



Sandy High budget May 19 crucial

Sandy Union High School faces virtually a do-or-die situation May 19 when its "A" ballot for basic operating funds goes up to bat again.

Last year it took three nerve-rattling turns at the plate to drive home the local high school's levy, after district voters rejected an earlier attempt for a tax base.

A shakier economy this season makes the effort even scarier for the high school, which traditionally takes two or three swings before hitting on a budget.

Unfortunately, the school could operate only until something like November without security of a voter-approved operating budget. Hence, they'll go to bat for as many swings as it takes.

Actually, they're not asking much in the "A" phase of the budget May 19, so it's hard to understand voter rejection and apathy.

The "A" ballot levies \$1.8 million outside Oregon's constitutional limitation for operating expenses during fiscal 1981-82. If this measure is approved, \$2.1 million of taxes levied will be financed partially by the state including a \$296,088 tax base.

That boils down to an estimated \$3.77 per \$1,000 assessed value or 41 cents LESS than the 1980-81 levy, exclusive of levies for bonded in-

debtedness.

Even if approved, that meager amount likely will be insufficient, since the school has lost at least \$238,000 in state basic school support and possibly as much as \$400,000. It will be left to a school budget committee at a key budget hearing 7:30 p.m., May 1, to ponder how to struggle with that shortfall.

The school district's original "A" ballot levy remains intact for the May 19 election, despite the loss in state funding.

A telephone campaign and series of neighborhood coffee klatches for clubs and informal gatherings are being organized through the superintendent's office. Persons are needed who are willing to phone their neighbors to urge them to vote or organize a meeting for presentation of district budget needs.

Budget crusaders are focusing on neighborhoods where the district traditionally received strongest support — Firwood, library precinct, high school precinct, Cottrell and possibly Boring. It all may boil down to getting out the vote (tough on a special election), so supporters are properly represented. Heavy election turnout often favors SUHS levies.

It's time to rally for Sandy High and pass this levy. (VB)

Letters to the editor:

Landowners fear zone squeeze

Land bill protects

This week in Salem hearings will be held on House Bill 2534, the "lot of record" bill that would restore "grandfather rights" back to property owners.

Most people do not realize that through land-use planning, government agencies and their rules we have lost this basic right of property use.

To express it more clearly, an example would be: You purchase or inherit a 5-acre tract of land that is legally divided and buildable. You hold it for several years, and in the meantime the property zoning changes to 20-acre zoning. You could be denied the right to construct a home.

This situation has not existed in Clackamas County, as a more common-sense approach has prevailed. In other counties, such as in Yamhill and Polk counties, however, people have been denied the right to build — not because of local inforcements, but because the decision to build has been appealed to LCDC and LUBA where the local permitted use has been overturned, denying people the right to use their property for their home.

It is vital that people call or write their legislator to see that this bill is passed. It is in the Environment & Energy Committee, chaired by Wayne Fawbush.

The hearings are 7 p.m. Thursday, April 23 and 1:30 p.m. Friday, April 24.

The toll-free number to Salem is 1-800-452-7813. For more information I will leave copies of the bill at Reliable Realty in Sandy.

Sincerely,
Ginny Brewster

buildable, only to have the government take that right away. If House Bill 2534 is not passed, there will be a tremendous hardship to a great many Oregonians.

The LCDC has required individuals to go through a public hearing process and develop a farm-management plan to get a building permit. The planning staff systematically recommends denial of these building permit applications, and only the most tenacious people stick out the appeal process to the county commissioners for at best a 50-50 chance.

I can't believe people in rural Oregon are being put in a position of not being able to use their property in the manner they wish. The growing degree of state restrictions has to be reversed. Granted — some restrictions are necessary, but governmental rules and regulations that are evolving must be curtailed. We must prevent further erosion of private property owners rights in this state.

Citizens living in metropolitan population centers have had the voting power to pass legislation concerning land use in rural areas that doesn't affect their property, because they live in lot and block subdivisions. Urban people generally do not have the knowledge of rural properties to make effective decisions concerning those rural properties.

Citizens who choose to farm and live in rural areas have not had voting power concerning land use.

People who live in metropolitan areas should only have the right to vote on land-use plans that affects them.

People who live in rural areas should have the right to determine the use of their land. Since LCDC generally affects only rural property owners, shouldn't they have the most say on their land use?

Donald B. Ingram
Sandy

indicates that by dropping the kindergarten program from the "B" ballot the cost would be cut "From \$357,704 to approximately \$197,000." This last figure shows a discrepancy in what the kindergarten in the previous article cost.

As a voter, I would like a more detailed account of what each program would cost. What are the costs for the athletic program, the talented and gifted program and the kindergarten program?

Also stated, approximately 700 students are involved in programs involved in the "B" ballot. However, how many children would be involved in kindergarten? Eventually every child in school. How many children are involved in the outdoor school program? Eventually every child gets this opportunity.

I feel the voting public should be reminded again what the costs for each program are and how many children participate in each program. Maybe when more questions are answered, we can make a better decision on how we want to vote May 19.

Kathleen Boomhower
Sandy

Board seat open

This is an open letter to residents of Boring Fire Protection District No. 59.

Dale Irwin, a member of the Board of Directors for the past six years, has moved out of the Fire District and, therefore, resigned from the Board of Directors, effective April 7, 1981. The board of directors will be appointing a resident of the district to fill the remaining two years of the vacant position.

If you are a property owner or a registered voter residing within the fire district, have the time to commit to the district and wish to be considered for appointment to the vacant position, contact Chief Matt Shields at the district's business office in Boring.

The Board meets the first Tuesday of each month at 8 p.m. There are special meetings from time to time. The board's primary function is to set policy and provide directives for the management of the district.

On behalf of the board of directors and district personnel, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Dale Irwin for his six years of commitment to the district and assistance in

providing a valuable public service.

Earl S. Meier
Chairman, Board of Directors
Boring Fire Protection District No. 59

Landowner upset

On May 5, 1975, we purchased a 6.12-acre tract of land in Yamhill County. At the time we bought the land, we could have built our home, which was the sole reason for our purchase.

After making a number of improvements to the property and obtaining approval for a septic tank, we applied for a building permit July, 1977. At that time, we were told that we would have to apply for a lot size variance, since our property (without our having been notified) had been placed in a 20-acre zone.

We paid the fees, hired a lawyer and participated in three public hearings. After three months, and more than \$1,000 in attorney fees and other costs, the board of commissioners voted 2 to 1 against granting us a permit to build our home.

Because our land was rezoned, we cannot build our home!

It is our understanding that what has happened to us has happened to others, as land throughout the state is rezoned, allegedly to comply with LCDC goals.

We support land-use planning and the protection of farm and forest land in the state. However, in those cases where the land has already been lawfully partitioned or subdivided and sold to people for homesites, we do not believe government should have the right to change the rules and prevent us from building our home.

David J. Rennie
Ethel D. Rennie

Road bill due all

The leadership of one of Oregon's legislative committees recently commented that the condition of Oregon's highways and streets was perhaps best understood by the contractors and engineers who largely built the system that is in place today.

Acting on that premise, the Associated General Contractors' Oregon-Columbia Chapter asked for a national, non-profit highway research group to give us its assessment of the state's highway needs. The results were dramatic and deserve an in-

tense examination by all Oregon motorists and by those who shape public spending policies.

The Road Information Program (TRIP), based in Washington, D.C., studied Oregon's main, paved traffic arteries. It found nearly 20,000 miles in substandard condition. Since these are the roadways that carry almost 90 percent of all traffic volume and the bulk of commerce in the state, we were interested in what it is costing each driver to use worn-out roads.

Fuel waste and vehicle repairs tied directly to bad highways cost Oregon drivers \$438 million annually — a staggering \$233 for each driver in the state. In all, we are wasting 271 million gallons of fuel by forcing our cars to operate over rough and bumpy stretches of highway that reduce fuel efficiency by not allowing vehicles to function as they were designed to perform.

The total financial waste due to driving on bad roads is two-and-a-half times the costs of bringing up to standard the most critical of the deficient highways, some 5,500 miles. At a cost of \$182 million a year for the next decade, this resurfacing and rebuilding work would do much to eliminate the senseless pocketbook drain we now experience along Oregon's roadways.

We are penny-wise and pound-foolish, if we think the highways are going to get better by themselves. We each use the system and depend on it to fuel economic growth in this state. Without a highway and street network that is usable, we would all suffer — including those who depend on rubber-tired transit systems in the mix of commuter options.

Users of the system may eventually have to bear more of the burden for its upkeep and repair, but the cost probably will never approach the ridiculous level of \$438 million — \$233 each — that bad roads are already costing us.

Burying our collective heads in the sand in an effort to ignore the problem is an option we can ill afford and one the AGC, by releasing TRIP's report to the public, hopes we can avoid.

As investors in a system that was built with tax dollars, we have an obligation to speak out and demand that investment not be allowed to decay further.

W. A. (Bill) Bugge,
The Associated General Contractors
Wilsonville, OR

Are local family farms in danger?

The family farm has played a major role in this country, and this continues to be true in Clackamas County with big 4-H and FFA contingents.

Proposed amendments to the county's comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance, however, could change all that.

The county board of commissioners seek to draw a more distinct line between commercial (working) farms and hobby (family) farms.

To be zoned as a hobby farm under the change, a parcel of land would have to be used for production of farm products primarily used by residents of the property or provide a minor source of income for owners or residents.

Hobby farms also would be restricted from EFU-20 GAD and timber zones.

Perhaps the ultimate answer for Oregon's dwindling farm land — much of it in the hands of "gentleman farmers" — would be to encourage greater utilization of family farm land.

But small family farms do provide a good training grounds for

Future Farmers of America in FFA and 4-H programs, and Clackamas County has more than its share.

Restricting family farms here is not the answer. Families who have moved here for this life-style should not be outzoned by an impersonal government — if they're truly represented by that government.

Perhaps the best way to fight the decay of family farms in Oregon by overzealous government land-use planners is to encourage legislative passage of House Bill 2534 that extends "grandfather rights" to farm families, so they can't be outzoned.

There's an uproar across the state today over land-use planners who roll over farm land with the personal touch of a bulldozer. Maybe it's time to get involved in all those bureaucratic games like hearings.

Attendance and participation 2:30—7 p.m., May 11, at the next county board hearing of proposed farm zone changes in Oregon City would be a good place to make your own feelings heard. (VB)

Don't be outzoned

This letter is in regards to House Bill 2534, currently under consideration in the legislature. I am definitely in favor of the passage of this bill.

Many citizens have bought acreage that even the county told them was buildable when purchased. In many cases, years later, they found that their property had been downzoned to EFU or GAD.

A parcel of land purchased years ago should be buildable. This is plain, common sense. No one would have knowingly purchased unbuildable land and paid taxes at a valuation indicating the property was

Salem scene:

Tight fists, small ring in Salem fight

by JACK ZIMMERMANN
Associated Oregon Industries

The Oregon Legislature might be compared with a prizefighter — fists cocked, capable of delivering any number of punches that would seriously damage the state's economic base.

Poised punches represent issues such as increased taxes and fees, land-use restrictions, compensation for injured and unemployed workers and further regulation of energy use. Landing a combination could send the economy to its knees.

With the economy already reeling from repeated jabs of excessive regulation, tight money, inflation and existing taxation, each of the foregoing could be the haymaker that would send many businesses to the canvas for the count.

Anyone doubting the veracity of this allegory, need only note the soaring number of current business failures — up 223 percent from a year ago.

After three months of sparring, lawmakers and business interests still are clinched in the center of Salem's legislative ring. Though business protagonists long have had their guards up against most of the foregoing issues, they now are beginning to comprehend the magnitude and potential effect of a solar plexus punch involving energy.

Restrictive energy measures have been part of the Legislature's



arsenal since the early Seventies, when the Arab oil embargo coincided with a drought retarding hydroelectric power generation. Federal regulation of both domestic petroleum and natural gas development added to the crisis.

Since that period, some controls have been eased, much conservation has been mandated and incentives provided for any number of schemes involving recycling, alternative energy use and generation from heretofore uneconomical sources.

Now, at a time Congress appears to be moving away from a punitive approach to the problem, Oregon lawmakers seem to favor more government regulation.

Legislative action two years ago — bolstered by the electorate, effectively erased this state's nuclear energy option. Congressional passage of the Northwest Regional Power Bill tended to reinstate Oregon's ability to benefit from results of the option elsewhere, but at a cost still undetermined.

All along the path of punitive approach, costs of energy in nearly all forms have become virtually unbearable for some and imponderable for the rest.

Gov. Vic Atiyeh — backed by a Department of Energy created to deal with the problem, has introduced a package of some 29 bills this session, aimed mostly at encouraging further conservation and rewarding development and use of renewable and alternative energy sources.

A portion of the Legislature, abetted largely by social activists, continues to seek solutions that punish larger volume energy users, with little apparent comprehension of results of this single-issue approach.

Altogether, more than 100 measures currently under study address the energy problem. The Senate has created a special standing committee this session to deal with the issue. It meets regularly four days each week, a frequency exceeded only by Revenue and Ways & Means Committees. In the House, energy issues still share committee consideration with those involving environment.

Only a relative handful of energy related measures have so far achieved sanction from both chambers. Hearings — particularly before the Senate panel, have produced feints that have business interests bobbing and weaving for all they're worth.

While the economy would benefit from a number of pending energy proposals, passage of others could produce devastating results. Examples of the latter are those requiring commercial and industrial electricity users to subsidize low rates for residential users, blacking out electric signs from September through March, creating a new bureaucracy to watchdog commercial and industrial energy users to make certain they conform to as-yet-to-be-determined use formulas, prohibiting more aluminum production and limiting industrial expansion to so-called labor-intensive, energy-efficient operation. Others abound. But these are among the sticks that are receiving more attention than the carrots also awaiting consideration.

Passage of almost any of the punitive propositions appears most likely to aggravate current problems and produce conditions their sponsors don't anticipate or desire.

An energy-short economy is forced to adapt to conditions or cease altogether. Most commerce, industry and system-wise consumers already have responded. The punitive approach only tends to artificially hasten the economy's demise.

It would be ironic, indeed, if those cocked fists threw only one punch, and it turned out to be the one that halted the wheels on which the economy turns.