

Lockheed permit denied

By JAMIE MARKS
Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ — The Board of Supervisors sent a message to U.S. and Soviet arms-talk negotiators early this morning — Santa Cruz will live without Trident II in its back yard.

Voting 3-2 after a five-hour public hearing at Santa Cruz High School, supervisors denied a grading permit to Lockheed Missiles and Space Co. The permit was a prelude to Lockheed's plan to construct a

large D-5 manufacturing building in which a component of the Trident II nuclear missile was to be built for the Navy.

After the vote, Lockheed General Manager Vern Smith said the company is still "considering options B, C and D. Give us a couple of days to decide."

Lockheed options include filing a lawsuit, putting the D-5 manufacturing in another building or moving the operation to their Santa Clara facility, which would

transfer some of the firm's 370 employees over the hill.

Although the board majority was legally compelled to restrict their denial to environmental grounds, it was undeniable that the greater issue of nuclear weapons also weighed in the decision.

Making the motion to deny, San Lorenzo Valley Supervisor Joe Cucchiara said, "There are significant and reasonable land-use reasons to deny the permit."

Immediately after his motion passed,

Cucchiara read a quote from Albert Einstein, that said, "Our representatives in New York, in Paris or in Moscow depend ultimately on decisions made in the village square. From there must come America's voice. A message to humanity from a nation of human beings."

It was greeted with resounding applause.

Chairman Gary Patton said, "Somehow we must find a way to eliminate these

Please see back of section

Lockheed permit

Continued from Page A1

weapons." He followed with an explanation of the environmental reasons he would deny the permit.

Joining Patton and Cucchiara was Aptos Supervisor Robley Levy. They denied Lockheed's application to grade 14,600 cubic yards of soil at the Empire Grade facility on five grounds:

- Granting the permit would endanger the health, safety and welfare of the public;
- The permit violates the Master Use Permit, granted in 1979, which said large, mature trees should be protected;
- The permit represents an expanded use, which can't be found consistent with the General Plan (the building is three times larger than other facilities at the site);
- The Lockheed environmental impact report of 1977 did not address the issues of added traffic, energy requirements and related construction of a D-5 manufacturing plant;
- The expanded use has not been fully assessed.

The planning staff had recommended approval, but the public testimony was weighted heavily against the permit. Much of it was a repeat of the 3½ hour Planning Commission hearing in November.

Speaker after speaker implored the supervisors to take a stand against nuclear weapons manufacturing here by rejecting Lockheed's application. Many also argued along the land-use lines. Every

time a point on their side was made, they waved green flags.

There were many employees and supporters of Lockheed in the audience, who urged supervisors to consider the jobs that could be lost if the permit was rejected.

Lockheed attorney Robert Bosso opened the hearing by saying, "What this is is a simple grading permit for a building the size of a common supermarket, about 31,000 square feet."

Lockheed General Manager Smith, a former mayor of Santa Cruz, held the component Lockheed is to build in his hand as he addressed supervisors.

The part is an energy transfer device that's used to separate the various stages of a missile. It looked like a common electrical cord.

Smith explained the large building was needed to house the computers and machines that would be used in the operation.

During the many hours of testimony, the only rise from supervisors came after law professor Anne Fagan-Ginger argued that the permit should be turned down on constitutional grounds that prior international treaties haven't been upheld.

Supervisor Dan Forbus said the argument was "an insult to my intelligence."

"Every generation has to learn to live with things that will destroy it. First-strike weapons are not that bad. The safety and welfare of the general public is best served in the world today by having a Trident missile to protect us."

Peter Klotz-Chamberlin, one of the organizers of the Lockheed protest, said he was "very pleased" with the outcome.