

March 19, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley Irri. Dist.,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall;

Enclosed find copy of letter that is
explanatory but must be kept confidential It is
certainly encouraging.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

May 5, 1925.

I wish to correct an impression that has been given the
public by Councilman Held's statement yesterday.

The state authorities authorized us to create an irriga-
tion district of 22,000 acres. At our San Francisco conference
by agreement of all parties, we cut the maximum size of the district
to 18,000 acres. The 5,000 acres that have lately been added to
the district is made up mostly of lands in El Cajon Valley, originally
agreed to last fall between the district and the El Cajon Valley
people ---- all as originally planned.

No lands north of Murray dam have been taken in and the
only lands north of Murray dam in the district are 1200 acres which
were taken into ~~the district~~ in 1916. Colonel Fletcher has only
put in about 600 acres of his own lands at Grossmont and Mt. Helix,
and 800 or 900 acres of the Thum lands, all according to the
original contract of April 5, 1924. 200 acres of the Thum lands
are now under irrigation.

Petitions are now before the Board of Directors to include
the City of El Cajon. With El Cajon included, the district will
comprise only the 18,000 acres, and we have lived up to the San
Francisco agreement to the letter.

The city officials agreed to submit the Railroad Commission
plan on April 7th for a "yes" or "no" vote. We are still waiting for
the city officials to call the election thereby living up to their
promise.

H. A. Hall, Vice-president
La Mesa, Lemon Grove and
Spring Valley Irrigation District

INTERVIEW OF H. A. HALL, VICE PRESIDENT
LA MESA, LEMON GROVE & SPRING VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT

- - - - -

"The breaking of negotiations, the reasons therefor and the the commencement again of litigation by the city, is a decided shock to this entire community.

"The good faith of San Diego is involved. The city officials have repudiated their solemn obligation to submit the Railroad Commission plan to the people of San Diego, after a definite agreement was entered into in San Francisco, immediately put in writing, all parties receiving a copy thereof and not one word of protest as to its correctness.

"The latest protest that we are not acting in good faith by putting lands in the district in the Sweetwater drainage is pure bunk. A large part of the area of La Mesa and Lemon Grove, also all of Spring Valley, is within the Sweetwater drainage and has been irrigated by Cuyamaca water for thirty-eight years.

"It is none of their business what lands we take in, for the agreement made with the city officials allows us to have 18,000 acres in the district. The state authorities had approved 22,000 acres and we made this concession to 18,000 acres as one evidence of our good faith. We have lived up to the San Francisco agreement to the letter. Col. Fletcher has not put as much land in the district as his original contract of April 5th, 1924 calls for, said contract with Fletcher and the Cuyamaca Water Company being known to all of the councilmen for months.

"As to the controversy over our water supply will say, we are absolutely under the authority of the state engineer and state bonding

commission. In San Francisco the state engineer explained to us all the requirements of the state as to the water supply, in order that they might approve the bonds of the district. The mayor, city attorney, city manager and four members of the city council, after the state engineer's explanation, agreed that we should have a 'reasonable supply' and so included those words in the contract. Now the council side-steps and violates its solemn obligation to submit the San Francisco agreement to the people. Why? Politics and lack of vision!

"We are your own flesh and blood. Seventy-five percent of the irrigation district lands lie between Grossmont and the city limits of San Diego. In ten or twenty years all of this territory would naturally become a part of the city, but never by such treatment as we are now receiving.

"The district is now using less than 3 million gallons daily, after 40 years' growth. Long before we would need 8 or 9 million gallons a day we would naturally be in the city, and this agreement would not apply.

"The city council is just putting up a straw man to knock him down, not realizing that the state authorities control us and the bonds of the district must be protected by a guarantee of a reasonable supply of water.

"Over three thousand years ago a famous prophet said, 'Without vision the people perish'. When will the city of San Diego wake up and put men of vision at the head of its municipal affairs!

"The city's action means years of litigation and no water, but

we are determined to take over the Cuyamaca System and protect ourselves from being robbed of our heritage.

"We always have been, and still are ready to arbitrate or leave to the Railroad Commission anything that can be arbitrated, in order that we all may enjoy early and rapid development, sure to come from an immediate settlement of this vexatious water question."

June 1, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
Bank of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Inclosed find a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. Stern.

I agree with ^{him} ~~you~~ that there should be no change - at least until the District gets possession of the Cuyamaca System, unless something unforeseen comes up. This matter however is wholly up to you.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

July 27, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
Bank of La Mesa,
La Mesa, Calif.

My dear Hall:

Inclosed find copy of letter from
Mr. Harrison of the Attorney General's office.
Please keep it confidential, but I am getting
some quick action anyway.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

July 31, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
Bank of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Inclosed find copy of letter received
from Robert Harrison of the attorney general's
office. The respondents in this case are the
La Mesa District and it seems to me Mr. Stearns
should have either filed his reply brief or
notified the Supreme Court he wasn't going to
do so.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

August 1, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Enclosed find a tentative basic agreement which, in my opinion, is the best we can get out of the city, of course, assuming that the contract will be drawn fairly, protecting all parties in interest as to details.

Even if the district directors do not approve it, it may be the wisest course to pursue to submit it to a vote of the electors of the district for their approval or rejection, - if the city is ready to go ahead on this plan.

Think it over.

Yours very truly,

EE:KLM

C.C. PARK, PRESIDENT

H.A. HALL, VICE PRESIDENT

H.C. PARK, CASHIER



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California

August 6, 1925.

Mr. Ed Fletcher,
920 - 8th St.,
San Diego, California.

Dear Sir:-

In answer to your letter of the 4th, regarding the filing of briefs. It certainly looks as if there has been some slip up in regard to the Supreme Court Decision, but I took the matter up with Mr. Sanders and he states that Mr. Stearns made an oral argument before the Court in Los Angeles and was asked by the Court if he desired to file a brief. He stated that he based his entire case on the Escondido case which all had been placed before them, and did not desire to file a brief, and the matter was closed. I cannot see that Mr. Stearns is at fault in the matter and feel that there was negligence on the part of the Court of Los Angeles in not advising the Supreme Court that no brief was to be filed, however, that is past and gone, and I note by the letter from the Supreme Justice that we may expect action soon.

Yours very truly,

H A Hall



August 25, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, Calif.

Dear Sir:

At the request of Mr. Fletcher I have examined a copy of the contract for the sale by Mr. Fletcher to the La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley Irrigation District of the property known as the Cuyamaca Water System, copy of which contract is on deposit with our Company, and was executed under date of June 13, 1925. Section 3 of the contract provided:

"It is further understood and agreed that in purchasing the said properties the said District takes the same subject to all litigation now pending or which may hereafter be brought at any time before the final consummation of said sale."

Section 5 of said contract inter alia provides:-

"Deeds of Transfer of said properties are to be deposited in escrow with the Southern Title Guaranty Company of San Diego, under instructions to deliver the same to the said District upon payment of the purchase price aforesaid."

Section 7 of said contract provides:

"It is further understood and agreed that all legal expenses, costs and fees including all attorney's fees incurred by the parties of the first part up to the time deeds of transfer of said properties shall have been deposited in escrow as in Paragraph V hereof provided, shall be borne and paid for by the parties of the first part, and that all expenses, costs and fees incurred thereafter in connection with any

-2-

litigation in respect to said properties shall be borne and paid for by the party of the second part."

A deed duly and regularly executed by Ed Fletcher and Mary C. B. Fletcher, husband and wife, to the La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley Irrigation District, covering all the properties of the Cuyamaca Water Company included in said contract, was deposited in escrow with the Southern Title Guaranty Company on the 22nd day of June, 1925.

After a careful consideration of the provisions of this contract, I am of the opinion that Col. Fletcher should pay all legal expenses, costs and fees, including attorney's fees, incurred in the litigation effecting said property up to the 22nd day of June, 1925, and that the La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley Irrigation District should pay all such expenses, costs and fees incurred thereafter.

Very truly yours,

Southern Title Guaranty Company

By _____
Attorney.

EMH:V

November 18, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
Bank of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Inclosed find copy of letter from
Judge Sloane that is explanatory and confidential.
If this deal falls thru and the new people are
ready to buy at private sale and pay their good
money, it is their risk - not ours.

Yours very truly,

ER:AH

December 2, 1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
Bank of La Mesa,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

I don't want you to think I am butting
in by writing this personal letter to you, but I think
it is vital that the District acquire both of the ranches
just above the El Monte pumping plant. These are the
only two places that are affected above by pumping, and
there are possibly one or two places that you might
later on find it advisable to buy below, but that is
not as serious a matter.

All you will have to do is to take over
Pratt's contract, and it involves no large amount of
money - about \$125 a month. As you know, I have taken
an option on this, and am carrying the payments for the
benefit of the District. As you know, the City is sur-
veying for a pipeline to El Capitan at the present time.
Their plan is to pick up here and there pieces of property
and pump temporarily from the river until some dam is
built.

Spreckels tried the same thing five
years ago, and he yet hasn't pumped a drop of water, but
we don't want the City to acquire this Pratt piece.

I don't want to reflect on Mr. Stearns,
but he is the attorney for the El Monte Ranch Company
that sold the property to Pratt, and he is also your
attorney, and he must realize the value of this property
to the District. It is remarkably cheap, and unquestion-
ably it is vitally affected by any underground pumping,
and the land just above the El Monte pumping plant is
the only piece that I know of that has never parted with
its riparian rights. The old San Diego Flume Company
and the Cuyamaca Company should have acquired this long
ago. At any rate, it is the basis of a nasty law suit,
and if the City got possession it is dangerous.

I have paid \$100 to Pratt for the month of December, and I feel we ought to have an answer this month if and when you get your money from the sale of the bonds, as you cannot expect me to carry it on indefinitely for the District.

Please do not bring my name into the discussion at all with the Board, but you are free to use any information that I have given you on the subject, and if I can be of service call me at any meeting.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

December
Tenth
1925

Mr. H. A. Hall, President,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa,
California.

My dear Mr. Hall:-

Concerning our telephone conversation and referring to your request for a thirty-day extension of time, or until January 17th, 1926, on the contract to sell the Guyanaca Water System to the District, it is my understanding that you will have the necessary papers covering the extension of time drawn up for the approval of Mr. Stern and myself.

I want to call your attention, however, to the relinquishment of certain rights in the event a settlement was made with the City of San Diego, on pages 4, 5 and part of 6. In the extension of time on the contract, this relinquishment should be eliminated..

Yours very truly,

EF:F

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION BETWEEN
H. A. HALL OF LA MESA AND ED FLETCHER, SAN DIEGO
December 11, 1925.

Mr. Fletcher telephoned to Mr. Hall and read to him the letter written by Mr. Harritt to be sent to Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Hall: I see

Mr. Fletcher: --They think I am going to be spiteful and try and kill any compromise between the District and the city. You know that is entirely erroneous.

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Mr. Fletcher: Nothing there but what is o. k. ?

Mr. Hall: Nothing that I see but what is o. k.

Mr. Fletcher: All right, old top. You are going to telephone to Stearns, are you?

Mr. Hall: Oh, yes.

Mr. Fletcher: When are you going to see our friend Sterns?

Mr. Hall: Charles F. you mean?

Mr. Fletcher: Yes, he will play ball with you to the finish. There is no hurry about that. Don't you think you ought to ring up Higgins and tell Higgins that the district at this time is not going to get in and fight the city on Fletcher dam, and try to quiet them down for a little while, and when you do want to start work on Fletcher dam you will let him know.

Mr. Hall: I don't know just the situation. I don't think I should do that.

Mr. Fletcher: Awful mistake for Crouch to have done that.

Mr. Hall: I would not have done that myself.

Mr. Fletcher: He did not have any authority to make that statement.

Mr. Hall: No.

More conversation referring to Crouch's statement, etc. which I have not transcribed, but have some notes on.

December
Eleventh
1925.

Mr. H. A. Hall, President,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa,
California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Concerning our telephone conversation of today, and your approval of the inclosed letter, will say, as you know, the City of San Diego don't like to negotiate with Ed Fletcher, but they are anxious to get hold of the distribution lines, and Mr. Rhodes, on his own initiative, asked Mr. Harritt to outline a proposition in a letter from Harritt to Rhodes.

I have approved the inclosed letter, and am sending you a copy just as a matter of record. I am sure that this is a step in the right direction. The City Council has an idea that Fletcher and Stern will oppose any compromise between the District and the City. It is to laugh! Let them think so.

Very truly yours,

EF:F

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED	
TELEGRAM	
DAY LETTER	
NIGHT MESSAGE	
NIGHT LETTER	

Patrons should mark an X opposite the class of service desired; OTHERWISE THE MESSAGE WILL BE TRANSMITTED AS A FULL RATE TELEGRAM

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT GEORGE W. E. ATKINS, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

NO.	CASH OR CHG.
CHECK	
TIME FILED	

Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

To W. H. Hall Pres District S. 7 19

Street and No. (or Telephone Number)

Place

Saw State Controller Today

Sacramento He has authority to sign
District Bonds and if you pay
expense will send me down
with stamps should have bonds
ready for delivery Monday
Received from State yesterday
time to pay 1929
and district

SENDER'S ADDRESS
FOR REFERENCE

SENDER'S TELEPHONE
NUMBER

Ed Fletcher



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California

Jan. 28, 1926.

Mr. Schroeder, Editor,
The Independent,
San Diego, Calif.

Dear Mr. Schroeder:-

I am enclosing a letter which I will be glad if you would publish in order to set at ease the minds of the people in the Irrigation District as regarding the statements which have been made in the Union and Tribune regarding the Normal Heights pipe line.

I remain

Thanking you for your co-operation,

Yours very truly,

H. A. Hall

President, La Mesa, Lemon Grove &
Spring Valley Irrigation District.



Mr. Schroeder,
Editor of the Independent,
San Diego, Calif.

Dear Sir:-

We have read so many different articles in some of the papers regarding the water situation, which have apparently come from the office of the City Attorney of San Diego and the office of the City Engineer, which conflict with conditions as we see them so that I wondered if it would not be wise to state to the people of San Diego our views in the matter.

First, the four clauses which the City attorney insists must be inserted in the purchase contract of the Normal Heights-Kensington Park distributing system refer to payments which are made to the District for water is to be understood to be for service instead of for water. Naturally we would not recognize such a condition.

The entire four clauses are so ridiculous so as not to need comment by us.

We signed an agreement for the transfer of the system to the City which carried out the terms of the option which we had with the Cuyamaca Water Company, and which we are willing to stand by but these separate conditions of Mr. Higgins are impossible from our standpoint.

We also note with a great deal of interest that the officials are making their plans to build a large pipe line from the City to El Capitan dam site and are promising the people six million gallons of pumped water per day. It might be well to call the attention of the people to the fact that Mr. Higgins has made the statement himself that if they did not have the paramount rights to the river that they did not have any rights on the river whatever. Our position in the matter of pumping water from El Capitan or from any other part of the river which might interfere with our holdings would be that until the Supreme Court has finally adjudicated this matter and given the entire flow of water to the City of San Diego that we will not permit any water to be taken from these various sources. Surely not from the El Capitan dam site which we own.

In this connection we would like the people of San Diego to know that it is not our purpose to hold up water development on the San Diego River. We were ready at the time of the hearing before the Railway Commission and still are ready to agree to any reasonable compromises on the division of the waters.

Should your City Council be willing to enter into such a compromise we both might start building dams at once and be ready to conserve any run offs which we might get this coming winter. In the face of the drouth conditions which seem to be upon us it would look as if it was good business sense to stop litigation about the San Diego River and commence some water development.

Yours very truly,

H. A. Hall

President, La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District.



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California

Feb. 3, 1926.

Col. Ed Fletcher,
920-8th St.,
SAN DIEGO, Calif.

Dear Sir:-

At our meeting Monday night the matter of the option on Mission dam site #5 was brought up and in view of the various suits which are now in progress it was thought best, if you were willing, that you give us a separate option on this site, which we might file of record.

You might take the matter up with Mr. Stearns to get it in the proper shape.

Now in regard to the little reservoir on the side of Mt. Helix. Mr. King is making various plans, one of which seems to include the use of this reservoir. You have told me personally that you intended to give this land to the District and I think at this time it would be wise if you would write us a letter stating just what you will do. I am not sure that we should be to the expense of pumping all this water but perhaps the giving of the land and possibly any other concessions which you might feel willing to give might swing the sentiment toward using this site.

Yours very truly,

H. A. Hall



February 4, 1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring
Valley Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Answering yours of Feb. 3d, I will see Mr. Stearns relative to the separate option re Mission Gorge Damsite No. 3, the terms along the lines agreed on on April 5, 1924.

Regarding the Mt. Helix reservoir, as I told the district directors personally, we will deed the land free of any cost and give rights of way free as well, the boundaries of the land to be mutually agreed on, the above referring to the Mt. Helix reservoir that is under consideration.

I am of the opinion that the District should do a certain amount of pumping, say to the lower levels, at the expense of the district and be paid for out of the general fund; that there should be an additional charge for pumping to the higher levels where extraordinary conditions exist.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

Not reviewed after
dictation as Mr. Fletcher
left the city before the
letter was transcribed

February 12, 1926.

La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

Attention Mr. H. A. Hall, President

Gentlemen:

Referring to your letter of February 3d, we have granted your request for a separate option on Mission Gorge damsite No. 3 and same has been signed and recorded.

I am asked by the City to give rights-of-way for their San Diego River pipe line and in so doing am protecting the irrigation district in every way, as well as myself, thru a reservation protecting our riparian rights and water filings, and I want again to go on record as saying that I am and will cooperate with the district in every way possible for the success of the district.

In that connection, however, I can see myself possibly hanging out on the end of a limb under certain conditions. I was told by an influential man yesterday that it is only a question of a short time before there will be a compromise between the district and the city, and with Fletcher out of the picture it would be a case of Hamlet with Hamlet left out, -at least I think so! What I ask of the La Mesa District at the present time is a resolution at your next meeting assuring me that if you make any compromise with the city that compromise will include the purchase, either by the district or the city, of Mission Gorge damsite No. 3, and the exercise of the option which I have just given you. I hope you do not think this is asking too much, but it is an evidence of your good faith in return for the good faith I have kept with you in co-operating with the district in every way possible in the past.

I do not want to go to the extreme of employing an attorney in this paramount right suit to protect the interest of the Cuyamaca Water Company, which still owns Mission Gorge No. 3 damsite and which also owns several miles of riparian rights on the river below El Capitan.

-2-

I am of the opinion that it would be far better from the standpoint of your district to have the Cuyamaca Water Company entirely eliminated from this litigation from now on and that it may be known to the court that it is purely the La Mesa Irrigation District and the municipality of San Diego. Your chance of success to win is better than to have private interests publicly fighting for their rights in court.

The continued, deliberate, vicious action on the part of the Union and Tribune in ignoring the La Mesa Irrigation District as a factor, and in showing up to the public the red flag of the City of San Diego vs. Ed Fletcher, Fletcher interests and Cuyamaca Water Company, is being taken care of as best I can. The matter has been put into the hands of Judge Sloane. He has given me an opinion that it is libelous and a written demand of retraction is now being prepared, which we shall request be printed on the front page of the Union and Tribune. Let us pray that we may be successful and that this form of abuse be stopped.

In closing, I hope that next Monday night the La Mesa Irrigation District, by formal resolution, will go on record as asked for in this letter. Said action will be appreciated by

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

February 15, 1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall, President,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring
Valley Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

I had a talk with Mrs. White yesterday regarding the reservoir land between Grossmont and Helix. We will donate the necessary land, will build a good road around the property, will properly protect it from pollution by necessary ditches and culverts on both sides so that even any flood waters will not reach the reservoir, and will properly landscape the borders of the lake to make an attractive park; the plans to be first approved by the Board of Directors of the District. Will also give free rights-of-way for pipelines thru the property.

I hope this is agreeable to the Board.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

February 17, 1926.

Board of Directors,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove, & Spring
Valley Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

Attention: Mr. H. A. Hall

Gentlemen:

Inclosed find letter from Mrs. Long under date of February 13th and statement which she has made that is beyond me. Please send it to your attorneys if you think it advisable.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

February 17, 1926.

Board of Directors,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring
Valley Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

Attention: Mr. H. A. Hall

Gentlemen:

In my opinion the case of the La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District in court is to some extent hurt by the continued use of the names Ed Fletcher, Charles F. Stern and Cuyamaca Water Company as defendants. It is being used by the San Diego Union and Tribune continuously as the only defendants, the La Mesa Irrigation District's name not being mentioned. This is misleading to the public, and the Union and the Tribune have 35,000 subscribers who are being told all the time that it is still a fight between private individuals and corporations vs. the City, when as a matter of fact it is a lie and they know it.

I am satisfied it would be to the interests of your case to have a substitution of parties defendant in such a way as to eliminate the names of Cuyamaca Water Company, Ed Fletcher and Charles F. Stern from the case. If you are of the same opinion, will you kindly have this done?

Yours very truly,

EF:AH

C.C. PARK, PRESIDENT

H.A. HALL, VICE PRESIDENT

H.C. PARK, CASHIER



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California February 19, 1926.

Col. Ed. Fletcher,
San Diego, California.

Dear Colonel:

Your letter regarding the Mission Gorge #3 was received by me several days ago, and I filed it with the Secretary, and they discussed the matter last Monday night in my absence. We will go into the matter more fully at our next regular meeting, but I am inclined to think that for your best interest and ours it would not be practical for us to pass a resolution making it a matter of record that we insist on the sale of this dam site being a condition of the compromise.

I have had it in mind for some time, have talked it on each occasion when I have talked compromise of just this condition, as you suggest, and am willing to give you my assurance that I will do everything in my power in making the sale of this dam site a part of the compromise.

I believe after you study the matter over yourself you will realize that we should not make this a matter of record.

Very truly yours,

LA MESA, LEMON GROVE and SPRING VALLEY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

H. A. Hall
Pres.



February 20, 1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

What would be your attitude, please, as regards withdrawing 50 or 100 acres of land from the district and replacing it with 50 or 100 acres of better land, more centrally located, and the exchange in the interest of the district and would mean immediate development near La Mesa. The Santa Fe and San Dieguito Districts have allowed exchanges this way several times.

I would appreciate your personal attitude in this matter before taking it up with the District Directors officially.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

February 20, 1926..

La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

Attention Mr. Hall, President.

Gentlemen:

I thank you for your letter of the 19th.

I do not want it made a matter of record in the court house, but I do think, after what I have done for the La Mesa Irrigation District I should have some assurance in the form a resolution of the district protecting us in this matter, and it need not be public in the newspapers.

Are you in agreement with me in this matter?

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California February 23, 1926.

Col. Ed Fletcher,
920 Eighth Street,
San Diego, California.

Dear Col. Fletcher:

Your letter at hand regarding the withdrawal and replacement of from fifty to one hundred acres of land.

The location of the land would have some bearing on our attitude, but as far as I can personally see I would have no objection to your making a transfer providing you were willing to pay for the expense in connection with it.

Please remember that at all times we wish to cooperate with you in anything which is for the best interests of all concerned.

Very truly yours,

LA MESA, LEMON GROVE & SPRING VALLEY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

H A Hall

Pres.



February
Twenty-fourth
1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall, President,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley Irrig. District,
La Mesa,
California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Answering your letter of February 23rd, will say that part of the land I have in mind in exchange is one hundred acres just North of Grossmont and North of Murray Hill, through which the pipeline was built on its way to the Thum property. It would benefit the District materially to have this land in instead of some land that I am going to suggest we take out, and which I control, and which lies East of the Thum property. Thank you for your interest in the matter. I will see you in a few days in relation thereto, and will bring you a map.

Now, regarding 20 odd acres of land in Villa Caro Heights, just East of the Grossmont Store. The pipeline to El Cajon runs to the property and you are now furnishing five or six consumers there. I am wondering if some arrangement can be made to take these 20 or 30 acres into the District, as you are now furnishing partial service. It will all be out up into house lots and will take domestic service, and give a high rate of profit for water sales.

I will take both these matters up with you the next time I see you.

Yours very truly,

EF:F

March 4, 1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

Please let me know what the district had done in the Pratt matter. My understanding from Mr. Harritt is that you intend to purchase it. How about the refund of the money that I have personally paid on the option?

I have made arrangements with Mr. White to hold the Griffith property just above the pumping plants for a reasonable length of time for you.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

C.C. PARK, PRESIDENT

H.A. HALL, VICE PRESIDENT

H.C. PARK, CASHIER



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California March 5, 1926.

Col. Ed. Fletcher,
San Diego, California.

My dear Col. Fletcher:

Your letter in reference to the Pratt matter has been referred to Mr. White who has charge of the same.

As I understand it, we are planning to take over the lands, and your claim will be considered with the rest.

We are grateful to Mr. White for protecting us on this other land, and as soon as we have gotten ourselves on our feet we will discuss the matter with him.

Very truly yours,

H. A. Hall

(White)



March
Tenth
1926

La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa,
California.

ATTENTION: Mr. H. A. Hall, Pres.

Gentlemen:

Inclosed find letter from my friend Mr. George Bach and statement re. the Pratt matter, also statement of \$600.00 due me for monies that I have loaned Mr. Pratt to carry his contract. All I want is the \$600.00 back and 6% interest. Unless some official action is taken by the Board of Directors of the District next Monday night, a foreclosure will be started. Mr. Bach has verbally told me that he will discount the Pratt contract \$500.00 for cash, or you have the option of paying \$790.34, getting Mr. Pratt to assign the contract, and continuing the monthly payments. What is your pleasure in regard to this matter? Please notify me of your action.

I would certainly recommend that you acquire this property. Mr. Bach informally told me that if the La Mesa District acquired the consent of all the ranchers on the El Monte Ranch to your unlimited pumping, the El Monte Ranch would not stand in the way of the District. I think this is a very fine attitude for Mr. Bach to take, and while he is not speaking for the Company, it shows you a way of solving the water situation regarding your rights to pump.

Yours very truly,

EF:F

March 20, 1926.

Mr. H. A. Hall, President,
La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring
Valley Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

My dear Mr. Hall:

I have 650 acres of land of the Thum tract within the District and which is entitled to water now. Only 150 acres of that land is being irrigated.

There are 400 acres of land in the Thum tract that I will put no water on this year, but just adjoining it are 20 acres which have been levelled, are ready to plant, a home has been built on it, and on which I want water if only for temporary purposes. I have already petitioned for this 20 acres to come into the District. You have the legal petitions duly signed for inclusion, also other lands for exclusion, all as per our conversation last night.

All I ask at the present time temporarily is to run the water off of some of the Thum lands that are in the District to the land adjoining so that we can put in a crop of tomatoes, and the entire acreage would be irrigated, not to exceed 20 or 30 acres. It has been done so many times both in the Santa Fe and the San Dieguito Irrigation districts, and particularly where it benefits the District with better land and the saving of money to make this exchange, with the result that the tenant has gone on the property, cleared it, levelled it, graded it ready to plant tomorrow, and built a home.

You can rest assured that I will not get caught in this fix again and will make no more leases on any lands that are not in the District, but where I agree to give up the use of water this year on 400 acres to which I am entitled - lands now in the District - it seems to me this is a small courtesy that can be extended me under the circumstances.

I am leaving for the East on Sunday for a four months' trip and I hope under the circumstances the directors will extend this courtesy informally before I leave, and it will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

EF:AG

cc - Mr. Halley
Mr. Scott
Mr. Russell
Mr. Barry
Mr. Robinson



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California March 31, 1926.

Col. Ed. Fletcher,
916 Eighth Street,
San Diego, California.

Dear Colonel:

Your letter of the 30th at hand. Mr. Harriet was supposed to have seen you yesterday and talked with you about your twenty or thirty acres of land which you desire to have water on that lie outside of the district. It will be absolutely impossible for the directors of the district to consent to your taking any portion of the water outside of the boundaries of the district. We appreciate what you have done for the district, and yet it is purely a matter of right and wrong and one which would cause a great deal of scandal should the matter come to light, both from your standpoint and ours. We are very sorry indeed that we cannot see our way clear to take this land and exclude the other. This we may be able to do within a month or two, but until we have arrived at some conclusion or have broken off entirely with the City, I do not feel it is wise to take any action whatever. You are in no worse plight than several score of people in La Mesa Heights who are being deprived of even domestic water.

A matter was brought to my attention the other day which I did not just understand, and I did not feel that you should have taken this action. Some woman living in La Mesa Heights, outside of the district, informed the office force that you advised her to hire an attorney to straighten out her affairs with the district.

Also another man was in the office yesterday and said that you had advised him to hurry a line out of his lands which lie outside of the district that he might be sure to get his water.

These are all things that are past and gone, and still we do not feel that this is exactly the proper attitude to take in both these matters.

Assuring you of our desire to cooperate in every way with all of our people, I remain



Very truly yours,

H. A. Hall

President,

LA MESA, LEMON GROVE & SPRING VALLEY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT.

April 2, 1926.

La Mesa, Lemon Grove & Spring Valley
Irrigation District,
La Mesa, California.

Attention Mr. H. A. Hall, President

My dear Mr. Hall:

Answering yours of March 31st, will say that I tried to look at it from the point of view of the District Directors. The permit could have been granted without injury to anyone, ie: to give us a temporary supply of water on lands coming into the district for which you had a petition of inclusion and exclusion, and owing to the fact that I was perfectly willing to sign any waiver of rights if for any reason the lands were not finally included in the district.

I feel I have rendered valuable service, and gladly to the district, in many ways, and have shown the right spirit of cooperation all the way thru.

I have made no recommendation to any woman outside of the district and advised her to hire an attorney to straighten out her affairs with the district, and any who says so lies. A woman did see me and demand water. I turned her down and told her to go to the district. She said she had seen the district and you had turned her down. She created a scene in my office, made all kinds of threats and I told her that if she had any kick coming to hire an attorney and find out what her rights were. You would have said the same thing.

You say another man said that I had advised him to hurry a line out on his lands which lie outside of the district, that he might be sure to get water. This is also a lie, and you can tell the man so, with my compliments. That man to whom you refer asked me how much water he was entitled to. I told him in reply that he was entitled to as much as he received last year. He answered that he would have to put in some distribution lines on his own account in order to use as much water

-2-

as he had used last year economically and I told him that if he did not want to lose his water right to the amount of water he had used last year he would have to do it. You would have answered the same way.

Thank God, I am getting out of the country so that no more of these things can come up, and I feel today that I would like to stay away for good and all.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM



Bank of La Mesa

COMMERCIAL SAVINGS

La Mesa, California June 23, 1926.

Col. Ed. Fletcher,
% Mrs. S. W. Fletcher,
Spencer, Massachusetts.

Dear Friend Fletcher:

Your welcome letter from Paris received a few days ago.

We are still holding our own with the enemy although this morning's Union would indicate to our people and to the people of San Diego that the City has again gained another marvellous victory. Judge Andrews denied our temporary judgment on the pipe line on a very small technicality, ruling, however, with us on all the Supreme Court cases which were recited by our attorneys. When the matter comes to trial for permanent judgment, if tried before Judge Andrews, I am confident that the City will be permanently enjoined from building.

Your Company had not taken any action toward joining with us, and Mr. Harriet got in touch with Charles F. Stern through your sister, and he immediately ordered Judge Sloan to enter a separate suit, and I received a long wire from Mr. Stern assuring us of his entire co-operation with the District even if it meant the sacrifice of the entire Mission Hills system. It was no more than I would have expected from the different statements which Mr. Stern has made in the past, but it was certainly gratifying to receive the wire and knowing that he was still with us.

Our greatest problem at the present time is keeping Carrol Smith on his feet. He seems to be overwhelmed with the conditions as he sees them arising out of Judge Conkling's decision and then this denial of our temporary judgment. C. O. Smith, his father, is perfectly stable, and we are hoping that tonight when we have a little conference with Carrol, his father and Harry Park on one side, King, Harriet and myself on the other we will be able to stiffen his backbone a little for it will make our battle harder if our own people weaken, especially without cause.

I am glad to know that you have been having such a splendid time and anticipate that you will be glad to be back home again.

Before you get this letter you will no doubt receive the saddest news which has come to us as a District and to you and myself personally,



2 - Col. Ed. Hatcher. 6-23-26.

the sudden death of our friend McClure. I certainly wish you were home right now to have a hand in appointing the new State Engineer for if the City of San Diego beat us to it the Lord knows our troubles will be magnified. I think I will write to Charles F. Stern to keep an eye on the situation.

Wishing you a pleasant trip across the Atlantic, I remain

Very truly yours,

H. A. Hall

President,
LA MESA, LEMON GROVE & SPRING VALLEY
IRRIGATION DISTRICT.

Ed Fletcher Papers

1870-1955

MSS.81

Box: 9 Folder: 29

General Correspondence - Hall, H.A.



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.