

Bicyclists, pedestrians cross risky paths

Bicycles are not yet classified as lethal weapons in Eugene. Most often, the bicyclist is the injured party (or worse, the tragic statistic) when cars and bikes tangle in traffic.

Campus congestion has created a new transportation tangle — between cyclists and pedestrians — which has also caused injuries. Thousands of students who traverse the campus daily are dodging bicyclists who use the same thoroughfares. It is no contest. When push leads to shove, the momentum is on the side of the cyclists.

The 13th Avenue corridor between Kincaid and University streets is the most potentially threatening area. On any given day, one can observe several near-collisions, some of which result in an angry exchange of curses and threats.

Such a problem hardly seems insurmountable, yet bureaucratic inertia strikes at both simple and complex problems alike. The problem is simply defined and the solution seems equally within reach: Get out the white paint and put in a bike-lane or two. Unfortunately, this would lack

the sophistication that our committee-centered mentality seems to demand.

Dave Roe, from the University's planning office, assures us that action is being taken. The campus planning committee recommended a comprehensive bike plan to the administration last June, according to Roe. The proposal provides

ours

guidelines for a network of campus bike-lanes, as well as suggestions to increase the number of bike racks.

Roe says the administration has endorsed the concepts of the plan, but pointed out that implementation would involve expenditures requiring further discussion. That discussion still continues. Roe also says that he will be contacting Frank Anderson, chairer of the transportation sub-committee, to arrange a meeting of committee members. Roe thinks the session will be

scheduled for sometime next month. He is reasonably confident that the proposal generated at this meeting will be immediately approved.

We endorse any proposal which will make it safer to walk on campus, as long as it provides fair access for those travelling on two wheels. However, the process seems ridiculously laborious because so many issues are tied up together. By trying to deal with several issues at once, a committee ends up choking on its own red tape. This approach also guarantees slow going on the administration's end, since its financial concern increases with the magnitude of a given problem (and its accompanying proposal for solution).

In fairness, we agree that a good solution to any problem does require careful formulation. But it is also evident that the more committees involved in generating solutions, the more time and energy is wasted by all.

Walking across campus should be a healthy activity, not an exercise in frustration and survival — at least 'til the winter monsoon season comes to town.

yours

Hanford result

The "Hanover" nuclear waste dump to which you refer in your Oct. 8 editorial is in reality the Hanford Nuclear reservation, home of the Manhattan Project, whose efforts were responsible for the annihilation of two civilian populations on the islands of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As an intern in the Legislature for Rep. Rick Bauman, I had an opportunity to investigate the radioactive pollution of our environment that results from Hanford.

During the 1960's nuclear reactors used to make atomic weapons turned the Columbia River into the most radioactive river in the world because they used the river for cooling water.

In addition, more than 450,000 gallons of highly toxic nuclear waste has leaked from the storage tanks that are now 30 years old and were not built to contain the waste for such long periods of time. This waste leaks into the Columbia River Basin and radioactive material is present in the river even today.

Despite this, the City of Portland is planning to drill a series of wells along the Columbia River to supplement their water supply. They plan to dilute the contaminated water with Bull Run water to make it acceptable to the public. They do not even address the health risks that may be associated with radioactivity in the water.

As head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Gov. Dixie Lee Ray played an integral part in the operation of the Hanford

site. In your editorial, you fail to point out that we are approaching an election year, that the polls show that the governor is going to have a close race for the first time in a long time and that her philosophy of a "nuclear solution" to our energy needs is likely to come under strong attack.

Despite this information, you commend her for her "action to protect the welfare of the people of Washington" when in fact she is responsible for the danger in the first place.

Gov. Reagan also supports regional energy legislation that would take away local control over our energy future and grant it to a czar-like federal bureaucrat, and that would also pay the cost of tremendous cost overruns that have occurred at the two new nuclear plants now under construction at Hanford. This legislation would pay the costs of the plants whether or not they have ever produced electricity.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you for your open-mindedness in printing this letter. I know that these are technical issues but I would hope that you would do more adequate research for future editorials. In an attempt to provide students with accurate information about crucial subjects such as these, SOLAR, a new statewide student organization, is sponsoring forums where we will bring knowledgeable people to campus to talk with students about these important matters. I hope that you can attend.

Bob Jensen
Sophomore, Political Science

Letter off-base

In response to Cal Fager's letter in the Emerald on Oct. 9.

I am not one to customarily direct letters to the editor of the Emerald or any other newspaper. I fear that I am a political amateur and often misinformed, so I shy away from sharing my confusion with others. However the letter printed in the October 9th ODE, written by Mr. Fager, contains some misinformation that should be clarified.

I am a union member, formerly an officer. I am not a union activist. My response does not represent the official opposition to Fager's letter. I too have been disturbed by inflammatory rhetoric. It seems however that Fager resorted to the rhetoric that he so despises, for he has only given a cursory examination of the facts.

There are two misconceptions in his argument. First, he accepts the statistics in Olum's letter at face value. Olum's letter contains a statistical comparison of wage rates by the hour for GTFs at the University and at other state supported schools.

Hourly wage rates are based on the assumption that a certain number of hours have been spent on the job. GTFs at the universities cited by Olum are allotted 20 hours per week to complete their jobs; whereas, many GTFs at the University are allotted only 15. The GTFs at the other institutions are performing tasks, class instruction, grading, and office hours, comparable to the ones that the GTFs at the University are performing.

Hourly wage rates are meaningless under these circumstances. My presentation is also a simplification, since no two GTFs work the same amount of time for a similar task. Duties vary from GTF to GTF. Work load is an extremely complex issue. Olum's statistics, although accurate as statistics, (perhaps), are deceptive in attempting to compare situations. As a critical thinker, Fager should realize that numbers can lie.

Second, Fager has no comprehension of the health care issue. I chaired a joint GTF-University committee that investigated this issue in the

Winter-Spring of 1979. Neither the University nor the GTF can negotiate for a GTF health care plan until several Oregon statutes are amended. The GTF made a strong effort to amend these statutes during the past legislative session. The University offered no lobbying assistance. The effort failed. Thus, the issue of salary becomes crucial in aiding the GTF in buying health care, an expensive proposition on a fixed income.

I only offer this letter in an effort to clear up some facts which fueled Fager's opinion. He wishes to have a say in GTF decisions. I recommend that he join the GTF. It is my opinion that there will be a strike vote sometime this term. By law, only union members can vote. If Fager fears the irrational acts of a radical group of GTFs, he should become a voting member and use his rhetorical abilities to express his point of view. Only when all GTFs are in a position to vote does the union represent the will of the unit.

Pete Wallace
GTF, History

theirs



WELL, I REMEMBER SWIMMING IN THE POND... AND I REMEMBER LOOKING UP AND SEEING THIS SCREAMING MONSTER WITH HUGE RABBIT TEETH COMING AT ME WITH A CANOE PADDLE... BUT THE REST IS A BLANK.

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and try to print all letters containing fair comment on ideas and topics of concern or interest to the University community. Letters must be typewritten, using 65 char-

acter margins, and should be triple-spaced. Letters must be signed, the author's field of study (or faculty status) noted and should include address and phone number when possible.