

J.C.O.
M.E.M.

J.C.O.

Mr Dawson

Mr. Dawson

1st September, 1911.

Mr. Julius Wangenheim, President,
Board of Park Commissioners, Panama-California
Exposition, San Diego, Cal.

My dear Sir:

Mr. Dawson tells me that he learned from you that you are going to negotiate with the School Board as to the athletic ground and stadium.

I venture to suggest in this connection that possibly as a matter of policy you would deem it best to discuss an agreement between the School Board and the Park Commission by which the School Board would pay a reasonable part of the cost of the athletic ground and stadium (say one-half at a guess) while the Park Commission would pay the balance unless some contribution could be obtained from the Exposition or from some athletic association or by subscription of private citizens. The Park Commission could agree that the School Board should have the option of the exclusive use of the athletic

Wangenheim - 2.

ground and stadium on certain days and hours during certain months of the year, and that at other times the public should have the free use of the ground and on the principle of "first come first served", except in such cases as it would be necessary to close the grounds and charge admission, which could be done at the discretion of the Park Commission providing they obtained authorization by law after the Exposition. Such an agreement should extend, of course, only through a limited number of years, subject to renewal.

I am decidedly in favor of having an athletic field and at least a moderate amount of wooden seating on the slopes and it was with great regret that I had to concede to Mr. Allen that this item would have to be left out of the estimate which we presented with my third preliminary plan last May. I earnestly hope that some adjustment of the plan and estimate can be made by which a reasonable sum can be reserved for this athletic ground and stadium and also for a lath house.

I am informed that it will be impossible to include the bridges over Cabrillo and Spanish Canyons and their approaches in the estimate. I firmly believe that it will be for the best interests of the City and Exposition and

Wangenheim - 3.

more especially of the park, as a matter of permanent development, that these two bridges and their approaches should be included in the work to be done, and I believe that it would be very much better to omit the art museum as well as the auditorium in order to be able to have these bridges. It seems to me the art museum, after the Exposition is over, will be poorly supported. The City will not be sufficiently populous and wealthy for many years to come to make it reasonable to undertake the carrying on of an art museum unless one or more individuals should give comparatively large sums for collections, maintenance and endowment, which is not to be calculated upon. On the other hand a great many times more citizens and visitors would be favorably impressed by the bridges. They would be large and noble structures and would command admiration in comparison with park bridges in other cities, while the art museum would be comparatively small and insignificant and attract but little attention from visitors and probably very little favorable comment. From a business point of view, therefore, I think the park money would be much more profitably spent for the advancement of the prosperity of the City in the bridges than in the art museum.

Wangenheim - 4.

Even if you have an art museum it seems to me a questionable policy to have it attached to the California State Building as proposed on Mr. Goodhue's plan. I agree that it would be in the direction of a more grandiose effect to combine the two buildings, but fail to see any practical propriety in doing so. An art museum is an institution which surely ought to grow, but it would be much hampered in this respect if combined with the California State Building.

Yours truly,