

oregon daily emerald

An Independent Newspaper

Vol. 79, No. 151

Eugene, Oregon 97403

Wednesday, May 10, 1978

Candidates present similar concerns

By CAROLYN BEAVER
Of the Emerald

ASUO presidential candidates Jeff Warren and Ramon Herrera spent an hour Tuesday during the presidential "debate" agreeing with each other.

The major differences in the two candidate's comments were in opening remarks. Herrera said he saw himself as an "alternative" candidate and continued that he felt he could "turn the tide in the ASUO to one of inclusion (for students) and not of exclusion."

Warren listed his previous ASUO experience and said because of his year on the Student University Affairs Board (SUAB) and the Incidental Fee Committee (IFC), he thought he had "a good working knowledge of the nuts and bolts of this University."

Yet even in the opening remarks, Herrera said they were "concerned with the same issues" and that their differences lay in "technique and style."

Both candidates said the ASUO's

Presidential choices reveal few differences on issues, only style



ASUO presidential candidates Jeff Warren and Ramon Herrera (foreground) held an open debate Tuesday in the EMU Forum, but they didn't ended up debating all that much. They agreed on almost all the issues, including the role of the three ASUO branches, legislative lobbying and stabilizing tuition. The difference lay in their methods of accomplishing their goals. Everything went very smoothly, with both candidates ending up calling each other "good guys."

and the relationship between the three branches of the ASUO brought up by this year's ASUO executive and programs.

Each candidate envisioned the ASUO executive's relationship with programs as circular rather than hierarchal.

"I don't see a system where the ASUO executive is on the top. It should be in the middle," said Herrera.

Warren said the role should be "one of cooperation. There's no place for edicts from the executive. The ASUO was never intended to sit on top."

As for the executive's role in University affairs, Warren said SUAB's "whole intent is to handle University affairs" and if elected, he said he would make the SUAB chair in charge of those affairs for the ASUO.

Warren said to make the SUAB more effective it's "necessary for members to take their job seriously and do their work." Herrera said SUAB was the "most misunderstood of the three

Herrera says he'll 'turn the tide in the ASUO to one of inclusion.'

largest problem is apathy. Warren advocated "opening up the whole process," and Herrera stressed making the ASUO more visible because "the majority of students are confused about the responsibility of each person" in the ASUO.

Herrera also favored expanding student involvement in the ASUO and suggested ASUO executive members attend various program and University administrative meetings weekly to improve communication.

Again, both candidates addressed next year's legislative session in their opening remarks and their approaches were similar. Tuition stabilization was each candidate's goal; Herrera mentioned trying to secure tax credits for students attending college. Both discussed child care for students and Warren talked about sponsoring legislation to release faculty evaluations.

Warren and Herrera then were questioned by ASUO Vice-Pres. Molly Devlin on issues including legislative lobbying

Warren says he knows 'the nuts and bolts of this University.'

branches" and that "there hasn't been much of a job to do as far as University affairs."

The candidates agreed that the IFC is the ASUO branch most students are familiar with and said they would continue a strong relationship between the executive and the IFC. Warren said he thought the role of the IFC "had been blown out of proportion," however.

Herrera and Warren made similar statements on legislative lobbying as well. Both felt a strong working relationship with the Oregon Student Lobby was necessary, but also felt the ASUO should lobby for issues on its own.

Even the candidates see their similarities and are not bothered by them. As the debate closed, Warren said that if he lost he "would have no problems working with Ramon. I mean, you can tell he's a good guy."

Herrera answered, to audience laughter and applause, "Thank you, Jeff. You're a good guy, too."

Proposal may lead to Trojan closure

By RUSSELL LINEBARGER
Of the Emerald

The state Energy Facilities Siting Council heard testimony in Eugene Tuesday on a proposal that would limit spent-fuel storage, a move which could eventually lead to the closure of the Trojan nuclear plant.

The siting council's focus was outlined early in the hearing by Chairer Marie Dresler who stated the criteria:

- The propriety...from legal and other standpoints of adopting such a rule.
- The consequence of adopting such a

rule on the use and further development of nuclear power in Oregon.

- Whether reasonable and effective alternatives can be effected.

- The specific federal action needed to permit additional on-site storage.

- The environmental impacts and public health and safety impacts of such a rule.

The council began hearing testimony from both sides on the issue.

Don Solitz spoke for limiting the amount of waste saying Portland General Electric (PGE) had not shown "responsible management" in disposing of the waste and that

federal "promises of 'safety'" were unreliable.

Solitz suggested that "for every fuel rod that comes into the state...a fuel rod should go out of the state."

Don Chalmers, candidate to the 40th Congressional District, said that the Department of Energy claims "PGE could save money by closing down Trojan for the next ten years."

According to Chalmers, "Hydropower would generate 80 percent of the state's needs." The current cost of electricity obtained from Trojan is about 18 mills, but it is

sold "down south" at a rate of 5 mills, which means Oregonians are picking up the difference of 13 mills reflected in their rates, he says.

Brad Hopkins, a student of nuclear engineering, offered some arguments against the limitation of spent fuel storage saying the alternatives to nuclear power were unimpressive:

- Coal-fired plants are as expensive (as nuclear) and as much a detriment to the environment as nuclear was purported to

(Continued on Page 8A)