

Express Highway Chamber Backs Freeway Routes

The board of directors of the Greater Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce yesterday unanimously endorsed Line 2 for the Highway 1 freeway route through this city and Line BE for its connecting "beach loop."

Both freeway Lines 1 and 2 follow the general alignment of Mission street from the Highway 1 expressway connection to a point near Walnut avenue. There, Line 1 veers slightly north of Mission and Line 2 turns considerably to the south.

The BE line for the beach loop follows Ocean street from the highway to the beach, turns along the beach and then returns to the highway at Bay street.

The directors endorsed an expressway status, rather than freeway, for the loop. Gordon Sinclair, chairman of the chamber's subcommittee on highways, said that designation was adopted because an expressway allows connections at surface grade, would allow better use by local traffic and would distribute traffic better than a freeway.

He continued that a freeway would disrupt east-west traffic and would be of unnecessary expense.

Line 2 was endorsed for the freeway, he continued, because it lies to the edge of a natural promontory and would create less of a barrier than Line 2 which follows the center of the land elevation.

Also, the cost of property to be moved and the blow to future development potential was felt to be less along Line 2.

The chamber's recommendations came after a presentation on freeway planning by W. J. Zenoni, district planning engineer, and C. F. Greene, deputy district engineer for the State Division of Highways.

The two later made the same presentation before members of

the city council and the planning commission.

Greene emphasized the importance of the city's taking an active role in freeway choices. He said the state would ultimately ask Santa Cruz if the city thinks a freeway is needed, since the state doesn't want to be in the position of being the only advocate of freeway construction.

He also said Santa Cruz should speak up loud and clear on route choices.

Greene said routing was based on the factors of traffic service, cost and effect on the community. The state has facts and figures on the first two of these factors, he noted, but the city itself should assess the latter.

The engineer pointed out that freeway construction would necessitate the destruction of a great deal of property. He declared that it must be decided that the construction was worth the cost or the freeway should not be built at all.

Although he made no recommendations, Greene appeared to favor Line 1 or 2 over Line 4 as a route choice. He pointed out that Line 4, which lies far to the northwest of the other two, would have to pass over 6 per cent grades and would be of less benefit to local traffic.

It was also noted that Lines 1 and 2 call for depressed freeways which would stifle traffic noise.

Line 4, considering the freeway without the connecting beach loop, would be cheaper than the other alternates. It would cost \$22.2 million at today's prices, whereas Line 1 would cost \$28.7 million and Line 2 would be \$28.3 million.

Beach loop connection costs would be far greater on Line 4, however, so the price of the freeway-loop combination would be virtually the same for any