

# To Plan Or Not To Plan

6-6-82

South county supervisor E. Wayne Moore believes in civil defense.

"The strongest instinct of people is to survive, and even in a nuclear war, there are going to be people who want to live," says the Fourth Supervisorial District supervisor, who is also a captain in the U.S. Army Reserves.

Furthermore, not to plan for nuclear survival "will only encourage aggression on the part of the Soviets," he relates.

Moore, however, was in the minority on that point when supervisors voted last month not to cooperate with a federal civil defense program which would relocate people from high risk areas to host areas, including Santa Cruz.

Supervisors voted 4-1 not to allow Santa Cruz county time, funds or employees to be used in Crisis Relocation Planning.

In a separate resolution Santa Cruz County urged a temporary ban on the production of nuclear weapons until a permanent freeze can be worked out.

Santa Cruz joins Sacramento, Marin, Contra Costa, Humboldt and San Francisco counties in voting not to participate in the program.

The San Jose City Council has also voiced its objections to the plan, as has the state's top health officer, Beverlee Myers, director of the state Department of Health Services.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency believe it is possible to save 80 to 90 percent of the American people if such a plan were implemented and one official — T.K. Jones, deputy undersecretary of defense for strategic and nuclear forces — told the Boston Globe full recovery could occur within two to four years.

Opponents — such as Third District Supervisor Gary Patton, who authored the anti-CRP resolution — believe such logic is madness.

"It's an absurdity and I feel it is important to let the president know the American people do not think it is acceptable to even contemplate a nuclear war," says Patton, a Quaker usually voting opposite Moore.

"I think our board should go on record, loud and clear, stating that any such plan is foolishness itself."

Moore called the resolution "an abdication of county responsibility."

What does the resolution means in practical terms?

"It means it'll be a lot less work for me," offers Lt. Bill Plageman, county emergency coordinator, on whom fell the task of coordinating public safety agencies in case of such an evacuation.

The Office of Emergency Services has copies of a FEMA survey of shelter spaces. Plageman also receives, four times daily, wind pattern reports from the federal government so that he could chart how much danger Santa Cruz would be in from nuclear fallout.

Plageman had sent the County Administrative Office a memo recommending Crisis Relocation Planning "be put on the back burner" so that the county could concentrate on more-likely natural disasters such as floods and earthquakes.

Santa Cruz seems to be exempt from federal sanctions for its move, according to Loren Fields of the state Office of Emergency Services.

Some counties receive FEMA matching funds to pay for the salary of their emergency coordinator. Part of the contract for funding includes provisions that the county "cooperate" with FEMA.

The previous Santa Cruz County emergency coordinator received such funding, but when he retired last year, he was replaced by Plageman, an employee of the county sheriff's department.

Resistance to crisis relocation planning has come from other circles as well. Santa Cruz Mayor Mike Rotkin sent a letter to the state Office of Emergency Services, pledging to "resist the insanity of such a dishonest and misleading program as civil defense against nuclear war."

"Ironically, there's enough real disasters around they could be working on instead of wasting their time and ours."

Fields said his office will attempt to gather

information as possible without help from the city or county.

"When the time comes that we need the plan, we'd like to have it," he said.

By LAURIE SLOTHOWER