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AS: Thanks for doing this Craig. I tracked down your previous interview that you had done for the Grey Hair Green Roots project. I reviewed that, and tried to write some different questions about areas that I thought could be clarified, or have some more input. Mostly [the questions] deal with the early stuff dealing with the history, and going back to your relationships in the Department. Before I go any further, will you please state your name, date of birth, and when you were born?

CJ: This is Craig Johnson. I was born August 27, 1941, in Willmar, Minnesota. I began teaching in the LAEP Department in 1966 and retired in 2008 as Professor Emeritus.

AS: So I want to go back to your early relationship with the department and faculty from the Department, probably all the way back to the University of Illinois, and what was going on.
CJ: Yes, I could talk to that, and maybe a little bit before that. I started out at Macalester College in Saint Paul, Minnesota, which is a pretty well respected liberal arts college. How I ever got into Macalester I will never know. The liberal arts aspect was really fascinating to me. I was in the pre architecture program. I was going to be an architect, and then I ran into advanced calculus and physics, and decided that this was not for me. So the next semester I took an art class, a botany class, a nature study class, and then the other liberal arts classes that everybody took, speech and some other things. I was on a different track, and the interesting thing was, and I think I talked about it in Grey Hair, Green Roots, my mom went to a lecture series in my home town. The University of Minnesota had what they called the Traveling Lecture Series, and they would bring lecturers into small towns and set them up in the auditorium, and they would give a presentation. The speaker was the director of the Minnesota State Arboretum. He was a horticulturalist, but his son was going to Michigan State as a landscape architect student. My mom thought, “Wow, it’s got architecture in the title, and this guy is kind of a plant freak.” She told me about the talk, and said to me, "Why don't you think about it."

I wrote Michigan State and got all of the preamble information about what I needed for prerequisites to make a four year program into a three year program, I applied a year later and was accepted. It was a great time to be at that school, because almost all of the faculty, with a couple of exceptions, were relatively young, they were recent graduates from Harvard. Hideo Sasaki had kind of taken over the program as Department Head at Harvard, and it was very modern in its design philosophy, and the rest is sort of history. I just fell in love with this whole thing called landscape architecture, and graduated from MSU in 1964.

Then I went to the University of Illinois. I had applied to Harvard to go to graduate school, got on the waiting list, but didn't make it so I went on to Illinois. The program at Illinois had somewhat of a different focus. It had more of an environmental focus, It reflected the beginnings of the Ian McHarg kind of influence in the profession, which I didn’t get at Michigan State, because it was “big D” design emphasis there. That Illinois experience kind of changed my career path. While I was at Illinois I got involved in a research project that kind of paid for my education. That was through the National Sand
and Gravel Association. The research had to do with reclaiming mine sites. That eventually came back to be part of what I decided to do later on in my career when I pursued a degree in wildlife biology at South Dakota State. At that point the mine reclamation research kind of planted that seed. It was part of growing up hunting and fishing and living a whole lot of my life in the outdoors as a kid. It was a natural thing to combine “big D” design with this thing called reclamation and restoration. That is kind of a long answer to the question.

AS: There were a few other folks that end up at LAEP going through that program. Who was there?

CJ: It was better than fifty percent of the graduate student. Joe Porter was there, Craig Hanchett was there, and so was Tony Bauer. Later Vern Budge came, along with Dave Jensen, Larry Whitlock, and Jerry Fuhriman. Gere Smith was there. I am trying not to forget anybody, and I am trying to think of who else was there. Vern Budge and I became very good friends. He was about a year behind me. He came in a little bit later. I had never been to Utah, I had not heard anything about the place, and Vern is talking about hunting and fishing, and how LAEP is a great growing program, and all this stuff. I thought, "It’s worth looking into." They actually had an opening. I think I talked about in this Grey Hair Green Roots program, I had applied to be Department Head at the University of Minnesota after graduating from the University of Illinois, because I thought that I was qualified, which was kind of a joke. The Dean of the University of Minnesota said that I was a little young. Vern said, "I think they have an opening at USU." Again, this was back in the day, and Vern probably put in a good word for me, and I got pretty good letters of reference. I never even came out for an interview, I just got the job.

AS: Did you have a conversation with Burt Taylor?

CJ: I don't recall having a conversation, but I do recall corresponding, and of course this was pre email and cell phones. We wrote letters. He intrigued me in the correspondents about what I might be teaching, and he wanted to know what I was interested in, and what he thought my strengths were. He also had my letters of reference, which would tell you that
there were some things I did very well, and construction was not one of them. It kind of worked out that way, I taught Introduction to Landscape Architecture, basic design and planting design in the first quarter. I got married in August, and Judy and I honeymooned on our way out here to USU. I started teaching in September.

AS: What year was that?


AS: What were your first impressions of the Department when you first got here, the leadership, and also what was going on in the Department?

CJ: I think the leadership had just turned over. Laval Morris was Department Head when Vern was a student here. Burt had been a student in the LAEP Department under Laval's mentorship, and had just been Department Head here two or three years at the most after Laval retired. I think there were three of us on the faculty, and we were housed in the basement of Old Main in the Northwest corner. I had the original limestone foundations as part of the wall in my office. You would come in and turn on the lights in the morning, and the silver fish headed back into the cracks in the wall. We had one big studio. Lord knows what that room is now, but that was where all the drafting tables were. I don't remember if we had more than fifteen or twenty students in any graduating class, and maybe sixty total in the whole program.

I think Burt brought some interesting ideas. He had gone to Harvard, and had tremendous experience, mainly as a construction manager with Pereira and Luckman in California. He knew the business end of landscape architecture. He pretty much gave us free rein. There was a curriculum in place, and we worked and modified that based on our graduate school and private practice experience.

I was here for three months, and then Vern graduated and came to the Department. Nobody knows construction like Vern. One of the other fellows [at Illinois] was Joe Porter. He and I roomed together, and that was something else. We had a great time. He was quite the guy, he worked with the extension landscape architect and did consulting
work for a developer in Pekin, Illinois, and he is one of USU's outstanding alumni, along with Tony, Dave, Larry, and Jerry from that era.

All of that kind of came together, and Burt was pretty flexible. We didn’t have formal faculty meetings, we would just kind of get together once in a while and go over to the Blue Bird, an on campus cafe, and Burt smoked a pipe and so did I, so we could go to the Blue Bird and drink coffee, smoke our pipes, and “BS”. Vern would come along once in a while, and we would talk about things, and what Burt thought that we should be doing. Burt also took me fishing up Logan Canyon a couple of times always to the same place. I named it Burt's Roll Off. Vern had the institutional memory of Utah State, he was a graduate of this program, and knew what things really clicked for him. I had gone to two different schools. Well, we both went on the Illinois, but I had gone to Michigan State, which had a different focus, and was a much bigger program with a lot of bright folks from Harvard who were out on a mission to bring the Harvard approach to site planning to Michigan State University. We combined all of that stuff, and slowly over time we started to work the program out.

AS: That is one of those area that I would like to discuss more. What was the vision early on, were did you see the program going?

CJ: I think early on it had a Neo Romantic design philosophy and small scale project orientation. It was more similar to what I had at Michigan State. There weren’t a whole lot of environmental things in the curriculum. I think indirectly, given my reclamation research at university of Illinois, I took some ecology classes and other things, and in classes like planting design I would incorporate something about native plants and other ecological things, but the main focus was pretty much design. We looked at ways to make the curriculum stronger, in terms of what the course offerings were, and how the courses would sequence from one to the next. That was where the work was early on, and what we worked on to improve the program. Again, Burt pretty much gave us free license. In fact, I got a card, and I suspect Vern did too, from Burt at Christmas, and this may have been in my second year, and he simply said, "Thanks for all you do. No man could be as blessed as I am to have a faculty like this.” Which was about three of us, Vern, Me, and a guy named Malcolm Bishop, who had some professional experience in
New York State, and was a really good designer and construction person too. We were just a bunch of right out of school people. Burt was the oldest guy.

AS: Very early on, after Burt takes over the program, and the program moves towards accreditation, were you involved in the process of first accreditation?

CJ: A little bit, and that is a good question, in the sense that some of what we did with the curriculum was in part responding to the initial review in 1964, and there were some criticism in the report. So part of what we were doing was not only our vision for the program, but what the accreditation people thought needed to be done. We would modify things, and did a better job of sequencing things, and things like that. I think both Vern and I were somewhat involved in putting the report together. That is a little bit foggy in my memory as I was teaching three different classes at the time. I think Burt did most of the writing of the accreditation report. We did give input on things, and he accommodated whatever changes we had made to the program, and sort of rewrote the response to the initial accreditation.

AS: Regarding the early environmental stuff. Dick Toth comes and does his summer lecture. Did you start to see that encroach into the curriculum more, what was kind of the atmosphere that brought about some of those changes?

CJ: It was certainly Dick's influence. In the summer time the Department would bring someone in to teach LA 3 which was the introductory course. Dick and I both got to be good friends when he came that first summer. We both liked to fish, and Vern liked to fish, so we spent a lot of time just talking about things. As time moved on, and Dick became Department Head, he started to bring in a lot more of the things that he experienced both at the University of Pennsylvania, teaching in Ian McHarg's program, and also the beginnings of the use of computers to map things, and the use of overlays from his teaching at Harvard, and a lot of the very beginnings of that he brought with him, and we started to incorporate that into the program, particularly in the graduate program, but also introducing that in other venues as well.

Burt had health problems and had to step down. Dick was hired to replace him. Then we really got into working on the curriculum. A logically sequenced four year curriculum
was Dick's thing. We had periodic faculty meetings, but we would have some day long sessions dealing with the curriculum, and sequencing things. Pretty much what you see today, at least when I was here five years ago, and I suspect what you see today too, was a function of a lot of those meetings, and integrating more of that kind of process oriented thinking into what the program was about.

Of course this was right in the late sixties, early seventies, and all of the environmental movement stuff became much more a part of everybody’s thinking. We had a wonderful, and still do, have a wonderful Natural Resources College at USU. We didn't interact as directly as we did later, but that was an influence that was available here. Again, part of my restoration work at Illinois and in private practice had to do with plant succession, and native plants, and ecology, and how plant systems work, and you combine that with some wonderful stuff that Dick brought about planting design process, and you incorporate the “big D” design and the natural stuff more than we had done before. Particularly the curriculum in those early [academic] years focused on a course, that lead to a second course, and then a final comprehensive course that combined it all, and that leads to some other things as you move through the program. At the time, given my experience at two other universities, that sequencing and building was pretty innovative stuff. At a lot of the other universities, you had courses and you kind of figured out how to stitch it together. This LAEP program became much more sequenced and programmatic. I guess I would say that the emphasis was certainly on all of the traditional content things, but I think what Dick brought was more of a focus on this whole notion of process, this was about solving problems, and there was a process that we needed to go through. We tried to mirror that in the curriculum itself, in the way that we structured and sequenced the courses.

AS: Any specific things that you can point out in the curriculum that kind of illustrate that?

CJ: I think the sophomore year is probably the classic example. The early 1970s was also the same time that we began to get lots of students, seventy or eighty in the sophomore year, and we would matriculate twenty-five, so you had better have your act together. In the sophomore year, part of the idea was that if we were going to matriculate students, not everybody is a designer, not everyone is a construction person, not everyone is a plants
person, and landscape architecture is all of those things and more. So, if we can design a system of course sequencing that introduces the student to how all of those things are a part of what we do, and this is how they relate to each other, we could get a pretty good sense of how well each individual student confronts, addresses, and participates in this eclectic interdisciplinary, for lack of a better word, process. So, you had LA 3, now LA 103, to introduce you to profession. You had Basic Design, and that was a basic design course, and covered basic principles like balance, emphasis, unity, continuity, serial plane, etc, and how to use those principals in projects of various kinds. We were on a quarter system then, which makes this all a lot easier to bring a diversity of courses into one year. Then there was Site Planning, which was about the design process (inventory, analysis, synthesis, concept, design), and soils, and geology, climate, vegetation, etc, and some of the McHargian stuff, and Dick’s stuff, which was not here when I got here, such as site opportunities and constraints. Here is the natural resource component, and the last quarter was putting all that together. Here is the site, the soils map, here is the vegetation map, here is the topo, etc., and here is the design program that you are suppose to put on that natural system, and you go through a process that tells you how you are suppose to integrate the design program with the site to achieve a minimal impact on the natural systems. There would be two or three or four pretty good sized projects that asked the students how to put it all together. Construction was there as well, so the technical part of it was included.

AS: I wanted to go back to something that we have started to move past. As Burt Taylor starts to become ill, how did leadership transition through that time?

CJ: I don’t have a real strong recollection of that, except that Burt kind of went on sick leave, and I think Dick Toth became the acting department head, and then Burt’s health really deteriorated, and Dick became the Department Head. That is the best of my recollection of how that worked, and some of that went through the Dean’s office to work out how some of it was going to come together. I think that is pretty close. Vern may have a better recollection, given his history with the program, but I think that's pretty much how the transition took place.
AS: So you were all just kind of younger guys at this point. How did the faculty mature over those first few years, and come together?

CJ: We did come together as a team. I think part of this, the sophomore year would be an example but other years as well, In the Junior year we always had a focus on housing, and usually an urban design component. There were other modules, recreation was the other one, and sometimes campus planning. There were sort of three modules, and they focused on the main things that landscape architects were doing in private and public practice. Given our diverse backgrounds, in the early years people would tend to focus on their particular strength going on in the Department, and being able to build on that. Dick focused on project scale design, GIS, and regional planning. Vern focused on recreation, design, and construction. Jerry focused on urban design and graphics. Gere focused on history and design. I focused on site planning and planting design. We often collaborated in design studios and filled in as needed to teach a course when someone went on sabbatical.

At that point and time there was some research things out there, but the focus was really on teaching. Indirectly, you could build your own expertise a variety of different ways. Vern and I, in particular, chose, I think because we were relatively new, to spend our three months off in the summer to basically do professional work, and get a sense of what is out there for students to become aware of. So we worked for government agencies. We worked for private firms. We worked together in Alberta over three summers. I worked in Minneapolis several summers. We worked all over the place basically to build our own background in what this profession is really about not just in private practice, but working for government sectors as well. I think those were things you could bring back into your particular area of expertise and bring to the classroom. This was, for lack of a better word, on the job training. I also continued to do some land reclamation research.

Later on, standards for promotion and tenure beyond teaching excellence and service started to become more of an issue. Publication, research projects, and/or in our case creative works grew in importance. Well, when we went out and worked on private projects they could be considered creative works. Vern and I did a really big project in Edmonton, Alberta basically for the city square, Sir Winston Churchill Square. It was an
enormous project. *We also did a plan and all of the working drawings for May Fair Park playground in Edmonton. It was built and still going strong when I saw it twenty years later.* That goes in your submission for tenure, rather than a research report. I did a couple of sand and gravel research and design things simply because I had the experience in that area. There were obvious sand and gravel mining problems in Utah, at least to me, and I was concerned about what was going on in Cache Valley and along the Wasatch Front. I got some outside funding, and did a proposal, completed the research, and put the report together on reclaiming sand and gravel sites in Utah, mainly along the Wasatch Front. I worked on a lot of other things. Dick, at that time, was beginning to develop more the Harvard model for graduate students about regional planning, and those sorts of things that lead to funding research. Over time the faculty really morphed into something very different, and in many ways better, than three or four young guys teaching good stuff in the classroom.

AS: Another thing that changed over time was the facilities, moving from Old Main. I was wondering about changes that you witnessed and how they came about?

CJ: As I said we, started out in the basement of Old Main with one studio. This was about the beginning of Earth Day and all this other environmental stuff, more people were being attracted to programs like Natural Resources and Landscape Architecture. So we started getting more students. We got a second studio down the hall, also in the basement of Old Main. It had been the old cow milking parlor in the basement of the building. *Before becoming Utah State University, the school was named Utah Agricultural College (UAC).* I am serious, that is what it was. We didn't have to shovel out manure to get the students in the room, but that is what it was.

I don't recall why we ended up in Mechanical Arts, but it is obviously no longer here. There is a parking lot just south of Old Main on the old building site. It was one of the original early buildings on this campus. The building had big high ceilings. Part of our studios was in a welding shop down on the ground floor. It was on hundred percent corner, we had a view across the Valley. The Temple was sitting there right in the foreground with the Wellsville mountains behind, and James Peak as background looking south. It was an amazing place, with glass on two sides facing northwest and almost due
south. It was terrific. I think we had one or two other small studios downstairs. There were days that you didn't dare hang drawing on the wall for critiques because the roof leaked.

It was quite a place. I think once the enrollment exploded that is what caused the move, because we simply could not get any more people in the basement of Old Main, so we moved into Mechanic Arts. We had to go over and lobby the Dean's office to get saw horses, and buy hollow core doors for student drafting table. I am serious. There were so many students. We brought the drafting tables from Old Main, and they were pretty good tables, I mean this was pre computers, and every student needed a drafting table. The rest of the students were working on hollow core doors and saw horses in the old welding lab, in the room below the big beautiful space upstairs. Most of the good tables went to grad students and the seniors. We had matriculation reviews, because even then we had lots of those really primitive facilities for the freshman and sophomores. By the time matriculated students went up stairs, to remain accredited we had no choice but to reduce student numbers to twenty per upper division class. Then we outgrew the Mechanic Arts building. Our offices were in a small building just across the parking lot from the driveway and parking for the Mechanical arts building, and we just out grew that as well. At one point the Mechanical Arts building site was being considered as the location for a new LAEP/Art building. Sadly it was rejected in favor of the present location in the Fine Arts building.

AS: This growth, you mostly attribute it to changes in social trends and awareness of the environment?

CJ: I think that in terms of the number of students, yes! While all of this growth was occurring with the student body, we were adding more faculty to the department. Jerry Fuhriman came on, he was also at Illinois after I had left, he may have been there with Vern for a year. Vern came here three months after I did to join the faculty. Gere Smith had been at the University of Illinois and he had joined the faculty. Jim Webster, who was a Harvard grad and Utah native, joined the faculty. Dave Cotter was on the faculty for a while. He had been a graduate of this department and was kind of tied in family wise into the nursery industry in Logan and did a lot of stuff with the courses in plant
materials. We taught that course our self, and a number of years later we jettisoned that to Plant Science to free up time to teach more LAEP studios. There were some good people in horticulture that could teach that course. The faculty numbers are growing at the same time student numbers are growing. Student to faculty ratio is important and when you get up to seventy [students] you had better have a fair number of teachers. We still had to drop the student numbers to 25 in the final two years to meet their standards [for accreditation], so we were initially well above the student to faculty ratio, because there were so many students.

AS: Those would have been some interesting studios. To trends, environmental awareness, you spoke to this in the previous interview, and social awareness, even like entrepreneurial awareness, and these sorts of changes, what do you think is the driving factor that dictates these changes in the trends?

CJ: In some ways, I think the whole natural resource focus that Ian McHarg popularized, there were certainly people, Phil Lewis at the University of Wisconsin; Carl Steinitz, Dick Toth and Doug Way at Harvard, and other universities, that were talking about these types of issues, along with some Canadian landscape architects. But the profession was pushing a whole lot of other things as well, in terms of landscape architecture education, to get more environmentally sensitive. In a sense environmental awareness was a social movement, but there was also some leadership provided by the landscape architecture profession that said these are the serious issues, here is a process or way of thinking about solving those environmental problems. I think that has grown over time, and of course with the advent of computer technology and aerial photography and satellite imagery, and other things that we never had early on, there became this whole other technical component that combines with the other things, that allows you to take on bigger scale, more complex problems than you could before. All of this was going on at the same time. The seventies and eighties were an amazing time to be in the profession. Most of the landscape architecture programs were beginning to respond to this need for synergistic thinking.

I am glad that you mentioned the whole social component to complex problems. I know that after I left their program at Illinois switched to deal more with social issues, and
thinking more about that, we incorporated some of that. There was a course called Social
and Behavioral Dimensions of Design that we added to the LAEP curriculum. I taught it.
It incorporated a lot of that kind of social and behavioral thinking. It wasn't just art,
which has never left this program. All of these other things, including social concerns,
have become part of the art and design that produces comprehensive solutions. It is all of
those things combined. I think, for lack of a better term, landscape problems have
become more complex. We tended to incorporate those emerging issues, and then figure
out where do you fit those into the system - system in term of sequencing of courses - so
social dimensions went back into the sophomore year. It is a long answer, is that what
you were asking about?

AS: You mentioned in the previous interview that environmental concerns started to become
less important later in the eighties, and you see this shift in emphasis in different
programs. What motivates those shifts? There seems to be moments when big scale,
landscape level things are in vogue, and other times when site scale projects are in vogue.
What do you think pushes programs to adjust?

CJ: Environmental concerns didn't become less important, but they seem to me to be less
emphasized in many landscape architecture programs. Part of it was a shift in social
values. Being "green" in the Ronald Reagan era wasn't in, programs, research funding,
and environmental projects and jobs were disappearing or greatly reduced. Part of it is a
response to the market. What are design firms or government agencies looking for in a
new hire to meet their needs. Bottom line, in some respects as a Department, is you want
graduates who can solve problems and think creatively, be integrative thinkers, but you
also want them to have a job. That is part of it.

I see it, and I think the Department has seen it as a series of different scales of concern,
and all of it is related. If you get it wrong at the big scale, you can tinker all you want at
the intermediate scale, or small scale all you want, but you haven’t solved the problem.
The reverse is also true. For example, think about the Clean Water Act, and what that did,
it affects regional plans, watershed plans, site plans, and grading plans, large to small
scale, aimed at protecting water quality, holy smokes! And complying with the act has
become more rigorous, the Threatened and Endangered Species [Act] is the same way.
Recently I have been doing some work in Minnesota, it is about habitat protection and restoration, water quality and onsite drainage, which is required, and a bunch of other things. If a landscape architecture program doesn't offer an introduction to GIS scale down to rain garden design, at least to some degree, so that students can at least have a talking knowledge of what those issues are, they are going to be less employable. Part of curriculum change is a response to the regulatory environment, which changes periodically. Part of it is what clients are requiring. Part of it is the leadership that the profession can provide. There are developers who still hire landscape architects to do it the old way, and they are a declining number, and a lot of them are struggling, and there are developers who are doing it the right way, and by right I mean including all of the concerns we've been talking about from the big scale down to the small. Do we really need a sewer here, or can you use onsite drainage and other things to protect water quality and wildlife habitat using more sustainable environmentally friendly solutions?

AS: What would you describe as some of the high points of the Department during your time?

CJ: I think in a lot of ways, both for faculty, students, and the State of Utah, the high point is in the Environmental Field Service projects that we worked on over several decades. Dick Toth brought that idea out here too, and it has been going on for a long time.

Just like how I went back to work in private offices, and Vern did similar things and worked for Campus Planning, and other things, we went to get that kind of background experience, so that we could offer that as teachers to the students. In a sense, the field service projects say that we can play "once upon a time" in a classroom forever, but this Field Service project is what it is like when you get out there in the real world and preparing responsible, defensible designs. It’s interacting with the public, it's giving presentations, and it is having people through rocks and tomatoes because they don't like what you are talking about. I think it is one of the real strengths that the Department has had, and we have done it at the undergraduate level, usually in the senior year, and more recently involving all classes, including graduates.

I used to do Field Service projects every year. An example would be the Jordan River Parkway, and I am not tooting my own horn, but we were asked by the Utah DNR to take
a look at what we could do there to protect habitat and water quality. Two graduate classes ended up creating a parkway system design proposal for the City of Murray. The design went out to private consultants. I am not quite sure who the consultants were, but they were Utah firms that did the detailed design. That original design has had a life of its own that you wouldn’t believe, spawning other designs up and down the Jordan River, and many of those were Field Service project as well. Look at the projects that were done right here in Logan, street tree plantings, and midblock pedestrian walkways behind the court house, those were Environmental Field Service projects, as were several projects on the Logan River west of town.

I think that is one of the real strengths. I think some of the large scale regional planning studies, Camp Pendleton certainly is a classic, [are a strength]. A book and research publications have been published about what Dick, Carl Steinitz from Harvard, and graduate students from both Departments put together at Camp Pendleton. Their students and our students worked together, and that was a wonderful experience, and that was a great project, and an example that was published simply because of how complex, and how thorough the process was, and that went from big scale too small scale. By that time I had gone back to South Dakota State and received a degree in Wildlife Biology, and my part of the project was writing habitat models for endangered species on camp Pendleton. I could do the biological literature research, and this was before you could get it on the Cornell website on birds, it was all there. I had to go and get the basic documents. Without the people who had the technical skills to put the computer model together it would have been lost. I would try to find as much specific information regarding physical habitat features in the literature that I could find to give them some guidelines about how to build a computer map that would indicate where these animals were. Without the modeling it would be just a report.

I think that Environmental Field Service has been a great addition to, and real strength, of the program.

AS: One of the import things from a faculty standpoint has been the tradition of this Henry's Fork fishing trip. I wanted to ask how it got started and what kind...
CJ: I have some fond memories of those trips. I don't know, it was probably 1969 or 1970. It was Dave Cotter, Vern Budge, and I who first went. Vern had fished the area with his brothers. He had grown up in Malad, Idaho, and was the guide. It was an experiment. We camped at the Big Spring campground. It was colder than a cob. We slept in tents. By the time dinner was done and you put it on your plate, you had about ten minutes to eat before it froze. Off we would go in the morning. We didn't make breakfast, we just got in the canoes and floated downstream, fishing the entire day. For me, it is probably close to 40 years of having done those trips. That was the first one, and we probably did that 2 or 3 times with the three of us. Then one of Vern’s classmates, Stewart Loosli, his family through his wife, had a cabin on Bill's Island, which is in Island Park area. So we fished Island Park resevior, Box Canyon, Henry’s Fork, Warm River, and Henry's Lake, and we had a place to stay. By then Dick had joined the Faculty. He was a fly fisherman too, from back East. He fished in some of the trout streams in New Jersey, which believe it or not, they had, which was news to me. Carl Steinitz joined the group at Dick's invite and has come on the trip every year since. The fishing was tremendous for the first ten years or so, the last ten years not so much.

The fishing trip began to grow. Then there were a number of years when other people would be invited. It was a treat. We had Darrel Morrison from the University of Georgia. We had faculty from Slovenia that would come on the trip. You would invite other people, Stewart would invite contractors that worked on projects his firm did work for. Then it went from there. Because the Loosli family sold the cabin, for a couple of years we stayed in motels in Ashton or other places in the area, which wasn't quite as nice. Then Sumner Swanner, who was a graduate of our program, hosted the trips. His father and mother owned a cabin right on Henry’s Fork, and it was in a fishing club that started in the 1920s. Entrepreneurial types from Salt Lake City were members in the club, and would go up and Fish. It was a great place.

The crowd kept changing, other than the core faculty. We would invite different people. My brother, Todd, came along, so did Vern's son Terrell - my brother and Terrell are graduates of this program and work for Design Workshop. It morphs, some years some [people] can come, some years they can’t. Other years we stayed at Ponds Lodge on the
Buffalo River, which goes into Henry’s Fork below the dam. We spent a lot of time up there, and the neat thing about it is, yes, sure it is a fishing trip, and we do talk fishing, and if the world series is on we will watch a ballgame or two in the evening, but a lot of it is sitting around and talking about what the profession is up to, how are things going at your school. The Slovenians would talk to us about what was going on at their school, and they had some very different things, and some very good things that we could learn from. It was an intellectual exchange along with what types of flies are you using, and that is maybe 70% of the conversation. It was a way to get to know each other as people who put on waders and fished in a cold lake or river and had fun.

AS: Were there any times that you felt concerned about the Department, perhaps from the standpoint of accreditation or internal University decision making?

CJ: I think that if you have taught in a place as long as I have, invested my career in helping build a program, I think the emphasis on research and publication and creative activities has changed since the 1960s, I think it is good and an important thing. The administration keeps talking, and probably still does today, about tenure and promotion as a three legged stool. You have extension and service, you have research, and you have teaching, all are important for tenure, but early on teaching was emphasized. It seems to me that because of what is going on now, not just here but in higher education in most other places - South Dakota State for example, I still talk to those folk, they have a start up landscape architecture program, and they have the same issues - less and less of State University budgets are covered by tax dollars. Where does the rest of the money come from? It comes from getting research grants. They take time and energy to get and complete, and they are great in many ways. You can support grad students, I supported many over the years, so has Dick and other faculty too, and it is great. But if that research gets to be overwhelming, then what suffers? The other two legs of the stool. I think that is unfortunate. I don't know if we ever had "glory years", probably, I don't know. Maybe we did, maybe we didn't, but the focus during those early years was really on teaching. I don't disagree with the importance of research and staying up to date. It is really invaluable, but if more and more of the emphasis goes over here [to research], then I think that tends to [cause the other legs of the stool] to suffer.
In my tenure here, the thing that made this Department really great and it is and had been rated as one of the best around for many years by different review groups and accreditation. It was about quality education and personal interaction with students. I worry a little bit about that, and not only here, and not only in this discipline. When you have to generate this huge pool of dollars to keep the program floating, it gets tough to do all of those things. We, as landscape architects, are such an eclectic profession anyway, and to stay tuned in to all of this becomes pretty difficult.

AS: Just sort of a last question, LAEP is entering its last quarter century, with the 75 anniversary, you were just reflecting on this, but what do you see as the Departments greatest legacy?

CJ: All you have to do is look at the number of Fellows in the American Society of Landscape Architects who are graduates of LAEP, as well as those who have gone on to productive careers in the public and private sector. Their work has made the world a better place. The Legacy is the students, and the fact that all of us contributed our individual strengths to their education. They are not my students, they are not Dick' students, they are not Vern's student, or any other faculty members students, they are the Departments students. That is it, what else can you say. That is the Legacy, and once again I will emphasize that that comes from, and hopefully still is the focus, quality teaching and quality education. The Jordan River Parkway in Salt Lake is great, and the students generated that, and downtown Logan is great. Dave Bell can give you a list of a whole bunch of other really great Environmental Field Service projects orchestrated by him and his predecessor Larry Wegkamp. Camp Pendleton was wonderful. Those are things that will have an impact, and probably get changed again, because the context within which they were designed changes, and that is the way that the world works. But the fact that you have quality graduates out there that know how to solve problems, that are creative, that are thinkers, that are motivated, and that motivation comes from good teaching, and not from any place else. You get students fired up by an initial interest, but that gets whetted and sculpted by quality teaching. That is our legacy. I can't name all of the former students that have gone into leadership positions in ASLA, and run workshops, and been on work groups that do things regarding sustainability and
restoration. A couple of our former students, sustainability and restoration is what they focus on, and that is what they bring to every annual ASLA National and Utah Chapter meeting, and they have a working group, and they talk about it, and they integrate it into their programs or private offices. That is student motivated environmental ethics.

AS: I think that sums it. Was there anything else that you wanted to add?

CJ: Nope. I think we have great facilities, we have great faculty, and we have a good program. We were part of that growing from a tiny little seed, when Vern Budge, Stuart Loosli, and Dave Bell all went to school here, to where we are today. Now it is someone else’s turn, and hopefully the legacy of quality teaching and the focus on that becomes part of it, and I am sure it will. At least I am hopeful, because you cannot be sure of anything, but hopefully it will be part of what we are. I am pretty darn sure that I won't be around for the hundredth anniversary, but when they celebrate that, hopefully those will be some of the things, and the students will be the legacy for that program in the next 25 years.

AS: Thanks you.

CJ: Okey-dokey, Thanks.

Additional conversation after interview

CJ: One of the things that I failed to mention was the fact that probably in the 70s early 80s, by then Dick Toth was Department Head, Gere Smith was on board, Jerry Fuhriman, Dick, Vern, and myself. - I am trying to think of whom else - Carlyle Becker may have been part of it, Jim Webster, and Lee Nellis. We all had, not a lot but, a considerable amount of professional experience. We weren't necessarily interchangeable parts, but you respected what other people did, because you maybe did not do it as well, and they respected you because they respected what you did well. It was easy - well, not easy - but you could move from one class to another class if someone were on sabbatical and probably do a pretty good job standing in. Now in a lot on universities that I visited during the later years that I was here, you find specialist in this and specialist in that and not necessarily in the core areas of what the profession has been, which are design
process, plants, and art, engineering, and, more recently, environmental and social issues, and all of those other things we have talked about. It makes it more difficult to get that kind of synergy we had while developing the program, because you understood the synergy and the role that you play, and you had some sense of the whole thing. It becomes more difficult to integrate a program that includes all of those things, and I think some programs have more of one thing then another, and that is fine, but they still have the core. So it is that kind of interactive stuff that I think is really important, and that means making room for emerging professional concerns, social concerns, and technologies like the Department had done all along.

AS: There is a time there where there are nine of you and you all have BLA and MLA.

CJ: And professional experience.

AS: Yes, and professional experience.

CJ: For years Vern, Jerry Fuhriman, and I worked with Grassli. We were associated with MGBA for ten years and it finally got to the point where you couldn't do it all and teach fulltime. That was what we did during the summers, and that was where we got our creative challenges that we worked on over the years, such as projects like Weber State Campus Master Plan, and other projects in this State, which we worked on collectively. Dick Toth did Olympic Games in Montreal, and the list goes on of all the kind of things that people have worked on. Gere Smith and Jerry Fuhriman had an office in Logan. There was this wealth of faculty experience related to the core of what we are as a profession. That is different then you find in some universities. I think the other thing that is a good thing, is that there are a lot of new concerns. When I went to school, or Dick, or Vern, or Gere Smith, or Jerry Fuhriman that was probably near the end of the requirement that you had to have an undergraduate degree in landscape architecture or you didn’t go to graduate school for an MLA. Now we take people from other backgrounds; ecologist, artist..

AS: History
...They are historians. They have been like you, and I think that is a good thing, because landscape architecture historians, like Michael Timmons, enrich who we are, and what we know, and how we can participate in making changes. Because there are so many special things that you can work on you must have a good talking knowledge about what this profession is, and what it has been. Most of our MLA students in LAEP are first professional degree folks. But in LAEP's MLA program students still take the core classes. Heaven forbid we would think today's designs are cut from whole cloth, and that we forget that they have roots in the past going back thousands of years. That is a personal opinion, but I think it is an important thing to keep in mind.