

Editorial & Opinion

Von Braschler, Publisher
Caroline Duff, Office Manager

Mark Floyd, Editor
Dan Dillon, News Editor

SANDY, OREGON, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1981

Sandy's budget taxpayer's bargain

The city of Sandy's budget levy Tuesday looks so squeaky tight and bright that it's surprising few people are singing its merits. But that's the way it goes in politics—the bad draw public outcry, while good efforts draw silent nods.

There's a lot that's good about this tight, little city budget and the creative budgeters who measured time and weather before running it up the local flagpole. After all, this is not the year to buy new equipment or expand city facilities or services. Federal and state funding support is down, and recession makes local taxpayers reluctant to build.

So we see a frugal city operating levy—just an "A" basic support budget without "B" frills.

In fact, the requested general fund operation dollars amount to just 8.3 percent more than last year, despite a two-year city growth factor twice that percentage (plus inflation).

Actually, the tax rate sought is less than the 1980-81 Sandy tax rate (\$6.96 per thousand of assessed valuation versus \$7.24 total last year, including previously approved bonds).

With state revenue sharing paying 30 percent of the city's basic operations, local taxpayers can expect to pay less than \$4 per thousand of assessed valuation for the general operation of the city (depending on new assessment levels). A local taxpayer can expect to pay only about \$20 per month on a \$100,000 home for full city services.

Overall city salaries go up only

about 10 percent, and staff number remains the same except for one new parking control officer who will be self-supporting with new revenue generated and one new summer park aid afforded by revenue sharing outside funds. Both control of parking and park litter and vandalism should be welcome additions.

City departments even may have to pool workers to compensate for loss of federally-funded CETA workers, cut after Sandy's budget was written. Then, too, there may be more cuts in state and federal revenue sharing.

Most of the city's general fund as budgeted goes toward maintaining a 24-hour police department with one patrolman on duty weekdays and two on duty during critical hours of weekend.

The rest of the budget is pure creative genius—getting more for less. Examples include city plans to gear up the library for a countywide automation pool, improvements of roads and improvements to water and sewer systems.

The city is through wasting money to maintain overworked pump stations and tired of potholes on North Bluff Road and unfinished Hood Street. Also slated are installation of a walkway along Meing Avenue from Highway 211 to Barker Street and improvements at Tupper Park.

No city with 16 percent growth in two years can expect full city services to come cheap, but this maintenance budget before voters Tuesday looks like a bargain. (VB)

COUNTRY MARKET NELSON MEMORIAL PIONEER PARK



Letters to the editor:

Heliport, levies stir readers

Heliport favored

Your story on the Zig Zag heliport warrants correction. Contrary to fear-filled critics, the proposed location poses no undue safety hazard for Highway 26, the school or playgrounds.

Curiously, the same aginners don't mind when helicopters land on the school playground.

As the fire chief indicated, helicopter bigots blind themselves to the mayhem on that highway, in contrast to helicopter safety.

Helicopters everywhere operate in complete safety. To cite congestion in Zig Zag is laughable, when heliports work superbly well on city roofs and crowded yards at hospitals, parking garages and the PGE tower downtown, Johnson Creek, Marx Road and Sandy Boulevard.

At least 80 are located in Oregon, and more than 30 are in the Portland metro area. Their safety record speaks for itself. They are never heard from in the news, because they have no accidents and make no nuisance. Not even in the vicinity or on the roofs of hospitals.

As one of the proponents, I certify that Emanuel's Life Flight will use this heliport, as any other, when it suits the need. That is because designated heliports are safer for all concerned. And safety is one of the prime reasons for having this one.

Don Wilner was misinformed, as we sent this proposal by letter to the county commissioners April 14. They assigned it to the planning department for study and recommendation. No doubt, they will hold a public hearing.

Finally, we believe a good idea should be considered and judged on its merits. Public safety and suitability are matters for impartial study and evaluation, not emotional guesswork, cynical distortion and hearsay.

In the final analysis, this one promises good things for a whole community, and favors no individual or group. It is worth a try.

Joseph A. Stein
Gale Peterson
Zig Zag

Dear Mr. Kurth:

I have just been advised that a helicopter pad has been proposed for the area near the Hoodland Womens Club on Salmon River Road.

Please consider this letter as an expression of my opposition to any helicopter pad for the following reasons:

It is entirely unnecessary. To the best of my knowledge a medical evacuation by helicopter has been necessary only twice in two years. The athletic field at Welches School is adequate for use in an emergency. (Please note that I am not including any Timberline evacuations in this statement.)

The proposed area is too close to Welches School and Highway 26. Assuming the pad would be used for recreation as well as for possible emergency, those people using the pad would be, for the most part, coming and going to Bowman's or Rippling River. If this were the case, would it not make more sense for a pad to be built on their property and not County property?

In my judgement, the proposed expenditure, as well as the property, could be put to better use as a softball field or some other athletic field where it would be of more use to more people. After all, pilots and passengers of helicopters are not all that many.

So far, everything related to this has been very secretive. I would certainly hope for a public hearing. I do believe you will find more opposition than approval.

Please let me hear from you.

Arthur G. Bock
Rhododendron
cc: Board of County Commissioners

Carolyn Smith
Rhododendron

Pass Welches levy

Residents of the Welches School District will be asked to vote May 19 on school board positions and a budget which contains "A" and "B" ballots. In order for the "B" ballot to pass, the "A" ballot also must pass. If the "B" ballot does not pass, the Welches students would be deprived of many benefits, including kindergarten, music, library, a vice principal, extra curricular activities and a good teacher to student ratio.

The "A" and "B" ballots would add about 50 cents to the taxes per \$1,000 of assessed property value. For a \$30,000 home, this would be \$25 for the year.

Many folks would spend \$25 for a dinner out or a new sweater.

Any voter who has ever had or expects to have a child in school or who participated in the community school program at Welches School should appreciate its value to our community.

Whether you decide to vote for or against the school budget, your decision is worthless, unless you physically go to the poll May 19 to vote.

Marjorie Wicks
Rhododendron

these facts:

1. Welches can operate a state-approved program on its present resources of \$738,492 without either an A or B budget.
 2. Failure of the B budget will, without question, result in a new B budget proposal.
 3. There is some figure between \$738,000 and \$945,000 acceptable to the voters that will insure a superior quality of education and still eliminate adding needless teachers.
 4. Welches School is experiencing a growth rate 85 percent less than that predicted by school authorities to gull us into building a new school.
- The Welches B budget should be voted down to give the school board the unmistakable message that taxes are needlessly high, local business gravely depressed, building at a standstill, unemployment rising and that waste is not acceptable.
- The board must produce a new B budget that reflects the board's concern with current economic trends and shows its efforts to achieve greater efficiency with the present staff.
- Milton M. Fox
Brightwood

5. \$216,000, (b) \$201,000, (c) \$187,000, (d) a figure to be announced.
 6. Unpaid taxes will not exceed \$48,897 or 7 1/2 percent per county estimate.
 7. Present student population will: (a) remain stable, (b) increase 2.3 percent, (c) not shift dramatically within grades.
- The projected cost for the 1981-82 budget including bonded indebtedness, is estimated at \$5.44 per \$1,000 before tax relief.
- The decision to support or not to support the A and B ballot is your individual choice.
- K. C. Blackburn
Superintendent
Welches School

Play good

I am addressing this to all of you who have not yet seen the current production at the Sandy Community Theatre, "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum."

This weekend (Thursday, Friday and Saturday at 8 p.m.), you have an opportunity to experience the extraordinary performing talents of many of our local Sandy residents—students and adults, alike.

Give yourself a break. Turn off the television. Get the lead out and drive, walk or crawl to the Sandy Community Theatre and treat yourselves to an evening of great fun, shrieking laughter and no-host brownies.

Pauline Stafford
Sandy

Thank you

We wish to thank our friends, relatives and neighbors for their prayers and sympathy in the loss of our husband and father. Also, many thanks for the food, flowers and donations. They were greatly appreciated.

Family of Mervil Kirby

LETTERS POLICY:
The Post asks that all letters to the editor be typed, double-spaced and signed. Deadline is noon, Tuesday. Letters should be accurate, free of libelous remarks and in good taste. This newspaper attempts to publish all letters it receives and may edit material lightly to conform to guidelines. Maximum length is 200 words.

Legislator's report:

State rolls up welfare roll

by KEN JERNSTEDT
State Senator, Dist. 28



who provides much of the money and most of the say.

Welfare reform hasn't occupied much of the public spotlight this session, but it surely is one of state government's major achievements of the past two years.

An aggressive top-to-bottom shakeup of welfare programs waged by the Atiyeh administration has replaced welfare with work for thousands of Oregonians at a savings of more than \$150 million in your federal and state tax dollars.

It also has provided a blueprint for the rest of the nation to follow, because what happened with little fanfare here in Oregon is what the Reagan administration hopes to achieve for all states.

No one can quarrel with the original concept of welfare, designed during the 1930's as a system of temporary aid for people who—through no fault of their own—were unable to meet their needs and the needs of their families.

But somehow—without our quite knowing how it happened—this system of temporary aid has turned into a system of lasting shackles, and it has reached the point where we now have third and fourth generation welfare families.

What to do to solve this problem and to break this chain of dependency has puzzled the State Legislature for a number of years. Reform attempts, however, generally have been frustrated by the federal government

Oregon turned the corner two years ago with adoption of a policy that permits the state to require able-bodied welfare recipients to accept available employment.

Now we have a federal government with a new attitude and a new agenda, and it is as determined as is the Atiyeh administration to return to the original concept and goal of welfare.

Oregon's policy has resulted in 5,000 recipients being immediately dropped from the welfare rolls, with another 15,000 receiving a sharp reduction in their payments.

It is estimated that nearly 75 percent of those affected by changes now are employed and no longer dependent on such help.

Salem scene:

State said guilty of sexism

by JACK ZIMMERMAN
Associated Oregon Industries

A condition exists in Salem these days, setting apart deliberations of the 61st Legislative Assembly from any of its predecessors.

It's a subtle preoccupation with sex!

The all-encompassing condition actually doesn't deal with sex legislation. It deals with virtually all legislation and consists of the elimination of sex.

Furthermore, it was mandated by the 1979 Legislature and creates a condition that is expected to persist for at least two more regular biennial sessions—until the mid-Eighties or beyond.

Simply speaking, the Legislature is neutering Oregon Revised Statutes.

The process actually began Oct. 3, 1979, the effective date of House Bill 2448, pushed through the 60th Assembly by sponsors and co-signers Reps. Gretchen Kafoury, Mary Burrows, Jane Cease, Nancy Ryles, Mae Yih, Joyce Cohen, Sue Pisha, and a lone male, Sen. Frank Roberts.

Its passage, 45-6 in the House and 27-3 in the Senate, expressed state policy that

statutes, rules and orders be written in sex-neutral terms.

Legislative counsel, the bill drafting arm of the Legislature, figures it will take at least three sessions before current law experiences the amending process to bring most wording into compliance.

This rewriting involves tens of thousands of laws and even more rules and orders. Oregon Revised Statutes alone fill six massive volumes.

In essence, the sex-neutralization means ferreting out masculine pronouns wherever they currently exist and omitting them in the drafting of new material. It means the eventual elimination of the words he, his and him. Pronouns that through the centuries have been accorded status representing both genders in law and certain grammatical situations throughout the English-speaking world.

A curious anachronism involves the fact ORS 174.110(2) — which specifies: "Words used in the masculine gender may include the feminine and the neuter." remains on the books in obvious opposition to the newer ORS 174.115. One assumes this helps cover situations that may arise in the interim before the neutering overhaul is completed.

Don Wilner was misinformed, as we sent this proposal by letter to the county commissioners April 14. They assigned it to the planning department for study and recommendation. No doubt, they will hold a public hearing.

Finally, we believe a good idea should be considered and judged on its merits. Public safety and suitability are matters for impartial study and evaluation, not emotional guesswork, cynical distortion and hearsay.

In the final analysis, this one promises good things for a whole community, and favors no individual or group. It is worth a try.

Joseph A. Stein
Gale Peterson
Zig Zag

Nix heliport

Mr. Winston Kurth
Asst. Director
Dept. of Environmental Services
902 Abernathy Road
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Be heard

I want to thank all the citizens of the mountain communities who took the time to come to the informational forum on the proposed Zig Zag Heliport.

I was proud of the concerns that they expressed over the potential use of "public" park land for a commercial venture and for their concerns over its proximity to our school and senior center.

I want to also thank Ken Blackburn for acting as moderator at the heliport meeting that allowed both sides to present their cases.

For those unable to attend the Friday meeting, there are petitions at many local mountain businesses against the proposed heliport.