

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

---

2-26-1975

## "Land Use Planning: Alternatives For the Future"

Ernest Bonner

John Gustafson

Lawrence Rice

Nohad A. Toulan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

### Recommended Citation

Bonner, Ernest; Gustafson, John; Rice, Lawrence; and Toulan, Nohad A., ""Land Use Planning: Alternatives For the Future"" (1975). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 119.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/119>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

Ernest Bonner, John Gustafson, Lawrence Rice, Nohad A. Toulan  
"Land Use Planning: Alternatives for the Future"  
February 26, 1975  
Portland State University

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives  
Oregon Public Speakers Collection

<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/11369>

Transcribed by Julian Younger, July 26 - Aug 10, 2020

Audited by Carolee Harrison, March 2021

*PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.*

NOHAD A. TOULAN: On behalf of the university, the committee of Vital Partners week, and the Urban Studies Center, I'm pleased to open this panel discussion on "Land use planning: alternatives for the future." Land use planning is not a recent invention, is not something that we just discovered, whether it is in Oregon or in the rest of the country, or in the rest of the world for that matter. In fact, land has always been regulated and controlled by societies in one way or another for the benefit of one group or another. We have talked about the negative, and in some instance about the positive, aspects of urban sprawl for a number of years. We have also developed a conviction that we need to preserve open spaces in one form or another. Some of us will only think of the immediate past, when William Whyte of *Fortune* magazine pioneered his ideas about the importance of preserving open spaces and controlling urban sprawl in the late '50s. Some of us may have entered the interest in open spaces and land use regulations and control from the London Green Belt idea to the Garden City movement, and to Olmsted's integrated park systems in the late 19th century in this country. But very few of us will go beyond the time when Elizabeth I of England pioneered the idea of the necessity of controlling the size of London, for the sake of maintaining open green belts around the city, to maintain the continuity between the city and the countryside and to prevent the city of London from growing in other neighboring communities and municipalities, and by doing this, depriving them of their identity, and leading to the destruction of their character. These were ideas that were discussed more than 400 years ago. They are not something new for us today. We are beginning to rediscover these ideas, but it's something that has always been with us.

In a sense, what I'm trying to say here is that many of the tools and regulations that we keep talking about have always been with us, have always been known to men in different ages of time and different societies; and as such I'm totally safe for me to say that land use planning is not something really that is new to us, it is something that has been with us for a number of years, for a number of centuries for that matter. In fact, it is easier to say that somehow, we keep rediscovering the value in the system of land use planning, and we do this every time we face a major challenge in the relationship between ourselves and our physical environment.

Furthermore, some of our historians may even argue that the reality of what we are rediscovering are the same old problems and the same old solutions. There are some ironies that could be developed from this, there are some lessons to be learned. Even in Oregon, here, we seem to be rediscovering and relearning some of the things that have been already tried in other parts of the country. Many of these have some attraction for us, we seem to be learning something out of rediscovering them, out of relearning them. Nevertheless, I don't want to give a pessimistic point of view here concerning the view or the future of land use regulation. I do believe that we have reached a point in our state of affairs where we cannot afford the luxury of alternating between neglect and rediscovery. In other words, I do believe we have some reason to be optimistic concerning the future of our land use planning efforts and endeavors. A future which I hope is brighter than what we have managed to accomplish in our immediate past. Such optimism is, in a sense, reflected in the title which we have chosen for tonight's panel: "alternatives for the future."

Things have been happening at such a rapid rate that I don't believe that land use planning could be set aside or assigned a low priority on the scale of our social and environmental problems. However, the future is not entirely rosy. We are talking about land use and environmental controls at a time when shrinking energy resources are forcing many of us to reassess some of the values that we have nurtured during the past ten or fifteen years. More important, perhaps, is the fact that for the first time, we are approaching land use planning with more than one level of government being involved, and imposing regulations, establishing standards, and procedures. In Oregon, land use regulations and planning standards are being established by three different levels of government. In our region these levels are the Land Conservation Development Commission representing the state, the Columbia Regional Association of Governments representing the region, and a large number of municipalities and local agencies that are establishing each its own regulations, plans, and standards. Uniformity in such standards is still lacking, awareness of the nature of the relationship that should prevail is still missing, and in a sense I do believe that the future success or failure of our land use regulations and planning efforts is largely dependent on our capability to handle that difficult subject of communication and coordination between the various levels of government. I'm

therefore hoping that the three distinguished panelists whom we have tonight will be able to shed some light on some of these issues, and it is my pleasure to present to you three individuals who are responsible for some of the major land use planning decisions that affect this metropolitan region.

Sitting to my left, on the extreme end of the table, is Ernie Bonner, the planning director of the city of Portland. Mr. Bonner has been in charge of the Bureau of Planning since 1973; prior to his present assignment with the city, he was the chief planner for the Cleveland City Planning Commission since 1970; prior to this he was an assistant professor of urban and regional planning at the University of Wisconsin. He holds two undergraduate degrees in architectural engineering and in business from the University of Colorado, he has a master's degree in regional planning from Cornell University, and is a Ph.D. candidate in economics at the University of Pittsburgh. He's an author and co-author of a number of books and articles, and finally, I should add, he is also an adjunct member of the Urban Studies faculty at Portland State University.

Next to him is Larry Rice, executive director of the Columbia Regional Association of Governments. He has assumed his current position early in 1974, and he came to the region from Eugene, where he served as director of Lane council of governments for more than eight years. Prior to that, he was the director of planning and urban renewal for the city of Warren, Ohio, his own native town. Mr. Rice is a graduate of Western Reserve College in Cleveland. He majored in engineering, but over the years he has accumulated a wealth of knowledge in public administration and urban planning.

To my right is Mr. John Gustafson. At this point I should add that we are very pleased to have him with us tonight, and I am sorry to hear that Mr. Harold Brauner, the executive director of LCDC, was unable to make it because of illness. However, I am pleased that we have Mr. Gustafson with us in his place. Mr. Gustafson is currently the public affairs director for the Land Conservation and Development Commission. His responsibilities cover coordinating legislative programs, agency-citizen involvement, media, and educational training programs. Formerly, he was the deputy labor commissioner for the state of Oregon, and prior to that he has been involved in a number of federal programs. In addition, he has had experience on Capitol Hill as a staff member of the United States senator from California. He was also involved in a number of economic development projects for a number of American cities. Mr. Gustafson is a graduate of Stanford University, and I'm pleased to turn the floor over to him.

JOHN GUSTAFSON: Thank you. I'd like to apologize again, if I may, for Hal Brauner, who had expected to be here tonight. He has been taken down with the flu, which I know has hit

Portland State as it's hit the LCDC staff, and he is recuperating quite successfully, but just can't take these extra schedules that have been forced on him during the legislative session. So, please accept his apology.

I'd like to, if I may, spend a few moments this evening describing to you the work of LCDC so far, and to try to give you an underpinning for the kind of philosophy that is being carried out by the commission and by the department as we go in to this, really, our second year of operation.

A recent editorial in a newspaper in Salem described the mission of LCDC as trying to save Oregon's livability with a minimum of state control. And by livability, it addressed itself to concerns of the economy as well as concerns of the environment. LCDC is aiming to try to help build a foundation for Oregon's future, but assisting in doing this, it is trying to make sure that foundation is built through local comprehensive plans. In other words, the basic bricks of that foundation will be local comprehensive plans, the goals and guidelines that you have in your hands, if we have enough of them to go around, will be analogous to the mortar holding together those basic building blocks.

LCDC has a duty to develop statewide land use goals and guidelines; another duty to develop specific geographic areas of statewide concern; for example, two were identified during the past year that will be referred on to the legislature: one the Metolius Winter Deer Range, and the other one the Columbia Gorge. It's another additional responsibility of LCDC, it's to make sure that activities that various governmental units are involved with, for example, siting of schools, transportation, water and sewage; that these are coordinated, and there is a significant activity section of the statute, Senate Bill 100. And then, of course, the appeals process. When there are conflicts that may exist between the cities, a city, for example like Portland, and a regional government, for example like CRAG, if those conflicts were to exist, LCDC becomes the appellate body, taking on a quasi-judicial role to decide those conflicts, of course with subsequent appeals going on up to the court of appeals.

But those are some of the basic responsibilities that Senate Bill 100 gave to the Land Conservation Development Commission when it was passed in 1973. It's kind of interesting to pause for a moment and think about what happened in that year, 1973. Usually, when legislation passes, it takes about three times for it to become state law, when it's of the magnitude as Senate Bill 100 was. But, for a lot of reasons, because of the preparation, the leadership of Governor McCall, because of the survey work that had been done, because of the concern that citizens had, interestingly it took one year for Senate Bill 100 to go through.

However, Senate Bill 100 was not the first bill that was passed relating to statewide land use planning. Some of you may recall back in 1969, Senate Bill 10 passed, and incidentally, the rules, the goals that you have in your hands were based upon those Senate Bill 10 pronouncements, requests, to local government to start developing comprehensive plans. Those were the... that was the base upon which the LCDC goals were developed. The statewide land use planning came to Oregon in 1969 through Senate Bill 10. Between 1969 and 1973, for a number of reasons, citizens were concerned, farmers were concerned, environmentalists were concerned that something be done to develop statewide ways of resolving problems relating to the land.

The economy of the state of course depends on getting the best use out of our resources. The woods products industry, agriculture, fishing, and tourism all depend on conserving Oregon's land. As LCDC conducted workshops, and we've had about over 70 workshops and hearings, total meetings, in the past year we've had more than 100 with almost 10,000 people participating at a variety of levels. The highest priority that emerged among... we heard from you, the citizens, was the protection of agricultural land. This was one of the reasons that LCDC came into existence, that Senate Bill 100 passed, and of course, we heard that again. In fact, one night... during our last, during the fall rounds workshops the same night, there was a meeting being held at the labor center here in Portland and another meeting being held in Ontario, Oregon. Same night, two different locations in the state, and again, the top priority emerging was the concern about the protection of agricultural land. I think that that doesn't just come because of those of us who are Oregonians believe that we should be able to maintain that sector of our economy, but I think that with the food crisis, the international food crisis, and the wastefulness that we observe in the misuse of agricultural land, that all of that has had an impact. There were also questions that emerged from time to time about what the degree of support is for statewide land use planning. And of course one of the things that we wanted to make sure as we went through the planning process was that we, LCDC staff of the Commission, was not too far away from what the people wanted. The surveys that were done, that we did in our meetings, indicated again that agricultural land and that protection emerged as the highest priority.

So, you'll notice in a few minutes when you open up your goals and guidelines, that LCDC probably deals more specifically with trying to handle the problem of the solution, or the problem of diminishing agricultural land than any other. In fact, one of the goals, one of the budget goals has been laid out by the Commission over the next two years, and it's so specified in our budget to the 1975 session, is to try to reduce the rate of loss of agricultural land in the Willamette Valley by 50%. That's a heavy aim, but it again manifests the concern that the Commission and the staff have for that problem.

So, the Oregon economy depends on using our natural resources, our land, as efficiently and productively as possible. LCDC developed goals that deal with the economy. It developed goals having to do with housing, goals dealing with the economy itself. And what weaves all through this is that LCDC is addressing local government with this request: that as these local comprehensive plans are developed, that they take into consideration energy concerns and conservation, housing concerns and conservation, pollution concerns and conservation of air quality. All of the things that are listed. In other words, the comprehensive plan vehicle is much more than most people have realized that it would be. The developing comprehensive plans will be a substantial task for much of local government. The agricultural goal is going to help save farmland for the production of crops and livestock, and we will help protect the beauty of Oregon by the goals having to do with scenic resources and natural resources.

What this leads to is really a new partnership, a new relationship between state government and local government. With state government requesting, again, based on the 1969 act, Senate Bill 10, reinforced and in fact made into a mandate through the 1973 act, Senate Bill 100, requesting that local government address specific needs as it continues planning. Between now and the first of next year, the local governments in our state will have an opportunity to develop their comprehensive plans, and we do anticipate that there will be requests for extensions. But it's that new relationship that ends up being one of the basic pillars of understanding of what LCDC is all about. That was again shown by our budget that was submitted to the 1975 session of the legislature, which calls for 6.1 million dollars, 4.4 million dollars being a direct pass-through to local government to assist them in carrying out the responsibilities that have been laid on them by the passage of Senate Bill 100. So, we believe that with the proper funding and with the administration, that this new partnership between local government and state government can be a reality.

LCDC has made an attempt, as I've described to you, to address both the conservation needs and the development needs of our state. It's made an attempt to try to take a look at the... to try to develop a new partnership between state and local government, and of course, underpinning all of that, is that Senate Bill 100 mandated—unlike any other state land use act—mandated that citizens will have an opportunity to be involved, all the way through the planning process, and that mandate as seen in goal number 1 applies not just to LCDC, but it will apply to all of the local governments that will be carrying out—and regional governments—that will be carrying out their work during the next year and the years to come.

I would say that this year, 1975, is perhaps an even more significant year than many of us have paused long enough to realize as far as land use planning and future planning for Oregon is

concerned. Just think for a moment that this spring, the Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission will be coming in with its report, which will go to the legislature, that will be laying the foundation for what will occur in development and conservation of resources along the Oregon coast. Of course, CRAG is going into its final phase, it has a draft plan now, and it's going into its final phase of regional plan development. The Willamette Greenway—which stretches of course all the way from Lowell clear down to Portland—the Willamette Greenway program will be dealt with this spring by the Land Conservation and Development Commission. So, the spring of 1975 is a very significant time for planning in our state, because while all this is occurring, of course, cities and counties, regional governments, are starting to gear up to try to meet the deadlines that were required under Senate Bill 100.

With this, those of you who have copies of the LCDC goals and guidelines, let me go through it with you just for a moment. If you don't have copies, maybe you could look over the shoulder of your neighbor; I hadn't anticipated we were going to have such a great turnout tonight. There's a difference between a goal and a guideline. A goal is intended to carry out the full force and authority of the state, to achieve the purposes of the act. A goal is a mandate. Guidelines are suggested directions that will aid local governments in activating their mandated goals.

The first goal is citizen involvement. And again, the thrust of that is to make sure that Oregonians have an opportunity to be involved all the way through the planning process. That probably... that was selected by the commission to be included as the first goal not because they are trying to prioritize, but because they do recognize the importance of citizens being involved in every element of the planning process. It's obvious that better planning occurs if citizens have an opportunity to be aware of the issues; it'll be much less likely that plans are overturned, it forces those of us who are in the planning business to be more on our toes if we know citizens who are going to have to live with those plans are looking at them every step of the way.

Another goal that I'd like to have you take a look at, if you would, is the one on agricultural lands, the third goal, to maintain and preserve agricultural lands. Again, that's a goal that was based on the work that was done out of the Senate Bill 10 and applied to, or included in Senate Bill 100 section 48, and now has been broadened and fleshed out, calling for the use of exclusive farm use zoning as a mechanism to try to protect agricultural land. That obviously is going to have an impact in Multnomah County, where there is no exclusive farm use zoning, and in some areas of the state where that mechanism hasn't been tried. This has built-in conflicts. Not too many days ago, I had an opportunity to speak to a group of growers at East Multnomah County. I was pleased to be able to return from that speech with most of my hide



on me, because these are individuals who are right in the path of development in the Portland area, and one of them told me that the county urban service boundary is right at the edge of his land; if it would be extended over so he could develop and grow TV antennas, as they say, rather than growing crops, his land was worth 600,000 dollars. It's worth 300,00 dollars as farmland. Now, that's an extreme example, but it gives you an idea of some of the concerns that exist in the developing area. The aim of LCDC, of course, is not that there would be no growth, not that there would be boundaries that are iron rings that will stop Portland or other areas from moving out, but that that development take place on a step-by-step basis, that there not be sprawl, that there not be leapfrogging. And of course, this particular fellow wanted very much to be included in some eventual Multnomah County plan that would allow him to develop his prime agricultural land into growing either trailer houses or TV antennas. Judging from the conversations that I'd had with the county planning commission, that is not likely. But that kind of friction, that kind of conflict brings about a lot of heat, and I think that that's kind of the heat that all three of us recognize, and it's the kind of thing that will definitely be a concern in common. Those of us who are kind of on the cutting edge of change, namely a new land use planning mechanism at the state level, recognize that that cutting edge is thin, and that when you're helping to bring about change, really you don't know for a while whether or not that thinness will be so fragile that it will not be able to be sustained.

When I first came to the Commission staff nine months ago, there was a lot of discussion and a lot of concern about whether or not LCDC was going to be able to last through even our second or third round of workshops, let alone through the legislative session. As the one who has to spend most of his time meeting with legislators, I would say that the likelihood of LCDC making it through the legislative session is very good. The commitment of Governor Straub is apparently at least as great as the commitment of Governor McCall. The commitment of the majority of the legislature, as much as we can tell right now, is that the mechanisms that we're trying to develop, that new partnership with local government, citizen involvement all the way through the process, and addressing both the conservation and development needs of the state is something that they want to give an opportunity to be tried.

The last goal that I'm going to bring your attention to is goal number 14 on urbanization, and I mention these three because a lot of people would agree that that's where it's at. The issue of urbanization, protection of farmland, and citizen involvement—even though the rest of the goals are very important, and I'm not diminishing them—I would say that if it weren't for the issues around urbanization, if it weren't for the issues around farmland, if it weren't for the issue of citizens being involved with planning, that there probably wouldn't have been a Senate Bill 100. The urbanization goal is aimed to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban use. And what it calls for is the development of urban growth boundaries. Some

of you who may be from the Salem area are aware of the urban growth boundaries that Salem developed through its COG down there, Council of Government. It's interesting, just again to give you an idea of what this can mean to families, I had an uncle who farmed for 40 years on the edge of outside of Salem in an area called Lake Labish, that is some of the best soil in Oregon. If you've ever seen it, it's black, it grows onions, it's rich, and of course there's great concern about its productivity being protected. The urban growth boundary in the Salem area, so the story goes, actually cuts down through the land of two brothers who are on the edge of Lake Labish. One of them wanted to be a developer and one of them wanted to stay in the business, and stay in the business of being an orchardist. But, what that shows is that these decisions actually having... where a governmental unit is actually having to decide where the line is going to go, and where development will occur, actually are being made right now in Oregon, in fact have been made for a number of years. The 1990 plan in Lane County, which I'm sure that Larry can describe in ten times as much detail as I could, addresses the issue of growth in the Eugene area. Right now, the city of Woodburn is going through its own—I mention this because it's a small community—it's drawing its urban growth boundary, anticipating what it will be like by the year 2000, and that boundary will be moving down in the south, to the boundary of the Salem metropolitan area coming up in the north, the objective is to save 55,000 acres of farmland in between. These are occurring right now, these actions are occurring right now, and what LCDC is saying in this goal on urbanization is that it's important to try to facilitate that.

With that, I will lay out, if I could, a couple of issues that I think could be problem areas that... or, if not problem areas, areas of discussion that would occur between the agency that I'm representing, LCDC, and the other fellows on the panel tonight. There's a question of really to what extent is CRAG, and to what extent is the city of Portland, really required to comply with the LCDC goals. And, I think one of the areas that would bring that out is in the area of citizen involvement. One of the questions that I hope we'll discuss later on in the evening, perhaps, is whether or not CRAG feels that it is required to comply with the citizen involvement goal of LCDC. I know what LCDC's position is. And the same would be true of the city of Portland, and if so, how are they organizing now, to try to come to grips with that objective, of making sure that citizens have an opportunity to be involved all the way through the planning process. With that, Doctor, I'd like to thank you, and I guess that I'll be on the menu later on to answer questions, or maybe I'm on now.

[applause]

TOULAN: The structure that I suggest we follow here is that we proceed with the three panelists, and then turn to questions at the end of this period. Each member will take about

twenty minutes, and then we will come back for forty minutes of discussion and questions from the floor.

Our next speaker is Larry Rice, the executive director of CRAG, the Columbia Regional Association of Governments. Larry?

LARRY RICE: Is this thing working? It sounds like it. Thank you, Doctor; fellow panelists. I'd like to find out who's in the audience, and I could ask about three questions. Number one, would those of you who are students in school, here or other lower levels of school system, raise your hands? I see, that's almost everybody. Now, I think that almost everybody left are those that are paid public officials that primarily deal in urban planning. Could I see a show of the private and public paid professional planners in the audience? Hi. Now, if I could ask the third question. Is there any common citizen in the audience? [laughs] That's... students aren't common citizens... [laughter] they're subsidized citizens. Okay, so we have interested students in the... I'd ask the embarrassing question how many are here because it's a course requirement, but I won't. [laughter]

Okay. To start off with a couple of observations, it's nice to welcome... is there any... I think I might wanna welcome... I might wanna welcome the new CRAG, whatever that is. [speaking off mic] They can't see me. [clapping] Well, I'm sorry that you're disappointed. [laughs] I thought you were better off if you were sitting down. Okay, I wanted to welcome a new state division, called LCDC. We did have one called OCCDC on the coast, but LCDC decided they didn't want it anymore, so we have LCDC now. We welcome a new division of state government, amongst the many federal and state agencies that try to effectuate lives below their level of government. And hopefully you will be a viable partner and hopefully CRAG will be a viable partner in this god awful mess of comprehensive planning. And, that's just the way I feel about it. I talked to Ernie about it... Portland's been here how long, Ernie? It's got a fifth of the state's population and, you know, they've been planning, and LCDC and CRAG didn't have to come along and tell the city council, the elected officials of Portland that they had to be planning, you know. And many of the cities that were in existence were here before the state of Oregon was, and even before it was a territory, you know, and I think they probably did some planning. So, it's not a new thing, and I think the doctor mentioned it's been going across the world for several thousands of years, I guess. So it's not new. We that are new to the business like to feel that we can tell all of you that it's new.

Okay. Comprehensive planning, I want to straighten out the definition, there. CRAG isn't doing comprehensive planning, Ernie isn't doing comprehensive planning, and LCDC does statutes, is not doing comprehensive planning, we're primarily dealing with environmental planning and a

limited number of that. Okay? And most of us don't have the slightest idea about how to prepare an education plan, including the institutions, I think. And, no one has come up with a comprehensive health plan, or a social service plan that is comprehensive, let alone talked about a comprehensive land plan and its relationship to the delivery of health and social services, or educational services, all those other neat things people want done for them. Okay? So, we're not doing comprehensive planning, and we probably won't for years. Now, the state mandate, the LCDC, their plans change, hopefully they'll make a good attempt at that, and hopefully we'll be a good partner. And hopefully, Ernie, we won't get in your way too much. Okay.

Maybe I can add to some of your knowledge by kind of giving you some of my perspective about what's really going on. Okay? Well, first I think we ought to talk about, you know, what in heaven's name is CRAG? There's... how many, so I won't be redundant for information, how many know what the board of directors at CRAG is? Hmm, okay, we have about half; roughly it's elected officials representing 35 cities and five counties and [...], Tri-Met, Port of Portland, State of Oregon. Okay? And none of those people are elected to the board of CRAG. They're all selected by their appointed agency. Beaverton. Portland. And so it isn't representative government, fact number one. Okay. State's representative government, you know, it's in the constitution, Portland isn't in the constitution, CRAG isn't in the constitution, but the state of Oregon is, because they joined the association of governments called the Federation of the United States. The first COG. Okay? All right. Since they are a constitutional entity and they have... we're creatures of the state, we bow to the state's supremacy in planning, all right? So, you've got it, along with all the other divisions of the state government.

What is CRAG then, if it's not representative government? It's an attempt to have units of government below the state statutory level, to get together to solve problems that the jurisdictional boundaries prevent them from solving themselves. And to that extent, we might form some kind of vehicle to do that, I don't know yet. There are 550 "councils of governments" in the United States, and CRAG is one of the few that has some of the things that I'm going to talk about. Well, CRAG is kind of unique in this national experiment of public management below the state level, and it kind of provides a national management model. This model is kind of testing the concept of representative government, and whether cities and counties together, through associations of governments, like CRAG or voluntary, can indeed form vital institutions which perform. We have a strange thing in the system of government in the United States. That is, we taxpayers, and we're all, somewhere along the line, taxpayers—why can't we have government that does things we want it to do, and we tell it to do, and we're in control of it? And if it doesn't perform some kind of public service, we might simply get rid of it. CRAG or anyone else. Okay? So it's gotta perform, otherwise there's no purpose for it, for its formation

to begin with. And that model, also, is going to test whether Congress in the United States will be affording an option based upon a state local design, 50 states, to their completely—Congress's completely—helter skelter, non-system of regional public management, now being put into place, unrelated, by the House and the Senate and the President, in Congress, piece by piece.

[Note: audio becomes increasingly fuzzy and certain words and phrases are unintelligible]  
How many have heard of health service areas? Well since I'm on the governor's task force committee to hear public testimony on health service areas, I could talk about that for an hour, and basically, I'm going to tell you the whole nation's divided up into new health service areas that will rule and regulate every [...] home in country, and will [...] the particular needs for every hospital and other related services, and will probably be the vehicle through which the new health insurance program is managed, as well as regional medical programs and all those kinds of things. And it's a planning agency for this region, and it'd be at least as big as CRAG, and maybe Clatsop and Tillamook County, also, and it will be operated by the federal government, 50 cents at least per capita, per year per person, with a non-profit private corporation board of elected by nobody who did anything in a public election. Okay? And I think if you want to name a whole batch more of those kinds of things that you've probably never heard of that's going to rule and regulate all your lives and minds, too. Okay? And that's the new national management system that nobody knows what it's all about. It's being built.

Well, I'm trying to tell you, at least CRAG has elected officials on its board, and by golly you can call Mayor Goldschmidt or even get Mrs. Schwab, who is an [...] member, who I thought maybe she's playing next door, there for a moment, early in the game. And now you can get Mayor Young in Beaverton, and Commissioner Gordon and a whole batch of those people, from Wilsonville, Mayor Balsiger, and Dr. Beckett here on campus, who's my vice-chairman, and you can mail him. And you can say something about CRAG, in fact you can probably get me fired if you work hard enough at it, but all those other things, there's not much we can do about a nonprofit private corporation that is affecting the [...] job and the people in it; there's nothing we can do about that. You know, how do you try and fire that guy. Or recall him, or do anything? And we're going to have more power than LCDC thinks they have, and CRAG wishes they ever had, and Ernie, they're gonna tell you what to do if you help [...], whether you like it or not.

Okay. That kind of a system is also going to test what states will do in forming the mechanisms. Now, here's the governor, new governor, a great, I think, going to be a great governor, yes, he has all the potential that every great governor in Oregon has ever had and more. He's going to be faced with, in the next 60 days, with designing all those health service areas. Now what am I

going on that for? Well, we have 14 administrative districts, and we probably will end up with 46 health service areas, because we've got 500,000 people in 'em. That's a good management size. See, if you don't have 500,000 people, it wouldn't be big enough to be a good management size. How do you get 500,000 people in more than two areas in Oregon? You know? There's Portland and Vancouver in two states, and then there's the rest of the state. [laughs] So, wow, it's a toughie, and Washington's the same way. When you take out Seattle and the metropolitan area, what do you got left? You know, a lot of agricultural land and trees. So, that's the new management system, and they're going to blanket the United States with it, and they're going to say "Now let's build aging into that, and let's build [...] into that, and let's build the other health and service programs into that, and we got a new management system that makes land use in the administrative district look pretty sick.

Okay? So, we're devising the mechanisms, and CRAG is one of those manifestations, and the reason that we [...], because we're statutory. Did you know that the 550 forms of government that are springing up as an attempt for cities and counties to form some kind of a coalition together to address these problems, and keep the state and everyone else off their back. Almost all of them are voluntary. If they don't like it, they quit. If they don't like the land use decision, they say "I'll take my [...] home and quit."

Now, can you tell me how you can develop a new management system for the nation's 247 regions [...] and associations that say "I don't like what you do, I quit." You can't. [...] So the states have to figure out what they're going to do or the feds will lay on, and all of these management systems, health and services. [...] States gotta react, they're a constitutional entity, and all the states got state rights, let's find out if a state can hack the management system problem, and come up with their own units, and tell the federal government "We're going to use these." That's kind of like what CRAG and [...] and all those are all about, too. Little management experiments. Okay?

Our membership is mandated to the three urban counties, in Multnomah and Clackamas and Washington; they are members whether they like to or not. [...] And our assessments, once we step out of the general assembly, our mandate to [...] take them to court and collect them, [...] and some of them said "Try it." Okay? CRAG goals that represent plans will be complied with, by golly, and not only do you have to comply with his and ours and everyone else's, but surely you have to comply with CRAG's. And I think that's pretty neat, because why would you plan all these plans, spend all this money if all you're going to do is give it to them and say "Now if you like it, okay; if you don't, throw it away." Somehow, I don't think taxpayers are going to put up with that. They think their taxes are too high.

Okay. CRAG also can designate areas of regional concern. You hear the states say they disagree with a couple, and I don't pore over those designations; I don't know what CRAG will designate, if any, but if we do it'll be through the use of the board, which is local government, and they'll all do what should be done. And then we'll also come up with a series of regulations to govern the area, and we'll turn it over to Ernie and say "Ernie, in Portland, if it's in your area, like the international airport, you can devise all of the mechanisms to do what we think you should do, then you do it. We don't need to." Okay?

We can also act on behalf of the state to plan reviews, so we're a functional agent of the state, also. Now, to you, maybe, that isn't so new. I just got back from Chicago where I had people representing a council of governments from Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Boston, Miami, Los Angeles, places like that, and I said "My gosh!" you know, "You get the [...], responsibility? Fantastic! I can't tell my board about this, now, it seems. They'd fire me." You know, and this is Los Angeles, a good friend, they love me down there. They've got ten million people [...] all ten million people, you know, and that's an ocean! It's got fourth or fifth largest budget in the world! And we treat it like Beaverton. We call it a city. They've got a police force bigger than most national police forces in the world. It's ridiculous. Okay? [laughing] How do you plan for Los Angeles? With a planning commission, Ernie, I don't know.

Okay, getting on with it. We're a subdivision of the state, we're a municipal corporation, we have state-delegated functions, we carry out things for the state, okay, under Senate Bill 100. Ours, also, is a framework planning goal; the bulk of planning must be done by cities and counties in the land use area. We can have a permit filing process; if we do, I hope to goodness that it's folded in the plans of city government and that CRAG isn't staffing locations and permits for some development someplace. But we can act, and probably will only act in those areas of designation, like the Johnson Creek drainage basin, where there are several local entities that can't seem to come up with a joint plan to solve the problem of flooding every other year. And maybe we'll have to say "No, okay, that's a multiple jurisdiction problem, we can develop some kind of controls for that that we'll lay on you, and maybe you ought to comply with them." Okay? So that's kind of a last resort sort of thing.

Okay? I think our real problem, if CRAG is gonna have a problem, [...] will have some, will be in the federal and state single motion agencies, okay? Primarily air and water, new energy commissions, and the department of transportation. It seems like this nation is in the purpose of land, even within that major element of comprehensive plan, land, the thing called air quality seems to have skipped the point that everything happens, you know, in the air there's land down below, and air quality says you can't build a road, can't build a parking lot, you can't do this you can't do that, unless you meet all the air standards, whatever they are. Okay? And then

the division of EPA says, "Well, I'll tell you what you're going to do, forget about the air, you've got water quality and 1984 goals set by Congress, and you're going to meet those regardless of what happens to the air or the land." Okay? And they lay those on us, and say "No funds unless you meet those goals and do that first"; LCDC comes along and says "Meet our goals and do that first," and, you know it's, here we go again. Okay? So we have more problem with [...] agencies that are trying to solve single things in the urban and rural areas of the nation than we have with LCDC. Okay?

As a transfer from a public agency, as I mentioned, with the emotion and trauma associated in birthing and nurturing a new national state and local urban planning and public management and delivery system, get all those words, and in attempting to bring federal, state and local elected and appointed officials up to a level of common understanding of the real governmental public management issues and their evolution, so that their actions may be taken in context of history, okay, national perspective, and within the framework of our democratic representative government system, is our problem. It's quite [...] knowledge, you know, if you don't understand some of the things I just said, you treat it as a local phenomenon, you know. It's a transition. This country devises its government below the state government, by devising some of the water districts, fire districts, park districts, cemetery districts, lighting districts, and CRAG. You know? Okay? And all they are is designed to serve the purpose, a public purpose. And we do that one day at a time, and it's called representative government, and it's government of our design, to see to our needs of the day. But we have a rule. We say "Once they're in place, we never do away. We never, never, never do away with them." If it can't work anymore, build something else, but keep them in place. We've got 36,000 cities and counties in the United States. Okay? None of them can address the problems that we're discussing today, so the states say there's gotta be something, so we come up with CRAG. Okay.

Our times, I think, are exciting. It's dynamic. It's where the action is. It's representative government in its true form, representative government is dynamic, faces the problems in an emotional, dynamic way, and solves them. And we're changing institutions over ten years, and it takes hundreds of years to change institutions, some of which have never been changed in the history of Europe, you know? Unless they had a big war. So we're trying to do it to a representative government way, and it's not undemocratic, or in a representative government, to come up with things like CRAG, solving problems through the Port of Portland, or TriMet, or collecting two regional entities in the Bay Area. You know? They'd be like CRAG, to coordinate the 22 regional entities that are down there. It's called ABAG, the Association of Bay Area Governments.



Okay. We're responding to this public service challenge and attempting to get the job done. And believe me, if I have anything to impart to you at all, it's that all of this public people that are on the public payroll, trying to get some public jobs done, [...] you'd better get on with doing it, takes eight years of your [...], all we can do now in city planning in government is say "No, you can't do it." You know, ask someone to say "Yes we can." And if you get them to say "Yes we can," a dozen agencies like CRAG and ABAG, or CRAG and LCDC come out of the woodwork and say "No, don't do that." CRAG, to be effective, has to be effective at getting public jobs done expeditiously, timely, and without conflict may be at the [...] of cost. You know, if you can't serve that kind of public purpose and get a public job done, you've got to go. Okay?

Today's shift in urban public management is at stake. I believe the focal point of urban power is shifting nationally to 240 or 50 urban regions, okay? The kinds of mechanisms below state levels that are addressing these issues would be the new power, okay? This new power will be the focal point for urban central cities, to live up to their expectations and the region [...], to provide leadership for the region, and they'd be joined by a few urban counties, and a new partnership of urban counties and urban cities. That'd be the focal point for national leadership, to provide answers to our immediate problems. Now we've got one problem standing in the way of that, and it's a constitutional problem in that 60% of our people live in 38 multi-state regions, and there's no constitutional framework for decision making in more than one state. So, they can pollute the area and worsen it, they can go over here and we can have a particular [...] limit over here that says no more industrial locations, go to [...] to build. Okay? So we've got to solve a constitutional problem, and that's Congress, and that's, you know, kind of like looking at a new region as what they are. Natural places that people live, it's unnatural in that way, there's boundaries, you know, stopping from solving public problems. Okay?

I'm proud to be, at the level I can be, a part of the [...], LCDC, [...] planning, to be involved in the department of transportation, [...] and all the people in the cities and counties that are facing these issues. And, I hope I can contribute to the solving of the public problems, and CRAG can, because it's a collective knowledge and skill of all our elected officials, in this region, to begin mechanisms for solving these problems. Thank you.

[applause]

TOULAN: Thank you, Larry. Our next speaker is Ernie Bonner, the director of the Bureau of Planning of the city of Portland.

ERNIE BONNER: First thing I will say is I'm from Nebraska, and when Dr. Toulan was giving that introduction, I couldn't believe it. It sounded so long ago, and so I started thinking back about

where that began, and I came to that conclusion that actually what you should know about me is I'm from Nebraska, which appeared before all the rest. The other thing [...] was kinda interesting, I'm sure you could see it, in [...] they have this interesting thing in their universities where a professor sits down in a hole, and you have to look up here to students, which is actually a different situation, and most of you students probably don't have a classroom situation where you look down at the professor. That's the first time I'd come across that in [...] years of teaching. It makes a difference to look up at who you're lecturing to. Gives you a little humility.

One of... the other thing that occurs to me about LCDC coming on and CRAG coming on is that some of the normal responsibilities we have as individuals and as institutions, governments, agencies and so forth, I don't think we [...]. I don't think we discharge. And the consequence of all that is that we get something from on top of us coming down to tell us what to do. In fact, in 1969 there was a Senate Bill 10, in fact before there was Senate Bill 10 and some communication from the state legislature, there was a need for comprehensive planning in the city of Portland. In fact, the city of Portland did have a comprehensive plan, dated from 1966, before that they were engaged in planning efforts for some years. The point being, I think, that because the... and it wasn't the city planning commission to go through the planners, who were, I don't think were particularly at fault in the situations, but who wants a plan, when you get right down to it? Who needs it? Like, what person who has to make a real serious decision, actually has to place actions, has to say "You get, you don't," okay, wants consistent values and direction. You know, if I'm going to make that decision I'm not going to advance anyone. You know, I'd like to be able to go over here and get this time, and over there I'll get that time, I don't want somebody to tell me that you've got to keep doing it this way. So it's not inherent with those who make decisions that they want guidance, in fact, a lot of times they really don't.

So really what I'm trying to say is that CRAG coming on and regional bodies in general come about mainly because the federal government is coming in and saying: if you don't start getting your act together down there we're not going to give you any money, and you get your act together by following, you know, all together, so the roads don't go to a county line and stop and start up again in the next county, you know, and stuff like that. But the... it's because we are discharging that responsibility ourselves, we were certainly capable of sitting down and coming to a rational decision and saying "Well, there are a bunch of us here and we ought to... there are some things that are lying between one of us in terms of decision, yeah we'll get together and try to work it out." But we didn't, so people started laying some stuff on us, just like: a good story I have is about—and I think this is something that's really serious about our society, that we've really gotta get into this before we go too much further—we've got a guy named Bill on this side of the street, and a guy named Joe lives on this side of the street. And

Bill's got a dog, and Joe's got some roses. Okay? Well, Bill's dog is over doing something on Joe's roses. Well now, if you think about it a minute, just... what Joe should do is go over and say "Bill, could you stop your dog from doing that on my roses?" and Bill would say, "Oh, I didn't realize he was doing that on your roses, if he's killing your roses," and then Joe says "Those are really great roses, those are my prize county fair roses," and then the guy with the dog says "Okay, I will keep my dog from getting into your roses." Get themselves together, work it out, okay? We gotta live together. They were right across the street from one another, and they can't be roughing each other up.

Okay. What happens? [...] They say Bill's dog goes over and does it on Joe's roses, and Joe calls the dog catcher. Now you can't get into the dog catcher, because everybody's getting it on their roses, see? So there are so many people calling the dog catcher that you can't get a dog catcher out there to take care of Bill's dog. And furthermore, if you call the dog catcher on Bill, people are scared that Bill might come over, and you know, maybe he's going to do something heavy. So, the problem is that people, when you don't... when you're not responsible enough to get yourself together, what you do is you invite somebody to come down and lay something on you; like we almost passed an ordinance limiting the number of dogs, by the zoning office, because of that problem. Dogs are the number two problem in this country, in cities. Ask any mayor, okay? It's crime and then dogs. [laughter] I'm not kidding. So like, it's a simple... it seems like such a simple problem, but it comes down to that people have got to be responsible enough to try to get along with one another. And to [...] do that, frankly, you'd [...] a lot of us, a whole bunch of us [...] if we just learned how to do that. [...]

The second thing is that there is such a thing as rational and there is such a thing as irrational, and at times that could be rational. The problem is that rationality is a kind of a code for... everybody has his own little black box of rationality. In order to have a bike path, okay? Now, who doesn't want a bike path? Everybody wants a bike path, okay, but the problem is that there's one guy who doesn't want the bike path to come by his house, he had to take his car off the street, he liked to park on the side of the street. So he says, "You can't have a bike path, where will I put my car?" Put the car in the driveway, there. They said, "Why do you have all that grass on your driveway?" Well that's... so he starts on the whole thing. He says, well, he says, "I like house plants, I really like house plants, the problem is I can't afford to have a lot of house plants, they cost too much, so what I do is I grow them in my backyard. You know, I start 'em out there and then I transfer them into my house, but the problem is I don't have enough room back there, okay? So, I... you know, to have both grass and houseplants, and so I put the grass in the driveway." So, I don't know about you but that's rational, isn't it? [laughter] So, I mean, so rationally... you have to kind of keep that in mind. Last time, we come on like we

know where it's at, and if you were really smart you'd get this way, but in fact, you don't really know that, know so much a lot of times.

[...] sometimes the things they're saying to me about the way the federal government is beginning to rationalize to them their whole system of delivery is really a hot topic, you know; it doesn't get me any awards, but it's really going to make a lot of differences for us and that's something that I must confess I don't pay much attention to, myself. Anyway, he said [...], he said to me "You know, we gotta go if we don't perform." I think that's true, I mean all of you ought to be kicked out, frankly. Furthermore, I think that one of the best measures of how well you perform is how soon you go. Right? So that the stuff which we can [...] disappear. The reason I say this is because the only... one thing that we've got going for us, which has been, you know, [...] is that we've got set of very confident systems that are around, and people are starting to think "Oh god, it's just too complicated, I won't be able to understand it," well, we had to have systems around us to... maybe a comprehensive plan or something like that, and so you know, in fact the systems are just very, very complicated, but the point is that they don't have to be. You know, they're a lot more complicated than they really have to be, and so I would propose that some of the [...] as planners is to make systems simple enough so that they don't need [...], which [...] say to that. [...] Okay, let's get down to the question that [...] [audio skips; some of recording is lost]

BONNER [continuing]: ...The problem is that we're beginning to understand what comprehensive really means, now, and we're beginning to understand it more and more and more, that... and what it means is you can't simply sculpture regions anymore into a set of kinds of accommodations that... you've got to understand even much more basic things than what we didn't get into a lot in school, which is things like where's the water and sewer, you know, where are the pipes, and where are the roads, and you know, what are the, you know, banking practices and things like this. Even some of those things are not considered sometimes in making comprehensive planning decisions. But we're getting into things that are even more than that, and all the connections between the very, you know, the whole idea of kind of like a spaceship, kind of notion about, you know, how much longer can we continue to be, you know, like put it in on this end and it goes through this process and we throw it away, so we put things in here and they go through this and out there and they're put somewhere like in a landfill or in an air shed or something like that. So, we're beginning to understand a lot more about that.

I think we're also beginning to understand a lot more about just like what people are like, and it's interesting that it takes us this long to come to that, but in fact there's a lot of psychology, kind of like things like a guy has a feeling about something and that's kind of important, and we talk a lot about community; we don't get down to it very often, but in fact that's very

important. I mean, kind of like an idea you have about an area is very important. It sets up a whole, like... we can't do anything but hope that both public and private investment decisions as well as other decisions might be made on behalf of some common goal we have. Well, we can't get anybody to give a damn or invest in anything unless they kind of believe in it one way or another, I mean they have to have some sort of motive. You know, so like that idea of community is very important. We don't really get to that, we really don't understand that very well, but we simply have to know more about the interrelatedness of things, and we've gotta be more serious and sincere about it, rather than just saying "Oh yes, we have a comprehensive plan. You know, 14 elements in 64 colors." But, we really have to be more serious than that about it.

The other thing is that this whole idea about equity and justice... you know one of, you know, that this business about the alienation of people from their governments, in my opinion—I could be wrong but in my opinion—is that a lot of it comes from root injustices, you know, and inequities. Not the kind of thing—although, that's part of it—but not the kind of thing, necessarily which says that we've got a lot of poor people and a few rich people. But things that are even more common, like why is it, why is it that this guy over here, okay, has to pay that much to get his garbage picked up and this guy over here only has to pay that much? It's simple little things, simple little things that people can see and understand. Why is it, okay, that the guy comes down here and he says, "How come I can't get a building permit to build my house there when you gave one to this guy just a year ago?" Okay. A year ago we didn't know about the sewer problem, see? And you're looking at this guy and he says, "Well that's ridiculous, that's not fair, you gave that guy a building permit, give me one." And you know, is he right or wrong? Well, it's that kind of a thing, a kind of a notion that your government, that the regulations that people have got to accept, just like law; people have got to accept the law while never having enough cops to enforce the law. You know, people have got to accept the basic justice of that, and that's not just true about our criminal and civil laws, it's true about our varied regulations that we're into. We gotta be more careful about being, you know, a certain justness and fairness to the kinds of things we do.

And that of course gets back to, you know, there are the obvious things about that too, about who pays, who gets. Every time you do something, somebody's going to get something and somebody's going to pay, and that's, you know, like being sure you know who's consistently getting and who's consistently paying.

The other thing is that I think has to be absolutely clear, clearly spelled out for the city of Portland, for any major city in this country today is kind of a conservation ethic. It's more common upon us than probably it is on anybody else, I think in certain respects you could say

that about the region here. You know, “use it up and then reuse it.” We can’t afford, we can’t afford the throwaway society that we have had in the past. You know, I don’t believe in apocalyptic kind of visions about, you know, tremendous energy and food shortages and things like this, I don’t believe in that; I think, you know, we will adjust ourselves over time to a great many things that we now think are tremendous problems. But, it’s all gonna be at a cost, and that cost is going up, and that cost ain’t gonna come down, and you know, sooner or later it’s just gonna be impossible for us to continue to live the way we have.

The problem that I see that’s a basic problem for us is that, you know, let’s don’t position ourselves as a city or as a region in such a way that our grandchildren will not have half the choices we do. And they may have twice the income. Okay, so you know, that’s what I’m really worried about, and that’s another thing—it’s done, if you don’t mind me just two more minutes—about citizen participation and citizen involvement. Being... one of the things that I think a planning commission, particularly a planning commission should be, one of the things they have to do is they have to at least admit the interests of future generations. They are the ones who have to carry to the halls of decisions: what’s it gonna be like for our grandchildren? And our grandchildren ain’t around now, they’re not running for president of the neighborhood association, okay, they’re not down there screaming and hollering about a sewer assessment. They’re not around, they’re not here, they’re not voting, okay? But they should have a voice. They’re never gonna have a vote, but they gotta have a voice, because in fact, if there’s anything that I think we’re in great danger of doing, is of making our grandchildren like I say, much worse off than we are, and we think we’re really bad off.

So, at any rate, that’s another thing about citizen involvement and our sort of like our pragmatic... which you know, we get into, like you know, like we got a council, you know, you gotta get a decision, you gotta make compromises and I understand all that. It’s just that every once in a while we ought to just stop and think that the people who aren’t even here today are the ones fifty years from now who are gonna own this. Okay? Thank you.

[applause]

TOULAN: Thank you, Ernie. Well, in a sense I started backwards in my history since 1958, that’s the year I entered the planning profession, I didn’t feel that I should dwell on anything since 1958, I don’t know what you’ll learn from that, Ernie, but... before I open I promise that I will not take any time to comment on what our speakers here have mentioned. However, in view of the subject matter that we have been discussing here, I feel that I have a small story that I would like to share with you. By the time I finish it you might think it’s a joke, believe me it is not a joke. Two years ago on one of my trips to the northern part of Nigeria, I was called upon

by the government there to advise them what to do with... how to transfer the city of Sokoto, a city of 150,000 people, that had just been declared as the capital of a new state into a modern city overnight, something that incidentally they are managing to do; I went there again last year and the city is certainly unknown to me when I landed there. I went to the mukhtar of the city, this is the spiritual leader of the community, and I tried to get some information from him, what the lifestyles or how people functioned in the community, how did they live, and the one thing that struck me from what he was saying is that he kept stressing that he lives in a house with three doors. And I didn't see anything so special about living in a house with three doors, after all, I have a door to our living room, we have a door to our kitchen, we have a door to our garage, I pointed that to him and he said, "No, but my three doors are in sequence. I have three doors in a row. You enter through door number one to door number two through door number three." And I tried to get an explanation, why does anybody need three doors for an entrance, can't you enter through one door? He said, "Well, I don't like to lock my doors. So, by doing this, somebody opens the first door and go in, will have to go through the second door and through the third door." I said, "What happens by the time he reaches the third door?" He said, "One of two things. Either he will get tired from going nowhere, or I will eventually catch him and stop him where he is." I don't know what you learn from this, [laughs] I'm not implying here that our three levels of government or three levels of agencies that we are dealing with in land use planning are leading us to the nowhere... [laughter] although to some extent, some of the comments which were mentioned tend to suggest that that's possibly where we are leading. And this is where I was slightly wondering between being optimistic and pessimistic in my opening remarks, which I always try to make them on the formal side. Now, however, I will not take your time more, and if you have any questions you'd like to direct to our panelists, please feel free.

TOULAN: Can you speak up please, and talk loud, unless you want to come here so that you can be heard.

QUESTION 1: I don't know where's the door, I want to leave, frankly, but anyway. My question would be to, I don't know, I misunderstood the [...] of what you were saying but I felt that he was saying that CRAG was somehow autonomous by which, if it wants to exercise authority in any sort of instance, prevails. On the other hand, I kind of felt that he was saying that maybe he did not like that kind of situation. My question is, do you personally subscribe to that kind of an attitude, or to that kind of a philosophy in the kind of society we live in today? That's my question.

RICE: Ernie is leaving. Let me see if I can address it correctly. What I was trying to tell you was that, in my opinion, our traditional units of government, 36,000 cities and counties in the

United States, 50 states and thousands of special districts, okay, that are quasi-public kinds of things, aren't equipped to solve the problems of today's society. All right? CRAG is one way that we, in a democratic representative government, have seen fit to put into place, at least temporarily, to address these multiple agency problems that exist in two states, in a common living area. Okay? Called a natural urban region. Portland/Vancouver. All right now, that is a, to me, an experiment in handling the public business in a very limited fashion. In the state law, the limited fashion is restricted to comprehensive planning, not major service delivery, not jobs and employment, okay, those kinds of things with limited function. Like LCDC is very limited in its function, and if we can survive the test of American representative government, which says that traditionally we have formed our governments by having an area, territory, and saying here are the things that we want done as public services in that area, and here is the elected official board we'll put into place to do those things and directly elect. Okay, that isn't CRAG. We don't fit that mold of the water board, of the fire district, or the cemetery district. Okay? We don't, also, fit the mold of a state commission. TriMet is a state entity, okay, it doesn't fit the unit of local government elected by an electorate. No one votes on that. The Port of Portland is a state agency, okay? We don't know today whether we'll accept the Port of Portland anymore as a state agency. Studies from the League of Women Voters and others suggest that what we want the Port of Portland to be is locally elected and controlled, okay? I'm saying the cities and counties have got together and the state said, "try it," and we're going to try it, and we're going to try with all of our sense and with all of our public honesty to make a thing called CRAG work to perform the services it's expected to.

Now, you're not going to like that because what we're going to do is lay on Ernie goals and objectives in areas and activities, and all that sort of thing. Okay? And Ernie's going to say, "Citizens, who gave you that license?" What board, you know, do you serve and elected from? The people are going to say, "Mayor Goldschmidt, you're our mayor of Portland, but you know, why are you making decisions for banks?" Okay? So I don't know that we'll survive the American representative government test, so I'm assuming that we're going to do the best job we can while we're here to address the problems we all agree we should address. And we're going to get on with that. But let's not kid ourselves that we're the ultimate answer to anything. Okay?

QUESTION 1: Well, you're putting yourself in the position of being the ultimate answer, because you said earlier that some body... let's say for example in Beaverton or Hillsboro had agreed to sit in CRAG's way... nevertheless, you can say you're going to abide by it, and overrule what that...



RICE: Absolutely. And I think that's much more appropriate in this day and age than having the federal government establish some kind of a regional direction in Seattle to say, "Here's your new standard, and live up to it regardless." And I think it's even more appropriate on our level than to have a state commission tell us, and I think the LCDC is following this philosophy, if you can do it and live up to our guidelines, we've done our job and you've done yours. It's much more appropriate for our elected representatives on a local level to do it, if it has to be done. If Ernie can't solve his problem and can't, you know, figure that the street does go into Multnomah County, then it's gonna be CRAG or some entity that has to say, you know, the street needs to continue. Sure, we can lay that on him. We're going to lay it on him because it's collectively us that's laying it on us in local government. What I'm saying is that probably will not survive for long, because it's contrary to the American representative government system below the state level, which is to elect a board.

QUESTION 1: Thank you.

RICE: Yes?

QUESTION 2: Let's split off from the idea of planning, what we're all faced with. Seems to me curious that we're dealing with issues of planning, especially on a state level, without really dealing with some of the kind of gut issues that come up when we try to make some decisions. Mr. Gustafson referred to the fact that he went to East Multnomah County and was lucky he came back alive. At the present time, if things continue, I will venture to say that probably in six months he won't come back alive. Simply because of this: because there are people that are going around the state right now, like the realtors, for example, who are saying that planners are communists, this is a communist plot. And what we're really doing in planning right now is saying something that goes: you folks are going to be able to make it, and you folks are not going to be able to make it. And on the state level, with the land use goals that were... have passed right now, this is one of the major issues I think the state has a case with, because I think that within certain groups of people, such as are here right now, we can all agree that it is vital to maintain agricultural land; but I would venture to say that if we went to other communities and you go on that same proposition, that you may not get the same kind of response. For example, in East Multnomah County. Because in very many cases, there are people there that have banked their livelihood on the land, and what has happened is that the state or local government, or CRAG as the case may be, is coming into that and saying, "You cannot develop, you are going to have to keep your land in agricultural use for many, many years," at least for another 20 years, in some cases. And yet, to mind, except for [...] very slightly, I really haven't heard an address to the really serious issues of planning and the performance that is expected of planning in the next couple of years. I think you've made very

light-hearted and supercilious remarks, as a matter of fact, about planning, especially on the state level, I'm afraid. I would like to hear from Mr. Gustafson, about, for example, how LCDC is proposing within the next year to deal with those kinds of issues that are really the gut issues.

GUSTAFSON: Well, first of all, I would say that unless LCDC can be closer to, or as close to, the concerns that you're talking about as the local elected official, at least the local legislatively elected official, that in my personal opinion, the likelihood that LCDC or some body like that will continue is not very great. Now, I say that because I recognize—and I wasn't, believe me, I wasn't joking about the degree of concern that people in these Multnomah County have, and I don't want any impression left that I don't have some sympathies for the kinds of concerns that they express. Because, as you say, some of those people have banked their lives on being able to, in their retirement, sell their land and sell it for TV antennas. It's a very, very specific and tough immediate problem that they're having to face. Now, how do we plan on dealing with that?

Well, one way we plan on dealing with that is the way we've been dealing with it. I think that we will have to be able to make sure that the kind of policies we are coming up with are not supercilious, but in fact are specific enough and have enough public support that they'll be able to be sustained, and we have tried to do that. We tried to do that in ways that are fairly sophisticated. For example, there are polls that were done as we went on through our process to make sure that we weren't too far out, too far away from where public opinion in Oregon was on a regional basis on the values that you see in these goals. There were polls that were done—and we can't take, we know we aren't going to be having our commissioners stand up to election—we also know, at least I think I know, that unless the policies they come up with are within the ballpark of what public support would be, that that form of government, the LCDC, isn't going to last. So, one of the things that we do is to fulfill our legal obligations to make sure that citizens get involved, but also as those policies emerge, to make sure, try to make sure that those policies aren't so far out that they in fact are going to create so many problems that it's going to bring down the whole structure of land use planning. That's a practical consideration.

Another way of doing it, and I don't want it misunderstood as to what we do. We are not going to be in the business of deciding issues in East Multnomah County. There are opportunities, there will be opportunities for individuals like the ones I met with, to appeal, and they may be appealing that in fact the decision that was made by their local government was a violation of what they interpreted the LCDC goals to be. In other words, there's a shot for those people who are substantially affected by the development of the comprehensive plan to come to us and appeal that. And I think that how responsive the LCDC is in a sincerely, not a heavy way, to those kinds of citizens' concerns will again determine whether or not the system is going to

work. Now, these may not sound like the traditional vehicles of planning, but I think that one thing we are having to do is to somewhat learn as we go along. What we're trying to do is to establish a decision making structure that will work and then learn as we go along, and perhaps have to respond to some concerns we haven't anticipated previously.

One other thing, we're also trying to legislatively address some of those specific problems by trying to get the legislature to come to grips with windfall and wipeout legislation, that is not our responsibility, but it's the responsibility of the joint legislative com...

QUESTION 2: Why not? Why not?

GUSTAFSON: Well, because legislatively, it was set up in Senate Bill 100 that the joint legislative committee would come up with such a report. They have come up with a suggestion on legislation that hasn't seen the floor yet, but it will be coming out soon. We will be testifying on that legislation; but what I'm saying is it isn't for a lack of concern, it just happens to be the way that Senate Bill 100 was written and who was given responsibility to research and come up with suggestions on this particular problem. So it's not a copout. In fact, I would say... I would say if there's one thing that kind of bothers me in the discussion I've heard so far this evening, is that maybe I'm personally kind of naive, but I feel very strongly that government must establish ways to be responsive to the kinds of concerns you're talking about. These... the sections that are developed at the local level are very human problems, some of them are cases of individuals who really are trying to make a fast buck, but in most cases you're talking about people whose average age is 55 to 65 who are not going to have any other means of getting an income, who maybe are not going to be able to sell their land even for agricultural use.

QUESTION 2: Blaming the people for this issue is really... is a strawman.

GUSTAFSON: But we are not asleep to those people. You know, I don't want to... okay, we are not asleep to the concerns of those people. I am not sure, in fact I would say right now, state government and local government does not have an adequate mechanism to deal with that problem, and I can kind of glibly go along and say, "Well, why don't we have a land bank, and why don't we have windfalls, and wipeouts," and I personally have been interested in the land bank thing from pre-Senate Bill 100 days, just as an aside; but the point is government isn't coming to grips with those problems right now, and it should be.

QUESTION 2: Let me ask you this. One question and then I'll [...] Don't you think that's really where the issue lies? In the legislative process and the political process, as to what kind of decisions can be made? The government says what kinds of decisions planners can make.

GUSTAFSON: I believe I agree with you. I'm... I think that mainly one thing that we're seeing now, and one of the objectives I have as kind of a personal objective in terms of the legislative program that the commission is interested in, and the whole land use area this session, is to make sure that these issues do get out and in front of appropriate committees for discussion, because the legislators may not decide this session on some of these issues, but they're going to have to come to grips with them, and there's going to have to be some more equitable way worked out to deal with these problems, and if they end up being lost between the cracks because a certain committee didn't report on time or because of the fact that somebody didn't get a bill drafted on time, it's going to be very unfortunate. So, I think that there really is a personal commitment on my part and on the commission's part to try to make sure that these issues come up. We do not have the authority to solve all of them, we do have the responsibility to make sure that they're brought before the people who can deal with them.

QUESTION 2: Thank you.

QUESTION 3 [in background, partly inaudible]: It seems to me that the most problem [...] keeping farmhands and farm operation on this continent are in British Columbia and Saskatchewan. I go to the *Wall Street Journal* earlier this month, I heard that there the provincial government will buy the farmer's property and then will lease it back to a [...] family or any other buyer, and will keep the land in farm use. After five years of successful renting, they lower your interest, then you can buy it. That way you [...] keeps a balance, monies behind a policy that really means what it says, to try and maintain agricultural land in that use. We keep ducking the issue of compensation in Oregon, I'm not ducking [...]. The reason people are so worried, they feel [...]

GUSTAFSON: I agree, I think that to a considerable degree... I don't think we're ducking it yet, I just think that it hasn't been addressed properly yet, 'cause I think that the legislators are willing to deal with the question, they just haven't found the right vehicle. But before leaving that British Columbia example, I was in Victoria when that order of council came out. Incidentally, the order that came out from the provincial government was a good example of how a different form of government can deal with problems. As you know, under the parliamentary system, the ruling party has the power that was previously given to God under former forms of government in the British system. They were able, on order of council, without passing it through their parliamentary body, to say that there would be no more farmland that will be allowed to be developed, and as you indicated, that they would buy up that land. Now, what that did... we hear that example brought to us in legislative halls and in meetings a lot, as what could happen when communism takes over the United States. Because, of course, these

were direct orders; there was no option that was given; the impact on housing costs, the impact on availability of housing, all of these things are brought up to us as examples of the kinds of things that will happen here in the United States if we allow planning to go farther down the line. I think it's instructive, though, that we have to recognize that we have to deal with the problem, perhaps in compensation the same way they do, and it's also instructive to notice that we've got to make sure that our plans are flexible enough, that since we don't have a governmental system that has that authority, that our plans are flexible enough to adjust to change.

QUESTION 4: I think one of the basic mistakes, Mr. Gustafson, that you've made is the assumption that everyone wants to conserve agricultural land and that should be a goal. If you phrase the question in terms of the following: If you want to assure citizens an adequate amount of land for housing, so that they don't necessarily have to live in apartment units as population grows, you'd find that you get a lot more support for that. So it's wrong just to structure the issue in terms of a few farmers who are looking forward to retirement and want to sell off the land to speculators versus a public that wants to conserve agricultural land. Fundamentally, you meant are you going to force a change in lifestyle on people, are you going to force them to live under much denser conditions than they prefer to live in, simply because you've set up exclusive agricultural zoning as a good without looking at the tradeoffs involved. Now, if you want to conserve land for recreational purposes, that's legitimate for the LCDC and for other units of government to ask [...] as a group, "Do you want to expand a certain amount of your tax money, of your resources, for land for recreational use, and bring about the subway." That's a legitimate way of doing it. But by exclusive agricultural zoning, you're really forcing people to change lifestyles in the long run, you're going to build up a lot of opposition to this illegitimate interfering with the preferences...

TOULAN: Do you have any specific questions...

RICE: Could I just quickly remark to that? I think the gentleman forgot that most of us are going broke in paying taxes, and the high cost of providing a full range of public services to that urban sprawl is something we also want to look at as an alternate.

TOULAN: Yes, that is a question, though, that has been up for some time.

QUESTION 5: I'd like to ask a question based on two assumptions. Assuming that the city of Portland does what CRAG wants to do, CRAG does what LCDC wants it to do, and then also assuming that planning is continuing, what do each of your agencies see for your own ulterior feature besides stamping building permits and settling [...] disputes?

TOULAN: Are you directing your question to a specific person?

QUESTION 5: Sure, I'd like to know what the city of Portland is going to do after they get accepted, what's CRAG going to do after they get accepted, what's LCDC going to do after they've accepted their...

BONNER: Half of what we do now is stamping building permits. I mean literally, I mean half of our organization is administration of the zoning and other design codes and that sort of thing. There's plenty to do, I mean a plan ain't nothing really when you stop and think about it. It's a series of very generalized policy decisions, usually. It doesn't get very specific. Getting down to the nitty gritty of it, I mean like who do you talk to to get so many dollars to do this at the same time that somebody else is going to do that, and everybody's together, and you know the implementation thing we could go on and I'm gonna try to get into a whole course of that at PSU this spring. Implementation, there's plenty to do, plenty to do. And I would say one thing about... we have talked a lot about how, you know, it seems like it's going to be some tremendous burden for all of us... [audio skips forward a half-second] ...the same one's gotta be made tomorrow. Hopefully, the properly adopted public policies will straighten that indecision mess out.

GUSTAFSON: And I would add to that, that at the statewide level, Governor Straub indicated that one of the problems that he wanted to solve was that delay problem that occurs—and that's partially what Larry's addressing—the delay problem of those people who want to build and can't do so because they've got 17 different organizations to deal with. What we have under the authority of our law—and it may not be done by us but it will be done by some state agency—is to try to make sure that those kinds of decisions, those sign-offs can be done at the lowest level of government possible once the comprehensive plans come into place. In other words, to make sure that development can occur after the plans come into place. There will also be a lot of time, I think, that's going to be spent by LCDC in dealing with some research questions having to do with questions of carrying capacity of certain locations of the state. Just how much population can be sustained? The issue of growth centers. Are there areas of the state, really, where there should be more stabilization of population after a certain point, as Larry's plan calls for, or mentions in the CRAG area, at around a population of 2 million. The question is: Oregon is going to grow, in all likelihood; now are there areas that have the infrastructure, the local governments, communities that are losing population now that should be great places for people to live? You know, I could spend... that's where I come from, frankly, is that issue of trying to make sure that smaller communities have an opportunity to have the kind of living advantages that many of us have enjoyed in the valley, frankly.

QUESTION 6: [...] my question, one of the topics you've all mentioned on the info page on operation and utilization, which I appreciate. Another question, too, do you foresee at some time in the future, because of a change in economy, a change in the environment, a change in population, that this cycle that you're beginning will start all over again in a revised plan, ten years down the road or something and begin this whole process will keep looking...

TOULAN: Well, maybe I should try to summarize an answer for you on this point that you're raising, and... I think yes, we might keep continuing on the same cycles on and on and on. I think the basic question that we have to face is that if we want to do proper land use planning, we have to adopt the proper measures, the proper changes in attitudes. We are trying to solve problems with the same attitude that prevailed with us in the past that lead to no solutions, and if that summarizes your question, yes; I think there is a serious need for accepting not only new regulations but also accepting new attitudes in our relationship between the system itself, I mean our relationship to ownership in land, our relationship and going... I'd like to add here one point.

When I referred in my opening remark to our experiments in the past, I was particularly referring to the Green Acres program that was started in the state of New Jersey early in the 1960s. I was one of the people who worked on the initial document that launched the program trying to preserve the New Jersey Green. The state of New Jersey incidentally was completely subdivided in 1926 or 27, the entire state including all the marshes of Eastern New Jersey, and of course there was no market for that. Later, back in the 60s, rediscovered that it might be re-subdivided back again, and they decided to do something about it. We went through the question of development rights, something that we are talking about in the state of Oregon today, 15 years later. In 1961, the state of New Jersey decided that they would have to mortgage the entire state if they really had to pay compensation for development rights for the state, and the decision was made that unless somebody in the state was willing to accept basic changes in the attitude and the constitution of the state towards the private ownership of land, that there is nothing that really could be done in terms of compensation. And so I'm not really advocating here the points or worries that planners are really communist. It is true that many of the ideas that planners keep advocating either border dictatorship or what you call communal principles, but I wouldn't say it's exactly communism. I have been to the Soviet Union, I didn't see much planning in the Soviet Union, so I [laughter] ...I will not relate them. So, that's the question answered. Any further questions, please?

QUESTION 7: My context is that of the university-city vital partnership, and the reference is to Ernie Bonner's closing remark, about concerning ourselves with our grandchildren. Ernie, would

you suggest that most planners have been equipped in their methods of training to anticipate or be able to envision the context in which their grandchildren may be and grow up? And if so, could you suggest just a little about the curriculum for our purposes on this campus; and if not, if you don't think planners are equipped now to deal with your urgent notion, do you have any suggestions, do you think there might be resources on universities now that would help planners, or would you suggest curriculums, would you suggest something that we could do so that planners could better deal with the needs of the grandchildren?

BONNER: No. [laughter; applause]

QUESTION 7: What does CRAG have to say about that?

RICE: Yes.

TOULAN: Well, any further questions? [laughter] Yes?

QUESTION 8: I have one for Mr. Gustafson. I don't readily identify with the agricultural sector or the farming community, and I would like to know, in a state that only has one large population center, exactly how the input was voiced to him by the citizens of Oregon that agricultural conservation, or retaining that agricultural land should be one of the goals of LCDC.

GUSTAFSON: When we went out for the first round of workshops, we had... understand that we did 28 workshops around the state, we did it in the spring, we did it in the fall; then we had about 18 other hearings in December, that was the sequence we went through. During the first and second rounds of workshops, the aims were to isolate the issues people were concerned about, and prioritize them. And at that... during the second round of workshops, people were broken down into small groups and they were asked by group to prioritize, and then they were asked through individual surveys to prioritize. In both those cases, agricultural land came out as the highest priority. I would say, even with that, you know, I don't... I emphasized agricultural land for several reasons. One, because in this state, it was really a coalition of forces that were concerned about the environment. Agricultural land: agriculture, agricultural land, also open space, and what it represents to livability, that helped bring about Senate Bill 100. That was where we came from, and that was, again, the attitudes that were reflected in our workshops; that is not a higher priority goal than any other goal that exists, but I think that any honest description of our process would have to point out that that's where the public's... that was the public's top interest.



TOULAN: Well, at this point we are running out of time. I would like to thank Ernie Bonner, Larry Rice, John Gustafson, and thank you, all of you for your participation, and good night.

[applause; program ends]