

Notes of
speech by
Lyman Allen
CF 04-136,
Soto Stabried

Sept 30, 1951, PUC decision 45682
Pasadena Short
Sterra Vista local
LA - Glendale

491 feet x 52 feet
44ft

(page)

Greetings, I am B HA, a 30-year resident of North Hollywood, Los Angeles.
The ^{grey de} helmet symbolizes that I am a ^{low-pollution and a} pollution-free
transportation consumer.

The proposed project before ~~you~~ ^{you to demolish} the historic,
ex-Red Car highway bridge ~~which~~ ^{now} bridge-separates
the intersection of Soto Street and Mission Road in El
Sereno (yes within council district 24). Nevertheless,
this project is of citywide and regionwide importance,
for it would destroy the last of its kind ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ a great
artifact of the Los Angeles ~~area~~ ^{region's} ~~most~~ famous
and much-beloved Big-Red Car System. This bridge
is, ~~the~~ ^{second-} by my reckoning, the largest operating
artifact of the Pacific Electric Railway Co. ^{in the city of Los Angeles,}

the largest being the endangered ~~remnant of the once 9-mile long~~
Pacific Electric subway, ^{recently} ~~now~~ ^{dubbed} ~~by~~ ^{the} press ^{as} the Belmont

Tunnel. ~~Another~~ ^{electric interurban} This bridge was one of two
four-track ^{electric interurban} railway bridges of the P. E. Railway,
the other one being the Firestone Boulevard bridge ^{in the unincorporated} Florence
demolished by the LACTC during its construction of ^{district,}
what is now called the Metro Blue Line. This bridge ^{now} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~an~~ ^{is} issue
had four tracks because the route was used both by
locally stopping cars of the Sterra Vista local line as
well as the non-stopping Pasadena Short Line and
Glendale Line, all ^{three} ~~two~~ abandoned Sept 30, 1951 under Cal.
PUC decision 45682, ~~incurred~~ ^{incurred} by a Cal. DMV of
H always refusal to pay for the Red Car track
relocation necessitated by the rebuilding of Aliso
Street as the Santa Ana Freeway.

On the city's environmental checklist, the answer of "no impact" is erroneous and misled in response to the

Item

5a "Cultural resources". The city's checklist item

7. Hazardous and Hazardous Materials is ^{legally} inadequate in its ^{generic} failure to show a category of ~~hazardous materials~~ exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death NOT involving fires, airstrips, or hazardous materials. ~~exposing people to a significant risk of maiming or death in auto crashes now precluded by the present bridge~~

This project exposes people to a significant new risk. I emphasize NEW risk, of maiming or death in auto crashes now outright precluded by the present highway grade-separation. That constitutes a significant adverse effect upon the physical environment both independently and in the context of removing an extant, ^{established} safety system, i.e., ~~the~~ highway grade-separation. Therefore, the mandatory finding of significance ^{on page 36 in} item 17c of "no impact" ^{is erroneous} in response to the question "Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?"

Therefore the mandatory finding of significance ^{on page 35} in item 17a of "no impact" is erroneous in response to the question, in relevant part, "Does the project have the potential to ... eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history ...?"

1

Greetings. I am Bryan H. Allen, a 30-year resident of Northeast Los Angeles, about 4 miles from the proposed demolition project. The bicycle helmet symbolizes that I am a low-pollution and a pollution-free transportation consumer.

Mr. James H. Washington, Jr., a decades-long transit activist and member of the ~~ERHA~~ ERHA (Electric Railway Historical Assoc.), wanted to appear here to oppose this project, but he could come today over misinformation about to which day the matter would be continued. I register opposition to this project also on his behalf, as shown in his speaker slip, which I ~~introduce~~ introduce into the record. Mr. Alan Fishel and other ERHA members oppose the demolition but could not appear to speak. The remainder of my comments are mine alone. I incorporate by reference all of my hand-scribbled comments.

The arguments against this project generally are four:
1) Contrary to the DPW report, the bridge is not a historic site.
2) demolishing the bridge inevitably will kill some motorists & auto crashes which are physically impossible to avoid.
3) The bridge represents an element of the high low after the way.

The proposed project before you to demolish the historic, ex-Red Car highway bridge which now grade-separates the intersection of Soto Street and Mission Road in El Sereno lies with council district 14, and I just confirmed today, district 2. Oops. Sorry. Nevertheless, this project is of citywide and regionwide importance, for it would destroy the last of its-kind great artifact of the Los Angeles region's famous and beloved Bro Red Car electric interurban-railway system. This bridge is, by my reckoning, the second-largest operating artifact of the Pacific Electric Railway Co, in the city of Los Angeles, the largest being the endangered remnants of the once 0.9-mile-long Pacific Electric subway, recently dubbed by the press as the Belmont Tunnel, also in district 2. ~~MA~~ Councilman Reyes, shall the wedding ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~city's~~ ~~two~~ ~~last~~ ~~greatest~~ ~~Red~~ ~~Car~~ ~~operations~~ assets be part of your legacy? Make no mistake about this

3

If, contrary to facts, this bridge had been built by a famous WWI general or had been the scene of a ~~WWI~~ noteworthy WWII battle, that alone might entitle it to federal and local protection.

In fact, this bridge was occupied by the famous Pacific Electric Railway, the nation's most expansive interurban electric railway in terms of track length. This bridge is cumulatively rare, extraordinary and noteworthy in these four respects: (1) It is a former electric-interurban bridge, (2) It was a very rare ~~example~~ example of a railway bridge converted to highway use, (3) It was a very rare four-track bridge not in or adjacent to a railroad or railway storage yard, and (4) It is about 68 years old.

On the city's environmental checklist, the ^{city's} answer of "no impact" is erroneous and invalid in response to the item 5a "Cultural resources". Therefore the mandatory finding of significance on page 35 in item 17a of "no impact" is erroneous in response to the question, in relevant part, "Does the project have the potential to ... eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history...?"

The city's checklist item 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials is legally deficient in its generic failure to show a category of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death NOT involving fires, airstrips, or hazardous materials. This project exposes people to a significant new risk. I emphasize NEW risk — of ~~harm~~ ^{warming} or death in ~~auto~~ crashes now outright precluded by the present highway grade separation. That constitutes a significant adverse effect upon the physical environment both independently

Direct the Department of Public Works to do all of the following:

- a. Expediently investigate practical, interim methods to protect the public from the effects of possible, catastrophic seismic failure of the bridge, including methods based upon advance seismic detection and warnings, like ~~those~~ used in automatic natural-gas shutoff valves and on Japanese railways.
- b. Promptly implement one or more effective protective methods for this bridge, if found feasible, and return to the city council if additional, unprogrammed funding is needed to do so.
- c. Examine the potential citywide implications and applications of PWS investigatory findings for interim seismic protection.