

Note: This transcript was substantially edited for accuracy, clarity, and legibility by Brent Lake and Jim Knight in October of 2015.

Brent Lake Interview
Friday, 07/24/15

INTERVIEWER: Greetings.

BRENT LAKE: Okay. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: My name is Jim Knight. I've served for 29 years on the staff of the Department of Land Conservation and Development, known as DLCD. I retired in 2003. Today is Friday, July 24, 2015. It is my very good fortune to speak with Brent Lake, who has agreed to be interviewed as part of Portland State University's Oral History Project of Oregon's statewide land use planning program. Brent and I began our service with DLCD in 1974.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And as close friends and colleagues, we performed over the years numerous key assignments and tasks for the department and the Land Conservation and Development Commission, LCDC. In some ways, the most important of these were helping draft 12 of the first 14 statewide planning goals, and later, representing the agency as field representatives to cities and counties in regions of the state. Today's interview is taking place in the DLCD main office in Salem, Oregon. 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 Brent as one of the many Oregonians whose hard work and leadership on the DLCD staff did so much to make the enactment and implementation of Senate Bill 100 possible.

Second, for those 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: 1) generate new relevant primary source material and historical records for research projects, publications and articles on Oregon's land use planning; 2) identify and further understand the views, opinions and interests of the many organizations, agencies, officials and citizens who actively participated in the drafting, adoption and implementation of Oregon's land use statutes, statewide planning goals, and administrative rules; 3) 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; and 4) lastly, enable comparison of the current State of Oregon's land use program with the views, opinions and recollections of various participants, regarding their vision and intentions behind the passage of SB100 and its implementation.

Third, we interviewers and the individuals being interviewed, referred to as narrators, in this first group, and those that will follow are the project's most visible participants. However, much is owed to those behind the scene at PSU's College of Urban and Public Affairs, working in close collaboration with DLCD and LCDC, overseeing the project's many details of organization, management and funding. Four who deserve special thanks are Sy Adler and Kevin Pozzi at PSU, and Jim Rue and Rob Halliburton at DLCD.

Finally, in May, 2013, DLCD held a special gathering to mark the 40th anniversary of the enactment of Senate Bill 100 and the startup 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 to today's interview by repeating my May, 2013 remarks. However,

here are quotes from two of the land use program's most famous champions whose words I feel are very relevant as we start this oral history project.

First listen to 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 a sane manner. We're talking about the economy, the environment, we're talking about balance. In short, we're talking about the people and the land."

And the other quote is from the person I feel is the land use programs 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 type of 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 when, since then, when I wondered if it was going to last through the next election. So, I guess, the most delightful thing is that it really is still here and its gotten some national recognition and is 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.

BRENT LAKE: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: Question 1. Brent, why don't you begin, by having you give us a brief personal background of you and your family's arrival, settlement and life in Oregon.

BRENT LAKE: In 1971, I came to Oregon to go to Oregon State University and to get my master's degree in geography.

INTERVIEWER: Where did you come from?

BRENT LAKE: Southern California.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: I was born in Idaho, but I was four years old when my folks moved to California. And so I was in California until I came to Oregon when I was 33. But like I said, I obtained my master's from OSU and went to Bend to work with the state's local government agency. What was it called?

INTERVIEWER: LGRD, wasn't it?

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. Local Government --

INTERVIEWER: Relations Division?

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: And so I worked in central Oregon but the job folded on me because it was federally funded. I applied to DLCD for a job and, fortunately, I got it, because they wanted

someone with a background and of eastern Oregon. And so I got the job at DLCD. I'm a very fortunate person. I've never had a job I didn't like, period. I mean from working in an oil refinery, going to school, then both in Bend, and then here in Salem, and then back to Bend because after three years in Salem I had the opportunity to return to Bend as the DLCD field representative. And, in fact, it was kind of funny, because Wes Kvarsten said, "Now you've got to promise me you'll stay on the job for a while." I said, "I'll give you two years that I will not interview for any jobs, but in planning that's, you know, a fair amount." And he said, okay. Well, I saw him many years later and I was still there. And, he said, "I never believed you'd stay the whole time." I said, "Right up until the day I retired."

INTERVIEWER: For our -- for our listeners, Wes was the director of DLCD.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: At that time, right?

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: He wasn't the director when I -- when I started with the agency, but he became the director and he was the one that decided that we needed field representatives stationed throughout the state, instead of all coming out of Salem.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And so that's what we did. And, like I say, I've never had a job I didn't like and I really enjoyed being the field representative for LCDC.

INTERVIEWER: Question 2 is almost a part of question 1. Next, take a few minutes to recount your overall, personal and professional experience in relationship with Oregon's statewide land use program.

BRENT LAKE: Well, I did get my degree in geography from Oregon State University. It was my understanding that the director wanted me on his staff.

INTERVIEWER: Hal?

BRENT LAKE: No, the first one.

INTERVIEWER: Arnold.

BRENT LAKE: Arnold.

INTERVIEWER: Arnold Cogan.

BRENT LAKE: Arnold wanted somebody from eastern Oregon on his staff. And I happened to fill the bill. So, you know, I worked.

INTERVIEWER: How did you find out about the position being open?

BRENT LAKE: (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: I'm just curious about that.

BRENT LAKE: Well, I applied to the state, because I'd been up in Seattle for a geography conference. I was a geographer so I went up there. And somebody said, have you applied for the DLCD job? And I said, no I haven't even seen an ad or anything about it. So, I called the Oregon personnel office and they said that the position's been closed. So, I called a good friend of mine who worked at DLCD and I said, is that really true? And he says, just send it in and I'll make sure it gets on the stack.

INTERVIEWER: Who was that person? Can you tell us?

BRENT LAKE: I would have told you in a minute.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: Well, the field representative in Southern Oregon that started out there. A bicyclist.

INTERVIEWER: Mel Lucas?

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Mel Lucas.

INTERVIEWER: Mel Lucas.

BRENT LAKE: See, Mel had worked for...

INTERVIEWER: Bob Logan didn't he?

BRENT LAKE: He worked for Bob Logan. And I met him through my work in central Oregon. And so, Mel was able to put my application in. You and I are very similar in this respect. So, I just did, and like I say, they were looking for somebody with eastern Oregon experience and a geographer and there I was. So, it just happened to work out. And I didn't really ever think about leaving the position. There was a couple times I questioned it, but I never did.

INTERVIEWER: You began in 1974.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And how many years did you serve with the department?

BRENT LAKE: 25.

INTERVIEWER: 25 years.

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. A little over 25, I retired in '99.

INTERVIEWER: '99. Wow. And out of all those years you spent only two or three years in Salem, right?

BRENT LAKE: About three.

INTERVIEWER: Three.

BRENT LAKE: About three years in Salem.

INTERVIEWER: And then the other years?

BRENT LAKE: All in Bend.

INTERVIEWER: All in Bend.

BRENT LAKE: All in eastern Oregon from there on.

INTERVIEWER: And the area you served was huge in the beginning until we brought in more staff as field people?

BRENT LAKE: It was huge to begin with, yes. I had all of eastern Oregon at one time. Except for Hood River County, which I got and, you know, bounced back and forth. Other than that I had everything east of the mountains.

INTERVIEWER: You must have laid in bed at times thinking, holy cow, this is a huge assignment, you know, and we supported you.

BRENT LAKE: But I -- oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: -- In Salem.

BRENT LAKE: I liked to drive. It was never a problem. And I love working with small cities. I mean that's the thing that I found out, as I got into it, I really enjoyed the small cities throughout my field area.

INTERVIEWER: Giving them technical assistants and help, right?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: And explaining what the program was and wasn't.

BRENT LAKE: Well, for example, one of the times when we started into the periodic review process and trying to review the program, the person that was in charge before you of the field representatives, wanted me to pool a meeting of all the people to come together. I said, you've gotta be kidding?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: You know, you're not -- they're not gonna take three days of their time to come to a short meeting. They're not gonna get anything out of it, as far as money. And so I ended up going to every city and explaining what was gonna happen. And sometimes it was two or three cities in a day, sometimes it was one. But that's the way it had to be done in my opinion.

INTERVIEWER: You got on, what I would call, a first name or personal basis with a lot of the local officials in small cities.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, no question.

INTERVIEWER: I mean, so when you called, it wasn't just the state of Oregon, it was Brent --

BRENT LAKE: No, this is Brent calling.

INTERVIEWER: Representing our department.

BRENT LAKE: Two things. Yes, they knew me, but they also knew that I worked for the state of Oregon.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: I firmly believe that. And they understood that right from the start that while I can be a nice guy, I was responsible to the Department of Land Conservation and Development. I had to be careful to walk that fine line at all times.

INTERVIEWER: That's really good to know that.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. It is really important.

INTERVIEWER: You're right; that's very important.

BRENT LAKE: That we have people in the program that believed there was the state and there was local government and I felt it was only one program that worked together on behalf of both state and local interests and I really pushed that real hard.

INTERVIEWER: It must've gotten interesting for you when you were dealing with UGB's [Urban Growth Boundaires] and you were dealing in a county with one or more of its cities.

BRENT LAKE: That's for sure.

INTERVIEWER: And, so you had to, obviously, connect with and communicate with the county people, as well as elected officials, as well as city people.

BRENT LAKE: Oh yes. I can't tell you how many people I worked with. I couldn't remember everybody. But yes, I did. I arranged a lot of meetings where I pulled people together and acted as a facilitator in those meetings. I also just talked to a lot of people one-on-one. Here's one of the funnier stories I used. Baker County did not want to adopt a plan. They flat out said, we don't want to do that. And I said, well, fine, but I've got 200,000 good reasons why you should and that's the money that you're gonna get if you do this. If you don't, it's gone, and you'll still have to do it. And so, I think that's what happened. I would tell them what had to be done, but I also told them what the consequences would be if they didn't. And they knew that I worked for the state and I would enforce those consequences.

INTERVIEWER: What were the local officials' concerns, was it their comprehensive plan or the zoning ordinance or maybe both?

BRENT LAKE: Probably both, at least in Baker County, I would say it was both. Lake County kind of felt that way, but they moved away from it. Do you remember when we came back after the state planning goals were adopted and I went to every city in eastern Oregon and I got a letter back and said we don't want to do your program and on the side was a picture of an eagle coming down on a mouse. Remember that?

INTERVIEWER: I do. I remember that very well.

BRENT LAKE: But that's what you got and I didn't shy away from it. I went right back to the county commissioners and said, I saw your letter, I thought it was kinda cute, but there's a lot of people that don't like that, and let's see what can we do.

INTERVIEWER: It would be nice if you have a copy of that still today.

BRENT LAKE: I think so.

INTERVIEWER: That might be something that'd be good for the historical record.

BRENT LAKE: I'll look and see if I do. I'm not real sure what I've got anymore.

INTERVIEWER: So, you worked for about 20...

BRENT LAKE: Twenty-five years.

INTERVIEWER: Twenty-five years and the vast majority of those years was in the field?

BRENT LAKE: I spent three years when I came over here and took the job with DLCD, and worked on the statewide planning goals. I was in Salem three years and then I went back to Bend, and was there the next 22 years.

INTERVIEWER: I mean, you were an institution over there.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I don't know about an institution, but...

INTERVIEWER: Well, we did the best we could to support you and the other field people.

BRENT LAKE: Well, you did a good job.

INTERVIEWER: We also cautioned you not to get into a situation where you would say, do this and you'll be there, because sometimes the issue was complicated.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And one that needed to be talked about, because UGB was a new and how it was gonna work and so forth took a lot of explaining. So, we had to, not invent it, but we had to talk it through in the office. So we, in the office, and you, in the field, not just you as the only field rep, but we all, had to be more or less on the same page.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree. That's why there was at least one meeting a month and for -- even more than that in the early days, but I'd come to Salem for a meeting --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: -- from Bend and then go back that night.

INTERVIEWER: And you'd bring questions in, I'm sure?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yeah, but at the same time if there was a new or amended process or policy or program, I wanted to know what it was what we as field staff were to do.

INTERVIEWER: So, you were informed.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Let's move on to Question 3.

BRENT LAKE: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: As Oregonians, I know we and our fellow citizens treasure our state's outstanding natural beauty, sites and resources that are not only beautiful, but are also critical for our state's economy.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And as you look back over the last 40 years, which of the state's natural resources do you believe that the state planning program has been most successful in protecting? Also, if you wish, please identify any areas, sites and resources, in your view, that the planning program has not done enough.

BRENT LAKE: There's no question in my mind, it's the agricultural goal.

INTERVIEWER: That's Goal 3.

BRENT LAKE: Goal 3 by far has had the biggest impact on everybody. Goal 3 maintained agricultural land, whether here in the Willamette Valley, the range lands in eastern Oregon, or the wheat lands in northeast Oregon.

INTERVIEWER: Could you explain for our listeners and readers, Goal 3 a little bit, in terms of what it did?

BRENT LAKE: Okay. Goal 3 required every county to identify all of their agricultural land based on the definition in the Goal.

INTERVIEWER: They inventoried their land, right?

BRENT LAKE: Inventoried their lands and then rate them based on the federal Soil Conservation Service standards, classes 1 through 8. Class 1 was the very best, such as the bottom lands of the Willamette Valley. Class 8 was the least productive such as the desert lands of eastern Oregon. So, if we had to evaluate that we made the decision to do classes 1 through 6. At one time we were looking at only 1 through 4 classes, because that's really the good agricultural land.

INTERVIEWER: Soil classes 1 through 4.

BRENT LAKE: Soil classes.

INTERVIEWER: Soil classes 1 through 6.

BRENT LAKE: And LCDC was convinced that if Class 6 soils were not brought in, a lot of the wheat land in northeast Oregon and throughout the state would be in jeopardy.

INTERVIEWER: Did you feel you could agree with that? Is that, was that an issue? I'm just not trying to ask you to...

BRENT LAKE: No, that's okay.

INTERVIEWER: Betray any confidence, but I'm just asking did you agree with that policy?

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Was interpretation maybe a better term?

BRENT LAKE: Well, I think there was another way to protect the range lands without calling them agricultural lands.

INTERVIEWER: Interesting.

BRENT LAKE: I think we could've done something different, but we didn't, because, as you well remember, we didn't have time between when they made decisions to go back and say, well wait a minute. So -- no, I think if we would have left 1 through 4 as agricultural lands, and then did something different under that goal for the wheat lands and Class 5 and 6 soils, and I think it would have been a much easier way for a lot of people. And there's a lot of wheat lands in this state that are not in eastern Oregon. So, it would have been a better way to go, but that's hindsight. We did what we felt, and the LCDC was one of the policy things we really got to look at. The original commission, those original seven people, really did work hard on developing the goals. We did a lot of work in developing Goal 3. And then there was the maneuvering, the political stuff that LCDC chair L.B. Day and Steve Schell, vice chair, and the other commissioners had to do.

INTERVIEWER: And Jim Smart.

BRENT LAKE: Jim Smart. I can't remember the name of the commissioner from Charleston, because I was just through there.

INTERVIEWER: Paul Rudy?

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. They were all good. And Dick Gervais from Bend. But they saw the need for rounding out the political stuff as well as the technical stuff that we were doing was and I thought it was great.

INTERVIEWER: Any other goals that you felt were particularly important?

BRENT LAKE: The forest lands goal.

INTERVIEWER: Goal 4.

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. Goal 4, but I think the forest lands probably would have been protected anyway through other programs. The state Department of Forestry and other people, but I think we all had to put up a big basket over everything for the state and I think that's it. The other one is Goal 5, the natural resource goal. Say, as you can tell, Jim, I did the natural resource stuff and you did the cities and those sort of urban things and I'm a natural resource person.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: So, I felt the other goals were important, but 3, 4 and 5 I thought were the three most important goals.

INTERVIEWER: I thought Goal 14 for you in dealing with cities was...

BRENT LAKE: Well...

INTERVIEWER: Was that an easy sell for you?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, it was an easy one for me.

INTERVIEWER: It was not?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, it was.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, it was?

BRENT LAKE: No, it was a very easy one. Because we were protecting the spread of cities, not to just go out and go crazy, and being from California, I was raised for 30 years, I saw that. I saw that urban growth continually spread.

INTERVIEWER: Sprawl?

BRENT LAKE: Well, sprawl and spread, you know, same thing. And, yes, I felt we had to protect – to limit the spread of cities -- we had to -- and I think the UGB was a great idea. Wes Kvarsten was involved in that before he became the DLCD director. And L.B. Day clearly understood that.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: So, yes, I had no problem saying, hey, wait, this county and this city and we've got to work together, but they're not always going to be together, because...

INTERVIEWER: Getting those agreements between cities and counties was often difficult.

BRENT LAKE: Oh.

INTERVIEWER: Jurisdictions didn't always agree on much.

BRENT LAKE: No. It was very tough sometimes but they worked it out.

INTERVIEWER: They worked it out.

BRENT LAKE: But a good one is Bend and Deschutes County. We had a county commissioner there by the name of Abe Young, who was 100 percent against this program, no question, but he also was very much in favor of Deschutes County being a good place to live. And so he saw the meshing and not letting the city spread clear out into the county. He was very much in favor of that.

INTERVIEWER: I suspect there were some issues that local county commissioners, particularly, the financial impact of having development spread.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. No question.

INTERVIEWER: In terms of sheriff's protection and fire and water service and stuff.

BRENT LAKE: And that's why they saw the containing of their cities as being a good thing.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: They just didn't like as Abe said, he didn't like the state telling local governments what to do.

INTERVIEWER: Are there areas that you think we should have done more in the first round of goal development? I'm not talking the coastal goals or Goal 15, but just first 14.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. No, I know what you mean.

INTERVIEWER: Looking back now.

BRENT LAKE: Yeah, I know. I think kicked around a lot of issues. For example, we kicked around a thing called the Metolious Deer Winter Range.

INTERVIEWER: Even back then?

BRENT LAKE: And then we considered the Columbia Gorge, we looked at that. Now the Gorge came in later under federal control. But those are two things we looked at and the commission decided and the department totally supported that those two areas were something we had to do.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Good point.

BRENT LAKE: But, you know, there were some things that we had...

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: The original goals didn't do, but at the same time they were broad enough to bring in almost everything.

INTERVIEWER: So, looking back today, do you feel at that time we probably had done just about enough what we needed to be doing?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yeah. And looking back on it, I'm amazed that we got as much done as we did with the small staff we had. What did we have 25 people in the department? Something like that.

INTERVIEWER: If that. Yes, or less.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: In the beginning.

BRENT LAKE: And we went to all those public meetings, you know, which I think is one of your questions, but at the same time, we just did it. All of us right up until the day of the adoption.

INTERVIEWER: I remember an anecdote of mine, that maybe you were there for I'm sure, but we had leading off the commission's final hearing goal in early December of '74.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: The lead-off testifiers were Governor McCall, leaving office.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And Governor Elect...

BRENT LAKE: Bob Straub coming in.

INTERVIEWER: -- Robert Straub.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And having them sit, Republican and Democrat, side-by-side, more-or-less saying the same thing that you need to proceed and adopt what's before you today. And I just thought that this was a remarkable demonstration of bipartisanship and working together. I'm not saying that they didn't have individual differences to some extent.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: But at that stage, knowing what was at stake.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree totally.

INTERVIEWER: To have them agree publicly and make statements, recommending adoption, to the commission. I mean, here's our commission listening to the existing governor and the incoming governor.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Wow, that was pretty powerful stuff.

BRENT LAKE: That was.

INTERVIEWER: That was really moving.

BRENT LAKE: I was in that room too.

INTERVIEWER: So was I. Yes.

BRENT LAKE: And I was just as amazed as you were.

INTERVIEWER: And that to me was just great.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree.

INTERVIEWER: To be present as staff.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: To have a public meeting, which, of course public meetings around the country weren't always in -- (chuckling) in favor, but in Oregon, you know, we had public meetings.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And so our commissioners did their part.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, they really did. I agree totally with you. That was so important. That was important for program, not only because of the two of them saying what they said, but the people who had voted for them, both McCall and Straub for doing that, it was just amazing. And everybody, you know, kind of supported that at the time.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Yes.

BRENT LAKE: And --

INTERVIEWER: And they really helped the commission fulfill their statutory responsibilities by the end of the year deadline.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: At the end of the calendar year.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: And they were adopted.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And we all looked at each other, I'm sure, and said, wow, we actually did it.

BRENT LAKE: How did we do it, is what we said.

INTERVIEWER: That's right. Yes.

BRENT LAKE: And we really worked ourselves to a frazzle.

INTERVIEWER: LCDC commissioners and staff and supportive interests groups and so forth.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Wow. Okay. Let's move on.

BRENT LAKE: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: I think Question 4 was dealt with, you know, which goals you feel were most important and less so. You've already answered that here.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Pretty much.

INTERVIEWER: So, I'm looking at now, Question 5. Senate Bill 100 passed in 1973, created a framework for land use planning in Oregon. In overseeing the land use program, describe the steps and actions which -- which you are familiar that LCDC and DLCD took to ensure that every city and county comprehensive plan, implementing ordinances, fully complied with Senate Bill 100 and the statewide planning goals, in your opinion?

BRENT LAKE: Well --

INTERVIEWER: And you can look up the question.

BRENT LAKE: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: You can look up the question, if you need to?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I know what you mean.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: I've looked at the questions pretty much. There's no question in my mind that the commission and a lot of people supported the program. However, I'm not saying every legislator favored the program, but most of them understood that in order to do this we had to have enforcement capability. And when we started this program, LCDC wrote the goals, and they

saw that the goals were implemented, and then when necessary they went to court to require them to be implemented. And a lot of people understood that this agency, and of course that has changed over the years, as we both know, but clearly, that was very important that everyone understood that the commission had that authority.

INTERVIEWER: The legislature granted that authority to the commission.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. And nobody until the legislature established LUBA, the state Land Use Board of Appeals, it was very important how LCDC and DLCD carried out their responsibilities. LCDC adopted the goals with DLCD's assistance, and the department and commission then reviewed every plan that came in for compliance with the goals.

INTERVIEWER: You were a field rep and so in 1975.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And you carried with you copies of the adopted goals.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And how did we go ahead to communicate what the commission had done in terms of helping local governments amend their plans and ordinances to do what the goals required?

BRENT LAKE: One of the first things we did was to send out DLCD staff to meet with every county and as many of its cities as we could to explain what the program meant, how was it adopted, how do we comply with the goals, and where do we go from here? And fortunately in those days there was financial assistance we provided to help local governments and it did.

INTERVIEWER: To help them do that work?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. And so you know, that was a key part of it, explaining that to everyone, and I don't know how many cities I went to. I even went to ones on the coast as well as in eastern Oregon.

INTERVIEWER: We didn't have a lot of field people in the beginning.

BRENT LAKE: No, it was Mel and I.

INTERVIEWER: And I was there doing some things as well.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Who else anyway?

BRENT LAKE: I think it was Mel and I and you.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, there was somebody else I'm forgetting, but go ahead.

BRENT LAKE: But anyway we had to go out there and explain in detail what the goals meant, what the program was going to do, and updating their plans and ordinances to comply with the goals. Even in Lakeview.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: That's where the letter came from by the way.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: But I still did that. And it was just so important that we had people like you and I, and other staff that were willing to go out every week and meet at least several counties and their cities, come home for a day or a weekend and then go back out again.

INTERVIEWER: You're right.

BRENT LAKE: So, fortunately, our wives put up with it.

INTERVIEWER: My wife still remembers me being late for dinner many, many times.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes, mine too.

INTERVIEWER: Or not being there at all.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. There's many times when I said, well, I'll be back by 5:00, and I'm pulling in at 9:00 or 10:00 and I still hear about that. But that's the way it was. And I think the reason was, you know, all of us on staff, in that first group, we totally believed in what we were doing for Oregon and its citizens.

INTERVIEWER: That's a very good point.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: I think that we had a passion, maybe that's too strong of a term, but a common view of what needed to be done.

BRENT LAKE: So right.

INTERVIEWER: And we shared that, didn't we.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: We were together.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. We were right together.

INTERVIEWER: We certainly argued about technical points here and there. No question about that.

BRENT LAKE: That's for sure.

INTERVIEWER: But in terms of the overall program, we were all on the same team and we moved together. And the commission provided, in general, very, very good direction and leadership.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Question 6, Goal 1 and Citizen Involvement. This goal is considered by many as critical to the development and implementation of the statewide planning program. Is Goal 1 still relevant today? Why or why not?

BRENT LAKE: That's a tough one. On one hand I think Goal 1 is not that relevant. However the concept of people being involved in land use planning is very important and Oregon has always had commitment to it.

BRENT LAKE: It's really important that citizens have a right to know what's going on. That's where L.B. Day was very much in favor. We were not going to do backroom planning in Oregon. We're going to do it, and people are going to know about it, and people could be involved. But as the program developed and city and county comprehensive plans are in place, citizens don't get involved too much, simply because they know there's a plan that they can go back to if they have to raise a question. There's no question that there are some people who participate in their community's planning but the majority of the population doesn't go to land use meetings. They trust the local staff and appointed and elected people that are doing it. And so the goal itself I don't think is as important as it was in the early days of the program but the concept is still very important.

INTERVIEWER: I remember we required cities and counties to comply with Goal 1 by adopting a local CIP, citizen involvement program, which covered a various range of things in terms of meetings and participation and outreach and so forth.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, you're right.

INTERVIEWER: We had to judge local CIPS. For certain communities we had to say, you need to clarify this or what you're saying here isn't adequate. So, just like meeting Goal 3, 4 or 14, or whatever, they had to comply with Goal 1.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I know.

INTERVIEWER: And we had to review that. That came in before the bulk of the plans as I remember.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Because we reasoned, and I think it was right that the local government had to have a functioning citizen involvement program, meeting Goal 1 requirements, before the jurisdiction could begin the process of involving its citizens in their planning work. Does that make sense to you?

BRENT LAKE: Yes, because we had to have that in the early days. But now you're gonna find very few independent local committees for citizen involvement, calls CCIs.

INTERVIEWER: There still is a statewide advisory committee on citizen involvement called Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC).

BRENT LAKE: We still have local CCIs.

INTERVIEWER: Local committees?

BRENT LAKE: Yes, there aren't that many.

INTERVIEWER: In many cases, planning commissions or governing bodies were designated the local CCI.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, you're right, many city and county planning commissions are serving as their community's CCI.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And most people, especially in the smaller communities, cities and counties, it's hard to get people to serve on local advisory committees.

INTERVIEWER: When you say smaller, just so for our readers, you don't mean small in area, but in terms of population?

BRENT LAKE: Population. Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Just to be clear, can you sum up Goal 1 issues for us?

BRENT LAKE: Sure. Harney County, which is largest in the state, has the same citizen involvement issues to deal with as, for example, Hood River County. I can't speak for the Willamette Valley, because I never worked in the Valley, but Hood River is much smaller, has a much smaller base, both population and area. But Hood River had to work hard to do the same thing to comply with Goal 1. So, anyway, that's where we are.

INTERVIEWER: All right. Question 7. Are there any land use policies that are missing or are overlooked that LCDC failed to incorporate in the adopted statewide planning goals?

BRENT LAKE: Other than the ones the commission addressed over the years, like the Greenway program (Goal 15), and the coastal goals (16-19), I really don't think so. I think that's one of the things that we, as a staff, really kicked around. Senate Bill 10, which was a predecessor to SB 100 had already set the stage for what we were going to look at and I don't think we missed anything. Maybe I'm wrong, but I don't think we overlooked anything. Do you?

INTERVIEWER: No, I think Goal 2, land use planning, which I think often gets overlooked, has a lot of, what's the word I'm looking for, clout in getting communities to do the right thing in terms sound factual inventories, mandatory policies and consistent implementing measures (e.g. zoning and subdivision and partitioning ordinances).

BRENT LAKE: Yes. And that was very important.

INTERVIEWER: And also the whole area of coordination.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: At the local level this included coordination between cities and counties, and of course we can't forget coordination agreements with special districts and state agencies.

BRENT LAKE: State agencies.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, we had a lot to do there in terms of promoting coordination between local governments and state agencies.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And so, it was hard for some people to understand the value of coordination in the early stages of the program.

BRENT LAKE: You knew it all along, Jim.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, sure Brent. (Chuckling)

BRENT LAKE: You were the staff for that. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Well, O.K..

BRENT LAKE: No, seriously and that's important.

INTERVIEWER: And, frankly, one of the true godfathers, if I can use that phrase, for Goal 2, is a person who's no longer with us, one of our former deputy directors, Herb Riley.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, no question about it.

INTERVIEWER: He was on Wes's staff at the Mid-Willamete Valley council government before he joined DLCDC. Herb had as much to do as anybody on our staff in the drafting of Goal 2.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree with that.

INTERVIEWER: And without Goal 2 I think we would have struggled a lot more than we did.

BRENT LAKE: Again, I agree totally.

INTERVIEWER: And often it was a basis for why we would send back a local plan or ordinance, because the facts, plan policies and implementing measure were inconsistent or didn't connect.

BRENT LAKE: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: Maybe the facts in the local plan would say this much land, dah da dah, whatever it was, and the implementation was far less. There just wasn't a good connection between those pieces in the local government's submittal.

BRENT LAKE: I fully agree. That was because usually that plan review was done in Salem, where DLCD plan reviewers were looking for those relationships.

INTERVIEWER: O.K..

BRENT LAKE: I never disagreed with that aspect of plan review analysis. However, once in a while I might say we were going too far.

INTERVIEWER: You felt, though, overall though, that we had done enough analysis that needed to be done.

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. I can't think of other goals, other than the ones we identified in our plan reviews.

INTERVIEWER: Later.

BRENT LAKE: But really, I don't know of anything else we could have put in our plan reviews.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Right.

BRENT LAKE: And I think we were right, because at the time there was the Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission (OCC&DC) and they were doing the coast.

INTERVIEWER: And OCC&DC and CCDC were merged, in what,'77, I think.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And that's when Jim Ross and his staff joined ours.

BRENT LAKE: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: And I thought we made that transition about as well as we could.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I think so too.

INTERVIEWER: And, yes, we had our arguments and our issues, but I think the two organizations were brought together and made one.

BRENT LAKE: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: And OCC&DC brought some very needed expertise and staff resources too.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree

INTERVIEWER: Okay. In 1974, LCDC and its staff, DLCD, undertook an unprecedented statewide public outreach and involvement effort engaging thousands of Oregonians in helping the commission draft and adopt the first 14 statewide planning goals. How effective do you think this extensive outreach process was and do you believe it was worth doing? How, if at all, did this outreach effort affect your own thinking and views about the scope and content of the statewide planning Goals 1-14?

BRENT LAKE: Well, for me, there was no question that extensive public outreach and communication built the basis for the program. Going there and doing what we did, and all those meetings we did, and it was so important to the people. We put them in different tables and asked them to discuss different things. And Arnold Cogan, DLCD director, was a master at that. He was so good at talking to and working with people. Of course L.B. Day and the other

commissioners were very important. But public outreach -- that was Arnold's baby and he really did a great job on that one. And Arnold -- he's still around.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, he is.

BRENT LAKE: Great!

INTERVIEWER: Arnold has been interviewed for this project, by the way.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Well, like I say, I think that portion of the program, putting together those meetings and going to all those meetings, and you and I both did it, we went to a lot of meetings out there. Well, you and I were so busy working in the office with the information and suggestions gathered at these meetings.

INTERVIEWER: That's for sure.

BRENT LAKE: We didn't get to go to many of the meetings.

INTERVIEWER: As you'll recall you and I also staffed the goal technical advisory committees that Steve Schell organized.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, I remember.

INTERVIEWER: I mean there were 12 committees.

BRENT LAKE: I think it was 12, six and six.

INTERVIEWER: Six and six. Yes. And you had six and I had six and we would go to those meetings to provide staff support.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: In those meetings we would take notes and address other issues and raise questions and then bring our notes back to Salem and sort it all out. And it was a very, very intense period, but in the end, very rewarding because you and I played a major part in helping get Goals 1-14 adopted.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I think it was a very rewarding experience, because the goals were adopted and we got to know the people on the committees that we were staffing.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: You know we'd sit down with people throughout the state.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: During all this I attended meeting in Jefferson County to talk about the Metolious deer winter range as a potential critical area.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And at the same time, I attended meetings in the Columbia Gorge and tried to explain to folks up there what they've got to do to protect the Gorge as a critical area. Some folks wanted to expand it or compress it, depending on who you were talking to.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

BRENT LAKE: But no, I'm very proud that I was deeply involved in the drafting and adoption of Goals 1-14 program.

INTERVIEWER: You and I have a lot of pride today, don't we?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, there's no question about it.

INTERVIEWER: And those of us on staff that are now well past our dates of retirement can look back with a lot of pride and a sense of accomplishment.

BRENT LAKE: So true.

INTERVIEWER: And, yes, a lot of work's been done since we left the agency and is still being done.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And we're off into new issues and things. And, of course, now we have a significant number of administrative rules for interpreting and applying the goals.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes.

INTERVIEWER: I don't mean to be negative about the rules, but the rules deal with many of the details that the goals weren't designed to do.

BRENT LAKE: Not at all.

INTERVIEWER: Like the issues of inventorying resource lands or how far back development has to be to protect wetlands and related resources. The rules respond to complicated Goal 5 and Goal 14 questions dealing with housing and how that gets worked into justification for an urban growth boundary.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: All that stuff and a lot more is something that can't be ignored at all.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree, administrative rules. The program would never have stood up without the administrative rules.

INTERVIEWER: Because we got asked questions and the rules did much to provide the answers.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And we had to provide guidance.

BRENT LAKE: Right, because we had to provide guidance about how to comply with the goals provided the overall concept.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: But we had to do more and provide more detailed guidance.

INTERVIEWER: Correct.

BRENT LAKE: And that's where the administrative rules came in.

INTERVIEWER: Right. Okay. Question 9. Stepping back, do you think that the legislatures enactment of SB 100 and subsequent statutory actions in the state goals adopted by LCDC have established and maintained an appropriate and workable balance between the state's and local governments' land use interests and values? If you can, give us any examples demonstrating that this balance has been successful and/or where this balance was not achieved. That's kind of a tricky question.

BRENT LAKE: Very tricky question.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, but it goes to the heart of a lot of what people were worried about or hopeful for, depending upon your point of view about the state's land use interests and those of local governments.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: And here comes the land use program being fairly directive in some ways, but on the other hand people were saying, without that direction we wouldn't accomplish what we're trying to achieve with the goals in the planning program.

BRENT LAKE: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: And local governments would say, you're intruding on our sovereignty and our way of doing things out here in our area.

BRENT LAKE: Well...

INTERVIEWER: Brent, I'm just curious what your thoughts are about that.

BRENT LAKE: Well, one of the answers I would constantly have to that question is, when you go driving down the freeway and you get pulled over because you're doing 90, you've

broken the law. If you violate a land use goal, you've done the same thing, you've broken the law that the legislature passed and LCDC put in place.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. So, you know, you've got to obey the law. And I don't care if you like it or not, the law is there and it has to be obeyed. And now we're doing 65 or 70, but still, you can't do 90. So, you know, that's what my view has always been.

INTERVIEWER: Do you think there was a proper balance now, in general, between state's interests and local interests.

BRENT LAKE: Not totally. That'll never happen. The state's has different interests, the legislators have it and they look at it totally different than local government does. I don't think it'll ever be a real long lasting harmony. But as long as the legislature passes the laws and I think as long as Oregon requires that you obey the laws, which they do, and there's no question about that, then I think things will work.

INTERVIEWER: So, would you conclude by saying we're at a point of relative balance now?

BRENT LAKE: I think so.

INTERVIEWER: In general?

BRENT LAKE: Yeah, I think we are.

INTERVIEWER: And some would say, of course we've exceeded that and gone way, way beyond where we should. Others would say we haven't gone far enough. And that'll always be the case.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. There's no question about that. I wrote down a question when we first got started about, has anybody really done the same thing we're doing for the people that

were involved in the program in the beginning versus new people who have come to the state after we got the program adopted? That's my question.

INTERVIEWER: Wonderful question.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. I don't know what you'd get because I know I've got people that have talked to me and said...

INTERVIEWER: And is that because they're asking why or where does this come from? I mean are they uninformed?

BRENT LAKE: Yes. A lot of them ask why.

INTERVIEWER: And so...

BRENT LAKE: You know, you mean I can't break up my 40 acres into a bunch of five acre tracks? Why not?

INTERVIEWER: So, we have to rely on local governments, primarily, to explain that. We have our own staff and technical assistance and so forth, but the first line of, I don't want to say defense, but the first line of information is really the local planning office.

BRENT LAKE: Local government.

INTERVIEWER: Do you mean the planning commission or the elected officials?

BRENT LAKE: And, fortunately, we have got a tremendous amount of good people in this state that have gone into planning. Now some of them left, like you and I.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

BRENT LAKE: But a lot of people are still here. I'm not talking historical; I'm talking about the good people that have come into the job after the goals were in place and they believe what they're doing. There's a woman in Deschutes County that was working in the

swimming pool as a receptionist, and a job came open, and so she talked to me and I said, I think you'd do a great job. She applied and she got the job. She is one of the best planners they've got.

INTERVIEWER: Who is that person? That's okay.

INTERVIEWER: Not Catherine Morrow?

BRENT LAKE: No. Catherine was a good one too.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: But, no, I'm thinking of...

INTERVIEWER: That's okay.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, let me think for a minute. Cindy, uh -- I can't remember her last name but Cindy's her first name. And she's been there probably 20 years now.

INTERVIEWER: Wow.

BRENT LAKE: I think she was there before I retired she had taken the job.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: And she's good, I mean she's a great planner, because I did some consulting work, you know, and I'd have to go in and talk to them occasionally. And she was very fair in explaining things to people. So, that's what I'm saying. There's lots of good people that have come into this program that believe in the planning and are carrying it forward because like you say, they're the front line.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, they should be.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Next question. From an overall standpoint, how would you compare Oregon's land use program in 2015, with the program that was approved when SB 100 was enacted in 1973?

BRENT LAKE: Well...

INTERVIEWER: In general, of course.

BRENT LAKE: One of the problems is that is you really have to look at the program that was in place, in say 1976, 1978 after all the local plans were adopted the first time. Now how was the program then? Because in 1973, not only did the local governments not know what we were doing, we didn't know what we were doing.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: You know, you've really got to look at 1978, probably 1979. I mean when I went out to eastern Oregon, I had two counties that were not going to go with the program. And it took hard work by the people here in Salem and myself to get them to do it and they finally did it.

INTERVIEWER: Did we have to adopt enforcement orders (EOs) a couple times?

BRENT LAKE: We threatened enforcement orders but we never had to --

INTERVIEWER: We threatened.

BRENT LAKE: To put them in place.

INTERVIEWER: To do that. We did EO's later.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: On some...

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. Deschutes County we had to do one, because, you know, they just kept giving us problems even after they had adopted a plan. They had a couple planning directors in there, at different times, who really didn't want to do it. And finally they moved on, and the other people that were there, that saw the benefit of following the state program and did it and it has gone pretty good.

INTERVIEWER: Good.

BRENT LAKE: But, yes, there were some -- some times, but I would say, not 1973, but I'd say after 1980.

INTERVIEWER: Well, after we got plans acknowledged.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, after we got all the plans acknowledged.

INTERVIEWER: That was the key 10-year period to get the local plans into compliance with the goals.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: That was a long decade. (Chuckling)

BRENT LAKE: It was a long hard pull. No question about it. But, now, once they were adopted are the plans today still working? And the answer, at least as far as I'm concerned, yes, they are. And it's one of the reasons that people have gotten used to dealing with their plans, the local people, not just the elected officials and their staffs, but the people. The general public accepts it, you know, because I go to some places and say, you know, what I used to do and they said, oh, I know about our comprehensive plan or I had to do this in order to get my house approved. So, yes, I think we've done a good job, but it took 10 years to get things really in place, where we could compare what we have today as to what it was like 30 years ago.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we had to, you know, review so many local land use documents.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: Lots of them. And write long reports and go to our commission to get them to approve our staff recommendations and those were often tense sessions before the

commission, because we would have local officials testifying contrary to what we were recommending.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: So, it was a long slog, I think.

BRENT LAKE: And occasionally our commission didn't agree with what we were recommending.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And so they'd send us back and we'd redo it. And that was the way it was. But, you know, oh, I'd say in the 1980s, the goals were in place and most people were accepting having to revise their plans.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And so it changed in the past 25 years, or whatever that is, from 1980 to what we're doing with today, 35 years later, I guess? Yeah, it has changed. And it's still working.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's good to know that. I had my own personal concerns about periodic review and whether we're exempting some jurisdictions from doing it at all.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, I know.

INTERVIEWER: And maybe it's overly difficult for smaller cities to do it. On the other hand, you wonder, how are we measuring whether a plan is still relevant in addressing the issues, be it industrial development, increased tourism coming in or changes in agriculture or non-farm uses -- all those issues, how do we know how we measure whether a plan's still doing what it needs to be doing? And that's a serious question.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: I'm not saying there's an easy answer to that, but that's what I think is the key question that needs to be answered.

BRENT LAKE: I agree.

INTERVIEWER: Are we able to measure and assess how well we're doing out there with these plans?

BRENT LAKE: I don't know if the word is measure is the right one.

INTERVIEWER: Evaluate?

BRENT LAKE: What is the feeling for the local plan and for the state program out there? How do people feel about it? And I've got a question that I want to ask you, because I was told to get you questions.

INTERVIEWER: Oh. (Chuckling)

BRENT LAKE: (Chuckling) But, anyway, I still think the program is working very well.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Well, Question 11 is gonna poke even more at that point and that is, do you think that SB 100 could be approved today by the Oregon legislature? Please explain why or why not. And this is just asking for your opinion.

BRENT LAKE: That's a tough one. That is hard.

INTERVIEWER: Would it be approved today with the nature of our politics and so forth?

BRENT LAKE: Ha. Before the governor resigned I would have said yes. (Chuckling).

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's a whole other discussion. We won't get into that.

BRENT LAKE: But, no I really think it would be. But the problem would be all those people that have come into the state since we've adopted it in 1973. You know, we're at least twice as big population-wise as we were in 1973. I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: Is that because not how did we respond to that back then, but if we were to take the program as a proposal out now, how would we communicate to people?

BRENT LAKE: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And that's because things are different today in terms of how we convey and communicate and involve ourselves with people. You know, it's more than just individual field people going out.

BRENT LAKE: For sure.

INTERVIEWER: It's a whole range of ways of communicating with people.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree. And one of the things is, you know, we didn't have all these electronic methods of communicating when the program first got started.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: In 1973. We had to write it.

INTERVIEWER: Write it and then...

BRENT LAKE: And type it by hand. Later we did get computers to do it faster. And today we wouldn't do public meetings like we did, we'd do a screen and project it up there, and I don't think that would work, today.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, right. Well, and the question is how would we convey that to the legislature? Not just "we" the department and the commission, but how do we get local elected officials, state officials, and interest groups to support a program that has all these other things that are coming in at the same time? It would not be easy.

BRENT LAKE: It would be tough.

INTERVIEWER: And, as you know, as Senator MacPherson talked about in my quote, is that he and Senator Hallock were the ones that really, you know, carried the ball in many ways, and other people as well, but do we have those kinds of advocates today? And I don't have a good answer to that question.

BRENT LAKE: I really don't think so.

INTERVIEWER: I'm not that close to it, but I think it's pretty uncertain. The way I would answer that question, as to whether SB 100 would pass, at least in the same form as we have now, because I think the feelings about private property and now we have measures like Measure 49 in place, would that get in the way of getting the program adopted as it is today?

BRENT LAKE: I think so. I think we'd have a hard time doing it.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: I really do think that we would have a very difficult time. I personally feel if SB 100 went on a ballot again, I'm not sure it would survive another ballot measure.

INTERVIEWER: We would have to really work hard.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And "we" being, you know, proponents of the program and elected officials at the state and local levels that we'd have to have a lot of support, no question about it.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yeah. No question. And we'd have to have people that would really go out there and do it. And unfortunately it probably would be like people like you and I.

INTERVIEWER: Wow.

BRENT LAKE: Our challenge would be to talk to them at public meetings. But I don't know. I just think with the influx of people we've got, and I've talked to a bunch of people that have said, oh, I've got a 40 acre thing, I want to break it up, and I can't do it because of the stupid land use law. And I say, hey, it's not a stupid one, it's a very good, well-thought-out program. But California doesn't have it. You're right. And look what's happened there. So, I just don't know. It would be very interesting.

INTERVIEWER: This question would make a -- a great (chuckling) topic for a debate sometime.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree.

INTERVIEWER: Land use proponents and opponents.

BRENT LAKE: I agree.

INTERVIEWER: To have thorough debate before a listening audience and just hear how the exchanges would occur back and forth would be something.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I think it would be very interesting, but like I said, I'm concerned that if it went to the ballot, I'm really concerned it would go down.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: I hope I'm wrong, and considering everything that's been done so far coupled with some serious soul searching, people would still support the program.

INTERVIEWER: Yes, well --

BRENT LAKE: So, I'm hoping it is there.

INTERVIEWER: O.K. let's move on to Question 12. Some Oregon land use observers believe that the approval of SB 100 in 1973, was due to the convergence of four key factors, vision, leadership, federal money and luck.

BRENT LAKE: (Chuckling) Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Please explain whether you agree or disagree with this statement and whether there are other factors you believe were critical to the passage of SB 100.

BRENT LAKE: I think there were some people at that time who firmly believed we needed to protect this state from being Californianized.

INTERVIEWER: So, vision? Right. So you would agree with vision?

BRENT LAKE: Vision. Oh, no question about it. But I'm talking about individuals.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: The Hector MacPherson's, the L.B. Day's --

INTERVIEWER: The key individuals is that what you're saying?

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Key, well-respected individuals known throughout the state. Not just known in their local areas. And we had individuals who did that. So, give me again the four factors.

INTERVIEWER: Again, vision, leadership --

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Leadership.

INTERVIEWER: Federal money.

BRENT LAKE: No question.

INTERVIEWER: -- and luck.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, luck came into play. Federal money -- the money that came from the federal government. Local governments and the state really wouldn't have carried out the program if we hadn't had that federal assistance.

INTERVIEWER: To assist them --

BRENT LAKE: We couldn't have gotten those land use plans adopted.

INTERVIEWER: Because they would have seen we had to perform, "we" being a local government, without any federal and other financial assistance.

BRENT LAKE: Yeah. All the assistance, maps, and all the analysts, you know -- and like I said, the soil samples and all the other tasks that had to be done without the money to do it.

INTERVIEWER: So, that was a factor, obviously. And luck?

BRENT LAKE: Luck was there. No question about it. It was -- if you remember, was it '72 or '73, where the nation tried to get a national land use program when, of all people, Nixon was in office, and it came very close to passing.

INTERVIEWER: Senator, what's his name, from Washington State? But go ahead.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. But it came very close to passing. So, people were thinking about land use planning and that's why we were lucky, because it was there. It was in the national and Oregon thinking processes.

INTERVIEWER: Timing?

BRENT LAKE: Timing. Yes.

INTERVIEWER: That was a key -- maybe that's what we're saying is timing?

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: You know, luck, I guess is another way of saying the stars were in the right relationship or whatever to make this happen.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. I'd say it was more of a timing issue.

INTERVIEWER: Timing issue...

BRENT LAKE: More than just luck.

INTERVIEWER: O.K..

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Luck also means we had some very special people in unique positions.

BRENT LAKE: For sure. And if you look at legislators today they don't want to be in the legislature very long. They want to become the governor. They want to move up. You know, there's a guy in Bend that's doing it. He tried to become Secretary of State and didn't make it. Now he's in the legislature. Now he's talking about running for governor. They didn't do that that quickly.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: They kind of stayed where they were, worked on what they had, and did move up and John Kitzhaber, our past governor, he worked himself up to be it. He was a legislator. I don't think he was both a senator and a house, but he was a senator.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: And Kitzhaber, he worked his way up through.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: People now don't want to do that.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: They want to jump from the House -- or from their own house to the Governor's mansion. I mean, they want to jump and I think come on guys. So, that's why I'm saying I don't think that the people that are here today are the same type of people that we were dealing with in '73.

INTERVIEWER: There was a coalition of urban and agriculture interests back in '73.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: That were led by Hallock and MacPherson, particularly.

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: They more or less brought that coalition together.

BRENT LAKE: Yep.

INTERVIEWER: And I don't think we could expect that today. Maybe, I don't know.

BRENT LAKE: I would be very surprised if we could see that today.

INTERVIEWER: I think a lot of it rests on economic issues and seeing whether the program was a new program that was being done for the first time. Is the program going to help or hurt the state economically? And that would be an argument that no one would ever win one way or the other.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. You're not going to win that argument.

INTERVIEWER: You'd have to just believe in something.

BRENT LAKE: Yes. Like you said, it was a unique time with unique people who were involved in it.

INTERVIEWER: Brent, I've got another set of questions what I call optional topics, but our time is running down a little bit here and...

BRENT LAKE: What do you want to do?

INTERVIEWER: Do you want to look at those or do you want to ask your two questions of me or ask them of yourself in some ways too.

BRENT LAKE: Well, we've hit on some of them.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: I think that one of the things that has to be looked at, if we go any further, is dealing with different parts of the state. You know, there is no question in my mind if we were to try it again we couldn't do the entire state all at once. We would need to undertake the

program region by region, such as eastern Oregon, southern Oregon or the Willamette Valley and come up with different approaches for each region. You know, the impact that the program has had on east of the Cascades, because that's where I've lived for the last 40 years, is very important to me. And that's why I loved it out there so much and I got along with the people out there.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: But I think we need to consider whether the impact of the program will be positive or negative if we keep what we're doing. I know that it's one of the things we're throwing out there. Now, looking at cities that are certain sizes or counties that are changing may alter the program and I don't know how it's going to work. I think the impact is going to be significant if we don't look at the different sizes of jurisdictions. There's no question in my mind that we can't have Harney County doing the same program that Multnomah County is doing.

INTERVIEWER: In terms of what?

BRENT LAKE: In terms of expecting...

INTERVIEWER: Requirements?

BRENT LAKE: Well, agriculture, housing. You know, to me Multnomah County is an urban growth boundary in itself.

INTERVIEWER: It's part of the tri-county regional UGB up there. Metro's boundary.

BRENT LAKE: And it's, you know, I think all of Multnomah County's in that.

INTERVIEWER: I don't know enough about it but you may be right or close to it.

BRENT LAKE: But if you go to Malheur County, we have one large city and a bunch of small ones. Well, I was thinking of Harney County not Malheur.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, excuse me.

BRENT LAKE: Now Malheur is what I'm thinking of. Not Harney.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: And you know, you got a city right there on the boundary with Idaho that has no state land use planning at all.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

BRENT LAKE: And like a lot of the people, one of the planning director's in Oregon lived in Idaho, because he didn't have to do all the stuff that they did in Oregon. He'd come across the bridge every day and go back every day. And so fortunately he's gone but I don't know if we can -- if we're going to be able to jump that hoop. The impact that we're looking at is going to be very difficult.

INTERVIEWER: Don't we have the regional problem solving program (RPS) in place, where the state agencies in connection with or coordination with local governments, in a certain region, try to focus on common things that are important to all in that particular region.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, in terms of problems and solutions.

INTERVIEWER: And you're right that the solutions that are devised to satisfy Southeastern Oregon aren't gonna be the same ones that will work, say in the Willamette Valley.

BRENT LAKE: Of course. Well, that's why I say, I think we need to look at regions individually.

INTERVIEWER: Is the RPS program working? What's your experience or your understanding of the regional problem-solving program and whatever it's called today?

BRENT LAKE: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: There's state-local teams, but has that been helpful in addressing your concerns?

BRENT LAKE: I think so. Yes. I was the field representative when we started the RPS program.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: And I used to be able to go out and help a county, a small city or small county. When the RPS program came in, I lost at least one day a week to that program, which meant I didn't have the time to go out and help my jurisdictions. But the RPS teams have become quite effective in terms of helping people. They've got some good leadership with the main coordination person for each team coming from the state. And there's some good people out there doing that.

INTERVIEWER: So, the RPS concept is working?

BRENT LAKE: It's working.

INTERVIEWER: So, we are responding to your point a moment ago that we haven't just tried to come up with one stroke or one thing that fits all --

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree.

INTERVIEWER: But, in fact, we knew that way back when, you know, for example, when we developed the definition of agricultural land.

BRENT LAKE: Right.

INTERVIEWER: But in terms of other things, in terms of economic development and whether a grant should be approved or not approved or different ways of addressing problems in one area versus another, and, still be consistent with the state planning program, I think, that's where it can get complicated. If we're doing something in region X that maybe is okay, and we do something different in region Y that's contrary to the program, but still is helping them, how do we

reconcile those differences? That's the question I think that maybe we are addressing now and I'd like to hear more from our DLCD staff today just how effective those efforts are.

BRENT LAKE: Sounds good.

INTERVIEWER: I mean, to be quite honest, both of us don't have much -- well you're probably closer than I, have a better understanding how well RPS is it working out there.

(Chuckling) What else? I mean, here's a list of other things that you want to cover here or do we want to just say we've done our duty?

BRENT LAKE: I think we've done enough.

INTERVIEWER: Done enough damage for one day?

BRENT LAKE: If you'd like to have me come back, we can do that, or we can do it over the phone?

INTERVIEWER: I guess, what I would do as a wrap up is to have you sit back, so to speak, and look at the future, and are there some things that you would like to see done, not differently, but what does the future of the program mean for Oregon? Like we're going to get a lot more people coming to our state.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. No question.

INTERVIEWER: Another million or so, and we have the issue of climate change and I'm not suggesting you and I are gonna come up with any answers today, but as you look ahead are there some things that should be done by the program to anticipate some of these big issues, and maybe you don't want to even begin to speculate about that, but just offer a couple of closing thoughts that you might have?

BRENT LAKE: Well, sure. Climate change. You know it's gonna happen, so at least I believe that. And there's a lot of communities along the ocean -- along the coast that's going to

see some big impacts happen, not tomorrow, not the next day, but 30 years from now. And, you know, and the lack of water. Look at California now what's happening to them. And even us, there's places where we're really getting dry. So, yeah, there's gonna be some changes and I don't think we ought to change the program to reflect those. I think that'd be a mistake. If we went in and said, okay, we're going to have global warming, now all cities on the coast can expand their urban growth boundary 100 -- 200 miles up the hill...

INTERVIEWER: Or feet or whatever.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, I don't think that's gonna be the answer. I think the answer's going to be looking at it and adjusting on how we can do it, but it's going to have to be a slow adjustment. I think that's one of the keys we've got to do is don't jump too quickly.

INTERVIEWER: Should we engage in some type of information, education process, any different than we're doing now or maybe we don't have all the answers, but do we want to even raise the questions of is the program doing its job it needs to be doing and then, also, what lies ahead? I mean those are not answerable but it --

BRENT LAKE: Yes. I agree. Those are not answerable.

INTERVIEWER: But -- they're out there and I think we need to anticipate whether it's, you know, global warming or whether it's housing issues.

BRENT LAKE: O.K.

INTERVIEWER: You know, how are we doing as a state in terms of meeting our housing needs? And the question you just raised, are communities wanting to expand their UGB's to address either new economic development, new housing developments or to meet recreation needs, or for other reasons?

BRENT LAKE: Well, a good example of that is Bend. Bend submitted a revised plan to DLCD two years ago, I think.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

BRENT LAKE: And they wanted to expand the urban growth boundary by 10,000 acres.

INTERVIEWER: Seriously? 10,000?

BRENT LAKE: Seriously. The department opposed it right away. DLCD said, look, be more realistic. Now the city's proposing two to three thousand acres. And that's probably pretty reasonable. If they would have done that the first time they would have gotten it, but 10,000 acres, come on guys. And there is still a lot of land inside the urban growth boundary today, vacant land.

INTERVIEWER: Is it buildable land?

BRENT LAKE: Oh, yes. Yeah. People are just holding on to it. Because a lot of people think if you expand your urban growth boundary out, prices are gonna go down. They don't. Prices stay steady when you move it out, so they don't go down, because if Tom's getting that kind of money inside, why can't I get it with the new land I brought in? So, it's just not going to work. And so that's why I think, it's going to take time. And that's why it's so important for the program to have the ability to say, no, you can't do that.

INTERVIEWER: Should we try to encourage the formation of coalitions of interest to support your thinking like that?

BRENT LAKE: Yes I think we should.

INTERVIEWER: And how we do that, of course, is a whole bunch of other questions?

BRENT LAKE: A whole different thing.

INTERVIEWER: We're almost out of time here.

BRENT LAKE: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: I was just gonna suggest that you may want to end by looking at the whole oral history project and are there some things like your reactions to it and how it should be carried on and any other questions you may have?

BRENT LAKE: Well, I think that this oral history project should have been done 10 to 15 years ago. I agree totally with it. In fact, I was looking at something on oral history and came across a preliminary list of reference sources. Did you know we've been doing interviews for some time? I guess 1992 was the first one. But we've got to continue doing oral history interviews as it is an extremely effective way to maintain an ongoing, permanent recorded record of Oregon's state land use program.

INTERVIEWER: Would you look at the results of the interviews, not just the oral, but in the visual, but also when they're transcribed so historians can see and hear what's been said by the staff of the past like us?

BRENT LAKE: For sure, there's no question on that.

INTERVIEWER: Our interview and others done by this project should be analyzed to check for common points-of-view about Oregon's planning program.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, I agree.

INTERVIEWER: I don't know whether or when such a review will be conducted, but I certainly hope it will be done.

BRENT LAKE: You're absolutely right. Somebody has to keep the oral history project going. Portland State is managing the current project and I think they're the best ones to do it. There's no question in my mind. I think they are an independent, well-staffed organization that

can conduct the interviews, analyze the results, and identify significant findings and trends. You and I? No. We're way too biased on this program.

INTERVIEWER: Good. We should probably recommend to PSU and DLCD that this oral history project be continued and we want to maybe broaden it to include the views of others, you know, not just the immediate ex-planning people and so forth, but elected officials, state agency people and interest group representatives.

BRENT LAKE: And new people.

INTERVIEWER: And new people.

BRENT LAKE: I think we ought to talk to some new residents that have just moved into the state in the last 10 years or so and see what they think about these kinds of questions we've been addressing today.

INTERVIEWER: And, you know, I don't want to say educate them but inform them about what we think about the past, present and future of Oregon's state planning program.

BRENT LAKE: Well, one of the things to do would be to go and interview elected officials and staff members that have not been here since 1973.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: You know, maybe there's probably a lot of those.

BRENT LAKE: Oh, there's a lot of them, you know.

INTERVIEWER: I don't know what our agency is doing with regard to informing this community of new Oregonians about the state's planning program.

BRENT LAKE: But that's why Portland State would be the one to do that.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

BRENT LAKE: You know.

INTERVIEWER: Maybe conducting one or more conferences based on the oral history interviews should be held.

BRENT LAKE: Yes, but not DLCD. That's should be done by an independent organization such as PSU.

INTERVIEWER: Brent, anything else?

BRENT LAKE: I think that'll pretty much do it.

INTERVIEWER: I appreciate it very much to interview a former special colleague and friend.

BRENT LAKE: No problem.

INTERVIEWER: It's been great. Let me shake your hand to express my thanks.

BRENT LAKE: Think you can turn that thing off?

INTERVIEWER: I'm going to try. (Chuckling)

(Concluded)