

It will be cold and rainy tonight and Wednesday with the high in the upper 40s. Chance of rain is 70 percent through Wednesday.

The Associated Press rankings of the Top Twenty basketball teams came out Monday. See page 5.

## Bus fares may rise in fall 1980

By EVELYN SAHR  
Staff Writer

The Chapel Hill Transportation Board is considering a proposal which, if also approved by the Board of Aldermen, would increase adult bus fare 63 percent and increase bus-pass prices by perhaps 56 percent over a five-year period.

The plan would increase bus prices beginning in fall 1980, from the present 25 cents to an eventual 40 cents. It also would increase the cost of bus passes on a fixed discount rate basis accordingly. The board will vote on the proposal Jan. 30 and will then pass it on to the aldermen.

Under the proposal's discount rate schedule an annual bus pass could cost as much as \$70 five years from now. An annual pass now is \$40. The University buys a number of passes and resells them to students for \$36, a \$4 discount.

"This proposal hinges on the fact that the fare-box fare in Chapel Hill is very low in comparison to the rest of the state and, in fact, is one of the lowest in the nation," said Janet D'Ignazio, Chapel Hill transportation planner on Thursday.

"Most transit fares in other parts of the country are already up and about 35 to 40 cents, and in a very short time, at the present bus-fare prices in Chapel Hill, it really won't be worth it to collect fares when you look at the staff time and paper work required to record them," she said.

Another reason for the proposal, according to D'Ignazio, is to coordinate the fare and bus-pass prices because they bear no relation to each other at present.

"We think that there should be some fixed discount rate and that this discount should be based on the length of time a person buys the pass for," D'Ignazio said.

The proposal suggests that an annual pass be discounted 50 percent from the farebox price; and academic-year pass discounted 45 percent; a six-month pass discounted 40 percent; a three-month pass discounted 30 percent and a 40-ride ticket discounted 20 percent.

"We feel that these are reasonable discounts," D'Ignazio said, "but, even so, they would make the bus passes more expensive than they are now. Right now an annual pass is discounted 65 percent, which is a terrifically good deal."

D'Ignazio stressed that the proposal "is neither cast nor concrete," and that before any decision is made the matter will be discussed with both the Board of Aldermen and the University.

"We are in the process now of starting our annual negotiations with the vice chancellor's office to determine to what extent the University will be able to contribute to the bus system next year," D'Ignazio said. "The University was given a copy of the transportation department's memo to review and I've heard they had some hesitation about it, but nothing definite as yet."

A representative of the University's business and finance department said, however, that the administration has no opinion on the matter yet.

"You have to realize that we are proposing some radical things insofar as fare increases are concerned," D'Ignazio said. "It does look like we are socking it to the bus riders. But we are trying to be careful, because our ultimate goal is to keep ridership high and, if we find that in order to keep ridership high we need to change the proposal somewhat, we'd be willing to do so," D'Ignazio said.

The Transportation Board also included in its memo a suggestion to offer the bus-pass purchaser the option to pay an additional amount, possibly \$10, so their pass would be transferrable.

Another suggestion to increase ridership on the U and S routes, would make a special pass valid only on the U and S bus routes and would cost half the yearly pass price.



The old Tri-Delt house on Pittsboro Street  
...now houses Zeta Tau Alpha sorority

## Increased popularity brings three new sororities to UNC

By MARLA CARPENTER  
Staff Writer

The Office of Student Affairs recently has had to wrestle with a new problem of supply and demand: too few sororities coupled with a soaring interest in joining them.

Each year, more women have registered for that year's fall rush than registered the previous year. With each sorority trying to maintain a balance between house size and pledge quota, an increasing number of women were being denied an opportunity to make a bid. Informal rush, held one week after formal rush and again in the spring, hardly helped alleviate the problem.

The solution? On the recommendation of the Faculty-Student Committee on Sororities, Donald Boulton, vice chancellor for Student Affairs, invited several national sororities to make presentations on the UNC campus. Of these, Zeta

Tau Alpha, Delta Phi Epsilon and Zeta Phi Beta were selected to colonize at the University.

According to Sharon Mitchell, Panhellenic adviser, the committee evaluated all prospective sororities on the basis of national size, financial strength, energy and number of alumnae in the area.

Becky Burbage, out-going president of the Panhellenic Council, said the decision to colonize was a result of increased demand and a desire to lessen the number of women being closed out of sororities—in other words, to increase their opportunities. Figures show that in formal rush of Panhellenic sororities, 652 women registered and 314 pledged in 1975, 657 registered and 294 pledged in 1976, 693 registered and 310 pledged in 1977 and 794 registered and 409 pledged (including new sororities) in 1978.

See SORORITIES on page 2

## Begins negotiations

# Board delays action on Press Building

By CAROL HANNER  
and MIKE COYNE  
Staff Writers

Town and University officials may have avoided a head-on collision in court when they agreed Monday to negotiate a compromise on the proposed UNC Press Building.

The Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen voted unanimously Monday night to delay a decision on whether to take legal action against UNC on the proposed building.

The vote came after Historic District Commission Chairman Joe Herzenberg asked the board to defer action on the issue because the University agreed Monday morning to negotiate with the commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The Press Building has caused controversy during the past months because the town's Historic District Commission and concerned residents do not feel the structure is appropriate for the neighborhood. Buildings planned for the Chapel Hill Historic District require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the commission before construction can begin.

Controversy heightened when UNC expressed plans to go ahead with the building without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Town officials have said the certificate is binding, and that the University cannot build without it.

One opinion issued from the attorney general's office said the University, as a state agency, is exempt from historic district requirements. A second opinion from the office said the issue is not clearcut and must be decided by the legislature.

"We do believe there is a principle involved, and that principle is the integrity of the Historic District Commission," Herzenberg told the board.

Herzenberg told the aldermen he took an informal poll of commission members and they were willing to reconsider the Press Building issue.

Aldermen expressed approval of the University's decision to re-apply to the Historic District Commission.

Epting said the University's action indicates it agrees that town boards should have jurisdiction or it wouldn't be trying to comply with the Historic District Commission ordinance.

Alderman Gerry Cohen said he was pleased the Historic District Commission ordinance was going to remain intact, but he said the matter of town boards' jurisdiction over the University would probably come up again.

Cohen said he would like to see the issue resolved now.

The board will delay making any decision on the Press Building until negotiations between UNC and the Historic District Commission have been completed.

Earlier Monday, Herzenberg, Mayor James C. Wallace, Aldermen Marilyn Boulton and Robert



DTH/Robert Kennedy

Joe Herzenberg  
...asked aldermen for delay

Epting, UNC Board of Trustees Chairman Tom Lambeth and John L. Temple, vice chancellor for business and finance, met to discuss the issue.

Temple said UNC would work with the town to try to design the facility to comply with Historic District Commission criteria.

Temple said the possibility of court action was not ruled out.

"(The town and the University) could go forward with the purpose of getting the judgment of the court—not a lawsuit," Temple said. "I would hope we can avoid the town and UNC suing each other per se."

"In a matter of a couple of weeks we'll know whether a compromise can be reached," Boulton said.

She said the Historic District Commission would advise UNC on the changes it must make to bring the Press Building in conformity with the surrounding neighborhood.

## Carter budget proposal draws criticism

WASHINGTON (AP)—President Carter urged Congress Monday to let him spend more for defense but cut some job programs in a \$532 billion budget that is stirring controversy within the president's own party.

Describing his budget as "lean and austere," Carter said he plans to reduce this year's \$37.4 billion budget deficit to \$29 billion in 1980, during the presidential campaign. The deficit would fall to \$1 billion in 1981.

"Real sacrifices are to be made if we are to overcome inflation," Carter said in his budget message. "I have made every effort to spread that burden fairly and objectively."

Liberals within the Democratic Party, particularly Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., have criticized proposed cuts in school lunch, jobs and other programs. "The budget asks the poor, the black, the sick, the young, the cities and the unemployed to bear a disproportionate share of the...reductions," Kennedy said Monday.

"The budget contains wasteful increases in defense spending and no reductions in wasteful tax spending," such as tax breaks for the wealthy, Kennedy said. And House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill found fault with proposals to pare some job-creation programs and

reduce some Social Security benefits. He told reporters: "I didn't become speaker of the House to dismantle programs I fought for all my life."

Predictably, Carter was also under fire from Republicans. Sen. William V. Roth, R-Del., co-author of the last year's Kemp-Roth tax cut bill, said, "To describe Carter's budget as lean is like looking at the package of bacon in the supermarket—you don't see that fat until you open the package."

However, Carter was commended by Rep. Robert Giaino, D-Conn., chairman of the House Budget Committee.

"I believe it will meet with cooperation generally in the Budget Committee and the Congress," Giaino said.

As he signed his budget message Monday, Carter said, "I believe at this point it is fair to say that the response has been very encouraging."

Carter's decision to fight inflation with an austere budget that cuts some domestic social programs follows advice from his political adviser, Patrick Caddell, who told the president-elect in 1976 that a second term depended on substantial support from middle-income suburbanites who view federal spending and inflation as major problems.

At the same time, Carter and his chief political lieutenant, Hamilton Jordan, say the anti-inflation effort will help poor people more than they will be harmed by the cuts in social spending.

Carter says his cuts will fall hardest on people who are not in desperate need. For example, he says subsidies for school lunches will be reduced for children of middle- and upper-income families but maintained for children of the poor.

He said his budget includes \$4.5 billion more for the poor, with increases in programs such as food stamps, Medicaid, subsidized housing, education, urban grants and help in providing food for underprivileged women and children.

One group of college students would no longer get federal grants to pay their tuition, but others would for the first time get subsidized loans to pay education bills. The number of college students eligible for Basic Opportunity grants that provide up to \$1,800 for education costs is projected to drop in fiscal 1980. The reason, the budget says, is that inflation will push more families into higher income brackets and thus make them ineligible.



Edward Kennedy  
...opposes Carter budget

## Allen Jernigan declares 'DTH' editor candidacy

By PAM HILDEBRAN  
Staff Writer

Allen Jernigan, a junior English and history major from Raleigh, announced his candidacy Monday for editor of the *Daily Tar Heel*.

"I'd like to see a complete *Daily Tar Heel*," Jernigan said. "The *Tar Heel* is the only paper most students read, and I'd like to see it as the only paper they need to read. To do this, you need to make distribution work."

Jernigan called for a three-point approach to improve distribution: to study the corridors of student traffic across campus and strategically locate distribution boxes; to add one person to the distribution staff to refill often-used boxes as they empty; and to make certain enough copies of the paper are printed.

"The editor and the editorial page should be responsible to the students," Jernigan said. He said the *DTH* has the responsibility to probe issues such as racism and sexism, and he would like to

hire a full-time staff of columnists for the editorial page.

Jernigan called for a fresher approach to news and features. He proposed a campus-briefs column to give needed coverage to events of campus bureaucracy; expansion of coverage to a wider range of local, state and campus events; acknowledgement of women's basketball and soccer as major sports; and provision of a weekly scoreboard of intramural and club sports.

"I'd like to broaden coverage away from mundane things such as CGC and the council of governors," Jernigan said. "I'd also like to refocus features toward students and student lifestyles."

Concerning the financial stability of the *DTH*, Jernigan said he would call for stricter financial accountability, increased advertising revenue and better money management.

"I'd like to do away with four-page papers," Jernigan said. "Four-page papers are caused by the drop in ad



Allen Jernigan

revenue after Christmas; by running tighter money-saving papers in the fall, we could expand four-page papers in the spring to six pages."

Jernigan has served as a photographer, summer editor, photography editor and columnist for the *Daily Tar Heel*. He has written for *Nutshell* magazine, the *ACC Basketball Handbook* and *Cellar Door*.

## N.C. nuclear power companies not affected by new safety study

By JIM HUMMEL  
Staff Writer

Officials of North Carolina's two major power suppliers said Monday that a decision by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to withdraw its endorsement of a widely used safety study on nuclear power will have no effect on construction or operation of their nuclear power plants.

Spokesmen for Duke Power Co. and Carolina Power and Light Co. said the licensing of their plants had nothing to do with the safety study, known as the Rasmussen report.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission withdrew its endorsement of the Rasmussen report after a panel criticized parts of the study.

"The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decision about the report will not have any regulatory bearing on us," said Angie Howard, director of energy information for Duke Power Co.

"I really don't expect NRC's decision to have a great deal of effect nationwide either," Howard said.

"I'm sure nuclear opponents will try to make an issue of the situation, but from a technical and licensing standpoint it will not have much effect."

"I don't think that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission refuted the Rasmussen report," said Ellison Clary of Carolina Power and Light Co.

"They questioned the statistics, but it's still a viable report," he said.

The Rasmussen report is named for Norman Rasmussen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who led a group that issued the report in 1975. The study found the danger of nuclear power plants was very low when compared with other man-made or natural hazards.

"The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has not essentially repudiated the Rasmussen report as a whole," said Frank Ingram of the NRC public affairs division.

"There was study conducted last fall by the Lewis panel that found certain weaknesses in the Rasmussen report," Ingram said. "Because of certain questions raised by the Lewis panel, we want to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the report," he said. Ingram said the panel was very critical of certain parts of the Rasmussen report but also found favorable parts.

As a result, the NRC has adopted a neutral position, according to Ingram, neither endorsing nor rejecting the report. The Lewis panel was headed by Harold Lewis of the University of California at Santa Barbara and found a number of shortcomings in the 1975 report.

The panel accused the research staff that drafted the Rasmussen report of failing to adequately assess the probability of nuclear accidents and said the report "greatly understated" the range of chances for a nuclear accident.

Concern about the validity of the Rasmussen report was originally by Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz.