

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor Editor

STUART TONKINSON
Catherine Cowan
ANJETTA McQUEEN
JANET OLSON
JAMI WHITE
ANDY TRINCIA

Managing Editor
Associate Editor
Production Editor
University Editor
News Editor
State and National Editor

LORETTA GRANTHAM
MARK POWELL
LEE ROBERTS
ELIZABETH ELLEN
SHARON SHERIDAN
LARRY CHILDRESS

City Editor
Business Editor
Sports Editor
Arts Editor
Features Editor
Photo Editor

It's the students' affair

The Oct. 9 firing of Campus Y Associate Director George Gamble may prove to have

board opinion

been the straw that broke the camel's back. First, students are angry that a well-respected man — with whom they have worked and shared both trust and admiration — has been cast aside without any stated reason. But more significantly, students are angry because they had no voice in the decision.

That decision was first announced by newly appointed Campus Y Director Zenobia Hatcher-Wilson. But many members of the Campus Y have reason to believe that the decision was not made by Hatcher-Wilson alone, since the firing was affirmed by Vice Chancellor Donald Boulton and Assistant Vice Chancellor Edith Wiggins of the student affairs office. Although funding for Campus Y programs is partly appropriated by the CGC and partly gotten through fund raising, Student Affairs pays the salaries of the three full-time Campus Y employees, including those of the director and associate director.

The big bone of contention is that whoever initiated the decision to fire Gamble did so without consulting student members of the Campus Y. Neither did they consult the advisory board of the Campus Y — a group which comprises community individuals as well as students. Legally, the office of student affairs holds the right to hire and fire and is not bound to consult members of the Campus Y before making personnel decisions. But when students are so personally affected by a decision, don't they deserve to be included in the decision-making process?

Campus Y Director Zenobia Hatcher-Wilson announced the decision to fire George Gamble without giving any reasons — though at the time, under state law, she was not permitted to discuss the decision publicly. But Gamble signed a waiver of confidentiality on Oct. 28, which clearly allows Boulton, Wiggins and Hatcher-Wilson to comment on the firing if they so choose. Now members of the Campus Y feel manifestly entitled to a full explanation; they are calling for the office of student affairs to account for the decision.

Tensions between Campus Y members and the Student Affairs office mounted late last spring, when Chancellor Boulton appointed Hatcher-Wilson as director of the Campus Y over the contrary recommendations of four search committees. Two of the committees recommended Gamble as their first choice for the position while none recommended Hatcher-Wilson first. The final decision to appoint Hatcher-Wilson was made after students had departed for the summer.

Some students believe that Boulton's hiring of Hatcher-Wilson was intended to help re-establish the Campus Y's

affiliation with the national YWCA. The advisory board of the Campus Y chose to disaffiliate last year, noting that the YWCA has a distinctly Christian charter and that it does not allow men to vote on policy — and, more importantly, that it may be illegal for a state-funded organization to subscribe to a Christian charter.

Jennifer Ayer and David Brown, Campus Y co-presidents at the time, sent notification of the decision to disaffiliate to Vice Chancellor Boulton, who failed to respond in any way. The Campus Y then deliberately allowed its national dues to fall into arrears, thus marking a somewhat official disaffiliation. But Hatcher-Wilson has made it apparent to some Campus Y members that she intends to see that the organization is reaffiliated in the future.

Perhaps the office of student affairs would have members of the Campus Y believe that Gamble's firing was initiated by Hatcher-Wilson alone. However, both Wiggins and Boulton must bear the burden for the decision as well. Clearly, Boulton's decision to hire Hatcher-Wilson as director of the Campus Y revealed an obvious negligence of student wishes. Wiggins, a former director of the Campus Y herself, is likewise responsible.

The firing of George Gamble was carried out without consulting students at the Campus Y. So it seems that a pattern of student affairs action is unfolding — one which, though legally countenanced, cuts across the very grain of the student organization that it affects. The Campus Y is a student organization, one whose identity should be defined by its members, not by any outside force. The office of student affairs has no right either to dictate or insinuate the directions that student organizations ought to take; rather, student affairs ought to remain neutral, allowing student organizations to map their own directions.

Likewise, the director of the Campus Y should manage the organization as smoothly as possible — and should channel student energies constructively, not work against them when they are manifest.

This situation has far-reaching implications. Any student organization that is bound to the office of student affairs may be subject to decisions which seek to alter the very nature of the group. Students are no longer faced with a mere mandatory meal plan — a monetary subsidy to swallow. No, this development may strike to the very heart of our beliefs, the foundation of our rights to recourse and the essence of our self-respect.

Someone must answer for the firing of George Gamble. If the answers prove insufficient to those whom they most affect, then students — all students — must band together in defense of the Campus Y and in defense of their own beliefs.

To the dth degree

Only those 18 and older admitted

The University doesn't stop at Franklin Street. There happen to be two towns that can significantly influence the campus and the people on it.

And best yet, unlike their relationship with University administrators, students can have a direct voice in what leaders hold that sway — in Chapel Hill and Carrboro elections Tuesday. If you're registered in the area, it's time to vote.

To help in your decision, we're devoting the back pages today and Tuesday to the candidates for Chapel Hill mayor, Chapel Hill Town Council and Carrboro Board of Aldermen. Incumbent Mayor Jim Porto of Carrboro is running unopposed.

Today's offering, you can see (just to the right, up a little, a little more — yeah, that's it, a mayoral box without letters). And Tuesday's page will offer prepared statements by candidates for councilmen and aldermen, races in which 10 council candidates are vying for four seats and eight alderman candidates are vying for three seats.

In addition, a panel of *Daily Tar Heel* editors will endorse a candidate for Chapel Hill mayor on Tuesday. We're basing our votes on interviews we conducted Oct. 12 and on what we've read about the candidates in news stories and campaign literature. The majority opinion will run, unsigned, in the editorial column.

Dissenting editors are welcome to write a separate column consolidating their opinion as a response. This prevents any minority opinion of such a panel from being stifled, yet it maintains the collective voice of the newspaper behind the majority opinion. Arne and I plan to continue this policy toward endorsements during February's campuswide elections.

We regret that we can't do the same for the Town Council and Board of Aldermen candidates, for their positions and power are no less important than the mayor's. But we are limited by time and manpower, especially when faced with 18 candidacies. The organization and scheduling of the mayoral interviews and back-page material — in addition to news stories about forums and dead-end leads about campaign violations — already have dominated the lives of our city editor and her staff.

For all of her work during these elections, Loretta Grantham deserves many thanks.

But regardless of how we treat them editorially, each race is very important, and registered students should make every effort to participate. Too often, we're told that student views must give way to the decisions of others because we're only here a relatively short time. Take advantage of one opportunity to make your opinion count.

— DAVE SCHMIDT

Mayoral Forum

To provide readers with an additional look at the five Chapel Hill mayoral candidates, *The Daily Tar Heel* asked each candidate to answer five questions. Following are responses from Wes Hare, Beverly Kawalec and Jim Wallace. Candidates David Nash and Benjamin Saxon did not respond.

How do you feel about the extraordinary growth in Chapel Hill and Carrboro?

Hare: I don't believe anybody currently on Town Council ran on a platform of massive condo development, yet that's what's happening. Who decided on that? Who's going to benefit from it? The assumption is that there is a need to enhance the tax base and that new development is of necessity economically desirable. There are many ways for a town to increase revenues without raising additional taxes.

As mayor, for example, I will be exploring a waste resource recycling project to turn the town's trash from landfill to economic opportunity. I also propose expanded requirement of user fees to raise additional revenues. My commitment to grass-roots democracy, on this issue, means that as mayor I would be in the community working to assure that town staff and town people have the opportunity to form local neighborhood groups. I am talking here about people in a neighborhood having a chance for prior review of proposed construction. That's not happening now. Creative application of grass-roots democracy would result in cooperative interactions between town staff and community people.

The town has a responsibility to make sure that elitism is not an inevitable consequence of housing starts. The Town Council must require maximum innovation in the areas of user fees,

security deposits and available town land, including the possibility of reducing the requirements for landfill through the previously mentioned waste recycling program. Town government can continue to provide priorities and special incentives to developers of affordable housing, cooperative housing options, self-help incentives and town/community group shared housing, such as Habitat for Humanity.

Kawalec: We must make every effort to protect the livability of Chapel Hill in view of the rapid growth that is occurring. We must protect all that we like about our community including open and green spaces, the pedestrian orientation and the charm of the village atmosphere. Many efforts are already under way to ensure this protection, including:

- establishing joint planning
- coordinating the Capital Improvements Plan with Orange Water and Sewer Authority, the schools and other governments in the region
- revising the Land Use Plan
- devising a means to control the pace of development
- refining the design manual
- reserving and acquiring open space
- establishing an entryway district
- revising the sign ordinance
- adopting a tree protection ordinance

• establishing a storm management system
• adopting a public facilities ordinance.
As mayor, I would guide all of these efforts through to completion as quickly as possible.

Further, I propose revising the Land Use Intensity System to require that on every piece of land developed, a portion is maintained as undisturbed and that only a portion is covered with impervious surfaces.

Wallace: The local area, including Chapel Hill and Carrboro, attracts people of every description and money in great quantities. As a result, we are faced with a critical situation regarding the increased threat to public safety and the unwanted consequences of explosive development. Criminal activities appear to be on the rise (nine murders in Orange County this year; two of them in Chapel Hill last week), and the congestion due to rapid development along inadequate highways and streets is now a commonplace. While this process cannot be terminated, I believe that it can be managed.

Beefing up the police arrangements in the area will be of help toward greater public safety. Overhauling an excessively permissive Development Ordinance by down-zoning many areas now carrying high-density identification will enable us to resume control of the erosive development now taking place.

Do you support the Rosemary Square project?

Hare: It seems to me that Rosemary Square is a creative idea that could be made better. A smaller-scale development plan would be more appropriate for Chapel Hill because there is a consensus in Chapel Hill to preserve as much of the "village" atmosphere as possible. Their proposed three-level basement parking lot will definitely add to traffic congestion. Instead of the traditional design process, whereby an architect is selected by the municipality, I'd like to see the design process open to the townspeople, including school children and retired citizens. Architects are naturally inclined to overdesign because the larger the project, the bigger the fee.

If Chapel Hill held a design competition open to the public, we'd be more likely to arrive at a design appropriately scaled for our town. Furthermore, such a design competition has good educational possibilities. There is so much construction currently under way on campus and in the town that Chapel Hill seems like one big construction site. Even a good development plan should possibly be delayed until we have a chance to see how the current projects will impact on the human and other ecological resources of the community.

Kawalec: I support the current proposal

for Rosemary Square.

Four studies since 1967 have indicated the need for additional parking in downtown Chapel Hill. The council has made a major commitment to providing additional parking in three places: at Rosemary Square, at Rosemary and Church streets and at Rosemary and Columbia streets.

At the same time the council values and wants to encourage a pedestrian orientation downtown. Rosemary Square opens up the alley and the parking lot, where there are now just cars, for pedestrian use. Pedestrians will be attracted to the area by street furniture and walls to sit on, by greenery and water fountains, by shops and outdoor eating areas.

Rosemary Square rises five stories above Franklin Street and is three stories lower than the NCBN building. It is comparable in size to the University buildings across Franklin Street, and its design is beautifully sensitive to its surroundings.

The town is issuing revenue bonds to pay for its share of this project. The bonds will be repaid with revenue from the parking deck, not with property tax money.

The council has been considering a public/private project at this location for the last two years. The council has had various aspects of

this proposal on its agenda for a vote on 15 different occasions. In January 1985, the council unanimously approved the Development Agreement with the Fraser Co. Subsequently, the Fraser Co. has spent nearly \$1 million in plans and preparations.

Wallace: I oppose the Rosemary Square project. However, I favor more parking for downtown Chapel Hill. We started out, many years ago, with the idea of a simple, straightforward parking facility — above ground — that would meet our needs. In 1979, we came within 350 votes of having the citizenry authorize general obligation bonds for this purpose. We should have, at the time, immediately proceeded to revenue bonds. We did not.

Now, six years — and probably 250 percent increase in cost — later, we are going at it again. Unfortunately, the new project, while slightly increasing the available parking, vastly increases the congestion because of the hotel and the shops involved. In the beginning, we wanted to maximize parking and minimize congestion. The present plan is exactly the reverse. I know that many UNC students park in our existing lot. I am confident that the new project will be to their detriment.

Do you support a merger of Chapel Hill and Carrboro?

Hare: There will be much emotion expended on the question of a Chapel Hill-Carrboro merger. I suspect that Carrboro residents have more reservations about this issue, because Carrboro is a smaller community. However, Carrboro will not lose its identity as a refreshing, optional location, even if there is a merger. Its character is set for generations to come. What's needed is a study to get at all the hard impacts a merger would entail. If these impacts are positive, in terms of improving the quality of life and economy of both communities, then the issue should be opened for community discussion, following detailed factual analysis by staff

of both towns for comparison and cost efficiencies review.

Kawalec: The question of a Chapel Hill-Carrboro merger should be decided by a referendum by the people. Whether or not we merge, more cooperation is desirable and possible, particularly in land-use planning.

Wallace: I support a merger of Chapel Hill and Carrboro. I have done so for many years. At the time that we merged the two school

districts, I was in favor of accomplishing the whole thing. This did not occur. I favor the merger study that will, I trust, soon be under way.

Although I favor merger, I realize that this event is rather far down the road, and I will not press it at this time. There are many people in Carrboro who have conflicting views on this matter. I will vote for merger when the people of Carrboro, acting through their elected representatives, make known their wish to engage in serious merger talks with the town of Chapel Hill. I am confident that this will eventually come about.

What are your suggestions for improving traffic and parking problems?

Hare: The town must make a renewed commitment to public transit. Park-and-Ride services must be revitalized, and the town, in cooperation with the proposed Council of Neighborhoods and businessmen, must work with the University to lessen the traffic impact on downtown. The U.S. 15-501 bypass between Carrboro and Chapel Hill also needs attention because it cuts through our neighborhoods. Routing of cuts through traffic needs to be examined in terms of moving traffic through or around the town without damaging the neighborhoods or creating safety risks.

Building on the existence of community neighborhood groups and a complementary Council of Neighborhoods which would be formed from local groups. I believe interaction can then occur among the business community, town government, the University and the townspeople in a balanced way. The issue is (now) totally out of balance.

Kawalec: We need to provide a road system that will keep the commuter traffic off the neighborhood streets. This means we need to provide adequate arterial roads. We need to keep through traffic out of town all together. This means we need to complete an outer loop. We need to intercept traffic as it approaches town and provide ride lots and transit to the center of town. We need to ensure the viability of the transit system.

The town will have to work cooperatively with the State Board of Transportation to accomplish these goals. As mayor, I would energetically pursue a good working relationship with state officials to insure their consideration of Chapel Hill's needs.

Wallace: One-way streets should be a last-resort "solution." Properly placed park-ride lots are a necessity. Expansion of circumferential routes is a must. The four-laning of U.S. 15-501 will come soon after the coliseum opens.

This will expedite the movement of larger volumes of traffic with less noise and congestion. The completion of I-40 will enable us to divert all through traffic, north and south, around Chapel Hill. Thus, trucks and other vehicles, not having an origin or destination in Chapel Hill, can turn at the Blue Cross-Blue Shield building if they are going south and emerge on Lystra Church Road in Chatham County on U.S. 15-501, once again. Similarly, traffic moving north can take the same route and avoid Chapel Hill all together. Thus, good-bye to the chicken trucks forever!

The greatest single bottle-neck in traffic in Chapel Hill is the short stretch of Columbia Street between the Naval Armory and the Carolina Inn. We need one more lane there, just eight feet, to make four lanes. This can be accomplished with minimal damage. The roundabout now in effect is extremely cumbersome and will result, I fear, in accidents that could be avoided were we to do the obvious.

What will be the worst problem that Chapel Hill must face in the coming year?

Hare: For me, the most crucial issue is that Chapel Hill is increasingly becoming a town dominated by intellectual elites and bureaucratic structures. This dominance inevitably results in a lessening of the cultural diversity, which I value for myself and my family. I want Chapel Hill to provide the kind of experiential, cultural interactions that people must have in order to be able to survive and be nurtured and nurtured in this complex world. In order for this to happen, certain things must be identified as priorities by those in town government. The following statement of values reflects the priorities of my campaign: ecological wisdom, non-violence, decentralization, grass-roots democracy, cooperative economics, inclusiveness, cooperative community, future focus, and personal, social and global responsibility.

If Chapel Hill has not already enacted a complete divestment policy for South Africa, that will be an immediate priority for me as mayor. I support Proposition Paz as an additional reflection of the unique circumstances of Chapel Hill as a community leader in the state on these critical Central American issues. I think the issue of violence, most recently evidenced against women in particular but also against all minority groups in our community, goes beyond the obvious commitment to additional street lighting

and police foot patrols. It requires deliberate and thoughtful discussion at the community, administrative and policymaking levels within the town. This discussion must necessarily involve the University and other public institutions such as schools, hospitals and etc. — grass-roots organizations. Finally, to my knowledge, no community in North Carolina has established a local Equal Rights Amendment. I think this is a necessary action for Chapel Hill to be arrived at through community discussion and action.

Kawalec: The greatest challenge for Chapel Hill in the coming years will be growing into the new role demanded of towns and cities as a result of the federal deficit reduction and tax reform efforts and as a result of state government's changing expectations for town. General Revenue Sharing, Community Development Block Grants, money for assisted housing and EPA wastewater grants are all being reduced or eliminated by the federal government. Public transit funds are threatened. State government is looking to the urban areas to finance a greater portion of their needed roads. We are passing out of the era of "grantsmanship," when towns needed to know how to attract outside support, and moving into an era of self-sufficiency. Local government leaders must recognize this new

and respond with initiative and resourcefulness.

Wallace: Chapel Hill, during the coming year, and for the next several years, is faced with the critical problem of saving itself from being engulfed by the extraordinary developmental pressures, which are going on in the whole Research Triangle area. If we should fail, in the next two or three years, to stake out what we consider to be essential to the health, identity and vitality of Chapel Hill, the place, as we have known it, will have disappeared.

We should remember, I think, that we started here when the General Assembly sent out a search party, under the leadership of William Richardson David, to find a suitable place for the location of a state university. Thus, there is no question about our origin and Chapel Hill's origin.

My concern is that we are in danger of losing this identity. The Chapel Hill that past students knew, and that present students know, will soon disappear unless major corrective action is effected. After all, there are many students here who, in the succession of days, might wish to send their own children to this place. I would like to feel that there is a fair chance that those other generations will be able to enjoy and love this remarkable spot.