

Portland State University

PDXScholar

People and the Land: An Oral History of
Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program

Planning Oregon: Research, Innovation and
Practice

2013

Interview with Dorothy Anderson

Dorothy Anderson

Sy Adler

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/planoregon_interviews



Part of the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Dorothy and Adler, Sy, "Interview with Dorothy Anderson" (2013). *People and the Land: An Oral History of Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program*. 62.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/planoregon_interviews/62

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in People and the Land: An Oral History of Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

People and the Land: Dorothy Anderson Interview
Wednesday, 9/18/2013

SY ADLER: So it's my pleasure to be talking this afternoon with Dorothy Anderson, one of the original members of the Land Conservation and Development Commission. It's September 18, 2013, 40 years after the passage of Senate Bill 100 in 1973. It's a pleasure to talk with you. So we want to gather as much information as we can from the folks who were actively involved in helping to get this program started, both to document what you were thinking, what you were doing, what others were doing way back then, but also get your thoughts on how the program has evolved over time. So I have a set of questions and please, anything and everything that you think is relevant to this topic please add.

DOROTHY ANDERSON: I guess you can edit out, yes.

ADLER: Okay, as an LCDC Commissioner, what did you hope personally to accomplish in carrying out Senate Bill 100 and, in particular, through the statewide planning goals?

ANDERSON: Okay, well I think it's best to explain my background because as soon as my husband and I moved to Oregon in 1957, I immediately joined the League of Women Voters. And the league, at that time, was putting a lot of effort and study into the problems of urban growth because this was a period when we had a lot of people moving to the state, they were settling down often, too often, on the agricultural land outside of city limits. And so the league had several statewide studies, one of which I chaired, looking at the problem from different points of view and what to do about it. And in Senate Bill 10, in 1969 Legislative Session, it dealt specifically with the problem of counties not having plans and zoning. I was also on the 1990 Plan Advisory Committee for the Eugene Springfield Metropolitan Area, where we developed our long range plan and we came right up smack against that problem of the counties not paying any attention to what was going on outside of the city limits. So by the time we had Senate Bill 10 and

following Senate Bill 100 in 1973, I was, by then, the lobbyist for the League of Women Voters and was very much in favor of the idea of Senate Bill 100 and had actually participated in Govern McCall's -- I think it was a three day land use conference --

ADLER: Yes.

ANDERSON: Being held in November of '72 and I was one of the panelists. So I was raring to go, the League of Women Voters was raring to go, so we really worked very hard to have that bill passed in the legislature. Our main emphasis was citizen involvement because we were very determined that citizens should be involved in every aspect of the planning process because if they weren't, they wouldn't be participants, they wouldn't understand what was going on and so our big thing was to be sure to have a Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee. We also were particularly concerned with air pollution, water pollution, you know natural resources, the protection of agricultural land, the resources that the state had. So that by the time I was appointed to LCDC, I was very much and already in favor of Senate Bill 100 and very much wanted to see that it would work.

ADLER: Could you tell us a little bit more about your experiences working for the passage of Senate Bill 100, testifying to legislative committees during the course of deliberations on Senate Bill 100?

ANDERSON: It was a slog, I know that. And as the league lobbyist, I had to go to Salem three and four days a week during that session, commuting back and forth. Some hearings, of course, would start at 8:00 in the morning, many of them would go late at night. And I don't know why my husband didn't leave me at that time. He learned to do some cooking during that period. Actually, contentious as it was, there were so many that were strongly supporting it -- we weren't alone. I mean, we had the Oregon Environmental Council, you had other groups that were working for the same purposes we were working for. So we had colleagues and I think there was a sense of yeah, it was going to be a hard fight but we were altogether and we had friends, also in the legislature,

like Ted Hallock, like Hector Macpherson, and we had enough of them that we felt we could, with a proper -- oh, I should have definitely mentioned Nancy Fadeley because she was a friend from way back. So we had all of these people to work with and just kept pushing and pushing and pushing until we got it through.

ADLER: Could you say a little bit more about what influenced you with regard to public involvement, its importance, and some of the other issues that you mentioned?

ANDERSON: As far as one concern is, I said it was the league experience and also the fact that, you know, the league, all along, has been you have to educate citizens. We started out, primarily as a voter service organization where we would go around and explain to voters about all of the ballot measures that were on the ballots so they would understand what was involved and be, hopefully, better voters, you know, because they understood the issues. And I think that just carried over into what we were trying to do with the land use and citizen involvement. And I will say, there was one other thing. In those days, it was rare to find planning commissions, not only here, locally, but all over the state that weren't totally dominated by the real estate developer interests. They were not well balanced at all. And of course, that was one of the other bills that passed in '73, which was to limit the number of people on a planning commission from one particular area so that you had a better cross-section of interests. So that was another thing that was going on.

ADLER: Okay, so --

ANDERSON: Does that help?

ADLER: Yes, it does. Now you're on the commission.

ANDERSON: Now what?

ADLER: You're on the commission now.

ANDERSON: Yes, okay, yeah, I'm on the commission. And then you want me to start talking about what we did, or --

ADLER: What did you, personally, want to accomplish --

ANDERSON: Oh, what I --

ADLER: As a commissioner and accomplish through the statewide planning goals?

ANDERSON: Well, of course the main thing is I wanted to make the bill work and, of course, from my perspective and also the league's perspective, as I said, we were particularly interested in the natural resources and protecting the natural resources from improper development. That also was backed up by my experience on the Plan Advisory Committee down here because we had a lot of people who were fighting what we were trying to do because they were more interested in being able to develop their land however they wanted to develop it and they didn't really want to pay attention to some of the natural resources. So that was really my prime interest was to see that you used, what I would call common sense, but some people would argue with that probably, that you would be very careful in making your land use decisions so that they would be efficient and protective of the natural resources that could be irrevocably damaged if they were used improperly. And I think that was really my main focus on the commission. And if you want to get on to the question of anything in particular, the goals I thought worked out, except for one. There was one goal that I was very sorry that was not adopted and that was the shorelands goal and this is an example of what I was concerned about. When my husband and I moved to Oregon, we actually came, sight unseen, down the McKenzie Highway. We'd come from eastern Nebraska, I mean you had the muddy Missouri, you had the flat Platte, and we were just blown away by this absolutely magnificent river. And almost every summer, we would either hike or camp or fish, many times along the McKenzie River. Then we discovered that there were all of these people, most of which were from California, who were building lots or building houses right down on the river and, unfortunately, not always using it wisely because often -- too often, many of them would just tear out all of the existing riparian vegetation and very carefully put green lawns all the way down to the river. And we thought, you know, why

did they want to move there if that's what they were going to do? So, when we got to doing the goals, Steve Schell and I shared the common interest in pushing for that but we couldn't budge it. We tried very hard. We had one other commissioner who was on our side, but then, the rest, I think, thought it would just make it too controversial because so many people wanted to live on the water, either around a lake or along the ocean shore or along river shores and we had enough problems with people fighting us trying to repeal Senate Bill 100. And I think the majority of the commission felt that would just be taking on one too many but I look back on it still and say that was a mistake, we should have done it because we had to pay a lot more now to try to correct the problems that that caused in the past, particularly on the McKenzie River. So, that was one. By the way, something else, I was on the EWEB board, this is why when you get to the point of asking me about what LCDC is doing now, I've really been pretty much out of it for the past 20 to 25 years because in 1990, I went on the Eugene Water and Electric Board. And that meant that we put a lot of attention into what was happening on the McKenzie River because that's the water supply for Eugene. And, in fact, very soon after I went on the board, we created the McKenzie River Watershed Council and that is the first time we really began to get a handle on the development that was still taking place and had taken place on the river to try to get people and educate them to why they needed to protect the river and not take down riparian vegetation. It was still a fight, it was still a fight, but we've at least made some progress now. I'm just sorry it took so long to do it.

ADLER: Anything more about goal one, which was a major concern of yours?

ANDERSON: Well, it was an extremely successful program at first. 'Cause that was one of the first two things -- our first meeting that we had right after we'd been appointed, we had to meet in the governor's office because we had no office of our own, we had no director, the only staff we had was borrowed from other agencies. So the first thing we had to do was get a director. The second thing we decided to do when we were faced with this deadline of having to get the goals completed by December of the

following year, 1974, was we had to get that Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee going and it was a marvelous group, an absolutely marvelous group. They worked very, very hard on it and they helped design the program that we had, which was going out and as you know, you well know, we had all of these meeting all over the state. And one of the points that I was really impressed by is that everybody agreed that instead of going out with a list of goals, you know, what do you think about this, what do you think about this list? We went out with a totally open mind. We went into these communities, 28 of them in the first round, and we met with these public meetings and they had a piece of paper in front of them. And the piece of paper had several questions. We had six to eight at a table. At every table there was at least one commissioner, one Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee member, or a staff member to sort of keep the discussion going. The questions were: What do you like about your area? What do you want to protect in your area? What don't you like? What are you concerned about? And then also, what do you like about the rest of the state or are concerned about the rest of the state? Are there any areas of statewide concern, sort of thing. And that was the start of the goals. So we didn't come with preconceived notions, I know what we kind of hoped they would do. But we let it come from them and, actually, when we went the second round in the fall to another 28 communities, generally, it was not there yet, you know, you've got some more work to do. But we were able to salvage as much as we could of the original list and then we added on to it and finally, because the legislature was causing us so much problem, they were trying to starve us to death, they wouldn't give us any money and we had to keep getting it doled out from the emergency board, we finally said, or actually, it was L.B. Day who said, look, he was a consummate politician, he said look, on Senate Bill 10 in 1969, they had a list of goals that the counties were supposed to look at. And he said, you know, that's a pretty good list of goals and the legislature can't gripe because they adopted those goals in Senate Bill 10. So we basically went back to them and made some additions and we left one off and I think, pretty much, they were the list of goals we were

able, through them, to incorporate the concepts that we had gotten from the people – originally, the ideas and concepts they had. And so those were the goals that were adopted.

ADLER: What were relationships like among the commissioners during that goal development process?

ANDERSON: Oh, it was great, with one possible exception everybody dove in and the possible exception was Al Bullier but it wasn't because of lack of interest. He was interested but, after all, he was running this commercial real estate business. He didn't have much free time. Well, I mean, it took a lot of time and Steve Schell also had problems going to many of the meetings because he was a young attorney and he had to, you know, he had to work. He didn't have the flexibility that some of the rest of us had. But everybody was supportive, everybody worked hard, went to so many meetings. We had a lot of meetings, in addition to the hearings in working to develop these goals, and there was just so much enthusiasm. It was a wonderful experience even though we came, you know, from different backgrounds. Jim Smart, who was the farmer, couldn't have been a better person on the Commission. He made clear that he was the farmer, that was his expertise, and so whenever we'd get to an agricultural issue, he was the one we'd turn to and he would explain the problems and sometimes he didn't agree with some farmers. I mean, you know, his attitude was very strongly that you had to preserve that land for agricultural use and that some of the excuses farmers had were saying, well, we can break off here, we can break off there. He's say, no, no, no, no, don't -- don't do that, don't do that, don't do that. And then, when we came to other issues he was present, he participated, but he didn't push because he said, I don't know enough about that, in these other areas. So he was probably the consummate Commissioner in that sense that he only really pushed because he knew what was going on. He really understood agriculture. I don't know what else to say.

ADLER: Did you and your colleagues have a sense that you were doing something special?

ANDERSON: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

ADLER: And what was that like?

ANDERSON: We just kept talking about how we had to work hard to do a good job because here we were creating not only a new agency from scratch, but also a totally new program that was being experimented with, you know, all over the country, you had different states getting into the need for state land use. But, of course, in our case, we went off in a different direction because most of the other states that were working in this area had everything coming from the state level. The state was to see that this was done. The state was in charge, not the local governments. We would give the state the law or the goals or whatever and then the local governments would implement them. And they didn't give much power to the local governments in most cases. And I think that really was the secret, again, that was L.B. Day and his consummate politician, you know, he knew what was going on. And he said, you'll never get it passed, it will never work unless you have the local governments feel that they are in charge.

ADLER: Okay, you mentioned disappointment that we didn't get a shorelands goal during the early period. Were there any other topics, issues, that you think should have been reflected in a goal?

ANDERSON: There was another topic that a lot of people pushed and I was sympathetic and it was carrying capacity. That was one that a lot of people were pushing for, but it was one that, you know, you couldn't really get a handle on in the same way that you could the other goals. It was sort of vaguer and not as specific and it was very controversial with many of the interests involved. So it got dropped. I think it ended up being considered after all, just in the whole program. I think you had a sense of carrying capacity. So I don't look on that as being as necessary as shorelands, but that's my bias.

ADLER: Okay, the goal adoption process engaged a broad range of interest groups, public, non-profit and private organizations, state agencies, local governments, and citizen land use activists. Which specific ones do you think were most influential and/or effective in shaping the goals that LCDC adopted?

ANDERSON: You know this is kind of a hard one. I think I'm gonna start with the one that surprised me and that was the state agencies. I had naively thought that the state agencies would be willing and eager to come in and contribute to the process -- not the goal making process because they had their own areas of expertise, they must have had frustrations. But in almost every case, they just wished we'd go away. Turf wars, because the Senate Bill 100 gave LCDC the responsibility for seeing that all state agencies coordinated their efforts with these goals that we were to adopt and some of them, like Economic Development, I mean they were just out right enemies. Others were we just won't participate. Just go away, we really don't want to be involved with you. You had a couple that were very helpful, one of them was ODOT, the Department of Transportation, particularly the Parks Division, they were enthusiastically in support of what we were doing and also the Fish and Wildlife people. I don't know about the Commission itself but certainly the staff was very enthusiastic and helpful in developing a program. DOGAMI [Department of Geology and Mineral Industries] was, too, DOGAMI would cooperate but generally it was this, stay away, stay away, stay away. Actually the Department of Forestry was another problem because they didn't want anyone interfering with their Forest Practices Act and I think they recognized that some of these goals might interfere with what they thought the forest industry needed, freedom to do anything they wanted, to cut trees, you know, sort of thing. And that remained a problem all through my experience, this whole six years I was on the Commission, the Forest Practices Act was a pain and recently, I was reading, I don't remember where it was now, there was a little article in the paper about some problem with the Forest Practices Act some place in Oregon. So I don't know if it's ever been solved.

ADLER: And how about private, non-profit organizations that were involved?

ANDERSON: Oh, yes, I'm sorry, I focused too much on the state agencies.

ADLER: No, that's fine.

ANDERSON: Oh, definitely. We had a lot of organizations, Oregon Environmental Council, of course, was right there all the time. We had a lot of people representing other environmental organizations. The Wilderness Society, we had a young gal who was following us very closely and pushing for the protection of wilderness areas. So you had a lot of these people. Also, as far as being influential, even though I sometimes didn't agree with everything they wanted, the Associated Oregon Industries, on one hand they were really trying to get rid of us, but on the other hand, they recognized that they needed to play a role and they made, very clear, what might cause real problems for them in the goals and what wouldn't. That was helpful, it was very helpful. The only two organizations that I had real problems with -- I'm gonna pick another one on the other side. Fred VanNatta was the lobbyist for the statewide homebuilders and he was persistent, never let go, he kept arguing, he'd never accept no, he just kept arguing, arguing, arguing. But he was really very effective. I think he played an effective role even though at times he wanted to say go away for a while. The Portland Homebuilders were much more supportive of the program. I think they recognized that in the long run, these goals were going to be helpful to the building industry because they wouldn't have to fight wars all the time. Once they knew where the planning and where the facilities were going to be, it made it easier for them to figure out where it was best for them to build. However, the realtors never understood that and the realtors, their testimony, the board of realtors I think it is, their testimony was never very helpful. It was just very, very negative. They didn't have any suggestions, just we don't want you, we don't want you. And the other was, I can't remember the name, the Western Trade Association? Does that ring a bell, something like that? And I remember there were these two guys, I called them Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee, they kept showing

up at all of our meetings and again, pure negative, never anything that was positive, never any specific suggestions for what might be changed. It was just get out of here, leave us alone. So except for those few, most people really -- sand and gravel people, for example, they were very helpful in what should be addressed in the goals. I found them helpful. It's an industry you can't ignore. So I learned a lot from all of these different interests that testified. I know it helped me in finally deciding what I thought should be in the goals.

ADLER: How about the local governments?

ANDERSON: How about what?

ADLER: The local governments, the counties, the cities?

ANDERSON: I think again, there was a certain turf war. For example, I had a major problem with my city, Eugene, people because they just said, trust us, we'll be okay. They didn't really fight the goals. I think the problem came more in the acknowledgment of the plans than it did the goals. So I think most of the governments really said, okay, we're not sure, we may have problems with you later, but, basically, we like the idea of the program. There were parts of the state, the Willamette Valley was pretty supportive of it, but you got on the coast and, of course, the coast was busily trying to develop its coastal plan with the Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission. And they had their own ideas about what they thought should be done on the coast but they just said, well, in our plan we'll take care of what we want. So during the goal process, they were so busy with their own plan that -- we knew that they didn't like us, particularly, Florence and Coos Bay and Curry County and Lincoln County but they weren't that much of a problem in the goal process. The ones that were really a pain in the what, you know, were Klamath County and Klamath Falls. It was a problem all during the process. They were very, very negative about the whole thing. That was the days of the posse comitatus where they had these armed guys that would run around and take care of people that they didn't agree with sort of thing. They were pretty much

under control by the time we got in our planning part but they had been extremely active in the past until the state police cracked down on them. But generally, wary, that probably gets around to when we went around in the goal process, you know, when we went around the state, but -- oh, I was going to look something up, I don't know if I can find it. Lakeview was wonderful because Lakeview -- I don't know if you've been told this or not and I found something and I meant to hunt it up for you and I didn't have time this morning. They first sent us a letter, very formal, included the logo of the City of Lakeview, signed by every one of the City Councilors announcing that they requested to be exempt from the dictates of LCDC, that they could very well handle their own business and they just went through this very formal statement. And then attached to it was this wonderful, wonderful drawing -- have you heard about this one?

ADLER: No.

ANDERSON: That's why I'll see afterwards if I can find it. It was this owl coming down on a mouse and at the foot was this mouse and yet when we went to Lakeview and actually visited them, they were very nice. And I must admit, I had to feel that they didn't really need us. There's not much around that area, it's very open, it's ranch country, and they had taken one area with geothermal activity and built a whole bunch of greenhouses, where they took the heat from the geothermal to grow all kinds of things like tomatoes, that no way, with their short growing season, could they get otherwise. And then they were very polite, they took us to dinner and they actually had a wonderful restaurant in Lakeview. I was surprised. I didn't expect it. And then the next morning, after a somewhat contentious public meeting, it was orderly, and they sent us off with a beautiful, delicious picnic brunch. So, you know, you never knew what was going to happen with the different cities and mostly eastern Oregon was willing to accept it except for Klamath County

ADLER: Okay. Based on Senate Bill 100, the statewide planning goals were drafted to express the State's policy interests in local land use planning. Do you believe LCDC acted correctly to ensure that those State objectives were carried out?

ANDERSON: Well I touched on that earlier. You know, when we started this citizen involvement program, I called it the dog and the pony show, which we started in the spring of '74. We called it the listen to the people, listen to the land and to me that was the best way of expressing the interests in what we hoped to accomplish in Senate Bill 100 is that we really did go around. As I said, you know, we didn't come with any set proposal. We let things develop from the people that talked to us. I think that that whole program really very successfully gave the people a chance to express their concerns. We tried to address as many as we could. Of course, there were conflicts. I mean some people would say you're not doing enough, you're not being tough enough and other people say you're being too tough. So I think the compromise was really a very good one and I think it's held up quite well.

ADLER: Any particular examples of that balancing process you want to say a little more about?

ANDERSON: Of the what?

ADLER: The balancing process, not too tough, not tough enough.

ANDERSON: Well, of course, we discussed it quite a bit in the Commission when we were going over these different proposals. We also had, I think, something that helped us quite a bit, I think this was Steve Schell's idea, it was an excellent idea. For each goal to have a technical advisory committee, you talk about this in your book, a technical advisory committee made up of experts in whatever area the goal was and they were to help word the goal and the guidelines. And paying attention to what they said really helped, to me also, to get a better feel for how the goals should be focused and how it should be addressed later. So I found them very helpful. And to me, it was helpful in the balancing process because you had people who really had no vested interest

generally, even though they were knowledgeable, but they weren't really pushing a point of view but looking at it from a more objective point of view, that helped, too. Also, so many of the people that testified, particularly from the opponents, were not really that knowledgeable. So many of them were coming from their own personal perspective, what they particularly want to do rather than trying to look at the whole picture. And so that, to me, was one of the big roles of those of us on the Commission because we had representatives from the different interests trying to balance those and trying to come to compromises that would do, overall, what we wanted done.

ADLER: So did Commission members, staff people, have some clear ideas about what are key statewide interests that were at stake here and you paid a lot of attention to when you were trying to again, reach a balanced judgment?

ANDERSON: I think the best way of addressing that is, from my point of view, is that by the time we really got into the goals, we knew that there was so much opposition and that we really couldn't come down too hard on the state's interest. I think the way we had to go, I mean the goals would express them but we had to recognize that there were different situations in different parts of the state. And so we knew we were going to be faced with this problem of, well, like Lakeview, you're faced with very little problems there while other areas had so many conflicting interests. The sort of release valve for that came from the question that we asked about areas of statewide concern and there were a number that were mentioned. And we struggled with that when we got to the end of the goal process. For example, some people wanted the Metolius deer area. That was really popular in central and eastern Oregon. Everybody wanted the coast as an area of statewide concern. The Willamette Valley, the Columbia Gorge, those are others that I remember, those were the biggies as far as that was concerned. But again, we were afraid to get into it because there was so much opposition, we didn't know if we were gonna live more than two years, you know? We were on the ballot in '76. Every time we turned around we were fighting a ballot measure, too, as well as the legislature -- some

certain legislatures. So it just seemed like it was too dangerous an area to get into that we better just stay away from that statewide control. It was solved to a certain extent by finishing up the goals and looking at what was left over, so to speak. The Metolius deer range we never knew what to do with. The Columbia Gorge involved another state; that was way too complicated. The Willamette greenway, ODOT had not yet finished its Greenway Plan and so they hadn't given it to us yet. And so we said, we're gonna deal with that through a goal because we knew there was a lot of opposition to what ODOT had done. So we would deal with that next year. And also, hopefully, next year we would have the plan that the coastal commission had come up with. They had not finished by '74, so we didn't really get it until '75, so we would finish that one up, too, which, of course, was a dream because by the time we got it, Federal Coastal Zone Management people were saying, uh-uh, uh-uh, it isn't going to work. So we had to put that off but we dealt with them, as you know, of course, in those four separate goals that we did in '76.

ADLER: Right, right.

ANDERSON: But the others, except for that, just seemed like too much to take on for the statewide area. By the way, I was interested. I noticed something else in the paper about the Metolius -- some Metolius plan that is being considered.

ADLER: It was.

ANDERSON: For an area of statewide concern.

ADLER: It was. It is.

ANDERSON: It is. It's still going. Well, cause I read this some place and I don't know what happened, you know?

ADLER: Yes, it was adopted as an area of statewide concern.

ANDERSON: Wow, oh, that's gonna be fascinating to see how that works.

That's great, how exciting.

ADLER: Okay, in 2014, it'll be 40 years since the original 14 goals were adopted, as a former Commissioner, has the Oregon Planning Program, over the past four decades, fulfilled your expectations for it?

ANDERSON: I would start out by saying, generally, yes. There's always the problem of expectations and hopes. Expectations mean you have to be realistic about what can be accomplished, while the hopes you can get off into a little bit more of never-never land. So, as I said, we -- like the shore lands goal, their areas, and also citizen involvement, they've had to pull back to a certain extent on it. I think for understandable reasons, money for one thing. We have so much more material that went out to local groups and local citizens about what the program was. The only way you can find out now is if you get online. You have to make the effort to do that except for that, you hardly know LCDC exists anymore, which is fine as long as the people are happy. But you have to wonder what would happen if somebody really tried to make an effort, a realistic effort to destroy LCDC. I don't think that's going to happen, but it's going to be difficult getting the enthusiasm of the public, which we did have. We had developed a lot of enthusiasm. Having made that comment, I have to understand that, for many reasons, you couldn't keep up that level of focus on citizen involvement. Partially, money reasons, another thing is local governments are not doing as much with citizen involvement as they used to. I've seen even here, there's much less citizen involvement than there had been. But again, it's because the cities are starving. They don't have the money to do it. So I can't criticize them, I can't criticize anybody, it's just an unfortunate fact of life. So I think those are the only two areas and well, of course, also the fact that I wish the Forest Practices Act would be brought into shape.

ADLER: So you've talked a little about this already, have the statewide planning goals struck the balance between state and local control that the Commission intended back in 1974?

ANDERSON: One of the things that really pleases me is the shift in emphasis that has occurred. When I was on LCDC, I did not go off until -- oh, it was before the acknowledgment process was complete. And as long as you had that acknowledgment process going, the whole emphasis really had to be on the reviews of plans, on working with local governments to get them to do the things they wanted -- well, we wanted them to do but they often did not want to do. And we were having all these fights, even Lane County, you know Lane County lasted long --

ADLER: The last one, yes.

ANDERSON: I'm long past cause I went off in '79 and, in fact, I remember I went back working with the League of Women Voters and going before LCDC and saying now you've got to hang tough with Lane County. Klamath County, I don't know if it ever got its plan. It did get its plan adopted, but it was a real struggle. Curry County, there were a lot of them that were still struggling. As long as that process was going on, it was really impossible for DLCD to do what we all had hoped we could have done way back when and that is assisted local governments and providing them with inventories, information they really needed to make intelligent decisions. It just couldn't be done. Now that's what LCDC, I gather, is focusing on now from what I've seen on the web, is they're really focusing on all these model codes and educational materials, to give suggestions to local governments in how the local governments might address problems in their areas. And so I think it's great. I think that shift is -- has been working pretty well. I haven't talked to anybody who has said, oh, you know, we don't like this, we don't like that. But just from my view from here, since I haven't been really been following LCDC for over 20 years, I'm impressed. I really am.

ADLER: Okay, how do you think Oregon's land use program in 2013 compares with what was envisioned four decades ago? I know you've said that you haven't really been following it that closely for a while but again, generally speaking, looking back over the 40-year period?

ANDERSON: I think it has and part of it is because we finally accomplished something that I had at least envisioned from the beginning. And that is, it's a collaborative process, that everybody works together to accomplish something and that certainly was not the case when I was on the Commission because there was just so much contention and so much conflict. You know, pulling because the local governments wanted to be able to do things and we'd say well, no, from the statewide perspective, you know, you shouldn't be doing this or your plan should address that. And I think getting over that and getting into a collaboration where everybody agrees it's important that we address these goals because it will be better in the long-term for the state in directing how it grows. Maybe I'm looking at with too much sunshine, but I think it's come very close to doing that because they are focusing, obviously, much more on collaboration instead of you have to do this to meet the goals.

ADLER: Anything else? Any particular moments that stand out for you that you'd like to talk about?

ANDERSON: Well I talked about one of them and that was Lakeview.

ADLER: Yes.

ANDERSON: That was really a big moment. There were, of course, some interesting moments like the time that we were having a work session in the capitol and suddenly we had to empty out the whole capitol. Fortunately, the legislature was not in session, because of a bomb scare. I still think it was a hoax. I think we all thought it was a hoax, but we still had to go out while the state police came in and checked to be sure that there wasn't a bomb. There was when we had a hearing in the fairgrounds in Douglas County, we were told we couldn't leave during the day, it was a daytime hearing, that we couldn't leave until somebody had checked on a sniper up in the hills --

ADLER: Oh, really?

ANDERSON: Above the fairgrounds.

ADLER: Wow.

ANDERSON: Again, it could've been a hoax or a misunderstanding or something, so we had to sit there for a couple of hours while they checked that out. The hearings along the coast were very, very contentious. The one that I remember very, very clearly, was in Brookings. When we met in this small city council chamber and we sat where they sat, it was a very simple room, not a particularly large room, and we were sitting sort of up against some windows where the city council sat, the room was absolutely packed full of people. They were even standing behind us, between us and the windows and they were almost all violently opposed to what we wanted. It was a pure, go away, leave us alone, we don't want it, we don't it kind of thing. During a break, one man who was sitting in the front row -- and he was very quiet, and I think he was actually supportive of what we were doing, but he came up and leaned over and said, I think you'd better get the state police to escort you out of town. Here, they shoot first and think later. So, we thought, well, we thought he was, you know, probably not likely, but we did pass the word along and sure enough, by the end of the meeting, there was a state policeman with a holster gun just standing at the door making himself obvious. There was no problem. There was no problem at all, but you know, you sort of hated to have something get that contentious where people felt that strongly about it. And then, of course, going back to Florence, we were heading up Curry County and Coos County to Florence and there was L. B. Day hung in effigy. And the other thing I remember about Florence is they were very nasty down there. They put us for the hearing, I think it was one of the final hearings, they put us in this weird auditorium. I think it was a school auditorium and there was this little space, the floor where we sat and then rising above a steep tier of seats. Now, you know, they didn't stretch out this way, it was up this way so we were down in the pit with all these people jammed full of seats, not liking what we were doing, blah, blah, blah. It was a little disturbing, it really was. It sort of felt as though, this isn't the way Oregon should be. You know, we should be more friendly to

each other, but we survived. I think they got a lot out of their systems by doing things like that.

ADLER: Right. Well how did such an atmosphere affect relations between Commissioners and staff, relationships among the Commissioners, the fact that there was often such hostility?

ANDERSON: We just accepted it because we had gotten so much testimony anyway. I don't think it affected the commissioners at all in the sense that we had to sort of look beyond that to what our main job was; developing the goals. The staff, of course they were young, you know, they just accepted it. And in those days we worked so closely with the staff. We sometimes would go down the coast with one of the staff members who was a field representative down on the coast and so we'd travel back and forth together and so we really got to know each other very well. We had an excellent relationship with the staff. It was much closer than it usually is and I think it was because we were all so focused on this very contentious situation.

ADLER: Right, right.

ANDERSON: So I don't think it affected it at all.

ADLER: How about 1,000 Friends and its impact?

ANDERSON: Oh, my God, yes. You know I should've thought of 1,000 Friends when you were talking about influence. Somehow I almost had the feeling that they were also a member of the Commission because they were there constantly and they testified regularly. We were so much in sympathy with much of what they wanted and they were writing us all the time. You know, sending us written communications. I'm ashamed of myself for not having mentioned this. I'm a member of the 1,000 Friends, too.

ADLER: And were you then?

ANDERSON: What?

ADLER: Were you then a member?

ANDERSON: You know, it's funny. I decided that it was better for me not to join until after I went off the Commission. I just felt it wasn't proper or appropriate for me to do that. But as soon as I got off the Commission, I joined and I've been a member ever since and very supportive of what they've been doing. So yes, they were extremely important in that whole process. And they were ones that, I think, were most effective with the Commissioners like Dick Gervais the lumber guy. I'm trying to think, of course, there were times when -- what other Commissioners? Al Bullier, probably Dick Gervais and Al Bullier both cause they were the two that were much closer to and sympathetic with the Oregon industries and those who wanted to have as much control over what they did as possible. They were the most sympathetic and 1,000 Friends would never let them get too sympathetic because they always came back with testimony explaining now, if you do this, this might happen, so you'd better just keep the situation so you can have some say over what can and cannot be done. And in the end, it all worked out -- I think it worked out. You're getting a very personal viewpoint.

ADLER: That's the whole point of this. Anything else?

ANDERSON: I can't think of anything. I'll see if by any chance that Lakeview thing is over there.

ADLER: Okay.

ANDERSON: Oh, and did you ever see the t-shirt? L.B.'s shirt?

ADLER: No, I never saw an L.B. T-shirt.

ANDERSON: Okay, I'll go upstairs when we're through, and bring that down and show it to you also. I'm just hoping that that one thing is over here. I was looking for it upstairs and I couldn't find it, but I know where the shirt is because I talked to the Oregon Planning Institute last week. They wanted me to talk about some of the early days of LCDC and so I showed them the shirt. I know I have that.

ADLER: Okay, well thank you very much.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

ADLER: It's been great to have your recollections about this stuff.

ANDERSON: Well, it's been sort of fun as I said. Suddenly, after getting my brain back into this stuff, it's been a long time.

ADLER: Yes. Okay.

ANDERSON: Now let me go up and get the shirt and see if by any chance --

CERTIFICATE

I prepared this transcript of the digitally recorded and supplied to me by the Oregon Department of Justice. I declare that this transcript of those proceedings is true and accurate to the best of my abilities.

DATED: November 3, 2013

s/Renee O'Barton
Renee O'Barton