

# INDEPENDENT

MARCH 1-7, 1979

A FREE NEWSPAPER

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 33

## Supes Light Lockheed's Fire

by Bill Elder

Capping off what had to be the longest and most involved public hearing in the history of

county government, the board of supervisors Tuesday night voted 3 to 2 to grant Lockheed Space and Missiles Company a

conditional-use permit.

The supes' action thus paves the way for construction of five new buildings at the rural Bon-

ny Doon plant and very likely construction of non-nuclear parts for the nuclear Trident II missile as well.

Boos and hisses filled the Santa Cruz Civic Auditorium after the vote was conducted, as the board affirmed the earlier 4-1 decision of the county planning commission to grant Lockheed its controversial permit.

In a replay of the 10-12 hours in which the commission listened to public testimony centered mostly on the moral issue of letting Lockheed build Trident missile parts, the supes sat like

charges that the Regional Water Quality Control Board hadn't given Lockheed a water allocation permit since 1975.

Opponents also labeled granting of the permit as "tacit approval to worldwide murder," and some urged the supes to grant Lockheed the permit but with the condition that it not build Trident parts.

Proponents argued that Trident was vital to the defense of America, and if it wasn't, then national defense was not a problem to be addressed by a county board of supervisors. No



"Mama, mama, they're trying to wipe us out!" whimpers this little gray whale as it swims beside its big mama. And the kid (or rather, calf) is not kidding: whales and dolphins are both on the hit list of big business (especially of the Far Eastern variety). Explore the awesome wonder of — and the need to save — the earth's whales and dolphins in a weekend symposium sponsored by Loma Prieta High School to take place at Cabrillo College starting March 1. Check our Calendar for details.

sway the unswayable permit-givers.

Charges from opponents concerned an inadequate environmental impact report for the expansion, as well as

about specific buildings which Lockheed intended to construct.

Pat Liberty, not willing to be intimidated by a "hungry mob," Marilyn Liddicoat, and Dan Forbus, who said, "It takes more than just us to bring peace to the world — it takes somebody to agree with us," cast the votes in favor of the permit.

Gary Patton and Chris Matthews both said they believed that national defense was something that could be partially decided at a local level, and cast the opposing votes. □

## Planners Salvage Galleon Heights from "Legal" Depths

by Jerry Busch

The Santa Cruz County Planning Commission yesterday succumbed to legal pressure from local developer Bill Nugent and tentatively approved a 176-unit development in the mountains north of Boulder Creek.

The development came up for consideration before the planning commission Wednesday at the request of the board of supervisors, which is being sued by Nugent for previously disallowing the project.

The commission decided to recommend to the supervisors that the previous decision be overturned and the Santa Cruz County General Plan be amended to be consistent with the project. Nugent, a former recall candidate and an active member of the Public Trust, purportedly has agreed with the supes to drop the suit if allowed to build his development, Galleon Heights.

"The whole thing is a sham," exclaimed Mary Hammer,

representing Save the San Lorenzo River. Hammer declined to comment on the possibility of a lawsuit from environmentalists.

The commission's approval came just two weeks after heavy sedimentation from the Galleon Heights area filled in the Bracken Brae reservoir downstream from Galleon, precluding further removal of drinking water by Bracken Brae residents until the reservoir can be cleaned out.

Officials from state Fish and Game, the Water Quality Control Board and the county watershed department are presently investigating the siltation to verify whether the source is — as Bracken Brae residents contend — Galleon Heights.

The commission decided to approve development based on the original PUD approved in 1972, despite county counsel's testimony that no "grandfather clause" exempted the development from the requirements of the 1974 general plan.

The 1974 general plan would have eliminated development in Galleon Heights to a density of 10-40 acres per unit, allowing room for only 16 units.

The commission also chose to ignore March 1972 mountain development standards, which the planning staff says would allow a total of 37 units on the property.

The vote on the general plan amendment to allow room for the entire Galleon Heights development was 3-2, with Commissioners Ivan Eberly, D.W. Gotthold and John Dixon voting for, and Commissioners Celia von der Muhll and Charles Rowe voting against.

At the close of the voting, von der Muhll remarked that "it's obvious that we're not going to use planning on this thing."

The staff of the planning commission pointed out a number of environmental constraints to development at Galleon Heights, including high erosion and siltation potential, sewage service and water quality of Bracken Brae water reservoir, a stand of rare and endangered Monterey Santa Cruz Cypress trees on the site, severe fire hazard, proximity to the Zayante Fault, traffic impacts on Highway 9, as well as impact on local schools.

As far back as 1975, Nugent was cited by Fish and Game for destroying stream habitat in Bracken Brae Creek. Although he was found guilty by a jury, he won an appeal before a panel of three judges and was acquitted when the DA's office missed its own deadline for appeal.

That same year Nugent won an award for "environmental excellence" from the Northern

(cont'd on page 4)

## City Passes a Lemon

One of the last acts of the present Santa Cruz City Council (assuming that its makeup changes after March 6) was the passing on Tuesday night of a fortune-telling ordinance which is a prime example of what people mean when they talk about a "government boondoggle."

The law bans commercial fortune-telling within the city and allows the practice of "metaphysical science" if the practitioner has obtained the necessary permit — but what's the difference between fortune-telling and metaphysical

science?

The law calls both astrology and palmistry metaphysical sciences, but defines fortune-telling as attempting to "predict or influence future events through any magic, mystical, supernatural, occult, psychic, extrasensory, or metaphysical techniques."

Which is what astrology and palmistry attempt to do, right? Right. And the disclaimer giving metaphysicians rather than fortune-tellers the benefit of the doubt in a case when the police can't discern the difference between the two only fore-

shadows costly court battles which could attain the heights of the absurd.

Also absurd is that fortune-telling when performed as a religious practice is exempt from the prohibition. In other words, this is a law that probably won't be enforced — it's a lemon.

The only good thing about it — from the city's point of view — is that it costs \$50 for a background investigation before handing over the permit, as well as an annual \$10 renewal fee. □