

Note: This transcript was substantially edited for accuracy, clarity, and legibility by Maggie Collins and Kevin Pozzi in July of 2015.

Maggie Collins Interview

Wednesday, 5/27/15

INTERVIEWER: Today is May 27, 2015. It is my pleasure to be talking this afternoon with Maggie Collins. Maggie was an original member of the State Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, which was established by Senate Bill 100 to advise the Land Conversation and Development Commission on Goal 1 of the statewide planning system, Citizen Involvement. My name is Jim Sitzman, and I'm a former planner with CRAG and Metro with the work of drawing an urban growth boundary around the metropolitan area. I'm also a long-time field representative for the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Maggie, we are honored that you would be willing to sit down with us today. We are hoping to gather as much information as we can from the folks who were influential in forming and shaping Oregon's land use system. We are aiming 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. In your comments, please try to add dates and locations and names as best you can to identify your subject. We encourage you to share anything you feel is relevant to this effort. So, let's begin.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, thank you, for inviting me. I'm honored to be part of this project and I'm happy that it's happening.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. All right. So, in your own words, when and why did you get involved in Oregon's SB 100 program?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I walked into the Oregon Environmental Council office in 1973 and wanted to volunteer on some kind of environmental activity and Judy Nielson handed me

a copy of some legislation. She says, "Here, take a look at this," and so I took it home and read it and just fell in love with the idea of Senate Bill 100. It was the perfect resource idea -- and I was always a resource person to say, "Let's work with the natural resources in the state because they're so precious." And, so I ended up being a volunteer lobbyist/activist for Oregon Environmental Council through 1973, through the adoption of Senate Bill 100. Martin Davis was the other volunteer who spent a large amount of time on passing Senate Bill 100. So, that was my first involvement right there at the beginning. It looked like quite a daunting process to really actually formulate the goals because all Senate Bill 100 did was set out the processes. The newly-formed LCDC, and the state staff or DLCD, had this huge project to do. So, it looked like there was plenty of room for activism and during this lobbying process, I got typed or identified as an environmental representative. When the State Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee was organized in early 1974, the state was looking for a widely representative group of people. People like me got appointed, and I was the environmental rep for the SCIAC, and so I served on that committee, going through 14 citizen involvement townhalls with the statewide program in 1974. As OEC Land Use Chair, I was able to coordinate little citizen groups that were working on goal formulation. My role was to work on this citizen involvement end, but also to make sure that the goals, many of which really needed to be fleshed out, actually got fleshed out, with an environmental perspective in them as well. By the end of 1975, we were goal-formulated and I was still on the SCIAC. I went back to graduate school in '75, and when I first finished graduate school in '77, I worked at DLCD. I don't know if you were there then or not?

INTERVIEWER: No. I was at Metro.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh. It was in 1977, from June to September, I worked full-time as the Citizen Involvement Specialist at DLCD. So, I got to know the newly-forming staff

people who were going to actually be the push behind the State role in making these local land use plans work.

INTERVIEWER: Well, you've alluded to it a little bit already. Could you kind of highlight out of that cluster of experiences and roles what some of your early hopes and expectations were?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I thought this program and what the Legislature was trying to do in Senate Bill 100 was to keep the natural resources in some kind of more permanent state than they were before this legislation. We did have the coastal goals, and we had Senate Bill 10 and all of that, but I thought this was a perfect way for every community to say, "Here's what's important in our natural resource area, in our area, and this is what we will plan for to preserve and conserve." So, mine was very, very much a green orientation.

INTERVIEWER: Senate Bill 100 starts out with the term "uncoordinated use of land." How does that play into what you were describing?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, that gets back to the sinking fear that somehow the timber harvesting industry, the pollution of the Willamette River, the sage brush rebellion, and the urban sprawl that was happening in places like dinky little Bend, [MC: 5,000 population back in those days] were going to destroy something that was really important in Oregon, only we didn't know how to make sure it didn't get destroyed. That kind of background was really important for me and a lot of people. We were just sort of winging it: "There's something wrong with paradise here and we don't know exactly what it is but, oh, we don't want sprawl." People like McCall and other very, very astute kind of state leaders who said we are running into trouble in paradise and so that contributed.

INTERVIEWER: I remember, I think, maybe this is what you're alluding to is that both McCall and Hector McPherson were the ones who pointed to Charbonneau.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh, yeah. I forgot about Charbonneau.

INTERVIEWER: Is that when you were alerted?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. That's when I was there. The Project Foresight, the big green illustrated book promoted by The League of Women voters was influential in saying sprawl is coming; and here's Charbonneau, here's a great example.. And what about all these freeway exchanges along I-5, up the Valley? Sprawl was a very Valley-oriented concern at that time but that's where the population was, and that's where development pressure was beginning to push itself outside of city limits and local jurisdictions weren't dealing with that. They just weren't.

INTERVIEWER: You talked of Tom McCall and Hector MacPherson, were there any other things and people like that that stimulated your awareness that Senate Bill 100 is on target and we need that?

MAGGIE COLLINS: No, I was a really ignorant sort of citizen activist --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah? (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: -- from Portland. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: So, the starting point for a citizen activist is your ignorance?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I just started with this bill and to me -- but, again, I probably couldn't ever put into words this sort of feeling I had when I read it; yes, this is the idea that will work, because it appeals to something -- well, could we call it a deep love for this state? You could.

INTERVIEWER: So, which of the 19 goals do you think have been the most and the least important in the way they have been drafted and carried out?

MAGGIE COLLINS: The one that's been carried out the best is Citizen Involvement, actually, and then when speaking of the substance goals; we always said that Goals 1 and 2 are "throw-away" goals.

INTERVIEWER: Huh.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Three, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are the "real" goals; they're the land goals and I believe that the Agricultural Lands goal has been a fine success. It's been carried out really very well. Why? Because it had some specific guidelines that you had to follow in the goal language. You couldn't get away with just saying, well, this isn't ag land. You had to prove it.

INTERVIEWER: Together with a whole other set of statutes there?

MAGGIE COLLINS: That also contributed. You're quite right. The exclusive farm use zoning that had previously been in place is pretty key. Goal 14 is the other one. I would pair these two as being the most important legs of the goal system.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Three and 14?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. Goal 1 for the people part of planning but if we're talking about the topics, those are the two that are outstanding, and people from other states ask, "Just how did you ever do that? How did you ever put a line around cities and have it stick?" It seems like some kind of miracle and I'm not sure that it could happen today.

INTERVIEWER: Can you expand on that?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, the 70's were a time in Oregon where, aside from the abysmal history Oregonians have had with blacks, and with other minorities, and even with giving women some rights -- let me go at this from a different angle. It seemed at the time when I was growing up in Oregon that there was little gap in social mobility, and economic gaps were not as

big; and so there was, to me, an egalitarian kind of environment that was very, very much the heart of the white population.

INTERVIEWER: Well, let me reshape the question just a little bit. Your comment about you're not sure it could happen today, the urban growth boundary, it seems to point to an observation that maybe the urban growth boundary is disliked. That people don't support what we have.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh, no. I didn't mean to imply that. Good that you're clarifying that. People in this state love their urban growth boundaries. They see the sense of them and the strong selling point of separating urban from rural by a boundary. That's pretty simple. And you can see the results of the separation. You get back to Oregonian's love of their environment and their resources and you can see resources are still there because there's this boundary. And inside of the boundary then we have all this room to do our urban thing, do our people thing. Today, there's still a respect for the environment as it is, the natural resource bounty that this state has. The way that people manipulate the environment, it's nice to keep human impact contained and corralled. In my opinion, I don't think in the state there's any or very little problem with endorsing urban growth boundaries.

INTERVIEWER: So, maybe your comment is that if Oregon citizens had not experienced what they have, with an urban growth boundary, and it came up as a new idea today, that it -- it might not fly?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I think you'd have a terrible time making it fly because you would immediately have every special interest group battling until everyone's down and out, in order to not gouge your own interest. I think that the volatility of population, the obvious movement toward special interest groups, the inability to collaborate and cooperate with someone

who doesn't agree with you; the whole kind of legislative environment in which you'd have to deal with would be incredibly difficult. We were in a kind of people citizen legislative arena at the time, which was strong enough to let something like this go through.

INTERVIEWER: Just to step back to your juxtaposition of Goal 3 and Goal 14, and go to your originally identified area of interest and you did a cluster of Goals 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 --

MAGGIE COLLINS: Goal 4, Forestlands, has been surprisingly well done but started out incredibly weak. It was a toughy, and DLCD staff and especially people like Lloyd Chapman had to work extremely hard to assist everybody in identifying forestlands and how Goal 4 applies to them. What it really meant. What it meant to conserve forestland for forest uses. People would say, 'Hold it, hold it.'" That was a really hard thing to do because our timber industry was declining at the time or starting to decline and the Seven Sisters were starting to move out of the state. So, that goal gets high credit but not like Goal 3. The Open Spaces, Scenic, and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources Goal -- I think it's served its purpose. It hasn't in the past been as important to local plans as it might be in the future. For example, as jurisdictions have decided this is historic, this is not, and the pressure on those historic or natural resource features gets stronger, as our population grows and changes in demographic content, then this goal might become more important. Air, Water and Land Resources, not so well, because we call that the "DEQ" goal.

(Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: Areas -- Goal 7, Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards, not so well because it's mostly a floodplain goal, and it's weak on standards. It's never been taken as seriously but maybe it will now in the future because of more awareness of earthquakes and also

the tsunami portion of the coastal goals. Recreational Needs, Goal 8 -- people have taken it for granted.

INTERVIEWER: Moving another step beyond separate goals, another aspect of Senate Bill 100 is the focus on comprehensiveness. And I would be interested in your comments on how that notion has been carried out and how it gets expressed through the combination of the goals? You've done a bit of it by saying Goal 3, ag, and urban growth boundaries.

MAGGIE COLLINS: So, are you suggesting -- are you asking me if I think that the resource tank is as full as the urban tank?

INTERVIEWER: That's one way of approaching it. And another is just the need under Goal 14, under Senate Bill 100, to emphasize comprehensiveness, like Goal 4, Forestlands. Goal 14 is kind of weak, but what's been done there in relationship to Goal 5 and these other goals has created a cluster of effects perhaps.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, you said it very well, and I think we just started to understand that if we have things to do with forestlands that also could be recreational or --

INTERVIEWER: Create habitat?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Create habitat or anything like that, we -- there was sort of enough of a planning background that we could do that. So, in that way we probably were, and we didn't even know it, we probably were fulfilling Barry Commoner's admonishment back in the early 70's when we said everything is connected to everything else.

INTERVIEWER: Exactly.

MAGGIE COLLINS: And so in the resource end of goal implementation, a lot of people would say we haven't done enough, we only get a "C" grade or so in natural resource preservation statewide; and maybe that's true, it depends upon which perspective you take. But

we also have to remember that this planning process, its comprehensivity, it's also a quilt of different plans with different focuses, whether you're a small city, a big county or whatever.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: If there's an uneven focus with the goals, this state is "lumpy", and so if you wanted to make a big push to preserve resources to the highest degree possible, the land use planning system is not going to work so well.

INTERVIEWER: See if this was accurate: I think what you're saying is this program didn't set down in a virgin environment where everything was the same in whatever location around the state you wanted to name, but because it came into an existing set of conditions that are different in Dufur than they are in Portland, comprehensiveness works differently in --

MAGGIE COLLINS: Absolutely.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. I think you're saying it better than I would. Dufur and Portland are great examples, of the wide variety of concern, focus, population, resources, and desire to regulate themselves through something called a comprehensive plan.

INTERVIEWER: Well, one of the next questions is about Senate Bill 100's goal of expressing the State's policy for local land use planning. So, the question is, has LCDC acted correctly to ensure a balance between State and local interests in the way it's applied the goals?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I think they've done an excellent job. I personally believe that LCDC has been through time one of the most sterling people/citizen commissions in our state and maybe in a lot of other states. Their job was tremendous. It was to be the mediator between what people perceived and how the goals were first laid on to a local community, the heavy hand of state government coming down on them. LCDC was right there in the middle, and for some reason or another, I believe that most of the local jurisdictions in their dealings with the Commission came

away feeling like they were heard; feeling like they were equals in terms of wanting something done that was good for the state and good for that community; and were pretty much willing to go along with the program and the process. LCDC was pretty good on process and didn't go into a whole bunch of rulemaking, which was good. Plus LCDC didn't have to do judgment stuff because we had LUBA. So, altogether, their job was to be a spokesperson for the good of the state as a whole. And each of the jurisdictions coming up before the Commission needed to be a spokesperson for the good of their part in the state. So, I think they were wonderful. The first commission was superb and it was L.B. Day, who did the job.

INTERVIEWER: What role, if any do you think, given your comments about the Commission, do you think the fact that the goals, as they have responsibility for adopting and nurturing over time, have the force of law?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, do you mean how jurisdictions perceived them as laws?

INTERVIEWER: No. How the Commission perceived it because Senate Bill 100 accords the goals a legal status that's equivalent to actions of the legislature.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, LCDC never took that too terribly seriously because the real decision was made in Senate Bill 100 when Senate Bill 100 said, "No, this is not going to be a state planning program, this is going to be a local planning program, and it's going to have a state guidance about it, but it is going to be local control." What LCDC wanted was to make sure everybody did is, first of all, line up and do a plan, even if it's totally inadequate, get together and figure it out; and then, second, as these questions come up, we want to be with you in trying to solve them. It seemed a less adversarial approach than simply pounding on local jurisdictions. It was disgusting sometimes the sort of extensions that LCDC was giving jurisdictions, for not getting their jobs done. But overall the Commission said, no, long-term it's better for this community to

try to make their plan as comprehensive as possible, than for us to start fining them, and come in there with state planning; that's never going to work. That approach saved the program in those years of trying to get the compliance going.

INTERVIEWER: Well, let me press you just a little bit more on that. I wasn't thinking so much about state versus local planning, that question, but the fact that in your praise of the Commission over time, the fact that they were dealing in making and enforcing law, statements of law, must have been a factor and -- I'm asking your opinion, do you think that was a factor in how they dealt with this state and local tension that was going on?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, I think everybody understood that they were law. The goals were law.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: But the way the goals were written, they were aspirations. So, you had a big wiggle room.

INTERVIEWER: So, the State was emphasizing local planning but saying in your local planning, take into serious account our vision --

MAGGIE COLLINS: And don't forget we know there's a new law out there.

INTERVIEWER: Ah. Okay.

MAGGIE COLLINS: The operating principle for five, six, seven years was that local jurisdictions of 246, in 36 counties, struggled, went to bat and did their thing, all those years of negotiation and worrying, and local disputes -- finally coming up and saying, 'Hi, LCDC, here we are with our plan, aren't we good?' (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: And plan acknowledgement was always pretty much a celebration. The work and the ownership being at the local -- very much at the local level, I'd say there were few cases where I remember the Commission getting on some local issue, except maybe what to do with the Metolius winter range.

INTERVIEWER: We've talked a lot about the history of the program. How does the Oregon planning program in 2015 compare to what you remember in those early years?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, before we do that I want to step back and say something about the Citizen Involvement Goal.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

MAGGIE COLLINS: It wasn't a substance goal and it was true that the first plans really worked hard to address resource goals. I think it was true that the State sort of ignored everything inside the urban growth boundary. Getting the boundaries established was hard work, and then addressing the resources management inside boundaries. Oregon land use planning turned out to be one of those programs where the people, from my perspective as a Humanities major, loved their state. I'm saying that that was the first part of local planning, and during that first part, the citizen involvement goal was so critical because it gave people who weren't even interested in land use planning, it gave them a chance to say "Here's what we love about our area, here's what we want for the future," and the aspirations and the love of the diversity of natural resource space in this state has always been there, and it was there then and is here still today. I'm saying the citizen involvement process was the first time in maybe recorded history that people could sit down and say I really love this place in planning terminology. We have this collective consciousness of love for the resource base of this little tiny part of the planet that we exist on. With the citizen involvement goal neighbors actually sat down at tables and talked together. It was

a wonderful exercise. And it gave a lot of cover to local officials who wanted to do things that maybe summoned the community to support.

INTERVIEWER: So, you're describing kind of a creative expansion of a plebiscite.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. That's a good way to put it. When we did the citizen involvement goal and set it up, it was firmly believed that people had a right and a need to be involved in the affairs of their local community and land use, period. And I believe that's still here today but the processes have become pretty ossified.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: We have our vision processes and we have our focus groups and now we have email and all this technological stuff.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: And so we don't sit around the table with our neighbors very much and really talk about the important kinds of "soft issues," how are we going to live together, how are we going to make a go of it, and what do we care about for our kids and our future. If you get people sitting around the table talking about it, they always say the same thing, they say we want good communities, we want good schools, we want to be safe and clean, we want good parks and recreation. Those basic things.

INTERVIEWER: I have some additional questions related to Goal 1 type activities. One is that in the adoption of the first 14 goals there was a large-scale public outreach effort in 1974. How, if at all, were you involved in that effort? And I'm distinguishing here between an outreach regarding that package of goals, versus in the adoption process, the engagement of citizens that shows that this is the effort on the part of LCDC and the State to outreach to the public about what is it doing.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Right. You're talking about the statewide workshops --

INTERVIEWER: Correct.

MAGGIE COLLINS: That was one of those genius efforts and I think it's because the fledging DLCD staffers knew exactly what topics should be goals: I mean you had some topics out of Senate Bill 10, but there's this huge thing we're still going to set up as law, and we better get some better ideas of what it should consist of. That was their focus. We just really needed more people on board in the state. So, DLCD did the 14 workshops. I think I attended 12 of them.

INTERVIEWER: All right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: All around the state. All the way from La Grande and Burns, to Bandon and Portland. That was how I was personally got involved in that workshop material and, you know, after the second one it's like I said, we started getting the same responses from people sitting down together at tables, the first time many of them in their communities had ever really done that. So they're talking about, though we didn't call it at the time, livability. How can this program foster and promote livability and --

INTERVIEWER: Yes. One of my follow-up questions, was this effort productive? And it seemed like livability is one of the products that came out of this.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes, walkability was another, using modern terms. It's really tough to make these generalizations, you know, Jim.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Because thinking back to something we already talked about, the Dufur/Portland situation -- what people in Dufur have in common with Portland, I would say, is this thing we'll call livability. They don't necessarily have in common a lot of other stuff.

(Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: I have a little bit of trouble making generalizations about that, but I do remember clearly, workshop after workshop, the results being reported out of the work sessions. And it would be the same things over and over again. We want to live in places that sustain us. It was an amazing thing.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. See if this was accurate, it sounds like what you were also saying is that that effort on the part of the Commission provided them, in terms of productivity, a sense that they had an avenue to move forward. It was okay to proceed?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. That's correct. And it also gave us some goal topics. The process went on, after the workshops were through, and the staff was starting to put together drafts of goals and language, they added workshop ideas to goal topics that were in Senate Bill 10. All the way through 1974 to the adoption, goal topic material was added and subtracted. You know, but here's the thing that's weird, I can't remember when an urbanization goal became a goal. I remember the afternoon that Anne Squier and I sat down and talked about an urban growth boundary goal and we drafted a version of the urbanization goal, Goal 14, that we gave to OEC, as OEC's submittal. That was in 1974. I remember late in the goal formulation process where the topics that people were talking about morphed into goal topics; that there wasn't an energy goal. The City of Portland submitted that one in at the last minute; the economy goal was pulled out several different times because nobody could figure out what it was saying or whether it should be in there or not, so it went through variations. So, where were we? The focus of the citizen group and the workshops got translated, it seems to me now looking back, pretty effectively into the goal topics that were probably going to be adopted through public hearings at the state level by the LCDC, without having too terribly many absolute revolts.

INTERVIEWER: And because you've known Anne Squier, it would be kind of interesting to hear your comments on people like Dorothy Anderson and L.B. Day, and what they were doing at that time.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, you know, Dorothy was just incredibly good at getting League of Women Voters activated and that was such a strong political subgroup in the state at the time that they carried the day several different times when crises came up. They testified at all the LCDC hearings. Gosh, we were down there all the time. Room 32. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: We spent hours and hours in that room listening to testimony with each hearing. 1974 was a gigantic year for the state and its programs to be set up because we had to do everything. We had goals to adopt. The Commission was saying this is the way you're going to do it and here's your process, and then the DLCD staff, who were new. I think Arnold was there -- and maybe two or three people. There were all these citizen involvement groups and those of us who had worked on Senate Bill 100, who were chomping at the bit to get going. There were DLCD staff disagreements on how the goals ought to look and what they ought to say. And then there was the public at large. Were we going to get this done in time? Were we going to have a state law passed in one year about topics that were essential to every Oregonian in the state at that time? Were we going to get this done or not? It was in that context that I think the one person who had the strongest vision of mediating, negotiating and getting the job done was L.B.

INTERVIEWER: L.B. Day.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Absolutely. The guy was a marvel. He knew how to do it. Dorothy was the organizer of people who could make comments that made the difference. It was so much fun to watch her. By that time Gordon Fultz and Steve Bauer, Gordon with the counties,

and Steve with the cities, were wonderfully supportive and helpful, even though the year before we'd been clashing swords over many, many issues about this program; once SB110 adoption happened, they brought together cities that were supportive, they brought together counties that weren't just going to throw a bomb at you.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

MAGGIE COLLINS: And then there was Paul Rudy from the coast. And while he didn't necessarily get too excited about issues, he was very respectful of the coast being so different. He was ready to remind everybody in a good way, to not forget the coast, and that was really helpful. The agreement was to wait until everybody else does their stuff and then go back and deal with the coast, which is what happened.

INTERVIEWER: Well, let's move from that engagement period and the public outreach to the goal adoption phase where there was an effort to engage a lot of interest groups, the public, non-profit and private organizations, state agencies, local governments, citizen activists -- to engage all of them in the adoption process. Which of these do you think were most influential and/or effective in shaping the goals?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Wow. Good question. Well, I think I'd have to say a coalition, from my perspective anyway -- this tree-huggin' person that I am, I believe that the Oregon Environmental Council's influence, and the League of Oregon Cities, and the Association of Oregon Counties, together were the most influential when the chips were down. Other people might think differently. Again it was environmental protection, the rural side, you might say, with the urban side where people live--we want it to be good; and that combination and influence and the ability to bring people out at the hearings and say important things: like the cities were saying, well, don't forget that we have limited resources, we have political problems and we need a lot of

help and assistance to do this, but basically our heart's in the right place. And the job that Gordon Fultz was able to do with the counties to bring them from some kind of roaring about a communist government plot into a circle where at least they would look at it and say, okay, I guess we have to do this after all. Well, that was an amazing amount of turnaround in education that was necessary in less than three months.

INTERVIEWER: Did any cities or counties individually stand out in that process?

MAGGIE COLLINS: As anti-counties? The southern counties opposed to all of this? Yes. Douglas and Jackson and Curry.

INTERVIEWER: Were there any counties that stood out as a conduit for this undertaking?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. Polk. Yamhill wasn't too bad and Lane County was good. Umatilla was pretty good and then Multnomah. They made cases that this would be good for everybody.

INTERVIEWER: So, there were individual citizen activists that stood out apart from the L.B. Day's people who were officially involved at that time?

MAGGIE COLLINS: You know, I don't recall any, but I can tell you why that probably was the case, because at the time I was coordinating, I think it was six goal formulation committees who were drafting materials all the time and I was just focused on getting our representatives to the hearings to testify for the language that OEC wanted before LCDC finally adopted goal language. So, no, I don't remember anybody who really stood out. You mean was there a Tom McCall at one of the goal hearings?

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: No.

INTERVIEWER: Were there eloquent spokespeople for what was going on? I suspect there were some -- Anti's.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yeah. Probably so. But, actually, there weren't. It was a mostly special interest -- what we call special interests today staking out their positions and oftentimes just saying, okay, so we know what's going to happen so if you do it, here's what we think is the best language.

INTERVIEWER: Homebuilders?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Homebuilders? Oh, I forgot about the homebuilders. Well, there were Jon Chandler and Fred VanNatta.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: Everybody's friends. (Chuckling) They were always there. And, yes, they had a point-of-view.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh, man. Drove us nuts.

INTERVIEWER: A thread runs through the language of Senate Bill 100 to the goals and also that thread to the local comprehensive plan. What factors most influenced continuity in that thread from one to the other?

MAGGIE COLLINS: The business of having and working towards or acknowledging viable livable communities. That's one thread. Is that what you're kind of getting at?

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's certainly a kind of answer. What comes to mind is that people like Maggie Collins that worked at DLCD as a goal specialist, and there was a network of people at that time who were kind of pulling at threads.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh. Okay. Well, the underlying premise, I think, for pulling the thread as a staffer -- that kind of thing, was to individualize the focus and approach for each jurisdiction. It had to be individualized so no one could come down with a hammer.

INTERVIEWER: A hammer?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yeah. We just didn't do the hammer thing even though some of the claims were ridiculous. For example, a city saying that they didn't have any natural resources. Well, come on, city, everybody has natural resources; you will address this in your plan. That kind of thing. The only thing that we could really hammer on was if a city wanted to say they didn't have any resources in this goal topic, then you've got to put it down in your plan and we'll evaluate it. You've got to address it that much.

INTERVIEWER: You've just got to be consistent with your inventory.

MAGGIE COLLINS: That's right. And if you haven't done your inventory, and you don't know, say that but you've got to say something and address every single goal. If there was any other kind of thread going on, it had to do with all the citizen involvement programs we reviewed. So, if you wanted your planning commission to be the local CIAC, say so. Tell us why. We'd even coach jurisdictions quite a lot. The point was to get everybody to line up at the Commission with their plan. That was the point of the whole process. The hope was that perhaps we'd end up with a better sense of who we are as a state, what the issues were, what we could do to make our futures better and so on and so forth. All of those kinds of futuristic ideas were important, but the real product would be coming to the Commission with your locally adopted plan asking for acknowledgement. That was our primary goal.

INTERVIEWER: To take you, for example, as a goal specialist, and the Commission certainly was a thread puller on this but perhaps even the field representatives of DLCD --

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, they were the best and most fun group of people with whom I've ever worked, we had so much fun; and that was even after I was at Yamhill County, developing its comprehensive plan. DLCD staff people were young, enthusiastic, idealistic, and inspiring; they were terrific. They had good ideas; they went the extra mile; and they worked as hard as they could with their jurisdictions to pull them along. So, if somebody called up Eber and said, "Hey, Ron, we think that this area is going to be inside an urban growth boundary and it's Class 1 ag land. Well, what can we do to make this work or not work?" When a local jurisdiction adopted a boundary that included that Class 1 soil, well, then it was up to the staff to figure out how to project that in the plan and in their review process; and those were not easy issues. Lloyd was getting called almost every day about how to define forestland in Coos County, or something like that. Or somebody would call up and say do you have to have a historic resources inventory for our county? Things like that. DLCD staff made up a mythical county called Bounty County.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: Do you remember back then?

INTERVIEWER: I remember that. Yeah.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Bounty County was somewhere between Lane County and Deschutes. (Chuckling) Bounty County had every one of the goals in it and we used to vent our frustration, you might say, on little pieces for the 'Bounty County News,' that sort of thing.

INTERVIEWER: Yes

MAGGIE COLLINS: We had a close-knit, enthusiastic staff who I think later on, saw themselves as being in an historic opportunity.

INTERVIEWER: Exactly. Yes.

MAGGIE COLLINS: I don't think there's anyone now who doesn't look back and say, "Oh, my gosh, how lucky was I?!" Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Speaking of staff, you were with DLCD staff but you were also a local staff person doing comprehensive plans.

MAGGIE COLLINS: I was.

INTERVIEWER: Reflect on that a little bit, please. Milwaukie?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I go back to Yamhill County.

INTERVIEWER: Yamhill? Okay.

MAGGIE COLLINS: And because I was the Planning Director there, my job was to revise the Yamhill County comprehensive plan and get it ready for acknowledgement and to conduct a program, which the county undertook, to assist seven small cities in Yamhill County, to get their plans done as well. We hired a small staff, divided up our cities, and went to work, and one of the issues that happened in Yamhill County was that the wine industry was just starting up. We had this great -- again, it's another one of these great opportunities that happened then -- to accommodate this growing industry, and we were able to do that, with a natural resource and mineral industries land classification and zoning. We also protected gravel pits.

INTERVIEWER: So, you were certainly a thread puller. Who were some of your colleagues that played some different but similar roles?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Polk. Jim Owens in Polk County was there at the same time I was in Yamhill County. Dave Siegal in Polk County as well. Polk County did pretty well. They were sort of under the gun though.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: They had to do well. And let me see. Who else -- who else at that time? Polk and Yamhill, we were sort of classic examples of Willamette Valley planning, you know, with the new set of goals because we had all this ag land. Polk and Yamhill County both had Class 1, 2, 3 soils. One of my fondest memories is one afternoon, George, and I don't remember his last name, our SCS agent said, "Let's go out and I want to show you something." So, we went out in a van, my planning staff and me, and we tromped over to a field over by Amity, and maybe inside somebody's UGB, maybe not. George says, "Okay, the soil was just plowed over." He picks up a handful and he says, "Okay, feel this." And we each picked up a handful of soil. It was the most viable, silky, full-of-energy soil, and, he said, "Now that's Class 1 soil, folks." It was like, oh, we've got gold here. And then we spent some time while he told us about the geology of the area and how it was eons and eons before that that Class 1 soil was developed and therefore, the conclusion, and you didn't have to say it, is don't destroy eons and eons of natural resource bounty with your stupid developments in the future. It was a fantastic day, which for me, probably reinforced this business of, no, you know, we can do all kinds of things to ourselves and fight with one another but, boy, we cannot squander the planet Earth that we live on and this little land use program has some kind of tiny statement about that very issue and topic.

INTERVIEWER: I'm going to take a moment to recount my moment of the same kind in a meeting once with Bruce Anderson, the Director of Ag Department and some officials from Washington County, elected officials, and the mayor of Hillsboro. They were pretty directly, but delicately, trying to persuade Bruce Andrews that the Ag Department really ought to take agriculture to Eastern Oregon with all that open land they have over there -- and why do you have to be so fussy about this stuff out here in Washington County? Bruce just kind of looked at him and said, "253 crops," and went on to point out that the soils in Washington County are capable of

producing over time 253 crops, which provided lots of opportunities for varying the crop production, and if the market is down in one crop, you can do something else, you had good soil, you had water, and I thought really that was kind of the point. They crawled back. Yep.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yep. Because, again --

INTERVIEWER: Indisputable facts. Yes.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Other people who helped in Yamhill County, who were thread pullers, at least for that county and who had some kind of statewide pull, included Bill Blosser, who happened to be the chairperson of the Yamhill County Planning Commission when I was there. Boy, I was a lucky staff person. We had a wonderful planning commission, and it had a lot of farmers on it; they were all kind of thread pullers. You know, now that I think about it, is I didn't very often see me or one individual as a significant thread puller. It always seemed to me like there was a group of us kind of trying to herd ourselves a certain way, don't you think?

INTERVIEWER: Well, certainly. You describe that well in the adoption process, but every group is made up of individuals. So if you have one individual pulling, it seems to me, that inspires another individual to go ahead and pull -- and then the group begins to form.

MAGGIE COLLINS: And makes a difference. One of those thread pullers that I really admire, but didn't understand at the time, was Mary Pederson on the original SCIAC from Portland, who advocated for a process used in Portland, which it started out with this neighborhood association program. And she really worked on the State CIAC to adopt that kind of process in our Goal 1 work. She was a thread puller that way. She convinced us, even though this process sounded like way too much work for people living in Dufur.

INTERVIEWER: We've been dealing an awful lot with development of the goals, but let's go to the last couple of questions here. I think related to the acknowledgement and

implementations process, briefly tell us what you think about the 10-year long acknowledgement process. You've already alluded to this at one point. Its accomplishments/mistakes. Its duration.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, it was too long. We could have chopped some years off of that, two to three, it would have been better for everybody. One of the reasons that it was too long was that the stingy State Legislature didn't give the jurisdictions, or the DLCD staff, any money and it took more time and energy than anybody anticipated. The Legislature didn't believe that we were having some needs that were not being met in terms of staff time. Also some jurisdictions had been asleep at the wheel, and realized that, oh, god, we need planners; and they had to hire somebody to come in and help them. It gave some jurisdictions too much time to crab and crank around. So, in that way, probably the DLCD staff and the LCDC were too generous, oftentimes, giving yet another extension and another extension.

INTERVIEWER: Well, what could they have done as an alternative to that?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Boy, I don't know. Maybe nothing. Given the purpose of getting everybody to do a plan that was halfway decent that you could acknowledge under this law.

INTERVIEWER: And to avoid doing a state plan for it.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes. I'm not sure that I can say there was any alternative but we really did suffer from not having enough State resources behind this program.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

MAGGIE COLLINS: That wasn't because the Commission didn't ask for it in the State budget. There was a growing discontent that the State was telling locals what to do. And meanwhile, the State was saying, local control is no control, you know, and we planners were just trying to get down the road. It was tough.

INTERVIEWER: Can you offer any changes or additions that you'd like to see in the planning laws, including the goals, to assure that they face the challenges of the future?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, the tendency with a question like that is to fill in all the holes and make it bigger than it is right now, knowing that the world is more complicated and we've identified a lot more issues. Right. I'd say let's avoid doing that to the very extent we can. Certainly, the energy goal can use a huge revision. How big I can't even tell you. We could do something about the economy of the state goal, Goal 9, which I'm not even sure belongs in this land use plan because so much of it has to do with economic conditions that are in nobody's control. Right? But at the same time, the economy in this state leads to a land use issue of too much industrial land reserve for no result. We should really should look at the economy and that goal today. We definitely need to look at the Natural Hazards goal-- maybe we need to add climate change. And, finally, I don't think that it should be a goal, but I think that the comprehensive planning effort ought to be evaluated somehow using equity issues. Okay. Social and minority equity issues would bring more insight into the Housing Goal-- affordable housing. Above all, we should quit thinking that we really have to have such huge amounts of expansion of UGB's for the future.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I know I'm not supposed to put words in your mouth, but let me do just a bit of it here on that subject, because I thought about that a lot with regard to the Portland Metro UGB and the fact that when that UGB was acknowledged, it was well-documented that we had at least a 20-year supply of land for urban growth. And because of a lot of factors involved that are spelled out in the submittal document, there was an additional like 14 percent of land added beyond 20 years. It then took, because there was so much emphasis placed on three-year, five-year extensive analysis and updating of the boundary, it took 12 years before Metro had

the resources and the wherewithal, otherwise, to do the regional plan, which got into the details about transit locations that would reverse the intensive development in central cities and -- I forget their language now, but they had a -- nice plan. Wouldn't it have been neat if that 20-plus year supply had been looked at -- as a place to come in and do everything we can to stimulate infill and redevelopment and -- use the vacant land that's already identified?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. I think that's what you're--

MAGGIE COLLINS: Everybody says that a little differently but the thing is you have to kind of shake your head and say, why do we have these extra things? What is it that stops us from having the will to develop fully and livably the area already in the boundary? It just makes no sense. It's that screaming American version of manifest destiny, move on out, which reminds me of another thing too as a goal revision. We really need to take a look at the measurements that we're using for bringing land into an urban growth boundary with those archaic 20th Century notions about expansion, and substitute a decent demographic profile instead. We have better measurement tools.

INTERVIEWER: Better measurement tools?

MAGGIE COLLINS: We have ways now of using the census tract to identify blocks or areas where there's new and migrant immigration instead of saying, in the year 2040 we expect 500,000 more people with X amount of jobs and, and they never say an X amount of this, and without saying anything about X amount of recreation resource areas. It's just jobs and housing. We don't consider our absolute need to keep our eye on and get ahead of the sustainability thing that matters most, our natural resources in a given area.

INTERVIEWER: So, I think in highlighting, I have a follow-on question I'm supposed to share, but I think we've already trod over that ground a lot about state and local officials, ballot measures, legislature, court ruling that have been significant in affecting the program. I don't know if you have any further comments --

MAGGIE COLLINS: No. You know, I think the ballot measure that passed, was a setback, but given the issues that I believe we need to be facing that are affecting and can affect this program, the business of people going back to their plan, revising on basis of a revised set of goals that fit more of what we're facing in the future so that we will continue to have livability, that's where I think we ought to be going.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. If we wanted to talk endlessly on, we could note the fact that there were other things that we haven't even broached as subjects yet. The role of regional planning. The periodic review process. The influence of LUBA. There are a couple things identified in Senate Bill 100 itself but do you have comments on the entities' regional planning or periodic reviews, or LUBA?

MAGGIE COLLINS: I love the construct of Metro. When I was working at the City of Milwaukie, we used to have folks come in from all over the country, planner types mostly, they asked, "How do you do it? How do you get that many people to sit down at the table?" I remember getting assigned to meet these visitors sometimes and we'd look at our fellow Metro jurisdiction planners, smile, and reply, "We just do it." Coordination is just a total gift, you know - that we really have to be careful and not lose. LUBA is one of, if not the best implementer this program could have had, and has had all the way through. Getting into a rational sort of decision-making away from the kind of messy citizen business that goes on with the program at the local jurisdiction level, really a great idea.

INTERVIEWER: My recollection is that some of the impetus was the Appeals Court and the Supreme Court wanted to take some of the pressure off their agendas, land use planning is a big program -- statewide program

MAGGIE COLLINS: You're right.

INTERVIEWER: Well, special districts and state agencies were specified in the statute.

MAGGIE COLLINS: It would be nice to have a renaissance of interest and involvement in our comprehensive planning by many of the state agencies and special districts. You know, they, in my opinion, slid down the coordination hill because they've been allowed to. But on the other hand, if they're viable units for the future, they would be looking at this coordination role and getting more collaborative and cooperative with things they could do to help. It's a sort of two-way street there.

INTERVIEWER: Do any state agencies over the years stand out in your mind as being particularly contributory to the --

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, for a long time, I think ODOT was really a good strong partner. Not so much in these last eight or nine years. One of the reasons that ODOT, however, in the early days was helpful, is that it had a lot of money and it had a lot of federal assistance. It was a pass-through agency for Tri-Met and light rail in Portland, for example. Highways were on the improvements list and it wasn't going to take 25 years before they would get some improvements done. It was a good strong agency and it had a mission that it would, you know, cross lines.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. There was a lot of effort for a period of time there to stimulate cooperation and collaboration between ODOT and locals. Grace Crunican and Susan Brody were influential.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Craig Greenleaf was there for awhile.

INTERVIEWER: Department of Agriculture.

MAGGIE COLLINS: It's always been a quiet partner. I think it could probably, again, help us do a new inventory of our ag land potential statewide now. Wouldn't that be fantastic? We really need to have that done.

INTERVIEWER: Let me see if you would confirm or not my observation on Jim Johnson at Ag, who has been an avid supporter and very active in providing soil information in various spaces.

MAGGIE COLLINS: He has and maybe he needs some support. My point is that the Department of Ag is the obvious logical one to do the statewide inventory that I desperately want us to have, you know, to make sure that we're doing everything we can with our viable soil.

INTERVIEWER: Good point.

MAGGIE COLLINS: DEQ is really spotty. When it was at its best, it was fantastic to work with DEQ. It's just been a roller coaster thing, you know? So, I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: At the high point do any contributors come to mind?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, yeah. Well, people like Greg Winterrowd. At DEQ there was a program where field reps called you up and said, "Hi, we hear you're working on so and so, can we be of help?"

INTERVIEWER: Fred Hansen. He and the influence of Joyce Cohen contributed a lot. Yeah. Well, I'm exhausted. (Chuckling)

MAGGIE COLLINS: (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: So, we've come to the end of the formal questions. Do you have any closing thoughts you'd like to add?

MAGGIE COLLINS: Oh. We have lots of new issues and problems in this state. We have the people resources to tackle them. We have an example, through this program, of one way to tackle some of them, not all of them, but some of them. We have a bounty of resources from which to draw that could disappear without our stewardship and watchfulness. It seems important that this program makes its necessary adjustments for middle age, you might say, and get into the clothes that are necessary for it to march along for a little. It seems really important for people to understand that if they love living in a nice environment it just didn't happen. There's this huge historical movement of people and places that have made this special and that should not be ignored by our 21st Century dwellers, you know. We shouldn't let it go.

INTERVIEWER: Super. Super. We've been speaking with Maggie Collins, one of the original members of DLCD's State Citizen Involvement Committee. Maggie, we appreciate your contribution today and look forward to seeing the finished product. Thank you very much.

MAGGIE COLLINS: Well, thank you for asking me to participate. I appreciate it.

(Concluded)

mc7/11/15