about these non-Goal 4 lands which probably the bulk of interface falls into. Actually, I have been going down to the upper Rogue River around Shady Cove for our 22nd year this year fishing; October. And you watch the forest-scape down there which is mainly rural residential around there. Oh my god the number of homes being built in places that are just totally indefensible is mind boggling. There are some houses, I have no idea where the people get their money. And there's one above Roseburg; probably north of Roseburg. You can see from the freeway of to the west up on the top of a hill. It's like oh my god, are you kidding; how are you going to get out of there?

And so, you know the lessons we have we are learning them but are we applying them. [39:23]

MIKE: That was the Morgan house. Joyce Morgan used to be on our planning commission in Douglas County and then became county commissioner. Her husband and her built this huge house overlooking the North Umpqua.

TED: Ya, there divorced now. Who got the house?

MIKE: She's passed away too.

TED: But I think one of things I saw I don't if you want to get into this in terms of the gaps. That is still one of the big gaps. And the landslide hazards on forest lands. Again, if I look at the gaps. The forest land definition again still has always boiled down to some commercial test I mean and that's … we've broadened it out to include other lands to maintain the commercial forest land base. But there is so much of this secondary land stuff that is essential forest land.

MIKE: So, what changes would you want to see? **[40:27]**

TED: I would have another goal maybe. I don't know. The solution is hard on that one. It is probably too late. Maybe. But, if Goal 5 was truly implemented. You know winter range and water quality issues, if those sorts of things were addressed. It would be very helpful. The fire thing is somewhat being implemented on these non-forest lands that are highly … that met the definition of forest lands under fire program but not under the land use program. And the hazard goal could be used to do that. The landslide issue, the last probably couple of years of my work in the forest practices program, we went out on a field trip. Oh, we were trying to adopt, it was the legislature adopted a requirement for the department to address the rapidly moving landslide issue. So, we were looking at issues there. We were along the main Umpqua issue above Elkton. There was a landslide that had come down across the highway. And ah, this was probably 96-97 after a bad winter. And ah, the county had approved a dwelling; they had staked it out and were starting construction on the landslide deposit … And it came out of BLM land. It was all old growth forest. And we walked up the channel, and it got up to the headwall area that was a huge logjam of stuff that was going to fail again. We walked back down and we told that landowner that you doing something really stupid here. And you need to be aware there is an imminent hazard above you. And he didn't give a rat's ass. And it's like you know I don't want to hear about it. If I do anything it's going to lower my [property] values. Yada-Yada,

JIM: What county, Douglas County?

TED and **MIKE**: Douglas County.

TED: And DOGAMI [Department of Geology and Mineral Industries] was supposed to map these areas and that foundered. I still think they have been doing Multnomah County first using lidar [light detection and ranging technology]. But I mean, that's not where the risk is.

So those are big holes. The fire issue, I think somebody's going to have to – I mean the State is going to go broke if the fire problem keeps going the way it's going. I mean the last fire season was not - normally, the bad fire season is when you have a lightning storm that overwhelms the system. This was not that this year. This was basically where you had a few lightning storms that set fires on mainly federal lands in July and they did modified-suppression actions on them. And I've always said that any fire that starts in July will go out of prescription. Well, they did. And the Chetco Bar Fire is an example when the run off of the federal land and get on the private lands in this case the Chetco Bar Fire – people were evacuated and it threatened the town of Brookings.

But now we are moving into - so the dilemma is we are moving into the era of we are trying to manage fire differently. We are trying to use fire as an important element of the ecosystem.

Yet, you have got all this infrastructure out there. And they have not reconciled that. And the land use program probably needs to back into that in some way and say you know you just can't – our concept of defensible space has gotten changed. Because, you get a conflagration like that it don't make a bit of difference about defensible space. The house is going to burn up.

And you know people and it puts people at risk.

MIKE: Santa Rosa [California] is an example.

TED: Yes, exactly.

MIKE: No one ever dreamed that a city would burn inside …

TED: Global warming, things are getting drier; fire seasons are longer. And so, you just need to have a system that allows those processes. The Goal 5 issue is a big issue. It's never really been implemented. And again, I think the forest land – I mean there's equity issues – forest land in part to the SAC conflict that we resolved at least it is fair to say that Goal 5 resources have been protected. And then you've got the overlay of "ESA-listed" stuff that provides another tool to have that happen on forest lands. It doesn't happen on other land uses. In the Willamette Valley – ag lands, all the rural residential stuff, I mean they get a pass and that goes for nest sites to water quality to whatever. That's an issue you cannot save salmon on the back of forest lands; particularly Coho salmon. You got a deal with it in a watershed scale. On the top of the ridge to the mountain rivers and we are not doing that. **[46:00]**

JIM: Has the state fallen down in terms of pulling these things together in some ways because it sounds like there are very smart people working in agencies individually but it seems like going backwards and of course on top of all of this there was a thing called, I think acknowledgment and you know that was I don't know how ever did it, but we did. And some of our calls were not always the best, but they got plans acknowledged. But okay, now where are we going? And as all know, at least several of us know that upcoming review of how the plan is being implemented; plans is not going to be happening.

TED: Periodic review is important.

JIM: And that's a real problem, question. And how is all of this going to come together. And right now, Mike and I know this is that not very far, not very fast. Again, we can't let some of this go.

MIKE: Now it's an unfunded mandate.

TED: Right.

Mike: There's no money for planning.

JIM: We gave out a lots of money for acknowledgment. In terms of grants and stuff. That was one of my jobs. A staff person would come in and say Benton County wants let's say 50,000 dollars for this. What marks did I have to sort of say that was too much, too rich? Or I am just saying we had a lot things going on at that time. Holy smoly. Rule-making was another thing. Citizen Involvement was an ongoing issue. Working with the interest groups both pro and con with the program. And would always have to go across the street and to meet with the cities and meet with the counties and right next door to 1175 [Court Street] we had industry. You know forest industry particularly. I am not saying there all bad.

MIKE: No

Lloyd: All have interests.

TED: Well, the way I – against my Seattle experience. Seattle when growing up in the late fifties, early sixties, and the early seventies was a remarkable place. I mean the schools were awesome. I mean I gotta say some of the bad schools. I can't relate to that. My schools were just awesome. King County consistently would pass levies that they had forward thrust programs; they call them. They built parks and swimming pools and libraries. All this stuff. The quality of life was incredible. And by the time I got out of school, you were getting the push back on you know, too many people issues. But you had the driver of the economy was from the greatest generation folks that were used to sacrifice; who were willing to invest in the whole. And by the time I left the Seattle area that generational flip had started to occur, and Seattle, I mean culturally, is an incredibly different place for a whole host of reasons. But their willingness to tax themselves is a mix of on and off. They are willing to do it for some issues and not for others. You read some of the stuff about growth that most of the new people there are happy for more growth you know, and the old folks complain about all the people there. And they do parodies in the newspapers about, you know, the unwelcomeness that people get from these old-timers. But you know you had this fairly affluent, economy is booming, they'd sacrifice a lot, they are still willing to sacrifice for their kids. Schools, at least where I grew up, we were pampered. It was awesome. College was cheap. The University of Washington was like; you know I mean I could work a summer job and pay room and board and my tuition. You know. So, you had all this going on. And then you started having in the late 70's and then successively about every 5 to 10 years some recession process, and I think the attitudes are much difference and the knowledge is much different.

MIKE: You got freezing; the bond issues came in to freeze property taxes; California and then Oregon, and I mean that changed things here.

TED: Well and then certainly now the land use program and the forest practices act as well you got the land use regulation compensation issue. And so, it allows some management around the margins in terms of forest practices, but any big scale regulations are off the table.

JIM: Of course, we have the regional boundary in Portland. That is not a small thing.

TED: And in Oregon compared to California and Washington, we are doing really great. We are losing forest land cover is in that rural residential zone. But we are seeing other things again that probably the land use program can't deal with. Like invasive species is a huge issue. In both waterways and land based invasive species and it gets to - I mean like sudden oak death down in Oregon, southern Oregon and California its probably a big factor in the fires. But we are having these ecosystem changes. Sudden oak death is just changing the vegetative component as well as the volatility to burning in over a huge portion of the landscape as well as loosing species. **[52:19]**

JIM: Where does the finger fall then is it against you guys or is it mainly against us or do we all share in quote-unquote blame or responsibility? That's the thing I am having a hard time with. Here I am a few years away from where I was. What is it now – 03 – 17 years – that's 14 years ago. I mean, your memory is tremendous in some respect. You know Lloyd knows and Mike knows that we did a lot of stuff in those years and a - with a pretty small staff. In the very beginning particularly, when I first got here, you know we had what 10 to 12 ___ people. And you would think we were nuts to try to undertake such an across the board plan for - where's the policies i.e. the roles. Rulemaking came later; but that was another big struggle. And then implementing those things. And having plans come in and we would look at them and say that thing in Goal 8 or something was okay; but boy these other things are not there yet, and back it goes. And we did that so many times. I don't know how we did it. We kept laughing about it – but not really. But, it was a real – what was it 10 years or so?

MIKE and LLOYD: Oh Ya

JIM: And that's about 10 years of your career or whatever.

Ted: But think about this. Again, the energy level, I mean the generational shift is significant. There was a lot of idealism coming out of the 60's and 70's. A lot of positive; we want to do something for the environment. We had all legislations going on. We wanted to make a difference. People worked very hard to do that. And I thought, I mean one of the things I saw; I really appreciated working with you guys on the Goal 4 rule was that it was really a collaborative effort to problem-solve. And we couldn't always agree but we wanted solve some problems; and we worked really hard –

JIM: We stayed at the table.

TED: We stayed at the table and we came up with some really creative ideas; I mean not all of them worked out well – template test maybe being one example – of an approach to solve a problem. You know it was a technical solution to a political problem that was dominantly politically-induced, I guess. But, you know it had some basis and functioned fairly well. It provided certainty and provided a standard that could be applied consistently. But, we were all at the table to come up with these ideas, and I don't see that energy in the; I don't see that leadership at the Governor's office level; I mean whatever people might think of Goldschmidt for his behaviors; I mean the guy put a lot of - he was a hard-working dude.

JIM: Yes, he was.

TED: And he had a really good staff, and they were equally as engaged. They wanted to get stuff done. Tom McCall, I think the same way. You know, when you think about Janet McCellan on his staff. That women, even when she was in her 80's, was working hard. I mean; awesome Board of Forestry Chair. So you had that kind of energy.

JIM: We had also, what I would say speech making. That was a real art; particularly McCall.

TED: McCall ya. **[56:03]**

JIM: I think – you know you look at some of his quotes from his various outings, and I wish I had today a copy of the comments that he and Governor Straub, one coming in and one going out in our final hearing in December of what 74 and to say support the 14 goals you have proposed us to adopt. And to me that was great. And we don't have people to articulating some of this stuff.

TED: That's very true.

JIM: Now, maybe I am being a little bit overboard but we just don't have anybody that's really representing us, and maybe you can help me here.

MIKE: That had a vision of the future.

LLOYD: And it is interesting because the goals talked about carrying capacity. It was never, never got anything into implementation. There was an energy conservation goal cause it happened when we went through the oil embargo. And, and I was the staff responsible for that along with the forest lands, and it was no clearer than the forest lands goal in terms of what did it mean. What is it supposed to do? And I finally said, I can't, I can't make this stuff up. I mean there is no nothing to hang any requirements on.

MIKE: And the [Oregon] Department of Energy didn't come forward and do much when [the Oregon Department of] Forestry did, and that was the difference.

LLOYD: But it was to me, as you were talking about, you know who's to blame for the not having the foresight. And in some ways the opportunity was there, but you know then, gas became available again and that was no longer an issue; and we don't really know what kind of carrying capacity is and all of a sudden if we knew what carrying capacity had been back then, and we are keeping track of it, we might have ended-up in a better place today, but. **[58:04]**

TED: Well, you know I am interested in the Forestry Program for Oregon. The current Board [of Forestry] is kind of quit doing that visionary work. For a whole host of reasons. One is I don't think they agree. But I think that was, I do think there was a vision. And even, Tom McCall did a nice job in carrying capacity as a technical term but I think basically framed it in both values and the emotions of look we don't want Oregon to be filled-up with people and lose our quality of life. That is caring-capacity right in one way. And you know, one of the things Jim Brown did with the FPFO was to try and get a set of metrics to measure progress recognizing the concept of sustainability which again, Oregon adopted all those sustainability stuff; each agency was supposed to have a sustainability plan right? demise politically. But you don't see a whole lot of – mean I – just legislative leadership; you had some really great states people back then.

JIM: I was going to ask about, who were the flag-carriers?

TED: And I was trying remember …

JIM: For Forestry?

TED: Ya, and there were a bunch of them in the legislature.

JIM: We had two that were critical but particularly for the enactment of Senate Bill 100.

MIKE: Hallock and MacPherson.

JIM: Hallock and MacPherson.

MIKE: Ron Cease

JIM: Ron, ya, and there's others that were there as well. Do we have such people today? And, maybe there's a lot of reasons that we are not going to solve today why that is. But ah –

TED: There were some very strong forest legislators.

JIM: We are sitting back now looking backwards, and what lies forward? What exempted? Cities in eastern Oregon or many of them.

MIKE: For periodic review? Ya, most counties are exempted.

JIM: Of course, periodic review is an arrowless quiver or something right now; but not that we want to go after people to hurt them. But we …

MIKE: No, but the issues Ted raised are all valid issues.

JIM: They are.

TED: Well, I'm still, the carrying capacity thing. I mean - those sorts of notions are important to have a conversation around. What, wildfire being a good example this year. You know we were under smoke for; we were miserable. If you were down in Medford, you had it for or in Sisters you had it all summer long. It had a huge economic impact. So, what do we want our state to look like; to be like. And that conversation is not occurring at all. Basically, it's kind of – I want economic survival mode after coming out of the Great Recession. But climate change … I mean there is probably a more compelling set of reasons now to try and do something around periodic review than there was 25 years ago. Climate change, rate of growth; I mean we are growing like crazy again. **[1:01:13]**

MIKE: Cascadia Subduction Zone.

TED: Ya, the hazard issues; ya, the infrastructure issues;

JIM: Climate change.

TED: It's big.

MIKE: All of those …

JIM: All of those big things are out there in front of us. Are we gearing-up to deal with those?

Mike: You would like to see the same initiative that we had when the land use program got started.

JIM: We were collectively a pretty good crew of people; you know, the various agencies and some of the interest groups and doing the best we could; and we accomplished a hell of a lot.

TED: I am trying to think of some of the legislator's names back then. I mean, they were, they were forestry owners. I mean there were some real and there were "states persons" that saw the bigger

view. And Oregon is a little bit different on the forestry side of stuff than a lot of other states; so that's again changed and is moving toward the end of that maybe. But, you had a lot of family-owned corporations; where you want to call them; Roseburg Lumber being the example. Whereas, you know just a Weyerhauser; the corporate corporation; much different view of the world than Roseburg.

MIKE: We had amazing support from Bob Saunder's BLM [US Bureau of Land Management] who used to testify a lot. Champion International was great. Champion used to come; and they'd get battered maybe from even from co-industry people.

TED: They did.

MIKE: They saw the wildland issue; interface issues; I mean they said our lands are going to be in jeopardy if we don't do something about it. **[1:02:52]**

TED: Most of those; I mean, it would vary over time; but you had … you have segments of the forest industry, separated by family forest and industrial lands. You have a segment of the forest industry that just on … they tend to be fairly right-wing property rights advocates. And just on that basis they didn't like forest practices and the land use program, but they ultimately came around and said, well, to maintain social license at least on the forest practice side, we are going to have to go along with this. So, they were able to get there. And there was always … most of them had a pretty good neighbor policy that they wanted to work with adjacent land owners. You know, not get cross-ways with them, and that kind of stuff. And, so you had that conflict, internal conflict. Some of them liked it for an intellectual and political standpoint, but they understood as a practical matter they had to do it.

So … you know; they had a bunch of them that would say, I mean like Starker's for example (a family-owned business). You know, ya, we want to protect the forest land base; that's our number one job. And ah, you know, so you had that mix. Overall, industry would raise the ruckus in terms of we don't like it because of our values but will eventually get to it because it's a practical matter. But the small woodland owner, you know, they harvest rarely, kind of a once or twice time thing to get that big parcel of money; but they are really looking at transfer of ownership at some point in time.

And so, for a lot of them, where money becomes relatively more important, they kind of- they, they - are going to fight the both the forest practices and land use [laws] more. And it is fair to say that regulation probably proportionally impacts the small land owner, economically, greater than it does the large landowner. So, that was always a conflict within our agency, because there was a fair, fairly large number of our staff employees that kind of had the small landowner point of view. You know, they wanted to be a small landowner to begin with, and their business was out helping them providing advice or fire protection or whatever and so, there was always this under-current of, you know, we are kind of uncomfortable doing land use. And so, it did leave it to kind of the leadership of the agency to push it. And so, there was a tension there. But things always got done on the fire program most of them could see as being pretty important. But these more esoteric things like global warming, those sorts of things, you know foresters tend to be relatively conservative. And you know they are going to have a hard time; its going to be harder in periodic review, I mean that's kind of like whoa, you know how do we …

JIM: Esoteric thing …

TED: We're not funded for that. We don't get it. We don't want to do that. So

JIM: And a generation is passing. And so, they can't look back like you and I and Lloyd can and Mike. Where do we go from here? That is the thing I get worried about. This is a wonderful state for lots of reason. We don't always agree on things; but ah, not to have this wonderful thing, this accomplishments, jeopardized is something that I just have a hard time accepting. But, have said that, who and what is the next series of steps. **[1:06:42]**

TED: Well, things tend to be cyclical. You mean again, there is some opportunity for them to experience what we experienced. And that actually popped-up in an interesting way in a couple of years before I retired. You know prior to the Great Recession, the economy was booming in Clackamas County, Washington County, Lane County, we were seeing again the failure to reforest particularly on these recently sold parcels that had been harvested. People were buying 160-acre parcels for lifestyle purposes that had been harv - you know- cut-up even by some industrial owners. And so, we were ending-up 3 or 4 years down the road having to issue big citations given a big conflict. And so, it was – they some of them were experiencing that and the Great Recession hit and that all disappeared again. So, you – you know it's been 10 years -12 years now – there was a group of them that had this new experience; and they were like we need to do something with our land use program; you know we need to something more with the counties to stop them from doing this. **[1:07:45]**

But, you know the economy changed.

You know, you're talking to right … I used to call myself a skeptic, a healthy skeptic. Now I am a cynic, and I am very pessimistic in part because I think if you look at the core issues: population growth (population being the most core of that issue) and energy. We are not dealing with those at all.

JIM: Climate change.

TED: Climate change which gets to I mean one of the books I really like is Collapse … look ahead of that … Jared Diamond's books. He looked at societies that have collapsed over time and the reason why, and invariably climate change has always played a role in that. And ah, even like the Aztecs down in Mexico to the southwest Pueblo Indians, and of course, people tend to build-up their populations during times of benign climate, and then when the climate changes and things get worse, they are over carrying-capacity, and things tend to fall apart.

Well, if you define carrying capacity is the population that you can sustain at the quality of life that you want without diminishing the productive capacity of all your other resources and wildlife, we are way behind. We are nuking stuff right and left. And again, the Goal 5 thing gets to some of that, and I mean it's a bigger, bigger scale issue. The state of Oregon needs a leader that is wanting to get back to what's the vision of the state.

At the presidential level, I mean I look again at the 60's. [President] Kennedy as much as Johnson was doing stuff that weren't particularly nice around the war …

JIM: And Nixon

TED: And Nixon. They did remarkable things around the environment. And there was a huge consensus amongst both parties. And you look at … if you call yourself a Republican and a conservative; well conserve. Well, that means sustain; don't get over carry capacity; whatever it might be. There was the McCalls, the Packwoods, you know you had these, the Henry M. Jacksons, these were the kind of guys

that were. But on the other hand, you look at the … even the state of Washington … Oregon's easier … you had two million people back in 72, and so, the relative number of state representatives in the legislature; they represented a smaller portion of people. They were more known in their community; they had a much more direct involvement in agriculture and forestry.

I mean the antidote to tell is there's the conflict now in Lincoln County where they are dealing with local ordinances to restrict pesticide applications. That's a big deal.

JIM: What is it?

TED: Pesticide applications. **[1:11:08]**

JIM: Pesticide application.

TED: And so, um, there a – you know it's a big deal to both agriculture and forestry, and their application of pesticides in particular. And they finally ended-up meeting with the mayor of whatever city it is whether it is Lincoln City or Newport whatever. Anyways, and the - it was a lady and she had never met anybody from the forest industry before. She didn't even know they – there was a forest industry. You know what is the forest industry? You know - where – you know, I mean the good neighbor policy – I mean, I can say very specifically, a lot of Willamette Industries, which was one of the big owners up in Forest Grove, they were out being friends with everybody. I mean they had a local area manager. That person knew everybody around their ownership. They were involved in local politics, school boards; they were engaged. And with the current [economic investment] structure of these TIMOs [timber investment management organization] and REITs [real estate investment trusts], there not engaged at all. They don't care. And so, you – that, that's been a huge shift, in I think, Oregon in particularly. That the engagement of the managers of land, even, even on the federal side. I mean that's – there was a lot of town hall meetings where people were pissed-off after the fires. The forest service, even the Department of Forestry, the turnover is so great that nobody knows anyone any more. And …

JIM: Continuity.

TED: Ya, continuity and institutional memory. But that, that, you know when you have somebody knock on your door and say hey, Bill, we need to talk about this, things happen. And now you don't even know who to talk to. That's I think that is an important difference. Especially on the forestry side of stuff and ag. And I think that will really bite em bad. But, I do think overall, the Board of Forestry got to step back and provide some leadership, and I know they're not doing that. **[1:13:04]**

JIM: Our own commission.

TED: So, I mean I, I, I look back like you are. Wow, those were heady days. We got a lot done with very few people.

JIM: Exhausted us.

TED: And, ya, we are all dying [laughing]

JIM: We survived.

TED: And, but I'm not very optimistic. I, I and I think, I look at [Oregon Governor] Kitzhaber 1 versus Kitzhaber 2 administrations. The amount of energy he had the first two terms. And the vision and the effort he brought to bring the agencies together versus Kitzhaber two. It was gone. I mean it was a different world. And look what it did to him personally.

MIKE: Kind of got pre-occupied.

TED: We are solving the world's problems Rupp come on now.

JIM: Before you leave, not now. But I mean you know …

MIKE: Let me finish-up with a: If you were again involved in such an undertaking and had the chance to influence the development of a new comprehensive land use planning program, what lessons learned from Oregon would you borrow and what aspects of the program might you avoid?

TED: Wow

JIM: How much time do we have to answer that?

TED: No, I think, I mean, I think that the program; I mean it was the birthing of the programs again there was the integration of programs and agencies was remarkable. And it was designed to evolve, and it required, it requires the energy that we had back then to put into and evolution now to bring it up to date. I don't know where that …

JIM: Leadership.

TED: Leadership and, and the resources are going to come from, ah but that's I say it just needs um you know for all the flaws in the Forest Practices Act and fundamentally there has been progress; ah, and problem solving. I do think they are losing energy there.

But ah, I do think the other, one other shift that is fascinating to me, and it really gets down to more of the public lands and particularly maybe the state at this point in time and the federal lands to some degree; maybe more so. I mean there's been a – the, there is no longer a viable management strategy for most of those lands or a sustainable management strategy. I mean the Elliot State Forest being an example; where it basically they were going bankrupt and so now they gotta deal with this body of land that the public want to keep but no way of managing it. Ah and, even the Board of Forestry lands in Tillamook and Clatsop State Forests, they are the same pathway. There, there they cannot sustain the same program they got. They have always used the revenue from those lands to maintain the recreational program and all the other things the agency did and they can't do that anymore.

MIKE: So, what has changed; what, why do you see that?

TED: Well, um, some degree it's restrictions for other uses, but to a large degree it's the inability to come to an agreement with the federal agencies on what's acceptable for those lands to maintain those viable. Even the Elliot State Forest they had an HCP.

MIKE: What's that?

TED: Habitat Conservation Plan. And for the Marble Murrelet um and a they were renegotiating that to make it a comprehensive plan for the Spotted owl, Marble and fish. And uh, the US Fish and Wildlife Service was fairly agreeable, but the National Marine Fisheries Service wanted more. And that more

made those land non-viable. And so, you know you gotta have a way of saying how do you make this balance and for the federal lands that's different. And again, ironically, they tend to view state owned lands as much like you oughtta be able to do what the feds can do; but the feds are going bankrupt too. I mean they're spending 60 to 70 percent of their budget on fire protection and they're not maintaining their roads; they're shutting down recreational sites; they're doing all these other things that just don't make sense. **[1:17:51]**

And ah, some of its – I mean I – one of the classic examples we were on a field trip for the Salmon plan; we were out looking at a large arch pipe that was being - had been replaced on Willamette Industries land. This was probably a 20-foot arch pipe – pretty expensive – the actual cost was $21,000 to install this thing. And we were on a field trip with the US Fish and Wild Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Regional Forester and staff, the US Forest Service, BLM Director, and we were talking. You know, fish passage restoration is the one tangible thing that does the most benefit for recovering the fish and that has scientifically been proven. So, this was been done, and the Forest Service Regional Engineer was there asking how much did it cost to do that? Asked Willamette Industries, $21,000. If you were doing this on state lands, how much would it cost? It would cost $21,000. He goes, you know just to get approval it would cost us probably $150,000 just to get approval. And to implement the replacement would probably be another $150,000. And yet, here is an agency that's got a backlog of impassable culverts that is huge.

And so, process has become paralysis for them. And, you know, they're inefficient. And, I think that we've got to deal – I mean part of sustainability is being both effective and efficient. And we may be somewhat effective, at least on the government side, we've become very inefficient; not as regulatory agencies, but as management agencies.

But that's going to become a pressure on the land use program if, if, if private lands get regulated to where they are not viable. And that can occur for a number of reasons, I mean, I think the Tmo and REIT issue where you got basically, you're trying to bought but is not sustainable either. But you are going to have folks look at those lands and say well the best way to maximize the value is to subdivide and sell. We going to clearcut them; and we saw some of that with the effort to require compensation. A lot of the TIMOs and REITs were not - were supportive of the referendums.

So those sorts of things, I think we really need to look at. Again, the governor, we need a governor that can provide vision and leadership. But I think, I think the framework is there. I mean I, If we did everything, did everything we are supposed to be doing and did it well, I think things would be fine.

MIKE: We'd be in good shape.

TED: Yah

Mike: Well, I'm going to conclude.

TED: Okay, good. I'm getting dry.

MIKE: On behalf of Portland State University and those of us involved in this oral history project regarding Oregon's land use planning program, I would like to thank you for allowing us to interview you. So, thanks very much.

TED: Thank you.