

August 10, 1916.

June 10, 1915.

Mr. Geo. H. Thomas,
City Editor, San Diego Sun,
San Diego, Calif.

My dear Mr. Thomas:

It was really laughable to read in last night's Tribune that all water had been shut off from Otay Lake on account of moving certain pipe. An investigation will show that they had a bad break on the pipeline somewhere, with the result that all the water had to be shut off from Otay.

East San Diego was without water for hours, and our friend Lockwood telephoned out to turn on all water possible immediately yesterday morning, so last night we were turning in at the rate of 4,500,000 gallons daily. This condition is liable to happen at any time, and the Cuyamaca Water Co. is in a position, at a moment's notice, to take care of any emergency, for the reason that our water is within six miles of the City limits, at an elevation of 100 feet higher than Otay, and we are connected up so as to relieve any emergency at any time.

With the Otay pipeline broken yesterday, and with only the water from the pumping plant of the San Diego River available for city use, where would the city have been without the Cuyamaca? Another thing, the pipelines from Otay have not a large enough capacity to take care of the city's needs during the summer, and if the San Diego River pumping plant broke down, then you can see the value of the Cuyamaca. Under these conditions, it seems to me that it is silly for the city to treat the Cuyamaca Water Co. the way they have.

Don't put this in the shape of any interview from me, but the point ought to be brought out strong that the city needs the Cuyamaca in time of emergency, and we ought to be given a square deal. You might say that on hearing that the East San Diego was out of water you telephoned up to the Cuyamaca Water Co., and found that they were turning in water at the rate of four and a half million gallons every twenty-four hours for the city.

Yours very truly,

Manager.

San Diego Tribune

"Mr. D. G. Gordon's statements, as printed in the evening papers of Wednesday, were with reference to the Cuyamaca Water Co., are certainly false and misleading," said Col. Fletcher today.

"The article says that we made contracts and repudiated them; contracted to sell to the La Mesa Irrigation District and repudiated that; and that we will neither sell nor develop.

Our answer is, we have never increased rates ourselves. Any increase in rates has been made by the State Railroad Commission, and then it was only an increase of \$5.00 per miners inch, per year to Mr. Gordon.

Our contract with the La Mesa Irrigation District stipulated that if the deal was not consummated by January 1, 1916, the agreement was void. We agreed to take the La Mesa Irrigation District bonds, provided Dillon, Thomson and Clay approved the bonds. The La Mesa Irrigation District never was able to furnish bonds approved by Dillon, Thomson & Clay, for the reason that the Judge Boone suit clouded the title and questioned the validity of the La Mesa Irrigation District. This is the reason that Dillon, Thomson and Clay refused to certify to the bonds; and it was not until six months after our contract with the District expired that the Supreme Court decided as to the validity of the formation of the La Mesa Irrigation District.

We have spent \$300,000 or \$400,000 in the improvement of the system, although our total revenue has not exceeded our operating expenses. We have never received a dollar interest on our invest-

142

ment, which is today, including interest, between \$800,000 and \$900,000.

It is no fun managing and owning a public utility, under existing conditions.

We have a three year's supply of water now on hand in our reservoirs, and are reasonably secure of a five-year's supply, with normal rainfall.

It will be impossible, under present conditions, to secure any more money for the development of the system; but I believe the Railroad Commission will give us increased rates that will warrant the future development of our system."

November
29
1920

The Sun,
San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

As you are aware, the business men of this city are forming a Community Welfare Council, with the idea of systematic support of the charities of this city thru the budget system. The funds will be apportioned to the organizations given on the enclosed list.

Approximately \$175,000 will be needed to properly maintain the twenty-one charities mentioned in this list.

I am a member of the committee soliciting funds for this purpose. The Committee has arbitrarily determined upon the sum which they hope you can see your way clear to subscribe, the sum being \$500.00. It is our idea to raise the first \$100,000 from the large subscribers, and the balance in small amounts. It may be your wish to give more, or less. We hope you will be as liberal as you feel you can be.

I enclose subscription blank and would appreciate it if you would sign same and mail to me what subscription you feel that you can afford to give. In making this subscription to the Community Welfare Council, you are being relieved of the necessity of being called upon by any of the charities mentioned for further subscriptions. Many of the larger cities in the East have very successfully handled their charities in this way.

Hoping to have an early reply and for your hearty cooperation, I am

Very sincerely yours,

EF:KLM

LARGEST DAILY
CIRCULATION OF
ANY NEWSPAPER
IN SAN DIEGO
COUNTY.
MEMBER A.B.C.

The San Diego Sun

Established 1881

JAMES G. SCRIPPS
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
W. H. PORTERFIELD
PRESIDENT
GEO. H. THOMAS
EDITOR
W. S. DAYTON
BUSINESS MANAGER

San Diego, California, Nov. 30, 1920.

Col. Ed Fletcher,

City.

Dear sir:-

We have your letter regarding the Community Welfare Council and are pleased to enclose our pledge card.

We are going to go you a little bit better than the amount suggested and have filled out the card for \$600.

Yours very truly,

The San Diego Sun,

W. S. Dayton
Business Manager.

WSD/B

1
January
Twenty
1922

San Diego Sun,
San Diego, California.

Gentlemen:

As a member of the committee of the Community Welfare Council, your name has been assigned to me in the matter of the Community Chest subscription.

It is hardly necessary to explain the necessity of this welfare work, but it is being handled in a businesslike manner and everything is put on the budget system and a check kept by a responsible committee.

Your subscription last year was \$600.00. The committee asks that you increase it to \$1,000 this year.

Hoping to get a favorable reply from you.

I am

Sincerely yours,

EF:KLM

LARGEST DAILY
CIRCULATION OF
ANY NEWSPAPER
IN SAN DIEGO
COUNTY.

MEMBER A.B.C.

The San Diego Sun

Established 1881

W. H. PORTERFIELD
PRESIDENT

GEO. H. THOMAS
EDITOR

W. S. DAYTON
BUSINESS MANAGER

San Diego, California, Jan. 26, 1922.

Col. Ed Fletcher,
San Diego, Calif.

Dear Col:-

We are sending herewith our subscription card for
the Community Chest in the sum of \$600.

We would be glad to meet the increase that you asked
for and want you to feel that there is no disposition on our
part to arbitrarily refuse, but under the best possible cir-
cumstances we cannot expect to make as much profit this year
as we have for the past years. This due to the fact that an
old paper contract has expired and we are now buying at an
increase of 58%.

Yours very truly,
The San Diego Sun,

W. S. Dayton
Business Manager.

WSD/M

August 6th, 1929

San Diego Sun
San Diego, California.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed find copy of letter that has gone forward
to the Board of Supervisors today.

Yours very truly,

EF:GMF
Encl.

June Third,
1 9 2 9

San Diego Sun,
San Diego,
California.

Gentlemen:

I only ordered the advertisement in for the month of April for "Magic Street" and am not responsible for any obligations in relation thereto except with my written approval.

Yours truly,

BF:AK

August Thirteenth,
1 9 2 9

Mr. Joe Grossmon,
Sporting Editor,
San Diego Sun,
San Diego, Calif.

My dear Mr. Grossmon:

I see that you have given me some publicity in the matter of the 220 breaststroke race and by inference lay the blame on Mr. Olds of the San Diego Athletic Club for my entering the race against the A.A.U. request.

Mr. Olds is in no way to blame. It has been over a year since I have entered any swimming meet representing the Hollywood Athletic Club and I thought that I was eligible to swim in the county meet last Sunday.

I represented the San Diego Athletic Club for a long time and I thought they still retained my registration.

If there is any blame anywhere the responsibility is mine alone and I am willing to assume it as I insisted on going into the race because I felt that I was eligible.

Yours truly,

ST:AK

ADMISSION CARD
IP 31 PC
SEP 15 1929
CALIF

THE SAN DIEGO SUN
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

SAN DIEGO
SEP 15
11³⁰ PM
1929
CALIF



Col Ed Fletcher
1024 9 th st
City



October Fourteenth,
1 9 2 9

Mr. W. A. Huggins,
City Editor,
San Diego Sun,
San Diego, California.

My dear Huggins:

Enclosed find copy of trip across the continent
that you asked for. I think you will find it of
interest.

Let me know when you and the boys want to go hunt-
ing at Cuyamaca Lake and I will try and fix it
up for you.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

EF:AK

San Pasqual

March 17, 1935.

Mr. Paul Bartlett,
Editor San Diego Sun,
San Diego, California.

Personal

Friend Bartlett:

The City of San Diego owns 100 or 1500 acres in the lower end of San Pasqual Valley on both sides of the river, invaluable for flooding purposes if a dam is ever raised and more valuable as a pumping proposition for underground waters. Between that land and the land flooded by Lake Hodges there are two or three pieces of property which keep the land owned by the city from being contiguous. These properties are known as the Prentice property and the White property.

The City of San Diego contracted 8 years ago to buy the Prentice property for \$125,000 with some reservations as to water rights. The city paid \$25,000 cash and \$100,000 was to be paid, I believe in two years. I am not sure as to the time.

Senator L. A. Wright gave an opinion that the city was legally bound to pay that \$100,000 so, on Senator Wright's advice, F. M. White purchased for \$70,000 the Prentice contract and took a deed to the Prentice property. White also sold to the city for something like \$25,000 another 150 acres riparian to the stream, adjoining the Prentice property on the East. I believe the city refused to make any further payments, the courts determined that they were options and not contracts and abandoned the whole deal.

White had borrowed the money from his brother-in-law Yawkey. White died and Yawkey eventually got a deed to the property.

Mr. Paul Bartlett
#2

I have just submitted to the City of San Diego recently, on behalf of Mr. Yawkey, a price of \$50,000 for both the Prentice and the White properties. In other words, the city originally undertook to pay \$125,000 for the Prentice property, approximately \$25,000 for the White property, or \$150,000. The city paid \$29,000 or \$30,000 down, leaving \$130,000 still to pay, then three up the contract.

Today these properties can be purchased for \$50,000. Mr. George Buck, the City Manager, and the Hydraulic Engineer, Mr. Pyle, so I have been informed, are in favor of buying these properties at this time.

There are no improvements on these two properties but they have not alone the value for water rights but for flooding purposes. In case the dam is only raised 10 or 15 feet as it was at Lake Hodges, these lands will be flooded.

The appraised value of these properties is taxable properly on only about \$15,000 or \$20,000. They are rented today for only \$200 for cattle purposes. Don't forget that when the city condemned Louis J. Wild's damsite and lands flooded in 1916 at Jamul Ranch, 18 acres that were only assessed at \$20 an acre the jury gave a verdict of \$18,000 for and that land isn't worth anything for agricultural purposes. A compromise was made and the city paid \$9,000 cash for the 18 acres that was only assessed for \$36. It is only as and when the land is needed for this purpose that you can get these high figures. There have been many precedents established to confirm my statement.

The Prentice property is a tract of 300 or 400 acres, is practically all good plow land excepting about 50 acres in the river bed.

My son, Ed Fletcher, Jr., will bring you this letter and show you the map. I wish you would have a conference with the City Manager in relation thereto.

I am speaking now on behalf of the city and in the interests of the city it would be criminal to let this matter blow up. Will you kindly contact City Manager Buck or Mr. Pyle and get their reaction in relation thereto and greatly oblige me. Please do what you can to expedite this matter.

Mr. Paul Bartlett
#3

With these two properties and another small piece, the La Prade property, acquired, the city has a solid block of land for 10 or 12 miles up and down the river from Hodges Dam to the center of San Pasqual valley.

I am trying to get the riparian owners in the San Pasqual Valley above, between the city property and Sutherland Dam, to sell their water rights for \$200,000 instead of \$300,000 which they ask. When this is acquired the city is in full control of the river.

To my utter amazement the State Engineer showed me a report which is soon to be made public showing that, including even the Santa Margarita River, the San Luis Rey, the San Dieguito, the San Diego River, the Otay and a large part of the Tijuana, there is only enough water in the county for domestic purposes for a supply for 525,000 people. Boy, it's a knock-out. I have asked for a copy of the official report and will have it in the near future.

As you know they have spent \$25,000 in making these investigations during the last year, half paid for by the Supervisors and half by the State.

Very sincerely yours,

EF/RC

San Diego, California
February 15, 1936

Mr. L.E. Claypool, Editor
The San Diego Sun
San Diego, California

Dear Mr. Claypool:

In a recent article you published as coming from me the statement "that the Twenty-Second Agricultural District grounds were bought from Senator Ed Fletcher, Republican."

On investigation I find this statement was in error and an injustice to Senator Fletcher. The property was purchased from the South Coast Land Company, which Company Senator Fletcher has had no connection with directly or indirectly for over twenty years.

I regret this incident and ask you in the interest of fair play to print this retraction.

Yours very truly,

Henry L. Garber

Ed Fletcher Papers

1870-1955

MSS.81

Box: 24 Folder: 10

General Correspondence - San Diego Sun



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.