

Fort Worth, Texas

May 26th, 1925 at 10 o'clock A. M.

Minutes of a meeting of the Board of Directors of Tarrant County Water Improvement District No. 1 held at the District's office in the County Court House in Fort Worth, Tarrant County Texas.

Presiding: W. C. Weeks, Chairman; Present, W. E. Bidaker, H. M. Hightower and L. C. Abbott, being a majority of the Directors.

Mr. A. H. Eaton, an attorney representing Mr. W. W. Potts and other persons owning land located within the boundaries of this district, presented and read a petition filed by him with the Secretary of this District on the 4th day of May, 1925. Said petition is in the official files of this District as is here referred to as a part hereof. said petition asked that the described lands of the respective owners in said petition named, be excluded from said district for the alleged reason that the lands is said petition described could not be irrigated by gravity from the works proposed to be constructed by said District.

After the reading of the petition, the Chairman called upon the numerous petitioners present to state in detail the facts upon which they based their conclusion that the lands in said petition described could not be irrigated by gravity.

After a full hearing of the evidence, said attorney for petitioners announced that petitioners did not ask to avoid the relatively small small tax involved in the making of the preliminary engineering that is being carried on by the District, that petitioners wished the project well, but wished to protect themselves against the ultimate heavy tax which will eventually be created to carry out the project proposed.

That they in good faith felt that they would not receive any benefit and had filed the petition to fully reserve any rights

which they might exercise at any time before the issuance of Bonds.

Chairman Weeks then announced that the directors would proceed with the greatest caution to the end that there would not be created any unjust burden upon any one. that the directors would go into executive session and later announce their decision.

Therefore the Directors did go into executive session and did find as follows:

FIRST: That until the preliminary engineering has been completed it will be impossible for the Board to determine whether all or what definite part of the land described in the petition can be irrigated from the works proposed to be constructed by the District. This is made manifest by the fact that it will not be known what works will be constructed until after all engineering data is in hand.

SECOND: That until it is definitely known what will be the height of dams and at what part or points on the streams dams will be located, it will be impossible to determine whether the lands in said petition described can be irrigated by gravity.

IT IS THEREFORE ordered that the final decision on this petition do be, without prejudice to the lawful rights of the petitioners, reserved until such time as it may be possible to have before the Board evidence sufficient to enable the Board to determine, whether, in fact, the lands in said petition described can or cannot be irrigated by gravity from some of the works proposed to be constructed.

On the following pages is a stenographic report of said above named meeting before said Directors adjourned the open meeting and went into executive session.

Stenographic report of the proceedings had at a meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Tarrant County Water Improvement District No. One, called for the purpose of hearing petitions for exclusion of land from the Tarrant County Water Conservation Improvement District No. One.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 o'clock A M by W C Weeks, Chairman, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: This is the hour set to hear the petitioners with reference to exclusion of land from the Tarrant County Water Conservation Improvement District No. One. Now, we are ready to hear that petition.

MR ALFRED H EATON, appearing for Petitioners: You have a copy of it here, I suppose. I will not read all the names.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, please don't.

The petition was then read by Mr Eaton.

MR BIDEKER: Do you know what the acreage is?

MR JOHN PUTMAN: It is approximately 42,000 acres.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody else that wants to be heard? If there is anybody that has any remarks they want to make we will be glad to hear from them.

MR L T BURFORD: I called on Mr Eaton and I didn't have the field notes of one tract of my land, as he probably remembers, and I have been busy and I have never furnished him that abstract or the field notes to 156 or 160 acres, something like that, and he may not have that included, I dont know.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would have time to get that information all right. Is there anybody else?

MR C W PIPER: Gentlemen, from my experience in this water project and drainage districts and what I have had in Ellis County I want to state that I could not use this water on my land at any price; if it was all around it I would be ditching to get it away from me on account of the land, on account of the nature of the land. However, my farm would not stand irrigating on account of it being rolling, if I had all sorts of water that would be a benefit to it, and being planted to cotton from what I know about it the boll weevil would absolutely eat it up and besides when you need water actually if you put it on there it would kill the cotton. I noticed in the Star-Tele-

gram where they were going to have one Mr Hale Hardin up here before this body of the Chamber of Commerce to make a speech in regard to this water project. I happened to be and live in Ellis County for a number of years where we had some land in this district and we were worse off a hundred times than we ever was before we ever got what we call a drainage district down there because we made four crops out of every five anyhow and we didn't have those enormous taxes to pay and after we got this thing we never made but four out of five anyway and there were lots of people down there offered any man their land that would pay the taxes on it and cultivate it, and when this thing started it come into my mind it was something just like that. The property tax down there alone - the drainage tax alone ran as high as seven dollars an acre and they started out with two bits an acre and Mr Hale Hardin was the instigator of it and I will say if a man doesn't believe what I say there is a record in Waxahachie to show for itself; finally in later years I entered suit and got out of that thing by making them buy me out and I moved to Tarrant County hoping that I would never hear of a thing like that and still it followed in on us and I couldn't use the water myself and neither can these gentlemen here who are here to speak for themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

MR HIGHTOWER: Mr Piper, where is your land located?

MR PIPER: I am up here on the Haslet road and I own one tract of land right east of the Santa Fe above the Sterling P Clark place which comes practically adjoining and running northeast of the old Barrow place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else, gentlemen?

MR H.C. GILBERT: Common sense would teach any man if we had water here, plenty of it right here, the cost of getting it to our land, even if it would benefit it ever so much, the cost of getting it there would be prohibitive; the cost would be prohibitive. It is the wildest kind of theory. There is nothing to it. It is impractical, that is it; go and figure the cost of the machinery, and the power it would take to pump this water 200 or 300 feet, and then the friction for 12 or 14 miles in the pipe; there is right smart friction in pumping to get it there, besides, and this 200 feet, and you can imagine something of the cost to get it there. I have talked with some practical engineers, and they say it is impractical, the cost would be prohibitive.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? We want to hear from all of you.

MR EATON: I would like to state this, they are not talking very fast. As I understand it, the property of all the people here is in a limited area north of Fort Worth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Up around Saginaw. Is that the property?

MR EATON: Yes, where the altitude is considerably higher than it is here in Fort Worth, and the unanimous opinion of all the gentlemen who have signed this petition is that they are absolutely certain that water could not be put on their land by this irrigation system at any price that the people of Tarrant County could afford to pay, and that for that reason -- one reason, at least, that they don't want to be in this district, they don't feel able as farmers to pay for irrigating someone's land that happens to be along the river or some place where it could be irrigated and where the other fellow would get all of the benefit, and they have taken the position that the irrigation district ought to be confined and ought to be absolutely confined to those who will be benefitted from it, and that it can be done, and they realize, and I realize, and we all realize that irrigation projects can benefit certain land in this county, but to take a great big county like Tarrant County, where the geography of it is so different, and many different places, and include the whole thing in one irrigation project, including in it all land that can be irrigated and that that cannot, these gentlemen, at least those that signed the petition, are unwilling to pay the taxes, and feel like it would be unjust and unfair for them to pay taxes that they won't get any benefit whatever from, but feel like it would be sufficient for those whose land is subject to irrigation, and those alone, and the people down in Fort Worth who get the benefit of the manufacturers which will come here, with cheap water, that those people will be directly, or more directly benefitted, and will be the ones who should stand this expense, so they desire to take advantage of this provision of the law which allows them to come before this honorable board and show that they will not get any benefit from this proposed system of irrigation, and ask before any bonds are voted that their land be excluded from it, believing that they are well within their rights, and that it is nothing but justice. They don't desire to oppose this irrigation project, and I don't think they have any prejudice or ill will, but it is just a matter of whether it is right for them to pay taxes in a case where they get no benefit whatever for the benefit of others who will get all the benefit, rather than for the thing to be confined to those who will be benefitted in the matter. And they are very confident that they will not derive any benefit, and this matter, of course, originated

among them; this meeting here is not called by me, even indirectly; called by your honorable board, and I didn't know whether there would be one or five here, so that it springs direct from the gentlemen present themselves, who come here with their petition. I am sure there are others who can speak, if they will.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be glad to hear from anybody else.

4 MR T. T. BANKS: I lived on land in Ellis County that is irrigated, and the farmers there cannot live on the land on account of the high taxes, and they get about one crop out of six.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

MR. J.A. SIMONS: It is a matter that we are all interested in, and I feel like everyone present should speak their sentiments, in order that you gentlemen may know that the statements set forth in the petition are our real sentiments. I am not prejudiced against the water project you have. I think there are some men in the district that are entitled to it and should have it. I for one want to say that after having seventeen years experience in farming right adjacent to your city, that our land, in my judgment, is not susceptible to successful irrigation. In other words, individually, if you put the water on there free to me, I would not have it on my farm. Now, that may sound ridiculous to you, but I think there are other gentlemen here that will bear out the same statement that if you give them the water, put it on their farm absolutely free, that they would not have it, on account of the nature of our upland soil here. Now, some of the other soil is all right, but our rolling soil is not susceptible to successful irrigation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

MR JOHN PUTNAM: I am not much of a speech maker, but I think possibly I could tell you a little story that will be rather applicable to our case, and also a brief history of our little protest that we are entering with reference to this irrigation proposition. I was down at Galveston last summer, my wife and baby and I went down there, we went to the Shrine Convention. We went down there and I went down to the Convention, and I met a very few men from Fort Worth, in which I was very much disappointed. I finally met one man whom I had known in the past indirectly; he was a very affable fellow, and a mighty nice fellow, and in the course of the meeting they called on this fellow -- this fellow gave this man a hunch, and said, "Brother Putnam of Fort Worth is a talker." Of course he was a prevaricator

5 very much. I got up and told a little story, which I presume was all right, and after I left and made my little talk, this fellow came over and sat down by me, and said, "Putnam, your talk reminds me very much of the modern flappers of today, with reference to her dress." He says, "It is very short, but does not cover the subject." But I want to make my little talk a little different from the talk I made then; I want to try to tell you something. With 120 approximately signatures -- not signatures, but property taxpayers in this territory out here has signed, and paid off as our expression is, 3 cents an acre. We started in at Saginaw with the help and assistance of Mr. Piper; he is the man that was responsible; he started this proposition, because the old saying is "The burnt child fears the fire." He has had his -- I started to say got his tail mashed down there on this water proposition. He had the experience that he knows, and he told it to me, and it appealed to me as very practical and logical, and he tried to get out. Then we took in a little territory in an adjacent to Saginaw, and then we went over to Wautauga and Keller and Haslet and Dido and Peden. The majority of the people, we got them over easily, and some of them were rather reluctant to come in. I met a man the other day, and he said, "John, I believe that you just got too much territory." I don't think that we did. And that also makes me think of a story.

There was a man down before the prohibition days at New Orleans. He was sadly inebriated and he went into a saloon and said, "I want a drink of whiskey." All right, he shoveled him out a drink of whiskey, and he drank it, and he said, "I can whip any darn man in the room." There wasn't anybody said anything. He took another drink, and he said, "I can whip any man in the block." He took another drink and after he had the third drink he said, "I can whip any man in the city of New Orleans." About that time a big Irishman got up and whipped him. And when he got up, he said, "It is all right; I just took in too much territory."

I don't think we took in too much territory on this proposition, As Mr. Eaton said, and Mr. Simon, and quite a number of other men that I do know from a personal standpoint, where the water will stand in the corners, and have known it personally to be one or two years before that water would -- I mean that ground would grow anything, on account -- I attributed it to too much alkali. Also don't think for a moment that I personally, or any other way, want to take a shingle off of Fort Worth. If it were not for Fort Worth we out there would have a vast cow country, nothing at all, as you might say, a desert, but I am for Fort Worth strong as horse-radish; I am for Tarrant County; but at this proposition, I don't believe that it is logical, I don't believe that it is practical in our part of the country; that is the reason that I have busied myself for what little

I have done in our behalf to try to get this honorable body to exclude us, and we hope and pray that you will let us out. We have 42,000 acres of land; we have 100 -- I think Mr. Eaton said 110 signatures, but I think that we have more than that, and I hope and pray that you will exclude us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Is there anything else, Mr. Eaton, that you want to say?

6 MR EATON: Why, I don't think so, Mr. Weeks; I think the matter has now -- I think, though, that what Mr. Putnam and Mr. Piper have said, all of the other men would say, if they got up and said anything.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it they are a unit, so far as that is concerned.

MR EATON: And they are just what I told you; they are very seriously convicted with the opinion that this matter could not benefit their land. They also realize, or at least I have told them, I think I have advised them right - they don't know what the tax will be, and they do not feel rich nor able to assume unnecessary burdens, and they feel like they would be sleeping on their rights if they didn't object when they felt it in their hearts, and might hereafter wish very much that they had made an objection at the proper time. They come now at the proper time, as we believe, to object in a proper way, and to express to the Board just the way they feel about the matter, hoping that the Board, of course not being interested, I presume they are able to do their duty as members of the Board in this situation, and according to the law, and will exclude them from the district.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, now, I just want to say, gentlemen, that this is new to us, and our disposition is to treat everybody absolutely fair; we don't want to work an undue hardship on anybody, and we will take this under consideration, and we will give you the results of our findings, whatever we decide about it. We will advise you about it and give you our written findings; we will give them to Mr. Eaton, your attorney. If there is anybody that has got anything to say here, we will hear them; if not, we will stand adjourned, and we will go into executive session and consider it probably this morning. If we don't, we will soon.

MR IRELAND HAMPTON: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Board, and Gentlemen, the Board have asked me to make a statement which I feel like is due you-- they feel is due you gentlemen. In the first place, your right to be

7

excluded from this district in the final taxation that would arise if this work is going to be done, can be done by you or by the Board at any time whatever, up to the time bonds might be issued. The law is very wise in that respect, and they desire that I further call to your attention that on the original -- the law provides for what is called a period of preliminary examination, and in this county only the high values here which are created about 85% by the city itself, the original estimates on the cost of the preliminary work, engineering, was about 2 cents on the \$100 as a tax. Now that of itself is a relatively light tax, and the information that would be gotten for that money, from the standpoint of flood control in your county alone, if there was no other element, would still be worth the money, from the standpoint of flood control from which you are free; it is true there. But as the work has gone along, owing to the efficiency and the care of your Board, it now appears that all of the preliminary engineering concerning this project will be actually done and accomplished and placed in the hands of this Board at probably not to exceed one-fourth of two cents on the \$100. Now they have gone far enough to know that this preliminary period, and this is purely a preliminary period, that your tax would be not to exceed one-fourth of two cents; we will say it is a third or a little more than that, but it won't be that much.

Now next, a thing that they felt should be brought out here, that the thought in creating this district was not that they were going to rush pell-mell over every land owner in the county, whether he was benefitted or not, and the Board feel that they should have this called to your attention; it has been contemplated from the beginning for this one-fourth or one-third of two cents on the \$100, of which Fort Worth within her limits will have to pay 85% or more of it, you get all of this information. Now, when that information is in the hands of this Board perhaps -- you will be getting the elevation of the topography of every foot of land in Tarrant County, and it will be placed in the hands of this Board. It is altogether possible that when that information is complete, when the engineers have done their work, that this Board of its own motion and under the law, which it is their duty under the law, might have excluded and may probably exclude, regardless of any protest on your part, because it is their duty to exclude, if the showing is made, that no benefit will be received; it is altogether possible that on the motion of the Board itself someone or all of you might have been excluded from the district through the information which this Board would have in its hands if given the opportunity to complete this work. Now while the law allows three years for this investigation,

8

it is also true that this Board has made wonderful progress and the probabilities are that at a period not later than April 1st, or within less than twelve months, or practically within twelve months from the time they actually started to work, that all of this information will be in their hands. Now you gentlemen may be correct as to your conclusion. The Board would not see fit to discuss that with you until this work is actually done in an accurate manner by men who know their business, and if it is within the spirit of the petitioners here to appreciate the spirit in which the Board are working, it would seem that this petition should at least not be allowed to interfere with the completion of the preliminary work. Now when that is done, and it is a very short period away, and it is going to be at such a low tax that nobody would certainly complain, this matter ought to be disposed of in a way that will do absolute justice to everyone of you, and to the Board itself.

Now, the Board also know that we as individuals, not being trained in this work, knowing the high elevation of that area, in a general way, might conclude that your land should not have water placed on it by gravity. Well, that is a natural conclusion. Now, it is also true, gentlemen, and must not be overlooked, that the powers of this particular district do not end with the borders of Tarrant County. It is also true that this particular district has absolutely tied up under a preferential filing right all of the water that flows in either the Denton Creek, Clear Fork or West Fork from the east line of Tarrant County to the headwaters of each of those streams. It happens to be one-fifteenth of all of the water that flows in the State of Texas. Now, some of you will say that is silly, too; I would have said it myself, but men who are trained in that work have found out that that is so, and I have no right to question it. And it is also true that the county lines do not stop the powers of this Board. Now, as to whether your elevation prohibits placing water on it by gravity would depend entirely on what is the location of the dam. Under the law this particular Board here has just as much right to ~~dam~~ condemn land, it can even condemn Wise County's highway and tell her to remove it; it can condemn the Rock Island Railroad in Wise or Jack, and what this Board are waiting for is an answer from the engineers if they are going to do this at all, where does the dam belong, and manifestly until that is determined and the elevation of the storage reservoir is known, it is manifestly impossible to say where you could or could not put that water by gravity. So realizing the law with respect to that, and the desire of the Board to utilize this asset for its very greatest and highest value, you would appreciate the position of the Board in feeling that they

9

must weigh very carefully how they proceed in this manner, and their position is for the present - I don't know what conclusion they will come to. They might decide -- I am talking not for them precisely, but I am talking under the law, they would wish you to appreciate their desires to handle this asset, if it be one; it is either an enormously valuable asset, or it is nothing, and they would wish to proceed in such a manner as to wholly conserve the value of these filing rights, if it can be done, and for that reason the Board desires me to explain in this short way just how they felt, if they can see their way clear to act on your -- I don't know whether they can or cannot act on your petition for immediate exclusion; that is within their power. If, on the other hand, it would be their conclusion that they could not intelligently pass on it until this preliminary engineering work is placed in their hands, then there could be but one other answer, and that would be for the Board to reserve decision on your petition until such time as that engineering data was placed in their hands. But there is one assurance that you all may have, that other than this very light tax of, we believe not possibly to exceed one-fourth --

MR GILBERT: What is the land tax up in Wichita where they built that dam?

MR HAMPTON: I could not answer you that question definitely enough for the purpose of this hearing.

MR GILBERT: Well, they told me just the same thing that you are telling us, but I have an old neighbor upthere and he got no benefit.

MR HAMPTON: Well, I am talking about the law; until the bonds are actually issued, all or any part of your district may be actually excluded. I am just talking from the standpoint of the law, and there would be no loss of any rights on the part of any man here to be finally excluded before bonds are issued, and that is a long way off, and before there could be a dollar's worth of bonds issued there is going to have to be an election, and every voter in Tarrant County would have a right to say -- that is, tax-paying voter, would have a right to say whether there would ever be a bond issue at all or not, so there is no immediate grave situation in which your lands are about to be confiscated at all. There is just simply a situation here where this Board feels that as they are citizens of Tarrant County they would appreciate your indulgence until such time as they might intelligently know what property -- it might be that not only your property, through this work, but a lot of other territory, might be excluded; there is a lot of other high area out here east and it might be through its own motion, before

this thing is through, this Board would have this district looking like a crazy quilt. So there is no desire to rush a load upon you that would even harm you, much less to bring about the confiscation of your land. Was that what you had in mind?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

10 MR HAMPTON: There is also one other thing, gentlemen, that Mr. Biddeker just called to my attention. You perhaps have not thought of one feature of this that is a very material feature, that is, with respect to this preliminary work. Now there is no provision -- you also must appreciate one thing, too, that is that there is a flood situation arising not only -- I am not speaking about the local damage here; the local damager here is great enough at times, as we know, as it was in May, 1922, but that is not any big part whatever of the damage that occurs throughout the valley of the Trinity River. At such times as the North or Elm Creek, or Denton Creek, all belch forth streams of water at the same time, the heavy damage occurs further down the river. Now that is one thing. The next thing is that there has been a decided change from the standpoint of the interior department and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Federal Government in these two matters. The Federal Government has come to the conclusion that their efforts to develop additional farming land and bring about maintenance for a greater number of people by the development of water in desert areas has been a mistake. They have come to the conclusion that the Government would have better spent the money which they spent on these various projects, if he had come into areas more favored by nature, where the water might be provided merely as insurance in time of drouth. In other words, in the territory in which there are already fair crops being raised, and water is more or less in the nature of insurance. Now, without this preliminary engineering done, you are absolutely -- your hands are tied in approaching the Federal Government. They will not move nor spend one penny upon your preliminary engineering, but with this preliminary engineering done, I went to Washington in October of 1924, put in several days; now, that would come under two departments there, the prevention of floods would come under the War Department. If we, with this preliminary engineering, are able to convince the War Department that construction of retarding works on these streams here above the city of Fort Worth, the West Fork, the Clear Fork, Denton Creek, and Elm Fork, or East Fork, even, that would be all of your sources of flood on the Trinity, the United States Government would step in at that time, and with Federal funds, wholly without taxation at all on anybody within the area, take over your work and construct the works which in their opinion would relieve not only this city and this entire valley, but the Trinity Valley for many miles, from the destruc-

tive floods that occur. Now, if we, by the expenditure of one-third even of two cents on the \$100 can get the data in hand that would lead the United States Government to come in here from the standpoint of flood protection, and with her own money construct this work, it is also true that in constructing the work that would retard and protect us against floods will store the water, and that you have got your stored water for nothing.

Now, gentlemen, there is more wheels within wheels to this than would appear offhand. Now, if it came under the Department of Interior, the Reclamation Bureau, as it is called, we really feel that the very hopeful big prospect we have here is the ability to take this preliminary engineering work, go to Washington and convince the War Department that from the standpoint -- and I will tell you they are very favorable to it; I put in three days with them there. We went into this thing as fully as we could, with the very little information which you had at that time. Their request was that we go ahead with this preliminary work and at such time as we might be able to go into more detail to give them a better basis, that the War Department would be very favorable to a project to prevent these floods upon the Trinity, and if so, that it would be without cost to any man or any acre of land in this area. It would merely be an incident that there would be a vast amount of water stored here, which just as a matter of common sense would come to use where it had a value. So having looked ahead and tried to see every phase and angle of this, this Board feel that they would appreciate and believe they will receive the utmost sympathy and cooperation of our people until such time as we can get this engineering data in hand and have it placed in a position to go to Washington and see if we cannot get all of this for nothing. It looks like the result is a very big one, and it looks like that is likely.

Now that, gentlemen, briefly, is the thing uppermost in the mind of your Board today.

MR EATON: Now, gentlemen, in view of Mr. Hampton's remarks, I would just like to make a few remarks, and I think that this bunch of men here, of course, if there had not been anything more in mind than this preliminary survey, would not have given it any attention, of course. But it is the fact of the subsequent taxes and the increasing taxes, and matters which they felt would be more than they could financially be able to spend, in view of the fact that they would not gain anything out of it themselves at any time. Now, the Board will of course understand that these gentlemen here, the fact that they filed their petition does not mean that they are hostile to the Board, or think that the Board would be hostile

to them. Mr. Hampton said, or rather intimated in a way, that they would have been excluded if they had not filed a petition, but I don't think so, and I don't know for sure whether he said that or not, but if we have any reason we feel that we should inform the Board of it, and all these gentlemen have done is to bring it to the attention of the Board, without anticipating that the Board would do other than as the law requires.

12

Now, the main trend, though, I think, of Mr. Hampton's talk was to argue and to show these gentlemen the value of this preliminary survey, and the fact that there was no necessity for a hurry, but of course these gentlemen take that a little bit, you might say, with a grain of salt, when you tell them to not hurry, but wait, to delay. Of course they don't want to interfere with this Board, and yet they feel like they have got the matter to attend to, and it is a great deal of trouble to get a bunch of men, 200 men or 150 men, together on a proposition, and the best way to just let it die out altogether is to just put it off from time to time indefinitely and never have it acted on one way or the other; and that is the sentiments of these men, not my sentiments, but they have continually come to me and want to know "Why is it that we don't get some action here? Is this matter being delayed? Why doesn't the Board say something?" And I told them that the Board told me they wanted to make a preliminary survey in this matter. And so that is the situation, but when I present it to you gentlemen, that is presenting it to you as these gentlemen see it. They request of the Board -- they don't ask anything impractical or one-sided, or that cannot be done, of course, but at the same time the desire of these gentlemen is that -- if I don't express it correctly you can correct me -- is that as soon as it can very conveniently be done at all, they would like to have action taken in this matter, and the matter settled, as far as they are concerned. Is that correct, Mr. Piper? Is that your views?

MR PIPER: Yes, sir. I just want to make one little statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR PIPER: It wasn't exactly a water project, but where this thing came up in Ellis County under my observation, it seems to me it leads up here in about the same way; they started out down there with two bits on the hundred dollars, and we had an engineer, as Mr. Hampton said that he wanted to have, "And it is possible," he said, "a four-foot dam would do all this irrigation, and cause any land from being obstructed with any high waters," when I had seen the water seven feet deep from hill to hill, and I asked him if he

thought a four-foot dam would carry this water, and he got hot. He said, I must think that he didn't know his business. I said, "You don't, if you say that a four-foot dam will carry it, because it has been seven feet deep, and we have got statistics on it, and the first flood washed it out." And this thing just kept increasing taxes, and one time and another, and another bond issue and then another, until it got to be seven and a quarter (\$7.25) an acre, but I sued out a writ of injunction to stop a certain sale of bonds, when it was only five and a quarter (\$5.25), and we got out of the thing by compromise, and the other boys buying us out, and I am afraid this thing here will be the same thing; that is all I am afraid of; where a man has been burnt and sees what happens, and knows what is happening in other places, why, he cannot hardly stand to have to wait.

MR HIGHTOWER: Were you taxed for levee protection or for irrigation?

MR PIPER: We were taxed for levee protection.

MR HIGHTOWER: When I was a member of the Board of Commissioners, or the Commissioners Court, I denied the right to levee the river down here, because it would tax people so that it would ruin the land.

MR PIPER: Gentlemen, I want to say in this particular district I could not use your water at all, if you gave it to me; if it was all around me I would be ditching it off, because I have farmed too much, and I know that it would not benefit me a particle; you cannot use this water on black land for irrigating purposes for cotton, and that is what our principal crop is, and I say I haven't got it in for the water project one way or another; I hope the gentlemen all success, and I think it is good for the people up the Trinity River, but I think it is abominable for us fellows down there; if I was up there I would be for getting it on, but where I am I would be paying to get it off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? If not, we will stand adjourned.

After the Board of Directors had finished with said above mentioned executive session, adjournment was adopted, the Board to meet subject to call of the*President.*

Attest:

W. C. P. de la
Secretary.

J. C. W. de la
President.

The following list constitutes the number of petitioners, who petitioned the Tarrant County Water Improvement District No. 1., to have their lands excluded from the District, that were present at the hearing of said petition on May 26th, 1925 at the office of said District at the Court House, Fort Worth, Texas.

W. R. Whitley	T. C. Banks	K. Robey
W. W. Potts	L. T. Burford	J. E. McGinnes Stenographer.
Chas. Maloney	J. C. Thompson	Knox Hutchison
J. S. Murray	O. R. Pruitt	W. L. Miller, Jr.
J. R. Faulkner	J. R. Ellis	W. H. Irwin
John J. Putman	L. C. Holt	Ross Irwin
J. K. Peden	J. H. Knight	J. Ray White
R. L. Murray	R. E. Ellis	
G. D. Allen	P. C. Bishop	
A. C. Allen	H. C. Gilbert	
S. D. Penny	C. W. Piper	
E. A. Wheeler	E. W. Bradshaw	
Fred A. Wilson	W. L. Van Zandt	
Frank G. Allen	Jno. B. Hawley	
H. D. Allen	Ireland Hampton	
G. W. Duke	W. E. Bideker	
Denry Grigsby	A. H. Eaton	
W. J. McBride Est. By O. E. Cross	W. C. Weeks	
W. E. Rogers	J. H. Bullock	
G. S. Cantrell	H. M. Hightower	
J. A. Simons	L. C. Abbott	
L. P. Street	John Pengilly	