

May 31, 1918.

La Mesa Scout,

La Mesa, Calif.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith find resolution passed by the City of El Cajon. Will you kindly put this on the front page of your next issue, and if you can see your way clear to do it add a few words showing that the whole country is unanimous in sustaining our position. Also mention the fact that the Cuyamaca Water Co. has brought suit to condemn the private lands that will be flooded, and showing their intention to go ahead with the construction of a major dam at or near the diverting dam, on the San Diego River;

That the officials of the company have announced that the dam will be not less than 120 feet in height and possibly 140 feet in height;

That it will be of concrete construction and that the plans have been approved by the Chief Hydraulic Engineer of the State Railroad Commission, according to law;

That it is understood that the Cuyamaca Water Co. is negotiating with the riparian owners below, securing their consent to the construction of the dam;

And that in the near future, unless the City of San Diego intervenes by injunction proceedings, the Cuyamaca Water Co.

San Diego Naval Air Station

May 7, 1918

La Mesa Scout,
La Mesa, Calif.

gentlemen:-

Please let me have fifty copies of your issue of May 4th showing "Trustees endorse Fletcher Plan." All I desire is the front page, you may keep the rest of the paper. I don't care whether it is the El Cajon Valley News or the La Mesa Scout.

Yours very truly,

EF/bm

will undoubtedly be constructing one of the largest
dams for the storage of water in San Diego County.

Will you please print 300 extra copies of this
paper and then send me a bill for the whole thing
and I will mail you a check.

Yours very truly,

CUYAMACA WATER COMPANY,

By _____
Manager.

F-S

W. M. G. KIRCHHOFF
Vice-President
F. H. TOLLE
Secretary
H. E. HUNTINGTON
C. A. GANFIELD
W. G. KIRCHHOFF
E. E. KIRCHHOFF
H. W. KIRCHHOFF
H. F. BAUMGAERTNER

South Coast Land Company

(INCORPORATED)
MAIN OFFICE
SUITE 212 KIRCHHOFF BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CAL.
PHONE MAIN 227

H. W. KIRCHHOFF
President
Branch Offices:
SAN DIEGO, CAL.
DEL MAR, CAL.

September 15, 1923.

Mr. C. O. Smith,
La Mesa Scout,
La Mesa, Calif.

My dear Mr. Smith:

Answering Mr. Halley's letter, he is right in the first instance; ie: that the purpose of organizing the La Mesa Irrigation District was to build a system of its own, not to buy the Cuyamaca Water Company. For the first time Mr. J. H. Halley is smoked out. He has been telling everybody that the Cuyamaca Company backed out of a sale of its system to the La Mesa District on a technicality, ie: that we would not accept the bonds of the La Mesa District in payment for our Cuyamaca System. We did that on the advice of our attorney who said the bonds were absolutely illegal, for the reason that the bonds were voted for a particular purpose and it was specified in the call of the election to build a water system as per plans and specifications of J. B. Lippincott. Our attorney said, therefore the bonds voted for a specific purpose to build a new system could not be used to buy an existing system, without a re-submission of the proposition to the voters within the district, and their approval secured.

The truth is Mr. Halley and his outfit made an error in that election call, for it should have read to build a new system as per plans and specifications of J. B. Lippincott, or to purchase an existing system. It was the last phrase that Halley left out, and intentionally so, for he was bitter against ever acquiring the Cuyamaca System and always has been.

The District directors knew all of the time that those bonds were invalid. They never told us. We had to discover it for ourselves after spending several hundred dollars for an investigation thru our attorneys, and they tried to make us out pikers, but my opinion is that they knew all of the time that the bonds were illegal when it came to using them for the purchase of our system. It is true they furnished us with an opinion approved by Dillon, Thompson & Clay that the proceedings were regular, but that decision was rendered by Dillon, Thompson & Clay before there was any thought of buying our system, and the question was never put up to them whether those same bonds were legal for the purchase of our system.

Now regarding water supply. Enclosed herewith find copy of net safe yield study of our chief engineer, Mr. King, who is now the chief engineer of the San Dieguito Irrigation District. I am also sending you in strict confidence a copy of the report recently made by hydraulic department of the State Railroad Commission, with the consent of the Railroad Commission, at the request of the Chamber of Commerce water committee. It has not been made public and you must not publicly quote it as a Chamber of Commerce Water Committee report. J. C. Thompson, vice-president of the Southern Trust & Commerce Bank is chairman of that committee. He has given his consent however, to your using the figures in that report, and stating that they are the official figures of the State Railroad Commission hydraulic department.

You will notice in the report of the Railroad Commission engineer, Mr. Faude, on Page 5 the net safe yield of the Cuyamaca System as follows:

"In addition to a safe yield of 3.12 million gallons per day from the present gravity system the El Monte Plant could have furnished an additional supply of water in each year except 1900. The probable safe yield of the El Monte plant with the present equipment is not less than 2 million gallons per day, and this yield could be materially increased by the installation of adequate equipment."

The above means that the net safe yield of the Cuyamaca System today is 5.12 million gallons of water daily, and on Page 5 the report says:

"The present requirements of the consumers of the Cuyamaca System amount to approximately 3 million gallons a day."

Now, Mr. Smith, that shows a net supply under present conditions in excess of our demands, of over 2 million gallons a day. For \$35,000 we can install up-to-date pumping plant pumping 6 million gallons a day with a net safe yield of 4 million gallons daily from the Monte sands. There are between 9 and 12 billion gallons of water in the Monte sands. We own all the pumping rights, having bought them clear down to below Lakeside, and on Page 7 of the report of the Hydraulic Engineer of the Railroad Commission you find the following words:

"After the installation of new wells and equipment at the El Monte plant, a yield of from 3 to 4 million gallons a day can be depended upon."

On Page 6 the report says, that with the South Fork and Fletcher dams built "these reservoirs would increase the yield of the present Cuyamaca System to a total of 7600 acre feet per year or approximately 6.8 million gallons daily." The 6.8 million gallons daily is a gravity supply and by adding 4 million gallons daily as the pumped supply from the El Monte gravels brings a net safe yield of 10.8 million gallons daily, or approximately 11,500 acre feet of water, sufficient to irrigate 11,500 acres annually as a minimum supply and about 16,000 acres with a three-fourths supply only during periods of drought; However, that entire section, Grossmont to San Diego, is in a short time to be domestic supply or acre tracts.

There are not to exceed 1,000 acres of irrigated orchard land in the La Mesa District today. That will all be subdivided into small tracts a little later and this problem is one of protecting the future domestic supply of the La Mesa Irrigation District.

The La Mesa Irrigation District should be enlarged eventually to take in 12,000 to 15,000 acres, anyway. The unfortunate thing is that the district is in the hands of men of such small caliber that they cannot grasp the situation that it is a fight for domestic water to drink; they can only think of irrigation which is almost a thing of the past as far as the La Mesa Irrigation District is concerned, and 10 or 15 years hence there will be no irrigation as it will all be cut up into acre tracts. This is primarily a residential section for the rest of the United States, - all of Southern California, and particularly that land lying between Grossmont and San Diego City.

Attached hereto is a copy of the state engineer's report approving the sale of the Cuyamaca System to the La Mesa District. It is the only copy I have and must be returned immediately. You will get a large source of information from this. Since that report was made we have put between \$200,000 and \$300,000 into capital expense - improvements on the system, but speaking to you confidentially, the Cuyamaca System could now be bought by the district for \$1,500,000 and take 6%-40 year bonds of the district in payment, the bonds to be approved by the state engineer of California and the state bonding commission, with an opinion from Dillon, Thompson and Clay or some other reliable attorney

satisfactory to us. Of course, this price could not run on indefinitely. We would have to have some reasonable assurance soon that the district meant business.

Mr. Halley's presentation is plausible on its face, ie: that you do not enlarge the district, and if the present district pay for the total cost, then, of course, the acreage expense runs high, but the water is there in sufficient quantity to supply 11,000 arable acres with water, which would mean an irrigation district out there, good land and bad of approximately 15,000 acres. Assuming that the total cost of the completed project is \$5,000,000 eventually and the district is 15,000 acres, that would mean \$200 an acre, but that is for a domestic supply, not an irrigation supply and is ridiculously cheap. As there is outside demand for water and the district would have to continue delivering that water to outside consumers, it would be foolish to make the district larger, say, than ten or twelve thousand acres. As an offset to that, however, the Cuyamaca Company this year will take in \$135,000 in the sales of water, and its operating expenses are only \$65,000.

The plan of action should be as follows:

1st. Take an option on the Cuyamaca System for four or six months.

2d. Immediately get busy and see if the district cannot be enlarged to eight or ten thousand acres. Thum and I will put 1700 acres in the district immediately and I can probably get 1,000 acres more. There will be no trouble in getting pledged the enlargement of the district to 10,000 acres within two weeks.

3d. Have a conference with the city council, tell them you have an option, make the best settlement possible with them, getting the city's consent to stop litigation so that Fletcher dam and South Fork dams can be built and our water rights fully protected. Sell El Capitan to the city and then go ahead, complete the enlargement of the district to eight or ten thousand acres, issue bonds to purchase the Cuyamaca System and sufficient bonds to build the South Fork and Fletcher dams.

There will be enough revenue come in from the sale of water to our present consumers and the sale of surplus water which the City of San Diego will buy from the district, to take care of interest, sinking fund, etc. of the bonds and give a revenue to re-build the flume, commencing 5 or 6 years hence.

The city would undoubtedly pay the district \$200,000 or \$300,000, anyway, in the settlement with the district, and I do not believe there would be any necessity of a bond issue in excess of two to 2½ million dollars; with South Fork and Fletcher dams built there is a net safe yield of 11 million gallons a day from the Cuyamaca System, costing completely developed \$3,000,000. There is the City of San Diego, \$9,000,000 invested with a net safe yield of 9.2 million gallons daily, according to their own figures.

There is no other source of supply for the La Mesa district, and they would be buying the Cuyamaca water at one-third the cost that the city has paid for its water. It is as plain as the nose on a man's face, but unfortunately there is this man, Halley, ready to go to his grave, can only think of irrigating water and irrigating rates and does not know that he is of the past. Those directors should resign and a new bunch of business men should be put in, the option should be secured and an attempt made, at least, to whip this thing into businesslike shape, and if it cannot be done then call it off, but your moral duty to the people, and the obligation of a bunch of business men like you, is to make one more attempt before letting the "golden egg" slip out of your grasp.

There is a provision in the city charter of San Diego, which charter was approved by legislature, which gives the right to the city of San Diego thru its city council, to sell water for domestic and irrigating purposes outside the City of San Diego. The Railroad Commission would have no jurisdiction if the city bought the Cuyamaca System and the city would establish all rates for irrigating purposes outside the city and in. The present rate is 20 cents a thousand gallons.

If they had a board of directors of the La Mesa District that was composed of business men, in order to straighten out the water situation, if it were that best, I would be glad for two years to serve without pay as manager of the district, at least its water development, but I suppose that working for nothing even, I would be accused of having some personal interest.

I suggest the article attached hereto as your answer to Mr. Halley.

I must have the La Mesa Irrigation District report back here in the next two or three days. It is the only copy I have and is valuable to me.

Yours sincerely,

October 23, 1923

La Mesa Scout,
La Mesa, California.

Gentlemen:

My attention has been called to Mr. Halley's article in your issue of October 12th, and I wish to correct the wrong impression created by Mr. Halley's article particularly in relation to the net safe yield of the San Diego River.

Mr. Halley I am convinced has not quite understood some of the reports on the safe yield of the San Diego River which he has read. He makes a statement that the U. S. Reclamation Service engineer did not believe the South Fork Reservoir worth undertaking. As a matter of fact the U. S. Reclamation Service engineer is the man who selected the now accepted site of the South Fork reservoir and he personally supervised a survey of this damsite and reservoir site. In his safe yield studies he made studies both with and without the South Fork Reservoir, arriving at 7300 acre feet annually without the South Fork Reservoir and 7600 acre feet annually including the South Fork Reservoir.

There have been safe yield studies made on the entire San Diego River at every possible damsite by the following engineers: Mr. Charles H. Lee, former Chief of the State Water Commission, Mr. W. L. Huber, Consulting Hydraulic Engineer for the State of California, U. S. Reclamation Service, F. M. Faude, Chief Hydraulic Engineer of the State Water Commission, W. C. Earle, Consulting Engineer for the City of San Diego, H. H. Savage, formerly Hydraulic Engineer of the City of San Diego, and the writer. All of these studies show close agreement and in view of this fact it is safe to assume that a conservative estimate of the yield of the Cuyamaca Water Company under complete development would be 10.5 million gallons daily or 11,800 acre feet annually. These are practically the figures utilized by Mr. F. M. Faude in his report which is referred to by Mr. Halley.

Mr. Halley totally ignores the yield of the Monte pumping plant although Mr. Faude gave this serious consideration. Unquestionably a conservative estimate of the safe yield of this basin is around four million gallons daily or 4500 acre feet annually. This four million gallons daily must be added to the safe gravity yield of the Cuyamaca system giving 6.8 million gallons daily plus 4.0 million gallons daily equals 10.8 million gallons daily as the safe yield of the fully developed Cuyamaca system. I have used, however, but 10.5 million gallons daily for added conservatism.

Mr. Halley also gives the impression that all of the water now being delivered by the Cuyamaca Water Company to its consumers must be deducted from the amount which is available for the La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District. As a matter of fact considerably over one half of the water now being delivered by the Cuyamaca Water Company is within the boundaries of the present La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District. Thus, assuming one half of the present use of the Cuyamaca Water Company as deducted we have 10.5 million gallons daily less 1.5, representing one half of the Cuyamaca Water Company's deliveries, equals 9 million gallons daily for the La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District. Nine million gallons daily is equal, in round figures, to 10,000 acre feet annually.

Another point that Mr. Halley has overlooked and which is recognized by all irrigation engineers is the fact that the gross area of an irrigation district is never irrigated in any one year. It has been shown that on the average 10% of the area of every irrigation district is occupied by County roads or public streets. The average of other non-irrigable lands at 16%. The average for lands which in any year even under complete development will not be irrigated 15%. These percentages are the result of studies of the irrigation districts in California by Mr. W. L. Huber, Consulting Hydraulic Engineer of the State of California. Mr. Huber states in his report that the ratio of the net area to be irrigated in any one year to the gross area of an irrigation district is 60%. He further states that even in the irrigation districts in the San Joaquin Valley where only level, unbroken, valley lands are included that the percentage does not exceed 60%. In the area of the La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District there is a considerable area of broken lands and it is extremely doubtful if this district can hope to have as high a development as the districts in the San Joaquin Valley, therefore, unquestionably 60% is considerably higher than should be allowed. It is doubtful if over 50% of the gross area of the La Mesa, Lemon Grove, and Spring Valley Irrigation District will ever be irrigated in any one year.

Assuming a duty of water of one acre foot per acre and assuming that 60% of the lands would be irrigated in each year 7300 acre feet would be sufficient for a district of over 12,000 acres. 7600 acre feet would serve a district of 12,700 acres. 10,000 acre foot would serve a district of 16,700 acres. Should there be but 50% of the gross area irrigated in any one year, which is unquestionably nearer the actual conditions than 60%, 10,000 acre feet annually would be sufficient for an irrigation district of 20,000 acres.

Yours very truly,

T. H. King.

THK:ME

November 3, 1923.

La Mesa Scout,
La Mesa, Calif.

Gentlemen:

Inclosed find clipping from this morning's paper, also decision of the Supreme court, which please return without fail. You will find it on Page 472.

Inclosed also find copy of my letter to Mr. Gould of the Chamber of Commerce, all of which is explanatory.

You should particularly read Mr. Higgins' statement, and let the dear public out there know what the City is going to do to you if they acquire the Cuyamaca System.

Yours very truly,

EF:AH



SMITH & SONS

Printers and Publishers

EL CAJON VALLEY NEWS RAMONA SENTINEL
LA MESA SCOUT LAKESIDE JOURNAL
La Mesa, California

March 27, 1925.

Col. Ed Fletcher,
San Diego, Calif.,

My dear Colonel:

Our firm would like very much to have the job of printing the irrigation district bonds, and not primarily for business reasons, but because we want to see our imprint on each and every one of them, and feel we had a part in this water victory in more ways than one.

I understand it is quite probable that Mr. Sterns' bank will bid in the entire issue, and in that event would you be so good as to ask him if he would do us the favor of submitting a letter to me at the proper time, stating that he has no objection to our printing them, providing we are lucky in the bidding. It is quite customary for bond houses when taking over a large issue of this kind to state their preference in this matter.

We are prepared to furnish any kind of a bond desired, and at the right price, and can guarantee a satisfactory job in every respect.

If you can see your way clear to grant this favor, would be tremendously obliged.

Sincerely yours,
cc - Mr. Stern
La Mesa W. Dist. Carroll H. Smith.

August 26, 1925.

Mr. C. O. Smith,
El Cajon, Calif.

My Dear Mr. Smith:

Inclose find letter from the attorney for the Southern Title Guaranty Company, Mr. Hubbell. Also a copy of my letter to the Board of Directors which is confidential. Please do not give this any publicity whatsoever.

I have just been informed that Fred Stearns is determining how much of that \$ 25,000.00 the District should pay and how much the city should pay. In all probability the District will be asked to pay about \$6,000.00 and we will have to pay the rest I hope.

The profits over and above all the expenses in operating the Cuyamaca Water System since June 22, 1925, are far in excess to the attorney's fees of Crouch and Sanders.

Yours very truly,

EF:LF

April Twenty-third,
1 9 2 9

Mr. C. S. Smith,
c/o La Mesa Scout,
La Mesa, Calif.

Dear Mr. Smith:

Enclosed find article which I would appreciate if you would run in this week's issue of the "Scout".

Yours very truly,

EF:AK

May Nineteenth,
1 9 3 1

La Mesa Scout &
El Cajon Valley News.

Gentlemen:

So many libelous statements have been made regarding my connection with the paving in El Cajon Acres and Adams subdivision I wish the people to know the facts and would appreciate your printing same.

The Murray Estate owned about 65 acres in El Cajon Acres. I owned $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres. We decided that we should develop El Cajon Acres by the grading, curbing and surfacing of the roads, also the installation of water mains.

Before the petition was drawn up Mr. Graves representing 20 acres on Chase Avenue approved of this plan and signed the petition. The whole object was to beautify that part of the valley and sell it which heaven knows needed some development. The original petition was filed on February 7th, 1927.

The original petition definitely outlined the boundaries and did not include Adams Subdivision or the lands between Washington Avenue and Adams Subdivision. Practically all of the acreage was owned by the three interests above mentioned, namely, Murray Estate, Graves-Hotchkiss and Fletcher.

The signed petition represented 80% or 90% of the property owners.

The Board of Supervisors approved the plan. They appointed an engineer and also an attorney in the usual manner. It is not a Mattoon Act but the usual individual assessment tax.

These improvements were being made and cast iron water mains installed as a condition precedent

to our joining the City of El Cajon and getting water from the La Mesa District.

The City Trustees of El Cajon insisted that Adams Subdivision and other lands be included in the proceedings and that sewers be installed to connect up with the sewer plant being constructed inside the city of El Cajon. I was not consulted in the matter.

The Board of Supervisors asked for complete jurisdiction of the job and the City Trustees of El Cajon granted the Board of Supervisors request by formal resolution passed on March 24, 1928.

I am no way directly or indirectly responsible for the inclusion of outside lands or Adams subdivision and it delayed us nearly a year in getting our own improvements completed, a most disastrous delay.

After Adams subdivision and the other properties were surveyed and all plans ready for filing only needing the action of the county engineer, he insisted upon a six foot storm drain being installed as a condition of his signing the map and until the map was signed the proceedings could not continue. I protested against it to the engineer of the job but to no avail.

The original estimate of the engineer, T. H. King, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, was \$373,614.25. The report was a matter of public record. The Board of Supervisors published official notice and any one protesting had thirty days to investigate. Not a protest was made on the appointed day for the hearing of protests and the contract was let for \$371,617.17, some two thousand dollars less than the original estimate of cost.

I estimate that the storm drain and sewers alone cost 25% of the entire cost of the job and wholly unnecessary at this time.

I have never directly or indirectly received a dollar in compensation from the contractor or any one else for having the work done.

My only interest consisted of $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land and which I have voluntarily deeded to the bond company rather than pay the assessment that cost me several hundred dollars an acre.

There have been so many libelous statements made about me in relation thereto is the reason I am making this definite statement and to inform my friends what the true situation is.

Yours very truly,

EF:ASK

Ed Fletcher Papers

1870-1955

MSS.81

Box: 16 Folder: 3

General Correspondence - La Mesa Scout



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.