

# Supervisors want a say on UCSC R&D project

By BUD O'BRIEN

Santa Cruz County supervisors would like to talk to UC-Santa Cruz Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer about his plans to develop a "research and development" center on the campus.

Supervisors voted Tuesday to invite the chancellor to discuss the proposed project with them in hopes of avoiding the type of bitter confrontation between county government and the university that occurred between that institution and the city of Santa Cruz over the proposal.

The antagonism between city officials and Chancellor Sinsheimer grew out of the latter's refusal to submit the development proposal to the city's planning process, even though most of the acreage involved is in the city limits. Sinsheimer argued that the university, under state law, is not subject to local planning regulations.

Angry city officials then placed on last November's elec-

tion ballot a measure that demanded that the university be subject to local planning processes in ventures such as the R&D project. City voters overwhelmingly approved the measure, but it's doubtful that it carries any legal clout.

Now the county is being urged to take the same position that the city has taken and demand that the university go through the county's "normal review process" in regard to any portion of the proposed development that would be located on land in the unincorporated areas of the big campus complex.

Santa Cruz Supervisor Gary Patton asked the board Tuesday to take a hard-line approach in seeking to force the university to subject its plans to county review. Patton left no doubt in his letter of recommendation and in remarks during the discussion that he believes development of the ambitious project

would impose unacceptable burdens on the county.

Patton, a tireless advocate of strict growth control and environmental protection, warned that such an "industrial complex" as is being planned "would radically induce the siliconization of Santa Cruz County" — a reference to the burgeoning electronics industry in this county.

Even though the state law would appear to exempt the university from local planning review, Patton said: "I disagree that the university, when it builds a profit-making business, is immune" from the same sort of scrutiny other developers must undergo.

Midcounty Supervisor Robley Levy also expressed her fears that the development of the project — which would provide upwards of 2,000 jobs — would overtax the resources of her district, already faced with an

imbalance between population and public services.

"My understanding is it would mean major impacts in the Second District in housing and school impacts," Mrs. Levy said. "We would have no way for the public to be involved unless we have a public planning process."

But the two conservative supervisors, while agreeing that the proposed project raised legitimate county concerns, argued for a more cautious and conciliatory approach.

Said Watsonville Supervisor E. Wayne Moore Jr.: "I want to see the planning process carried out, but it will take legislative action to meet Patton's request." It was Moore who suggested that the board invite Sinsheimer to appear before it to discuss publicly the university proposal and the role the county might play in the process.

Soquel-Live Oak Supervisor

Dan Forbus also stressed the need for facing the reality of the law. He said the only way the chancellor could be forced to go through the county process would be through a change in state law. He also noted that the county had not hesitated to use the same law in building such edifices as the new County Jail inside the city of Santa Cruz without going through that city's planning review process.

Both Forbus and Moore also saw positive economic and job-creating aspects to the project if it is eventually built. Forbus labeled as spurious the argument that thwarting the project would spare the county further adverse impacts on its resources.

"Those pressures are going to be there anyway," he said. "They're already there. An R&D project or something else is going to put a lot more pressure on."

All the supervisors agreed,

however, that the county is not going to build a new road into the eastern portion of the campus. Chancellor Sinsheimer is asserting that the county promised to build such a road as a condition of locating the campus here and that the redemption of that promise is long past due.

But Forbus said, "We should point out to the university that we have no intention of financing this road" to accommodate a commercial venture. The other supervisors agreed emphatically with that statement.

The supervisors then softened Patton's original recommendations a bit by dropping a direction that county planning officials take part in the process of developing the project, as well as extending the invitation to Sinsheimer to present his case to the supervisors personally.

