

POLITICAL EFFICIENCY AND POLITICAL EFFECTIVENESS IN WATER-RELATED POLICY AREAS:
A REPORT OF RESEARCH RESULTS ON THREE STATE AGENCIES IN OREGON

Prepared by
W. Bruce Shepard
Department of Political Science
Oregon State University

and

D. Jay Doubleday
Atkinson Graduate School of Administration
Willamette University

Completion report for Project A-030-ORE funded by
the Office of Water Research and Technology, U.S. Department of the Interior,
under the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, as amended.

November, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Background	1
Introduction	1
The Research Objective	2
General Research Design	6
The Three Agencies	8
State Water Resources Board	10
Department of Environmental Quality	14
Land Conservation and Development Commission	18
The Four Counties	23
General Description	23
Water Problems	25
Local Contacts	28
Findings and Discussion	36
State Programs and Policies: The View from the Local Level	36
Shared Responsibilities at the State Level	37
Sharing Responsibilities Between State and Local Government	47
Perceptions of Agency Success in Finding Out Local Needs and Interests	56
Success in Incorporation of Local Needs and Interests in Policies Adopted	63
Regional Differences	69
Water Quality and Stream Flow Concerns of the Sample as a Whole	71
Water Quality and Stream Flow Concerns by County	78
Major Land Use Concerns by County	83
Local Sentiments on Desired Programs and Policies	88
Success in Obtaining Compliance	90
Perceptions of State Agency Success in Obtaining Local Compliance	90
Factors Related to Success in Obtaining Local Compliance	93
Conclusions	108
Notes	112
Appendices	115
A. Selected Tables	116
B. Instrument for Interviewing Local Contacts	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Percentage of Local Contacts Identifying Agencies with Programs of Local Importance in Each of Three Policy Areas	9
2 Selected Characteristics of Deschutes, Jackson, Lincoln, and Marion Counties	24
3 Types of Water Supply and Sewage Disposal for Housing Units in 1970 by County	27
4 Number of Local Contacts by Position and County	31
5 Amount of Contact with SWRB, DEQ, and LCDC Reported by Local Officials	33
6 Most Frequent Type of Contact with Agencies	35
7 Local Perceptions of the Degree to Which Responsibilities for Water Quality, Stream Flows, and Land Use are Shared among State Agencies	38
8 For Those Who Perceive State Responsibilities Shared in Several or Many State Agencies, Percentages of Informants Seeing Advantages and Problems in That Sharing	41
9 Types of Advantages and Problems Resulting from Shared Responsibilities among State Agencies	43
10 Perceptions of State and Local Responsibility for Policy Areas	48
11 Frequency Which Local Contacts Identified Types of Changes in State and Local Responsibilities as Desirable	50
12 Reasons for Changing State and Local Responsibilities by Policy Area	52
13 Perceptions of Level of Success of Three Agencies in Finding Out About Local Needs and Interests	57
14 Perceptions of Relative Success of Three Agencies in Finding Out About Local Needs and Interests	58
15 Reasons for Relative Success and Failure of Three Agencies in Finding Out Local Needs and Interests	61
16 Perceptions of Level of Success of Three Agencies in Using Information About Local Needs and Interests When Adopting Policies	64

Table	Page
17 Perceptions of Relative Success of Three Agencies in Using Information About Local Needs and Interests When Adopting Policies	65
18 Reasons for Relative Success and Failure of Three Agencies in Using Information About Local Needs and Interests When Adopting Policies	67
19 Percentage of Contacts Mentioning Types of Water Quality Concerns by County	72
20 Percentage of Contacts Mentioning Types of Stream Flow Concerns by County	76
21 Percentage of Contacts Mentioning Types of Land Use Concerns by County	85
22 Levels of Success of Three Agencies in Obtaining Local Compliance	91
23 Reasons for Success and Lack of Success of Three Agencies in Obtaining Local Compliance	95
A-1 Amount of Contact with SWRB, DEQ, and LCDC by County	116
A-2 Amount of Contact Reported with SWRB, DEQ, and LCDC by County and City Officials	117
A-3 Local Perceptions of Degree of Shared Responsibilities at the State Level for Three Policy Areas by Type of Official	118
A-4 Perceptions of State and Local Responsibilities for Water Quality by County	119
A-5 Percentage of 53 Contacts Mentioning Desired Policies by Policy Area	120
A-6 Success Scores by Agency by County by Policy Stage	121

BACKGROUND

Introduction

Oregonians don't tan in the summer, they rust. So states a bumper sticker popular in Oregon. In many ways, Oregonians promote an association between Oregon and rain. Most universities pick tigers, bears, lions, and the like as their mascots; only at the University of Oregon does one find, "the Fighting Ducks."

Oregon and rain, the two are synonomous. Yet in the spring of 1977, Oregonians anticipated major disruptions from a dry fall and winter. Water would be in short supply for agriculture, industry, domestic users, power companies, fish and wildlife, recreation, and shipping. There were hardships. And there were hard decisions to make on water allocation. Groups jockeyed for positions from which to protect their interests. But the decisions made during the summer and fall were--in part--applications of state water policy established in prior decades.

Beginning with enabling legislation passed in 1955, the State Water Resources Board adopted basin-by-basin policies on minimum stream flows and permissssble water uses. The board sought to blend local potentials and needs with state interests and objectives. These policies have a planning dimension: they point and delimit the direction of future water use. Years of drought will test the ability of state water policy to guide and endure.

Sound water policies--policies which do in fact have their intended effect upon subsequent decisions--must be based on an accurate assessment of water needs and potentials. Such accurate assessment promotes the technical integrity of water policy and plans. It is also a step which can cultivate the local political support needed to assure that one's policies and plans do shape future water use decisions. How successful was the State Water Resources Board (SWRB) in identifying local needs and interests? Once information on local

needs and interests was obtained, how successfully was this information incorporated in the policies that were finally adopted? And how successful has the SWRB been in obtaining local compliance with state policies? People's perceptions on these and other questions are presented and analyzed in this report.

Sections below provide an introduction to the research objectives, the general research design, the three state agencies which were studied, the counties studied, and the group of local officials who were interviewed.

The Research Objectives:

Analyzing Intergovernmental Relations

Our system of federal, state, and local government has been described as marble-cake federalism, rather than layer-cake federalism.¹ One cannot neatly sort responsibilities into those which are federal, those which are state, and those which are local. Rather, there is a constantly evolving blend of federal, state, and local responsibilities in any particular area of public policy. Federal, state, and local objectives may, and often do, differ. Thus, conflicts and stalemates can be expected. However, there are also interdependencies. The assistance of local governments is required to achieve state and national objectives; the cooperation and assistance of federal and state governments is often required in order to meet local objectives.

We slice into the marble cake by considering relationships between local governments and agencies of the state of Oregon in the field of water policy. Our principle aim is to analyze the alternative procedures of three state agencies for working with local governments. As bases for accomplishing that aim, our specific objectives are to report:

1. the nature and salience of local concerns with respect to the structure and substance of state policies affecting the use of water resources.

2. the various state policies and procedures which will likely elicit voluntary local compliance or substantial and potentially effective resistance at the local level.
3. those aspects of water policy which may be successfully established in a uniform manner for large areas of the state and those portions of state water policy for which considerable flexibility would appear requisite given varying desired and consumptive preferences among localities.

We describe state-local relations as a process of finding compromises between the often conflicting objectives of political effectiveness and political efficiency.² Political effectiveness requires the provision of access to decision makers, representation of diverse groups, and responsiveness to citizens and their interests. Political efficiency is achieved by speeding the process of formulating and implementing policies, cutting the costs of achieving compliance, obtaining the technical and fiscal economies of large scale, and internalizing the external effects which arise when the actions (or inactions) of one political jurisdiction affect other jurisdictions.

Political efficiency and political effectiveness are discordant for several reasons. Access and representation (political efficiency) is promoted by decision-making bodies which include a large number of members and by decision-making procedures which proceed segmentally, making only small or incremental changes after lengthy periods of consultation, hearings, and debates. Such procedures sacrifice political efficiency. Decision bodies with many members, incremental policy making, and processes for reported hearings slow the pace of policy formation and implementation. The scarce resources of time and personnel are consumed and the eventual costs of ameliorating the problem which initiated public attention may grow as that problem worsens over time.

Political effectiveness and political efficiency are discordant in another way. A state's population is heterogeneous in many aspects as a composite. But the population may be more homogeneous in those same aspects at some level of geographic disaggregation. For example,

Oregon is a complex blend of urban and rural settlement patterns, life styles, and economic activities. But at a level of geographic disaggregation one finds relatively more urban or relatively more rural counties. In such situations, political effectiveness is promoted by decentralized decision making: access, representation, and responsiveness are improved by smaller political jurisdictions that correspond to a population with more homogeneous needs and desires. Political efficiency, however, requires centralization, larger political jurisdictions to obtain economies of scale and to avoid the inefficiencies of external (inter-jurisdictional) effects.

The lack of political efficiency is often a subject of criticism. Critics point to lack of coordination--even contradictory actions--among agencies and levels of government. Decision procedures which are designed to be responsive have been described as also irresponsible particularly where responsiveness to the interests of the regulated occurs at the stage of implementation. And incremental policy making--making a small change and then waiting for feedback to decide the direction of the next small change--is also seen as abdicating the responsibility for and the possibility of planning, of anticipating future problems and needs. Good or bad, the Constitution of the United States has set a course designed to promote political effectiveness at a cost to political efficiency: power was purposely fragmented among branches of government and points for access and even stalemate were multiplied by a division of sovereignty between governments. And the history of American local government suggests that citizens will tolerate considerable political inefficiency in order to guarantee potential, although possibly never utilized political effectiveness.³

Much of the recent evolution in water policy can be seen as an attempt to find an acceptable compromise between political efficiency and effectiveness. In certain areas, uniform policy and centralized decision making may be facilitated by the occurrence among localities of consensual values, disinterest, a willingness to defer to state objectives, or an insufficiency of political, fiscal, or technical resources. For other aspects of water policy, however, fundamental

differences in locally held objectives may suggest a need for flexibility in order to promote the feasibility and effectiveness of water policy.

Local governments are of significance in the water policy field as targets of attempted influence through state programs. Achievement of state water quality standards are dependent upon actions taken by local governments in such areas as sewage treatment, domestic and industrial water supply, and recreational development. To the extent that local government actions are required by state policies, the pace, feasibility, and net benefits of implementing such policies will be a function of the compliance costs involved. Consequently, an understanding of local predilections with respect to water use and development is immediately germane to fully comprehending the strength and weaknesses of alternate state water policies and procedures.

Although important as targets of state influence, local governments cannot be thought of as simply administrative extensions of a state government. Constitutional scholars would point out that local governments are "children of the state." But in practice, local governments have been given a large degree of autonomy. Although local governments lack constitutionally guaranteed sovereignty, custom and public support do assure considerable autonomy. Existing policy suggests that, to date, the costs associated with forced local compliance have generally been judged to be excessive. Rather, and as with virtually all public policy, the tactic has been to maximize voluntary compliance. Through grant programs, cooperative planning, and shared projects, existing strategies are designed to effect and affect local action with a minimum of coercion. Where such mechanisms are contemplated, an understanding of local objectives, value commitments, and the orientations of local officials toward state agencies is clearly relevant to enhancing state (and local) accomplishments in the area of water policy.

In interpreting our results, one should recognize that political efficiency and political effectiveness can be complementary in one very important respect. Political effectiveness involves both the

representation of and responsiveness to the varied interests of citizens. To the extent that both of these occur, the likelihood of voluntary compliance is increased. Where politically effective procedures have reduced the costs of obtaining compliance, one aspect of political efficiency--and an important aspect--has been achieved.

Our principle aim can be rephrased as the analysis of alternative procedures used by three agencies for obtaining compromises between the two values of political effectiveness and political efficiency. The two values may often conflict: maximizing one value may require sacrifices in the other. The "right" procedure depends upon the importance attached by citizens to trade-offs between political efficiency and political effectiveness. As we have indicated, political inefficiency is a common concern of critics while citizens--in the structures of governments they support--seem to place a high value on political effectiveness. The politically acceptable trade-off between efficiency and effectiveness depends upon policy area; political effectiveness is an extremely important value for decisions in the area of elementary education, while political efficiency--as we use the term--seems important in the area of national defense policy. That trade-off which is politically acceptable also depends upon a changing environment. For example, as a resource becomes scarcer (e.g. water, energy, "prime" agricultural land) and the costs of inaction are perceived to rise, political efficiency may receive increased public support with sacrifices accepted in political effectiveness. We can and will describe the advantages and disadvantages of procedures for intergovernmental relations used by three agencies. But we cannot discover or prescribe the "right" blend of efficiency and effectiveness. That judgement depends upon the citizens of Oregon and their perceptions of the environment

General Research Design

In order to accomplish the three research objectives, we incorporated information from individuals presumed to be informed about the subjects of research with comparisons made between counties

and state agencies. Local contacts were interviewed at length on the subject of the first specific objective: the nature and salience of local concerns with respect to the structure and substance of state policies affecting the use of water resources. We compared the experiences of three agencies which have used quite different styles of state-local interaction in order to address the question of which state policies and procedures will elicit voluntary local compliance. Perceptions of local needs, problems, and agency successes and failures were obtained for four quite different counties in order to complete the third objective: identification of those portions of state water policy which can be established uniformly and those portions of state water policy which would appear to require flexible adaptation to local circumstances.

We have studied the perceptions of three state agencies by local contacts in four counties. The inquiry was directed at three broad, related areas of public policy: water quality, stream flows, and land use planning. Within each policy area, we investigated agency practices and accomplishments at three stages of policy: the assessment of local needs and interests, the incorporation of information on local needs and interests in adopted policies, and the attainment of local compliance.

The project began with a period of familiarization with the three state agencies. During this period, relevant legislation and agency publications were reviewed and public meetings were attended. In early 1975, selected members of the agencies' staff, boards and commissions were interviewed. These people were asked about the scope of their agencies' responsibilities, relationships with local officials, and relationships with other state agencies. Interviews with local officials provided the last major source of information used in the study. Those interviews and the local officials are described in a section below.

The Three Agencies

We studied the state-local relationships of three state agencies: the State Water Resources Board, the Department of Environmental Quality, and the Department of Land Conservation and Development. The agencies are of central importance in our three areas of substantive interest; namely, stream flows, water quality, and land use planning. DEQ was selected as that state agency whose activities were most important in the area of water quality. In the area of stream flows, the State Water Resources Board was considered to be of primary importance. LCDC was chosen as the state agency most involved in the area of land use. These selections were based on our review of relevant legislation.

In our interviews with 53 local contacts we included questions to check the reasonableness of our a priori selection of principal state agencies. Asking separately about each policy area, local contacts were asked to name state agencies with important programs in their county. These questions were asked prior to any indication of the three agencies we were studying. The agencies volunteered by local contacts are reported in Table 1.

In the area of water quality, DEQ was mentioned most often. When asked about stream flows, the State Water Resources Board was the most frequently mentioned state agency. LCDC was the most frequently mentioned state agency when local contacts were asked about the policy area of land use. Thus, the modal categories in Table 1 support our selection of agencies. However, there are two other features of Table 1 worthy of note. First, a large number of agencies were mentioned in each policy area: in each policy area at least four state agencies were mentioned by at least 10% of the local contacts. Second, the frequency with which the State Water Resources Board was identified as important in the area of stream flows was not much greater than for three other agencies; namely, DEQ, the Fish and Wildlife Commissions, and the State Engineer.

The three agencies were also picked because they have developed quite distinct patterns for working with local officials and citizens.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF LOCAL CONTACTS IDENTIFYING
 AGENCIES WITH PROGRAMS OF LOCAL
 IMPORTANCE IN EACH OF THREE POLICY AREAS^a

Agency ^b	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
DEQ	73.8% ^c	20.8%	52.8%
SWRB	26.4	22.6	7.5
LCDC	5.7	1.9	73.6
Health Division	49.1	7.5	17.0
Fish & Wildlife Commissions	13.2	18.9	1.9
State Engineer	9.4	18.9	0.0
Highway Division	0.0	1.9	18.9
Courts	0.0	0.0	11.3
Oregon Coastal Conser- vation & Development Commission	0.0	0.0	7.5
Forestry Department	1.9	1.9	5.7
Real Estate Division	0.0	0.0	5.7

- ^a Based on questions 2, 8, and 14: "What are the most important activities or programs of state agencies which affect (Water Quality/Stream Flows/Land Use) in this county?"
- ^b This table lists only those agencies which--in at least one policy area--were mentioned by 3 or more local contacts.
- ^c All percentages are based on a denominator of 53 local contacts. Percentages within columns do not sum to 100% since local contacts could mention zero or more than one agency for each policy area.

This variety allows one to assess the merits of each approach by examining the successes and failures of each agency in working with local governments. Immediately below we describe the origins, responsibilities, and style of interaction with local government used by each of the three agencies.

State Water Resources Board

The Oregon legislature created the State Water Resources Board in 1955, charging it with the duty to ". . . progressively formulate an integrated, coordinated program for the use and control of all the water resources of this state and issue statements thereof."⁴ In a reorganization of water agencies in 1975, the Board became a part of the Water Resources Department and was given the name of Water Policy Review Board.⁵ Because the present study deals with the work and role of the Board prior to the 1975 legislation, we will refer to it by the pre-1975 designation.

The Legislative Interim Committee on State Water Resources, created in 1953, reported to the subsequent legislative session that many policy declarations had been placed in the state statutes with "little regard to coordination."⁶ The result had been a tendency to create conflicts among water agencies having broad powers and to encourage single-purpose development.⁷ The Committee reported that the state should have a statutory water policy, which should be administered by a single agency empowered to make studies and investigations of present and future water needs, to allocate water to meet those requirements, and to resolve conflicts over applications for water in accordance with the statutory policy.

The legislature responded by creating a seven-member board appointed by the governor with Senate confirmation. Board members served for a term of four years without compensation. The legislature directed the board to study existing water resources; means of conserving and augmenting such resources; present and future needs for water for domestic, municipal, irrigation, power development, industrial mining, recreation, wildlife, and fish life uses and for

pollution abatement, all of which were declared to be beneficial uses; and to study related subjects including drainage and reclamation.

The law required the Board to consider a number of legislative policy declarations in formulating the program for using and controlling water resources. Existing water rights were to be maintained. Multiple purpose impoundment structures were to be preferred over single-purpose structures, and upstream impoundments over downstream. Fish were to be protected. Minimum perennial stream flows sufficient to support aquatic life and to minimize pollution were to be encouraged if existing rights and priorities permit. When proposed uses were mutually exclusive or supplies were insufficient, preference was to be given first to human consumption, then to livestock consumption, and thereafter to other uses "in such order as may be in the public interest consistent with the principles" of the 1955 legislation.⁸

The Board had broad power to control the use of water; all state agencies and public corporations of the state are obliged by statute to conform to its decisions.⁹ The Board represented the state in negotiations with the federal agencies and other states in carrying out agreements that may be reached. The law directed the Board to carry out the state's participation in federal flood control projects, and it could acquire land, relocate works, and operate such projects.¹⁰ It could classify and reclassify lakes, streams, underground reservoirs and other water sources as to highest and best use and specify quantities of use for the future, and it could withdraw unappropriated waters from appropriation for any particular use or for all uses. It reviewed federal projects for conformancy with state water policy, and it consulted and cooperated with local, state, interstate, and federal agencies to solve water problems through projects and programs. The Board was the state's center for water resource data, and it provided information and technical advice to state and local agencies.

Two basic tools employed by the Board are "Water Use Programs" and "Resource Management Guidelines." A water use program is a legal document that directs the future utilization and protection of water

resources. The water use programs are statements of policy: they are supposed to provide direction to the state regulatory agencies in making water decisions. The programs classify waters as to their highest and best use, establish minimum perennial stream flows, and designate quantities of water for a specific beneficial use. With three exceptions, the Board prepared a water use program for each major drainage basin in the state. The programs were designed to be modified as additional scientific, technological or other knowledge became available. The Board planned to make a comprehensive review of each water use program about every ten years, to take into account changes in population and the diversity of water demands.¹¹

The management guidelines provide specific information and suggestions for local planning efforts and individual development projects. Specifically, the management guidelines include an assessment of the existing water use, water availability, future water needs, and potential for meeting future needs. Existing water rights and minimum flows for fish and water quality are compared with the natural flows to determine present availability. Future water needs and potential methods of meeting them, including reservoir sites, are examined. The guidelines treat specific problems, such as municipal water supply, irrigation shortages, flood damage, erosion and sedimentation, and flow augmentation for fish life and enhanced water quality. The guidelines also identify project and program priorities developed with the aid of local recommendations and federal agency participation.¹²

The Board also participates directly in preparation of local and regional proposed water resource plans or projects. Some technical assistance is available. But of more importance, the Board can, through such participation, offer guidance to save local agencies from investing time and resources in plans that the Board considers unwise.¹³

In the thinking of at least some of its members the State Water Resources Board was the agency responsible for formulating water policies for the state of Oregon and responsible for deciding questions which arose under those water policies. However, authority for enforcing important parts of water policy rested with the State

Engineer, an office not under the control of the State Water Resources Board. This division of policy and enforcement responsibilities appears to have been a regular source of irritation to the Board.

In developing its water use programs, the State Water Resources Board sought the views of local interests through "Local Voluntary Water Resource Committees." In 1961 the Board noted that eight Local Voluntary Water Resource Committees had been created in the past two years, making a total of 35 in existence at that time.¹⁴

Twenty-one of these were organized on a county basis, others on a river or other basis. County boards of commissioners (or county courts) usually sponsored the committees, often appointing their members and chairpersons and sometimes even hiring staff.

The Board played a major role in the formation and functioning of local committees. Staff from the Board worked closely with the chairperson, helping to identify sources of information and likely committee members from among numerous public and private groups with water-related interests. The Board developed detailed suggestions for committee membership organization, constitution and by-laws, agenda, and activities.

The committees were used for several purposes. The committees made recommendations for water use programs. Priorities for in-stream and out-of-stream water use were developed with the assistance of local committees.¹⁵ The committees studied water uses and controls to provide information on which to base water use programs and for incorporation in water management guidelines. The committees requested and financed precipitation stations, stream gage stations, ground water studies, watershed treatment investigations, and surveys of potential reservoir sites. As conceived by the Board, the committees were also to serve a local coordinating function at the center of interrelationships among governmental agencies interested in water:

These committees serve as a coordinating agency between all water use and control interests within their area, and as a liaison between local water use and local, state and federal agencies that have an interest in water resource control and development.¹⁶

The Board discussed current practice regarding "public involvement" in its Tenth Biennial Report:

Whenever possible, the Board utilizes existing public involvement programs. Where no such program exists, the Board cooperates with the counties and/or Councils of Governments to select a committee of representatives of various interests and backgrounds from the area to provide citizen input. The Board is working with committees around the state on activities which vary depending on the level of planning and development in the area.¹⁷

The Board saw public participation in the planning process as indispensable for the implementation of water resource plans, and asserted that local people should be a "vital part of all project phases from data collection to implementation."¹⁸ Working with local committees is, however, "relatively expensive and time-consuming," and the Board found itself able to maintain "active involvement with only a few committees at any one time."¹⁹

We will refer to the style of local interaction used by the Water Resources Board with the term local organization. Staff members identified representatives of all local water-related interests, organized these individuals into a local committee, and worked very closely with the committees in preparing materials for consideration by the Board. The role of staff members in establishing and maintaining the local committees seemed to be crucial. With limited resources, staff efforts had to be focused on those committees in localities that were to be the subject of pending Board decisions or hearings. Where staff attention was not present, local committees often remained inactive. After the reorganization of 1975, our evidence indicates that most local committees ceased all activity.

Department of Environmental Quality²⁰

At the 1969 legislative session, the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) was established to succeed the State Sanitary Authority. Public concern for polluted rivers had led to the creation of the State Sanitary Authority in 1939 through an initiative ballot measure passed in 1938. The Authority, with initially weak enforcement powers,

monitored water quality and conducted many studies in its early years. Water Quality standards were first adopted by the Authority in 1947. The state first required permits for the discharge of industrial wastes in 1967, when major revisions were made in water quality standards. Abolition of the Authority and incorporation of its functions (and personnel) under the Environmental Quality Council in 1968 was designed to integrate pursuit of air and water quality objectives. The reorganization was also of at least symbolic importance in making a shift from a traditional public health orientation toward the vaguer but increasingly appealing concept of environmental quality.

The EQC consists of five members appointed by the Governor with confirmation by the Senate and serving four-year terms without pay. Members may be removed by the governor and may not serve more than two consecutive terms. The Commission establishes policies for the operation of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) which is headed by a director formally appointed by the EQC (in practice the EQC appoints the person recommended to it to be the governor).

The Department operates through divisions of administration, information and technical programs. Technical programs comprise air quality, water quality, land quality, regional operations, and laboratories and applied research. Six regional offices provide information and communication with local governments, industry, and the public; participate in the preparation of waste discharge permits; investigate complaints; and enforce policies and procedures of the department.

Under the policy direction of the EQC, the Department has broad authority to prevent or correct water and air pollution problems and to control sewage systems. The Health Division of the Department of Human Resources retains authority, however, for making and enforcing rules relating to the quality of water for human or animal consumption and for swimming places.

Water quality standards are adopted by EQC. The standards are to define "desired water quality" in specific and enforceable terms, and may be modified as knowledge, technology and public policy goals

change. The primary tools for protection of water quality standards are (1) plan review authority, (2) discharge permits, (3) financial assistance, and (4) enforcement.

The plan approval program is intended to prevent and correct pollution by requiring prior approval of plans for collection, control, treatment, and disposal of wastes. Waste discharge permits are viewed by the Department as means of communicating to the permittee the expectations of the Department, interpretations of laws and standards as applied to the permittee, the limits to be met, and the time allowed for implementation of improvements. The final permit is drawn up after a public hearing on a draft permit at which all interested parties may present their views. Permits are reviewed and modified approximately every five years, allowing for the imposition of more restrictive conditions made possible by technological advance. Oregon modified state laws in 1973 to conform to federal requirements arising from the 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Quality Act, thereby qualifying to issue the discharge permits required by the Environmental Protection Administration. All existing permits had to be reviewed and approved by EPA.

Financial assistance enables municipalities, counties, and industries to meet state standards. Assistance includes federal and state grants for sewage treatment facilities, state pollution control bonds available for loans to cities for sewage works construction, and tax credits offsetting part of the costs of industrial pollution control facilities.

The DEQ has power to enforce state regulations through investigation of suspected sources of pollution, including inspection of public and private property, issuance of desist orders and levying of civil penalties for violations. All state and local police agencies are required to cooperate in enforcement efforts. The EQC is authorized by statute to delegate enforcement authority relating to water pollution or solid waste to the state Health Division or to any county, district, or city board of health. Generally, the Department has relied in considerable measure on lengthy negotiation and voluntary compliance by industry and local governments.

Existing legislation prohibits the construction of subsurface sewage disposal systems without a permit from DEQ. The EQC is required to adopt standards prescribing minimum requirements for the design, construction, and operation of such systems, but the legislation has specifically authorized the EQC to establish varying standards for different parts of the state. DEQ may contract with local government for permit issuance. The EQC may limit or prohibit construction of subsurface systems in an entire area. The requirement of state permits for septic tanks has been one of the more controversial aspects of the environmental quality programs of the Department. Owners of property and developers in areas where septic tanks have been prohibited object strenuously to this restriction on the use of land.

In 1975 the legislature amended the law to permit the EQC to grant variance from the requirements of subsurface sewage disposal standards upon such conditions as the Commission considers necessary to protect the public health and welfare and to protect the waters of the state. The EQC may grant variances only where it finds that strict compliance with the standard is inappropriate for cause or because special physical conditions render strict compliance unreasonable, burdensome, or impractical.

In its earlier day, DEQ was noted for highly publicized--some would say, flamboyant--positions and threats to local governments. And throughout its history, DEQ has made clear its willingness and ability to impose sanctions such as development moratoriums and the denial of all septic tank permits pending development of local plans. However, it would be wrong to characterize DEQ's style as that of confrontation. As problems arise, DEQ works closely with government officials to assist them in securing technical and fiscal resources. There are lengthy periods of consultation and negotiation. The problem at hand determines which local officials (and citizens) are involved in the state-local relationship, the cooperative or conflictual nature of that relationship, and the degree to which citizens seek involvement in the relationship. This is a problem-solving approach. But it is more; one must bear in mind that DEQ has demonstrated a

willingness and ability to impose sanctions. Negotiations may be lengthy. But DEQ has made clear that it will act in the case of stalemates. Thus, we will refer to the style of state-local interactions used by DEQ as the imposed problem-solving approach.

Land Conservation and Development Commission

In 1969 the Oregon legislature passed Senate Bill 10, which required local jurisdictions to develop coordinated comprehensive plans by December 31, 1971, and authorized the governor to undertake local planning in those jurisdictions that failed to comply by the deadline. This measure gave a stimulus to planning, but was inadequate. The need for statewide standards to control the planning process and the substantive content of plans was also not fully met by SB 10; the goals set forth were general and not enforced through any required review process at local or state levels. Ironically, the "teeth" in SB 10 were also too strong to achieve compliance; if local jurisdictions did not meet the requirements of the act--and a number did not--assumption of the local planning function by the governor was too drastic to ever be exercised.

A legislative interim committee studied the need for a statewide comprehensive planning program from 1971 to 1973 and made recommendations to the 1973 legislative session which provided the basis for SB 100.²¹ The legislature found that the "uncoordinated use of lands" was threatening orderly development, the environment, and the health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and welfare of the people.²² The legislative committee called for "coordinated comprehensive plans for cities and counties, regional areas and the state as a whole." Such plans would be implemented through more specific rules, regulations and ordinances.²³

SB 100 created the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development. The Department is administered by a director who is subject to policies adopted by the Commission, is appointed by it, and serves at its pleasure. The Commission is composed of 7 members appointed by the

governor and confirmed by the Senate. There must be one member from each congressional district and three members at large. At least one and no more than two members shall be from Multnomah County (center of Portland metropolitan area). Members serve a four-year term but may be removed for cause by the governor. Service is limited to two full terms. Members serve without pay.

Senate Bill 100 directed the Commission to establish statewide planning "goals and guidelines." Cities and counties were required to prepare and adopt comprehensive plans and adopt zoning ordinances consistent with the goals and guidelines approved by the Commission.²⁴ Failure of a local government to complete its plans within one year after the goals were approved could allow the LCDC to do the planning for a local jurisdiction unless an extension was granted, on the basis of "satisfactory progress." In such cases the planning costs would be paid by the county or city. However, this has not occurred; the provision of extensions has been routine.

For "activities of state-wide significance" the Commission was authorized to issue permits. Activities that could be designated as having statewide significance included planning and siting of public transportation facilities, public sewage systems, water supply systems, solid waste disposal facilities, and public schools. Other activities might be declared to have statewide significance by the legislature, upon recommendation of the Commission. The permit process was to become obligatory after the Commission had approved statewide planning goals and guidelines for activities of statewide significance.

The Commission was also authorized to recommend the designation of "areas of critical state concern." Some effort was made to identify areas of "critical state concern" in the first three years of its work, but the Commission took no steps to adopt goals and guidelines for activities of statewide significance and to implement the permit procedure for such activities. Rather, its emphasis was on the adoption of statewide planning goals.

The legislature authorized the Commission to review comprehensive plan provisions or any zoning, subdivision, or other ordinance or

regulation of a state agency, city, county or special district that is considered to be in conflict with statewide planning goals. Such a review may be requested by a county governing body or by any person or group of persons whose interests are substantially affected. Cities and counties may request a review of any "land conservation and development action" taken by a state agency, city, county or special district to determine whether the action is in conflict with statewide planning goals.²⁵

The legislature included provisions to "assure widespread citizen involvement in all phases of the planning process."²⁶ Accordingly, in April and May of 1974 LCDC held 28 workshops throughout the state to ascertain citizens' views about land use and related conservation and development issues. Some 3,000 persons attended, including several hundred local government officials and staff.²⁷ The citizen opinions were to be considered in the formulation of draft goals. However, the first set of draft goals adopted by LCDC consisted simply of ten broad goals stated five years earlier in SB 10. With this start, more goals were added and guidelines formulated which were then reviewed by the public in a second round of 27 workshops in September and October of 1974. Nearly 2000 persons attended the workshops and, in addition, about 400 local officials met with LCDC representatives in meetings preceding the workshops. LCDC then held 17 public hearings throughout the state and one in Salem preparatory to final adoption of the goals and guidelines in late December.

The Commission adopted 14 goals and corresponding guidelines in December 1974 and a fifteenth goal concerning the Willamette Greenway was added one year later. The goals stated desired conditions to be sought through comprehensive plans, suggested guidelines for accomplishing the goals, and stipulated procedures to be followed by local government in planning. However, there were numerous internal inconsistencies among the goals with no establishment of priorities among competing goals. Thus, what LCDC terms goals might--at this time--be more accurately conceptualized as setting the agenda for local governments: LCDC designated 14 factors which local governments must include in their deliberations on local plans.

Officials of smaller cities and counties feared the fiscal burdens of carrying out the requirements of the LCDC goals. Often, they lacked the expertise and paid staff needed to comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of the statewide rules. From the outset, the Commission sought to allay the fears of local officials in public pronouncements and by involving an advisory committee of local government officials. Some assistance was provided in the form of field staff, which was increased from 4 to 11 positions during the 1975-76 fiscal year, and planning assistance grants. Over \$3,000,000 in grants were awarded for the biennium, and in August 1975 a total of \$8.6 million was recommended for local assistance in the 1977-79 biennium by the director of the Land Conservation and Development Department.

Despite the financial and other assistance provided to local government and the continuing assurance that the job of local planning and zoning still rested primarily with local government, vigorous agitation against LCDC continued. In the summer of 1976 an initiative measure qualified for the November 1976 ballot, a measure that if approved by the voters would repeal part of Senate Bill 100 and would abolish the Land Conservation and Development Commission. Shortly thereafter the controversial chairman of the Commission resigned in order to remove himself as a factor in the campaign and election on the issue. The initiative to abolish LCDC was defeated in November of 1976 by a large margin.

The style of interaction with local governments used by LCDC differs in several ways from the strategy of the other two agencies. LCDC was the child of Senate Bill 100, an act passed when land use planning was a political shibboleth on the lips of many public spokespersons. Rather than spend political capital--by, for example, testing the major powers now dormant in the permit authority for activities of statewide significance--LCDC sought to build its legitimacy. People generally supported increased planning of land use but did not know what to expect from a state agency operating in an area of traditionally local responsibility. People were anxious and uncertain about a state agency's effects upon their interests,

influence, and neighborhoods as well as uncertain about the demands which would be placed on the resources of local governments. LCDC held numerous meetings with local citizens and officials. In contrast to the problem-solving and local organization styles of the other two agencies, we would characterize LCDC's approach as symbolic reassurance. Fitting the classic case of symbolic politics, LCDC used meetings, workshops, the media, and words like "conservation" and "development" to reassure the anxieties of citizens who did not know quite what to expect from LCDC.²⁸ The goals adopted by the Commission were a part of the pattern of symbolic reassurance. The goals were a laundry list of the interests of all active groups: whatever your interests, the goals provided assurance that LCDC recognized them.²⁹

The term symbolic reassurance, we believe, captures the essence of the style of state-local interaction used by LCDC during the period of the study. But by use of the term, we do not demean the importance of the style. Perceptions of legitimacy are critical to the endurance and success of governmental agencies. With a large budget to pass in the legislature and the threat of an initiative, LCDC fostered perceptions of legitimacy in a textbook example of skillful symbolic politics.³⁰ With the budget approved and the initiative soundly defeated, LCDC--through its efforts at symbolic reassurance--is in a stronger position to act on land use than at its inception.

The styles of state-local interactions used by the three agencies are distinct. These differences are necessitated, in part, by differences in the missions of the agencies. The State Water Resources Board had to develop local organizations because of the relative low visibility of the Board and because water policy was not an issue that was of major concern to most citizens and local officials. DEQ was concerned with many concrete, specifiable problems and it had sanctions available to promote participation from local officials in problem-solving enterprises. LCDC was a new state agency operating in an area that had traditionally been a prerogative of local governments. Symbolic reassurance was appropriate to maintain and increase support for the agency and its mission.

The Four Counties

Relationships between state agencies and local governments were studied in four Oregon counties: Deschutes, Jackson, Lincoln, and Marion County. The counties were selected to represent four regions in Oregon with distinct climatic, hydrological, and demographic characteristics. Selected characteristics of the four counties are reported in Table 2.

General Description

Deschutes County lies in central Oregon. It takes in the eastern side of the Cascade range and the level and rolling plateau to the east, an area totaling nearly two million acres. Almost all of the county lies within the Deschutes River Basin. Bend, with a population of 16,200, is the county seat. Of the four counties, Deschutes has the most rapidly growing but least densely settled population. The principal economic activities are lumbering, agriculture, and grazing. Recreation is also important and part of the rapid growth in Deschutes County can be attributed to migration by retirement age citizens. Annual precipitation in Deschutes is low; however, its rivers have sources in the snowpacks of the Cascades.

Jackson County is in southern Oregon, an area of uneven terrain with numerous valleys, foothills, and mountains. Jackson County lies mainly in the Rogue River Basin, but also includes part of the Klamath Basin. The county seat is Medford, largest city in the state outside the Willamette Valley. The principal economic activities in Jackson County are lumbering and agriculture. Jackson County, with a climate attractive to migrants, has experienced rapid population growth and its rate of urbanization is twice the rate of the state as a whole. The annual precipitation in Jackson County is lower than any other county west of the Cascades, which contributes to its attractiveness for migrants and to its water quality problems.

Lincoln County is in the coastal region and extends inland to include the western portion of the coast range. The largest city,

TABLE 2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF DESCHUTES, JACKSON, LINCOLN, AND MARION COUNTIES^a

County	Total Population Area Estimate (sq. mi.) 1974	Percent Change 1970- 1974	Percent Change 1960- 1970	Population per Square Mile, 1974	% Urban Population 1970	Change in Urban Population 1960-1970	% Acres in Farms 1969	Average Acres per Farm 1969	Per Capita Personal Income 1974	Median Age 1970	Annual Average Precip- itation
Deschutes	3,060	31.0%	31.8%	13.2	57.3%	14.1%	8.4%	324.7	\$4,466	31.0	12.1"
Jackson	2,821	14.4	27.8	38.4	55.2	55.7	28.6	497.1	4,096	31.0	20.6
Lincoln	998	6.0	4.5	27.7	47.4	45.3	7.6	183.6	4,159	37.9	70.7
Marion	1,175	9.0	25.2	141.4	67.0	32.0	38.4	107.8	4,646	29.4	41.1
Oregon	97,073	8.3	18.3	23.6	67.0	27.5	29.3	619.9	4,883	29.4	

^a Sources: University of Oregon, Bureau of Business Research, Oregon Economic Statistics 1975; U.S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1972; Secretary of State, Oregon Blue Book, 1975-76.

Newport, has a population of 5,840. Lincoln County is drained by a number of coastal rivers, including the Salmon, the Siletz, the Yaquina, the Alsea, and the Yachats. Annual precipitation is heavy, exceeding 70 inches. But during the summers, which are dry, stream flows drop rapidly with no snowpacks available in the coastal range. Lumbering, fishing, and tourism are major economic activities in Lincoln County. Compared to the other four counties, Lincoln has the smallest population and the lowest population growth rate. However, its population swells in summer months due to its attractions to tourists and as a site for recreational homes.

Marion County is in the Willamette Valley except for a narrow arm which extends to the top of the Cascade Range. Most of the state's population live in the Willamette Valley. And Marion County has distinctly urban characteristics. Together with Polk County, it forms the Salem Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The county seat and state capital, Salem, is the third largest city in the state. Of the four counties, Marion has the largest population and a population density which is three to ten times greater than found in the other three counties. However, lying in the fertile Willamette Valley, Marion County has a higher percentage of its land in farms than is found in any of the other three counties. The principal economic activities in Marion County are related to government, agriculture, and food processing.

Water Problems

Deschutes County lies almost entirely within the Deschutes River drainage. Water shortages occur during the summer months when a number of streams are dry and wells do not recharge as fast as they are depleted. Irrigational canals are a source for domestic water in a significant proportion of the rural housing units. In 1970, 86 percent of the housing in the county relied on septic tanks for sewage disposal, a larger percentage than in any of the other three counties (see Table 3). Installation of sewer lines is very expensive in Deschutes County because of unusually hard surface rock

formations. Significant amounts of water are lost from streams, reservoirs, and irrigation canals through underground channels.³¹ Some wells show signs of contamination.

Jackson County has serious water quality problems resulting from low seasonal stream flows and point and non-point sources of pollution. Ashland's water supply has experienced some degradation (turbidity) from multiple use of the national forest in which the water shed is located. Because of soil conditions, there is a high rate of septic tank failures. In 1970, two-fifths of the housing units in the county were on septic tanks. Non-point pollution problems include contaminants from forest land runoff, irrigation return flow, urban storm water runoff, and agricultural runoff (cattle feed lots and pastures).³² Individual wells are the source of domestic water for 30% of the housing units in Jackson County, a figure almost twice the state average.

Lincoln County has five major rivers and many streams, but much of the county has poor ground water potential. There is great variation between winter and summer stream flows. Many of the streams, springs and wells for municipal use are inadequate, resulting in water shortages and quality problems during the summer months when demands from tourism, recreational homes, and fish processing are at a peak. Water quality problems include color, offensive taste, and odor caused by decaying leaves and other organic material. Turbidity is a problem in the winter months.³³ Of 60 community water supply systems in the county, only two fully met the state statutory standards of adequacy and purity when surveyed in 1972.³⁴ In 1970 over half of the housing units in the county used septic tanks for sewage disposal. Septic tank failures are a problem. Provision of public sewers is difficult because recent settlement--particularly for second homes--is strung out along the coast and coastal streams and estuaries.

Water quality problems in Marion County result from both point and non-point source contaminants and seasonal low stream flows. Low summer flows coincide with a peak in the activity of the food processing sector, a major industrial user of water and source of organic wastes. Two of the major rivers--the Willamette and the Pudding--

TABLE 3

TYPES OF WATER SUPPLY AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL FOR HOUSING UNITS IN 1970 BY COUNTY^a

County	Water		Other or None	Public Sewer	Sewage		Other or None
	Public System or Private Company	Individual Well			Septic Tank or Cesspool	Other or None	
Deschutes	74.6% ^b	12.0%	13.2%	11.0%	85.8%	3.0%	
Jackson	66.9	30.5	2.6	58.7	39.8	1.5	
Lincoln	80.8	9.6	9.6	45.1	52.3	2.6	
Marion	73.55	24.99	1.39	73.05	24.45	1.43	
Oregon	79.8	16.9	3.3	61.0	37.5	1.5	

^a Source: Oregon State University. Resource Atlas. Deschutes, June 1974; Jackson, January 1974; Lincoln, January 1974; Marion, April 1974.

^b Figures in each column are percentages of all year-round housing.

have water quality problems in which municipal wastes, industrial wastes, non-point sources, sanitary and combined sewer overflows and urban stormwater runoff are involved. The Santiam River basin has problems resulting from non-point sources of pollution, municipal wastes, industrial wastes and urban storm water runoff. Non-point sources of pollution in Marion County include agriculture, sub-surface sewage disposal, forestry and urban storm water runoff. Some of the cities in Marion County state that their water supply systems are inadequate or soon will be.³⁵

Local Contacts

To achieve the research objectives, we required information on water policy concerns and the nature of state-local relationships of three agencies in four counties. We use local informants to provide that information. The use of informants--or more precisely, "strategic informant sampling"--differs in a fundamental way from the more conventional sampling approaches.³⁶ The difference follows from the purpose of the research. In conventional, usually random, sampling of a population, the people interviewed are the units of analysis. One is interested in describing and explaining their attitudes and/or behavior. In our research, the activities of three agencies in four counties are the units of analysis: it is those activities which we describe, analyze, and compare. Strategic informant sampling is used in such situations. The technique rests on an assumption that one can locate and elicit accurate information from individuals with above average knowledge of the units being analyzed. To test this critical assumption, one must use multiple informants for each unit of analysis; for a given unit of analysis--e.g. the activities of one agency in one county--the observations of informants should be consistent.³⁷

The technique of strategic informant sampling is widely used, principally in anthropology and--to a lesser degree--in sociology. Choice of the technique depends upon the focus and assumptions of one's research. The term informant, in its technical meaning, simply

implies the assumptions and type of unit of analysis discussed above. However, in common usage, the term informant has a pejorative meaning-- e.g. "stool pigeon." So, with the exception of this section, we use the term local contacts. Although we avoid using the term informant, our research is based upon the assumptions of strategic informant sampling.

We selected as local contacts in each county the chairpersons and members of the "Local Voluntary Water Resources Committee," County Commissioners, the County Planning Director, and the Mayor, City Manager (where there was one), and Planning Director for the two largest cities in each county. The cities were: Deschutes County-- Bend and Redmond; Jackson County--Medford and Asheville; Lincoln County--Newport and Lincoln City; Marion County--Salem and Stayton. In Lincoln County, officials in Newport and Lincoln City were assumed to be knowledgeable about water problems related to tourism, recreational homes, and fish processing. Lumbering and related activities are also important in Lincoln County. At the suggestion of a knowledgeable consultant, Toledo was added to provide information from a city with wood-products processing as the principal economic base. In Marion County, Salem and Stayton--both on the Willamette Valley floor--represent the urban, agricultural, and food processing characteristics of the county. Marion County, however, also extends to the peaks of the Cascades. The city of Silverton was added to the initial list of cities in order to include information on experiences in that part of Marion County which does not lie on the valley floor.

At the time of interviewing, members of the "Local Voluntary Water Resource Committee" had been inactive--in fact, appeared no longer to exist--in all but Lincoln County. This inactivity reflects a pattern alluded to in the discussion of the State Water Resources Board. Local committees are organized and work intensively for many months in preparation for policy formation and hearings by the State Water Resources Board. When the Board moves on to other basins, the local committee ceases activity. Only in Lincoln County were we able to identify and interview other members of the local committee. Chairpersons of the Local Water Resource Committees were interviewed

in each county. A mayor of one of the cities in Deschutes County was on vacation and could not be interviewed. One mayor in Marion County refused to be interviewed for reasons that could not be ascertained. Table 4 summarizes the positions and geographic locations of the set of 53 informants from which interviews were obtained.

The interview combined structured and semi-structured items. The instrument is in Appendix B. The interviewing style was not as rigid and formal as the instrument might indicate. Questions were not always asked sequentially or verbatim, if to do so would interrupt the direction of the informant's discussion. The items on the instrument were to be covered and were used to guide tangential discussions back to the subjects in which we were interested. But often, discussion and probing on one question produced clear answers to subsequent questions. In such situations, the subsequent questions were not asked verbatim; to do so would be insulting. Rather, the interviewer would simply double check, using language like, "Earlier, I believe, you mentioned. . . , is my recollection correct? Is there anything else you would add?"

The interviews were conducted by a trained and experienced interviewer. Interviews averaged one hour in length and ranged from 30 minutes to two hours. All interviews were taped. The interviewer used the interview form to note replies but--as instructed--did not attempt to make detailed notes where to do so would require a pause in the interview. Data were coded by project personnel from the tapes rather than the interview forms. For open-ended questions, each individual response was placed on a 3 x 5 card. The resulting 1,900 cards were sorted according to similarity to develop response categories used in this report to summarize those findings based on open-ended questions.

Procedures approved by the OSU Committee on Human Subjects to protect the anonymity and to assure the informed consent of local contacts were followed. The informed consent statement is included in Appendix B.³⁸ Tapes of the interviews--when not in use--were kept in locked storage available only to project personnel and were erased after completion of this report.

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF LOCAL CONTACTS BY
POSITION AND COUNTY

Position	County				Total Frequency
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
County Comissioner	3	3	3	3	12
Head, County Planning Commission	1	1	1	1	4
Mayor	2	2	3	2	9
Manager	2	2	3	2	9
City Planning Director	3	2	3	3	11
Head, Local SWRB Committee	1	1	1	1	4
Member, Local SWRB Committee	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Total Frequency	12	11	18	12	53

As implied in the strategic informants research technique, we were only interested in the responses on subjects about which local contacts felt knowledgeable. At the conclusion of an opening statement, informants were told:

We are interested in a wide range of subjects. We do not expect that one person will be fully informed on all subjects. And so, if any of the questions are outside your areas of experience and knowledge, please do not hesitate to say so.

No attempt was made to pursue a question when an informant indicated an insufficient basis on which to reply. Frequently, this meant skipping an entire set of questions on one of the policy areas or on one of the agencies. Because we encouraged "don't know" responses, tables which follow are not based on the responses of all informants. (The tables always indicate the number of informants on which the figures in a table are based.) Many of the informants used for one table may not be included in another table. This would be a major problem if our unit of analysis were the informants. However, this is not a problem in the strategic informant strategy. That strategy purposely seeks information about the units of analysis (agency activities in a county) based only on the responses of individuals informed about the subject.

How well informed were the local contacts? Answers to that question are crucial to the value of the informant technique. The tape recordings reveal that knowledge levels were mixed. Many contacts offered extensive and detailed information and evaluations supported by many examples. There were also informants who seemed to be responding to some specific questions by generalizing from personal ideologies rather than knowledge or experience in the area of the question. Unavoidably, we came to trust the statements of certain informants more than others. This affects our interpretation of the results. However, in preparing the results used in this report, we did not attempt to sort out those responses which we felt might be more or less unreliable. To do so would have been unacceptable. Such a procedure would incorporate our own judgements of what is "true" and "false" within the data in a manner difficult for others to discern or challenge.

The amount and type of contact that informants had with the three state agencies provides one source of information on the informants knowledge (see Table 5).

TABLE 5
AMOUNT OF CONTACT WITH SWRB, DEQ, AND LCDC
REPORTED BY LOCAL OFFICIALS^a

Reported Amount of Contact	Agency		
	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC
None	44.2%	21.2%	17.3%
Little	28.8	15.4	38.5
Some	7.7	17.3	21.2
A Lot	<u>19.2</u>	<u>46.2</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total % (Cases)	99.9 (52)	100.1 (52)	100.1 (52)

^a From questions 29, 30, and 31: "How much contact have you had with (agency)--a lot, some, little, or none?"

For the sample as a whole, 55% reported contact with SWRB; the figures for DEQ and LCDC were much higher (97% and 83% respectively). Approximately one fifth of the sample reported a lot of contact with SWRB, close to one quarter (23%) reported a lot of contact with LCDC and almost one half (46%) reported a lot of contact with DEQ (see Table A-1).

Curiously, the likelihood that informants have had at least some contact with state agencies is inversely related to the age of the agency: informants have had the least contact with the oldest agency (SWRB) and are most likely to have had contact with the newest agency (LCDC). The figures on amount of contact do correspond to the state-local interaction strategies discussed earlier. The State

Water Resources Board, with its lower visibility, one-basin-at-a-time efforts, and work through its own local committees, has had the least amount of contact with the local government officials we interviewed. The imposed problem-solving style makes DEQ the agency for which informants are most likely to report a lot of contact: our informants report a lot of contact with DEQ twice as often as for the other two agencies. Among the three, LCDC is the agency with which informants are most likely to have had at least a little contact. But compared to DEQ, relatively few informants report a lot of contact with LCDC. Such figures for LCDC correspond to its strategy of using wide-spread, highly publicized meetings to symbolically reassure local officials that they know and care about their anxieties, but without what local officials might call "a lot" of contact.

There is a little regional variation in the amount of contact with SWRB and DEQ (Table A-1). Comparing counties, the percentages of informants reporting a lot of contact with DEQ and SWRB are similar.³⁹ Informants in Jackson and Marion Counties report a lot of contact with LCDC twice as often as in the other two counties. County officials are more likely than city officials to report a lot of contact with each of the three agencies (Table A-2).

Informants were asked about the types and most frequent types of contact with each of the three agencies. Among informants who had contact with an agency, about half reported meetings with staff as the most frequent form of contact (see Table 6). Meetings with board or commission members, attendance at public meetings, testimony at hearings, and written or phone contacts were much less frequently identified as the major form of contact.

The amount of contact reported with SWRB is low. But the figures are not surprisingly low given the intermittent local organization style of the agency. While the figures are low, 29 of the informants have had contact with SWRB; three or more informants in each county report contact with SWRB.

TABLE 6

MOST FREQUENT TYPE OF CONTACT WITH AGENCIES
FOR THOSE WHO REPORTED AT LEAST A LITTLE CONTACT^a

Most Frequent Type of Contact	Agency		
	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC
Meetings with Staff	48.3%	62.5%	53.35
Meetings with Board or Commission Members	17.2	2.5	6.7
Written or Phone	17.2	15.0	17.8
Testify at Public Meetings or Hearings	6.9	7.5	2.2
Attendance at Public Meetings or Hearings	3.4	12.5	8.9
Other	<u>6.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total % (Cases)	99.9 (29)	100.0 (40)	100.0 (45)

^a From questions 29a, 29b, 30a, 30b, 31a, 31b.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings are reported in three sections. The first section reports local concerns about the structure and substance of state policies and programs related to water use. Differences between counties in perceptions of state agencies and local needs are described in the second section. The third section presents an analysis of agency success in eliciting local compliance.

State Programs and Policies: The View from the Local Level

Local contacts were asked a variety of questions about policy areas and state agencies. There are four general topics. First, we report perceptions of the degree to which responsibility for policy areas are shared among state agencies; the advantages and disadvantages which local contacts see resulting from shared responsibilities are included. Shared responsibilities between state and local levels of government are the second topic of this section. The success of state agencies in finding out local needs and the degree to which information on local needs is incorporated in the policies of the agencies constitutes the final two topics.

This section provides findings related to the first research objective. The section is largely descriptive: local perceptions are reported and summarized. The descriptive approach accomplishes our first research objective. Although descriptive, this section provides important bases for the interpretation and analysis in subsequent sections.

The perceptions of local contacts on the four topics of this section are broken down by program areas and state agencies. However, inter-county differences are not reported here; they are the subject of a subsequent section.

Shared Responsibilities at the State Level

Our first topic is local perceptions of responsibilities at the state level for the policy areas of water quality, stream flows, and land use. We are interested in establishing the context of state agencies and their shared responsibilities in policy areas as viewed and experienced by local contacts.

Within each of the policy areas of water quality, stream flows, and land use, state responsibilities are shared--in the view of local contacts--by several or more state agencies. When asked separately about each of the three policy areas, over half the local contacts who responded said that responsibilities were shared by several or many agencies (Table 7). There was a tendency for local contacts to perceive fewer state agencies responsible for the policy area of stream flows. Relative to the other two policy areas, local contacts--when asked about stream flows--were about half as likely to say that responsibilities were shared among many agencies.

Table 7 does reveal a substantial division of opinion on the degree of shared state responsibilities for policy areas. While sharing among several or more agencies is the majority view, 37 to 48 percent said that responsibilities are mostly located in a single state agency. Part of this variation is apparently due to differences in the experiences of city and county officials.⁴⁰ County and city officials differ in their perceptions of the number of state agencies sharing responsibilities (Table A-3). The major difference occurs in the policy area of stream flows. In that policy area, 80 percent of the county officials say responsibilities rest mostly with one state agency: an almost equal proportion of city officials (75 percent) say responsibilities are shared by several or many state agencies. This finding could not be interpreted by simply suggesting that city officials in general have broader perspectives or a wider knowledge of state government. In the two policy areas of water quality and land use, it is the county officials who are most likely to perceive responsibilities shared among several or many agencies. There appear to be differences

TABLE 7

LOCAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH RESPONSIBILITIES
FOR WATER QUALITY, STREAM FLOWS, AND LAND USE
ARE SHARED AMONG STATE AGENCIES^a

Perceived Number of State Agencies	Policy Area ^b		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
One	35.7%	47.6%	40.0%
Several	35.7	38.1	33.3
Many	<u>28.6</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>26.7</u>
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (40)	100.0 (21)	100.0 (45)

^a From questions 3, 9, and 15: "At the state level do responsibilities for (policy area) appear to be shared among many agencies, among several agencies, or are responsibilities mostly located in a single agency?"

^b For each policy area, table entries report the percentages of informants who answered "one," "several," or "many" to the questions above. As in all subsequent tables, responses of "don't know" or "no answer" are excluded in the calculations of percentages.

between county and city officials in their perceptions of responsibilities at the state level. Moreover, the nature of the difference depends upon the policy area involved. Explanation of this finding most likely lies in the likelihood--within policy areas--of encountering state agencies oriented predominantly toward rural (county) or municipal concerns.

Most local contacts see responsibilities shared among several or more state agencies. Table 1, introduced earlier, provides an indication of the state agencies which local contacts had in mind. In the area of water quality, DEQ, the Health Division, and SWRB were identified by a quarter or more of the contacts as having policies and programs of local importance. The Fish and Wildlife Commissions⁴¹ and the State Engineer were identified by a smaller but still sizable (10-14%) number of contacts. When asked about stream flows, SWRB, DEQ, the State Engineer, and the Fish and Wildlife Commissions were each mentioned by an approximately similar proportion of contacts. When asked about land use, LCDC and DEQ were mentioned by half or more of the local contacts, The Highway Division and Health Division were also frequently mentioned. Although not identified by any local contact for the other two policy areas, the state courts were identified as important in land use by 11 percent of the local contacts. The saliency of the courts to local contacts can be linked to a series of recent state court decisions identifying zoning decisions as subservient to the local comprehensive plan and stipulating tighter procedural rules for land use decisions by local governments.

There is an apparent anomaly in the policy area of stream flows when comparing Table 1 and Table 7. In the area of stream flows, local contacts are most likely to say responsibilities rest mostly with one agency. Yet, when looking at that same policy area in Table 1, four agencies are mentioned by one-fifth of the contacts and no agency is mentioned by more than one quarter of the contacts. Evidently, when local contacts are asked about stream flows, many can--at best--think of only one relevant state agency. And because the local contacts do not agree among themselves when they mention

an agency, one suspects that either the area of stream flows is not perceived as an area of state regulation distinct from the regulation of water quality. Either interpretation adds to accumulating indications of the relatively low visibility (at least from the perspective of local officials) with which the State Water Resources Board has operated in determining policies on minimum stream flows.

Those who saw shared responsibilities at the state level were first asked if the sharing created any problems in their locality and then were asked if there were advantages. This sequence of questions was repeated for each policy area. Table 8 summarizes the responses. In each policy area, a large portion of those answering the questions said there were problems created by shared responsibilities at the state level. The area of land use evoked a yes from 92 percent of those who had an opinion on whether the sharing created problems. Water quality was not far behind, with a figure of 79 percent. For stream flows--the area in which people were least likely to perceive shared responsibilities--those who did perceive shared responsibilities were least likely to see problems resulting from the shared responsibilities. Still, in the area of stream flows, over half of those responding indicated that problems did result.

When asked if shared responsibilities had advantages, those with an opinion were divided. In the area of land use, "yes" and "no" responses were about equally likely. In the area of water quality, local contacts split 45 percent "yes" and 55 percent "no." In the area of stream flows, two thirds said there were advantages but with only six contacts involved, a shift of one "yes" to a "no" would have left that group evenly divided.

Although there was division, many contacts could see advantages to shared responsibilities. Duplication, overlap, multiple permits, and the like are sacred passwords in the popular critique of government. Such disadvantages are publicized: attacks on them have popular appeal as has been perceived by many politicians. Advantages--and surely there must be some to account for the origins and persistence of shared responsibilities--may be less widely discussed and

TABLE 8

FOR THOSE WHO PERCEIVE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES SHARED
IN SEVERAL OR MANY STATE AGENCIES,
PERCENTAGES OF INFORMANTS SEEING ADVANTAGES
AND PROBLEMS IN THAT SHARING^a

Are There Advantages and/or Disadvantages ^b	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Perceive Advantages (N) ^c	44.4% (18)	66.7% (6)	47.6% (21)
Perceive Disadvantages (N) ^c	79.2 (24)	62.5 (8)	92.0 (25)

^a Table based on questions 3a, 3c, 9a, 9c, 15a, and 15c: "Does this sharing of responsibilities between state agencies create any problems in your county?" and "Do you see any advantages provided by the sharing of responsibilities at the state level?"

^b Informants were asked separately about advantages and disadvantages. Thus, an informant may mention both advantages and disadvantages. For that reason, columns need not add to 100%.

^c Denominator for the percentages. Don't know responses excluded.

noticed. We think it worthwhile, therefore, to note that in each policy area, close to half the contacts who said responsibilities were shared also perceived advantages resulting from the shared responsibilities.

What were the advantages and problems which local contacts saw resulting from shared responsibilities at the state level? For those who said there were advantages, Table 9 reports the percentage of those contacts who mentioned each of several types of advantages. Similar figures are reported for those who said that there were problems and the percentages are broken down by the policy area to which the advantages and disadvantages refer. The types of advantages and disadvantages used in Table 9 (the "response categories") were created by grouping together similar responses to open-ended questions.

The provision of checks and balances was an advantage of shared responsibilities among state agencies mentioned in regard to all three policy areas, more frequently in the areas of water quality and land use than stream flows. Checks and balances were seen as advantageous where shared responsibilities decreased the chances that an important aspect of one of the policy areas would be overlooked or ignored. In a sense, state agencies were seen as providing an oversight function, watching each other to see that multiple implications of a problem or decision were considered. This oversight function of shared responsibilities could--as several contacts pointed out--be used to advantage at times by local officials and other groups; selected state agencies could be used as allies in dealing with another agency. Thus, shared responsibilities provide checks and balances in two ways. State agencies can watch the activities of other agencies and groups or individuals who think the actions of one agency are unwise may use multiple points of access in attempts to circumvent or check such actions.

For checks and balances to operate, there must be some opportunity for agencies which share responsibilities to influence each other. Where this does not occur, the advantage of checks and balances is replaced by the problem of rivalry and conflict. Rivalry and conflict

TABLE 9

TYPES OF ADVANTAGES AND PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM
SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES AMONG STATE AGENCIES^a

Type of Advantage/ Problem	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Advantages ^b			
Checks and Balances	50.0%	20.0%	50.0%
Broader Scope	62.5	40.0	0.0
More Expertise/ Resources	62.5	40.0	40.0
Problems ^c			
Wasteful Duplica- tion	10.5	0.0	8.7
Poor Coordination	26.3	20.0	47.8
Rivalry-Conflict	26.3	60.0	30.4
Red Tape Hassles	42.1	20.0	26.1
Locals Become Con- fused	21.1	0.0	13.0
Other Problems	5.3	0.0	13.0

^a From open-ended questions 3b, 3c, 6b, 6c, 9b, and 9c. Response categories in the table are derived from grouping similar responses. See text for explanation of categories.

^b Among local contacts who said there are advantages, table entries report percentages who mentioned a given type of advantage. Bases for percentages in the three columns are: 8, 5, and 10.

^c Among local contacts who said there are problems, table entries report percentages who mentioned a given type of problem. Bases for percentages in the three columns are: 19, 5, and 23. Local contacts could mention more than one type of advantage or problem. Therefore, columns need not add to 100%.

was the problem most frequently mentioned when local contacts were asked about the policy area of stream flows. The advantages of checks and balances were least likely to be mentioned for the policy area of stream flows. There appears to be a mutually exclusive relationship between the advantages of checks and balances and the problems of rivalry and conflict. Shared responsibilities at the state level provide an opportunity for realizing the advantages of oversight functions (mutual "watch dogs") and multiple points for access by local representatives. Our results indicate that these advantages are not obtained where shared responsibilities lead to rivalry and conflict. Possibilities for oversight can turn into competition for control of the decision-making authority and budgets for various program areas. Multiple points of access--as viewed from the local level--can turn into multiple, conflicting directives as state agencies compete for authority over local officials.

In the area of stream flows, rivalry and conflict seems to result from a structural problem mentioned earlier; namely, the separation of policy formulation and enforcement responsibilities. Conflict between the SWRB and the State Engineer was the illustration most frequently used by those local contacts who mentioned the problem of rivalry and conflict in the area of stream flows. Several inferences can be suggested, although we go beyond what our data can clearly support in doing so. However, we offer the inferences as one way of making sense out of the findings summarized in Table 9. Responsibilities can be shared at the state level in several ways. The policy process has many stages ranging from identification of problems and articulation of interests through the formulation of policy to enforcement and program evaluation. State agencies may share responsibilities in the same phase of the policy process for different but interdependent program areas (e.g., formation of policy on land use goals and transportation plans). Sharing occurs in a different manner when responsibilities of agencies relate to the same programs but occur at different stages of the policy process (e.g. policy formation, policy enforcement).

The former type of sharing would seem to provide the best structure for achieving the advantages of oversight and multiple access. Agencies with related programs and interests share responsibilities at the same stages of policy making. Multiple points of access are available to local representatives and there are strong incentives for state agencies to watch and consult agencies with related programs. The combined resources and expertise of agencies is also an advantage one would expect to occur more frequently when agencies are working at the same stage of policy making on related programs. The same form of shared responsibilities also can lead to problems of coordination. Where different state agencies have similar responsibilities for closely related programs, attempts to achieve good coordination through circulation of various paper work may lead to what local representatives perceive as excessive red tape. The advantages of multiple points of access can also lead to confusion at the local level on the question of which state agency one should contact for a given program area.

Sharing responsibilities for the same stages of policy making is more typical of the policy areas of water quality and land use than stream flows. Our interpretation of the advantages and problems arising from that form of sharing is consistent with the figures in Table 9. The advantages of checks and balances and more expertise are frequently mentioned in those two policy areas. The problems of poor coordination, red tape hassles, and local confusion are most likely to be mentioned with regard to water quality and land use. In the area of water quality, one can also observe that where problems of coordination are less frequently mentioned, the hassles of red tape are quite likely to be mentioned. For land use, the hassles of red tape are not mentioned as often as for water quality but poor coordination is cited close to twice as often as in other policy areas.

When responsibilities for the same program are divided by stage of policy making, opportunities for oversight and multiple access are reduced. The authority of such agencies is restricted to mutually exclusive stages of policy making. Inter-agency accommodation

or influence is more difficult to initiate and easier to ignore. Points of access are fewer at any given stage of policy making. Where responsibilities for different stages of the policy process are clearly assigned to different state agencies for a given program area, one would expect fewer hassles with red tape, little duplication of efforts, and less local confusion over which agency to deal with at a given stage of policy making. These expectations are consistent with the types of problems mentioned (and not mentioned) by our local contacts for the policy area of stream flows. Among the three policy areas, state government structure comes closest to dividing responsibilities by stage of policy making in the program area of stream flows.

We have distinguished two types of shared responsibilities and developed certain problems and advantages associated with each. We offer one further speculation consistent with our findings but in no way "proven" by them. Agencies working at the same stage of the policy process on closely related problems are engaged in a process often described as "mutual accommodation." No agency can veto or even significantly determine the decisions of the other agencies. Yet the accomplishments of each agency depend upon knowing and accommodating the activities of other agencies. There are incentives for coordination and cooperation where interests are shared. Where interests are opposed, poor coordination may result but no agency can successfully dominate or impose its position. There are structural opportunities for dominating, or at least vetoing the activities of another agency if single agencies have complete authority for one and only one of several stages necessary to the policy process. At the national level, a President and the Congress provide an example. Where interests are opposed, the outcome may be stalemate and intense rivalry rather than mutual accommodation. Such structural differences may account for the frequency with which the problems of rivalry and conflict are mentioned in the policy area of stream flows.

Rivalry and conflict was also the second most frequently mentioned problem in the areas of water quality and land use. DEQ and LCDC were seen by some local contacts as having to waste resources

in battles with other agencies over responsibilities. Rivalry and conflict in the areas of water quality and land use were usually attributed to personality factors rather than structural causes. Several contacts accused both LCDC and DEQ as being vehicles by which certain people sought to extend their influence or build personal empires. Other contacts did not mention specific persons but saw local governments as victims of inter-agency rivalry; local governments were seen as targets of conflicting dictates from state agencies attempting to establish or expand their authority at the expense of other agencies.

Sharing of Responsibilities Between State and Local Governments

The local contacts in this study believe the program area of stream flows is largely a state responsibility. Seventy percent of the informants with an opinion say that the policy area of stream flows is largely a state responsibility and most of the remainder feel that although responsibilities are shared, the state has the larger role (see Table 10). Most local contacts identify the policy area of land use as largely a local responsibility. However, opinion is more varied than for the policy area of stream flows. Over one quarter of the local contacts say that responsibilities in the area of land use are shared with the state having the larger role.

Perceptions of the degree of shared state-local responsibilities in the area of water quality differ markedly. The most frequently observed perception is that the state is largely responsible for water quality. But 44 percent of the contacts feel water quality is either largely a local responsibility or else shared with local government having the larger responsibility.

The figures in Table 10 provide no surprises. Stream flows depend on activities occurring in many counties. Any regulation of stream flows must be largely the responsibility of a level of government encompassing the many counties with activities affecting the flow of a river system. The planning of land use, or at least zoning, has traditionally been performed only by local governments.

TABLE 10

PERCEPTIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY
FOR POLICY AREAS^a

Level of Government Responsible	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Largely State Responsibility	33.3% ^b	71.4%	0.0%
Shared-State Has Larger Responsibility	13.3	19.0	27.3
Equal	8.9	9.5	4.5
Shared-Local Has Larger Responsibility	22.2	0.0	6.8
Largely Local Responsibility	<u>22.2</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>61.4</u>
Total % (Cases)	99.9 (45)	99.9 (21)	100.0 (44)

^a From questions 4, 10, 16: "In this county, is regulation of (policy area) largely the responsibility of state government, largely the responsibility of local government, or is it a shared responsibility?" If response was "shared," questions 4a, 10a, 16a ("Who has the larger responsibility, state or local government?") were asked and used to define the middle three response categories in the above table.

^b Table entries are percentages of informants identifying a particular division of state-local responsibilities for a given policy area. Don't know and no answer responses excluded from calculation of percentages.

As Table 10 indicates, however, increasing state responsibility for land use has influenced the perceptions of 39 percent of the local contacts.

Problems of water quality range from the broad concern for entire river basins to spatially quite confined matters such as septic tank use and underground water. Both state and local governments can be involved separately or with shared responsibilities depending on the nature of water quality programs. Perceptions observed in Table 10 likely reflect differences between local contacts in the problems they consider to be particularly salient in the area of water quality. In fact, we find that perceptions of shared state-local responsibilities are related to counties in which local contacts reside (see Table A-4). While opinion is sharply divided in Lincoln County, contacts in Marion County tend to see responsibilities as equal, in Jackson County most contacts feel responsibilities are largely a local responsibility, and 60 percent of the contacts in Deschutes County say that the policy area of water quality is largely a state responsibility. The differences between counties on views of state-local responsibilities for water quality is a preliminary indication of differences between counties in the nature of water quality problems. Water quality problems reported by contacts will be analyzed at the county level in a later section.

Most local contacts would like to see changes in the relative responsibilities of state and local governments. This is the case in all three policy areas as shown in Table 11. There is considerable sentiment for increasing local responsibilities in the area of water quality. Perhaps one might conclude that such sentiments are simply what one would expect local contacts to say. But in the policy area of stream flows sentiments to increase state responsibilities occur more frequently than do sentiments to increase local responsibilities. And this occurs for a policy area where most contacts perceive that the policy area is already largely a state responsibility. Land use was perceived to be largely a local responsibility. Over half the contacts would like to see increased local responsibilities for land use.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY WHICH LOCAL CONTACTS IDENTIFIED TYPES OF CHANGES
IN STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AS DESIRABLE^a

Type of Change Identified as Desirable	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Increase State Responsibilities Relative to Local Responsibilities	8.9%	20.8%	8.9%
Increase Local Responsibilities Relative to State Responsibilities	44.4	16.7	53.3
Increase Both State and Local Responsibilities	6.7	4.2	8.9
No Change-- Leave As Is	4.4	20.8	11.1
Other ^b	<u>35.6</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>17.8</u>
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (45)	100.0 (24)	100.0 (45)

^a From questions 5, 5b, 11, 11b, 18, and 18b.

^b Most contacts in this category stated that local (and/or state) responsibilities should be increased in some aspects and decreased in other aspects.

The major tendencies in Table 11 can be simply summarized. Where contacts agree that existing responsibilities are largely state or largely local, there is also agreement that such a division of responsibility should be maintained or even accentuated (e.g. for stream flows, land use). Where there is no agreement on which level of government has the larger responsibility (water quality), local contacts favor increasing local responsibility.

Local contacts gave many reasons for increasing state and/or local responsibilities. Similar reasons were grouped within categories. Table 12 presents a summary of the reasons. Table 12 presents many distributions. To assist in reading the table, boxes are drawn to focus attention on reasons given for the type of change preferred by most of the contacts (i.e. the modal category in Table 11). So, most contacts wish to have local responsibilities increased in the area of water quality. The first box in Table 12 directs the reader's attention to the reasons given for such a change.

The sentiments of contacts in this study on the question of increasing or decreasing relative state-local responsibilities can be further explored by examining the reasons given by those who said responsibilities should remain as they are now. Some contacts saw no need for change because the current balance was proper or because they thought it wise to wait to see how things work. Many who were satisfied with the present division of responsibilities went on to say either that the state or that the local role (but not both) must be protected. A box is drawn around the frequency of such responses in Table 12. These are, in a sense, responses to an unasked question on what responsibilities should not be decreased. The figures only partially reinforce conclusions from Table 11 on desirable increases in state or local responsibilities. In the area of land use, most contacts who see no need for change are concerned that the local role be protected. This reinforces sentiments observed in Table 11 for increasing local responsibilities in the area of land use. Similar sentiments about protecting local responsibilities were frequently mentioned in the area of stream flows. Thus, Table 11 alone would appear to overstate sentiments to increase state responsibilities

TABLE 12
REASONS FOR CHANGING STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES
BY POLICY AREA^a

Reasons	Policy Area		
	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Reasons to Increase State Responsibilities			
Problems Transcend Local Boundaries	36.8% ^b	55.6%	80.0%
Overcome Local Resistance/Footdragging	21.1	11.1	26.7
To Increase Funding Available to Locals	47.4	33.3	20.0
State Agencies Better Equipped	15.8	22.2	0.0
Reasons to Increase Local Responsibilities			
Tailor Policy to Variations Between Localities	27.5	0.0	28.0
Locals Know Local Needs Better	50.0	33.3	32.0
Local Government is More Efficient	15.0	0.0	16.0
State Should Enter Only if Locals Are Negligent	45.0	0.0	44.0
General Response--Local Power All Ready Eroded Too Far	32.5	33.3	24.0
State Government is Too Inefficient	17.5	16.7	0.0
State Government is Too Arbitrary	5.0	16.7	32.0
Reasons to Leave As Is			
Proper Balance Now	38.5	50.0	21.1
O.K. Now But Must Protect State Role	38.5	14.3	26.3
O.K. Now, But Must Protect Local Role	23.1	57.1	52.6
See How it Works for a While Longer Before Change	23.1	7.1	21.1

^a From questions 5a, 5c, 11a, 11c, 18a, and 18c. Questions were open-ended. Response categories created by grouping similar responses.

^b Table entry may be interpreted as follows: of those who felt state responsibilities for water quality should be increased, 36.8% mentioned "Problems Transcend Local Boundaries" as a reason. The denominators of the percentages are as follows: in the policy areas of water quality, stream flows, and land use, respectively, 19, 9, and 15 contacts felt state responsibilities should be increased; 40, 6, and 25 felt local responsibilities should be increased; and 13, 14, and 25 said responsibilities should remain as they now are.

in the area of stream flows. Similarly, Table 11 alone would seem to exaggerate support for increasing local responsibilities in the area of water quality. In this policy area, those satisfied with the present division of responsibilities are more likely to be concerned about erosions of state rather than local roles.

Of the local contacts who felt state responsibility for stream flows should be increased, over half mentioned that problems transcend local boundaries. Few of these people mentioned local resistance or foot-dragging as a reason. In fact this reason was given only half as often as in the other policy areas. Of the minority who desired an increase in state responsibilities for water quality, many had a rather particular type of increase in mind; namely, there was a desire for the state to take a greater role in assisting local governments through increased funding.

Much of the increasing state role in land use is concerned with problems that transcend local boundaries. These are concerns for areas of importance to many geographically dispersed citizens (areas of so called "critical state concern") and concerns for coordinating the planning in adjacent counties or in cities and the counties in which they are located. For the minority who would like an increased state responsibility for land use, 80 percent mentioned problems which transcend local boundaries as their reasons. Most contacts with an opinion on the question felt that local responsibilities for land use should be increased. A sentiment that state government should become involved only if local governments are negligent was the most frequently given reason for increasing local responsibilities relative to state responsibilities. This position is, in a sense, recognition of a state role where problems transcend local boundaries. A county can be affected by the local planning effort--or lack of such effort in an adjacent county; municipalities can be affected by the presence or absence of a planning effort by the county in which the municipality is located.

Those who believe the state role in land use should be increased because problems transcend local boundaries would appear to have an evaluation of the status quo which differs from those larger numbers

of contacts who say local responsibilities should be increased because state government involvement should be limited to situations of local negligence. Specifically, the later group are implying-- or at times explicitly stated--that local planning efforts are adequate without state intervention. Others would argue that the current state role in land use is no more than the result of local negligence; local governments failed to undertake planning efforts required in Senate Bill 10 and so legislation defining a greater state role emerged. Whatever the interpretation, the local contacts in this study generally feel that local governments have not been so negligent as to justify the current level of state involvement in land use.

A view that local governments know local needs better than state governments was frequently offered as one reason for increasing local responsibility in all three policy areas. Contacts pointed out that local officials were closer to the needs and desires of the citizens and were accountable to them through local elections. A view that local government knows best how to deal with primarily local problems is a major and persistent popular justification for the American structure of federalism. Although some may feel power and responsibility have been shifting to higher levels of government over the past decades, one still finds programs such as revenue sharing, "creative federalizing," and "the new federalism" grounded in the view that local governments know local needs best. Yet it is often difficult to demonstrate factual bases for such beliefs. In fact, one might expect local government officials to be less representative of their constituents than state or even federal representatives due to the usually much lower visibility and participation rates in local government. Whether a matter of actuality or unrealized potential, the position that local governments best know local needs remains a value of importance to many of our contacts when they are weighing the advantages of increasing or decreasing state and local responsibilities. This reason seems to stand alone as a justification for increasing local responsibilities. The reason is cited even when-- as in the area of stream flows--no one notes a need to tailor policy to variations between localities.

There is further evidence that the "locals know better" view stands by itself as a major rationale for increased local responsibilities. The other side of the "locals know better" view would be observations that state government is arbitrary, unresponsive, and/or unrepresentative. Contacts expressed such sentiments which were grouped in the category "state government is too arbitrary." Such statements ranged from an agency "is not answerable to anybody" or complaints about "big brother" to an observation that "too many state laws (are) instigated by extreme environmental movements." Yet there seems to be little relationship between the incidence of such reasons and the frequency with which contacts stated that local governments know better. In the area of water quality half the contacts explained that local governments have a better knowledge of local needs when asked why they had stated local responsibilities should be increased. On the same question, only five percent gave arbitrariness or unrepresentativeness of state government as a reason.

The view that state government is too arbitrary or unrepresentative was most likely to be mentioned for the policy area of land use. In the area of land use this reason was mentioned two to six times more often than for other policy areas. We have mentioned the extensive efforts made by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission to meet with and reassure local officials. Among many of our contacts it is apparent that this reassurance was not sufficient to reduce anxieties. Several contacts thought the activities of LCDC at the local level were merely cosmetic. Others were worried about the appointive nature of the commission, lack of accountability, the personality and "true" intentions of the Chairman of the Commission, or state imposed constraints on the degree of flexibility which some local contacts felt was necessary in planning and controlling land use.

One reason for increasing local responsibilities stood out with a frequency we had not anticipated. Time and again, contacts simply said local government responsibilities had already been eroded too far, or words to that effect. Such sentiments were clearly

expressed by a quarter to a third of the contacts in each of the three policy areas. Such responses were offered as statements of general principle. "Erosion" alone was given as the reason; the reason was not in the form "erosion leads to such-and-such." Perceived erosion of local government power was reason alone to increase local responsibilities no matter what the other advantages or disadvantages might be. The discovery of this response came as a surprise. As implicit in our conceptual framework stated earlier, we thought about the question of divisions of responsibilities between state and local governments in terms of means appropriate to various policy objectives (political effectiveness, political efficiency). Responses of contacts in our study indicate that increased local responsibility has value as an end in itself. For a substantial portion of our contacts local responsibilities need to be increased across categories of policy for its intrinsic value as the way government ought legitimately to function no matter what other advantages or disadvantages may result.

Perceptions of Agency Success in Finding Out Local Needs and Interests

After asking local contacts about state and local responsibilities in three policy areas, contacts were asked to consider three state agencies in particular. The three agencies were the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the State Water Resources Board (SWRB), and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). Contacts were first asked about the success of these agencies in finding out about local needs and interests prior to making policies. Table 13 summarizes the results on the level of success of the three agencies in finding out local needs and interests. We also asked which of the agencies were most successful and which of the agencies was least successful. Table 14 reports the contacts' evaluations of the relative success of the agencies.

Both SWRB and LCDC were perceived to be successful in learning about local needs and interests (see Table 13). Over half the contacts said these agencies were very successful or mostly successful. Only seven percent of the contacts judged either of the agencies to be

TABLE 13

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF SUCCESS OF THREE AGENCIES
IN FINDING OUT ABOUT LOCAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS^a

How Successful in Finding Out Local Needs and Interests	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Very Successful	17.4%	33.3%	26.2%
Mixed--Mostly Successful	15.2	23.3	31.0
Mixed	19.6	23.3	21.4
Mixed--Mostly Unsuccessful	21.7	13.3	14.3
Very Unsuccessful	<u>26.1</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (46)	99.9 (30)	100.0 (42)

^a From question 20. ". . . . Considering the three agencies, how successful have they been in learning about local needs and interests prior to making policies?"

TABLE 14

PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIVE SUCCESS OF THREE AGENCIES
IN FINDING OUT ABOUT LOCAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS^a

Relative Success	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Most Successful ^b	17.6%	32.4%	50.0%
Least Successful ^c	76.5	17.6	5.9

^a From question 21, "Which of the three agencies, (the State Water Resources Board, DEQ, or LCDC has been most successful in learning about local needs and interests prior to making policies?" and question 22, "Which of the three agencies has been least successful in learning about local needs and interests prior to making policies?"

^b Figures report the percentage of 34 contacts who named one and only one agency as most successful. Three contacts who said "all" and one who said "LCDC and DEQ" were excluded.

^c Figures report the percentage of 34 contacts who named one and only one agency as least successful. Two contacts who said "all" and one contact who said "SWRB and LCDC" are excluded.

very unsuccessful. Comparing SWRB and LCDC, SWRB seems to have a slight edge. About one quarter of the contacts with an opinion were willing to describe LCDC as very successful; one third of the contacts stated that the SWRB was very successful.

DEQ is perceived to be very unsuccessful or mostly unsuccessful by about half the contacts with a judgement on the question. There is a substantial minority who hold a different view. About 33 percent of the contacts stated DEQ was mostly or very successful. This division of opinion on DEQ is consistent with divisions of opinion on DEQ noted in Table 10 and discussed earlier. Contacts are divided on whether they perceive the policy area of water quality to be largely a state or largely a local responsibility. One's perceptions of the degree of state and local responsibility for water quality is likely to partially determine whether one judges DEQ's attempts to find out local needs as adequate or a failure. Those who think the policy area of water quality is largely a local responsibility would, we think, be more likely than other contacts to view DEQ's efforts at finding out local needs as unsuccessful. Whether or not that explanation is accurate, Table 13 provides further evidence of substantial differences of opinion about the rule and performance of state agencies in the policy area of water quality.

The relative evaluations of the agencies are given in Table 14. When forced to compare the agencies, LCDC stands out as the most successful agency in finding out local needs and interests. Half the contacts select LCDC as the most successful and only a small proportion of contacts chose LCDC as least successful. SWRB seems to occupy a middle position in a ranking of the three agencies. Less than a third of the contacts nominate SWRB as either most or least successful. We would note that the relative ranking of LCDC and SWRB may over-emphasize differences in the level of their success. In Table 13, based on level of success, LCDC and SWRB seemed about equally successful; if anything, the edge seemed to go to SWRB. The success of DEQ in finding out local needs and interests is perceived by the contacts to be poor relative to SWRB and LCDC. Over three quarters of the contacts who provided a judgement selected DEQ as the least successful of the three agencies.

After naming an agency as least or most successful, local contacts were asked the reasons for their choices. Reasons given are summarized in Table 15. Again, we use boxes in Table 15 to direct attention to those sets of reasons given to support the most widely shared judgments of agency success or failure. For example, contacts were most likely to feel LCDC and SWRB were relatively successful (see Table 14). Thus, there is a box in Table 15 around the reasons given for those evaluations. Figures without boxes can be thought of as the distributions of reasons for minority judgements.

The relative success of the SWRB in finding out about local needs and interests seems--in view of the contacts--to be due to skill of agency personnel and a fit between agency objectives and local needs and interests. Half the contacts volunteered both reasons. We have noted the relatively intimate community organization style of SWRB. Evidently, these efforts were undertaken by personnel who came to be known well, respected and who were able to communicate a concern about local needs. Concern about local needs was a reason frequently offered for the success of SWRB, considerably more frequently than for the other two agencies. Contacts said they felt SWRB cared about their needs and problems. The SWRB worked through local committees of largely its own creation. While this style might foster perceptions of expertise, concern, and a match between local interests and agency goals, there appears to be a cost. Few contacts noted involvement of people as a reason for the success of SWRB, perhaps due to the necessarily exclusive, small nature of any workable, long-term committee. Involvement and consultation with people was three or four times more likely to be mentioned as a reason for the success of LCDC or DEQ. There is another explanation of the infrequency with which "consultation" is given as a reason for the success of SWRB. Consultation with local people may mean consultation with representatives of the people for some of our contacts. Most contacts were public officials and SWRB tended to work through committees of interested citizens rather than exclusively through public officials.

Of those who thought LCDC was most successful in finding out local needs and interests, all contacts mentioned LCDC's efforts to involve

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR RELATIVE SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF THREE AGENCIES
IN FINDING OUT LOCAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS^a

Reasons	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Reasons for Success ^b			
Involves and Consults Local People	72.7%	25.0%	100.0%
Agency is Concerned About Local Needs/Interests	18.2	37.5	0.0
Agency's Goals Match Local Needs/Interests	18.2	50.0	7.1
Skill/Expertise of Agency Personnel	36.4	50.0	28.6
Reasons for Failure ^c			
Agency only Dictates to Local Government	70.8	d	50.0
Agency is not Concerned About Local Needs	20.8	d	75.0
Agency Ignores Local Needs	29.2	d	0.0
Lack of Skill/Expertise of Agency Personnel	16.7	d	0.0
Law Requires Agency to be a "Policeman." Must Ignore Local Needs/Interests	12.5	d	0.0

^a From question 21a, "What accounts for the relative success of that particular agency?" and question 22a, "What accounts for the relative lack of success of that particular agency?"

^b Of those giving reasons for the relative success of an agency, table entries report the percentage of contacts mentioning a particular type of reason. 11, 8, and 14 contacts gave reasons for the success of DEQ, SWRB, and LCDC respectively.

^c Of those giving reasons for the relative lack of success of an agency, table entries report the percentage of contacts mentioning a particular type of reason. Twenty-four contacts gave reasons for the relative lack of success of DEQ. Four contacts gave reasons for the relative lack of success of LCDC.

^d Few contacts identified SWRB as least successful (see Table 14) and for those who did, no reasons clear enough to code were given.

and consult with local representatives. LCDC's efforts at symbolic reassurance--described earlier--evidently reach many people. The efforts at symbolic reassurance were successful in more ways than simply reaching people. LCDC was the agency most likely to be cited as successful in finding out local needs and interests. And the only frequently given reason for this success was involvement and consultation. The unusually extensive campaign of meetings with citizens, with local officials, and continual interaction with state-wide organizations of local officials evidently persuaded our contacts that LCDC had found out about local needs and interests.

As striking as the "100.0%" in the LCDC column of Table 15 is the "0.0%" directly underneath it. Contacts did not volunteer "concern with local needs and interests" as a reason for the relative success of LCDC. This contrasts to the results for SWRB and must in part reflect the dramatic differences in their styles of interaction with local people. SWRB worked closely over a long period of time with a small number of people. Under pressures of legislatively imposed deadlines, LCDC met briefly--often with quite large groups of people--over a short period of time. The zero percentage figure in the table also may reflect a suspicion of LCDC noted earlier. Just as contacts are worried that LCDC may act too arbitrarily, they are also not willing to conclude that LCDC is concerned about local needs and interests.

DEQ was judged to be relatively less successful in finding out local needs and interests. Time and again, contacts mentioned the dictatorial nature of interactions with DEQ. DEQ was perceived as coming to tell local government what to do rather than to find out about local needs. We have described DEQ's style of local interaction as "imposed problem solving." One can easily understand how such a style can lead to conclusions that DEQ is dictatorial and does not understand local needs and interests. Two contacts who said DEQ was least successful did go on to observe that DEQ had no choice. They observed DEQ had to act as the "policeman" in enforcing the law; they were not there to make up the law based on local needs.

Success in Incorporation of Local Needs and Interests in Policies Adopted

Contacts were asked about the success of agencies in incorporating information about local needs and interests when the agencies formulated policies. Responses to these questions should be related to the results of the prior section. Presumably, an agency which was unsuccessful in finding out about local needs and interests could not successfully incorporate that information in the policies of the agency. Yet, there is no certainty that an agency which can find out about local needs and interests will be able to incorporate that information in actual policies. For that reason, we asked contacts to judge agency success in using information about local needs and interests. As before, we asked contacts to judge levels of agency success and the relative success of agencies.

As shown in Table 16, evaluations of agency success in using information about local needs and interests are similar to evaluations of agency success in finding out about local needs and interests. LCDC and SWRB are judged to be very successful or mostly successful. Evaluations of DEQ are again sharply divided. Thirty-four percent of the contacts rate DEQ as mostly or very successful. More contacts, 48 percent, judge DEQ to be mostly or very unsuccessful.

Relative evaluations of agency success also parallel earlier results (see Table 17). LCDC is the agency most likely to be rated as most successful. However, LCDC was not as clear a first choice as was found when considering success in finding out about local needs and interests. SWRB is again least likely to be selected as the most unsuccessful of the state agencies. When the emphasis shifts from finding out local needs and interests to using information when adopting policies, DEQ does both better and worse. Curiously, when one shifts stages in policy making, contacts are more likely to select DEQ as most successful, and they also become more likely to select DEQ as least successful. As before, though, DEQ remains the clear choice of our contacts as least successful.

When asked about reasons for the relative success and failure of the agencies, contacts did not offer reasons as frequently as for prior

TABLE 16

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF SUCCESS OF THREE AGENCIES
IN USING INFORMATION ABOUT LOCAL NEEDS
AND INTERESTS WHEN ADOPTING POLICIES^a

How Successful	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Very Successful	31.0%	50.0%	40.7%
Mixed--Mostly Successful	3.4	11.1	7.4
Mixed	17.2	16.7	22.2
Mixed--Mostly Unsuccessful	24.1	11.1	18.5
Very Unsuccessful	<u>24.1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>11.1</u>
Total % (Cases)	99.8 (29)	100.0 (18)	99.9 (27)

^a From question 23, ". . . How successful have the three agencies been in incorporating information about local needs and interests when they adopt actual policies?"

TABLE 17

PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIVE SUCCESS OF THREE AGENCIES
IN USING INFORMATION ABOUT LOCAL NEEDS
AND INTERESTS WHEN ADOPTING POLICIES^a

Relative Success	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Most Successful	32.1%	28.6%	39.3%
Least Successful	83.3 ^d	3.3	13.3

^a From questions 24 and 25, "Which of the three agencies has been most (least) successful in using information about local needs and interests when they adopt actual policies?"

^b Figures report the percentage of 28 contacts who named one and only one agency as most successful. Figures exclude one contact who said "all" and one contact who said "SWRB and LCDC."

^c Figures report the percentage of 30 contacts who named one and only one agency as least successful. Figures exclude one contact who said "all."

^d There might appear to be an inconsistency in the figures reported for DEQ. Eighty-three percent of contacts say DEQ is least successful. Thirty-two percent say DEQ was most successful. The fact that the sum of these two percentages exceeds 100% results from the fact that the contacts answering question 24 were not always the same as the contacts answering question 25. Some contacts could name an agency which was most successful but could not pick the agency which was least successful and vice versa.

questions. A number stated or implied that reasons for success in using local information were the same as they had given earlier when asked about finding out local needs and interests. Those reasons which were offered are summarized in Table 18. As one can see from the categories derived for the reasons, the reasons given were quite similar to those given in the prior section. The distribution of reasons parallels earlier results with two exceptions. Unlike the results in Table 15, all who gave reasons for the success of SWRB mentioned involvement and consultation. Comments of some contacts suggest that the practice of lengthy local hearings by SWRB on drafts of regional water policies--prepared with the help of the local committee--is important in fostering perceptions that information on local needs and interests is actually used in adopting policies.

In Table 17 we noted an increase in the likelihood of DEQ being selected as most successful. How could an agency which is evaluated as doing a poor job of finding out local needs and interests be perceived as doing a better job of accommodating local needs and interests when adopting policy? Three quarters of those who gave reasons for choosing DEQ as most successful mentioned a correspondence between agency goals and local needs. This result suggests a partial answer to the question. DEQ is perceived to be relatively unsuccessful in finding out local needs, and as some contacts see it DEQ is simply an enforcement agency which ought not to be considering local needs and interests. Yet the goals of the state law enforced by DEQ tend to match local needs and interests. Thus, DEQ adopts policies which match local needs and interests without knowing local needs and interests. We shall have more to say about this outcome--developing a more formal explanation--after other results have been reported.

In considering the success of agencies in finding out about local needs and using that information one can identify a "chicken or egg" problem. What is the causal relationship? Are agencies perceived to be successful in incorporating information on local needs in their policies because of success in finding out about local needs? Or are agencies perceived to be successful in finding out about local needs and interests if and only if their policies match local needs and interests?

TABLE 18

REASONS FOR RELATIVE SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF THREE AGENCIES
IN USING INFORMATION ABOUT LOCAL NEEDS
AND INTERESTS WHEN ADOPTING POLICIES^a

Reasons	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Reasons for Success^b			
Involves and Consults Local People When Adopting Policy	12.5%	100.0%	77.8%
Agency is Concerned About Local Needs/Interests	0.0	28.6	0.0
Agency's Goals Match Local Needs/Interests	75.0	0.0	22.2
Skill/Expertise of Agency Personnel	25.0	14.3	11.1
Reasons for Failure^c			
Agency only Dictates to Local Government	47.6	d	d
Agency Does Not Know, Understand Local Needs	47.6	d	d
Agency Personnel Lack Necessary Skills	42.9	d	d
Law Requires Agency to be "Policeman." Cannot use Information on Local Needs	4.8	d	d

^a From questions 24a, "What accounts for the relative success of that particular agency?" and question 25a, "What accounts for the relative lack of success of that particular agency?"

^b Of those giving reasons for the relative success of an agency, table entries report percentage of contacts mentioning a particular type of reason. 8, 7, and 9 contacts gave reasons for the success of DEQ, SWRB, and LCDC respectively.

^c Of those giving reasons for the relative lack of success of an agency, table entries report percentage of contacts mentioning a particular type of reason. Twenty-one contacts gave reasons for the relative lack of success of DEQ.

^d Number of contacts giving reasons for lack of success of SWRB and LCDC were one and two respectively. Such frequencies were judged too small to be worth tabulating.

Undoubtedly, both processes occur. And in listening to the interviews, we sensed that the distinction we imposed between finding local information and actually using it was a distinction our contacts occasionally missed or thought artificial. We have the following impressions. People tended not to distinguish between getting and using information about local needs and interests. The paramount question--one we did not directly ask but seemed to be the one contacts thought was implied--was whether or not the agencies' activities met local needs and interests. Thus, when asked about getting information on local needs and interests, judgements were based on how well activities of agencies seemed to be suited to the locality. However, we also clearly sense a different causal relationship. Great efforts expended on finding out about local needs and interests increase expectations that policies will successfully incorporate information on local needs and interests. Such efforts may partially account for later judgements on the success of incorporating local information in policies. This is because public involvement efforts can be made quite visible while policies are long in the making and may be so vague that their actual meaning for a locality will only become clear--if ever made clear--as decisions are made on a case-by-case basis.

Regional Differences

The prior section summarized local perceptions of state and local relationships for water-related policy areas and state agencies. In this section we continue presentation of findings on local perceptions and concerns by reporting on water quality problems reported by local contacts.

Local water quality and land use related problems are broken down by county in the tables which follow. The four counties used in the study have been described earlier. They were selected as representative of four distinctly different regions of the state. The use of counties in our research was designed to facilitate accomplishment of our third research objective; namely, to report those aspects of state water policy which may be successfully established in a uniform manner and those portions of state water policy which require considerable flexibility. There is a bias implied in this design, one we did not note until results were analyzed. We had felt that needs for flexibility at the state level--decentralization if you like--could be identified by noting where water quality problems and policy desires varied between localities. This implied that flexibility, adaptation to local needs, was valuable largely as a tool for accomplishing disparate local desires. Yet we have observed in the prior section that decentralization, reliance on local government, is of importance to many local contacts as an end in itself, not simply as a means or a tool to improve efficiency and effectiveness. This is a realization to which we will be forced to return before this section is ended. For now we ignore this bias (perhaps oversight is more accurate) in the logic by which we pursue the research objective.

We will be reporting on the distribution of water quality concerns for contacts as a whole and then consider the distribution of concerns by counties. Our major interest is in identifying those concerns which are shared by all counties and those concerns which are evident in some counties but not others. Where concerns are shared by all counties we would conclude that state programs and policies can be relatively uniform. Where concerns differ, we would conclude that state programs

require some flexibility in adapting to local concerns. Any firm conclusion--as we indicated in the background sections--requires evaluation of tradeoffs between political efficiency and political effectiveness. Those are evaluations which must emerge from a political process, not from a piece of research. However, identification of areas in which concerns are and are not shared can assist in estimating likely costs and benefits of uniform or flexible state policies.

Certain of the water quality problems of the counties in this study were presented in the background section. There were problems related to the hydrology, meteorology, geology, ecology, demography, and economy of the counties. In this section, we take a different approach to water quality concerns. The contacts in our study are not hydrologists, ecologists, or economists. They do not generally speak of water quality concerns in terms of "turbidity," "biochemical oxygen demand," or "net social benefits." The contacts--most - all of them--are local government officials. They tell us, we assume, what is on the minds of local, politically involved citizens. Their language, and what are concerns for them, may differ markedly from the observations of various technical specialists. And this is how it should be for purposes of this study. To be effective, we assume state policy must deal with the concerns of citizens and their representatives and deal with them in the language they use.

When asked about concerns in their area, contacts tend to respond in one of two general ways. Reference may be made to specific, pressing problems of the present or immediate past--"septic tank failures in the southeast part of town," "failure of the last bond measure to finance expansion of the sewage treatment facilities," or "logging operations on the south fork of such-and-such river." Other responses are very broad, very general--"we don't have enough water," "the main problem around here is that there is not enough money," or simply "pollution." Both types of responses--the quite specific and the quite general--present challenges when attempting to code responses. Specific responses do not fit as neatly as one might like into response categories. Some of the uniqueness and multiple dimensions of a specific problem must be sacrificed when classifying. Broad, general responses are more easily sorted

into categories of similar responses. But the categories may seem frustratingly vague.

A number of questions were designed to obtain information on local concerns. There were three separate questions asking about the major water quality, stream flow, and land use concerns in the contact's locality. Probing for additional concerns followed each of the questions. At a later point in the interviews, we asked a series of questions about "what do people around here think government ought to do to affect water quality" (or, in other questions, "stream flows" then "land use").

Water Quality and Stream Flow Concerns of the Sample as a Whole

Results of the question on major, local water quality concerns are summarized in Table 19. All contacts identified at least one water quality concern. Many contacts offered several or more concerns: the 53 contacts provided a total of 172 water quality concerns. Table 19 understates the number of responses since often several distinct, specific responses mentioned by one contact would fall in the same response category used in Table 19.

The general response of "pollution" leads the list as the most frequently articulated local water quality concern. Almost half, 47 percent, of the contacts made general reference to pollution. More specific forms of pollution--from domestic sewage or from non-point sources--were each identified by a quarter of the respondents. Perhaps a general response of "pollution" is what one should expect to a general question like the one we asked. Yet that is too easy a way to dismiss what might seem like a frustratingly general response.

Pollution, no more or no less, is the water quality concern volunteered most frequently by contacts in our study. The response makes sense; if your water is not of the quality you desire at the price you are willing to pay then--almost by definition--your problem is one of pollution. Sensible or not, the response requires further reflection. Pollution as a term is widely used in lay conversations, on television PSAs, in schools, on literature from public agencies. Implied in such

TABLE 19
 PERCENTAGE OF CONTACTS MENTIONING TYPES
 OF WATER QUALITY CONCERNS BY COUNTY^a

Water Quality Concerns	County				Total % of all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Pollution					
General Mention of Pollution	42% ^b	55%	50%	42%	47%
Contamination by Domestic Sewage	42	27	6	42	26
Non-Point Pollution	17	46	11	33	25
Supply Problems					
General Mention of Inadequate Quantity	33	27	56	17	36
Low Seasonal Flow	17	18	39	8	23
Treatment for Domestic Uses	33	36	44	42	40
Inadequate Storage Capacity	0	9	22	0	9
Problems with Water Table	25	0	0	0	6
Problems for Recreation, Fishing	8	18	17	25	17

TABLE 19 (continued)

Water Quality Concerns	County				Total % of all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Policy Problems					
State Standards too Extreme	0%	0%	11%	0%	4%
Inadequate State Financial Assistance	0	0	17	0	6
Need to Standardize Small Water Supply Districts	8	9	11	0	8
Other Problem	0	0	6	8	4
(Contacts Responding)	(12)	(11)	(18)	(12)	(53)

^a From question 1, "We are interested in three broad topics. They are water quality, stream flows, and land use policies. Beginning with water quality, what are the major water quality concerns in this county?"

^b Each table entry reports the percentage of contacts who mention a type of water quality concern.

use is a notion that everyone knows what is pollution and what is not pollution. Or else, there is an implied assumption that pollution can be defined by technical experts within the scope of their disciplines. Yet if pollution means water is not of the quality one desires at the cost one is willing to pay--and that is similar to the way we believe the term was used by the contacts--then the definition of pollution depends upon one's desires, one's values.

Recognition of the evaluative element in the word "pollution" has two implications for this study. Use of the term by our contacts implies that there is some agreement on the values needed to define pollution. A sentiment that "we know it when we see it" is implied. Yet we believe it would be very foolish for state-level policy makers to assume that there actually is the uniform agreement on pollution implied in our results. It is quite clear in other parts of the interviews that--as an example--what DEQ sees as pollution is not necessarily what a contact sees as pollution. Second, if the concept of pollution depends upon people's values and if people do not all have the same values, then use of the concept of pollution as a guide for public policy requires making a choice about a subject upon which people disagree. Pollution can only be defined as a result of a political process if one accepts that pollution entails evaluation and if one assumes that people will hold different positions on the relevant values. By pollution, are the contacts referring to a concept which has been defined through a local political process? No, that is clearly not the case. Pollution is one of those phrases like wasteful spending or extravagant energy use which has great political value; the terms precipitate agreement so long as one does not get specific. Such terms cannot be dismissed as "rhetoric": they symbolize genuine, deep concerns. But in interpreting the first row of Table 19 we believe it is clear that local contacts have been unwilling to precipitate the disagreements and conflicts necessary to give an operational meaning to what they most frequently identify as the major water policy concern in their area. We will report later in this section that local contacts have little to say when asked about the specific water quality programs which people in their area would favor.

Considering all contacts, the other two most frequently mentioned water quality concerns are a bit more specific. Forty percent of the contacts mentioned problems in the treatment of water for domestic consumption. Almost as many, 36 percent, mentioned that their problems were not with water quality as much as with water quantity. Low seasonal flows were identified as a major cause of supply problems. Answers to the question on local stream flow concerns provided more detail on the type of problems related to low seasonal flow. Table 20 summarizes the responses to that question.

There were 50 contacts who provided answers on the question of local concerns about stream flows, including two who answered by saying that there were no local stream flow problems. The remainder of the contacts in the study--three people--gave a response of "do not know."

When asked about stream flow concerns, contacts in the study were most likely to mention problems resulting from low seasonal flows. About a third of the contacts reported a general concern with low seasonal flows. Those who were more specific mentioned the flow-related problems created for domestic water supplies, irrigation water supplies, recreation, and fish and other wildlife with about equal frequency.

Pollution problems remained as a frequent concern of contacts when asked about stream flows. General mentions of pollution were less frequent when questioning shifted from water quality to stream flows. Nevertheless, close to a quarter of the contacts made general mention of pollution. Slightly more contacts specifically mentioned non-point pollution. Where sources of non-point pollution were mentioned, agriculture and agricultural irrigation were most often mentioned although several contacts identified pollution problems resulting from logging. Pollution and turbidity were mentioned frequently enough to warrant separate response categories in Table 19.

Dams ranked after low seasonal flows and pollution as a major stream flow concern. Twenty percent of the contacts identified a need for more dams. The need for dams was tied to problems of low seasonal flow rather than flooding. As can be seen in Table 20, a need for dams was most likely to be a concern in those counties most likely to be concerned about low seasonal flows (Lincoln and Jackson Counties). A need for

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE OF CONTACTS MENTIONING TYPES
OF STREAM FLOW CONCERNS BY COUNTY^a

Stream Flow Concerns	County				Total for all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Low Seasonal Flow					
General Mention of Low Flow	25%	30%	50%	17%	32%
Low Flow and Problems for Domestic Use	8	0	19	8	10
Low Flow and Problems for Irrigation	33	10	0	8	12
Low Flow and Problems for Recreation	8	0	13	17	10
Low Flow and Problems for Fish Wildlife	8	10	6	8	8
Other Pollution Problems					
General Mention of Pollution	25	30	25	25	26
Domestic Sewage Contamination of Water	8	30	0	17	12
Non-Point Pol- lution (Logging, Agriculture)	0	30	69	0	28
Siltation, Turbidity	0	20	19	0	10

TABLE 20 (continued)

Stream Flow Concerns	County				Total for all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Mention of a Need for Specific Dams	8%	20%	44%	0%	20%
Mention of Problems Created by Dams	8	30	13	17	16
Flooding					
General Mention of Flooding	8	0	6	25	10
Flooding Plus Development on the Flood Plain	0	0	0	25	6
Flooding and Resultant Pollution and Erosion	8	0	6	8	6
Anticipated Growth-Related Problems of Domestic Water Supply	17	20	19	8	16
Problems with Water Rights, Allocation Among Users	0	40	19	0	14
Other Specific Response	13	0	13	0	12
Stated There Was No Problem	0	10	0	1	4
(Total Number of Contacts)	(12)	(10)	(16)	(12)	(50)

^a From question 7, "Stream Flows are one specific area of water quality which we would like to ask about. What are the major stream flow concerns in this county?"

^b Table entries report the percentage of respondents who mentioned a type of stream flow concern.

dams was least likely to be identified where flooding was a frequently expressed concern (Marion County).

Sixteen percent of the contacts were concerned about problems created by dams. Specific dams were usually mentioned with each response referring to one of a variety of problems. Concerns expressed about dams included effects of temperature on fisheries, turbidity problems in a reservoir, siltation, policy on water discharge rates, and public opposition to a proposed impoundment project.

A variety of other stream flow concerns were expressed. Considering all 53 contacts, the frequency of expression was small for any particular concern. However, the expressions were often concentrated within one of two counties. Such localized concerns are the subject of the next section.

Water Quality and Stream Flow Concerns by County

Table 19 and Table 20 present distributions of water quality and stream flow concerns by counties. Several words of caution are appropriate before examining the tables. The distributions are percentagized. Percentages have the advantage of standardizing the distributions where results in different counties are based on different numbers of contacts. When the results are broken down by county, percentages are based on a relatively small number of contacts (see last row of entries in Table 19 and Table 20). The percentages may exaggerate or inflate apparent differences between counties. For example, in Table 20 a difference of 12 percentage points between a percentage for Deschutes and a percentage for Jackson County is actually only a difference of one respondent. So, in looking for differences between counties in the types of water-related concerns we will be looking for rather large differences in the percentages. Unless the differences between percentages in a row are large we will conclude that occurrence of a water-related concern does not depend upon county.

Pollution, as a broad, general concern occurs frequently in all four counties. Concerns about specific forms of pollution are related

to the county involved. Contacts in Jackson and Lincoln are concerned about siltation and turbidity; none of the contacts in Deschutes or Marion mentioned such concerns (Table 20).

Concern for non-point pollution is related to county although the pattern is complicated. There are a few expressions of concern for non-point pollution in Deschutes County and such expressions are frequent in Jackson County. In Marion and Lincoln Counties the expression of non-point pollution problems appears to depend on whether one is asking about stream flows or water quality. Non-point pollution is mentioned frequently as a water quality concern by contacts in Marion County and infrequently by contacts in Lincoln County (Table 19). When asked about stream flow concerns, contacts in Lincoln County frequently mentioned non-point pollution but none of the contacts in Marion County mentioned this concern (Table 20). These seemingly inconsistent results for Lincoln and Marion Counties may be related to differences in the origins of non-point pollution in the two counties. Marion County lies in the Willamette Valley where run-off from agricultural land and irrigation may be perceived largely as a problem affecting water quality. Lincoln County, on the coast, is drained by rivers subject to wide seasonal variation. The quiet streams of summer can turn into swollen, muddy torrents during the winter, the turbidity due in part to run-offs from logging operations and agriculture. In Lincoln County, non-point pollution is, therefore, a concern thought of in relation to stream flows.

A concern for low seasonal flows is mentioned in general terms as a stream flow concern by at least two contacts in each county (Table 20). This general concern is at least twice as likely to be expressed in Lincoln County relative to Deschutes and Marion Counties. Most of the specific problems associated with low seasonal flows do vary by county. In Deschutes, the concern is with problems created for irrigation. In Lincoln County there is no concern expressed for irrigation problems; it is the relationship of seasonal flow to domestic water supply and resort and recreational activity which is of concern in Lincoln County. When concern for seasonal flows is expressed in Marion County, there is a mention of all the related

problems distinguished in Table 20. One concern related to seasonal flows--problems for fish and other wildlife--is expressed by one contact in each of the four counties.

Concerns about flooding were infrequent when considering all contacts. But the concerns which were expressed are concentrated in several counties (Table 20). No concerns about flooding were mentioned by contacts in Jackson County. General concerns about flooding were three to four times more likely to be expressed in Marion County than in Deschutes or Lincoln Counties. Comparing Marion, Deschutes, and Lincoln Counties, there are differences in the nature of flood-related concerns. Problems of development on the flood plain were mentioned as a concern only by contacts in Marion County. In Marion--the most urban of the four counties--a quarter of the contacts expressed concern about development on the flood plain. In largely mountainous Deschutes and Lincoln Counties specific concerns about flooding were related to resultant erosion and pollution.

Contacts in Marion County did not express concerns about the need for dams (Tables 19 and 20). Concerns about a need for more dams and inadequate storage capacity were expressed in the other three counties. Concern was concentrated in Lincoln County where such expressions were two to five times more likely than in Deschutes or Jackson. This concern is understandable in Lincoln County where the season for maximum tourism and use of second homes coincides with the period of very low stream flows. Various problems created by dams were mentioned by contacts in all four counties; a concentration of such concerns in Jackson County is likely the result of controversy at the time of the study over a dam project in that county (Table 20).

Only in Lincoln County did we find contacts who identified stringent or unrealistic state water quality standards as a local water quality concern (Table 19). In that county, and only in that county, did we find mention of a related concern, inadequate state fiscal assistance with projects related to water quality (Table 19). The localized nature of this concern is surprising only in that we

would have expected to have heard the kind of stringent standards and "no resources" expressed in other counties as well. The existence of such sentiments in Lincoln County is not surprising. Problems of low summer flow, high summer population, diffuse settlement patterns, and population growth combine to create difficult water quality problems in Lincoln County. Some would undoubtedly add failures in local planning and the intransigence of local citizens to the list of relevant factors in Lincoln County. In addition, Lincoln County has appeared at times to be used as a "test case" for the adequacy and enforceability of state water quality standards. It would be an exaggeration to describe the circumstances as a test of the irresistible force and the immovable object but local contacts in Lincoln County do feel trapped between standards perceived to be too stringent and inadequate local fiscal resources.

Contacts in each county mentioned concerns about inadequate future water supply (Table 20). As brought out in the background section, all four counties have experienced recent moderate to large rates of population growth. Contacts in all four counties are concerned about the water supply implications of a long-term continuation of growth rates. In passing, we should note that our study does not include representation of the many counties in Eastern Oregon which are experiencing the problems associated with below-average or even negative rates of population growth.

Contacts mentioned a variety of problems associated with water rights. Most frequently, contacts observed that supply was--at times--insufficient to satisfy established water rights. Such concerns were not mentioned by contacts in either Deschutes or Marion Counties (Table 20). The concern was volunteered by 19 percent of the contacts in Jackson County. In fact, the problem of "over allocation" was--with the single exception of general references to pollution--the concern most likely to be expressed by contacts in Jackson County.

Next to general concerns about pollution, treatment of domestic supply was the only stream flow or water quality concern mentioned by a third or more of the contacts in each county. There was little variation by county in the incidence of this concern. Contacts

referred to costs in general, to needs to improve distribution systems, and needs to improve or introduce filtering and chlorination in order to meet state standards. Contacts occasionally spoke of a need to standardize small water districts--in the context of discussing water treatment and distribution problems.

We would note one final feature of water quality and stream flow concerns. At the time of our study responsibilities for policy on and regulation of stream flows were divided at the state level from policy and enforcement responsibilities for other areas of water quality. The distinctions between the two areas implied by state institutional arrangements was not explicitly reflected in the types of concerns contacts expressed when asked separately about water quality and stream flows. Similar concerns were expressed in both areas. This is suggested in the categories appearing in Table 19 and Table 20 but comes out most clearly in listening to tapes of the interviews; a given contact would respond similarly to both question #1 and question #7. For example, we did not find contacts who shifted from matters of regulation by DEQ to concerns within the categories of "beneficial use" used by SWRB when the contacts were asked to consider stream flows as one specific area of water quality.

Local concerns and state institutional organization appear to differ in two ways. First, there are dissimilarities between the way local contacts perceive water-related concerns and the ways in which state responsibilities for water-related policies are divided. Local contacts tend not to distinguish stream flows from other aspects of water quality when articulating water-related concerns. Second, concerns of local contacts tend to be expressed using language and concepts which differ from the language and concepts used to express state policy. This was most notable in the area of stream flows. For local contacts, stream flow concerns meant what the phrase means in common usage--concerns about problems arising from the flows of streams. Contacts did not express their concerns in language about minimum stream flows necessary to support aquatic life nor did they express concerns in the language of allocating previously unappropriated water rights among categories of "beneficial

use." Perhaps this is no more than a problem of translating the language of concerns into the language of technical, enforceable standards. Yet even if it is only a problem of translation, one might guess that the need for translation is a factor complicating the task of learning about and using local needs and concerns when making state policy.

As has been reported, counties share several water quality and stream flow concerns. Concern about treatment facilities is an example. The incidence of many other concerns--particularly those expressed in relatively more specific language--appears to depend on the locality involved. Hydrological, economic, and demographic differences between counties seem to give rise to differences in the nature of specific concerns about such matters as pollution, dams, and seasonal flows.

The paragraphs above note the major similarities and differences between counties in water quality and stream flow concerns. In the section below we will report land use concerns and then return to the topic of water quality and stream flow concerns by considering the results of questions on desired government programs.

Major Land Use Concerns By County

One can argue that water and land use are related. But that is not the major reason for turning to consider land use concerns. This study is based on a comparison of three agencies with different styles of state-local interaction. The nature of local concerns--their uniformity or diversity--provides one basis for understanding the successes and failures of each of the agencies. One of the agencies is the Land Conservation and Development Commission. Just as for water quality and stream flows, contacts were asked to volunteer the major land use concerns in their area. This section reports our findings on which land use concerns are or are not shared by contacts in the four counties. Our treatment of land use concerns will be briefer than our report of findings on water-related concerns. For purposes of this study, we are only interested in those aspects

of local land use concerns which may assist in understanding the successes and failures of techniques of state-local interaction used by LCDC.

One contact did not offer any land use concerns. The land use concerns volunteered by the 52 contacts are reported in Table 21. Two concerns lead the list of land use concerns most likely to be mentioned. Contacts mentioned concerns about preserving "prime" agricultural land and guiding growth for orderly development with equal frequency. The concern about agricultural land comes as no surprise. After many workshops and hearings around the state, LCDC found clear sentiment for selecting "retention of agricultural land in farm use" as the single, top priority goal when establishing a list of goals for land use policy. On no other subjects was sentiment clear enough to justify--in LCDC's judgement--attachment of relative weights or priorities to other goals.

Concern about preserving agricultural uses of land was not expressed uniformly across counties in our study. Expression of the concern was relatively infrequent in Lincoln County. Relative to Lincoln County, contacts in the other three counties were five to six times more likely to express concern about preserving agricultural uses of land. Concern about guiding growth and orderly development was also a relatively infrequent concern in Lincoln County. In fact, Lincoln County stands out--again in a relative sense--for the diversity of land use concerns. In Lincoln County, we found expression of each of the concerns reported in Table 21 but did not find that expressions were concentrated in any particular categories.

There appear to be two additional inter-county differences in land use concerns. Unlike the other counties, sentiments for promoting growth and economic development were rare in Jackson County and directly connected to promotion of tourism. One can also observe that expressions of concern about use of septic tanks was restricted to Lincoln and Jackson Counties.

Our major observation on results reported in Table 21 is that most differences in land use concerns occur within counties rather than between counties. The diversity of concerns in Lincoln County has

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE OF CONTACTS MENTIONING TYPES
OF LAND USE CONCERNS BY COUNTY^a

Type of Land Use Concern	County				Total of all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Preserve "Prime" Agricultural Land	67% ^b	55%	11%	64%	44%
Guide Growth, Orderly Development	50	55	17	73	44
Reduce Current Rate of Growth	17	27	28	18	23
Promote General Growth, Development	33	0	22	27	21
Promote Tourism	17	9	17	0	12
Zoning Absent or Incomplete, Inconsistent	8	18	11	9	12
Local Procedural Difficulties	0	18	11	9	10
State-Local Conflicts	0	0	22	9	10
People Question Legitimacy of Policy	0	18	17	9	12
Septic Tank Problems	0	18	17	0	10
Avoid Development Where Natural Hazard	8	0	17	9	10

TABLE 21 (continued)

Type of Land Use Concern	County				Total of all Contacts
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Mobile Home Proliferation	8%	9%	6%	9%	8%
General Response-- Use Land "Wisely"	17	18	17	18	17
Visual Quality-- Protect Beauty of the Land	8	9	6	0	6
Other	0	0	17	0	6
(Total Contacts)	(12)	(11)	(18)	(11)	(52)

^a From question 13a, "Changing from stream flows to land use policies, what are the major land use concerns in this county?"

^b Table entries report the percentage of contacts who mentioned a type of land use concern.

been noted. In all counties there is no uniform position on whether major land use concerns are preservation, growth management, growth reduction, or promotion of growth and development. Contacts are concerned about preservation of land for agricultural uses. But contacts are much more likely to express concerns in terms of guiding and directing growth rather than reducing growth. Directed growth can be a way of preserving land in agricultural use. But the objective of orderly growth was not usually expressed with that connection in mind. Being knowledgeable about the relationship of building costs to land classes, the contacts knew where orderly growth would likely occur. Concern for orderly growth generally had less to do with preserving land in agricultural use and more to do with reducing the costs of extending urban services, reducing the problems which arise when urban services are too expensive to provide, and facilitating the development of central facilities in a smooth, predictable economical way.

Intra-county differences in concerns are dramatically expressed in another way. There was considerable "preservationist" sentiment directed at the subject of agricultural land. But one can note contradictory concerns. If promotion of tourism is considered as one special case of promoting growth and development then contacts were more likely to be concerned about ways to promote growth and development than were they likely to be concerned about ways to reduce population growth. And we would add that these sentiments occurred in counties that have experienced recent rates of population growth which are above the state average.

For the areas of stream flows and water quality we noted that local concerns differ between counties, often as a function of inter-county differences in precipitation, terrain, economic activity, and population settlement patterns. In contrast, differences in land use concerns tend to vary within counties and--we would surmise--are more a function of geographically disperse values and attitudes.

Before moving on to other subjects, we would point out one additional feature of our results on land use concerns. Land use concerns tend to be expressed using language and concepts quite similar

to those employed in policies adopted by LCDC. The two most frequently expressed concerns--preservation of agricultural land and orderly growth--were stated in language quite similar to goals adopted by LCDC. This feature is noted because it contrasts with findings in the other two policy areas and so will be considered in analyzing those factors which might account for the relative success of various state agencies.

Local Sentiments on Desired Programs and Policies

At the conclusion of a series of questions on water quality we asked contacts: "When it comes to actual policies governments might adopt, what do people around here think government ought to do to affect water quality in the county?" The interviewer was asked to probe with statements like, "Are there other options?" and "Are there people who would disagree with the proposals you have mentioned? What would the disagreements be?" This question, along with its probes, was repeated for stream flows and land use at the end of the sections of the interview dealing with those policy areas.

We asked the question for several reasons. First, we hoped to compliment and confirm information on general concerns with more specific sentiments relevant to potential policies. Second, anticipating that many contacts would value increased local responsibilities, we wanted an idea of what local governments might do if given increased responsibilities. Third, the questions were a prelude to the next question, designed to find out intra-county diversity in attitudes related to the three policy areas. For each public sentiment mentioned in response to the question above, contacts were asked if the sentiments were shared by most, some, or few people.

The questions did not obtain the information we had sought. The number of responses was too small to tabulate specific policies or to make inter-county comparisons. Few contacts volunteered any thoughts on specific governmental policies desired by people in their area. Thus, there was also little opportunity to ask the follow-up question on diversity of attitudes. We kept the questions in the

interview, although our purposes changed from those that led to the design of the questions. Our purposes became more modest. We sought to find out if people could or could not name a policy desired for government and if not, what reasons might be volunteered. In addition, we were interested in whether ability to offer an answer was related to policy area.

The frequency and type of answers given were related to policy area. Major differences occurred between the policy area of land use and the other two policy areas. About one quarter of the contacts identified specific policies desired by people when asked about water quality and stream flows (Table A-5). When questioning turned to land use, general attitudes like "less government" were given. But specific policies were identified by only one-eighth of the contacts. There was also confirmation of an inference made in the prior section. Intra-county views seem to be particularly diverse in the policy area of land use. Of the 53 contacts, 19 percent said they could not mention a policy desired in the area of land use because local opinions were too diverse (Table A-5). Such an explanation of inability to answer the question occurred only once in each of the other two policy areas.

Questions on local policy desires did not produce the information we had desired. Inability to meaningfully break down policy desires by county is a particularly acute loss. Moreover, the results are still of some interest. Stream flows was the policy area most likely to be perceived as largely a state responsibility. Understandably, local contacts were most likely to say they did not know what local citizens wanted when the question concerned stream flows. However, local contacts were also unlikely to be able to name policy desires when questions concerned water quality, an area where contacts would generally like to see increased local responsibility. The apparent paradox is clearest for land use. Local contacts were least likely to mention specific policies in the area of policy--land use--for which there were the strongest sentiments to maintain and increase local responsibilities. We do not think that such results are paradoxical. They bring us back to an idea with which this section

began. Such results seem to provide further support for the speculation that increased local responsibility is valued as an end in itself, not necessarily as a means to efficiently meet local policy objectives.

Success in Obtaining Compliance

Local contacts were asked a series of questions about the success of three agencies in obtaining local compliance once policies are adopted. These questions--interpreted in the context of our results--were designed to meet the second research objective; namely, identification of factors likely either to produce voluntary compliance or create substantial and effective resistance at the local level. Perceptions of success and failure in obtaining compliance are reported first. This section concludes with a summary of factors related to success and failure in obtaining local compliance.

Perceptions of Agency Success in Obtaining Local Compliance

In two separate questions, contacts were asked how successful DEQ and SWRB were in obtaining compliance in their locality once policies were adopted. Wording of the question on LCDC's success in obtaining compliance differed in one way. Contacts were asked to express their expectations about likely future success of LCDC in obtaining local compliance with its policies. Use of the future tense in the question on LCDC was required because LCDC's policies were relatively recent at the time of the interview and dates for compliance with LCDC's policies--while known--were in the future.

Perceptions of the success of the three agencies in obtaining local compliance are summarized in Table 22. There are three striking results. First, the SWRB is generally judged to be very successful. Close to 80 percent of the contacts with an opinion on the subject evaluate SWRB as very successful in obtaining compliance in their county.

TABLE 22

PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESS OF THREE AGENCIES
IN OBTAINING LOCAL COMPLIANCE^a

Perception of Success in Obtaining Compliance	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC ^b
Very Successful	42%	77%	41%
Mixed--Mostly Successful	27	5	14
Mixed	17	0	24
Mixed--Mostly Unsuccessful	10	14	12
Very Unsuccessful	4	5	10
Total % (Cases)	(52)	(22)	(42)

^a From question 26, "Once policies have been adopted how successful has the State Water Resources Board been in getting compliance in this county?"; question 27, "Once policies are adapted, how successful has the Department of Environmental Quality been in getting compliance in this county?"; and question 28, "Thinking about the future, how much success do you think LCDC will have in this county in getting compliance with its policies?"

^b Note, wording of the question on LCDC differs from question used for other two columns (see wording in table note above). See text for reason for difference in question wording and consideration of its implications.

Second, when the subject is compliance, LCDC does not do as well as in other areas where we asked about success. In those other areas, LCDC rivaled and even exceeded the perceived success of SWRB. When combining the categories of very successful and mostly successful compliance, the resultant percentage is lower for LCDC than for either SWRB or DEQ. Of the three agencies, LCDC is also the agency which contacts are most likely to rate as very unsuccessful.

Third, DEQ is judged to be more successful in the area of compliance than in other areas such as finding out about local needs and interests. This improvement appears to be the result of both a shift in favorable evaluations and an absence of the division of opinion observed on other questions on DEQ. In results reported earlier, we found that opinions on DEQ were generally more divided than for other agencies. For example, we would find that ratings of "very successful" and "very unsuccessful" each occurred with relatively large frequency. This is not the case in Table 22. In fact, DEQ is the agency which is least likely to be rated as mostly unsuccessful or very unsuccessful.

In the area of compliance we asked only about level of success, there were no questions on relative success. This change from earlier patterns of questions was due to mechanical considerations of instrument design rather than differences in information desired. Questions on relative success could not be simply phrased because of the need to mix present and future tense when asking about LCDC relative to DEQ and SWRB.

The major features of results reported in Table 22 have been noted. One result required further evaluation. We must ask if the relatively poor evaluations of LCDC are an artifact of differences in the question on LCDC relative to the questions on DEQ and SWRB. For LCDC, contacts were asked about future expectations rather than current evaluations. In other areas of human behavior we know--or at least commonly assume--that people "discount" both future costs and future benefits. Perhaps there is evidence of this tendency in the relatively high report of "mixed" responses for LCDC in Table 22. We would add several other thoughts. Failure, or being very

unsuccessful might be reasonably equated with the concept of cost as used when discussing tendencies to discount. However, the concept of beginning very successful in getting local compliance is not as directly analogous to "benefit" from the perspective of a local contact. This reasoning leads us to conclude that lack of success is more likely to be discounted than is success, thus perceptions of lack of success may be understated in Table 22. This is rather circuitous reasoning.

We are led to the same conclusion by a different, more direct route. Survey research on such subjects as the many dimensions of quality of life regularly report an interesting result. People think they were better off five years ago than at present and think they will be better off five years in the future. The result is consistent--although a paradox is produced--when the surveys are repeated over time. People think they will be better off five years from now. Five years later people will still say they were better off in the past and expect to be better off in the future. Here, we emphasize the consistency of the result that people tend to see the future relative to the present--through "rose-tinted" glasses. If this tendency is applicable to our study, we would again conclude that the relatively poorer evaluations of LCDC are not an artifact of employing expectations; in fact, lack of success may be understated when expectations are used. In analyses which follow we will assume that the evaluations of LCDC's success in obtaining compliance can be compared to evaluations of DEQ and SWRB. When making those comparisons, question design will no longer be considered as an explanatory factor; we would look for other ways to explain the relative evaluation of LCDC.

Factors Related to Success in Obtaining Local Compliance

What factors facilitate achievement of local compliance with the policies of state agencies? Our first source of answers to that question is the local contacts. After the contacts had offered evaluations of agency success in obtaining compliance, we asked the

local contacts what accounted for an agency's success or lack of success. Responses are summarized in Table 23.

One reason stands out quite clearly as explaining positive evaluations of DEQ's success in obtaining local compliance. Sixty-nine percent of the contacts giving reasons for DEQ's success mentioned potent, credible threats or sanctions available to the agency. This appears to be the major factor accounting for DEQ's success. Factors important to explaining the success of the other two agencies-- cooperation, understanding of local needs, match between agency policy and local needs--were infrequently expressed for DEQ. In fact, among those who thought DEQ was unsuccessful, contacts were likely to mention lack of cooperation, understanding, and fit between state policy and local needs.

The single factor that accounts for DEQ's success--potent threats--seems to fit with our characterization of the agency's style of state-local interaction as "imposed problem solving." The agency works with localities. The agency, rather than the locality, may take primary responsibility for defining what the problem is and the conditions which any solution must fulfill. What is apparently clear to local officials is that a solution meeting the specified conditions must result from the problem solving conditions. Compliance in this sense--solutions meeting the conditions of state policy as interpreted and applied by DEQ--is not usually forced. It is not forced in the sense that DEQ steps in to solve the problem by usurping local government responsibilities if local government has been dragging its feet. Rather, the threat of such actions and other sanctions (the threat of cutting off sources of funding was frequently cited by local contacts) is sufficient. Rarely, it would seem, do the threats and sanctions have to be exercised. What is important is that the agency has made the threats credible through rare, but highly visible imposition of the sanctions upon which the threats are based. Through credible threats, DEQ has imposed limitations on the zone (or range) of agreements that can be reached through bargaining between DEQ and local agencies.

TABLE 23

REASONS FOR SUCCESS AND LACK OF SUCCESS OF THREE
AGENCIES IN OBTAINING LOCAL COMPLIANCE^a

Reasons for Success or Lack of Success	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Reasons for Success ^b			
Cooperates with Local Government	17%	39%	30%
Understands Local Conditions	3	17	13
Policies Match Local Needs, Not Any Contro- versy on Them	14	39	39
Policies Not Constantly Changing	3	11	4
Potent Threats Available	69	0	17
Staff are Respected	3	6	4
Other Reasons for Success	14	11	4
Reasons for Lack of Success ^c			
Uncooperative, Dictato- rial	32	d	19
Not Understand Local Needs	21	d	23
Confusing, Fluctuating Policies	21	d	15
Lack of Creditable Threat	0	d	4

TABLE 23 (continued)

Reasons for Success or Lack of Success	Agency		
	DEQ	SWRB	LCDC
Reasons for Lack of Success ^c			
Policies do Not Match Local Needs, Interests	37%	d	42%
Staff Poorly Regarded	21	d	23
Lack of Monitoring	11	d	4
Other Reasons for Lack of Success	21	d	0

^a From questions 26a, 27a, 28a: "What accounts for this (degree of success/lack of success)?" where choice of words in parentheses depends upon response to question immediately prior (26, 27, 28).

^b Table entries report percentage of contacts mentioning a type of reason for success taken as a percentage of those contacts who gave at least one reason for success. Denominators are the 35, 18, and 23 contacts who gave reasons for the success of DEQ, SWRB, and LCDC respectively.

^c Table entries are the percentages of contacts mentioning a type of reason for lack of success taken as a percentage of those contacts who gave at least one reason for lack of success. Denominators of the percentages are the 19 and 26 contacts who gave reasons for the lack of success of DEQ and LCDC.

^d Only two contacts gave reasons for the lack of success of SWRB. This frequency was judged to be too small to tabulate. Three reasons were mentioned--each by one of the two contacts. The reasons mentioned were: "Not understand local needs," "Policies do not match local needs," and "Lack of monitoring."

The availability of potent threats accounts for DEQ's success in compliance. But this explanation is not appropriate for the other agencies. For example, although LCDC has potential, quite potent sanctions which it could apply to local governments, local contacts seldom mention the existence of sanctions as a reason for expecting LCDC to successfully achieve local compliance. Perhaps the lack of importance attached by local contacts to potential sanctions is a result of the recent origins of the Commission. LCDC had not yet had the opportunity to make rare but highly visible use of sanctions in the manner practiced by DEQ. But we do not think such an explanation is adequate.

LCDC--as part of its campaign for symbolic reassurance-- heavily stressed its desire to work cooperatively with local governments. In fact, the Commission at one time promised an alliance with local governments against the Legislature; the Commission made a highly visible suggestion that it would not hold local governments to legislative mandates for local compliance with planning objectives if the legislature failed to appropriate funds to support the local planning effort. Thus, the symbolic actions and reassurances by LCDC would lead local contacts to assume that potential sanctions would not be an important element in producing local compliance.

We also suspect that local contacts judged that any threat by LCDC to use sanctions could not be credibly made. As mentioned in the background section, the requirements and dire sanctions of prior land use legislation (Senate Bill 10) had been ignored with impunity. Public concern about the legitimacy of a strong state role in local land use planning and strong sentiments supporting local responsibilities for land use were also likely perceived as reducing the credibility of possible sanctions imposed by LCDC. Thus, two reasons combine to explain why available sanctions were not an important reason for expecting successful compliance with LCDC's policies. The available sanctions could not be used to make credible threats and the Commission--well aware of the political

rather than legal limits on its ability to threaten--chose a course of symbolic acts designed to remove perceptions of threat.

Expectations on the success and the lack of success of LCDC in obtaining local compliance are both connected to results of the strategy of symbolic reassurance. Contacts who expect LCDC to be successful are most likely to give two reasons. First, they feel LCDC will cooperate with local governments, finding out and understanding local conditions. Second, they expect that the policies of LCDC will match those local conditions. For such contacts, reassurance seemed to have been effective. For the almost equal number of contacts who gave reasons why LCDC would not be successful, there was concern about the match between local conditions and policies of the Commission. Two other closely connected reasons were articulated. There was concern that LCDC did not understand local needs. There were also a variety of responses which we grouped in the category of "staff poorly regarded." Here, concerns were not usually directed at the technical and administrative competence of personnel. Rather, there were feelings that personnel lacked genuine concern, real commitment to publicly articulated positions vis-a-vis local government. In a word, there was suspicion, suspicion that current cooperative stances might be only a short-term strategy to be abandoned once sufficient political resources--legitimacy--had accumulated. For this latter group, reassurance--symbolic or otherwise--had not been achieved.

Unlike DEQ, availability of potent threats was not a factor mentioned by local contacts as a reason for the exceptionally high evaluations of the success of SWRB in obtaining local compliance with its policies. Given the division of policy and enforcement responsibilities between SWRB and the State Engineer, the absence of any mention of potent threats is understandable. What we find most noteworthy is the exceptionally high evaluations of SWRB's success in a structure where SWRB lacked direct responsibility for enforcement. Earlier, we reported finding that particular problems of access and oversight arose from such a form of shared responsibilities, (divisions between stages of the policy process). Yet

these problems did not, in the case of SWRB, adversely affect local compliance to any degree detectable by the local contacts.

The division of policy and enforcement responsibility appears to be eliminated as a factor that might contribute to lack of success in obtaining local compliance with SWRB policies. This is surprising. We had expected that such a division of responsibilities would create problems in achieving compliance. However, factors that might explain lack of compliance cannot be identified simply because we found almost no perceptions of lack of success in compliance with the policies of SWRB.

When reasons for the success or lack of success in obtaining local compliance were examined at the county level, we did not find any notable deviations from the patterns noted in Table 23. Frequencies were rather small when those contacts who gave reasons are broken down both by object of the reason (success, lack of success) and county. So, we would require distinct clustering of any particular type of reason before concluding that reasons for success or lack of success depended upon the county involved. In general, we found that the most frequently mentioned reasons in Table 23 were also mentioned by contacts in each of the four counties.

Perceived level of success did vary between counties (see Table A-6, discussed below). Perceptions of the success of SWRB were much lower in Jackson County than in the other three counties. The success of DEQ was similarly evaluated by contacts in all counties but Lincoln County; contacts in Lincoln County, on average, had lower evaluations of the success of DEQ in obtaining compliance in their county. Regional variation in evaluations of agency success were remarkably different when comparing LCDC to SWRB and DEQ. In Jackson and Lincoln Counties contacts had similar and relatively positive expectations about the success of LCDC. LCDC was expected to be less successful in Marion and Deschutes County with the most pessimistic evaluations occurring in Deschutes County.

Perceived level of success in obtaining local compliance seems to depend upon an interaction between the county and agency involved. As a step in identifying factors accounting for this interaction, we shall consider how successful the agencies were in ascertaining and responding to local needs and interests in each of the counties. We have measures of the perceived level of success of the three agencies in three stages of the policy process: learning about local needs and interests, incorporating information about local needs and interests in policies, and obtaining local compliance. We used the following computations to summarize the central tendencies of evaluations of each agency in each county for each of the three stages of the policy process. Responses of "very successful" were given a value of one, responses of "very unsuccessful" were given a value of six, and the three intermediate response categories were assigned values of two, three, and four. Then, within each county, we calculated the mean value of perceptions of success for each agency in each of the three stages of the policy process (Table A-6).

As has been noted earlier, perceptions of success in obtaining information about local needs and interests is closely associated with perceptions of success in incorporating information about local needs and interests in policies. We use the experiences of one agency in one county as the unit of analysis. Thus, there are 12 cases (three agencies times four counties) on which to base inferences about associations. The (Spearman) rank correlation between values in Table A-6 for level of success in finding out information about local needs and interests and using that information in policies is .865.

Success in finding out about and utilizing information on local needs and interests is associated with success in obtaining local compliance. Again using 12 "cases," the rank coefficient of correlation between success in finding out about local needs and interests and successful local compliance is .694. The coefficient of rank correlation between success in incorporating information about local needs and interests and success in obtaining compliance is .580.

One would not want to impart excessive meanings to the three coefficients just introduced. They are based on rather crude summary measures of the success in each county. Yet the coefficients do conform with and succinctly summarize results found in other tables. Perceptions of success in finding out about and utilizing information on local needs and interests are strongly associated. The association is weaker when considering the relationship of successful compliance to success in other areas. This conforms to earlier observations that DEQ does relatively better and LCDC relatively worse when one shifts from earlier questions of success to success in obtaining local compliance.

While acknowledging a risk of imparting too much meaning to the rank correlation coefficients, we would note that success in obtaining local compliance is more strongly correlated with success in finding out about local needs and interests (.694) than when adopting policies (.580). Difference in the magnitudes of the coefficients is not great. Given the high correlation between success in finding out and success in utilizing information about localities, these two measures of success would tend to be similarly correlated with any other variable. The difference we did find in magnitude of the two coefficients is notable for the following reason. One might reasonably expect that using information about local needs and interests in policies would be a more important determinant of successful local compliance than would simply finding out about local needs and interests. Actually using information about local needs and interests in adopted policies is-- in the policy process--more proximal to local compliance than is gathering information about local needs and interests. Yet we find that--to the extent there is a difference--learning about local needs and interests is more strongly correlated with local compliance than is incorporating information about localities in policies.

A finding that successful incorporation of information about localities in policies is not a more important factor than finding out about local needs and interest when explaining successful

compliance is consistent with the following interpretation. Steps taken to find out about local needs or interests--either their presence or their absence--can be made highly visible. The activities of LCDC in particular illustrate the feasibility of creating wide-spread local perceptions of opportunities to articulate local needs and interests. The connection between policies and their use of information about local needs and interests is much more subtle and difficult to perceive. Policies usually are largely procedural (emphasize procedures by which decisions will be reached). Their substantive content (priorities, objectives, material allocations) only becomes clear, if ever made clear, after a long period of case-by-case applications of the procedural elements. Inferences about the eventual substantive implications of procedural elements is not impossible but may be difficult. The act of finding out about local needs and interests can be observed. Its presence fosters a transfer of legitimacy from the process of making policy to the policies which result. The crucial transfer--long noted in the study of politics--promotes compliance. Policies, even if they differ from local needs and interests, will be accorded legitimacy where people judge that the processes which produced the policies are legitimate. To the extent that policies are perceived as legitimate, the achievement of local compliance becomes easier. Voluntary compliance will be more wide-spread; whatever resources are available to enforce or cajole local compliance can be concentrated.

Discussion above leads us to offer the following conclusion. Finding out about local needs and interests is an important factor in obtaining local compliance. To some degree, local compliance is fostered because success in finding out about local needs and interests results in policies that are easier to enforce because they match local needs and interests. But there likely is also an independent effect that does not operate through the intervening variable of success in incorporating information about local needs and interests in policies. The process of finding out about local needs and interests directly facilitates compliance by lending legitimacy to the policies which result.

Analysis of factors which facilitate local compliance has been based, in part, on comparison of three agencies using quite different styles of state-local interactions. But we cannot simply attribute degrees of success to differences in styles of state-local interaction. The agencies differ in other fundamental ways. Their areas of regulation differ. Some areas are more controversial than others, some agencies would appear to face problems which are more difficult than the problems faced by other agencies. The following paragraphs provide one way of conceptualizing the factors unique to the situations faced by each of the three agencies.

The metaphor of regulating a commons is often used in considering natural resource agencies. Use of the commons (say, grazing sheep) involves a tragedy if people, following what is in their individual interest (adding sheep) end up making the collectivity--including themselves--worse off (e.g., commons is so over-grazed that only scrawny sheep can survive). Each individual--it is argued--can make himself better off by voluntarily agreeing to give up his individual freedom to a regulatory agency that can coerce both him and his neighbors. A conclusion that "mutual coercion mutually agreed upon" will avoid the collective tragedy and make individuals better off is based on several simplifying assumptions. All individuals are assumed to be able to affect the use of the commons through their behavior. Members of the commons are also assumed to derive relatively similar benefits and costs from any given use or level of use of the commons. Relaxation of these assumptions can lead to quite different conclusions about appropriate regulatory strategies. By relaxing these assumptions, we will note differences in the situations of DEQ, SWRB, and LCDC.

To begin, we imagine counties as users in a commons problem involving the land and water in the state. One distinction is immediately obvious. Water may be widely perceived as having aspects of a commonly held and used resource. Land is less likely to be thought of as a commonly owned rather than privately owned resource. There are more subtle distinctions. Within the area of water, the players in our conceptualization (the counties) tend

to share similar evaluations of the costs and benefits attached to various uses of stream flows and their common property nature. We found this was true at least in a relative sense. Problems of stream flows did not differ between counties to the extent observed in other policy areas. Differences which did occur could be tied to hydrological factors rather than to heterogeneous values. Contacts were also likely to perceive that problems with stream flows involved interdependencies between the counties, the problems transcended their local boundaries. Of the three policy areas considered, stream flows appears to come closest to the classic commons problem. Here, we would expect that regulation would proceed smoothly, each user quite willing to go along with regulation so long as the user is sure that others are also abiding by the rules of the regulatory agency. Why? Because each user is made better off by being coerced.

The nature of the commons problem in the area of water quality differs in two ways from what has been observed for stream flows. First, some of the water quality problems are not viewed as transcending county boundaries. Second, the users (counties) differ in their water-related concerns. In the commons problem, this would be analogous to a commons shared by players each of whom can add either sheep or goats but not both to the commons. Interdependencies may result in a collective tragedy. But shepherds and goatherds will not be equally satisfied with any given social contract. There are differences between them in the values they attach to uses and levels of uses of the commons. Relative political resources may explain the substance of the social contract which results. Because of differences of values, those who win the struggle over the form of the social contract will likely see a need to establish an agency with strong enforcement powers. Some people will have to be more coerced than others, perhaps quite strongly coerced. One might also expect that once the contract had been adopted the agency responsible for enforcement would be disallowed responsiveness to the separate, differing desires of the shepherds and the goatherds. Few users would observe that the

agency was finding out their needs and interests; more, but not all, users would conclude that the policies of the agency match their needs. Furthermore, one would expect that while users of the commons will disagree on how well their needs are being served, most users will observe that compliance is occurring.

We think the situation of dissimilar evaluations of the various costs and benefits of using a commons best applies in the area of water quality. We have noted the inter-county differences in water quality concerns. The implications deduced above also correspond to findings on DEQ. DEQ--while being relatively unsuccessful in obtaining information about local needs and interests--did tend to end up with policies that a majority of local contacts judged to reflect local needs and interests. There was inter-county variation in those judgements. Local contacts shared even greater agreement on the successfulness of DEQ's efforts to obtain local compliance. Potent, credible threats were--in sharp contrast to other agencies--the major reason for successful local compliance.

The circumstances for regulating land use differ in type and degree from those used to characterize the policy area of water quality. Interdependencies from use of land are more localized than in the area of water quality. Contacts are likely to see land use as largely a matter of local responsibility. There are potential areas of state-wide concern (e.g., siting of highways, use of beaches). These areas have been avoided by LCDC in its early years and were not mentioned as concerns of local contacts. Preserving prime agricultural land was a concern which may involve spillovers. If so, it was a widely expressed concern, the achievement of which might parallel the circumstances observed for stream flows.

Differences in land use concerns occur within counties rather than between counties. This distinguishes land use from the other two policy areas. The commons problem, to the extent there is one, is largely intra-county in nature. Within counties, one finds a situation analogous to that described as occurring between counties in the area of water quality. Presumably, the solution would be

the same but at a different level of government; namely, a potent county land use regulatory body committed to enforcing a social contract rather than responding to individual needs and interests. However, the history of local land use policies is best represented by weak regulatory bodies very susceptible to individual appeals. Thus, there is an incentive for the counties, voluntarily, to agree to a structure where they coerce each other into establishing conditions for a solution of the intra-county commons problems. These conditions would be establishment of the terms of an initial social contract (comprehensive plan) and a local body able to rely on threats of a state agency to enforce the contract (while, quite likely, making that reliance appear reluctant or even coerced).

The role of the state agency relative to those land use problems which are inter-county in nature has several dimensions. The agency must first find out what should be the scope of coverage of local contracts. Concerns expressed at the local level can be adopted as goals in a laundry-list fashion. The seeming goals are actually an agenda for local governments. Having settled on the items to be decided by local contract, the state agency must emphasize a willingness to cooperate with and support the contracts established by local governments. In the area of land use the state agency evolves not as an enforcement agency for a social contract but as a means of facilitating local solutions of local commons problems. In this context, local compliance means coming up with some solution, not coming up with a solution prescribed at the state level. The state agency must walk a very narrow line between appearing to force a particular local solution and appearing to force the occurrence of some local solution. The position of that line is perceived differently by different people. Thus, one would expect mixed evaluations of the success of the state agency in obtaining local compliance.

Having introduced analysis of the unique regulatory problems of each agency we can no longer make simple conclusions based on a correlation between style of state-local interactions and level of success in obtaining compliance. The unique circumstances of

each agency determine, in part, the strategy of state-local interaction adopted and the level of local compliance which one might reasonably expect from any strategy. However, in discussing the nature of regulatory situations we did reach conclusions that the behavior of each of the three agencies was consistent with their unique circumstances. We cannot conclude that imposed problem solving (or community organization, or symbolic reassurance) is the best strategy. However, we have developed conclusions on the circumstances under which each of the strategies would appear to be most appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS

Our conclusions, organized by research objective, are presented in this section. We focus on major conclusions. Detailed conclusions on many subjects such as specific local concerns about water quality and stream flows are not repeated in this section. The major conclusions are only summarized; the bases for the conclusions -- both inductive and deductive -- are not repeated.

Local Concerns About State Water-Related Policies and Agencies

1. Shared responsibilities between state agencies creates opportunities for multiple points of access by locals and inter-agency "watchdogging" in the policy areas of water quality and land use. These advantages do not occur in the area of stream flows. Stated more generally, the advantages of multiple points of access and "watchdogging" occur where responsibilities for related programs are shared at similar stages of the policy process. Where responsibilities are shared for the same program but at different stages of the policy process, the advantages are less likely to occur.
2. Problems of lack of coordination, duplication of effort, local confusion, and "hassles with red tape" occur where state agencies share responsibilities for related programs at the same stages of the policy process. These problems are less likely to occur where responsibilities for the same program are divided between state agencies on the basis of the stage of the policy process in which the agencies are involved.
3. Where different agencies have sole responsibility for the same program -- each agency being responsible at different stages of the program's development -- the problems of inter-agency conflict and rivalry are likely to be a concern of local contacts.
4. State responsibilities in the program area of stream flows should -- in the view of local contacts -- be increased.

5. Local responsibilities in the area of water quality should -- in the view of most local contacts -- be increased.
6. Local responsibilities in the policy area of land use should -- again in the view of local contacts -- be increased.
7. Although there were frequent sentiments for increasing local responsibilities, there were important justifications which did not fit within the concepts of political efficiency and political effectiveness used to conceptualize this study. Increased local responsibility was valued as an end, not necessarily as a means to effectively or efficiently achieving local policy desires. Contacts quite often could not identify policy desires in areas they thought should be largely a local responsibility. But increased local responsibility, or at least "an end to erosion of local government," was valued in and of itself.
8. SWRB and LCDC were evaluated as quite successful in finding out about local needs and interests. There was local concern that DEQ was generally unsuccessful in this phase of policy.
9. When it came to actually using information about local needs and interests when adopting state policies, SWRB was evaluated as very successful. There were a few concerns about LCDC and considerably more concerns about DEQ.
10. Reasons for success and lack of success in the two areas described in 8 and 9 above are related to the styles of state-local interaction used by the three agencies (imposed problem solving, community organization, and symbolic reassurance).

Uniformity and Flexibility in State Water-Related Policy

1. Discovery of the importance of local responsibility as an end in itself had two implications for conclusions about uniformity and flexibility. First, our conceptual framework for identifying areas of uniformity and flexibility based on division of state-local responsibilities to achieve political efficiency and political effectiveness was not exhaustive; division of state-local responsibilities had relevance for other important values. Second, absence of responses to key questions on specific local policy desires limits the specificity of further conclusions on areas for uniform or flexible state policy.
2. Local concerns about stream flows are different in substance and conceptualization from the concepts used to express state policy on stream flows. However, there was an absence of opposing inter-county concerns in the policy area of stream flows. Differences between counties in their stream flow concerns seemed

to be largely a function of hydrology, economic base, and settlement patterns. The SWRB devoted considerable resources to facilitating flexibility when developing policy on stream flows. Given our results in the area of stream flows, one must consider whether the degree of flexibility -- and the time and other resources invested to achieve it -- was warranted.

3. Pollution -- stated no more specifically than that -- was a uniform water quality concern. However, the varied contexts in which the concern was articulated indicate that local contacts can mean quite different things when using the term pollution. Uniformity, therefore, would appear costly. There would be controversy over any given operational definition of pollution. However, our results lead us to speculate that local, political evolution of the concept of pollution is so retarded as to seemingly make flexibility pointless.

4. Differences in land use concerns occur largely within counties rather than between counties. Differences in concerns relate to markedly different valuations of growth and development, the diverse valuations being observed in each county. These conditions suggest to us a need for state land use policy which is extremely flexible in its substantive requirements for local land use policy. But in order to assure that intra-county diversity of values is represented prior to locally determined land use policy, state policy might emphasize uniform procedural requirements.

Factors Facilitating and Inhibiting Local Compliance

1. Local compliance is most easily achieved where: a) regulation involves a common pool resource generally perceived by local governments as transcending their geographic boundaries, and b) users of the resource (counties) share similar evaluations of different uses and levels of use of the resource. A match between state policies and local needs was a frequently expressed reason for successful local compliance under such conditions. Under such conditions a division of policy-making and enforcement responsibilities between state agencies did not appear to be a factor inhibiting local compliance. Interaction of these factors and their implications for local compliance is illustrated by the experiences of the SWRB in the policy area of stream flows.

2. As illustrated by DEQ and the policy area of water quality, local compliance with state policy is more difficult to obtain where: a) regulation involves a resource that is perceived as being both a state and a local concern, and b) counties do not share similar valuations of uses and levels of use of the resource. We further observed that under those conditions: a) perceptions of state-local cooperation and a match between

state policies and local needs were not important factors in obtaining local compliance, b) potent threats perceived as credible were very important in obtaining local compliance, and c) there were wide inter-county differences in levels of successful local compliance as perceived by local contacts.

3. As illustrated by LCDC and the policy area of land use, local compliance with state policy is more difficult to obtain where: a) regulation involves a resource that is perceived as almost exclusively a local concern, and b) people in counties do not share similar evaluations of uses and levels of use of the resource. We further observed under those conditions that: a) potential potent sanctions were unlikely to be important factors in obtaining local compliance, and b) expectations of state-local cooperation and a match between state requirements and local land use policy were the most important factors -- in the view of local contacts -- for successfully obtaining local compliance.

4. To achieve local compliance, local perceptions of agency success in finding out about local needs and interests was as important a factor, perhaps a more important factor than actually incorporating such information in state policies. Incorporation of information about local needs and interests in actual policies can be difficult to perceive. Activities designed to find out local needs can be made highly visible to local citizens. This would seem to result in a transfer of perceptions of legitimacy from the the process of making policies to the policies which are adopted even if the policies can not be clearly perceived as matching local needs.

NOTES

1. Morton Grodzins, "The Federal System," in President's Commission on National Goals, Goals for Americans (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960).
2. Our conceptualization of intergovernmental relations as striking a bargain between the discordant objectives of political effectiveness and political efficiency was stimulated by William Riker's position on the origins and maintenance of federalism: Federalism: Origin, Operation, and Significance (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1964).
3. For example, we interpret the regularity with which proposals for metropolitan governments are defeated as evidence supporting the point. See W. Bruce Shepard, "Metropolitan Political Decentralization," Urban Affairs Quarterly (March, 1975), 297-313.
4. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 536.300.
5. Oregon Laws, Chapter 581 (1975).
6. Legislative Interim Committee on State Water Resources, Report (January, 1976), p. 64.
7. Ibid., pp. 66-67.
8. ORS 536.310.
9. ORS 536.360, 568.552, sec. 2.
10. ORS 549.605 to 549.630.
11. State Water Resources Board, Tenth Biennial Report (Salem, Oregon: State Water Resources Board, 1974), p. 6.
12. Ibid., p. 17.
13. Ibid., p. 19.
14. State Water Resources Board, Third Biennial Report (Salem, Oregon: State Water Resources Board, 1969), pp. 14-16.
15. State Water Resources Board, Ninth Biennial Report (Salem, Oregon: State Water Resources Board, 1972), pp. 8-9.
16. State Water Resources Board, Third Biennial Report, p. 14.
17. State Water Resources Board, Tenth Biennial Report, p. 19.
18. Ibid., p. 38.

19. Ibid., p. 19.
20. This section is based on: Department of Environmental Quality, "Water Quality Control in Oregon," (February, 1975); ORS 454.605 to 454.755, 468.005 to 468.260, and 468.700 to 468.775; and interviews with agency personnel.
21. Oregon Laws, 1976, chapter 80.
22. ORS 197.005.
23. ORS 197.010.
24. ORS 197.175.
25. ORS 197.300.
26. ORS 197.160.
27. Land Conservation and Development Commission, A Report on "People and the Land" Public Workshops (July, 1974).
28. The use of symbolic reassurance by LCDC is elaborated in the fourth chapter of David Ervin, et al. Land Use Control: Evaluating Economic and Political Effects (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1977).
29. This laundry list approach to land use goals and the reasons for it are described in R. Kenneth Godwin and W. Bruce Shepard, "State Land Use Policies: Winners and Losers," Environmental Law Review (Spring, 1975).
30. The textbook we have in mind is Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967).
31. Oregon State University Extension Service, Resource Atlas: Deschutes County (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1973), pp. 15, 18.
32. Rogue Valley Water Quality Task Force, "Project Control Program," 1975.
33. Oregon State University Extension Service, Resource Atlas: Lincoln County (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, 1974), pp. 13-14.
34. University of Oregon Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, Oregon State Government Policies: The Quest for Coordination (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1974), pp. 20-21.
35. Information provided by the staff of the Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments

36. H. W. Smith, Strategies of Social Research (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 112.
37. Ibid., p. 118.
38. The informal consent statement promised contacts that their statements would not be used in anyway which would permit the statements to be attributed to them. Our contacts are public officials whose names could be easily learned. Therefore, if we were to report a frequency of 100% for a response category, our promise would be violated if the basis of the 100% is the entire group of 53 contacts. We never report such percentages. We remind the reader that a value of 100% appears in tables only if the basis of the percentage is less than the entire sample.
39. There is one exception; SWRB is mentioned with a higher than average frequency in Lincoln County. This is due to the inclusion of members of the "Local Volunteer Committee" among contacts in Lincoln County.
40. Here, and consistently throughout the report, the categories of city officials include mayors, city managers, and chairpersons of city planning commissions. County officials are commissioners and county planning directors. Chairpersons and members of the local SWRB committees are excluded from both categories.
41. At the time of the study, there were two commissions--the Fish Commission and the Wildlife Commission--and a recurring debate about whether they should be joined. In the statements of most of our contacts, the agencies were joined, either in referring to "The Fish and Wildlife Commission" or in habitually mentioning both in the same breath. For that reason, we have treated "The Fish and Wildlife Commissions" as a single response category.

APPENDIX A

SELECTED TABLES

Tables which provide the basis for some observations in the section on findings but which were not used for detailed analysis are placed in this appendix.

TABLE A-1
 AMOUNT OF CONTACT WITH SWRB, DEQ, AND LCDC BY COUNTY^a

Reported Amount of Contact	Deschutes			Jackson			Lincoln			Marion		
	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC
None	50.0	25.0	0.0	36.4	9.1	18.2	27.8	29.4	33.3	72.7	16.7	8.3
Little	33.3	0.0	45.5	36.4	18.2	27.3	27.8	17.6	33.3	18.2	25.0	50.0
Some	8.3	25.0	45.5	18.2	27.3	18.2	5.6	11.8	16.7	0.0	8.3	8.3
A Lot	8.3	50.0	9.1	9.1	45.5	36.4	38.9	41.2	16.7	9.1	50.0	33.3
Total % (Cases)	99.9 (12)	100.0 (12)	100.1 (11)	100.1 (11)	100.1 (11)	100.1 (11)	100.0 (18)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (18)	100.0 (11)	100.0 (12)	99.9 (12)

^a From questions 29, 30, and 31.

TABLE A-2

AMOUNT OF CONTACT REPORTED WITH
SWRB, DEQ, AND LCDC
BY COUNTY AND CITY OFFICIALS

Reported Amount of Contact	City Officials ^a			County Officials ^c		
	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC	SWRB	DEQ	LCDC
None	57.1	24.1	17.2	43.8	18.8	6.7
Little	39.3	20.7	34.5	25.0	0.0	33.3
Some	0.0	13.8	27.6	18.8	25.0	20.0
A Lot	<u>3.6</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>40.0</u>
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (28)	100.0 (29)	100.0 (29)	100.1 (16)	100.1 (16)	100.0 (15)

^a From questions 29, 30, and 31.

^b Mayors, city managers, city planning directors.

^c County commissioners, head of county planning commission

TABLE A-3

LOCAL PERCEPTIONS OF DEGREE OF SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES
 AT THE STATE LEVEL FOR THREE POLICY AREAS
 BY TYPE OF OFFICIAL^a

Perceived Number of State Agencies	Water Quality		Stream Flows		Land Use	
	County Officials	City Officials	County Officials	City Officials	County Officials	City Officials
One	37.7%	50.0%	80.0%	25.0%	33.3%	48.0%
Several	35.7	45.0	20.0	62.5	40.0	32.0
Many	28.6	5.0	0.0	12.5	26.7	20.0
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (14)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (5)	100.0 (8)	100.0 (15)	100.0 (25)

^a See notes to Table 7.

TABLE A-4

PERCEPTIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES
FOR WATER QUALITY BY COUNTY^a

Level of Government Responsibility	County				Total %
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion	
Largely State Responsibility	60.0%	30.0%	31.3%	11.1%	33.3%
Shared-State Has Larger Responsibility	0.0	10.0	25.0	11.1	13.3
Equal	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	8.9
Shared-Local Has Larger Responsibility	30.0	10.0	31.3	11.1	22.2
Largely Local Responsibility	<u>10.0</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>22.2</u>
Total % (Cases)	100.0 (10)	100.0 (10)	100.1 (16)	99.9 (9)	99.9 (45)

^a See notes to Table 10.

TABLE A-5
 PERCENTAGE OF 53 CONTACTS MENTIONING
 DESIRED POLICIES BY POLICY AREA^a

Type of Response	Water Quality	Stream Flows	Land Use
Do Not Know ^b	49%	64%	23%
There Are No Policies Which People Want	19	9	8
Attitudes too Diverse to Say What People Want	2	2	19
Mention of a Specific Policy	21	25	8
General Response--e.g. "Less State Government Interference"	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>43</u>
Total % (Cases)	100 (53)	100 (53)	101 (53)

^a From questions 6, 12, and 19. See text on Appendix B for wording of questions.

^b Includes contacts who were not asked the question because they had earlier indicated that they did not know about the general policy area. Question was skipped for 8, 29, and 6 contacts in the three policy areas of water quality, stream flows, and land use.

TABLE A-6

SUCCESS SCORES BY AGENCY
BY COUNTY BY POLICY STAGE^a

Policy Stage and Agency	Agency			
	Deschutes	Jackson	Lincoln	Marion
Finding Out Local Needs				
DEQ	3.33 ^b (9)	2.78 (9)	4.18 (12)	1.67 (3)
SWRB	1.50 (4)	3.00 (5)	1.29 (7)	1.00 (1)
LCDC	2.57 (7)	2.17 (6)	2.00 (11)	2.00 (5)
Using Local Information When Policies Adopted				
DEQ	3.60 (5)	2.40 (5)	3.33 (9)	2.00 (3)
SWRB	1.33 (3)	2.00 (2)	1.50 (6)	1.00 (1)
LCDC	2.57 (7)	2.20 (5)	2.00 (6)	2.00 (2)
Compliance				
DEQ	2.00 (12)	1.91 (11)	2.28 (18)	1.91 (11)
SWRB	1.50 (6)	2.50 (4)	1.45 (11)	1.00 (1)
LCDC	2.82 (11)	2.00 (10)	2.09 (11)	2.50 (10)

^a Based on questions 20, 23, 26, 27, and 28.

^b Table entries are mean scores where response categories are assigned values as follows: 1 = very successful, 2 = mixed, mostly successful, 3 = mixed, 4 = mixed, mostly unsuccessful, and 5 = very unsuccessful. Figures in parentheses report the number of cases (contacts) upon which each mean score is based.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT FOR INTERVIEWING LOCAL CONTACTS

Format has been condensed by eliminating blank spaces in the original instrument provided for recording responses.

Hello, I'm _____ . Before we begin, I would like to read a brief introductory statement. Although reading a statement may seem overly formal, our professional ethics, the policy of the University, and even Federal government guidelines require that you be fully appraised of our intentions for using any information you provide prior to beginning the interview.

I am a member of a research group at Oregon State University. We are studying relationships between state and local government. Our efforts are funded by the Water Resources Research Institute at Oregon State University.

Basically, we wish to find out the strengths and weaknesses of different procedures used by state agencies for working with local governments and citizens. To accomplish that objective, we have arranged this opportunity to learn about your experiences and judgements.

The statements that you make to us will not be used in any way that will allow them to be attributed to you personally. Our interview notes will be kept in locked files and will be available only to the research team.

In order to ensure an accurate record, we would like to tape record the interview. The tapes will be erased after we have completed our analysis of the information they contain.

If you prefer not to discuss any of the topics I raise, please just say so. In fact, if you wish to terminate the interview at any time, you are free to do so. And if you have any questions about the subjects of the interview, I will be happy to discuss them when we have finished. If I am unable to satisfactorily answer any of your questions, I will ask the project director, Dr. Bruce Shepard, to get in touch with you.

We are interested in information on a wide range of topics. We do not expect that one person will feel fully informed on all subjects. And so, if any of the questions are outside your areas of experience and knowledge, please do not hesitate to say so.

- 1 - We are interested in three broad topics. They are water quality, stream flows, and land use policies. Beginning with water quality, what are the major water quality concerns in this county?

Anything else?

- 2 - What are the most important activities or programs of state agencies which affect water quality in this county? (PROBE to get names of specific agencies. If response is "none" or no information, skip to Q7.)
-

- 3 - 3 many At the state level, do responsibilities for water
 2 several quality appear to be shared among many agencies,
 1 one (skip to 4) among several agencies, or are the responsibili-
 0 DK, NA (skip to 4) ties mostly located in a single agency?
-

- 3a - 2 Yes (ask 3b) Does this sharing of responsibilities between
 1 No (ask 3c) state agencies create any problems in your coun-
 0 DK, NA (ask 3c) ty?
-

- 3b - What are the problems created by the sharing of responsibilities?
-

- 3c - 2 Yes (ask 3d) Do you see any advantages provided by the sharing
 1 No (ask 4) of responsibilities at the state level?
 0 DK, NA (ask 4)
-

- 3d - What are the advantages?
-

- 4 - 3 State (ask 5) In this county, is regulation of water quality
 2 Local (ask 5) largely the responsibility of state government,
 1 Shared (ask 4a) largely the responsibility of local government,
 0 DK, NA (ask 6) or is it a shared responsibility?
-

- 4a - 3 State (ask 5) Who has the larger responsibility, state or
 2 Equal (ask 5) local government?
 1 Local (ask 5)
 0 DK, NA (ask 6)
-

- 5 - 3 Increased (ask 5a) Do you think it is desirable to increase state
 2 No changed (ask 5a) responsibilities, decrease state responsibilities,
 1 Decreased (ask 5a) or leave state responsibilities as they have been
 0 DK, NA (ask 5b) in the past?
 4 Increase in (ask 5a)
 some areas, decrease in others
-

5a - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/not changing) state responsibilities?
 PROBE: i.e. In what way, areas should state responsibilities be (increased/decreased)?

5b - 4 Increase in some areas, decrease in others (ask 5c)	Do you think it is desirable to increase local responsibilities, decrease local responsibilities, or leave local responsibilities as they have been in the past?
3 Increased (ask 5c)	
2 No change (ask 5c)	
1 Decreased (ask 5c)	
0 DK, NA (ask 6)	

5c - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/not changing) local responsibilities?
 PROBE: i.e. In what ways, areas should local responsibilities be (increased/decreased)?

6 - When it comes to the actual policies governments might adopt, what do people around here think government ought to do to affect water quality in the county. (If "none," DK, NA, skip to 7)
 Are there other options?
 What are they?
 Are there people who would disagree with the proposals you have mentioned? What would the disagreements be?

6a - For each of the public sentiments you have mentioned, I would like to know if it is shared by most people in the area, some people, or few people. Specifically, is the feeling that _____ shared by most, some, or few people? (Repeat last sentence as necessary)

7 - Stream flows are one specific area of water quality which we would like to ask about. What are the major stream flow concerns in this county? Anything else?

8 - What are the most important activities or programs of state agencies which affect stream flows in this county? (PROBE to get names of specific agencies. If response is "none" or no information, skip to Q13)

9 - 3 many (ask 9a, 9c)	At the state level, do responsibilities for the regulation of stream flows appear to be shared among many agencies, among several agencies, or are the responsibilities mostly located in a single agency?
2 several (ask 9a, 9c)	
1 one (skip to 10)	
0 DK, NA (skip to 10)	

9a - 2 Yes (ask 9b) Does this sharing of responsibilities between
1 No (ask 9c) state agencies create any problems in your
0 DK, NA (ask 9c) county?

9b - What are the problems created by the sharing of responsibilities?

9c - 2 Yes (ask 9d) Do you see any advantages provided by the sharing
1 No (ask 10) of responsibilities at the state level?
0 DK, NA (ask 10)

9d - What are the advantages?

10 - 3 State (ask 11) In this county, is regulation of stream flows
2 Local (ask 11) largely the responsibility of state government,
1 Shared (ask 10a) largely the responsibility of local government,
0 DK, NA (ask 12) or is it a shared responsibility?

10a - 3 State (ask 11) Who has the larger responsibility, state or lo-
2 Equal (ask 11) cal government?
1 Local (ask 11)
0 DK, NA (ask 12)

11 - 3 Increased (ask 11a) Do you think it is desirable to increase state
2 No change (ask 11a) responsibilities, decrease state responsibilities,
1 Decreased (ask 11a) or leave state responsibilities as they have been
0 DK, NA (ask 11b) in the past?
4 Increase in some
areas, decrease
in others (ask 11a)

11a - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/ not
changing) state responsibilities?

PROBE: i.e. In what ways, areas should state responsibilities be (in-
creased/decreased)?

11b - 4 Increase in some Do you think it is desirable to increase local
areas, decrease in responsibilities, decrease local responsibilities,
others (ask 11c) or leave local responsibilities as they have been
3 Increased (ask 11c) in the past?
2 No change (ask 11c)
1 Decreased (ask 11c)
0 DK, NA (ask 12)

11c - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/not changing) local responsibilities?

PROBE: i.e. In what ways, areas should local responsibilities be (increased/decreased)?

12 - When it comes to the actual policies governments might adopt, what do people around here think government ought to do to affect stream flows in the county? (If "none," DK, NA, skip to 13)

Are there other opinions?
What are they?

Are there people who would disagree with the proposals you have mentioned?
What would the disagreements be?

12a - For each of the public sentiments you have mentioned, I would like to know if it is shared by most people in the area, some people, or few people. Specifically, is the feeling that _____ shared by most, some, or few people? (Repeat last sentence as necessary)

13 - Changing from stream flows to land use policies, what are the major land use concerns in this county?

Anything else?

14 - What are the most important activities or programs of state agencies which affect land use in this county? (PROBE to get names of specific agencies. If response is "none" or no information, skip to Q20)

15 - 3 many (ask 15a, 15c) At the state level, do responsibilities for
2 several (ask 15a, 15c) land use appear to be shared among many agen-
1 one (skip to 16) cies, among several agencies, or are the re-
0 DK, NA (skip to 16) sponsibilities mostly located in a single agency?

15a - 2 Yes (ask 15b) Does this sharing of responsibilities between
1 No (ask 15c) state agencies create any problems in your coun-
0 DK, NA (ask 15c) ty?

15b - What are the problems created by the sharing of responsibilities?

15c - 2 Yes (ask 15d) Do you see any advantages provided by the sharing
1 No (ask 16) of responsibilities at the state level?
0 DK, NA (ask 16)

15d - What are the advantages?

16 - 2 Local (ask 17) In this county, is regulation of land use largely
1 Shared (ask 16a) the responsibility of local government, or is
0 DK, NA (ask 19) responsibility shared with state government?

16a - 3 Very (ask 17) How important is the state role at present--
2 Some (ask 17) very important, somewhat important, or of little
1 Little (ask 17) importance?
0 DK, NA (ask 19)

17 - 4 State As additional provisions of Senate Bill 100 are
3 Local implemented, will state responsibilities for land
2 State & Local use increase, will local responsibilities increase,
1 No Change or will responsibilities stay largely the same?
0 DK, NA

18 - 3 Increased (ask 18a) Do you think it is desirable to increase state
2 No change (ask 18a) responsibilities, decrease state responsibilities,
1 Decreased (ask 18a) or leave state responsibilities as they are now?
0 DK, NA (ask 18b)
4 Increase in some
areas, decrease in
others (ask 18a)

18a - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/not
changing) state responsibilities?

PROBE: i.e. In what ways, areas should state responsibilities be (in-
creased/decreased)?

18b - 4 Increase in some Do you think it is desirable to increase local
areas, decrease in responsibilities, decrease local responsibilities,
others (ask 18c) or leave local responsibilities as they have been
3 Increased (ask 18c) in the past?
2 No change (ask 18c)
1 Decreased (ask 18c)
0 DK, NA (ask 19)

18c - What are the reasons for the desirability of (increasing/decreasing/not changing) local responsibilities?

PROBE: i.e. In what ways, areas should local responsibilities be (increased/decreased)?

19 - When it comes to the actual policies governments might adopt, what do people around here think government ought to do to affect Land Use in the county? (If "none," DK, NA, skip to 20)

Are there any other opinions?
What are they?

Are there people who would disagree with the proposals you have mentioned?
What would the disagreements be?

19a - For each of the public sentiments you have mentioned, I would like to know if it is shared by most people in the area, some people in the area, or few people. Specifically, is the feeling that _____ shared by most, some, or few people? (Repeat last sentence as necessary)

20 - We would like to ask about three agencies in particular. They are the State Water Resources Board and its staff, The Land Conservation Commission and its staff, and the Environmental Quality Commission and its staff; namely, DEQ. When asking about the State Water Resources Board, we recognize that recent legislation will merge its activities with those of the State Engineer. Our questions, however, are of an historical nature, asking about the way the State Water Resources Board operated in the past. Considering the three agencies, how successful have they been in learning about local needs and interests prior to making policies?

21 - 7 SWRB	3 SWRB & DEQ	Which of the three agencies, the State Water Resources Board, DEQ, or LCDC has been most successful in learning about local needs and interests prior to making policies? (If "none," try and force the choice. If two agencies mentioned, try and force the choice)
6 LCDC	2 LCDC & DEQ	
5 DEQ	1 All	
4 SWRB & LCDC	0 DK, NA (skip to 22)	

21a - What accounts for the relative success of that (those) particular agency (agencies)? (PROBE! for any particular practices of the agency, characteristics of the local county, or characteristics of the subject matter dealt with by the agency.)

22 -	7 SWRB	3 SWRB & DEQ	Which of the three agencies has
	6 LCDC	2 LCDC & DEQ	been least successful in learning
	5 DEQ	1 All	about local needs and interests
	4 SWRB & LCDC	0 DK, NA (skip to 23)	prior to making policies? (Force
			choice as in 21)

22a - What accounts for the relative lack of success of that (those) particular agency (agencies)? (PROBE as for 21a)

23 - I have been asking about the success of state agencies in finding out about local needs and interests. I would now like to find out how successful the agencies have been in using that information. How successful have the three agencies been in incorporating information about local needs and interests when they adopt actual policies?

24 -	7 SWRB	3 SWRB & DEQ	Which of the three agencies, the
	6 LCDC	2 LCDC & DEQ	State Water Resources Board, DEQ,
	5 DEQ	1 All	or LCDC has been most successful
	4 SWRB & LCDC	0 DK, NA (skip to 25)	in using information about local
			needs and interests when they adopt
			actual policies? (Try and force
			choice of single agency unless DK
			response)

24a - What accounts for the relative success of that (those) particular agency (agencies)? (PROBE! for any particular practices of the agency, characteristics of the local county, or characteristics of the subject matter dealt with by the agency.)

25 -	7 SWRB (ask 25a)	3 SWRB & DEQ (ask 25a)	Which of the three agencies has
	6 LCDC (ask 25a)	2 LCDC & DEQ (ask 25a)	been least successful in using
	5 DEQ (ask 25a)	1 All (ask 25a)	information about local needs
	4 SWRB & LCDC	0 DK, NA (skip to 26)	and interests when adopting actu-
	(ask 25a)		al policies? (Try and force
			choice of single agency unless
			DK response)

25a - What accounts for the relative lack of success of that (those) particular agency (agencies)? (PROBE as for 24a)

26 - Once policies are adopted, how successful has the State Water Resources Board been in getting compliance in this county? (If DK or NA, skip to 27)

26a - What accounts for this (degree of success/lack of success)? PROBE for particular practices of agency, characteristics of county, characteristics of subject matter)

27 - Once policies are adopted, how successful has the Department of Environmental Quality been in getting compliance in this county? (If DK or NA, skip to 28)

27a - What accounts for this (degree of success/lack of success)? (PROBE as for 26a)

28 - Thinking about the future, how much success do you think LCDC will have in this county in getting compliance with its policies? (If DK or NA skip to 29)

28a - What leads you to that (those) conclusion(s)? (PROBE for particular practices of the agency, particular characteristics of the county, particular characteristics of the subject matter dealt with by the agency)

29 - 4 A lot (ask 29a) In the last several years, how much contact have
3 Some (ask 29a) you had with the State Water Resources Board or
2 Little (ask 29a) staff - a lot, some, little, or none?
1 None (skip to 30)
0 DK, NA (skip to 30)

29a - 7 Meeting with staff I would like to know which forms of
6 Meeting with Board or Commission contact were involved. From the list
members on this card (hand informant card),
5 Testimony at public hearing or what forms of contact have you had
meeting with the State Water Resources Board?
4 Attendance at public hearing or (Circle responses at left)
meeting
3 Membership on committee working
with agency
2 Correspondence/telephone conver-
sation
1 Other _____
0 NA (skip to 30)

29b - (Ask ONLY if more than one response to 29a) Of the forms of contact you have mentioned, which was most frequent?

- 30 - 4 A lot (ask 30a) In the last several years, how much personal
3 Some (ask 30a) contact have you had with the Environmental
2 Little (ask 30a) Quality Commission and DEQ - a lot, some, little,
1 None (skip to 31) or none?
0 DK, NA (skip to 31)
-

- 30a - 7 Meeting with staff Using the same card as before, what
6 Meeting with Board or Commission forms of contact have you had with
 members DEQ and the Commission?
5 Testimony at public hearings or
 meetings
4 Attendance at public hearings or
 meetings
3 Membership on committee working
 with agency
2 Correspondence/telephone conver-
 sation
1 Other _____
0 NA (skip to 31)
-

30b - (Ask ONLY if more than one response to 30a) Of the forms of contact you
have mentioned, which was most frequent?

- 31 - 4 A lot (ask 31a) How much contact have you had with the Land Con-
3 Some (ask 31a) servation Commission and its staff - a lot, some,
2 Little (ask 31a) little, or none?
1 None (skip to 32)
0 DK, NA (skip to 32)
-

- 31a - 7 Meeting with staff Using the same card as before, what
6 Meeting with Board or Commission forms of contact have you had with
 members LCDC and its staff?
5 Testimony at public hearings or
 meetings
4 Attendance at public hearings or
 meetings
3 Membership on committee working
 with agency
2 Correspondence/telephone conver-
 sation
1 Other _____
0 NA (skip to 32)
-

31b - (Ask ONLY if more than one response to 31a) Of the forms of contact you
have mentioned, which was most frequent?

32 - That completes the information we are interested in at this time. I
certainly appreciate your taking time to answer our questions.