

# The Origins and Future of Land Use Planning

A conversation with Arnold Cogan and Richard Benner, the first and the current director of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, interviewed by Sumner Sharpe.

## Interview Part I



Arnold Cogan

Richard Benner

**Sumner Sharpe (SS):** I want to get some perspective on where we have been, comments about where we are not, and then talk about where we are going.

The original vision involved protection of agriculture and resource lands, combined with trying to limit or define urban growth. Is that a fair characterization?

**Arnold Cogan (AC):** Those items were definitely part of the vision. Timber and agricultural land were to be protected. Rampant growth was underway; those resources were endangered, especially in the Willamette Valley. There was another part of the original Senate Bill 100 (SB100) of critical concern to state agencies which the legislature and subsequent governors saw as less important. These areas included the Columbia River Gorge, the antelope grazing areas, the Willows, and the coast, of course.

**SS:** The coast was a separate program at the time...

**AC:** Well, the coast was a separate piece, and we talked about making that an area of critical state concern. We already had the Oregon Coastal Conservation Development Commission.

**Richard Benner (RB):** I was a staff attorney at 1000 Friends of Oregon in 1975-76. At that time, of all that they could have worked on, the

Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) chose to emphasize getting the urban growth boundaries into place and getting Exclusive Farm Use zoning. Also, the purpose statement of SB100 talked about coordination and efficiency, so it was more than just a landscape vision, it was also a vision of more coordinated and efficient government.

**AC:** That makes me think of two other aspects, you might call them procedural subsets of the vision. How this would all be accomplished was through local land use planning, city and county comprehensive planning. It wasn't to be a state land use plan—a top-down approach to dictating or directing to local communities. We developed a set of state rules, regulations, and procedures which local government was to follow. That was new. The other part that was new was the departure from our neighbors to the north and south who adopted state environmental policies acts which prescribed procedures to look at environmental impacts, and required environmental impact statements or environmental assessments. We made the intentional decision to depart from that. We wanted to have more of a planning approach to produce a more orderly development pattern, to plan ahead of time rather than look at impacts after the fact.

**SS:** How well do you think we have done, either on the procedural side or trying to find this relationship between urban growth and resource land? What kind of marks would you give us?

**RB:** I think the vision that we were just talking about, confining it to the Willamette Valley for a moment, is actually fairly well imprinted. All the land that could reasonably be placed in a farm zone or a forest zone has been. In the last 10-12 years, since we have been keeping track of plan amendments or zone changes looking at land being





taken out of farmland zoning or forest land and putting it into a residential, commercial, or industrial zone, or adding it to an urban growth boundary there has actually been very little movement along those lines. State-wide over the last 10-12 years, the expansions of urban growth boundaries have averaged about 800 acres a year. This is pretty amazing, I think, for a state that has been growing as fast as we have.

All of that masks some things that have not gone according to plan. Within farm and forest zones, non-farm uses have been creeping in over the years golf courses, churches, schools, commercial activities in conjunction with farm use, and every legislative session adds two or three new uses last time it was insect farms, and the session before that it was amonies, so there is always a temptation to add other uses.

However, I would argue, since the new rules that LCDC enacted in 1994, those two zones are in much better shape than they were five years ago. You can no longer have a golf course on high value farmland. You can't have churches, you can't have schools, you can't have campgrounds anymore; and we were losing a lot of ground to those. But the most significant thing that the 1994 rules did was to make it more difficult to put a house on high value farmland in the state, most of which is in the Willamette Valley. DLCD gets reports from every county every year about everything in their farm zones, ranging from golf courses to houses. When you look at the number of farm dwellings built in the state in the years before the 1994 rules, and compare it with the years after the implementation of the rules, it has gone down by a factor of two-thirds. I think we can safely say that the new farm dwellings being built in the Willamette Valley are those that are associated with real farming and real farmers. So I think the vision is in place, and largely successful.

**SS:** How well have we done inside the

Continued on page 20



More of the conversation between Arnold Cogan,  
Richard Benner and Sumner Sharpe

Left, Standard Plaza in downtown

## Interview Part II

*continued from page 17*

people to think about a different way to grow within the boundary, in part to keep the boundary from expanding but also trying to give some direction to smart development and the transportation planning rules. How well have we done on that side of the equation?

**RB:** In the early days of the program, LDCD didn't have the respect of other agencies yet, and it had its hands full. There were 15 statewide planning goals and four more coming down, and a tiny agency with a small budget. What should it have worked on first? Well, it put the boundaries in place...

**AC:** No, the first thing we worked on was finding a place to have an office...

**RB:** You worked on the urban growth boundaries, and resource lands. Focusing on patterns of development inside of urban growth boundaries was a secondary concern, off in the future. If there has been a big shift in the emphasis of the program, it would be that. LDCD, with some pressure from Gov. Goldschmidt, realized that if we didn't look at what was happening inside of urban growth boundaries, we were not going to be able to contain urban development. We were not going to be able to protect farmland if we developed at low densities inside urban growth boundaries. We were going to end up prematurely busting out the boundaries. So we're paying more attention to what goes on inside the boundaries. If you just look at dollar for dollar where we spend our money now, about three-fourths of it is spent on projects inside the boundaries as compared to work on farm and forestland protection; so we have very definitely turned the corner. At the end of the '80s beginning of the '90s, we did a study of how things were going inside the boundaries. We looked at Portland, Bend, Medford, and Brookings, and found that new development was happening at relatively low densities, and definitely at lower densities than those authorized in the acknowledged comprehensive plans. We found it was very complicated with many different factors. Since that time we have been trying to get at those factors and influ-

ence them in one way or another. For example, the transportation and growth management program tries to encourage development at densities closer to what the plans call for, and more compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented developments.

**AC:** The process of planning and the substance of planning are connected and affect how we have done and what is happening inside of the boundaries. I think the process is working reasonably well. However, in traveling around the state and listening to people, my observations are that there is a concern by a lot of local planners, particularly at the city level but also at the county, that there is too much bureaucracy in the process; that there is not enough flexibility in the system to be able to allow individual differences to work; that we have the goals and we have the regulations and the rules; that we have the process of how it works and a lot of legal

The statewide  
planning program  
doesn't try to  
stop growth, it just  
tries to channel it in  
certain places.

precedent backing it up. But I think that when all is said and done, there is a lot of concern at the local level that there is not enough room to breathe within the system and to permit creativity. Which gets over to the other side of this. There is so much effort at the process and trying to maintain that process and keep it current, that I think the quality of the plan, of many plans, are not what they should be. I think we suffer from a lack of quality in the comprehensive plans that are prepared and updated, as well as in the actual development that occurs. I don't think that we are seeing the kind of quality development inside the urban growth boundaries that we ought to be seeing.

**SS:** Is this because of lack of clarity or

direction in the vision?

**AC:** I think the vision was always devoted to the areas that were emergent—growth, and farm and forest, and I think that Dick is absolutely right. We solved those or at least we pretty well contained growth and protected to a large extent the farm and forest lands. But the quality of development that has occurred inside urban growth boundaries is not to the level that it should be. Whether we have a system that is overprescribed or whether we have one that needs different prescriptions, I'm not certain. I think that there is an appreciation for the program's success in protecting farm and forest, and in containing urban growth, but I think there is some disaffection for all the other issues that are coming out, the feeling of a loss of local opportunity and creativity and being able to handle their own destinies.

**SS:** To what degree have we been either too prescriptive or not prescriptive enough? Is the process that you defined earlier, the local-state relationship, adequate for the next 20 years? Is that the model we want? Would you modify that model, that vision?

**AC:** I think that some modifications are clearly needed. Just because we have had a system in place and it has worked reasonably well for 25 years, that is not evidence or testimony that it is the ideal model for the next 25 years. As I said before, I'm not certain where all the changes need to occur. It seems to me there need to be some, perhaps some separation between mandatory standards of land use planning that we don't want to relax, and other areas where we could institute some flexibility that would permit local creativity and maybe even creativity within areas of a local jurisdiction.

**RB:** My view is that the program has always been fairly prescriptive outside the urban growth boundary. In fact, if you look at the exclusive farm use statute and the changes to the statute dealing with forest lands, together with LDCD rules, things are closely circumscribed out there—a state minimum lot size, a list of uses you can have, a set of criteria that are reflected in zoning ordinances, it's almost as though the state has done

The focus should be on what the community wants to be and then on whether or not they meet the rules, and what changes are needed to address the rules or why they cannot be addressed.

the zoning. On the inside of the boundary, take off the statewide planning goal, and where do you find the prescriptions?

**SS:** Maybe the Transportation Planning Rule?

**RB:** That rule is recent. The housing goal didn't tell you what your density had to be, except in the Portland Metro area, where we set a performance standard instead of prescribing actual uses. So you can be as creative as you want about how to get the ten units per acre, or eight units per acre, or six units per acre. The system does not circumscribe creativity. In the transportation planning rule, it's getting you in that direction. It tells you that in certain places where you've got transit or a transit opportunity you are going to have to orient buildings a certain way. I don't find that so stifling. If it were really prescriptive, then you would expect to see the same kind of densities and patterns of development and ordinances as you look from city to city, from Portland to Corvallis, to Bend. You don't see that. That's not what we have. We have something very different in the Portland Metro area from what you see in Medford.

**SS:** I think there is a growing frustration with the pace of growth, being able to respond to growth, and people's perception of change. Is there something we could do—more education, better information, more discussion—is there anything we can do to deal with this?

**RB:** I hear very different things from professional planners and from people in general as to what their expectations are, what they want out of the planning tools of the state system or what their own city or county government gives them. I certainly hear the refrain that you were talking about from county planners, who would like to try a different set of

tools to protect agricultural land from those in the statewide planning program. For example, they say, instead of having all these complicated tests for farm dwellings and non-farm dwellings, let's just establish an overall density, and as long as you keep it to one house per 40 acres, then you don't have to apply the tests, we won't have litigation and hearings and all that stuff. I don't really hear that from city planners very much. Most recently I hear from people who wonder why we have to have all this growth, who say they support the land use planning program, like protecting forest lands and farmland, but isn't there something we can do to cut down on the amount of growth that we are facing? That's what's bothering me in my neighborhood! The answer is that the statewide planning program doesn't try to stop growth, it just tries to channel it in certain places, so you really shouldn't look to the statewide planning program to slow or stop growth—it's not designed to do that.

**SS:** Sustainable is used in a lot of contexts—for example, people talk about sustainable economic growth or sustainable environments. There is a lot of discussion about that, but translating it into action is difficult. I think sustainable growth assumes we maintain a quality of life and makes sure that we don't outrun the capacity to service development that is occurring. There is concern about inadequate storm water management, loss of trees, there is a sense of the environment changing around people, and I'm not sure that regulations, alone, get us there.

**RB:** I don't think it is impossible to accomplish sustainability with regulation, but it may not be the best way to do that. In the discussions that we—the five agencies that make up the Governor's Community Solutions Team and maybe the natural resource agencies in addition—have had about sus-

tainability, people are usually thinking about natural resources, such as the steelhead plan. We have also tried to think about it in the context of urban sustainability. What does it mean in an urban setting? We have just begun to think about such things as sustainability of infrastructure, which means that if you continue to develop in a manner so that the next increment of development doesn't pay its way, it has to be subsidized by the existing residences. For example, if each new residence that comes in pays only 90 percent of its true costs in property tax assessments, that's probably not sustainable. If, on the other hand, you can develop a pattern that provides net revenue, or at least it's even in terms of its costs and benefits, well, in a sense that's sustainable from an economic point of view. I keep thinking of that American farmland trust study that was done in the central valley of California, which looked at the cost to the local governments there of settlement at three units per acre. For each new residence they were going to lose \$1.27 a year. If instead, they grew at six units per acre it was going to be a net gain of 27 cents a year per residence. It sounds like if you get a little bit more compact you could sustain it, but that's in isolation, of course, from the rest of what makes sustainability.

**AC:** The City of Portland's Sustainable Community Commission looks to Europe for its closest counterpart. There aren't very many similar sustainable community commissions in this country. In fact, Portland played host last Spring to an international conference of other countries and states that have such programs. Probably we haven't even scratched the surface with the sustainability criteria and goals that could be introduced.

Continued on page 30

Downtown Portland with  
Burnside and Steel  
Bridges, 1963

The final installment of  
a conversation between  
Arnold Cogan, Richard  
Benner and Sumner Sharpe

Interview Part III  
*continued from page 22*

**SS:** People see the Transportation Planning Rule as one being imposed upon them rather than looking at what the underlying reasoning is behind it. I think part of the difficulty is that planning efforts begin by saying this is what the DLCD says you've got to do so here's what your plan must do. Planners are sometimes as guilty of this approach as anybody else. That's a mistake. The focus should be on what the community wants to be and then whether or not they meet the rules, and what changes are needed to address the rules or why they cannot be addressed.

**AC:** I know that the process is very prescriptive outside urban growth boundaries, and that's where it has to be. But planners all over the state say it is increasingly prescriptive inside the UGB, whether it's a transportation/growth management program or something that came out of a periodic review process, that we are doing it this way because DLCD is making us do it this way. Whether it is fair or not, or true or not, that is certainly a common complaint.

**RB:** I hear it on a daily basis. Think about the transportation planning rule. For example, if you're a Metropolitan Planning Organization, you've got to meet a Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita reduction target over time. That's a performance measure, and you can do it any way you want to. You can be as creative as you want, and it doesn't even have to be a land use technique. You can do it by regulating the use of automobiles, if you want. I understand the reality of the accusation that inside urban growth boundaries the program is so prescriptive that it's cutting down on creativity and innovation, but I don't really see it.

**SS:** I suspect there is room for discussion with local planners, consultants, and DLCD staff who are in the field offices and involved with some of those





Isn't there something we can do to cut down on the amount of growth that we are facing? The statewide program doesn't try to stop growth, it just tries to channel it in certain places.

programs. Different planners approach it differently, and DLCD staff approach it differently as well. Some staff look primarily for specific regulatory output, and are a little less giving on the side of being more innovative. On the other hand, there are staff who are incredibly part of the process and are creative. So I think somehow the planning community has some responsibility to improve planning efforts and/or be more creative. Let me shift gears here. One of the original things in Oregon was that there was bipartisan support for the program. We've had several ballot box initiatives that supported the program by wider margins each time the program was tested, and legislatures have generally been pretty supportive. Given where we are now, given the political climate both in the country and in Oregon, and looking ahead to the next 20 years, do you think we have the political bipartisanship that is adequate to really carry us forward?

**AC:** Can I just go back? I'm not sure bipartisan is really the way I would totally describe it. It certainly required bipartisan support to get through the legislature and pass SB100, but there was also the bipartisan character of the legislature in 1969, and we didn't pass at least three other bills that would have given us land use planning four years earlier. So the bipartisan part was very important.

But I'd say perhaps more important was the large support coalition—the farming community, the environmental community, and a whole bunch of other organizations. The League of Women Voters was very active in that 1972-73 effort. But ultimately what helped, besides the farm bureau, was the business community, particularly the homebuilders. The state homebuilders association was especially supportive. So it

was an unusual coalition of support which allowed for bipartisanship and passage of the bill. It was not a landslide passage, but without that coalition, I don't think bipartisanship would have done any good. From that standpoint the coalition is really what helped keep the issue alive in the minds of most Oregonians, at least those who voted. And then all the public involvement that took place those first several years helped to cement that, and gave people a sense of ownership. So they felt it was their program. It's a very different situation today.

**RB:** I think that most of that coalition is still there, actually. If you think about what happened in the last two sessions of the legislature, all the bills that were put forth to change the land use program, to change the farmland protection part of it, particularly, it was the farm bureau and other farm support outside the farm bureau that carried the day.

**AC:** I think that's true.

**RB:** The home-building industry continues to support the program. It's perhaps not as passionate as it was in the late 70s and early 80s, when they saw there was something of value for their industry in the program. That's worn off a little bit, but I think you would find that the homebuilders are still strong supporters of the program. Every session they come in with a couple of bills not to destroy the program or even to change it radically, but to make it work better for them. So I think they are still part of the coalition.

I think that when you look at what has happened in the legislature, land use isn't suffering any more than a lot of issues. There is a more partisan view of the world, and it's true in Congress, it's

true in the Oregon legislature, and it's probably true in most state legislatures. There is more of a cleavage between the two parties, and every issue is going to be cast in a context based upon that partisanship, and that has hit land use, it has hit environmental agendas as well, and tax reform. So I guess I wouldn't say that land use had suffered from loss of bipartisan support any more than a lot of issues, and I hope that we can find the middle again in Oregon.

**SS:** There has been some talk about going back out to the communities to have another discussion about the program. Obviously it is a different time and place, but what one or two things would you like to have discussed? Fashioning a new vision or updating the vision—are there some things we would make sure are on the agenda?

**RB:** I would want to know if they still subscribe to the fundamental vision that underlies the Oregon planning program—the one we set out at the beginning. We protect farm and forest land and other things outside of urban growth boundaries, and we try to contain and focus urban growth and development where we have already made a commitment to public facilities and services. Do we continue to subscribe to that? Because it is so reasonable, I think people would say, yes, we continue to subscribe to that vision. That doesn't answer the fine point about whether, if it becomes necessary to protect farmland outside the urban growth boundary, you subscribe to the vision knowing that it might mean another dwelling unit on your block in your neighborhood. I would like to know the answer to that, too. When Metro was doing its polling from 1992 to 1994, they would post those questions, and people in the abstract would say, yes, I am willing to do that, I



Because we have had this regulatory system in place, maybe we have not thought about other things that we could have done to get to the same place.

am willing to accept a little higher density in my neighborhood if it means we can continue to sustain this vision. In the years since then, as zoning changes have been proposed in their neighborhood and the hearings have been held, and they see what it means, they are not so sure.

**SS:** Is it the density or is it the loss of something else? Is it the way that it is being done? That plans are not sensitive to local conditions?

**RB:** I'm glad to hear you say that, that's really a big part of it. In the Oregonian series on Portland, you'll remember the photograph, there was a person standing on his back porch, on a small lot, single family dwelling, looking across his back yard, and there is a facade or maybe the back side of an apartment building. The person says my back yard is destroyed and my neighborhood is diminished as a result of that. Chances are he might have felt differently about that complex next to him if it had been designed differently, if it had presented a different face to him, if there had been trees there, or if the community plan for that neighborhood had said to the community, all right, in order to have this whole thing work, there is going to have to be some additional development near you. Now, in order to make it worth your while, we are going to do a couple of things. We are going to provide you with a pocket park that you haven't had before. We are going to put in sidewalks so that your kids can walk more safely to the school to which you now have to drive them to because it is not safe for them to walk. To me, adding those amenities to a neighborhood is important. The Multnomah neighborhood is a good example—the resistance up there is because there are dead end roads, and

the city seems to promote additional development when they don't have the infrastructure figured out yet.

**AC:** I think that the consensus behind the programs, the whole land use image that we have, is fraying at the edges. While we do have homebuilders and other important groups and constituent organizations that form a coalition of supporters, I think that the consensus is fraying. I think there are several reasons why. Probably one of the most important is that many people, most of the people who live here, weren't around when this program was born, and they weren't part of that process, or even part of creating the goals or going to the meetings and really living through that creation process. So many of them don't have any connection with it, they don't have any attachment. I think that the question I would ask if we were talking to the public, is a more basic, open-ended one: how do we take the Governor's Oregon Livability Initiative, which I think is a good program, one step further? We assume that we know how to do that, that we'll beef up the Oregon Department of Transportation and help the Community Solutions Team, and I think all those would be wonderful steps to take, but I don't know if the people believe that. I think that we need to go out and ask people what they think we need to do to maintain the quality of life in this state.

**SS:** While achieving the vision?

**AC:** Yeah. What do we need to do to get to that vision? How do we do that? We might come up with other programs that DLCD doesn't even do right now, or that DLCD could do in combination with other agencies on the Community Solutions Team. However, I don't think that we've brought people into the

process enough and asked them what we should do to make this work. I think that we should not assume that we've got all the pieces and that we just need to organize them so that we can help people better. It's just go to those people and ask them what they think we need to do to make this community, this neighborhood, that neighborhood, a better place.

**SS:** I think in most places people would agree with the vision and goals. The challenge is how we are going to do the planning. The vision didn't specify exactly how to do that—there is flexibility—and I think that there are some very simple principles that underlie a lot of the administrative rules and goals. For example, kids ought to be able to walk safely to schools. We've got to get back to basics. I'm convinced that it's everyday life that makes a difference to most people, not the big things.

**AC:** And how do we develop a system, what are the characteristics and the functions of a system that helps to do that, to be able to create safe environments, quality environments? That's what I was getting to in the early part of this discussion. I think that in many places we don't have quality communities. We don't have quality, in fact, even in the new places being built.

**SS:** We've got a lot of subdivisions.

**AC:** We've got a lot of subdivisions, but I don't know if they add up, in total, to quality communities or quality environments.

**RB:** One of the weaknesses of the system is the periodic review process. We haven't figured out a way to get communities, people in communities, involved in those decisions. I mean, it

I don't think that we've brought people into the process enough and asked them what we should do to make this work.

can happen if a local government chooses to put the resources into it; but it's very time consuming and very expensive, and the state system doesn't reinforce it very well. Every four to ten years each community is supposed to revisit its plan. The notion behind that is that when you do periodic review everything is on the table everybody comes out, it's a big town meeting and we revisit our comprehensive plan does this still give expression to our vision? Should we change our vision? It's never worked out that way; there's not enough money in it, the state makes small grants to do periodic review, enough for two-thirds of a planner's time for a year, and local governments have state statutes to respond to that have to be in the work program. They have new goal requirements they have to respond to. So they end up focusing on getting it done instead of getting everybody out and having a big town meeting and figuring out what our vision should be. So this has got to be changed; the state has to set something up that is more conducive to bringing up the new Oregonians into the discussion about what the vision ought to be.

**AC:** They are disconnected. They are clearly disconnected. That is part of the problem.

**SS:** I remember very well in 1970 or 1971, trying to contact a guy named Arnold Cogan. I was teaching then and I wanted to ask Arnold to speak to my class. Well, he's somewhere out in central or eastern Oregon, he's in a van, driving from community to community. I call him on the telephone and ask when he will be back in town. He doesn't know when he is going to be back, he's meeting with someone in Christmas Valley.

**RB:** He had the first mobile phone in

the state.

**SS:** This type of a process, can we have a statewide discussion of some kind at the community level? It could happen at the local level if you look at periodic review, but I think we are suggesting a broader approach.

**AC:** It's much more comprehensive.

**SS:** So do we all get in vans and drive around?

**AC:** Well, something like that. What I propose is something like that that order of magnitude needs to occur. It shouldn't just be five town hall meetings in five strategic places around the state and that's it. I think it needs to be a serious effort of outreach and education and feedback so that it's carried out statewide. I went to 35 cities in the state three different times in a fifteen month period. It wasn't just five cities. Now when you think of going around the state you think, well, Bend will be everything east of the mountains, and Medford will be everything south, and that's the way we do it now.

**RB:** Well, you were going out, asking a much more fundamental set of questions than we would now. Now we are making a revision to the goals, and we're not asking people to rethink the world, we're asking them, what do you think about this adjustment here?

**AC:** That's what I was saying. I'm suggesting, that we go out and ask people, are you satisfied with the quality of life here? Are you satisfied that the plan is helping? What changes would you make? Where would you like the quality of life to be going, or how would you like us to improve it? What do you want to do? We went to Bend 25 years ago and asked, what do you think about the

Oregon coast? Are there some parts of that coast that concern you? We also went to the coast and asked people about central Oregon. So it wasn't just a little part of the state; we were trying to get a flavor of what everybody in the state felt about the entire state, not just back yards. I think it is important to try to connect in a very broad, open-ended way, where people feel not only that they are being a part of this, but there's a sense of good will that is created from that process, which if it is carried out well will do it.

**RB:** Now we only ask people in general whether they continue to subscribe to the overall vision for the state the containment of urban growth and the protection of farm and forest land outside. Instead, I go to several towns and make sure that the people have the tools to articulate a vision and then see what it would mean in their region. I guess I am talking about making sure that every region of the state had a base case scenario, a 2040 type capability. If they don't really like the vision, or don't think we should have urban growth boundaries and farmland outside, or think that we should have a bunch of new communities around a perimeter of the valley connected with superhighways, they should have the capability to see what that vision would mean. You would contrast it with the base case, and project it up on the wall, and they would have these performance measures. For example, I want to be able to have kids walk to school; well, how would that be affected if you put your vision into a plan. Then I think we could have a much more meaningful regional dialogue about what we want.

**SS:** So you're saying there could be regional differences?

Perhaps we can accomplish our growth management objectives just by doing the green tax shift in place of or to complement the existing set of strategies.

**AC:** It should build that in. The 1000 Friends of Oregon's Willamette Valley alternatives project is doing that but it's not going to have the public involvement component that it deserves.

**RB:** You've got this data base that everybody ought to see, everybody, and they ought to have a bunch of meetings around the Valley.

**SS:** I think that would be interesting, because I think that people have expressed a concern that when it's all said and done, 20 or 30 years from now, this will all be one urban region, from Portland to Salem, one place. It's all one market, and if you have 40 percent of people commuting back and forth, it's all really one metropolitan area. We haven't really done the job of defining our community.

**RB:** I think that's hogwash.

**SS:** But there is concern about that.

**RB:** I know there is. But Metro 2040 tells us that we can contain 40 years worth of growth and development in the existing boundary plus 18,600 acres. Well, let's say that's very optimistic and it's really going to be 25,000 acres. Well, most of those 25,000 acres are going to be rural residential areas ringing the area, and maybe 5-10,000 acres of farmland. Then you come to Salem, which says it's got a 35-year supply inside its urban growth boundary, so, when you go out 20 years, there's no expansion of the boundary. It's not coming up to Portland. Eugene, Albany, Corvallis—they all say they can contain 20-30 years worth of growth inside their boundaries with maybe some modest expansion. So where is this stuff that all of a sudden all of the urban areas in the valley start

touching one another? I don't think that's realistic, unless we are wildly off on our population projections.

**SS:** I think there is a lesson to be learned for planners who are out there, to really find ways to reconnect with people at the neighborhood and local level. We really ought to talk about the quality of life and what's important, and what it means for everyday life. That's where planning has got to go.

**RB:** Ask them what attributes they would like to have in their neighborhoods, their larger communities, and then get them thinking about how to get there. Saying that the rules suggest this and the rules provide that, gets to be rule-focused, requirement-focused, instead of value-focused as it should be.

**SS:** Any final comments?

**RB:** I would mention one thing. You got me thinking about where it is all going. The one thing that might have helped us, if we had been sophisticated enough 25 years ago, would have been to require that state agencies adhere to the goals and adhere to the acknowledged comprehensive plan. We did think about coordination; what we didn't think of, and we weren't alone in missing this, is how we could have used state investments and coordinated investment strategies in order to help accomplish the vision. And it's taken us until about now to figure that out. Neil Pierce has written about all the smart growth programs in New Jersey, Maryland. They all concluded that they did not want to try Oregon's approach, that it is too regulatory, but that they do want to go where Oregon is going, so they are going to try to coordinate state investments in order to get there. Maryland is only going to invest in designated areas; it is going to

pay only five percent for a new school out on the fringe, but it will pay 85 percent of reconstruction or improvement of an existing school. They are all coming to about the same conclusion. We have been slow on that point, in part because we've had another system in place on which we've been relying. We are finally getting to the point where we can see, we can re-enforce the growth management strategy by having a state investment strategy.

**SS:** It seems to me that in part it does say that at least in perception we rely too much on regulation.

**RB:** Yeah. Because we have had this regulatory system in place, maybe we have not thought about other things that we could have done to get to the same place. State investment strategy is one, maybe we can use congestion pricing as one. Perhaps we can accomplish our growth management objectives just by doing the green tax shift in place of or to complement the existing set of strategies.

**AC:** It's interesting to think about coming up with non-regulatory approaches to achieving our goals and getting to that vision. How do we put a public/private partnership together to achieve these kinds of investments and these kinds of advancements, improving the quality of life and the environment, with non-regulatory methods? We need to build a toolbox with non-regulatory tools, that put less emphasis on agencies and agency rules and regulations, and more reliance on non-regulatory approaches. We need to encourage that to happen—stimulate that kind of an environment. I think there is some promise to that.

**SS:** Thank you both very much.