

December 31, 1913.

Mr. E. C. Upp,

City Clerk,

La Mesa, Cal.

Dear Sir:

Herewith prints showing revised location of our 16" pipe line thru the City of La Mesa, said location conforming to conditions as specified in your resolution No. 32.

Yours truly,

Engineer.
Cuyamaca Water Co.

O-K

April 23, 1918.

Mr. W. E. Lyons,

La Mesa, Calif.

My dear Mr. Lyons:

I suggest the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the only source of water supply for the present needs and future growth of the cities of La Mesa, El Cajon, part of the City of East San Diego; also the towns of Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, Kensington Park, Normal Heights and adjacent territory must come from the San Diego River, through the Cuyamaca system; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Diego is attempting to acquire from the United States the right to flood certain Indian lands in the El Capitan Indian Reservation, with the object of diverting any surplus water from the San Diego River at a point a short distance below the Cuyamaca Water Company's intake; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Diego, through its City Attorney, has asserted before the Public Lands Committee of both the House of Representatives and the Senate that it will welcome any development of these waters by the Cuyamaca Water Company, for the benefit of the cities and towns heretofore mentioned and adjacent territory; and further that the City of San Diego will not interfere with, but will encourage this development by the Cuyamaca Water Company by building dams at the company's intakes and impounding the necessary surplus water to take care of the future growth of the sections heretofore mentioned; and

WHEREAS, the owners of the Cuyamaca Water Company have testified that they will not oppose the granting of the City's bill in

Congress, House Bill No. 10587, provided the City Council of San Diego gives reasonable assurances to the Cuyamaca Water Company that the City of San Diego will live up to the agreement as stipulated by the City Attorney in Washington; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of San Diego has not yet taken any favorable action; and

WHEREAS, the City Attorney of San Diego has repudiated his statements made before the Public Lands Committee of both the House and the Senate that the City would not oppose, but encourage the building of dams at the Cuyamaca Water Company's intakes, as evidenced by telegrams of the City Attorney to the City Council of San Diego, on February 14, 18 and 19, 1918; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of San Diego has refused to have any conference with the owners of the Cuyamaca Water Co. to discuss the question of a compromise and effect a settlement, as outlined by the City Attorney in Washington; and

WHEREAS, mass meetings have been held in the City of La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley and Bostonia, and it was the unanimous opinion at all the meetings mentioned above that the City of San Diego is doing a great injustice to the consumers of the Cuyamaca Water Company and the property owners in San Diego's back country, by attempting to take away the surplus supply of water necessary for the development of this section, when there are many other sources of supply much more easily obtainable by the City of San Diego, and at a less cost;

THEREFORE, we the City Council of the City of La Mesa, in session this _____ day of _____, 1918, respectfully petition the U. S. Congress that no action be taken toward the passage of House Bill No. 10587, which jeopardizes the development of our only source of water supply, the Cuyamaca system, both for domestic and irrigation purposes, until the City

of San Diego has entered into an equitable agreement with the Cuyamaca Water Co. which allows said company to construct the two dams at its intakes, as planned.

The City of San Diego's finances are such that it is utterly impossible to construct for many years to come any dam, as planned in House Bill No. 10587, and it would be utterly impossible to vote any bonds for this development, as an investigation of the facts will prove; and we feel that private capital, controlled by the state authorities of California, should now develop this water rather than wait many years on a promise by the City of San Diego to do it, and when done take away from this section of the county our future heritage.

Yours very truly,

F-S

May 6, 1918.

To the Honorable Trustees
of the City of La Mesa.

Gentlemen:

I was, indeed, pleased to return from the North, and find that your board had taken unanimous and favorable action, favoring the Cuyamaca Water Company's contention with the City of San Diego, in relation to our rights on the San Diego River. The whole controversy is over the surplus water that has been going over our diverting dams in time of flood. We claim the right of appropriation and ownership of these flood waters, for the following reasons:

1. Our original filings
2. As an extra precaution, our filings on June 1, 1910, the day we bought the system.

Since that time, we have spent at least \$100,000 a year in the development of our system, brought it up to 100% efficiency, as per the decision of the State Railroad Commission, and in addition have constructed Murray Dam, which is now almost filled with water. We consider this constitutes due diligence, and we believe the courts will maintain our position. We have the opinion of Ex-Supreme Court Justice Henshaw that the original grant of the U. S. Congress, in 1891, gives us the right now to build the diverting dam on the Reservation to any height desired, and we still have that unquestioned right, as per the written opinion of Mr. Henshaw.

We plan to go ahead with the development of our system, by the construction of diverting dams at our intakes. Mr. Murray is pledged to it, and Mr. Henshaw and I have already financed our end of it. But the situation is as follows:

We hesitate to let a contract and be in a position where the City of San Diego can enjoin us, as threatened by the City officials, after the dam is say a third or half completed. We would then have our investment tied up, and a suit for damages for profits on the part of the contractor, and the litigation would cover a period of years, although we are sure to win out, in the end. The city might say that we could put up a bond and proceed with the work, but only the court knows what amount of bond would have to be put up, and we hesitate about taking that risk.

The duly authorized representative of the City of San Diego, Mr. Cosgrove, has stated that the City is not opposed to, but will welcome, this development. We feel that we are entitled to a reasonable protection against possible adverse action of the City Council, before letting the contract for the building of the dam, and we believe that, in all fairness, we are entitled to a pledge or resolution passed by the City Council, committing the City to refrain from

bringing any injunction suit and agreeing not to contest the ownership of the future waters impounded by the construction of these two dams, at or adjacent to our present diverting dams. I hope that a way can be found to adjust our differences with the City.

Murray Dam is one evidence of our good faith, and as far as my influence is concerned, if I live, a much larger concrete dam will be built on the San Diego River, in the near future. This development

bringing any injunction suit and agreeing not to contest the ownership of the future waters impounded by the construction of these two dams, at or adjacent to our present diverting dams. I hope that a way can be found to adjust our differences with the City.

Murray Dam is one evidence of our good faith, and as far as my influence is concerned, if I live, a much larger concrete dam will be built on the San Diego River, in the near future. This development is your only source of water supply.

Personally, my desire is to see a district own this system, and I am working toward this end. Our surveys and estimates are completed at the Diverting Dam, and within two weeks evidences of our intentions to act will be forthcoming.

In reference to a dam on the South Fork, a little above our present point of intake, on the Conejos Reservation, the site has been selected and surveys made; informal consent has been secured from the Government to build the dam; and a commission has awarded the damages we are to pay, being \$2880. This money we have paid to the U. S. Government, and it has been accepted by them; the contracts have been drawn by the Government and signed by us; the bond executed and all the papers delivered to the Government. All that remains to be done is for the Government to give us one copy of the signed agreement, and we are ready to proceed. We asked that the matter be held in abeyance until the El Capitan question is settled with the city, and now the City Attorney informs us that the Government has refused us the right to build Conejos Reservoir. How true that is remains to be seen.

I thank you for your kindly interest in this matter, although I wish that the back country could have realized earlier the fact that their interests and those of the Cuyamaca Water Co. are identical, and then things would not have been in the mess that they are today.

This is your only source of supply. The City can, at a much less cost, develop water from many other sources, particularly Barrett Dam, and by letting us or a district develop the Cuyamaca System, San Diego will be greatly benefitted thereby, in my opinion more so than by trying to hog all the water on the San Diego River.

Assuring you of my continued efforts, to the best of my ability, to see that the suburban section of San Diego secures its only available supply of gravity water, to which it is entitled, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

CUYAMACA WATER COMPANY,

By _____

Manager.

May 6, 1918.

To the Honorable
The Board of Trustees,
of the City of La Mesa, Calif.

Gentlemen:

I hand you herewith a letter which has been written to you at the request of the President of your Board, which outlines our intentions with regard to future development of the Cuyamaca Water Company's properties.

I have been very careful in this letter not to make any statements which I did not feel could be fulfilled. You will understand that I, as a business man, in the present disturbed financial and industrial conditions, could not give you an unqualified pledge or guarantee. You know that I am associated with others in this development, and, while I can speak for myself, yet it is almost impossible to get men of large financial interests to commit themselves on paper definitely to a project involving the expenditure of large sums of money until the time has arisen for immediate action.

You know, however, of the fight that my associates and I have put up against the City of San Diego, before Congress, in order that we may be able to do what we planned to do. We have just finished the construction of one new dam near your city, and, if allowed to do so, we will construct additional ones, plans and specifications for which have already been prepared.

I write you this letter in the thought that you may feel that the letter accompanying this was not sufficiently definite, but I feel that after considering it you will agree with me that it is all that could reasonably be expected at this time, or that any cautious business man would be willing to write under the circumstances.

Yours very truly,

CUYAMACA WATER COMPANY,

By _____

Manager.

May 22, 1918

Mr. E. C. Utt,
City Clerk,
La Mesa, Calif.

Dear Sir:-

Answering yours of the 21st: enclosed find check for \$4.35 which I am pleased to forward to you.

Yours very truly,

EF/bm
encl

June 2, 1918.

Hon. City Council,

La Mesa, Calif.

Gentlemen:

In consideration of your appointing Hon. Wm. R. Wheeler as your representative in Congress in the matter of the El Capitan Bill, as asked by the City of San Diego, we agree that there will be no expense whatsoever charged to you on account of said appointment, and in case said Wheeler does demand compensation for his services in this case, we agree to pay it ourselves.

CUYAMACA WATER COMPANY,

By _____

Manager.

F-5

La Mesa, California.
January 16, 1919

Wm. R. Wheeler,
c/o Army & Navy Club,
Washington, D. C.

We have been informed that San Diego's El Capitan Bill comes up for hearing in the House January 20th. Will you inform the proper authorities that the City Trustees of the City of La Mesa today passed a resolution of protest against the passage of said bill for the following reasons:

The construction of El Capitan Dam vitally affects our only source of gravity water, needed by this City and vicinity for our future development, while San Diego has many other sources of supply to draw from.

San Diego's finances are such that for years she will not be able to build the dam if the bill is passed, thus blocking a much needed development by the Cuyamaca Water Company. It also means endless litigation.

Please make every effort to have bill defeated or referred to committee for further investigation.

CITY COUNCIL OF LA MESA

By

President.

La Mesa, Calif. Jany. 17, 1919.

Wm. R. Wheeler
C/o Army & Navy Club,
Washington, D. C.

C 2600

We have been informed that San Diego's El Capitan Bill comes up for hearing in the House January 20th. Will you inform the proper authorities that the City Trustees of the City of La Mesa today passed a resolution of protest against the passage of said bill for the following reasons:

The construction of El Capitan Dam vitally affects our source of gravity water, needed by this city and vicinity for our future development, while San Diego has many other sources of supply to draw from.

We do not believe San Diego will be able to build the dam for years if the bill is passed, thus blocking a much needed development by the Cuyamaca Water Company. It also means endless litigation.

Please make every effort to have bill defeated or referred to committee for further consideration.

City Council of La Mesa.

By E. C. Upp, City Clerk.

February 20, 1922.

City Trustees of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith find copy of protest of the City of San Diego, which is explanatory. I believe it is for your best interests to have your attorney intervene before the State Department of Public Works, and file a protest against the city's protest and give your reasons why.

I hope you will take immediate action in this matter.

Yours truly,

EF:KLM

March 12, 1925.

Board of Trustees,
City of La Mesa,
California.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed find copy of letter to the Board of Directors of the La Mesa Irrigation District, which is explanatory.

I do not know whether you would be interested, at all in this matter to take advantage of this offer for a pressure line for the City of La Mesa. If this is out of the question, Mr. Grable and Mr. Robinson and I own the tops of the hills just east of La Mesa, and would be glad to cooperate with you in putting a reservoir on that point.

We will be glad to go into consultation with you at any time in relation thereto, if either proposition is of interest.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

cc cc Smith

GUYAMACA WATER COMPANY

SUCCESSORS TO
THE SAN DIEGO PLUMB COMPANY
OFFICE: FLETCHER BUILDING
916 EIGHTH STREET, BETWEEN BROADWAY AND E
P. O. BOX 1412

ED FLETCHER, MANAGER
LOU B. MATHEWS, SECRETARY
C. HARRITT, SUPERINTENDENT

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

August 6, 1925.

City of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

Attention Mr. Upp

Gentlemen:

My attention has just been called to an assessment of \$3667.01, relative to No. 374 M. and B. description Orient Tract, in the matter of paving Parks Avenue and Lemon Avenue.

The total assessment is \$23,825.22. My understanding is that about one-sixth of this total assessment is made against property belonging to the Murray Estate, altho the Murray Estate gets not one dollar of benefit thru the building of any roads thru the property, or thru the extension of the pipe lines thru the property.

It looks to me like a big injustice, and I want to know the facts, please, by return mail. I do not believe it is legal and I would like to have the facts to report to the Murray Estate.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

After taking this up with our engineer, I find assessment for water pipe was on the basis of square footage. This tract contains sqw.ft. 2,395,100 according to the map, and it can all be served from the new cast iron pipe installed. As I understand assessment for paving was made on basis of 60% against frontage, 25% the next tier of property back of same, and 15% of paving charged to balance. This particular tract I believe was in the 15% zone, and assessment for paving was small in proportion to size of property and in proportion to other lots nearer. I wonder if you know as to size of the Murray property in this district. It is 500 feet wide commencing at Choblas Road around La Mesa Acres on the west and south to the east line of Orient Tract. Pavement comes within 400 feet of it, accessible through three roads, likewise water supply pipe line. I think the engineer and board considered the assessment very reasonable in view of the nearly 2½ million square feet in this tract. You know, of course, we do not want to work an "injustice" against anyone, least of all any friend of yours.

E.C. Upp

July Twentieth,
1 9 2 9

Mr. G. B. Sheldon, Mayor,
La Mesa,
California.

Dear Mr. Sheldon:

Enclosed find copy of letter I have sending to practically every consumer of the La Mesa Irrigation District together with a copy of Judge Alcone's brief that is explanatory.

Yours truly,

CUYAMACA
SOLANA BEACH
FLETCHER HILLS
PINE HILLS
GROSSMONT
AVOCADO ACRES

ED FLETCHER CO.

1020 NINTH STREET
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

February 28th, 1929.

Mr. L. Sperbeck, Tax Collector
La Mesa, California.

Dear Sir:—

Will you kindly send me the tax bill if still delinquent on Lot 2, Block 2 of Crouch Addition, which is owned by Jeanette Churchill.

Thanking you for your trouble, I am

Yours very truly,

Ed Fletcher

MEF:GMF

*Lot 2 Block 2 Crouch Addn
Paid 7/6/29
L. Sperbeck
Tax Collector*

November Twenty-first,
1 9 2 9

Mr. L. Sperbeck,
City Tax Collector,
La Mesa, Calif.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed find statement of the city of La Mesa
tax bill which we wish you would forward to us as
soon as possible, and oblige.

Yours very truly,

EF:AK

Ed Fletcher Papers

1870-1955

MSS.81

Box: 15 Folder: 25

General Correspondence - La Mesa City



Copyright: UC Regents

Use: This work is available from the UC San Diego Libraries. This digital copy of the work is intended to support research, teaching, and private study.

Constraints: This work is protected by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Use of this work beyond that allowed by "fair use" requires written permission of the UC Regents. Permission may be obtained from the UC San Diego Libraries department having custody of the work (<http://libraries.ucsd.edu/collections/mscl/>). Responsibility for obtaining permissions and any use and distribution of this work rests exclusively with the user and not the UC San Diego Libraries.