

COPY OF LETTER FROM C. H. PURCELL, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER.

Sacramento, Calif.  
Dec. 12, 1928.

Mr. H. K. Trask,  
Secretary Pro Tem  
League to Save Torrey Pines Park  
P. O. Box 278,  
LaJolla, California.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of December 6 requesting certain information regarding our position on the new road through Torrey Pines Park, San Diego, received.

Question #1 you state that I am being quoted by the supporters of the proposed cliff road through Torrey Pines Park as being irrevocably committed to this 6823-foot link to eliminate the present Torrey Pines Grade as the only practicable method of elimination of this grade.

The Division of Highways is not committed, nor am I, to any particular route for the simple reason that this highway is within the city limits of San Diego and as such is a city problem. However, from an engineering standpoint, engineers of this office, District Engineer Cortelyou, and I, consider the proposed cliff route location as being the most direct and the best alignment of grade for reaching the elevation of the ridge to connect with the Rose Canyon project.

Question #2 you state that I am being quoted as having vetoed the route through Soledad Valley and thence up through Sorrente Canyon to a junction with the present route 101 at the intersection of Camp Kearney and Rose Canyon roads as at present located.

I have vetoed no route for the same reason as given in answer to question #1; i.e., ~~xxxx~~ this road is within the city limits of San Diego and we have no jurisdiction in the location. My opinion on this route has not been solicited. Our District Engineer, Mr. S. V. Cortelyou, is very familiar with the proposed route, as well as the route through Soledad Valley. It is our opinion that the Soledad Valley location does not possess as good alignment as the cliff route, the distance is greater, and does not offer the scenic possibilities that the cliff route does; also that the present route up the hill passing by the lodge would never make a satisfactory connection into San Diego on account of the steep grades and alignment.

Question #3 you state that I am quoted as being committed to plans for a viaduct in connection with this proposed cliff location, this viaduct to take the present road off on a tangent over the Santa Fe tracks by bridge and thence southerly along the approximate line of the present roadway, the whole to span the low ground at the mouth of

Sorrento Valley, north of Torrey Pines Park.

I understand this matter was informally discussed by Mr. Certelyou, our District Engineer at Los Angeles, with San Diego authorities and is a project on the state highway which might be considered whether the route along the cliff or the route on the east side of the lodge through Torrey Pines Park up to the ridge was selected. In discussing this crossing Mr. Certelyou no doubt had in mind a future solution of this problem. I have not discussed this matter with him.

Question #4, it is stated that the State Highway Department is committed to maintenance of the cliff road and the Rose Canyon road after these roads are completed.

There has been no commitment of any kind regarding the Torrey Pines road. Authority for taking over this road for maintenance can only be accomplished by vote of the Highway Commission. No recommendation for such a procedure has been made or considered by this office. In connection with the Rose Canyon road, agreement between the San Diego City Council and this department stipulates that upon the completion of the grading and paving of this section, the road will revert to the city authorities and thereafter be maintained by them.

Yours very truly,

Signed C. H. Purcell,  
State Highway Engineer.