

I N D E X

Minutes of an Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Torrance City  
Council - Thursday, October 3, 1968 - 7 P.M.

<u>SUBJECT:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>OPENING CEREMONIES:</u>	
1. Call to Order	1
2. Roll Call	1
3. Flag Salute	1
4. Invocation	1
<u>PUBLIC HEARING:</u>	
5. Proposed Freeway Route	1,2,3,4,5,6 7,8,9,10,11, 12,13,14
6. Selection of Council representative	14
7. Council Meeting on October 16th	14

Adjourned at 1:00 A.M.

Ava Cripe  
Minute Secretary

Council Minutes  
Regular Adjourned Meeting  
October 3, 1968

Torrance, California  
October 3, 1968

MINUTES OF AN ADJOURNED REGULAR  
MEETING OF THE TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL

OPENING CEREMONIES:

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The Torrance City Council convened in an adjourned regular meeting on Thursday, October 3, 1968, at 7:15 P.M. at the Torrance High School Auditorium.

2. ROLL CALL:

Responding to roll call by City Clerk Coil were: Councilmen Beasley, Johnson, Miller, Sciarrotta, Uerkwitz, Wilson, and Mayor Isen. Absent: None.

Also present were City Manager Ferraro, City Attorney Remelmeyer, and City Clerk Coil.

A welcome to the capacity audience was extended by Mayor Isen at this time, along with an invitation to participate in all phases of City government at the Tuesday night Council meetings at City Hall.

3. FLAG SALUTE:

At the request of Mayor Isen, City Clerk Coil led in the salute to the flag.

4. INVOCATION:

Reverend Arthur Nagel, First Methodist Church of Torrance, opened the meeting with an invocation.

PUBLIC HEARING:

5. PROPOSED FREEWAY ROUTE.

The first speaker, at Mayor Isen's request, was the Mayor of the City of Lomita, Mr. Jim Cole, who stated that he is present at this meeting on behalf of the City Council of Lomita and the City of Lomita to inform the Torrance City Council of the results of their public hearing held two nights ago wherein the final action was a vote of 5-0 to oppose all routes.

Introduced at this time by Mayor Isen were the representatives from the State Division of Highways -- Messrs. Vern Hall, Sid Elicks, and Gaylord Wilson -- for their presentation, verbal and visual, of the proposed freeway routes, announcing that they are now in the last stages of the Route 1/107 Freeway, with a public hearing scheduled for October 10th at 10:00 in this Auditorium.

Mr. Sid Elicks outlined the many factors involved in the selection of the routes, the effect on the community, and the degree to which the alternate will provide existing and future traffic service, and the cost of the project, both as to right-of-way and construction. These considerations have been summarized in a brochure which was made available to those in attendance.

Comments and questions from the Councilmen were invited during the slide presentation, to facilitate clarification and understanding in this matter.

Councilman Sciarrotta inquired as to the proposed Artesia Freeway indicated on the slide, with Mr. Hall advising affirmatively that the Artesia freeway will be going through Torrance, extending from Normandie Avenue on the east to the eventual Torrance Freeway.

The Red Route was of interest to Councilman Miller -- specifically as it pertained to Sepulveda Boulevard, and the line to the south, veering to Hawthorne Boulevard to the east -- why is it necessary that it run through the Torrance Heights area when it can be rerouted to the present Riviera Hospital site (the Hospital soon to vacate this property) thereby protecting some 100 homes, and bypassing the Sam Levy School. Mr. Hall acknowledged that the relocation of the Riviera Hospital put a different light on the studies, and presents a feasible possibility, and the State will certainly study such an alternate for presentation at a later date.

At Councilman Uerkwitz's question regarding interchanges, Mr. Hall advised that interchanges have been assumed at most major streets, including Hawthorne and Sepulveda; on determination of the route, designers research with City staff to determine the details of the interchanges. Mr. Hall also confirmed that the State's estimates include the cost of the land and the interchanges.

Mayor Isen questioned the amount of acreage involved for the City of Torrance; such figures were not available.

Reiterated by Mr. Hall was the fact that a freeway agreement must be negotiated between the State and each city involved prior to the effecting of a freeway on any city streets -- in this manner, the city participates in the locating of the interchanges, the type of interchanges, the number of ramps, and, to some extent, the degree of the grade line. In response to questions as to the outcome of a "no freeway for Torrance" recommendation and possible dire results, Mr. Hall stated that no freeway has been built without the agreement of the City concerned. Mr. Elicks then described past experiences and negotiations in the matter of freeway routes, and the attempts to resolve areas of concern, without exerting pressure, although individuals on the line may exert some pressure.

Discussed, at Councilman Uerkwitz' question, was the TRW study wherein TRW indicated that the Route 1 Freeway should be put back in the system, which would be closer to the coast than the subject studies are, the concern of the TRW study being additional service in the industrial area of Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, and in the vicinity of International Airport. Recalled by Mayor Isen was earlier

action by a former Council in a neighborly gesture unanimously approving a resolution supporting the Pacific Coast Freeway, which freeway stopped considerably north of Torrance -- a gesture of friendship which should not now be held against this Council!

Councilman Beasley was of the opinion that the City of Torrance with 150,000 people is a mobile community, with 75% of the citizens travelling a freeway going back and forth to work, in great numbers to International Airport area, and with the San Diego Freeway pouring great numbers out onto the streets of Torrance, all the way to Hollywood Riviera. Expressions of protest for a freeway, in Mr. Beasley's opinion, are not based on logic nor on good common sense, nor the welfare of the City, but, rather, don't put it in my back yard, put it in Joe's back yard.

At Councilman Sciarrotta's query as to what prompted this freeway, Mr. Elicks explained that in 1957 by way of Senate Resolution #26 the Department of Public Works was asked to make an overall systems analysis for the entire State with the idea of coming up with a master plan for freeway express systems, with the Route 1/107 being established in 1959. The system is reviewed every four years, with the next review slated for 1969; it is a living system, under constant study. An important factor in these deliberations has been the projected development for the South Bay Area, and the traffic service that will be provided Torrance residents, he concluded. Mr. Sciarrotta then referred to his questionnaire circulating among the audience to determine the wishes of the people in reference to a freeway.

In conclusion, Mr. Hall commented that the reason for these hearings on the freeway is one of location -- the question of whether there is to be a freeway or not must be posed to the appropriate Assemblymen, this being the responsibility of the State Legislature, to add to, to establish and subtract from the freeway system. Further, the California Highways Commission's responsibility is an arm of the executive branch of State government with its responsibility to implement a system -- in implementing such a system the location must be determined of the various freeways yet to be built. Answering Councilman Uerkwitz' question as to what would happen in the event of a "no freeway" recommendation, Mr. Elicks advised that the Commission could conceivably defer the adoption of any location, but the master plan would still be in effect showing a "Torrance Freeway"; only legislative action could eliminate it from the master plan.

(A 15-minute recess was ordered by Mayor Isen at this time, the hour being 8:45 P.M.)

Having obtained information regarding Councilman Sciarrotta's questionnaire during the recess, Mayor Isen announced that such a questionnaire had not been authorized by the Council, and deemed it out of order at a regular formal Council meeting, as well as representing worthless, unsupported statistics. Councilman Sciarrotta

defended his questionnaire as being his manner of trying to carry out the wishes of the people he represents -- an individual effort to best ascertain the true desires of the community and completely in order.

The public hearing resumed with the first speaker being Mr. G.W. Webb, a member of the Board of Governors of the New Horizons community, representing some 1200 residents of Torrance who live in that area, who stated that the Red Route would affect the Sam Levy School seriously impairing the classroom quietude, create disruption for practically new homes in Torrance Heights and New Horizons, along with a shopping center near Sepulveda and Hawthorne that would be eliminated. Mr. Webb then read a petition bearing some 372 names expressing opposition to the Red Route which was presented (and returned) to the City Clerk. At Councilman Beasley's question regarding the modifications for the Red Route recommended by Councilman Miller, Mr. Webb advised that this would be much better than the other; anything that would move it away from this area would be appreciated. Mr. Webb then responded to a question by Councilman Uerkwitz as to whether his group wants a freeway in Torrance by stating that the majority of the people would not want a freeway; it is not needed nor wanted, a feeling that he believes is shared by 85% of the people of Torrance, the true need being for the people on the Peninsula. In conclusion Mr. Webb stated that when the people of Torrance realize the high cost and sacrifice of a freeway benefiting someone else, every effort will be made to otherwise work this out, including a trip to the Legislature, if necessary, to propose a freeway that will be worthwhile.

The president of the Torrance Heights Civic Association, Mr. Don Zavodnik, 3423 - 229th Place, presented a petition bearing 251 names specifically opposing both the Red and the Green Routes and outlining the reasons for their opposition. It is the opinion of this group that the most logical route would be the Blue Route; Mr. Zavodnik added that Torrance does not need a freeway if the present proposals for arterial highways are taken, and urged that consideration be given this area where such arterials are proposed on the one hand and a freeway on the other. Mr. Zavodnik acknowledged that Councilman Miller's modification might be an acceptable one; however, he reiterated the objection to both routes.

Major Tom Zimmerman, 23139 Doris Way (123 ft. 7" from the Blue Route) expressed the need for vigilance in matters of government, and questioned the approach regarding these freeway proposals, what with starting at the back and picking the solution which presumably calls for a freeway -- what's the problem? -- the unbearable traffic which will become increasingly unbearable? -- the objective? - to improve the long distance traffic and local traffic flow, and to promote growth of the area? Major Zimmerman is of the opinion that a freeway could save only 5 to 10 minutes for any person living in the South Bay; citing the dismal experience of Santa Monica, the appearance of the South Bay 20 years hence was questioned, should a freeway appear. Continuing, he stated that local traffic would only be aggravated by the additional traffic represented by a freeway, and there is a further harmful

effect in that funds are diverted from solving the surface street problems; suggested were traffic directors, overpasses, computerized traffic controls, as a better use of funds. The growth of Torrance is self-evident, and, to the credit of the Council and Mayor, is second to none in balance in the South Bay -- questioned, however, by Major Zimmerman was the reasoning of the Planning Commission that would sacrifice residential property in favor of industrial property, ringing the City with freeways -- whereas it is a fact that freeways enhance industrial land and increase the value. In conclusion, Major Zimmerman urged that the residents not tolerate any further encroachments in the South Bay by the Highway Commission, freeway-contractor combine -- do not permit Torrance beach and the South Bay beaches to be overrun -- that highway funds be used to improve local traffic flow -- that Mayor Isen and the Traffic Commissioner be supported in the stand indicated to date -- and recommended that the City Council inform the State Highway Commission of the desires of the people of Torrance by rejecting all proposed routes, reaffirming the All-American spirit of Torrance as indicated at this meeting, and directing the Traffic Commissioner to present a bold new plan to meet the City's traffic needs. Major Zimmerman further urged that the citizens contact Assemblyman Beverly relaying their feelings in this matter. (Applause from those in agreement with him was requested by Major Zimmerman; it was substantial and of some duration.)

Colonel E.D. Ellis, 2045 Via Madonna, Lomita, concurred with the above comments of Major Zimmerman, feeling, however, it should have been said in 1964, reciting as well the numerous changes that have taken place in Southern California since the war years. Colonel Ellis referred to the action of the City of Lomita in their "no freeway" action, and quoted the statements of these Councilmen and their references to the Red Route; Rolling Hills Estates has gone on record adopting the Red Route; Redondo Beach has selected the Red Route also - some interest in the Red Route was displayed by members of the Torrance Planning Commission. Colonel Ellis urged that this Council, if they want some hand in their destiny, recognize the consensus forming in the South Bay area.

Next to speak was Mr. Robert Philpott, 2062 233rd Street, who stated that he too had attended the Tuesday night meeting of the Lomita City Council wherein it was moved (Resolution 68-40): "Following two public information meetings with its citizens, property owners, and representatives of the Highway Commission, followed by a formal public hearing where citizens expressed their wishes as a matter of public record, the Lomita City Council finds that the overwhelming majority of Lomita citizens are opposed to the location of any the proposed freeway routes through any portion of the City of Lomita, and that the Council basing its action on the voice of its citizens directs the city administration to prepare a resolution of policy and intent consistent with the findings of this Council, to be acted upon at its next regular meeting, and directs that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the City Council of each of the cities of the South Bay." The motion was seconded, and was unanimously approved -- a unanimous decision

for the little City of Lomita, 20,000 strong, to stand against the Highway Commission and say 'no freeway'." Palos Verdes does not want this freeway, so it is pushed north, down into Lomita, nor is a freeway wanted by Rolling Hills Estates and Redondo Beach. Surely Torrance with 150,000 people can join Lomita in a "no freeway" stand -- Mr. Philpott then requested that the people in attendance favoring "no freeway" to stand -- the estimate was that 75% of the audience stood; those desiring a freeway were then asked to stand, comprising some 25%.

(The hour being 10:00 P.M. a 10-minute recess was ordered by Mayor Isen.)

On resumption of the meeting, Mr. Philpott (confirming that he is a Torrance resident in spite of his enthusiasm for Lomita) continued his comments, stating that he had asked Mr. Hall how the freeway could be effectively prevented, and learned that one way would be for the city to request their Legislature to have it deleted from the master plan; another way would be for the city to refuse to sign the freeway agreement with the State.

Mr. C. Farmans, 4709 Cathann, spoke of the Green Route -- described by the Planning Commission in its report of September 4th as the least desirable route -- a report of the Planning Department dated August, 1968, was in a similar vein. Mr. Farmans presented a petition bearing 983 names of residents in the proposed Green Route hereby stating their objection to same (petition returned by City Clerk Coil). The smog and likely pollution created by a freeway were described, as well as the tolls that are exacted from such exposure -- Mr. Farmans then alluded to "concrete monster" and the fact that freeways are not the answer, nor is the automobile as a mode of transportation the answer -- communities will increasingly develop into self-sufficient communities where people will live and work in the same area, and other modes of transportation will evolve.

Mrs. McManus, 3510 - 228th Street, inquired, if a freeway is must, why can it not be put in blight areas rather than selecting the best areas with clear air and lovely homes?

Speaking next was Mr. Steve Skromeda, 2344 West 238th Street, who reported on the information absorbed by him at this hearing, and asked the question, how does it make sense when talking of a rural community freeway serving Torrance to dump such a freeway back into the San Diego Freeway, with the San Diego Freeway unable to handle its present load? Mr. Skromeda is opposed to bringing a freeway into this community, feeling it unnecessary, with the streets today in the small area encompassed are the best metering device available for a freeway system -- in any event, there should not be further congestion for the San Diego Freeway, recommending that if a freeway there must be then run it along the coast, as originally proposed.

Mr. John Hudinger, 23343 Shadycroft, related his observance of the Planning Commission activities in the matter of the best freeway route, and the 4-3 Blue Route decision, outlining his disagreement with their reasons for this action. Traffic count figures were reported as well by Mr. Hudinger, compiled by the City Traffic Engineer which indicate that the Red Route would most effectively remove the greatest amount of traffic from Torrance streets, cause the least disruption, and best serve Torrance.

Mr. William Pennington, 5626 Ruby Street, stated that the "divide and conquer" routine is evident in these hearings, with neighbors pitted against neighbors in advocating the route most removed from them, with most people accepting the fact that a freeway is inevitable. This is not the case, in Mr. Pennington's opinion -- the beach cities eliminated a freeway and the same can be accomplished in Torrance if the residents are united in their opposition to any freeway at all in this area. Mr. Pennington then differed with remarks attributed to Councilman Wilson -- "The destiny of Torrance is being decided, and either Torrance will be the center of important crossroads, bringing convenience, traffic, and prosperity into our community, or it will stand aside and suffer the hardships of inadequate planning and stagnation" -- it being Mr. Pennington's opinion that any "convenience" would be for the people of Palos Verdes and Rolling Hills (who want no part of a proposed freeway route); "traffic" would indeed result with accompanying exhaust fumes and smog; and the "prosperity" will be taken care of by the smog and congestion. The hardships to be suffered, Mr. Pennington concluded, are by the people who lose their homes, the dust and noise which accompany a freeway while construction is in progress; the people who must breathe the smog, for whatever route is chosen, they are all on the western edge of the city and with the prevailing sea breeze that smog will be blown right down the Torrance throats. He urged that the City Council, the representatives of the people of Torrance, not recommend any freeway at all; not only does the desirability of dwelling in this city, and the prosperity, depend on the rejection of this freeway but the very act of breathing depends on it!

Mr. Roger Saunders, 22634 Ladeene, representing the Victoria Terrace Homeowners Association, approximately 500 Torrance families, urged that the City Council adopt the Blue or the Yellow/Blue Route -- this request is based on a thorough study of all routes and thorough discussions with members of the Association as well as neighboring homeowner groups, Torrance businessmen, and civic leaders. Their reasons for favoring these routes are: the lowest percentage of living units are affected; these routes include the use of more unimproved land than the other routes; the Yellow/Blue is least in cost and both routes are specified as having the lowest effect on percentage of assessed valuation involved; fewer Torrance schools are imperiled, thus making these routes the obvious choice from the standpoint of safety and welfare of Torrance children. Mr. Saunders noted that Councilman Miller's suggestion to move the Red Route slightly south and west so that it would take Riviera Hospital may move the Sam Levy School problem on to a corner of the Joseph Arnold School. Returning to the advantages of the Blue or Blue/Yellow Route, Mr. Saunders stated that fewer Torrance streets would be disrupted; traffic flow would not be a major problem; emergency public services would be least affected - placing the freeway on the west boundary of Torrance affords ideal usage by present and future Peninsula residents, as well as citizens of Redondo Beach and neighboring communities, without causing loss of tremendous aesthetic value; the beaches will be better served; these routes are sufficiently close to major shopping centers, business and industrial areas in Torrance so they will be highly beneficial to all and detrimental to none. In conclusion, Mr. Saunders pointed out that the Blue or the Yellow/Blue Route have been the first preference of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, the Public Works Department, the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, and the Torrance Chamber of Commerce; the Traffic and Lighting Department suggests

the Blue Route as its second choice; the Superintendent of Schools has also been quoted as favoring the Blue Route. In endorsing the Blue or Yellow/Blue Route, the Victoria Terrace Homeowners Association stands firmly against the entire Yellow-C-Red and Green Routes.

Coming forward to speak at this time was Mr. Steve Allen, 4307 Newton Street, a director of the Ellinwood Homeowners Association, who reported on the deliberations of this group -- the first question being, do we need a freeway at all? There were mixed emotions, and heated discussions, but the ultimate conclusion was that yes, a freeway is needed, although undesired emotionally -- the freeway is needed for purposes of handling traffic in two different ways, to divert traffic from the surface streets and for the people merely passing through Torrance; to deliver customers to and from places of industry and business in Torrance; to serve specific areas of major business activity and specific areas of major industrial activity. In arriving at the best route, there were many considerations involved, such as traffic relief which will benefit the greatest numbers, the route which will minimize the burden of the Torrance taxpayer; a route which will create no isolated sliver communities; a route which will service the shopping centers and the resultant sales tax generated to Torrance -- for these, and a number of other reasons, Mr. Allen concluded, their group has adopted the position of supporting the Red Route

Mr. Thomas George, 5021 Beran Street, stated that freeways lend nothing to the benefit and welfare of the people -- in the face of such vigorous opposition to a freeway, should the State Division of Highways proceed regardless, then, in his opinion, it is time for a change in the legislative body in the State of California. It is sheer fantasy to suppose that a freeway would create anything other than smog seriously affecting the children, hospitals will be gassed out -- Mr. George urged that this Council not select a route for a freeway in Torrance; let the routes remain in Sacramento.

Representing the Southwood Riviera Homeowners Association, Mr. Chris Karatzas, 23012 Kent, presented a petition bearing 1160 signatures (petition returned by City Clerk Cecil) and indicated their preference for the Yellow/Blue or Blue Route for the reasons of cost, the fact that least amount of families are affected, the effect on the tax base, either route most fairly divides the amount of right-of-way acquisition, and least effects public services to the community. It is the personal feeling of Mr. Karatzas that a freeway is needed, and the value to shopping centers represented by nearby freeways was pointed out; that the Red Route is the most intelligent and the most acceptable, to his personal thinking.

Mr. George Carpenter, 19922 Ingram Way, presented a petition containing 1327 signatures of "just people" opposing the Red Route for the reasons that Torrance would suffer a loss of assessed valuation for homes, business, and land in the right-of-way, with the greatest number of homes being eliminated in the right-of-way, and affecting the tax base. In conclusion, Mr. Carpenter stated that it is their feeling that the disadvantages

of a freeway should not be borne by one city, but by all who will benefit by it. It is the personal recommendation of Mr. Carpenter that the entire freeway be put underground so that home and communities would be least disrupted.

Mr. Wayne Bluemel, 23327 Susana, president of the Ellinwood Homeowners Association, presented a petition bearing 510 signatures (petition returned) and referred to the letter of record regarding the sentiments of this group -- in short, if there must be a freeway then the best way will be the Red Route.

Representing the Riviera Homeowners Association, Mr. Ted Baciu presented their recommendation favoring the Red Route which would best serve the traffic needs of Torrance, noting the emphasis that has been placed on through traffic which represents some 30%, with the main traffic problem being right within the City -- the Red Route would give assistance to the airport property, and serve a real need in alleviating the traffic problems occasioned by the tremendous growth of this area. Based on his experience in various civic groups, it is the opinion of Mr. Baciu that not to adopt a route at this hearing would be a dereliction of duty.

Mr. Ronald Gracias, 22317 Roberts Road, representing Seaside Ranchos, presented a petition of over 1200 signatures (petition returned) and reviewed the legislative process necessary in the removal of a freeway route; their choice is the Red Route because it best serves the residents and the central area of Torrance, the value of adjacent industrial land would be enhanced, and the overall cost would be less; the modifications recommended by Councilman Miller met with his approval, and thus the recommendation was for the Red Route as modified.

Speaking next was Mr. Al Gralnik, 21513 Evalyn, who stated that it is the responsibility of both the Planning Commission and the City Council to look to the benefits for the citizens of Torrance, and that the primary arguments be thoroughly examined, and experiences in other cities reviewed.

Mr. Eugene Docie, 4733 Greenmeadows, favors the Red Route because Torrance needs a freeway and this is the best route to serve the City of Torrance, outlining its proximity to the important functions in this community.

Mr. Richard Mills, 25913 Matfield Drive, stated that, in his opinion, the Yellow Route is ill-advised, outlining the numerous disadvantages of this route. Favor was expressed with the Red Route as best serving Torrance.

(A ten-minute recess was ordered at this time; the hour being 11:50 P.M.)

Mr. William Borton, 3116 Winlock Road, president of the Walteria Homeowners Association, presented a petition bearing approximately 1500 signatures (petition returned) favoring the

Red Route, adding that most of the Torrance residents do not work in Torrance and the need for a freeway is crucial with the ever increasing traffic, a fact which would be supported by a majority of Torrance residents. Mr. Borton described the detailed study undertaken by his group in arriving at a decision in the matter of a freeway which supports the Red Route in its entirety.

Mr. Thorensen, 5335 Reese Road, stated that after listening to the testimony at this hearing he felt impelled to point out that the freeway is not going to be a fact until perhaps 1980 or 2000; that's a long time away; such a long time, in fact, that unforeseeable technological progress will have been made, especially in the area of transportation, with rapid transit being a key issue. A decision <sup>out</sup> on this issue, in Mr. Thorensen's opinion, seems impractical with/ascertaining the impact of rapid transit.

Next to speak was Mr. John Leresche, 3634 West 228th Street, who stated that the basic idea of a freeway is to take traffic off Torrance streets, pointing out the traffic impact caused by an interchange in the area of Hawthorne Boulevard.

Mrs. Joseph Dumont, 5103 Lenore Street, presented a petition of 110 signatures against the freeway.

Mr. Gil Kemper, 5506 Laurette Street, stated that he does not feel freeways are a panacea to transportation problems, and recommended some means of transportation other than automobiles.

Mr. Robert Fero, 21321 Anza, recited the statistics of the City Traffic Engineer relative to the various routes and their relationship to Hawthorne Boulevard and could not see any significant difference offered by the Red Route, adding that the Red Route is the only route which so effectively sandwiches a section of homes between a freeway and a large high density commercial area and represents poor planning.

The next speaker was Mrs. Paul Hogan, 23203 Doris Way, related the disaster which would be wrought to her beautiful location by a freeway, and the fact that freeways hold no charm for women who shop locally.

There being no one else who wished to be heard, Councilman Uerkwitz moved that the hearing be closed. His motion was seconded by Councilman Beasley; there were no objections, and it was so ordered.

Expressions from the Council were invited by Mayor Isen at this time:

Councilman Johnson first complimented the many people involved in the preceding presentations. He then stated that he is not yet convinced that a freeway is needed, believing that the State Division of Highways must take the time to confirm with

the cities in the path of the freeway that a major crisis will develop if no freeway is constructed. If it is then necessary, then two alternatives were recommended by Councilman Johnson: Construct an elevated freeway above 101 Highway, and in cooperation with Rapid Transit, provide parallel rapid transit system as part of the route of the freeway; secondly, construct an underground tunnel freeway including the rapid transit system ostensibly following the Red Route, which would provide an option as to mode of transportation. Further noted by Councilman Johnson was the fact that local governing bodies have insisted that the freeway be located in a city other than their own - it does not seem to matter to these other cities that Torrance is being asked to provide the lion's share of the land to be removed from the tax rolls, with Torrance residents being asked to give up their homes and businesses. Councilman Johnson agrees that progress is needed, but that not one Torrance home or business should be given up which is not shared with the other cities which will be serviced by the freeway; we in Torrance do not intend to uproot our homes for the convenience of the other areas to speed through Torrance to their point of destination.

It was the comment of Councilman Miller that the decision to be made tonight dates back over a long period of time with the matter of selection of a route to be made at this time, rather than to have a freeway or not to have a freeway, with only legislative recourse available to those sincerely opposed to a freeway. Recognizing the tremendous effect on the people of Torrance, and the seriousness of the decision, as well as the varying recommendations from all areas with no two alike from City departments and Commissions, Councilman Miller recommended the adoption of the Red Route, subject to the adjustment of the Red Route to bypass the Torrance Heights Tract entirely, bypass the Sam Levy School entirely, to run in conjunction with the Green Route to Lomita Boulevard. Mr. Miller then outlined his reasoning for such a recommendation was based on the centralization of this route, serving people travelling in all directions in the best manner, with statistics revealing that in 1980 surface streets and a freeway will be imperative, and possibly rapid transit. Councilman Miller acknowledged that he does not want a freeway, but logic points to the need for a freeway, and in conclusion stated that the point that convinced him on the Red Route was the ability to retain 100 homes, which virtually balances out the Blue and the Red Route, along with alleviation of the Sam Levy School, apartments not having the same impact as individual homes since they represent commercial venture -- adding that his approval of the Red Route is based on his recommended modifications being met.

Councilman Sciarrotta agreed on the difficulty of the decision before this Council, expressing gratitude for the assistance furnished him by way of his independent survey which indicated that 28% of the people who voted do not want a freeway but 72% do desire a freeway. It is the feeling of Mr. Sciarrotta that it is more important to be right than popular -- the good of the City of Torrance is at stake, and there is an acute need to relieve the unbearable surface street traffic; there is a need

for approachability to the Del Amo Financial Center; with Torrance's sales tax revenue fifth largest in the State, and it is imperative to look ahead and make this city a well balanced city and this cannot be done without adequate arterial freeways and streets.

Councilman Uerkwitz could not agree that being presented with something from the State makes it always the right thing to do -- were this a freeway he would probably would feel more kindly, but since this is not a freeway, merely a widening of the San Diego which goes nowhere; further, it is not likely that technology is going to stand still for 20 years or even 10 years, and to drag out the concrete mixer every time there is a traffic problem will eliminate living at all. Mr. Uerkwitz further cannot rationalize the approach of a loop from one end of the freeway to the other -- also absent is any discussion of a monorail in envisioning the future. Further pointed out was the fact that no new north/south streets have been put in since the birth of the San Diego Freeway, as was the fact that candidates in an election who represent themselves as the "homeowners' candidate" and become a "homeowners' councilman" it would be two-faced without exhausting every possible avenue to vote to condemn their homes. Councilman Uerkwitz further stated that he is not anti-freeway just because it is a freeway; he is against putting the concrete roof in that will take a great number of homes and not solve the problem, nor does he believe that a freeway cutting across Artesia, coming down either the Red or Blue Route, and then eventually across the middle, is the solution to the traffic problem in the City of Torrance 20 years from now.

Councilman Wilson referred to references made earlier at this meeting regarding his feelings in the matter of a freeway -- the word he had used was "ludicrous" not to have a freeway in Torrance; a stronger word would be in order - "derelict" - the Council would be derelict in responsibility as Councilmen in not recommending a route. Thinking in terms of the future of Torrance, the great increase in population, increase in traffic on the streets, Councilman Wilson can see no other way and reality must be faced. To "wall up" Torrance and not have access to other parts of the County or concern for neighboring cities and counties smacks of the "dark ages". There is a decision to be made, Councilman Wilson concluded, there is a responsibility to make a recommendation - the question is not whether there should be a freeway but which one.

Expressing disagreement with Councilman Wilson, Mayor Isen pointed out the "damned if you do and damned if you don't" position in which he is placed. The endless exploration of this problem by him was described by Mayor Isen, his situation being peculiar to anyone else on the Council in that his home is on one of the routes, the Blue Route, and emotionally it would be very, very difficult to state preference for that route. In an attempt to be objective, looking at his friends on the Red Route, it seems to Mayor Isen that the entire matter is one of schematics -- were this a freeway, there might be legitimate argument, but this is

an arrangement that starts nowhere and goes nowhere. Mayor Isen conceded that Councilman Wilson would be right were this an isolated community, but such is not the case --weighing all the arguments against a freeway and then taking the difference in population and compute the loss in sales tax, assessed valuation, plus the human values, would add up considerably as against what the Highway Commission wants to give the City; further weighed by Mayor Isen were the benefits promised against the harm and heartache and the latter certainly outweighs the former. Further stated by Mayor Isen was the fact that the gainers are the transients and the neighboring cities; the losers are the sacrificial victims of the route selected, with serious financial losses, lower property values, miles of homes lost to be replaced by dust and cement, large numbers of people forced to live in an atmosphere of increased noise and air pollution. In conclusion, Mayor Isen stated that he is opposed to all the suggested freeway routes -- how to vote has been a problem which he has wrestled with, believing that it can be fought at Sacramento with the help of other cities, but he certainly could not vote for the Red Route which would perhaps imply that he was keeping the freeway from his front door, nor could he vote for the Blue Route which would pour traffic into a residential area and Torrance Beach. Mayor Isen does not believe in the freeway and certainly could not vote for it; to vote against it invites criticism because of the location of his residence, a problem entertained by many -- therefore, if there are any routes suggested for approval, Mayor Isen will abstain.

Councilman Johnson moved that the Council overrule the decision of the City's Planning Commission and vote to accept NONE of the routes. The motion was seconded by Councilman Uerkwitz.

Believing that the residents of Torrance deserve a decision, based on the welfare of the community, Councilman Beasley made a SUBSTITUTION: That the City Council recommend to the State Highway Commission the RED ROUTE with modifications suggested by Councilman Miller. The motion was seconded by Councilman Miller.

It was clarified that the recommended modifications of the Red Route are that it bypass the Torrance Heights Tract entirely, bypass the Sam Levy School entirely, to run in conjunction with the Green Route to Lomita Boulevard.

Prior to roll call vote, there was discussion on the motion.

Councilman Miller stated that it is his feeling that the people of Torrance will really use the freeway, a freeway that will run from 9 to 11 miles, running somewhere between 4 or 5 miles in Torrance with either the Blue or the Red Route, with the remainder in the neighboring cities; this somewhat clarifies the burden, and it may be assumed that Torrance will make equal use of the freeway.

Councilman Uerkwitz could see no end to the freeway kick so long as freeways continue to be approved, with fantastic sums of money poured annually into transportation of this type with no effort being made to research other solutions. The Red Route, in Mr. Uerkwitz' opinion, even if it had the 101 end on it which would make more sense, will not solve the problem to be faced in 1980; hence he cannot vote for it.

It was the comment of Councilman Johnson that he does not live on any of the routes, and is not emotionally involved, and can only do what he believes right for the City of Torrance.

Councilman Beasley stated that he lives on the Red Route.

Even with considerable study, Councilman Sciarrotta has waived between the Red and the Blue Routes - the Green Route was out completely from the very beginning - and every fact has been considered by him.

Mayor Isen called for the roll call vote on the substitute motion, pointing out to the audience that if it carries, there will be no vote on the original motion; if defeated, then there is roll call on the original.

The substitute motion carried as follows:

AYES: COUNCILMEN: Beasley, Miller, Sciarrotta,  
and Wilson.

NOES: COUNCILMEN: Johnson, Uerkwitz.

ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEN: Mayor Isen.

6. Mayor Isen then announced that there will be a meeting of the State Division of Highways on this matter, and recommended that the Council representative be selected at the Council meeting of October 8th.

7. Urgent pressing business, and the fact that the Council is scheduled to be dark on Tuesday, October 15th, Mayor Isen requested that a regular meeting be scheduled for Wednesday, October 16th, at 5:00 P.M. Mayor Isen so moved; the motion was seconded by Councilman Sciarrotta, and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

History in the making was noted by Mayor Isen in that this meeting represented both the largest in attendance and duration of the Torrance City Council.

The meeting was regularly adjourned at 1:00 A.M.

\* \* \* \*

*Vernon W. Coil*

Vernon W. Coil, Clerk of the  
City of Torrance, California

APPROVED:

*Albert J. ...*

Mayor of the City of Torrance