

M.E.M.

enter

7th July, 1911.

Mr. George W. Marston, Chairman,

Buildings & Grounds Committee, Panama-California Expo-
sition, San Diego, California.

Dear Mr. Marston:

Thinking it was best that Mr. Hengenheim, as President of the new Board, should have an expression of opinion directly from me as to the proposition to change the site for the Exposition from the south border to the middle of the park, I have telegraphed him by night letter, according to the copy which is sent under separate cover.

I had a session of several hours ^{day before} yesterday morn-
ing with Col. Collier at this office and while he did not agree to give up the central site, he expressed himself as not having fully understood before the advantages of the site in the southern border of the park nor all the disadvantages of the central site, and it appeared to me very evident that he did not intend to make any strong fight in

favor of the central site. In general, I took the ground that while there were some advantages in the central site from the Exposition point-of-view, there are also very material advantages in the southern site from the Exposition point-of-view, both as regards the possibility of carrying it out for the amount of money likely to be available and also because it would be expected to bring in more receipts by gate admissions and concessions, especially during the evening.

I stated that I had been informed by one who knew, that the greater part of the population of San Diego lives south and southeast of the park than west and north of it. While he said that was so, he said it would not remain so more than a few years. It seems to me that he and Sefton and Frank Allen and various others are disposed to ignore to some extent the disadvantage of moving the Exposition from the south border to the middle of the park as regards the population south of the park.

I explained to him that Mr. Goodhue's plan for the middle site was, to a great extent, such a plan as the students at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris are accustomed to make on paper, with little or no reference to a rolling picturesque site. That sort of plan is largely the result of working on the drawing-board, and while

it has advantages from the aesthetic point-of-view, it is not acknowledged to be by all artists the most desirable way of working. Very much more interesting and picturesque results are often attained by working in careful adaptation to a rough, irregular site. I pointed this out to Col. Collier and explained to him how very much more picturesque from many points of view and from among the buildings the group would be in the southern site.

One of his objections was the lack of space for the expansion of the Exposition, which he anticipates, owing to the much larger appropriations which he thinks can be expected by Brazil and other Latin-American republics. I pointed out that my plan, even without crossing the Spanish Canyon, made large provision for these republics and for the six or seven states and the seven California counties which he said would build in connection with the Exposition, and that by moving the dam a little further down the canyon, the mesa north of the canyon could be made very conveniently available even if no bridge can be afforded. I showed him that by extending up Midland Drive and taking in the nursery ground and part of the golf ground almost any area of land needed could be brought so that its frontage at least would be conveniently accessible and little if any further than

some portions of the ground would be in the case of the site in the middle of the park. He repeated Frank Allen's argument about the expensive grading incident to the southern site, and I told him that with my latest plan the total estimate for grading, including the approach from Date St. entrance, was 85,000 cubic yards fill and about 55,000 yards cut, and that by reducing the fill and increasing the cut by simple changes ^{in figures} of elevation the grading would be practically half way between these two figures, but even allowing a big margin for extensions of the plan the total cost for grading, aside from the item of topsoil, would be only \$50,000 or \$60,000, and that even if the grading at the central site were half as much, the saving was not such a large one that it ought for a moment to be considered as a conclusive argument in favor of moving the Exposition to the central position in the park, thereby ruining the park and necessitating the electric railway and the bridge over Cabrillo Canyon.

I explained to him that according to our fairly careful estimate and my plan No. 3, leaving out all the bridges ^{we} were still over two million dollars, not including maintenance, and making no allowance for the item of

publicity and administration expenses; and I was sure that there could be no possible saving in connection with the middle site that would anywhere near balance the additional cost of the necessary bridge. He said the bridge would be necessary for the southern site as well. I acknowledged that it would certainly be better to have it, but in case they could not get the money for it they could get the 3 per cent drive down from the Date St. entrance, which would afford a shorter and more convenient approach from the west than would be possible in the case of the middle site if they should never get the money for the bridge. I assured him that unless a very much larger amount of money could be raised for the construction of the Exposition it would be impossible to carry out the middle site satisfactorily, while it would be possible to carry out the southern site satisfactorily. To that he replied that he was going to get the City to vote more money, but I question whether the other principal men of the Exposition will feel that it is a wise policy to adopt the more expensive middle site in the hope that they can later get the City to vote another bond issue for the bridge and other expensive features.

You will notice on Mr. Goodhue's plan for the middle site that there is a great deal more arcade than on his plan for the southern site. That is a very expensive item, say \$20 per lineal foot, as we estimated for my plan No. 3.

Col. Collier said it was necessary to determine the site at once because of the ground breaking ceremonies. It seems to me that it will be a very poor policy to determine on the middle site without any thorough plans and estimates and without any adequate assurance that the Railway Company will be willing to build the railway, and without knowing where the money is to come from for the bridge across the canyon. I do not see how business men could afford to act in that hasty way on such an important matter. It seems to me that it would be far better to have the ground breaking ceremonies on the southern site and I do not see that any great harm will be done even if the site should be subsequently changed as the result of further planning and estimating.

Col. Collier said that the majority of the committee were in favor of changing to the middle site. That may be so, but I think that a few strong men on the committee

should look into the matter carefully and make sure of all their reasons for going counter to my advice and for almost ruining the park to gain a moderate advantage of economy in grading and convenience of construction and of intercommunication in what is to be a temporary affair.

It seems to me that the Auditorium and Art Building in Goodhue's plan for the middle site would be most extraordinarily inconveniently situated and would not begin to do the business in the way of drawing an audience, particularly at night, that they would if situated close to the border of the park and lighted streets.

As regards the electric railway, Col. Collier said it was bound to come whichever site was adopted, and you will see that Mr. Goodhue has shown it on his plans for both sites, as the result of Col. Collier's interview with him. I pointed out to Col. Collier that during my early conferences with Frank Allen, before he had come out with his Laurel Street site, he argued with me against the possibility that the Railroad Company would, for many years at any rate, find it profitable or even expedient to build the railway through the park.

He said he knew a good deal about the railway business and that he was sure it would be very bad judgment on the part of the manager of the railway to build and run such a railroad. I think that matter is a very important one and ought to be thoroughly discussed with Mr. Spreckles and with his railroad advisers before the committee change to the middle site on the assumption that such a railway will be built. As regards the expense of the railroad, Col. Collier said it ought not to cost over \$13,000 a mile or \$20,000 at the outside. I told him that might well be so in the case of his railroad to Ocean Beach but that if the work were properly planned, with due regard to the least possible injury to the park, I felt very little doubt it would cost nearer \$100,000 a mile. Besides the interest on that investment, the railroad would have to supply extra cars, working capital, additional power plant, taxes, etc. I pointed out that the construction would have to include several bridges and two or three masonry subways, and provide a great deal of retaining wall and screening walls, besides much rock excavation, topsoil to cover slopes,

fencing, planting, shelters at stopping places, etc. The Park Commissioners certainly ought to insist that the drives and walks which will eventually be needed should be carried under or over the railway by suitable and durable constructions. I am unable to take Col. Collier's optimistic view as to the certainty that the Railway Company would build this railway and in the manner indicated.

It is perhaps not for me to disagree with Col. Collier as to the possibility of getting a large additional sum of money to be spent by the Park Commission, but from what I know of the feeling of some thoughtful citizens, I am inclined to think the general opinion would be that it is unwise to go in for a very much more extensive and expensive plan than we have planned at the southern site and which we have estimated can be carried out for \$2,078,000 making no allowance for publicity and administration expenses.

I also pointed out that the middle site has great advantages in the way of beautiful park surroundings, but that it is most assuredly far inferior to the southern site as regards a near and imposing view of the City and of the

Marston - 10.

harbor, and that it seemed to me it was of the greatest importance that an exposition intended to call attention to the city and harbor should have the views which would give the strongest impression of these features. I think no candid person can go to the spur south of the Spanish Canyon and about 1300 feet north of the High School and study the views from there without being impressed by the superiority of this site from the standpoint of advertising San Diego.

Col. Collier objected to the Auditorium being so far from the proposed Camino Real in the southern site and the anticipated street car line there as it is shown on Mr. Goodhue's plan. I told him I agreed with him that from the practical point the Auditorium ought to be on the front row where I first planned it, but that I had conceded the matter to Mr. Goodhue in order to avoid having too many points of dispute with him. I should not, of course, object if the Committee should instruct Mr. Goodhue, (in case that site is adopted) to place the Auditorium and probably also the Art Museum, down by the Camino Real and east of the Plaza Larga.

I also differ with Mr. Goodhue as respects the size and type of building which should be erected for the Auditorium. In my opinion, what the people of San Diego have been expecting and ought to have is a large convention hall seating from 5,000 to 10,000 persons and adapted to use for special exhibitions like the automobile show and for other purposes requiring a large hall with a level floor. It seems to me quite unnecessary that it should be wholly fireproof or provided with a dome or designed as a great architectural monument. Whatever the objections may be to Mr. Goodhue's site for the Auditorium in his plan "F", it seems to me the similar objections would be decidedly greater as regards convenience and accessibility in the case of his site in his plan "E" and in his plan "G". I think, on the whole, the easiest way out of this question would be to eliminate the Auditorium entirely. I feel that the park money which would go into it could be much better used for the permanent good of the park in drives, plantations and other landscape improvements.

Col. Collier asked if I had decided to eliminate the Spanish Canyon garden. I said I had not and that the study of the estimate had proved it was necessary to omit the expensive masonry retaining walls, basins, stairways, terraces, balustrades, pergolas, etc., but that we could make the canyon very attractive and interesting as a garden at comparatively trifling expense for ordinary walks and for planting, and that I had assumed in my estimate that this would be done by the landscape gardening force from time to time as opportunity should serve.

There are of course many arguments to be discussed bearing upon the question of the site, but it should always be kept in mind that the weighty and conclusive argument against the middle site is solely that it would be the practical ruination of the park and that whatever advantages it may have, it would be in the nature of a breach of trust for the Park Commission to adopt such a site contrary to the carefully formed and absolutely settled opinion of their landscape advisor, and in the face of the fact that a plan has been worked

Marston - 13.

out and carefully estimated for a site in the borders of the park which would result in an entirely successful exposition and one which would have more individuality and picturesque qualities, owing to the configuration of the ground, than is possible on the flat ground in the middle of the park.

Yours very truly,