

## **Russ Beaton Interview**

Thursday, 6/18/15

INTERVIEWER: Greetings.

RUSS BEATON: Greetings.

INTERVIEWER: My name is Jim Knight. I served for 29 years on the staff of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). I retired in 2003. Today is Thursday, June 18, 2015. It is my good fortune to speak with Dr. Russ Beaton who agreed to be interviewed as part of Portland State University's Oral History Project of Oregon's Statewide Land Use Planning Program. Russ is an esteemed Professor of Economics, retired from Willamette University in Salem, Oregon. Today's interview is taking place in the Main DLCD Office in Salem. Before starting the interview, I'd like to take this opportunity to offer several brief remarks. First, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Russ and the many other Oregonians whose vision, leadership and involvement did so much to make the enactment and implementation of Senate Bill 100 possible. Second, for those of you who may not know, you may ask, what is an Oral History Project? In terms of this project, the overall goal is to document and preserve a record of Oregon's Land Use Program through the collecting and archiving of personal oral histories. To achieve this goal, the project's principal objectives are to generate new relevant primary source material and historical records for research projects, publications and articles on Oregon's land use planning; identify and further understand the views, opinions and interest of the many organizations, agencies, officials and citizens who actively participated in the drafting, adoption and implantation of Oregon's land use statutes, statewide planning goals and administrative rules; make available historical records and materials of specific interest to various local, state and federal agencies, tribal governments, public and private interest groups and organizations, academic

institutions and the general public; enable comparison of the current state of Oregon's land use program with the views, opinions, and recollections of various participants regarding their visions and intentions behind the passage of Senate Bill 100 and its implementation. Third, we interviewers and the individuals being interviewed are referred to as narrators in this first group, and those others to follow in the months ahead, are the projects most visible participants. However, much is owed to those behind the scene at PSU's College of Urban and Public Affairs, working in collaboration with the LCD, overseeing the project's many details of organization, management and funding. Four, we reserve our special thanks to Sy Adler and Kevin Pozzi at PSU, and Jim Rue and Rob Halliburton at the DLCD. Finally, in May 2013, DLCD held a special gathering to mark the 40th anniversary of the enactment of Senate Bill 100 and the start of Oregon's Land Use Program. I was asked, along with others, to offer some remarks to commemorate this historic occasion. No, don't worry; I'm not going to delay getting into today's interview by repeating all of my May 2013 remarks. However, here are excerpts quoted from two of the Land Use Program's most famous champion, whose words I feel are very relevant as we start this Oral History Project. First, here are Governor Tom McCall's stirring thoughts in 1973, speaking about the people, environment and livability of the state he loved and what I'm sure he believed is the continuing challenge of land use planning in Oregon. "We're talking about more than preserving the beauty of Oregon. We're talking about the growth of Oregon and how that growth can be accomplished in the same manner. We are talking about the economy and the environment. We are talking about balance. In short, we are talking about people and the land." And the other quote is from the person I feel is the Land Use Program's true patriarch. This, of course, is Hector MacPherson. Here are his inspiring words expressed in 1992, about the birth of the Land Use Program and its importance for Oregon's future. "No, I did not know what I was

creating. I think the most remarkable thing is that we are here 20 years later, after the enactment of Senate Bill 100 in 1973, and that it has been enough of a success to last at least this long. I knew that land use was a tremendously divisive thing. When I got into this thing, none of the other legislators, except for Ted Hallock, wanted to join me, because they didn't feel it was anything that would enhance their political stature. And, of course, we had a number of times since then when I wondered if it was going to last through the next election. So, I guess, the most delightful thing is that really it is still here and it has gotten some national recognition and that it's recognized, at least by some people in the State of Oregon, as having been desirable. I just hope with all the uncertainty that I see out there in the future that we can progress at least as well in the future, as we have in the past. I really have some confidence that the voters are sensible to recognize the strength of a program like this." Thank you, again, Tom and Hector, for your very moving comments. Now, let's get on with today's interview. Russ, I'm going to read some questions, one-by-one, and have you respond and we can clarify one's comments back and forth and we'll just keep moving and if you see one that you think we ought to just pass on, please say so.

RUSS BEATON: I will.

INTERVIEWER: So, those are in front of you there. I'll begin with number one. Why don't we begin by having you give us a brief personal background of you and your family's arrival, settlement and life in Oregon.

RUSS BEATON: Well, first of all, Jim, I'm pleased to be here today and the words you just read, strike many memories for me as well. We'll get to that. Well, my background in Oregon, at three years old I moved to the Hood River Valley, not of my own accord, of course. My folks moved from Los Angeles to the Hood River Valley in 1942, but more pertinent, I came back. I'm a Willamette University graduate in 1960, and went away, did my graduate work and taught a couple

of other places. The last one, before I came back to Willamette, was at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver BC. And oddly enough, my research there, I was there as a mathematical economist/econometrician, and I got a little bit bored about all of that, and I got interested in urban land economics and regional economics and environmental economics, which I had -- I'd actually done my doctoral thesis in, but didn't have any formal training. And when you don't have any formal training in an area at a big university, you're not -- you're a little bit suspect. And I had an opportunity to come back to Willamette on the faculty in 1971, and that's when I arrived in Oregon as a permanent resident -- back in Oregon. And so summer '71, is when I arrived, and my interest, Oregon was a hotbed then of environmental thinking, soon to become land use thinking, although I didn't predict that, and regional economics and all that was a favorite -- were favorite areas of mine. So, I looked to get involved. I've always, as an academic, felt very much the necessity of staying involved in the real world, have something to teach about, if you will, and, of course, I'm an economist, so that's a little easier job than if you're a philosopher or something like that. My introduction and this, more or less, gets us to question two.

INTERVIEWER: Uh huh.

RUSS BEATON: My introduction to the land use movement was very, very quick when I arrived. In my interviews to come to Willamette, one of the people in the interviews, was a city councilor who was a Willamette faculty member named Ed Stillings. And Ed was a political science professor at Willamette and brilliant in local government theory and a city councilor in Salem. And he was very interested in what I would teach and getting me to Willamette. And I didn't understand why at the time, but it was about September 10th, which would have been within a week or two of my first teaching at Willamette, that the phone rang and they offered me a

contract. The Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments offered me a contract to do a study on urban growth in Salem. Salem's urban growth issues.

INTERVIEWER: Had you heard from them at all before then?

RUSS BEATON: No. Not at all.

INTERVIEWER: Out, out of the blue?

RUSS BEATON: Out of the blue. Well I had talked to Ed and I'd befriended him just the first couple three weeks I'd been here and Ed had gone down to COG and said, you know, give this guy a shot. He wanted very much to involve me in land use planning issues in the area, because they were heating up with what to do in this area of land use planning. A fellow named Bob Lindsey was the mayor of Salem then and he turned out to be very, very instrumental in the ongoing planning issues that Salem was debating. We'll get to this more later I'm sure, but the importance of all of this was that Ed had invented this little device. He's written a document for Salem called, "Proposing that Salem Adopt an Urban Growth Boundary."

INTERVIEWER: What year was this, please?

RUSS BEATON: 1971.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And as urban growth boundaries always have been, it was a little controversial. You know, developers were saying, oh, this will be an iron ring restricting what we can do with housing or industrial development or whatever, and the major reason for it appeared to be to preserve farmland around the city. So I was to end my study, which I did publish in 1972 and it's published by the Willamette Valley Council of Governments. The director of that was Wes Kvarsten, who was later to become a long serving and in my opinion, a very successful head of DLCD. So I got going on this study and it took quite a while. Again we affected the

contract in the fall of '71 and I published the thing the next spring or early summer, I don't remember when. But parallel to that, this is equally important, OSPIRG, Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group representatives on the Willamette campus came to me and wanted me to direct a study, a grant, that they had an inside track in to attaining, on citizen participation in land use planning. And I said, sure I'll direct it for you. We put the grant request in. It took about three days to write it and we were approved in about a week.

INTERVIEWER: Who was the party approving the grant?

RUSS BEATON: It was a federal --

INTERVIEWER: Federal?

RUSS BEATON: Federal money, Title I grant it was called.

INTERVIEWER: Is that HUD or some other --

RUSS BEATON: I think HUD.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Thank you.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah, I never paid a lot of attention to exactly how the money trickled down to Oregon, should we say. And so here I had this grant and as I recall, it was \$20,000 or \$25,000, 1971 dollars is quite a bit of money. And I won't say I had no clue as to what I was going to do with it, but I didn't have a whole lot of specific ideas. OSPIRG had directed, you know, had made some very general, we'll get involved in this, get involved in that, et cetera, constraints into the grant, that had been in the grant request, but it was very open ended. And quite honestly then, after the grant started, there was very little OSPIRG involvement. It was pretty much my deal. One of the people that was an OSPIRG participate then was a guy named Henry Richmond.

INTERVIEWER: Had your paper been done before you had actually applied for the grant?

RUSS BEATON: Oh no. The OSPIRG grant came virtually at the same time that the COG grant. So I was writing this document on urban growth. You know, costs of urban growth for the Salem, Oregon area. Turned out to be this first study in the nature on urban growth boundaries, because it talked about urban growth boundaries in 1972. We were not to adopt urban growth boundaries until '74 or '75, you know.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Of course no one knew that at that time.

RUSS BEATON: No one knew that at that time, absolutely. But my point is, it was a very schizophrenic year for me, because it was my first year of teaching at Willamette. Fortunately I'd taught for seven years elsewhere, so I wasn't having any trouble in the classroom.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: If I had been, I'd really been in trouble. I'm a Willamette grad, so I was familiar with a lot of the people around. In fact, my old professor had begged me to come back, you know, so I was very happy in the Willamette community and a very happy thing going well for me on campus, because these parallel efforts of being involved in the drafting of Senate Bill 100 and being involved in writing my study, you know, were going on just separately. Now, I mentioned being involved in Senate Bill 100. I haven't told you exactly how that happened. I quickly heard of Hector MacPherson. Maybe one of the OSPIRG people told me or I'd heard it rumored, hey there's this senator who is doing something on land use planning and I had this grant money, so I know it was still early to middle September, and I called Hector and we got together. Had a genial meeting, one of the greatest people. And I said, can I help you out? And he said could I help you out, you know. In his own words later, he jumped on me like a duck on a June

bug. And here's the story that I think is important, probably the most important vignette I would have to offer in this. Of course the 1971 legislative session had just ended and what he told me, I knew no different at all from history, because I had, you know, I'd heard of this guy Tom McCall, but I had just arrived back in Oregon that summer. Back in Oregon, I grew up in Oregon of course, but I'd been gone for 11 years. He said, I went to Tom McCall at the end of the '71 session and I asked for interim committee status for land use planning. And interim committee status as you know, gives funding. It gives legislative acknowledgement for the fact that there's an issue coming up that will undoubtedly be an important issue in the next session. An interim committee study or funding will give the legislature or a committee of the legislature the ability to plan ahead and maybe do some intelligent thinking about that issue before it comes up. You know, I presume we have one every time for school funding or something like that now.

INTERVIEWER: Was there some, at this point, at least that you were aware, of dissatisfaction with Senate Bill 10, which was passed in 1969?

RUSS BEATON: No, Senate Bill 10 was -- in fact, that's one of the symbolic things that I knew Oregon had done that --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: -- drew me back and Senate Bill 10 was unique in its own way as you know. But there was growing wide spread agreement that we've got to go further.

INTERVIEWER: And by further you mean what exactly?

RUSS BEATON: Clear into land use planning on an urban --

INTERVIEWER: More than just the area, but the state as a whole?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. Now I'm not totally versed in the details of Senate Bill 10, but it just -- it's sort of a mandate to plan.

INTERVIEWER: To Cities and Counties.

RUSS BEATON: Without giving any guidelines as to how.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: I mean that's my understanding.

INTERVIEWER: And there was also this big threat that the governor, at least on paper, wheeled it, if somebody didn't do what the law said.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: But everybody around was saying, no way could that kind of --

RUSS BEATON: This is not going to come to anything --

INTERVIEWER: He's not going to do -- he's not going to come in --

RUSS BEATON: -- really specific.

INTERVIEWER: -- and take over planning for the --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- a certain community.

RUSS BEATON: Of course not. Right.

INTERVIEWER: But that was what the law said at that time.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And I was working at the time -- I got another grant from Local Government Relations Division --

INTERVIEWER: Oh, LTRT, Bob Logan.

RUSS BEATON: By Bob Logan, right. And that grant was to do an economic impact study of a 200 million dollar bond fund for low and moderate income housing. It was being proposed -- it was going to come before the legislature in the 1973 session, and so I was working on that too as a consultant and dealing with Bob Logan, who was more or less I think in the

position of implementing Senate Bill 10 with -- for McCall. I still remember the sign on Logan's desk, "Be Regionable" and he would admit, you know, we don't know where this is going. He had high faith in Councils of Government, because that was Logan's focus a little bit, more than counties and that affected my thinking a lot too, especially since I had a grant from the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Government --

INTERVIEWER: Government.

RUSS BEATON: -- to do the Urban Growth Boundary Study or do across the Urban Growth Study. So my thinking was very much along the regional planning sense. I wasn't deeply into Cities and Counties yet in -- because I hadn't been around in Oregon that long.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And of course those are the old guard jurisdictions. See, after this interview, you're going to interview Ward Armstrong or somebody is --

INTERVIEWER: Mike is, yeah.

RUSS BEATON: -- and Ward Armstrong was part of the committee that revised Senate Bill 100 in the middle of the session, that changed the focus from Councils of Government down to Cities and Counties. And I got to admit, it was a lot of my thinking that got it to Councils of Government at the start in the Senate Bill in Hector's process.

INTERVIEWER: There is so many different aspects of this, because as I understand it, there was an ad hoc committee formed that L.B. Day was --

RUSS BEATON: L.B. Day chaired that.

INTERVIEWER: -- chairing at --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- of -- and it had various interest groups represented there.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: They weren't necessarily connected directly with the legislature, but they were --

RUSS BEATON: I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: -- formed at the direction of Hector and maybe Ted Hallock. Maybe it was Ted Hallock.

RUSS BEATON: It was. They counted noses during the session.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: We're getting way ahead of everything --

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

RUSS BEATON: -- but that's fine.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And realized that the bill might not even make it out of committee, let alone the Environment and Land Use Committee of course, let alone past the legislature, if Councils of Government stayed as the focal point for planning from the state. And that was because Cities and Counties were saying, ooh, another level of government here.

INTERVIEWER: The word coordination of course was tied to that whole idea of COG's doing the coordination, and that made the Cities and Counties very, very nervous and anxious.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: They didn't really have a lot of confidence that they could affect what --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- coordination would mean. And that's what came out of the revisions to the proposed bill.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: It changed the responsibility for coordination and that covers a lot of different aspects, we know.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: From COGS to counties.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And this --

INTERVIEWER: And that brought the Counties on board didn't it? I believe.

RUSS BEATON: I believe it did. Well that's right.

INTERVIEWER: In terms of the statutes being --

RUSS BEATON: Gordon Fultz.

INTERVIEWER: Gordon Fultz, right.

RUSS BEATON: Gordon Fultz would be another very good man to interview for this series.

INTERVIEWER: He is going to be interviewed, uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: Gordon was on that committee, Ward Armstrong was on that committee and Fred VanNatta who is the Oregon Home Builders Association, was on that committee.

INTERVIEWER: Were the Cities represented on that committee?

RUSS BEATON: I believe so.

INTERVIEWER: They must have been.

RUSS BEATON: I believe so. I don't remember all the names, but --

INTERVIEWER: That's fine.

RUSS BEATON: -- they essentially took the bill into a smoke filled room and came back within a few minutes.

INTERVIEWER: In front of the committee?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And L.B. took that over at the request of the governor and maybe at the request of Hallock and I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: Well I think they -- Senator Hallock was very, very conscious of the fact that if certain changes weren't made, it wasn't going to be a success.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And being very smart politicians, I think Hallock felt it would be better to have this little blue ribbon committee and take it away and bring it back, rather than sit there in committee and do it day by day.

INTERVIEWER: Because there was a joint Land Use Committee, wasn't there?

RUSS BEATON: Because it brought those vested interests on board.

INTERVIEWER: On board and got the votes to get the bill out of the committee.

RUSS BEATON: Right. Exactly. But to get back --

INTERVIEWER: Go ahead.

RUSS BEATON: -- to the main narrative here, my point was going to be, Hector asked McCall for interim committee status.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: McCall, and these were Hector's words to me at the time in September of '71, he said, Tom said, oh, land use isn't an issue that's time has come yet. And you know, it's not really a livewire issue. And he turned down the request for interim committee status, which would have given Hector some funding. And Hector said, I'll do it myself. And so, as you

well know, he formed what he called Hector MacPherson's Voluntary Land Use Planning Action Group, and that was just starting to meet when I heard about Hector, went to him and offered him some money. And he said, my, my friend. And so I had all kinds of students coming to me then and one of them was a second year law student by the name of Russ Lucas (phonetic) who said, I'm really bored with the corporate law thing here at Willamette right now and I understand you're into land use and stuff like that. Do you got anything for me to do? Well I introduced him to Hector and Russ became his clerk and served at it, and I paid him out of the contract, out of the grant, for the entire duration of that committee and I of course viewed that part of my job as the Grant Director, was to meet with the committee. So I said to Hector -- I may be the only person that met every time. I mean, we had a floating crap game of people who came through in front of the committee. Because you got to remember, it started meeting in fall '71 and the goal was to write and sent -- Hector went downstairs to the legislative council and excised out Senate Bill 100 as a number. He said I want you to give this number to this legislation. Okay, they did that. And then drafting the legislation was the job of the committee and it took over a year of course. Russ Lucas incidentally, you know, by the time it finished, he was a third year law student and then a law graduate. Incidentally wrote a national awarding winning J.D. thesis on environmental planning or something like that. But Russ ended up writing a lot of the bill, at least with the legislative council lawyers, but from fall '71 into say the middle of '72, land use planning really hit the headlines all across the nation and that's why McCall got on board. By the time the bill passed, McCall, and it's lovely in the lower of land use planning to think of Tom McCall as the Godfather of Land Use Planning. But without Hector, there would have been no land use --

INTERVIEWER: But he made planning his lead issue.

RUSS BEATON: Absolutely.

INTERVIEWER: I mean the details were left to others and the politicians and so forth and the legislators, but he was the one that really carried the ball for this subject. Today, governors as we know have multiple major issues to contend with. He had fewer issues, major issues, but this is one --

RUSS BEATON: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: -- he's probably is most celebrated.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly. His celebration is well deserved.

INTERVIEWER: Well deserved, yes.

RUSS BEATON: And Henry Richmond met with the committee a few times. Steve Schell met with the committee.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Steve and I had become business partners, along with a very good planner from Portland named Greg Baldwin, whose father was Bob Baldwin ahead of the Highway Department --

INTERVIEWER: ODOT, yeah.

RUSS BEATON: -- and ODOT commission. And Greg and Steve and I and three engineers formed a company called Environmental Discipline's, Inc. And we were all busy with other stuff and we recognized that we would come together as a consulting group. We were intending to do environmental impact statements basically. We had an economist, a planner, an environmental lawyer, water quality engineer, and air quality engineer. We had all the pieces in place. Incidentally we did like \$800,000 worth of business and none of us ever left our other jobs. We never had a full time employee.

INTERVIEWER: Let me move on on a couple things. Looking at question two, just topically, in addition to helping to berth Senate Bill 100, many fathers and mothers were behind that whole effort.

RUSS BEATON: It did. Yeah, many people came through that committee.

INTERVIEWER: But after the bill was passed, topically what are the things you were involved in? Obviously helping to draft goals.

RUSS BEATON: Sure.

INTERVIEWER: And after that, what else besides? And then we'll get to some of the other details, later.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly. I stayed involved. I was hooked on land use planning by then. And I stayed involved in the technical advisory committee process and that's where you and I met.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: I chaired the committee.

INTERVIEWER: There were 14 committees as I remember.

RUSS BEATON: Not originally.

INTERVIEWER: Not originally, because energy came on late --

RUSS BEATON: Originally there was seven to nine.

INTERVIEWER: -- I think.

RUSS BEATON: Oh, I was in charge of the committee called Economics and Pollution Control and on that committee were Bill Moshofsky who had been the head lobbyist for Georgia Pacific and a guy named Hal Sawyer, who was the air quality head a DEQ. And Hal was clearly on it for the pollution control part and Bill Moshofsky was clearly on it for the economics part. Well,

the two of them had butted heads. They had respect for each other, but on an air quality issue for Georgia Pacific, and they had this history. I won't say they didn't like each other, but they had a lot in common. And every meeting would degenerate into a discussion between those two and the other members of the committee, some of the other members of the committee came to me and said, we got to split these guys up, we're not getting anywhere. And so I said, okay, I'll see what I can do. I went back to L.B. Day and told him the situation. Said, yeah, we'll split them up, let's form two committees. And so Pollution Control went off to one.

INTERVIEWER: Goal 6, yeah.

RUSS BEATON: And Economics --

INTERVIEWER: Goal 9.

RUSS BEATON: -- which I stayed with. And that's why we have Goal 9 and Goal 6, instead of just one.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And Jim, I think that's symbolic of this whole program. There are little junctures where accidents of fate happened and where personalities injected in, in a lot of it.

INTERVIEWER: And politics came along too.

RUSS BEATON: And policies emerged from that.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, for sure. After the goals were done, what were your areas of involvement, post goal adoption?

RUSS BEATON: You mean after 1975?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah, of course the bill was passed in '73 and it was to be implanted January 1, '75.

INTERVIEWER: And the famous last hearing --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- you know, when we had outgoing Governor McCall and incoming Governor Straub sit side by side and urge the commission to adopt the 14 Goals.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: I was there for that.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. I think I was --

INTERVIEWER: That was pretty moving.

RUSS BEATON: It was. It was, and my involvement, well --

INTERVIEWER: After that.

RUSS BEATON: After that?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. In general.

RUSS BEATON: In general, I was involved in quite a few of the hearings that took it around the state.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh, a program?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. I, I had a consulting job with the commission or with the department. And helped a little with the Citizen Involvement stuff. I'd been involved with the Citizen Involvement. I'd very strongly recommended and I wasn't the only one by any means --

INTERVIEWER: Oh no.

RUSS BEATON: -- but very strongly, even going back to '71 and '72 as we were drafting the bill, that if this thing is passed, you got to have a strong citizen involvement component. That's sort of the Oregon history.

INTERVIEWER: We're going to talk about Goal 1 later on here so --

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And so I remember several of the big meetings, you know. I remember L.B. being asked, what are you going to do to implement this thing and to, you know, publicize it around the state; he said we'll just go around the state. We'll just go around the state and we'll just hit every element of the state, and people of Oregon are reasonable, and he said, oh, but Klamath Falls, they're thugs down there. He was pretty quick with a quip. But the program did take itself to all kinds of areas in the state. And as I recall, you were an agency official, --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: -- you know much more about this than I did, but the early effort to implement it was very much publicized at first. Rather than before we --

INTERVIEWER: Remember the tabloids?

RUSS BEATON: The tabloids, yeah. I used to --

INTERVIEWER: And those were sent out in (inaudible - 32:06) copies.

RUSS BEATON: Right. I used to come over and get about 20 copies of those every fall and give them to my class on land use planning and ask them, what would you have done if you had read this.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And then I'd say, okay, you're -- you know, as a class element. I used to do this with L.B. Day too. I said, I'm assuming I'm a developer and I want to build a housing tract and you're saying, and you're given this treatise as the guidelines for land use planning, give me your comments, what would you do with it? And, you know, during the goal development process, the technical advisory committee process, I used to say to L.B. Day, you know, the conflicts are going to come when, you know, you've got a goal here that calls for promote housing, you've got a goal here, promote forestlands, promote agriculture, promote

commercial development, you know, whatever, they're going to conflict out there in the real world and local planners and local developed, local practitioners who try to get something done on the land, are going to say, how do I weigh these things.

INTERVIEWER: Reconcile them.

RUSS BEATON: Reconcile, yeah. And L.B. said, let's try a Conflict Resolution Committee and so I met with that two times and the Conflict Resolution Committee could not agree on how to proceed and it disbanded.

INTERVIEWER: Let's go on to question number three.

RUSS BEATON: Anyway, war stories.

INTERVIEWER: Many of them. Probably another interview will be needed with you I think.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Number three, as Oregonians, I know we and our fellow citizens treasure our state's outstanding natural beauty, sights and resources that are not only beautiful, but also are critical for our state's economy. So you look back over the last 40 years, which of the state's natural resources do you believe the state's planning program has been the most successful in protecting? Also, if you wish to identify any areas, sights and resources in your view that the planning program has not done enough.

RUSS BEATON: The one that stands out to me and I've subsequently to the time we've been talking about it, done other studies on urban growth boundaries and land use planning in general, always is agriculture. The thing that it's done the most for is preserving farmland. I really think that. You can look at some of the other goals. Forestlands, yes. But the way I view an urban system, if you look at a regional model, you got a city, you'll have boundaries, housing and stuff

around it, then outside the urban growth boundary you'll have farmlands and then somehow up in the hills, whatever, you'll have forestry. So forestry, I hate to say it doesn't need preserving to the degree that farmland does, but you don't have that strong interface, between forestlands and cities. In other words, land use planning as we could think of it, you know, citing housing and citing industrial development and citing commercial and all of that. The urban uses, they don't intersect with forestry like farmland does. And especially you know, with my good friend Fred VanNatta whispering in my year, I've stayed involved with Fred over the years, because Fred and I were classmates at Willamette. We were in the National Guard together in the 50's, so I've always stayed -- and I've done housing studies for him and so I've always been interested in housing as well. And Fred told me what turned out to be prophetic words back in the early '70's when Salem was adopting its urban growth boundary. Saying look, if you want affordable housing, you need flatland also. Farmland is flatland and affordable housing needs flat land. And to preserve farming, I think this has broad implications all over Oregon, but I'll use Salem as an example, Salem, the good farmland is east of town and north of town and basically the south and the west are hills. Now there is good agricultural activity in the south and west, you know orchards and stuff. All kinds of things can occur effectively in the hills for farming. But purposely, Salem made its boundary to the existing urban lands. It made its boundary pretty tight on the east, pretty tight on the north, Keizer area, and then a lot more space, a lot more flexibility in the south and the west.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Specifically to push housing into the south and west, as opposed to the east. You know, Fred and others told me at the time, says, well the efficient thing to build on a hillside is maybe a daylight basement home. This is a bigger home. He says, we're not going to have any trouble meeting moderate to higher income housing needs, --

INTERVIEWER: Affordability.

RUSS BEATON: -- but we're going to have trouble meeting the affordable housing goals.

INTERVIEWER: Good point.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And that was a wild issue in East Salem, because there'd been developments out there. January Gardens for instance with Bernie Stewart, was the developer, that had created special service districts, sewer and water, so that they could build, and January Gardens was built on county land. It wasn't in the city. It isn't to this day, as far as I know. There were special service districts built in Keizer as well, to create that. And there's a history there, because that's why Keizer is a separate city.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: If you look at Salem urban area, Keizer is just a suburb of Salem, you know, and people ask and have asked for many years, why is that a separate incorporated city?

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Well it's because Keizer developed under special service districts without the need of being in the city and so they essentially could say, well we've got what we need to exist as a suburb or whatever; no need to incorporate ourselves in the City of Salem, we become subject to a lot of other costs too and the property taxes and we don't need to pay the --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: You know, there's always been arguments over the library district and stuff like that, so because Keizer didn't want to come into Salem, it had already been developed in effect. Not completely developed in full urban service thing, but they had enough, see?

INTERVIEWER: They had enough.

RUSS BEATON: And it was avoiding this kind of problem again in the future that prompted Ed Stillings (ph) to develop the notion of an urban growth boundary.

INTERVIEWER: But of course today we have what, two counties and two cities inside our boundary.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And a lot of special (talking over - 39:16)

RUSS BEATON: That's right. And in my opinion, maybe you know differently, I think you live in West Salem, --

INTERVIEWER: I do.

RUSS BEATON: In my opinion, the planning process of Salem visive being in two counties has never been as serious an issue as some of the things they've come up against with Keizer.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: You know, two different cities, rather than two different counties.

INTERVIEWER: Number four, LCDC has adopted 19 Statewide Planning Goals.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Which of these goals do you believe have been the most important for the accomplishment of the State Land Use Program? Which of the goals do you feel has been the least important and why?

RUSS BEATON: Wow.

INTERVIEWER: That's a lot to cover, but just sort of quickly.

RUSS BEATON: You know, I'll make an exception here or a dismissal. I am not in position to judge the effectiveness of some of the more technical goals like pollution, like Goal 6 and like wetlands goals.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Although my daughter was head of the Wetland Program for a while. And I believe the wetlands goals have been pretty well served. There's a whole body of legislation that's more federal and state. Mitigation planning and stuff like that, that kind of goes beyond the scope. There are a lot of federal guidelines for wetlands and things like that. It goes beyond the scope of just what the state could do. But I do think the state's elements there have been pretty effective.

INTERVIEWER: That's Goal 5?

RUSS BEATON: Goal 5, right.

INTERVIEWER: Any other goals you think have stand out in terms or success?

RUSS BEATON: Well I think the Forestry Goal has been successful, but as you well know, the forestry act --

INTERVIEWER: Practices Act.

RUSS BEATON: Forestry Practices Act and the fact that so many millions of acres are on federal lands and all that, that the whole management of forestry innately gets beyond Senate Bill 100, more than the management of farmlands does. So I think the forestry goal, Goal 4 --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: -- has been effective, but I think it's had a lot of help and I think that the primary application of Senate Bill 100 effectiveness has been agriculture.

INTERVIEWER: So it's Goal 3?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah, Goal 3.

INTERVIEWER: All right. Okay.

RUSS BEATON: And quite honestly --

INTERVIEWER: Goal 9? What about Goal 9? That's your --

RUSS BEATON: Well Goal 9, the Economics Goal, I'll be honest with you, my intention of Goal 9, and I've always been a student of the growth process and is growth effective and not. I've written three books on sustainability, so I have been known to question growth for growth's sake, throughout my entire career. I've always taught environmental economics as well, and taught energy economics. My goal was to allow -- in writing Goal 9, was to make sure a local area had the jurisdiction of deciding whether it wanted to grow or not, and if so, how. And a lot of statewide efforts have more or less overstepped that. You know, I mean you can -- now to be sure, if a firm wants to locate in a community -- to be specific, I wouldn't mind seeing a local area be able to say no, if they don't want that firm there. And I wanted the guidelines to say that. Incidentally, nobody picked out that little element in the original goal for a long time and there was an amendment. I didn't take part in it and I didn't necessarily object to it at the time, because it was at least 20, 25 years later. There was an amendment that put a little bit more teeth into that and sort of allows the powers that be to say yeah, you'll take this firm. Now, to be quite honest, very few local areas will say no to a business that wants to locate in their community. But to answer your question directly, there's a big feeling about land use planning that land use planning should make sure the economy doesn't hurt the environment. And it's more of a, okay, locate there, but do it right kind of a thing, than it is to actively stimulate economic development in an area. I have never viewed the economics goal as a main purpose as to stimulate economic development, actually promote it in an area. And I stimulated quite an active discussion in a workshop I was involved in

one when I said that. I remember Kevin Kelly from Lewis & Clark and Ed Whitewell (ph). Ed agrees with that, but he's, ooh, it didn't have to state it that clearly. The Land Use Planning Goal is to make sure the environment isn't hurt by the economy, rather than to stimulate it. I've always thought that the promotion of economic development belongs elsewhere.

INTERVIEWER: So it's promotion versus having sufficient land --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- for that?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah, you can certainly have sufficient land.

INTERVIEWER: And I that's the distinction I think you're trying to draw here.

RUSS BEATON: It is.

INTERVIEWER: I mean obviously every city of a certain size --

RUSS BEATON: Was mandated to have enough acreage.

INTERVIEWER: But also to promote, you know, for its own well-being, they believe, development.

RUSS BEATON: Economic activity, right.

INTERVIEWER: You're not anti-promotion, but you don't believe that the goal per se, it's not a place where promotion takes place, it's to make sure that the planning for economic development is done in a sound effective way.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: I'm just trying to draw that out of you.

RUSS BEATON: Yep.

INTERVIEWER: I mean that's a key point.

RUSS BEATON: Well, you're the one to draw it out of me. You were my staff person on that committee.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, we had a lot of times together, didn't we, huh?

RUSS BEATON: Yes, we did. A couple three other goals that I want to mention.

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

RUSS BEATON: I may be responsible for the fact that we have an Energy Goal.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

RUSS BEATON: Because at the very last, we said what are we missing?

INTERVIEWER: And energy was a big issue at that time.

RUSS BEATON: Energy was a huge issue and I was heavily involved in Statewide Energy Planning. I helped write the legislation that created the Oregon Department of Energy. The committee's work was in 1974 and was still involved in Technical Advisory Committee stuff there too, but I have long felt that energy flows will really end up dictating our economy, and I think we're seeing that 40 years late.

INTERVIEWER: Was Goal 13, which is the Energy Goal --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- written in a way to address what you're getting at or is it something less than that?

RUSS BEATON: I think it's less than that.

INTERVIEWER: So it could have been done a more aggressive posture or more --

RUSS BEATON: Well, there again, it's almost analogous to my comments on economics. You promote energy efficiency and energy conservation. See and let's be real clear with energy. It has an element, economics doesn't. Energy has conservation as a major goal or

production of new energy facilities. You know, creation of energy. And those are very different. And of course the Oregon Department of Energy has wrestled with that and frankly I think done very well at delineating all of those minor nuances.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: But remember, this was 1973 --

INTERVIEWER: And '4.

RUSS BEATON: -- '74 --

INTERVIEWER: '5, yeah.

RUSS BEATON: '4 leading into '5. I had been on a task force in June '73.

INTERVIEWER: You lived on task forces.

RUSS BEATON: I did, yes. It was directed by Joel Schatz who was Tom McCall's energy advisor and I was a friend of Joel's. And I'd have him lecture in class and I'd go over and meet people he'd drag in, you know, like E.F. Schumacher, things like that, Howard Odom (ph) --

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

RUSS BEATON: And there was a task force formed in June '73 because we had a drought. I was appointed to it by McCall and the charge, as far as McCall was concerned, of that task force, was to give us some guidelines as to how to operate in the coming winter when the predicted hydro-electric shortages came on, because it was a drought. Well, Joel's agenda was to predict the upcoming energy crunch in that. And obviously we were an energy based task force because we were allocating hydro-electric resources. The report of that task force in June of '73, predicted oil shock. Predicted the OPEC oil embargo that occurred in October of '73, and you know, because of world oil issues, and so I've always been into energy planning as an element, and because of my interest in it, I started a course in energy economics that I taught for many years.

INTERVIEWER: Do you think we put too much of a burden on local governments to deal with such complex issues?

RUSS BEATON: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: So if you step back and look at the big picture, conservation versus promotion and development of new sources, that's a very complex equation to --

RUSS BEATON: Complex issue. And it's one that an energy goal -- I'm glad it's there, but it probably never had a hope of having a whole lot of effect coming from this agency. I'm glad it's there and it makes the whole planning process look more complete, but you're not going to solve the world's energy problems from the Land Use Planning Agency.

INTERVIEWER: Two other goals about seeking your opinion. One is Goal 1. We're going to talk about that also shortly, but also Goal 14.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. Well they are two, the two most important goals probably.

INTERVIEWER: You think so?

RUSS BEATON: I think because one sets up the process of how Oregon behaves and, you know, we've got a long history of citizen involvement, even going to our structure of how we, you know, operate. Usually with a Citizen Commission, over a department and, as you know, varying degrees of relationships between the governor and the Citizen Commission. The Highway Commission is a great example and then over the Highway Department. And that structure, in addition to the normal workings of the bureaucracy and the governors and the legislators and all that. That structure is a statement that I think Oregon makes of citizen involvement in government and a Citizen Commission that has a lot of say over how the Highway Department runs or how the land use or how the Environmental Quality Commission operates over the DEQ. You know, this

kind of thing. We repeat this process over and over again and I think Goal 1 kind of acknowledged that.

INTERVIEWER: We had some court cases that came along too that were really key. Fasano.

RUSS BEATON: Oh yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And what was the other one down there?

RUSS BEATON: Baker.

INTERVIEWER: Baker v. Milwaukee.

RUSS BEATON: Baker v. Milwaukee, right.

INTERVIEWER: And those brought the decision making process.

RUSS BEATON: Into focus.

INTERVIEWER: In a factual base and both legislative planning, as well as (inaudible - 51:45) judicial planning.

RUSS BEATON: Sure.

INTERVIEWER: You know, on more less the same foundation.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And I think planners from the start were aware that if you go through a process to get a development approved, if that development could be denied because there hasn't been adequate citizen involvement, that sends a pretty strong message.

INTERVIEWER: Right. And it hopefully got the process out of the dark into the light in terms of --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- how people could be involved.

RUSS BEATON: And I remember from Hector's meetings and people that used to come in there, Randy Curtis for instance who was Head of Planning for Marion County at the time. There was a strong feeling and you know, I hadn't been involved in many of them myself up to then, but there's an ethic that every Land Use Hearing, you ask for citizen involvement and none comes until a final approval comes and then you have a donnybrook meeting where the anti's come in. And there was a strong goal to get meaningful involvement into the process before it becomes a fight at the very end.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And the image of a fight at the end as all that the citizens got to say was burning in everybody's mind. That was part of the reason that we tried to energize Goal 1.

INTERVIEWER: That's a challenge even today of course.

RUSS BEATON: A challenge. It will be a permanent challenge.

INTERVIEWER: We'll talk about that in few minutes.

RUSS BEATON: Do you want to talk about Goal 14?

INTERVIEWER: Sure. Go ahead.

RUSS BEATON: Well, Urban Growth Boundaries are the signal. They're the signature element of Oregon's Land Use Planning Laws. And I have spoken on Land Use Planning in, I think five different states and absolutely the first thing anybody from any other state goes to is our Urban Growth Boundary. That's the big difference. You know, you'll have -- we were speaking in Washington once. When my daughter was the Wetlands Director up in Washington, she invited me up to a Land Use Planning forum, and one planner said, God, we'd love to have Urban Growth Boundaries and another developer type said, you're from that penal colony to the south. And so the image of the boundary as an iron ring constraining development is the bad guy image and the

image of it really giving guidance and form and meaning to your entire planning process, is as the professional planner's opinion.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: I of course take the latter.

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

RUSS BEATON: And one of the questions in here, we might as well touch on it now, is do you think the program has worked? I can't tell you the number of people that come to Oregon and say, you know, it looks different here. There's a boundary between -- there's delineation between your farmland and urbanization, urban lands. And that delineation maybe didn't take shape. I mean that's a long-term phenomenon. You wouldn't notice it early on in the first ten years that Urban Growth Boundaries existed, but gradually as they tend to fill up, that's another problem, as population growth continues over the last now 40 years of the program, you can see the difference and people from other states say, oh I envy you.

INTERVIEWER: One of the subtle, but very key issues is that a decision to amend a boundary --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- is not just a local decision. It's also reviewable as it does, is by the State and other participants at that level. So it's a tricky complicated equation to preach local control. That is, you have responsibility to develop a plan and maintain it. Including making sure your boundaries are equate to meet future growth. And yet others come along and say no, that's too big or it's not in the right place or, you know, what I'm getting at.

RUSS BEATON: Yes, the process.

INTERVIEWER: It's the balancing of these local and state interests.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly. And one of the issues -- yeah, I had published three studies in Urban Growth Boundaries by 1982, and all three of them -- the first one being '72.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And then I did one in '76, '77, which looked at the very quick early impacts on land costs in the Salem area of the Urban Growth Boundary. But, in all three of those studies, I said very clearly, a key issue is going to be, what happens at the end of the 25 years.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Urban Growth Boundaries, as you well know, mandated that we have enough land for X, Y and Z for the first 25 years. And I said the key issue is going to be when your 25 years is up, what happens? What do you do? And if you don't want chaos at year 24 or 26, if you don't want chaos, you better give some thought to that now, and make sure that we have a process. Quite honestly, I would love to see the Urban Growth Boundary as a permanent delineation, unless you feel that you've made a mistake of some kind, and that's entirely possible. Because if you're preserving farmland, you're not preserving it for future tracts of housing. You're preserving it for food production and food production is going to be a need in this culture, way beyond the need for suburbs. That's a pretty strong statement, but I really believe that. And I remember saying to Wes Kvarsten once, there's more land inside the Salem Urban Growth Boundary, than there is in Paris, France. And it's four million people and it's never been accused of having a bad quality of life.

INTERVIEWER: That's a lot to think about.

RUSS BEATON: It was a, Beaton, I gotta remember that one. But the point being, higher density urban forums will emerge. Now in another sense, if you look at it, Portland, in the last 40 years has become pretty much the big city model for good planning in the United States.

INTERVIEWER: For metro areas?

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And the reason? There's one fairly simple reason and I think it's the driving one, and that's the light rail system, MAX. Because a non-automobile transportation core, you know, a major development, will give a city its form. And the city will develop around that. You know, the one reason London is livable, is its burrows --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: -- are subway stops. And London has incredible green spaces between those, well inside the greater London area. If you imagine that your major form is suburbanization, suburbs, and the car is your major transportation device, you're going to get LA, Phoenix type of cities. And if you have more density, but --

INTERVIEWER: We only have one metro area in a traditional sense.

RUSS BEATON: That big, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: We have, you know, 200-plus cities or more, that are the Prineville's and the Happy Valley's.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah, you're not going to have a subway in Hermiston.

INTERVIEWER: And I think the agencies have been at work these last couple years and tried to streamline the UGB amendment process. I'm not involved with that at all, but I know that they've been working on this to give a little bit more specificity and guidance to how this should be undertaken.

RUSS BEATON: This was a big issue all along.

INTERVIEWER: It has been.

RUSS BEATON: And it's sort of rural Oregon versus Urban.

INTERVIEWER: And that covers many different aspects.

RUSS BEATON: Huge. I mean that's the driving force behind all the legislator in many ways.

INTERVIEWER: Local control versus, you know, what they view as (inaudible - 100:32) control, and that gets us into that politics stuff again.

RUSS BEATON: I believe that the Eugene's and the Salem's and the, you know, I won't even mention the Gresham, Beaverton, etcetera. They're probably more --

INTERVIEWER: But Bend's 80,000 people now.

RUSS BEATON: Bend and Medford.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: You know they could benefit as some of them have, by more of a transit planning. It's not going to be a subway; it's not going to be a light rail, but a bus system or a rapid bus transit. In some case, street cars.

INTERVIEWER: Maybe so.

RUSS BEATON: Most of the cities used to have them and I was kind of looking forward to the time when a city would say, well I'm dense enough, that we can do something with transit and have some form, some transportation mode that dictates our future development, rather than the automobile.

INTERVIEWER: Those are big questions.

RUSS BEATON: That's kind of my big hope and it's been a long career.

INTERVIEWER: Why don't we take a time out for a few minutes and come back.

RUSS BEATON: Surely.

INTERVIEWER: We're back now. I think we've talked about Goal 1. Do you think we've covered number seven, which talks about --

RUSS BEATON: Are there any land use policies that are missing or were overlooked, that LCDC failed to incorporate? I don't think so on balance. I directed a study that came out of the 77 session that was suggested by Vera Katz, who wanted to experiment with a carrying capacity goal for the Land Use Program. And that didn't turn out to be feasible, but I think she felt at the time, always been one of the main advocates of Senate Bill 100 and mayor of Portland implementer, that if we can get a carrying capacity goal, that would be a summary of everything -- all the goals tried to do.

INTERVIEWER: I think the idea is great, but the details are beyond --

RUSS BEATON: It never would have flown.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we just didn't have a way to communicate, one.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Two, what were the standards we would review something against and how would it work on the ground? You know --

RUSS BEATON: And it smacked of a --

INTERVIEWER: Growth control.

RUSS BEATON: -- growth limit.

INTERVIEWER: And a limit and I think we may get there in other ways, maybe a firm review of (talking over - 1:03).

RUSS BEATON: Of the environment.

INTERVIEWER: Well and the environment generally, right.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. Nature will put those limits on. But I don't think so. In answer to that question, I think they covered everything they needed to at the time.

INTERVIEWER: At that time, right.

RUSS BEATON: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Number eight talks about outreach and communication. We've talked a little bit about that and involvement. Are there any things, in terms of methods or strategies that we should employ as a program to take what we have done and what we are thinking about doing? When I say we, I mean the State of Oregon in terms of the Land Use Program, out to people. And if it's yes, okay, what's the substance of the message and two, what's the ways of doing it?

RUSS BEATON: I'm going to put my finger on an element, and I know that you've done a lot, but the education of professional planners in local governments. And Hector's original vision, as we all know, was that local planners should still do the job. Local control. But they need a framework that makes sense. They need assistance. They need a backbone he used to say or a statewide framework, and I think that's what we implemented. I've been around the state quite a lot and the thing I regret, that I've seen a few times years ago now, were planners who still viewed their job as controlled by the locals and the locals were saying the State is going to force us to do things here and I think a positive attitude on the part of local planners that they're a partner with the State and we're going to help you understand the thing.

INTERVIEWER: When you say local planners, do you mean the actual technicians --

RUSS BEATON: Planning staff.

INTERVIEWER: -- or are you talking planning commissions?

RUSS BEATON: Probably commissions too.

INTERVIEWER: And then of course you have governing bodies and they're the decision makers.

RUSS BEATON: Right. I am talking about planning commissions and the professional planning staff.

INTERVIEWER: Staffs.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. And I think too often, some of them fell into the -- they took orders from the local elected officials and just --

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

RUSS BEATON: -- you know, anti-state control.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: And I've always taken the position, that's regrettable if you do.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: If you use the State framework as a partner, you're going to get a lot further. And they're not coming down and telling you you can't do anything. They're simply telling you think about the criteria for whenever you do.

INTERVIEWER: Technical assistance from the State should be --

RUSS BEATON: And you had a lot of that.

INTERVIEWER: -- emphasis -- we have a lot of that even right now.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And training sessions and a whole bunch of other --

RUSS BEATON: I am not saying that you've never had it nor had enough of it even. I am saying that's critically important.

INTERVIEWER: Now that's one audience, are the local planners.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: What about citizens and do we -- how do we --

RUSS BEATON: It's so hard to involve citizens until --

INTERVIEWER: And how do we know --

RUSS BEATON: -- they see an issue. How do you involve it? I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: And do we get local officials more up to speed and those that are willing to be having interactions --

RUSS BEATON: I have seen elements of a future planning -- a future's project in a community, sort of anticipate your thing. You know, I was part of one in Salem.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And that really enlivens citizen interest in their landscape, shall we say.

INTERVIEWER: It's hard too to get local citizens who are concerned, most importantly, about their own community and their own area, but also, what about things in other parts of the State?

RUSS BEATON: Hard to get them involved completely.

INTERVIEWER: That's exactly right.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: If we're talking about doing things on the Coast, you know, I live in Baker, I'm not going to really worry too much about that, but yet that's where we were in the beginning with the goals when we went out and talked about that.

RUSS BEATON: We had that elements, areas of critical state concern.

INTERVIEWER: Well not only the specific areas, but just, what's important to you on behalf of the State of Oregon?

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: You know, not just in your own county, but, you know, what should you be seeking or hoping for to be done elsewhere.

RUSS BEATON: Uh-huh.

INTERVIEWER: I'm not sure we've ever really dealt with that.

RUSS BEATON: There would be some breakout group activity of that type in the original sessions --

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: -- where -- and in fact I think that was the role of one of the contract, that another colleague of mine at Willamette, and I had with DLCD, to assist with the citizen participation. You know the advertisement of the goals across the state and if you get people involved and say, what do you want and get them to specify features they'd like to see in the landscape.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we live in computer age now which we didn't have back in 1975.

RUSS BEATON: Not at all.

INTERVIEWER: And I know the agencies here and other agencies use, you know, that way of communicating extensively and so that's a method, but what's the content, and that's a whole other discussion.

RUSS BEATON: I know. I think people are getting a little jaundiced about checking the website.

INTERVIEWER: Well they get a lot of stuff.

RUSS BEATON: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: We all do and we all sometimes hit that, you know, delete button pretty quickly, but that's a question I think that the agency, in their strategic planning right now -- I don't know if I showed you that copy of their strategic plan for --

RUSS BEATON: Yes, you did.

INTERVIEWER: And in there, one of the major strategies is outreach and communication and I think that's where we need to put some real effort into how we do it and what is the message and how do we measure the success of it.

RUSS BEATON: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: Those are tough questions.

RUSS BEATON: Well let's touch on that by talking about the future of the program.

INTERVIEWER: All right.

RUSS BEATON: I have to identify my biases. I believe that the energy crisis, the energy situation and the impending end to the fossil fuel area, if we can get quite ahead, you know, as well as climate change. I mean it's all -- energy and environment are wrapped up in one big constraint. But those constraints are coming down on us and they're coming down on us very quickly. They are going to hit our practical every day activities faster than we think and what that means in the element of pure land use planning, I believe suburbia as a form is just about dead, just about over. Now our suburbs as they exist are going to continue to survive. But I'm saying that we will very quickly be seeing that we cannot afford to build massive new suburbs. We don't have the energy for it. We don't have the space for it and I believe that to the degree that we will have saved land from urbanization inside urban growth boundaries, Oregon will be ahead of the game. We've got to continue to honor the Urban Growth Boundary, because it's been the key planning device I believe, in our last 40 years, and I think it's going to be equally more important, if not more so, in the future.

INTERVIEWER: I wonder how we would communicate that to people. And I mean that somewhat rhetorically, but I'm just saying that's a big challenge to go out and talk to a newly elected city commissioner or a county commissioner, what have you, and --

RUSS BEATON: Right. It starts with awareness of climate change, Jim.

INTERVIEWER: And that's a whole other topic which I know -- I'm not sure what the program's connection or relationship is with climate change. It's not just this agency or the Land Use Program, it's state government.

RUSS BEATON: It's a little bit expansive to say that the Urban Growth Boundary will be a tool in combating climate change.

INTERVIEWER: That's a lot to swallow.

RUSS BEATON: It's a lot to swallow.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, and so we need to have leaders. Now we're getting into the personality side of things of not just today but future leaders, you know, in the next 10 or 20 years who can conceptualize some of these important relationships and then how to communicate them to people in ways that they can understand and how they're willing to accept them. Those are big, big challenges.

RUSS BEATON: Big challenges. And we have become so technologized, I don't know if that's a verb, but technocratically adept that experts out there in fields, tend to view themselves as experts in a certain thing. I'm a computer expert or I'm a transportation expert, maybe transit planning or something else. And these are very smart people, very highly educated people, very technically adept, and computerization of all of that is part of it of course. But what we need is leaders that understand in general they aren't going to know all the details that those experts know, but in general that that's all one big picture. Everything is connected to everything else. That land

use planning is going to be one of our major tools in adapting affectively to climate change. And it's easy to say, it's easy to conclude for me, that Oregon has a jump on that with its Land Use Planning Program. We may adapt to climate change a little better than other states. And if so, that'll be as massive a contribution of the Land Use Planning Program as anything you can imagine.

INTERVIEWER: That has to be handled delicately obviously, because if you are saying we need to address climate change, okay, and we connect that closely to the Land Use Program and people see climate change as a result of land use planning and I'm not saying that makes any sense really, but for a lot of people, there would be that connection, that if we were the break that link, things would be a lot better. And a lot of people just haven't gotten that message yet. We could talk about schools. We haven't even talked about schools and we're running out of time here, but you know, the whole thing about educating our young people, I don't mean It's necessary at the elementary level, but certainly at the secondary level and most certainly at the community college level and even in the regular --

RUSS BEATON: It goes back to the old environmental adage, you know, it's warned, threadbare, everything is connected to everything else.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: And we have gotten in the habit of a culture and this culture is so glitzy in it advertising dominates everything. In the recent years, the political conflict, you know, the culture wars I used to call it in classes, that people tend to look through scientific information and ask does this support or does it oppose my already pre-disposed value judgement, see?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: And now how that might take place in what we've just been talking about? Supposed that you've got a little issue of land use planning that's a favorite to you, getting

something approved or whatever. If somebody says to that person who's having a land use issue in his community, you know, this land use planning is going to be useful in climate change, combating, just because that person is already irritated about his issue, his or her issue, he's likely to say, that climate change stuff, I deny that too.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And a whole lot of that has gone on. A climate change is denied by vested interests that just simply don't want to believe it, so they look to some crackpot scientist that happens to support what they believe. Oh, science.

INTERVIEWER: If we just open up the UGB, we might be able to get around climate change, which logically doesn't make a lot of sense.

RUSS BEATON: It doesn't make a lot of sense.

INTERVIEWER: But for a lot of people, they might see that as a way to attack the program and I'm not saying that's even being talked about too much, but I think the possibility of that happening is not --

RUSS BEATON: What I'm saying is, in the connection that I just made, may come back to haunt us.

INTERVIEWER: Right. So it takes some skill and then I come back to leadership.

RUSS BEATON: Indeed.

INTERVIEWER: I don't know, if you look ahead, where those leaders are and who they will be and do we take decisive efforts to try to educate and inform? Yes. But how we go about doing that and who will do it and whether there's money going to be provided to provide for that. I mean, this is not going to happen on the cheap end. I'd like to think that the Oral History Project, and now I'm sort of getting ahead of myself a little bit, but how can we use the information

that we've collected and we're going to be archiving, how can we then -- other people, not just historians, but for people who look ahead and see these various interviews and so forth and say, you know, there's some things here that we ought to focus on.

RUSS BEATON: I've done enough of grandiose unfocusing of it, let me focus us back for a moment here on something you've already written. Number 12. Some Oregon land use observers believe the approval of Senate Bill 100 in '73, was due to the convergence of four key factors. You know, vision, leadership, federal money and luck. Well, yeah it was a nice amalgamation then of environmental, agricultural and urban interests, really.

INTERVIEWER: And leadership.

RUSS BEATON: But leadership. Yeah, leadership was so key.

INTERVIEWER: They galvanized those things together.

RUSS BEATON: Now it goes back to where I started. Hector MacPherson saw a need. It was a very localized need, but he generalized it so wonderfully. I can't believe anyone -- I've never seen anyone else in Oregon legislature, generalize a local problem into the appropriate statewide legislation better. Sometimes if you have a problem that's come up and somebody goes into the legislature and we're going to pass a law that means this problem won't come up again, the law is grotesque, you know, it just doesn't work. It's what I call legislating by anecdote. You know, you can't do it. Well, we had the vision -- we had that vision then that land use planning is needed. We've got another visionary need coming and it's coming soon and it's a vision that climate change is the big challenge for our entire culture. Now land use planning is something you can do locally. But the history of the environmental movement, which I've been very up on, you know, throughout the years as well, I've always viewed land use planning as an environmental issue in part. And I always involve land use planning in my environmental economics course and I

always use environment in my land use planning courses. So they're always together to me and I forget that other people view them in compartments.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: Well, we need vision about climate change and what we can do about it locally. The reason it might be even tougher than land use planning enactment was for the State of Oregon, is that there's an excuse for saying, oh, that's a global issue, we can't do anything about it here. You can do something about local land use planning. I mean, period, we know that.

INTERVIEWER: Does number one on that page connect with number 12?

RUSS BEATON: It does.

INTERVIEWER: The word livability, is that sort of a hackneyed phrase or term or is there some real meaning and importance to that? I mean, do we have a livability's issue? Are we more livable today than we were back in '73? The answer would be in some respects, yes, in terms of like farmland or UGB's, but are there some other things that are --

RUSS BEATON: Let me develop a ten second history of livability. In my opinion, the whole Oregon land use movement started with livability.

INTERVIEWER: Or the threat to livability?

RUSS BEATON: It started with livability.

INTERVIEWER: Or the threat to livability.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And I mean McCall used to talk about livability a lot. I mean more than Hector did.

INTERVIEWER: Sure.

RUSS BEATON: Hector was into the land use planning. I mean, he's big on livability too, but McCall articulated that. Then in the last 30, 40 years of implementing it and the

technicians, you know, the home builders, the realtors, the developers, you know, the ones that want to make damn sure land use planning doesn't get in the way of the economy. And as you know, there have been what, over 200 amendments to Senate Bill 100, most of which I have not kept up with for sure. But livability became a cliché at that period of time. You know, of this livability thing, you got to create jobs, you got to do this, you got to have acres, you got to allocate 100 acres to, you know, industrial development, etcetera, etcetera. The implementers that like to view themselves as the hardnose, you know, the lawyers and the consultants and the technical planners, you know, this livability thing is fine, but you can't hang your hat on it. Livability has come back and it's not back into our everyday vernacular as a reason for being, for doing the next legislative act that's needed, but that's where you connect to the public.

INTERVIEWER: We can't do anything directly, administratively, but how do we connect future leaders with the need to maintain and ensure livability in the future? That's the question I think that this program faces in some respects.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Not that we want to promote more regulations. That's a whole other discussion about the non-regulatory approach to certain things, but we don't have time for that today.

RUSS BEATON: We haven't even got into that.

INTERVIEWER: That's your next interview maybe.

RUSS BEATON: Maybe we can do that again.

INTERVIEWER: But livability, in terms of, you know, what can we achieve and what, how do we measure that we're moving forward on that or are we falling behind? And I don't have -

-

RUSS BEATON: Has the Oregon Benchmarks Program, which I've only been partially involved in --

INTERVIEWER: That's a good question. And I don't know. And it's also a political question.

RUSS BEATON: Is that defined livability?

INTERVIEWER: It's a political question too.

RUSS BEATON: Oh yeah.

INTERVIEWER: I mean certain people running for office are going to say, are livability's threatened by regulations --

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: -- as opposed to enhanced.

RUSS BEATON: And when you go into a local workshop with citizens and you get answers. They're all over the map when you ask people what does livability mean to you, what things do you want to see in your community that would cause you to say, this is a very livable community.

INTERVIEWER: If we break it down and we're not going to get too far with this today, but there's the environmental aspect of it, there's the whole issue of --

RUSS BEATON: Neighbors.

INTERVIEWER: -- the climate things, the crime issues.

RUSS BEATON: Safety.

INTERVIEWER: Safety. There's education.

RUSS BEATON: Walkability of communities. People will mention stuff like this.

INTERVIEWER: Affordability.

RUSS BEATON: Affordability of housing.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: Good schools, access to parks, you know.

INTERVIEWER: All those things. They all come together obviously to say, Oregon is a great livable state or Oregon has slipped backwards and how do we get our leaders to come together? These are rhetorical questions that we're not going to answer in today's interview --

RUSS BEATON: I know.

INTERVIEWER: -- but I think are out there that this Oral History Project can help shed some light on what we've accomplished and what remains to be accomplished up ahead.

RUSS BEATON: Uh-huh. Does there always have to be -- at the end of the day, once citizens have articulated some of these things, there always have to be someone who's in charge that knows how to get it?

INTERVIEWER: It's achieving, right.

RUSS BEATON: Yeah. See? In other words, I've had many, many experiences with planners all over the state. I've educated a lot of planners.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And the image that, oh I live out in a community and I'm going to turn the community over to my planner to make sure it's livable. But the planners don't view themselves in that power role and I don't think they are. They end up being the watch keepers of a whole bunch of codes. Setbacks. You see, our codes don't promote -- they aren't appropriate for promoting livability always. They promote economic efficiency sometimes. They do good things, but having experience trying to develop a sustainable project at Fairview and trying to say, we want

to get a sustainable community here and some of the things that all of the sustainability experts in the world say, well you need this and this and this, you go in and you can't have them because of the way the code reads now.

INTERVIEWER: Which is what the planner's going to say, you know off the record, I agree with you.

RUSS BEATON: They all say that off the record.

INTERVIEWER: I have an ordinance in plan policies I have to go by and I just can't go in and say, well we're going to sort of just look the other way on them. You can't do that.

RUSS BEATON: You can't do that.

INTERVIEWER: You shouldn't obviously.

RUSS BEATON: No. Right. And so in the opinion of those kinds of people, the planning decision ends up with the developer coming in asking for as much as he or she can get, and the planner administering the code allowing it to go right to the limit of what's allowed, and that's it. And that's what you get.

INTERVIEWER: Is he at fault or she at fault for doing that? No.

RUSS BEATON: Right. And that's why we've got suburbia.

INTERVIEWER: Right. And maybe we ought to re-examine that, which leads me I guess to my final topic I think for today. You and I, we can talk for a long time on many subjects, as the evaluation of the program. And we haven't really talked about that yet. And we've had the big look report and so forth, but should we institutionalize, and I'm not sure I like that word exactly, but an evaluation that would occur every set period of time and how it would be designed and how we would connect it to some of these big macro issues like livability and climate change and, you know, lots of other subjects is -- those are big --

RUSS BEATON: Let me ask a question, who do you ask when you evaluate?

INTERVIEWER: Right. Who do you ask? What are the questions you are asking?

You know if I go to you as a citizen in a neighborhood and say, is your neighborhood more livable today than it was ten years ago, and you might say, I don't think so because of whatever.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Or it's okay, but I don't --

RUSS BEATON: You know what would be an interesting comparative study is, you ask people to evaluate the program and you ask targeted groups of people and you ask, here's all neighborhood citizens, here's all professional planners, planning commission members, you know, and you would get some fascinating results by differentiating between the types of arguments, the types of answers you would get from the constituencies, and I'll bet you could put those together. You only start -- here is the cadre of 50 planning commissioners only and here are their answers. Here are 50 citizens out there, parents, you know, whatever, and you'd get fascinating results and you'd get, well gee, I see when I'm evaluating the program, that the perspective of a citizen is absolutely different from the perspective of a mayor, or a --

INTERVIEWER: Or a legislator or an interest group representative.

RUSS BEATON: Right. Everybody intersects with this program at their own level. I think one of the -- you know, not to play up the importance of this project and the people you are interviewing, but simply the verbal responses and comparing them. Because you're interviewing different kinds of people, even in this project. Comparing the answers you get from us would be rather useful. I'm not saying we're the -- set us up as the God of evaluation, but you know, per instance, I think the program has worked a lot because it's changed the landscape of Oregon.

INTERVIEWER: Or prevented it from being changed in ways that we wouldn't --

RUSS BEATON: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: Same thing.

RUSS BEATON: Same thing. It has adjusted the way we have developed. And my evidence is a lot of people who have seen a lot of other places that just say starkly, my God, this place is so different from Texas or California.

INTERVIEWER: Now we are half owned by the Federal Government, that helps too. You know, I think if we were all --

RUSS BEATON: I know.

INTERVIEWER: -- privately owned or, you know, it would be a much different situation. But I don't want to get into that today, but I think the idea of an evaluation on a fixed schedule has merit in exploring.

RUSS BEATON: Uh-huh.

INTERVIEWER: Of course that might mean that the legislature would have to authorize that in some way. I don't know if we should do it --

RUSS BEATON: You know what you need are hugely thoughtful and broad thinking leaders to read the evaluation. Because the evaluation itself is going to be all over the map, isn't it?

INTERVIEWER: Well it depends how you structure it.

RUSS BEATON: I know. You want to get a wide range of opinions, that's my point. And if you get a technocrat reading what you and I know, the range of stuff you will get in a good evaluation, I'm assuming the evaluation is done well and it's done broadly, comprehensively, you get a technocrat reading it and say, I can't use this. This livability, this, you know --

INTERVIEWER: Well, there might be different prescriptions for different audiences and it's to say, here's the things that we ought to do to the statutes. Here are the things that ought to

be omitted or changed with administrative rules or statewide goals, here are things in local ordinances, here is what we ought to do in terms of outreach and communication. I mean you're not going to get the perfect answer after the first evaluation, but you are going to be given some guidance I would hope or at least some indication of where we should be heading.

RUSS BEATON: You'll see themes.

INTERVIEWER: What we should be moving toward or what we should be moving away from.

RUSS BEATON: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And do we do that across the whole state? Do we focus on regions? I mean there's lots of structural questions that we would have to --

RUSS BEATON: Well, how have we done in your opinion? Let me ask you, how have we done in differentiating cleanly to their satisfaction, the varying needs of urban Oregon and rural Oregon?

INTERVIEWER: I think there's many people in rural Oregon, even though they live in small cities, who feel that they've been either overlooked or that they had problems that they're not being able to achieve.

RUSS BEATON: Well the common thing I hear is that we're not Portland and the Land Use Planning Guidelines pretend we are.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, I think --

RUSS BEATON: Or they force us to deal with problems we don't have.

INTERVIEWER: No, I think the agency or the program has tried to --

RUSS BEATON: Regionally.

INTERVIEWER: -- tailor and scale back a little bit, some of the requirements for cities under 2500 for example. We have about 242 cities in Oregon, not counting the metro and so forth. Wow, that's a lot of communities and we can't expect them all to march to the same drum or the same path. We have to come up with different ways.

RUSS BEATON: And I think your field reps have done a reasonably good job, to the agreed that I know them. I know a few. They've done a reasonably good job of fitting themselves into that culture if you will.

INTERVIEWER: They can both take messages out and bring things back. We've also done a lot I think to regional problem solving groups and organizations and various agencies.

RUSS BEATON: Regional solutions.

INTERVIEWER: But regional staffs of various agencies meet, and I don't know a lot about this anymore, but get together and focus on problems in a certain area or a certain region. Now how is that working? I would hope that it's working well and it's producing some good tangible results. But I don't know. So any evaluation of the program as a whole should obviously take credence and take a serious look at how that's working. And I think the strategic plan, and maybe that's a vehicle that we ought to be focusing on in other discussions, maybe --

RUSS BEATON: A strategic plan?

INTERVIEWER: That the program has a strategic plan, you know, and it's fairly broadly worded, but it goes out to 2022 and there's nothing magic about that particular year, but the idea is, looking ahead a good ten years or so and where should we be directing our efforts, our resources, our skills, and a lot of those kinds of questions.

RUSS BEATON: Any state agency would be asked, what's your key focus, what's your effectiveness range?

INTERVIEWER: And do we have benchmarks that we measure against and there's a whole bunch of, you know --

RUSS BEATON: You know what I fear Jim, to be a cynic here, it's customary to ask for accountability in state government, you know, and the whole culture clash issue, political, conservative, liberal, whatever you want to call it, you know, irritation with government, you know, has forced that on it. I mean, the private sector loves to ask for accountability in government and all that. And I've seen efforts to provide that crank up, where you really don't know where it's going to go and even the very most able and brought state employee, you know, are to say, how do we account for, how do we measure? And you know, the other side of that is, of course, is metrics, metrics. Everyone wants metrics.

INTERVIEWER: How are we doing?

RUSS BEATON: And see, yeah, if I ask you two questions, define livability and ask for metrics. You see, there's the conflict right there. Livability is a feeling in most people's opinion. You know, I can't measure it. I just want to know that if I walk down the street, I'll see a neighbor that I like, you know.

INTERVIEWER: And I'll have a job, you know, that's going to pay me well.

RUSS BEATON: Right. I'll have a job and my kids will be safe and go to school.

INTERVIEWER: And I'm not -- neither of us is saying that the Land Use Program has answers to all of those things, but we ought to at least identify that those are things that ought to be factored in.

RUSS BEATON: And let me tell you what's happened. A soccer mom will say, I'll tell you what livability is, it's having good schools, you know, and safe kids. Right. Well, the home building industry was smart on that and the developers or whatever and, you know, a lot of them

are good friends. I'll tell you what livability is, having a job. You know, livability starts with economics. And that's an attitude that dominates if you're not careful.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: You know Salem has been accused of being overly say Chamber of Commerce dominated. Well those people involved in economic development and I've been involved in it, hell I ran a study with L.B. Day that resulted in SEDCOR being formed here in Salem. I'm no newcomer to the economic development game. But the people who really promote economic development above all, business leaders, etcetera, they articulate the strong feeling that livability begins with a job, begins with incomes and then pretty soon they forget everything else. People are likely to say whatever their pet need is. That's the main element of livability.

INTERVIEWER: Are my kids going to be educated well, will I have job, do I have a community I enjoy --

RUSS BEATON: Somebody serving on the Parks Board, they'll say parks and open space, that's what livability is about.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And all of that is true, but see, that's what's happened is, is buzzwords like that have been used to pull it in under the tent to support whatever I believe.

INTERVIEWER: Or to oppose.

RUSS BEATON: Right. Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RUSS BEATON: I am the CEO of an oil company. I'm going to grab a hold of this guy that says the next climate move is an ice age. See, so climate change is, we're cooling down buddy, as fast as we're heating up.

INTERVIEWER: That's right.

RUSS BEATON: We need to get that oil out of the ground.

INTERVIEWER: We just have a couple minutes left. You must be out of energy so to speak.

RUSS BEATON: I'm not, I'm fine.

INTERVIEWER: Any closing thoughts about this interview, but also the project and things we ought to be thinking about in the future? Just take a few minutes.

RUSS BEATON: The project can end up being very important, depending on who all we get to interview. And I got to say, you know, I'm on tape here; I feel as part of a project, I feel as a part of the project as much as an interviewer. I'm also as an interviewee and I'd be glad to do that in the future. But this Land Use Program has been Oregon's signature activity for the 40-plus years I've been back in Oregon. I've lived in Oregon well over 50, 60 now, yeah. Born in LA three years before I moved here and then I was gone for 11 years for graduate training and teaching other places. Since I'm 76, I guess that means I've been in Oregon like 65 years.

INTERVIEWER: You don't look like you're 76. Go ahead.

RUSS BEATON: I try not to. This is a signature achievement in my opinion. I'm biased and any effort to document any of what's happened is worthwhile and I think we'll be -- I hope will be of interest to researchers and anybody who is interested in the future of this state ongoing. So good luck. Good luck finishing up. It's been a pleasure.

INTERVIEWER: It's been great too and this discussion will not end here obviously. We're going to, as you say, collect the various interviews I hope and read them and pull them together and --

RUSS BEATON: I might be interested in seeing some of the particular interviews myself.

INTERVIEWER: Oh yeah, maybe your own.

RUSS BEATON: Well --

INTERVIEWER: You'll get a chance to do that.

RUSS BEATON: -- no others more than mine. I know what I said. I'm curious to know what Fred VanNatta will say and Ward Armstrong will say and Ed Sullivan, Steve Schell and people like that.

INTERVIEWER: Steve Schell is next Wednesday for me.

RUSS BEATON: Are you interviewing Steve?

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

RUSS BEATON: Well please say hello for me.

INTERVIEWER: I will.

RUSS BEATON: At the birth of this project, we had an ongoing joke remember, that Steve and I were both ticketed to be interviewed and maybe to be interviewers. Get the two of us together and let us interview each other.

INTERVIEWER: We'll give you some boxing gloves.

RUSS BEATON: Right. I won't have any conflicts with Steve. Incidentally, our business that I mentioned, Environmental Discipline's, Inc., we took it under. The main job we did was the environmental impact statement of (inaudible - 1:41:10).

INTERVIEWER: Right.

RUSS BEATON: And we ended our company, because Steve didn't want conflicts of interest when he became the Vice Chair of LCDC.

INTERVIEWER: The clock keeper has showed up, so it's been great to talk to you today.

RUSS BEATON: The time Nazi. It's been fun.

INTERVIEWER: We've had a great conversation.

RUSS BEATON: Is that off?

INTERVIEWER: Yes, for today, all right?

(Concluded)