



UC president won't meet with mayor

By JOAN RAYMOND
Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ — The City Council Tuesday canceled a public hearing on Measure A after it became clear the star of the show — UC President David Gardner — would not be there.

Gardner has declined an invitation to attend a public hearing or to meet with Mayor John Laird on an informal basis during Gardner's visit to the UCSC campus next Wednesday and Thursday.

Council members debated whether they should continue to throw vinegar at university officials or switch to honey over UCSC's plans to build a high-technology research and manufacturing project on campus.

So far, the council has not gone past square one in its efforts to persuade UCSC Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer and university Regents to agree to Measure A, approved in November to try to give the city planning power over the electronics park project.

Councilman Arnold Levine was pro-honey, commenting: "You can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar."

During his visit, Gardner has scheduled meetings with local newspaper editors, with the Academic Senate and students, a press conference and a campus tour. But there is no time set aside for any meetings with city or county officials over the project.

Gardner's staff has said the UC president feels it would be premature to discuss the project at this time, since there is no proposal on paper.

Gardner's press secretary told The Sentinel Gardner does not want to involve himself at this time in what he considers a local issue between the campus and the community.

The environmental impact report on the

project has yet to be completed.

Sinsheimer has suggested a small group of university and community leaders meet "informally" to review the project, although the chancellor refused to sign an agreement to surrender planning power to the city.

With council members Katy Sears-Williams and Spiro Mellis dissenting, the council voted to write another letter to Sinsheimer raising two major points suggested by Councilman Michael Rotkin:

- The council would "very much like to cooperate with the university" but "must adhere to Measure A."

- The council "would be very happy" to consider in a public meeting procedures "that would be mutually acceptable to the university and city and which would fulfill the requirements of Measure A."

The council decided not to send a fiery letter drafted by Rotkin, but a polite one by Laird, whom they all agreed "has a way with words."

Rotkin's letter said the chancellor was proposing to meet with the city "on a private basis, behind closed doors and out of public view..."

University officials remind city and county officials that agreements were signed when the university first came to town whereby the community would pick up the costs for roads, sewers and other public services.

Rotkin maintains the demand on the city water supply for the university project perhaps would require the building of the proposed Zayante Dam, a project opposed by environmentalists and San Lorenzo Valley residents.

But added Rotkin: "I'm not looking to declare war" on the university.

Others feel war has already been declared.

Levine said for the council to continue "confrontation tactics" against the university is "detrimental to the best interests of everyone."

Levine maintained if the city would give a little, the university may be willing to help finance the cost of the new public services, considering the budget crunch the city and county are now experiencing due to Proposition 13 in 1978.

Levine suggested the project could be discussed with university officials in an atmosphere that is not a "fishbowl."

"You can't go up to a guy and say, 'Come to a table' but in the meantime say, 'There's a chip on my shoulder, knock it off.'"

Councilman Spiro Mellis said the tactics of former Mayor Bruce Van Allen were more diplomatic than today's approach, and were "on the right track."

Rebutted Councilwoman Mardi Wormhoudt: "Van Allen's process didn't get us anywhere."

"One party (the university) holds all the cards. I'm willing to listen to the university's concerns, but I haven't heard the chancellor respond to any of our requests."

"This council does all of its business in public (except for litigation and personnel

matters). The nature of the democratic process is not doing business behind closed doors."

But Councilwoman Katy Sears-Williams said, "I don't think we have, in fact, shown any good faith bargaining ourselves."

"Because of our attitude, dialogue with President Gardner is no longer available."

Measure A leader Don Lane told council members voters "expect you to do everything in your power to see the university goes through the city land use planning process."

"My interpretation of doing everything in my power means more than brandishing a club," said Levine. "It means compromise. I don't believe in civil disobedience. I do everything possible to resolve (problems) through reason."

In the meantime two new university-paid reports have been released on public opinion about the project and on projected traffic impacts.

One report called "A survey of Community Opinion" was prepared by UCSC Professor Dane Archer and Susan Brutschy, working through Applied Survey Research, a Santa Cruz-based consulting firm.

The survey is based on telephone surveys to residents in October when the pre-election debate over Measure A was heated.

The surveyors weren't the only callers to residents at that time.

The report stated: "One political group called large numbers of citizens under the guise of an opinion poll, but in reality to urge citizens to vote against the 'liberal slate' of council candidates."

"The intensity of this political campaign and particularly the use of pseudo surveys to try to change the voter opinion may have increased resistance to genuine scientific research," states the report.

The respondents to the survey said they were most concerned about impacts of the project on water quality, traffic, roads, chemical waste, housing, residential growth and population density.

The traffic study was prepared by Bill Dietrich of DKS Associates of Oakland.

It suggests a new traffic signal at Bay and High Streets at a cost of about \$120,000; a no-parking zone on the west-bound approach to the university on King Street at Bay; and improvements to the Highways 1 and 9 interchange at an estimated cost of \$5.8 million (the state Department of Transportation has some improvements here under way); a new eastern access route to the university at a cost that is under study; a traffic signal and widening of Highway 9 for the eastern access at an estimated cost of \$100,000 and widening of River Street from the city limits to Highway 1 at a preliminary cost estimate of \$136,500.

The reports forecasts "unacceptable traffic conditions" by 1993 on Mission Street and at the Highway 1/Highway 9 interchange, even if the project is not built.