

High-tech center headed for ballot

By PAUL BEATTY
Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ — A shot of adrenalin was pumped into the Nov. 8 ballot Tuesday night when the progressive council majority set two measures for election.

City voters will have their say on a proposed electronics park at UCSC and in a second measure, on whether the city should refuse to bank with institutions that do business with racially-segregated South Africa.

Both measures are seen by critics

of the majority as campaign devices to bring out the political left in November, when socialists Mayor Bruce Van Allen and Councilman Michael Rotkin are seeking re-election. Two other seats are up for the taking.

"I see this as very probably motivated by city politics," UCSC Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer said immediately following the 4-3 vote that puts his "research and development park" up for popular vote.

Rotkin blasted that criticism, saying "That is ludicrous: this is not a trivial issue to be played with like a

pawn. The people of Santa Cruz ought to speak on this as it's the most significant thing they're going to speak on in the next 10 years."

Van Allen and UCSC representatives had been meeting in an attempt to head off a ballot measure. But Van Allen announced Tuesday night that his negotiations with the university had broken down and said he came out thinking "I've been made a fool of."

He said he did not believe UCSC's representatives were negotiating "in good faith."

Van Allen said he believed the

university had already begun its campaign against the ballot measure and that it has already ordered "an elaborate public opinion poll."

Sinsheimer says he did "indirectly" order a poll to determine the community's feeling about the park.

"But, I'm rather baffled that Mayor Van Allen finds we negotiated in bad faith. I don't believe he can document that and I have to challenge him on it."

The chancellor directly challenged the mayor this morning in a letter to Van Allen: "Your statement has pub-

licly slandered the university and its representatives. I believe you owe it to the community either to document your statement or publicly to retract it."

The measure would order the council to ask Sinsheimer (again) to put plans for the high-tech center through the city's planning and zoning process. It would further ask state legislators to withhold funds for development of the electronics park until Sinsheimer agrees.

State Sen. Henry Mello, D-Watsonville, says he doesn't want to try to

put the state into a "precedent-setting position of subordinating its authority to a local agency. It would have to be done time and time again."

However, he says the state shouldn't ride roughshod over local agencies and that a vote on the electronics park will be helpful in his determination of funding for the project when it comes up under budget review in coming years.

State Assemblyman Sam Farr, D-Monterey, says he's willing to discuss it with the council, but he also wants

some legal checking done to see if the legislature can infringe on the university's constitutional protection for its development and programs.

Monday, Sinsheimer offered to let an outside arbitrator decide any "irreconcilable differences" before he would send the plans to the Board of Regents, probably in September.

Sinsheimer's park would allow research and development buildings to cover 500,000-600,000 square feet of 69 acres of land north of Crown College. At its completion 7-10 years from now, it would hire as many as 2,000 workers.

It could also cost the city \$4 million to expand the campus sewer line and use up from 3-9 percent of the city's water.

It could force the county to extend Coolidge Drive on campus, and somewhere down the line to build a road across the bucolic lands north of the city, currently called the city's "greenbelt."

Councilman Spiro Mellis spent a few minutes arguing for another week of negotiations, saying if the mayor didn't want to do it, other councilmembers could try. He gave up soon, however, accusing the majority of having its collective mind made up.

Voting for ballot initiative were Van Allen, Rotkin, John Laird and Mardi Wormhoudt.

Councilman Joseph Ghio said it

was a bad idea to go to the ballot because "you never get anything from the university by confrontation." The city has gotten concessions through cooperation in the past, he said.

Councilman John Mahaney said an election wasn't necessary since the council could petition the chancellor and the state legislators without spending \$8,000 to put it on the ballot.

He, Ghio and Mellis then offered to immediately enact the South African investment initiative to save the cost of election. That petition had enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

However, the liberals wouldn't agree, saying the campaign was an educational device and would confront the community with the problem of bigotry.

Mahaney said the council was two-faced since it had turned down a petition of 3,100 signatures from the Citizens Against Voter Fraud to hire an investigator to go after persons voting illegally.

Rotkin said he opposed putting that issue on the ballot "because it's a dumb idea."

Laird said he's a strong supporter of the university, which is his alma mater, "and this is like a family fight to me."

"But as long as the people of Santa Cruz are going to be subsidizing a project to the tune of millions of dollars, they should have a say in the project."