



...erected the El Pass to construct the Dam for the purpose of  
 conserving the fish ~~not~~ with the intent of strengthening the Dam, as  
 the dam was not considered dangerous by Mr. Wickham. Later on  
 Mr. Sherman C.E. of the C.C. ordered Mess. Newton & Ferris to  
 take out the dam because of its dangerous condition. Mr. Ferris  
 C.E. stated he examined the dam ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> the opinion that it  
 was not dangerous, thereby agreeing with Mr. Wickham. Mr. Newton  
 & Ferris however decided to remove the ~~dam~~ <sup>spillway</sup>, which they did,  
 and by their action not only destroyed the spawning grounds  
 for the fish, but undoubtedly caused many of the fish to  
 flow over the dam by lowering the level of the Lake,  
 besides causing an unhealthy condition through the stench  
 arising from decayed vegetation <sup>the liberation</sup> of noxious  
 gases, all of which is detrimental to the community & location.  
 In demolishing the ~~dam~~ <sup>spillway</sup> they lowered the level of the lake  
 about 20 inches below the crest of the ~~dam~~ <sup>old spillway</sup>, & caused personal  
 damage to all the property owners, who <sup>built</sup> erected riparian <sup>stage</sup> of  
 structures, which were built in conformity with ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> water.  
~~had~~ maintained for about 20 years, by the old spillway  
 at the dam.

In view of all the aforesaid, if the C.C. would enforce an order directing  
 N.F. to replace & rebuild the dam, thereby restoring the waters of the lake  
 to its former level & condition, the C.C. would be only enforcing  
 the law, necessary to the conservation of the fish & could in no  
 way be considered as "interfering in a squabble between  
 private parties."

On the other hand the C.C. still maintain <sup>that it is</sup> "a squabble between  
 private parties," it must be <sup>admitted</sup> explained that the C.C. brought it  
 about in the following manner:-

Mr. Wickham, in response to a request made by the El Pass  
 to visit the place & confer with a Committee in the matter of  
 conservation of fish, visited the Lake on Aug. 1913. There  
 recommended & outlined to the Committee of the Association the members  
 of which represented ~~all~~ <sup>almost</sup> all the property owners, possessing nearly



Handwritten notes in the left margin, including "Kaiser's...".

Furthermore, by the C.C.'s recognition of <sup>in</sup> N.T.'s act of demolishing  
of the dam, the latter have been encouraged in their disposition  
to extend from the property owners, a facade price for their lot 41  
for it has just recently developed that N.T. refused to  
consider \$1000 for this lot, which is considerably more  
than what it was worth, even before they destroyed  
the dam.

If therefore the C.C. <sup>continue to support</sup> ~~stand by~~ N.T. they are only  
aiding them in ~~this blacklisting~~ <sup>their</sup> scheme of extortion  
for the ~~unlawful~~ <sup>unlawful</sup> gain & profit to themselves.

The lot of N.T. known as #41 lies directly opposite  
lot #39 which belongs to the State and these lots <sup>occupy</sup>  
the north & south ends of the dam respectively.

The State also owns lots 25-22 & 23 adjacent to <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ State, the C.C.  
lake ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~therefore~~ <sup>therefore</sup> the C.C. ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~held~~ <sup>held</sup> ~~responsible~~ <sup>responsible</sup> ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~demolition~~ <sup>demolition</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~dam~~ <sup>dam</sup>.

~~Should not~~ <sup>Should not</sup> ~~therefore~~ <sup>therefore</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~C.C.~~ <sup>C.C.</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~held~~ <sup>held</sup> ~~responsible~~ <sup>responsible</sup> ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~demolition~~ <sup>demolition</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~dam~~ <sup>dam</sup>?

at least ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~majority~~ <sup>majority</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>property</sup> ~~owners~~ <sup>owners</sup>  
against ~~N.T.~~ <sup>N.T.</sup> ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~aid~~ <sup>aid</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~State~~ <sup>State</sup>.

Both State owned lands on this  
lake with <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ dam resting on one of the lots possessed by  
the State, how can the C.C. justifiably stand by N.T. as  
minority property holders <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ ~~opposition~~ <sup>opposition</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~majority~~ <sup>majority</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>property</sup> ~~holders~~ <sup>holders</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~State~~ <sup>State</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> ~~interests~~ <sup>interests</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>property</sup>.

N.T. did not become grantee of L 41 until after the C.C. had  
received & filed the app'd drawings of the E.L.P.O.A. and as  
N.T. did not demolish the old spillway until after the appl.  
& draw. recommended to the ass. by the C.C. <sup>has been filed</sup> ~~it seems~~ <sup>but</sup> ~~just~~ <sup>just</sup>

that the C.C. should intervene for the protection of <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ ~~State's~~ <sup>State's</sup> ~~interests~~ <sup>interests</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~property~~ <sup>property</sup> ~~by~~ <sup>by</sup> ~~enforcing~~ <sup>enforcing</sup> ~~direction~~ <sup>direction</sup> ~~upon~~ <sup>upon</sup> ~~N.T.~~ <sup>N.T.</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~reconstruct~~ <sup>reconstruct</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~spillway~~ <sup>spillway</sup> ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~place~~ <sup>place</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~lake~~ <sup>lake</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~its~~ <sup>its</sup> ~~former~~ <sup>former</sup> ~~level~~ <sup>level</sup>.

by enforcing direction upon N.T. to reconstruct the spillway  
at the place of the lake to its former level.

Should I write C.C. as Secy of E.L.P.O.A. to mail me app'd drawings, which are <sup>not</sup> ~~not~~ ~~yet~~ <sup>yet</sup> ~~approved~~ <sup>approved</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> ~~whether~~ <sup>whether</sup> ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> ~~have~~ <sup>have</sup> ~~been~~ <sup>been</sup> ~~app'd~~ <sup>app'd</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> ~~unapproved~~ <sup>unapproved</sup>?