

Jim Sitzman Interview

Thursday, 8/27/15

INTERVIEWER: Today is August 27, 2015, and it is my pleasure to be speaking this morning with Jim Sitzman. Jim has a long career in Oregon Land Use, including time at Metro and its predecessor, the Columbia Region Association of Governments, where he assisted in drawing the first urban growth boundary around the metropolitan area. He has also been a longtime field representative for the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Jim holds degrees from Willamette University and Harvard Divinity School. My name is Kevin Pozzi and I am the Program Manager here at Planning Oregon, which is a new program within the College of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University. Jim, we're honored that you'd be willing to sit down with us today and are hoping to gather as much information as we can from the people who are influential in forming and shaping Oregon's Land Use System. We're hoping to document the stories, anecdotes and experiences of people who were involved back then, as well as to get your thoughts on how the system has evolved, and where you think it might be headed today. So we encourage you to share anything you feel is relevant and I'm ready to begin. So as we start, I was hoping that you could touch on your personal and professional relationship with Oregon's Land Use System.

JIM SITZMAN: Sure. I had my start at the old Columbia Region Association of Governments, which as you've indicated, later became Metro. The urban growth boundary was actually concluded under the jurisdiction of Metro, the transition having occurred while we were laboring to get it put together and I guess my background is kind of unusual in that I had no formal training. I still have no formal training in the various subjects that inform urban planning or land

use planning in general. I had been recruited to the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) to do regional social service planning.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JIM SITZMAN: And I was there just a few months when the City of Portland representative changed with Neil Goldschmidt's election as mayor, and as those who remember Mr. Goldschmidt will attest to, he was a pretty dynamic personality, and it didn't take long for him to persuade the director at CRAG that the agency ought to spend what few chips it had on land use and transportation and not get further into social services planning. So, that left me kind of hanging there observing what was going on and in the meantime, the staff of the planning department came out with its "Red Book," as it was familiarly called, a large document that set forth a regional plan for the Portland area and it had, from my understanding, a limited amount of input in its production from local government to officials or planners and so it was popularly distributed around the region and people began absorbing it. There was a large human cry against it and that the neighboring region was trying to use to assert too much local authority, et cetera, et cetera. In the -- to make a long story short, the aftermath of that, the director of that department left the organization. His assistant was put in an interim position, but he left shortly after for a vacation. He went to Spinehorn in Scotland to try to find himself, following a divorce that he had had and he came back, worked a week, and came in the following Monday and resigned. So, that left the director with me sitting on the sideline and one of his two major departments without any leadership. So, he asked me to do an interim and the upshot of that was that it coincided with the need for Metro to begin orienting its planning program to the State Senate Bill 100 Program, and so our first assignment while I was doing an interim stint, was to draw up regional goals and objectives, which were largely patterned after the state goals and objectives, and then to commence

work on the metro -- the urban growth boundary, the law having been changed recently to assign to CRAG that responsibility, rather than doing 27 city boundaries in the metro area. So, I'd launched into that and I eventually became the permanent director of the department and followed the process through. And I would just observe about that that I think what made that work was the fact that I had had a history in working in group work type activities with the Portland YMCA, had a communications degree background, yet my degree work indicated I had some ability intellectually to comprehend subject matter, and that combination I think became very useful, because with the "Red Book" experience and then not having been much collaboration, that was really necessary getting into the UGB and the goals and objectives work. So my talents were to work with committees and staff, to communicate to boards and committees, to public groups and that combination of my skills, put together with 10 to 15 staff people with a wide diversity of backgrounds in planning, I think may have been a good combination. At least we got through the exercise and the boundaries eventually as (unintelligible) by the State.

INTERVIEWER: And we can talk more about your experiences with DLCD maybe at a different point in the interview.

JIM SITZMAN: Oh, okay.

INTERVIEWER: But I was hoping, you know, while we're back at that topic, what did you personally hope to accomplish in carrying out SB 100?

JIM SITZMAN: Well, I think, having gotten into it the way I did, part of it was just survival.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. (Chuckling)

JIM SITZMAN: (Chuckling) But, you know, and I recognize this was -- what I'm about to say was kind of an awareness that accumulated over time, but I think a couple things that

stand out was the -- I recognized in the goals, the opportunity to steward natural resources and human resources of the region. That became pretty evident with the emphasis on Goal 5, the natural resources, air, water, land quality kinds of issues, so that stewardship motivation, I think, was part of it. But I also became kind of fascinated by the fact that we're crafting a rational habitat.

INTERVIEWER: I like that phrase.

JIM SITZMAN: I'm sorry?

INTERVIEWER: I like that phrase.

JIM SITZMAN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JIM SITZMAN: I think as I -- as we go along here, I want to emphasize some of the comprehensive nature of the planning program that was set down by Senate Bill 100 and that comprehensiveness became exciting as you looked at inventories, you looked at the lay of the land, the extent of existing development versus undeveloped open space areas, and as we were considering all of those kinds of facts, it became evident that we were shaping the habitat for the region and that was important to me.

INTERVIEWER: And do you feel satisfied that those hopes were realized?

JIM SITZMAN: Satisfied maybe is a little over the top. I do feel that we are fortunate in this region for having done the planning that we've done. I often think about, you know, driving from Portland to Boise, and crossing over the border, and seeing for all those miles into Boise, the rural landscape fractured by subdivisions in both residential and industrial and things kind of a hodgepodge of growth and development. I was born, though not raised, in Colorado in the Denver area, outside of Denver, and the same thing is evident when you drive around that part of that state and so, you know, the fact that we can still go from Portland to Eugene and you see cities, but

they're confined to their local and the intervening spaces are pretty rural and pretty agricultural and pretty oriented to forestry activities and that's satisfying. So, I think, by and large, we've been favored by what we've done and we'll get into, I'm sure down the line here, but I think there are some danger signs that we need be cognizant of too.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we'll get to the danger in a little bit, but as you're fully aware, LCDC adopted 19 statewide goals, and I'm wondering which you feel may be were most important to the accomplishments of the program and maybe which ones haven't held up?

JIM SITZMAN: Well, no surprise. I think Goal 14 was probably, uh, among the goals, probably the chief one. It's a little hard for me to be too selective on that however, because I think the real value is in that comprehensiveness again.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

JIM SITZMAN: And I put Goal 14 on top because of all the single goals, that's the one that is most comprehensive. We spent a lot of time in doing the boundary, doing inventories of all the various elements represented by the various goals, and so, you know, when we started drawing lines, they were informed by good information. When we started estimating quantities of land for housing and industry and so forth, there was an understanding behind that of the economy of the area, the types of employment that are endemic to the area and were reasonable to expand upon. The kinds of housing that the region already had a lot of and the kinds that it lacked, because we not only knew single family versus multifamily and types of multifamily in their quantities and so forth, but there was a correlation to income that was related to being able to afford different kinds of housing. So, it was a comprehensive complex enterprise that we had to go through and, you know, interestingly, where it really started to break down I think in my mind was that the technique that we used in that process, was to take the Statewide Goals, frame them into

more simplified language, send them out to all the cities and counties, and said in your area of jurisdiction, send us back a map showing where you think these goals, if applied properly, would result in an urban growth boundary for your city. And they were later taken out of our jurisdiction, but North Plains, that you mentioned a few moments ago, as an example, came back with a map that had its urban area going all the way out to the -- to the hills to the north of the city, a massive, massive area, and so that -- we started bringing that in and then when they were taken out of our jurisdiction, LCDC in working with them, greatly shrunk that. One of the real areas of controversy was in the Beaverton area where Beaverton had gone over a mountain or a hill ridge, ridgeline and had large acreage on the backside, which took it out of the existing sewer system and so we began piecing together kind of the -- both fiscal costs and environmental costs of opening up a whole new drainage basin to accommodate typical sewer systems or the cost elements involved in pumping large quantities of sewage into the existing drainage basin. So there was that kind of comprehensiveness again that was present in, you know, our activity. And so 14, it gets my top billing.

INTERVIEWER: Are there others that you're an admirer of?

JIM SITZMAN: Yeah, well I think obviously 3 and 4, the farm and forest, because of the significance of those two industries to the state economy particularly at that time. There's been shifts in the last 40 years, 45 years in the region's economy, but statewide, agriculture and forestry were and still are very significant. I remember one incident that really brought this home shortly. The mayor of Hillsboro and a couple other Washington County officials asked for a received an opportunity to sit down and talk with the DCLD director and the Director of the Department of Agriculture. Of course we know Hillsboro sits in a very productive agricultural region and, you know, they kept sidling up to the point that they were concerned about why so much restriction was

being placed on them as to, you know, where they could grow and develop. And finally one of them made the observation that you got all this land in eastern Oregon, you got water in Columbia, you know, farm over there. And Bruce Andrews who was the Director of the Department of Agriculture finally says, in direct response to that question, well 252. And they said, what do you mean; he said, your area, because of the fertility of the soil and the water availability, is capable of producing, I think it was 252, 253 different products, different crops and that provides farmers with their large investments, a lot of flexibility, depending on changes in the market from year to year or decade to decade or climate issues kind of stuff, so it's a very critical part of the agricultural economy and it's -- well another thing, well document the importance of forestry in that same regard. So I guess those two probably, putting some tight controls in statewide regulation on farm and forest activity were very important. And I guess the last one I would single out is Goal 1 on citizen participation. I think even from my experience here, doing some of the interviews, it highlighted it for me again, the fact that particularly at the onset of this program, citizen involvement was very, very important, both in developing some understanding of what Senate Bill 100 is all about, giving a very thorough airing to the proposed statewide goals and objectives, the fact that the DLCD staff was bundled up and put in their vehicles and taken all over the state with their charts and maps and....

INTERVIEWER: Security issues I've heard as well.

JIM SITZMAN: Yes. You know so there was the impieties that came out of Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, propelled that kind of effort and it was really important in building a constituency for the program and develop some understanding. And I think looking back at it, we can credit the survival of three different ballot measures against the program to that solid work that was done to involve the public and not only the effort that emanated from the department itself,

But then as the jurisdictions started doing their planning and they had their Citizen Involvement Committees and processes and the state review process of their planning, wasn't looking only at the substantive issues, but also the processes that were being used and the extent to which citizens were brought into it. That also built that kind of constituency. I think it's not going too far to say the trajectory of that being very high at the beginning and, you know, has kind of had its highs and lows and it's probably ebbing at this point to -- you know, I think the Citizen Involvement Goal is still active at the local level when they're doing a periodic review or they're doing a plan amendment or they're reviewing a major development project, there is still that structure and most instances, readily available for citizen public input. But there's not the energy and the massiveness that once was there.

INTERVIEWER: And do you think that's because the goal is less relevant today? I mean we figured out how to do this or is it because we have to, you know, change our processes for a different generation?

JIM SITZMAN: I think it's more of the latter. Some of it's a matter of familiarity. At the beginning it was a matter of inventing some of these committees and processes and so forth and experimenting with different things, but once certain styles and practices became familiar and beneficial, you kind of stay in that. But I do think the social media type era that we're in now, means not only a difference in the environment for citizen involvement at this point, but it opens up a whole host of new opportunities that if some entity, some people really put their minds to it and try to apply various social media resources to kind of breathe in some new life into the program, that that would be very beneficial. And I think it's kind of necessary at this point, too. I was struck by a conversation recently with a very strong advocate from the beginning of the state program. And in the conversation, talking about their contribution and what they saw happening at that time,

there were repeated references to density that they were experiencing in their neighborhoods. They were very conscience of an unexpected consequence of the Land Use Program that they had been champions of, that they were not really comfortable with.

INTERVIEWER: And what aspects of density do you recall?

JIM SITZMAN: What aspect of --

INTERVIEWER: That they were uncomfortable with?

JIM SITZMAN: Residential primarily, but I think it also tripped over into transportation issues. And in fact on the news yesterday, there was a story about Portland being at the top or at least near the top of the metropolitan areas around the country with traffic congestion. Actually I think traffic congestion, that we were down in the ninth or ten spot. But it was also noted in a related news item about the fact that Portland is one of the recipients of the largest influx of population and some of it was being kind of tied back to, you know, climate issues, people getting out of wherever, and it made me think of the travels that I've done in the last 15 years, both to the east and to Europe, I always come back to Oregon and say, you know, I just experienced a lot of beautiful, wonderful places around the world, but Oregon is still very fresh and very special. And when I listen to the news all winter about seven foot snow banks in Boston, etcetera, etcetera, Oregon is kind of a special place, and some of my notes were, you know, we'll get into this a little bit later, but it seems to me that we have a lot to lose and if we take it too much for granted, we could start losing it.

INTERVIEWER: Well just going back real quick, are there any goals that you feel like maybe haven't lived up to what they had originally intended? Maybe, you know, there were certain goals that just haven't accomplished what they had originally hoped?

JIM SITZMAN: I would guess that Air, Water and Land Quality issues were probably not harmed too much in that regard, because we've had a strong DEQ over the years, but I'm not sure we've exacted all of the benefit at the land use planning side of things to have achieved as much as might have in those areas. I guess I would make a similar observation regarding Wetlands. It's still a little bit too easy, although I haven't been a constant watcher of this in recent years, but it's been a little bit too easy to convert a wetland or to pipe it kind of thing. You know, at least we've kind of gotten past the point where a lot of people think of a wetland as a swamp. It's a negative connotation, but I'm not sure we have the level of appreciation about the value and the function of good wetland systems. Metro has, I think, helped in some regards in some of the purchases they've made. I happened to live in an area where there's a very large wetland, that they purchased as part of their open space parks program and are working to protect and upgrade that wetland facility. And it's really kind of rewarding to come down the hill and see a wetland with still a lot of water, even in the circumstances of the hot temperatures this year. So some things are happening, but I just have this feeling that across the public generally speaking, they still are not appreciated and protected to the extent that they should be.

INTERVIEWER: Are there any policies or subjects that you feel like LCDC should have address in the goals that they did not, whether at the time or looking, you know, in hindsight?

JIM SITZMAN: Well a lot of it. Kind of hard to avoid hindsight, but it's valuable to us also.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh.

JIM SITZMAN: I guess one of the things that keeps me a little discontent about how successful we've been in this program, is that, and this is a generalization, I know you people can find exceptions to it, but it seems like we've kind of fenced in the idea of planning. It's one thing to

plan. It's another thing to see those plans executed and to some extent, that is, by the state from periodic review and so forth, making sure that the counties still have active land use plans and that they're using them and if the processes have been set up to make decisions, based upon those plans. The area where I think we were deficient has been more introspective about what those plans mean and what it takes to realize or to accomplish what those plans intended. The density issue I think may factor into this a little bit, talking about citizen involvement and maybe needing to refresh and upgrade public awareness of the program and all. Density doesn't come about by accident and it's not altogether bad or inappropriate. I think Metro has been very insightful in its regional plan, trying to emphasize mixed use development. Emphasize development in the station areas and central cities, so if they get high in density in activity, whether it's residential or commercial or industrial or a culmination and tying that to the transportation system. It makes little sense running a MAX line from one oasis to another with a lot of desert in between, speaking in those terms, applied to the urban environment. Or it makes even less sense to run transit around the places of low density population. I think we need to, on the citizen side, do more to educate and develop awareness about that. And on the execution side of it, to do more to stimulate the kinds of development that makes sense in that sense. I recall when we got the state's acknowledgement of the Urban Growth Boundary, Rick Gustafson, who was the executive of Metro at that time, immediately started to downplay -- in fact, part of his message to LCDC going through acknowledgement was, don't send them back to us again, our resources are limited and we got to get on to some other things. But his notion, which I think was right on, his notion was that Metro needed to shift from the, almost a total emphasis on the planning and begin to exert its influence in stimulating development in places where it made sense according to these plans and the goals, to develop. And with that philosophy, he also said, bye Jim, and I was out of a job. One of the last

things I did at CRAG was to work with Rick to recruit somebody who had had experience in stimulating in public private manner, development in chosen locations. And Phil Whitmore, he came to the region and spent some time at Metro and many more years at TriMet where he was working on stationary development. There was an old ODOT building at 60th and Glisan just up the bank from the MAX line and that property was converted into a civil story residential project, a lot of it oriented to senior citizens. I've noticed just recently in Hillsboro, a property that Phil had acquired for the region through some of the funds that were available to him. It was an old bank building. The property just in the last year or so has developed -- and this is right downtown Hillsboro, a sprawling low rise -- this is a four, five, six story apartment, condominium facility that takes kind of an L-shape around two quarters of a block. And that all came because we had somebody in the region that -- but there's been very little of that, compared to business as usual. I guess one of my observations would be that if nothing else we could be nurturing a more Rudy Kadlubs, behind the Orenco Station Project. We could be recruiting and training, if you will, more people like that to take on significant projects that could change the region.

INTERVIEWER: So based on Senate Bill 100, the Statewide Planning Goals were drafted to express the state's policy interest in local land use planning. Do you believe LCDC acted correctly to ensure that these objectives have been carried out?

JIM SITZMAN: Yes, by and large. I guess I have one observation that they maybe, in many instances, exercised too much patience with jurisdictions that were dragging their feet or not really putting the resources necessary to get the job done. With extension, after extension, after extension, and to some extent that probably was useful in that some children are harder to train and you got to go through iterative processes and try different methods and different techniques, so I think to some extent, that was of necessity, because the commission had to always have at least one

eye towards the legislature and not create a lot of decision makers who were in opposition of the program because their local jurisdiction or their neighboring jurisdiction was being gored in some way by this state agency. So it's a complex environment and there were a lot of things to consider. But there may have been some opportunities lost. For instance, the state had the statutory authority intervene in situations of that kind and do the planning from the state level for the jurisdiction. If that ever happened, it was very seldom, once or twice maybe, so that I think may be a bit of a chink, but it's not a -- also in the statute is the authority for the commission to document and identify activities of statewide significance. In that regard -- which has not been used very extensively either, and so some of the more attractive issues that local governments were faced with, maybe they could have been elevated into that category and dealt with. So in that regard, it wouldn't be so much a matter of, like you were disciplining a delinquent child if you will, but that you were recognizing something larger than that jurisdiction and you were exercising a broader authority to deal with it. So that may have reduced a little bit the effectiveness of what could have happened.

INTERVIEWER: Well you've talked a little bit about, you know, disciplining certain jurisdictions as if, you know, maybe they're children or -- I'm curious if you think that the Statewide Planning Goals have struck the right balance between state and local control that LCD originally intended in 1974?

JIM SITZMAN: Well I don't know I have a lot to add beyond what I just said, but I sometimes appreciate the fact that I -- about myself that I try to recognize context, complexity in situations and again, I think -- let me go back and add a couple things. I think, if you look at today versus when Senate Bill 100 was passed and the program was started, I had doubts that we could do today what we did then. Largely because of the fact that at that time, there was a greater

willingness to collaborate, to cooperate, to work across political lines and so forth, and there were some strong advocates on both sides of the political parties, strong advocates that developed a goal, a dream, and they put the load on their shoulders and they stuck to it and they got it done. I don't think -- there may be somebody out there today, some bodies but haven't emerged in that way, but unless until they do, I don't think we can do today what we did at that time. And I think that carried through in the early years of LCDC as well. The members of the commission had similar stick-to-itiveness and strong convictions. Where people who, despite their views and their objections, were able to work within a context of diversity and complexity. And you know people like, you and I were talking a bit ago, Anne Squire (phonetic), you know, I think she contributed a lot to that, Shirley Anderson, Jim Smart on the agricultural side. Those were people who stood up kind of above the crowd and achieved what they set out to achieve and that's very important. So I think, you know, the ability to look at complexity in that way and respond to this local state kind of dichotomy, you're not going to get a whole sale 100% one way or the other. And the product that comes out is often going to, not look like what you would ideally come up with if you just did it from a state perspective.

INTERVIEWER: Well this might be a good opportunity to discuss a little bit about what your role was at DLCD. You were a field representative, is that correct?

JIM SITZMAN: Yeah, I guess I was. I would summarize that role as an eyes and ears kind of function. And it differed a little bit, part of the time I was there I was sort of a staff coordinator for field reps around the state. You know, looking back at that, and even at the time, I was aware that the challenges to the different field representatives were different, because of where they were working. The decision makers and some of the outline of the state, the planners that were there may not have been as expert, you know, so the role of the field rep was kind of a

teaching, and kind of a directing little bit activity. And the Portland area had some pretty sophisticated dudes around and you know, they knew the lay of the land and so I think a lot of my job was eyes and ears, that I could pick up on the stuff that was happening at the state level that was kind of hot buttons and so forth and relay that to the local people. You know, I tended a lot of the regional planners meetings and stuff, so I'd heard a lot of what was going on. The problems they were having, the kind of aspirations that were being put forward and I could, from time to time, insert a little word of caution or do a heads up to my colleagues back in Salem. And so I took it as that kind of collaborative eyes and ears, being sensitive as to what's going on.

INTERVIEWER: Great.

JIM SITZMAN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: I'm just wondering if you have any interesting anecdotes or experiences from that time, whether it's, you know, someone you worked with that, you know, was unique or whatnot, that you maybe wanted to share.

JIM SITZMAN: Well there was one occasion where Metro was -- this is after the boundary was established, and where Metro was doing a boundary review process and part of that, going back to my comments about inventories and projections and so forth, they wanted to get a projection of housing needs for the next 20 years and so they kicked that ball out to the jurisdictions and said, you know, tell us what you think the needs are going to be in your location and what you think your capacity is to meet that need, realizing that there might be an overall regional estimate and that could be distributed in different quantities and in different locations kind of thing. So you may feel a need, but you really don't have the capacity for that for whatever reasons. And in any event, in that exercise, David Knowles, from the City of Portland was kind of ganged up on by some of the other planners, when he came in with a pretty large number of

housing units projected for the City of Portland. And the skeptics in the group said, oh David, Portland will never meet up with that goal. And then Pearl District happened, etcetera, etcetera. So I've always appreciated David Knowles' experience in that regard. There was another kind of experience, just for the heck of it here, there was one time where some of my colleagues in the region didn't like the messaging that I was delivering to them and taking back, and so a couple of them called Jim Ross, the Director, and requested of him a lunch so they could sit down and talk about me. And so Jim fielded that and said that he would do it and then he called me up and said, hey we have a lunch on such a such a day and so he took me to the lunch and it was a nice pleasant meal, but not much in the way of substantive stuff came out of it, but that was an interesting time.

INTERVIEWER: Well I'm wondering, so what are the major strengths of SB 100, particularly in regard to the Statewide Planning Goals and their relationship to the goals to local comprehensive plans? Do you think there has been any weaknesses or shortcomings that made drafting the goals of the program more difficult?

JIM SITZMAN: I don't know where I would go with that in particular, beyond some of the things I've already said. Henry Richmond, the conversation I had with him, was very emphatic about the, the...I don't know if power is the right word, but of the authority of the state, that when push came to shove, it was that availability of authority and the willingness on the part of some people in the process to utilize that. We may have had -- again, at the earliest stages that was important to a certain extent at the outset. But I think as I discussed a little bit about complexity and cooperation and so forth, over time it really became important to realize that this railroad that we were on had two rails and there was always a need to synchronize, in order to keep things on balance and moving forward.

INTERVIEWER: Well, and this could just be, you know, purely your own thoughts, but while we're on the topic of Henry Richmond, I know he had pushed on the national level for land use regulations similar to Oregon's, why do you think that Oregon is somewhat unique in the way that we've been able to craft this program and it hasn't worked on the national level or maybe to the degree in other states?

JIM SITZMAN: Well probably --

INTERVIEWER: We're special?

JIM SITZMAN: No. Well in a sense maybe. For the same reason that I think it would be difficult to do today what was...what happened then. There was -- and, and I think Henry would, you know, kind of speak to this too, that it was the moment and it was the personalities, the people that were involved. The litany of people. But Tom McCall was a unique personality. The Republican MacPherson was an insightful and dogged individual. And L.B. Day from the legislature was Oregon's example of a big city politician. He was demonstrative, he was firm. To his credit, he'd listen. I'd recognize this, he would, at a commission meeting where their commission is being kind of batted around by Home Builders or whoever, he would listen and then he had a way of putting a stop to it and moving on and saying, yeah, but this is the way it's going to be, kind of thing. So a lot of it was just the environment of the time. I think a significant, when you look at that Senate Bill 100, one of the very first things that's mentioned, kind of in the findings list up front, is reference to uncoordinated use of land. So Senate Bill 100 didn't emanate out of somebody's mind simply, it emanated out of people's observation of what was happening and they had not only the ability to see that and to understand the difficulties with what was happening, but also to speak about it in a way that people could understand. So in McCall's term of

subdivisions of -- I can't remember the exact term, but he had a phrase that he used fairly frequently about the scattered subdivisions.

INTERVIEWER: Sagebrush subdivisions and --

JIM SITZMAN: Charbonneau I think was one of his examples. Here was this little city along a state highway, Wilsonville and all of a sudden the population of Wilsonville is overshadowed by this huge development across the river, which -- a state highway and a state bridge, and that put added pressure on the State's system. In fact one of the -- you talk about incidents, one of the things that I was kind of amused about over the years, was the number of times Wilsonville, you know, would come back to the table with a request for another interchange between the two existing interchanges. And ODOT would have to say, no we can't do that kind of stuff, which is a good example of the support that the goals, the Land Use Goals gave to other state agencies, so that they could talk technically about weave lanes, because of the closeness of these interchanges. But they could also rely upon the state goal as further support for their saying no kind of stuff. And, you know, I suspect Charbonneau might not have happened, had the program been in place at the time, but he had the dream of building this large -- and it's not just private developers. One of the other examples that popped up along the line was the PCC Rock Creek Campus. It still sits out there like a second thumb on your hand, out on the edge of the boundary, but it was way out. Nothing urbanizing near to it at that time, and so it was that kind of thing, uncoordinated use of land that -- so you know, I think for all of those kinds of reasons, it came together at that time. We lack, as I've indicated, I think we lack the leadership to do that today, but I do think going to your quip about "special," that there is something about the environmental consciousness of people in this area. Yeah, we're still weird, we're still the step-child of Seattle or San Francisco, and so there's something about us that causes that and so I think from that point of

view, something more like 100 could emanate today, but it would still take the leadership to bring that together.

INTERVIEWER: While we're on the more political bend at the moment, I'm just wondering if there are any particular prominent state elected local officials or ballot measures or even, you know actions by the Oregon legislature that has advanced or undercut the purposes of SB 100. We've had many ballot measures over the years and just wondering if there was any one in particular that you think really struck to the heart of it?

JIM SITZMAN: Well, I've already talked a little bit about some of the strong personalities. I think -- I'm mentioning the start-up of LCDC and the goal adoption process. I think Arnold Cogan was the right man at the right moment, to realize that to move this thing forward; you couldn't just sit in the office and expect it to happen. You had to get out and mix with the people and get after it. I think it was also, in talking with Arnold, instructive about how he came on the scene out of the Port of Portland and some of the industrial planning that they did for the port properties. That was picked up by Ed Westerdahl and others and relayed to Governor McCall. The type of thing that the port was doing with regard to its special interest and its properties, because a model or a facsimile of what could happen in other respects in the state, in the region. So they were important. I think the ballot measures, even though they were defeated, kind of put a cloud of danger overhead and said, you know, you got to recognize the complexity. You got to travel both rails of the road or the next time, you know, might be different kind of thing. I do think people like Chandler, what's his name?

INTERVIEWER: John.

JIM SITZMAN: John Chandler from the Home Builders, as, you know, in one sense, I think he was a good example of somebody with a mission and a point of view who listened and

cooperated. He could rise above the parochial interest and look at the larger picture and maneuver his way into a place that was acceptable to him and his constituency, but didn't totally upset the apple cart for everybody else that was involved.

INTERVIEWER: Well, it's been 40+ years now, are we or is the system itself prepared for some of the challenges that you might see or that we see here in the future?

JIM SITZMAN: I eluded to one phenomena a bit ago, but I'd take up in response to that, I think the climate change situation is one that warrants us thinking carefully about may it is time or near time to generate a Senate Bill 100 type response. I think it's endemic to the climate change situation worldwide, that we face the prospect of a significant population distribution, where coastal areas, areas prone to desertification, are going to uplift people and move them in search of other places. And as we were talking about Oregon a while ago, I think Oregon becomes -- and if you think of it, we're kind of in that temperate zone between the south and the north and so it's natural that people would orient kind of to that circumstance and if heat and whatever else, drought, water conditions get in the way of life and for people in California, Oregon is pretty attractive and it stands to be attractive, relatively speaking, for some time to come. So you know, I think we really need to think carefully about what those kinds of changes will mean to us. If some of our strong advocates are already complaining about densification and if we're already being singled out as being among the worst in traffic congestion, it ain't going to get any better with the large population that's coming in. And so I think we have the makings of an environment that is similar to Senate Bill 100's uncoordinated use of land examples that people are responsive to, but we have a reason to be thoughtful about this and from my perspective what I said earlier about crafting your habitat in a reasonable balanced comprehensive fashion, that challenge is still there, because that habitat can get spoiled pretty quickly, if it's not continually tended with. And related

to that, one of the most significant specific items is water. I think that's an activity of statewide significance, that ought to be seized on right now and a good broad public exercise undertaken to adequately plan for water. And not the least of the issue, all of the issues involved in that are the privatization of water, to avoid industry trying to take over that. Because of the more precious and limited it becomes, the more incentive and the more sense of prophet potential is going to be there for private interest, and I think one of the worst things that could happen in the region, is to have the public put on the sideline with regard to that resource, so that's an activity I think is -- there's been a lot of concern about the movement of oil by train, around the -- that's another activity of statewide significance, that -- I'm not so sure about what even my -- some of my old colleagues at Transportation Department might feel relieved if they weren't almost solely looked upon as the good guy or the bad guy or the regulator, to take care of that issue. I think it needs to be elevated to a broader discussion and find a strategy for dealing with that issue. Well, kind of related to the water situation, the extent of which agriculture still plays a significant role economically for us. The water issue becomes, not just in the broad sense, but specifically for agriculture, because of the extent of its use of water, we need to enter Ag production into that equation and, you know, protect our water supply by being more efficient in use of agricultural water, which would make, I think over the years, some good progress. I remember as a kid going to my grandfather's farm in Colorado and watching my uncle, who worked on the farm with him, irrigating corn. There were big furrows and they'd just run a little water into the furrows, which had to be a massive waste of water kind of thing. We don't do that kind of thing any more. We sprinkle and it comes down and wets what needs to be wet and the corn is planted closer together, so that they get -- so there's a lot of things that have gone on, but those seem to be some issues look into the future that perhaps Senate Bill 100 or as amendments can address.

INTERVIEWER: We have about ten or fifteen minutes left, are there any other topics or anecdotes that you'd like to discuss? This is an opportunity for your thoughts into, you know, perpetuity.

JIM SITZMAN: I guess on the question of major strengths of Senate Bill 100, I think it's a strength that they set up a statewide commission and that they gave that commission the ability to make it state law. I think that's -- I don't know state government from top to bottom, but that's at least a rarity, if not the sole example of a state commission exercising that kind of authority. And you know, what the commission always had to, like I said earlier, have at least one eye towards the legislature, because the legislature could trump what they were doing, the commission nonetheless vis-à-vis local governments in particular or special interest groups, it had considerable authority that people had in the long run had to account for and be cognizant of, so I think that was important. In terms of, I mentioned Chandler a while ago, there were other Home Builder people who were -- they weren't Chandler's but they were strong advocates for the development community. And I think they were very effective in making their interests and their needs known. I do think it was beneficial that they learned all of Chandler to give and take in the process and that, you know, that was important. I think to some extent, that modeled for some of the other special interest folk, a way to behave or a way to engage or not engage. You know the farm bureau is always kind of the enigma in a way, as they could -- for those farmers among the people of the larger farm community, who didn't want to lose the opportunity for the next subdivision, out on farmland, but as long as they were serious about farming, they had to be cognizant of the help that they were getting from Goal 3 in the state program. So you know, they played this, sometimes both sides of the road approach to things, but usually in the final analysis, yeah, they could at least be silenced, if not become an advocate. But it's another example I think on

the farm thing that signifies the importance of a James Smart at the beginning because he could really drive the serious farmer's interest and embed it into the program. But as he passed on, a lot of that clear focus passed on, so Ron Eber became sort of a surrogate for a strong farmer, because Ron took up that cause a lot and always kept himself informed enough that it was difficult for any opposition just to blow things by him or by the commission who was being counseled by Ron's efforts. So Ron was pretty instrumental. I forgot the question now.

INTERVIEWER: It was just the opportunity to share anything else that you'd like to.

JIM SITZMAN: Yeah, okay. Yeah, right.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we've been speaking today with Jim Sitzman who has had quite the experiences in land use from the Columbia Region Association of Governments to the Department of Land Conservation Development. Jim it's been a pleasure today. If you have anything else you'd like to add?

JIM SITZMAN: I guess in closing I would just caution again that we need to be aware of those unintended consequences and stay ahead of the game, so we're anticipating things like reaction to density and traffic congestion and being proactive to deal with them before they become the rallying cry for the next ballot measure.

INTERVIEWER: Great. Well thank you very much.

JIM SITZMAN: Thank you.