

Sandy Post

Von Braschler, Gen. Manager
 Sue Lafky, Editor
 Caroline Duff, Office Manager
 John Kline, staff reporter

Published weekly Thursdays by The Outlook Publishing Co., Box 68,
 Sandy, Oregon 97055. Second class postage paid at Sandy, Oregon

668-5548

SUBSCRIPTION RATES	
In Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, per year	\$7.00
Servicemen, any address	\$7.00
In Oregon, outside Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, per year	\$8.00
In Northwest and Pacific Coast States outside Oregon per year	\$9.00
Outside Northwest and Pacific Coast states, per year	\$11.00

MEMBER
NATIONAL PAPER
 Association - Founded 1885

MEMBER
 Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association

Represented Nationally by
 U.S. SUBURBAN PRESS INC.

Page 2 Sandy Post, Sandy, Oregon 97055 No. 23 June 7, 1978

Tax relief needed

Some of the campaign rhetoric was a bit overblown, but the message from the voters Tuesday rings loud and clear:

Government spending is going to be cut back.

Not only in California where the voters approved a drastic roll-back in property-tax rates, but also right here in Gresham where the city's proposed 1978-79 budget levy was defeated for a second time.

The impact of the California vote will be felt nationwide, certainly here in Oregon where a similar petition drive already is under way. Its success — virtually assured already — means a tax limitation initiative will be on the November ballot and its passage in turn seems very likely.

What then? Government spend-

ing will be slashed. Where? We would guess in welfare, highways and education along with proportionate cuts in ever other aspect of state government.

Notice we said "state" government. That's where the flaw in any tax roll-back comes. State government is a relatively small frog in the puddle. The really big spenders are in Washington, D.C. If any substantial tax savings are to occur they have to begin in the federal bureaucracy. What we pay locally in taxes is peanuts to what Uncle Sam takes.

However, if enough states vote as did California Tuesday, the message eventually will get through to Washington, D.C. That's where tax relief really must begin.

Decision Smacks of Authoritarianism

We never have subscribed to the theory, advocated by some journalists, that newspapers and the electronic media are above and beyond the rest of us, that they have special rights and privileges. This, of course, because of the First Amendment.

However, we are worried and puzzled by the recent Supreme Court decision which authorizes surprise searches of news offices. In effect, the decision allows police, once they acquire a warrant, to invade a news office at any time, day or night, and ransack a newspaper's files.

We're probably over-reacting with words like "invade" and "ransack," yet that clearly is possible under the Supreme Court decision.

The majority opinion (in a 5-3 vote) was written by Associate Justice Byron White who pooh-poohed fears that police might rummage at will through newspaper files. White pointed out that the warrant process protects the news media.

Journalists are less sanguine. We vividly recall an experience in Tacoma some years ago when a small-town justice of the peace issued a midnight warrant for search of a suspected gambling

premise. Could not the same sort of justice be dispensed in the case of a newspaper or TV station?

There is more involved here than just freedom of the press. Might not the same search and seizure provisions be extended to doctors, lawyers, business people, etc., who conceivably might have something the police consider of value?

No longer would there be any confidentiality of sources and notes.

This is no idle worry. Even though the Supreme Court decision involved a case in 1971, at least 10 police raids on news offices in California have been reported recently, plus searches of a TV station in Rhode Island and a wire-service office in Montana.

Interestingly enough, the Oregon Court of Appeals this week ruled that police don't have to give the purpose of their visit before they break into a house. This, of course, had nothing to do with the Supreme Court decision.

Most people in the news media will agree that they have no greater rights to freedom of speech than anyone else. But giving police carte blanche to newspaper files smacks all too heavily of authoritarianism.

Traffic Abuses Need Crack-down

Now that Sandy has a 24-hour police force in a buildup to handle the city's rapid growth, we'd like to see the services.

Visibility is lacking on the streets where it all happens.

Thousands of cars zoom through the main streets of town at speeds well beyond the legal limits on their way up the mountain or toward Portland. Where are the patrol cars?

Sure, lack of parking space is a problem here, but should cars be permitted to park so close to street corners and dangerous intersections as so flagrantly done throughout Sandy? Some of the cross streets between Proctor and Pioneer are alleys of chance for the blinded motorist trying to pull out into onrushing traffic speeding through town.

Must we wait for one serious traffic fatality to see the problems and crack down on traffic control?

Overparking should be ticketed to discourage flagrant abuse of parking privileges downtown by a few who seem oblivious to the community's scarcity of parking anywhere these days.

Cars are parked on back streets and sometimes in town facing the

wrong way and posing possible danger to both the violator and the defensive driver in the other car when he or she swings back onto the road from the wrong side of the street.

These are traffic abuses many of us may help to correct on an individual basis, but shouldn't the Sandy Police Department assist with discouragement of these practices?

We realize the City of Sandy is waiting on possible funds for additional stop lights and that the new pedestrian crosswalk buttons display a good first step toward making this town a safer place to walk the streets.

But the stream of traffic through town will only increase in coming years, as the proposed city by-pass is at least five years away without inclusion in current state budgeting.

And the in-city traffic from new city residents will only increase in the next five years, with expectation that the city will double in size in that time.

The time to begin cracking down on traffic problems must be now before the congestion becomes unmanageable.



Letters to the editor

Benefit sale

Editors note: Glenn Izer, a Sandy Boy Scout, recently held a rummage sale to benefit a Sandy summer school program for the trainable mentally retarded — as part of his Eagle Scout project. The Post recently received a copy of this thank you letter.

To the Editor:

On behalf of our association and the trainable mentally retarded youngsters of Sandy, Oregon I would like to personally thank you for your outstanding fund-raising efforts which recently netted \$239.

As you had requested, the funds will be used to provide summer activities for the trainable mentally retarded of the Sandy area.

Our association is in the process of developing a summer recreation program which will include such things as arts and craft, swimming, movies, dramatics, several field trips, cooking, music, and nature walks, treasure hunt and guest speakers from the police department and Tri-Met for the handicapped youngsters.

Your donation will be a contributing factor to insure that these things happen for 10-12 youngsters between the ages of 8 and 16.

Every citizen of the city of Sandy and the state of Oregon owes you a debt of gratitude for your generosity in helping the handicapped help themselves, for by helping them, all of us will benefit.

Richard R. Keough
 Executive Director
 Clackamas County
 Association for
 Retarded Citizens

Growth

To the Editor:

Shades of the Memorial Coliseum hassle of some years ago when the city fathers of Portland were afraid they were going to lose a buck if the glass palace wasn't smack dab in the middle of already congested downtown Portland.

Me thinks our Sandy planners are guilty of the same greedy tactics! Re: Gale Meier and his proposal to move Sharo's Food King a "tad bit" away from the already overjammed corner of city center.

This appears almost shabby. Were I a businessman thinking of locating in Sandy, I think my thoughts would be "directed" towards a more enterprising community.

You of the board of planners and other opponents of progress, have the wrong idea of how a town grows. Certainly it's not by cramming all the business establishments in a few square blocks. If this be the case, perhaps Glos Ford, the Pizza Barn and all others outside spitting distance of the carillon tower should snuggle up.

call the whole town a "blip" on Highway 26.

D. Daugherty
 13150 SE Marsh Road
 Sandy

CB stop

To the Editor:

Mt. Hood React would like to publicly thank Sharon's Food King, Williams Thriftway, KRDR, McDonalds, San-Cada CBers, Ed Mills and Lee Smoot for their donations that helped make our Memorial Day Safety Stop for motorists a huge success.

We would also like to say a special thanks to Mt. Hood Lions Club who donated the use of their building and facilities for the three day weekend.

I am sure the 800 to 1000 motorists who stopped to take advantage of the free coffee, tea, hot chocolate, punch, donuts and cookies would like to add their thanks.

Children were given activity books - pencils and magic pads to help their travel time pass. There was also information and safety pamphlets for adults.

All in all it was a very good weekend for the Mt. Hood React people who gave up their weekend to help aid the tired and weary travelers, and I know we all enjoyed meeting the people.

Sincerely,
 Mt. Hood React

Tax base

To the Editor:

This is just a short note of thanks to all those who voted last Tuesday, May 23, in support of the Hoodland Fire Department tax base.

Right now, words express our thanks in the months ahead, as the new budget goes into effect, we will continue to express our appreciation in actions.

On behalf of your fire department, thank you.

Sincerely,
 Tim Sackett
 Secretary-Treasurer
 Hoodland Volunteer
 Firefighters Association

Youths volunteer

Editor's note: This letter dated May 24 was addressed to the Builders Club Sandy Upper Grade School. copy was given to The Post. Dear Boys and girls:

I only had a brief couple of minutes to meet you when you came to Sandy Community Action Center yesterday and that was my loss. I had planned to work with you when you came and to enjoy your company. I was required to attend a meeting at Gladstone on center business, however, and did not get in on much of the fun. When I came back from the meeting the first thing I noticed was the very neat job you had done on cutting the grass and getting all the tall grass stems left from the previous cutting.

When I went into the building I noticed right away that you had done a lot of work with the shoes and that

they were all in pairs and that the odd ones and ones really worthless had been picked out and put in the trash.

I saw that the windows were clean and when I checked the food room I saw that you had been carrying up things from the basement storeroom and had repacked some of the bulk foods.

As chairman of the board of directors for the community action center I wish to extend warm thanks for taking an interest and in giving us help. All of us who work at the center are volunteers and yesterday was the day we had the most volunteers ever.

We are serving about 450 people per month at the center. Our patrons give us many items of clothing, shoes and household items which we in turn give to people in need of those items. We provide emergency food for people without funds to buy food.

We help people get in contact with such government agencies as the county health department or food stamp office or welfare office or Well Baby Clinic.

Sometimes we help a family with some gasoline to get where they are going or to help a person get to a job.

I hope that you will continue your interest and perhaps come back again to help sometime.

W. Pete Sulzbach, chairman
 Sandy Community Action Center

Letters

To the Editor:

Thank you for your May 25 editorial explaining why certain submitted letters-to-the-editor cannot be published. Perhaps, however, even those you do not publish — because they are libelous, use foul language, disregard the truth or are too long — might have a germ of good in them, at least from the standpoint of some potential reader.

The writers obviously expect their letters to be publicized; so there would be no breach of confidentiality in allowing interested people to read them. Would damages arise, to which your paper might be liable, if you were to save all the letters you receive, and make them available for anyone to study? If there is a shortage of space, would the public library provide it?

If this wouldn't work, is there some better way people can learn what each other is thinking about? Meetings are difficult, for various reasons. Comments in writing can be more thoughtful than spoken ones; they can be saved, and, by being categorizable, can reach just the people who would be most interested in them.

Any suggestions or help would be appreciated.
 Joseph L. Miller Jr.,
 52815 E. Marmot Road,
 Sandy

Salem scene

Public involvement goal of proposal

by Jack Zimmerman
 Oregon Associated
 Industries

Proponents of a plan to let voters make changes in Oregon's land use law are having a hard time convincing Gov. Bob Straub they don't want to halt land use planning altogether.

The plan — now in the form of an initiative petition — seeks mainly to restore control of land use planning to the Oregon State Legislature and the people it represents.

Known as the LUPCAC Initiative, because its drafters call themselves the Land Use Planning Constitutional Amendment Committee, it needs signatures of 61,646 registered voters by July 7 in order to appear on the November ballot. Major supporters are the Oregon State Home Builders Association, Oregon Association of Realtors and Associated Oregon Industries.

Gov. Straub has been particularly critical of AOT's supporting role and appealed in vain for its board of directors to withdraw backing by that statewide association of private employers. Although the AOI Board refused to change its mind, the governor's cudgel has been taken up by editorial writers for major metropolitan newspapers. All either urge supporters to back off or warn the public of dire consequences if the initiative does indeed achieve ballot status.

In essence, the initiative proposes a constitutional amendment that would require the legislature to adopt statewide land use planning goals and cities and counties to adopt comprehensive plans under established procedures.

It would prohibit the legislature from delegating the goal-setting responsibility as it has to a seven-member appointed Land Conservation and Development Commission.

It would not abolish LCDC but permit it to function as an advisory, arbitrator and administrative agency with authority to provide funds and technical assistance to cities and counties, make planning recommendations to the legislature and arbitrate land use conflicts between cities and counties.

LCDC would continue to perform all of its present functions with the single exception of establishing policy by setting goals.

It would require the legislature to establish a procedure for giving notice by mail to property owners whose property is rezoned and make property owners eligible for compensation if the legislature imposes restrictions on geographic areas not applying throughout the state.

Oddly enough, these points aren't the biggest source of contention. The effective date is. Because if it does appear on the ballot and if the voters do approve it, the constitutional amendment becomes effective March 8, 1979 — two months after the next regular session of the legislature convenes.

Opponents claim the legislature cannot act on the issue in 60 days. They fear the issue will drag on interminably and the current system will collapse before lawmakers make a decision.

In actuality, the legislature must make several decisions if the LUPCAC Amendment is approved by voters. Some are more weighty than others. But in the meantime, the state's planning and zoning ordinances are controlled by cities and counties. They will remain unaffected and continue to conduct business as usual.

Another consideration, unique to present land use law and unaffected by the amendment, is the presence of the legislature's own standing committee on land use planning. It is a statutory body, in existence since passage of Senate Bill 100 in 1973.

This joint committee of both houses of the legislature is empowered now to conduct hearings on issues raised by the initiative proposal and draft bills for legislative consideration some six months hence. At the latest, that committee should start reading such legislation as soon as the votes are counted in November.

LCDC Chairmen John Mosser expresses fear the agency will not be able to expend already appropriated funds to assist cities and counties in completing comprehensive plans if the amendment is approved. An opinion by Attorney General James Redden refutes that contention and other contentions that hint land use planning would go down the proverbial drain if voters support the initiative.

Land use planning really got off the ground in Oregon a decade ago with passage of Senate Bill 10 during the 1969 legislative session. That measure called for statewide zoning, more or less an inventory function to be conducted by local governments.

The legislature in 1973 enacted Senate Bill 100, establishing LCDC and present land use law. That Oregonians generally favor land use planning is apparent by the fact a referral of SB 10 failed and so did an initiative to repeal SB 100.

In the light of such strong and continuing public support, it is difficult to understand the fear now being expressed by those who oppose giving voters a chance to ask their elected legislators to clarify and simplify the existing process.

The controversial nature of land use planning is apparent by continuing attempts to throw it out entirely or to change the law to make it more acceptable.

Voters already have significantly upheld the concept and lawmakers have approved some changes. Voter approval of the LUPCAC Amendment would most simply mean the people want land use planning controlled by elected legislators — individuals placed in office by a majority of concerned citizens from all parts of the state.



SERVICE WE GIVE!

INSURANCE WE SELL . . .

The personal insurance counsel and advice of a local agent is important to you in planning a complete insurance program.

WALRAD INSURANCE AGENCY
 Sandy, Oregon 668-4421