ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
SUPERINTENDENT OF LIGHTHOUSES
KEY WEST, FLA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

LIGHT
JUN 29 1920
HOUSES

COPY-VAA.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT, 7TH DISTRICT
KEY WEST, FLA.

OFFICE OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Southern District of Florida

7/19/20 Wrote 7th Supt

Jacksonville, Fla. June 14, 1920.

Mr. William W. Demeritt,

Superintendent of Lighthouses,

Key West, Fla.

Dear Sir:

In Re: United States vs. Schooner "William H. Davenport"

Replying to your letter of the 11th instant inquiring with reference to the status of said case beg to say that all the testimony has been taken. Inasmuch as the vessel has been destroyed I am not sure whether it is worth while to argue the case to the court. As the proceeding was a libel against the boat itself a final decree ordering the sale of said schooner would amount to nothing.

Yours very truly,

/s/ H.S.Phillips

United States Attorney.

What's to prevent holding parties responsible, just same
P C
7/16

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
SUPERINTENDENT OF LIGHTHOUSES
KEY WEST, FLA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

HBH-VAA.

LIGHT HOUSES JUN 29 1920

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT, 7TH DISTRICT
KEY WEST, FLA.

Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 -
Destroyed by Schooner "Wm.
H. DAVENPORT."

June 26, 1920.

7/19/20 Wrote 7th Supt. (Copy.)

Mr. H. S. Phillips
United States Attorney,
Tampa, Fla.

Sir:

1. Referring to your letter of June 14, 1920, relative to case of the United States vs. Schooner "WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT".

2. Kindly inform this office if there were any bondsmen responsible for the "WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT" in connection with this case. It appears to this office that such bondsmen would be liable for the damages inasmuch as the vessel would not have been lost if she had not been released under bond, that is, providing she was released under bond.

3. It is the opinion of this office that this case should be definitely settled, for under existing conditions it appears that it is the impression of owners of floating equipment in Tampa, especially of the influential ones, as in this case, that they may destroy aids with impunity.

4. Your attention is invited to the fact that this case was referred to the Department of Justice on March 11, 1918, something over two years ago.

Respectfully,

Wm. W. Bennett

Superintendent of Lighthouses.

898.

898

AEH:GP

July 19, 1920.

Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla.

No further report has been received from you relative destruction Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 by schooner WM. H. DAVENPORT; your indorsement June 26, 1920. Referring to the United States Attorney's letter of June 14, 1920, to you, it is requested that you suggest to the United States Attorney the possibility of collection, in any event, from the owners of the above-mentioned schooner, and also the possibility of libeling, if practicable, some other vessel which said parties may own.

attempt to have terminated satisfactorily within reasonable time
Keep Bureau advised

Acting Commissioner of Lighthouses.

COPY - VAA.

898

LIGHT
AUG 10 1920
HOUSES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Southern District of Florida

8/24/21 Wrote 7 ch

Hydrog.
Engr. Cons.
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Contracts
Chf. Clk.
Dep. Comms
Commr.

August 2, 1920.

WPH 8/12

Mr. Wm. W. Demeritt,
Supt. of Lighthouses,
Key West, Florida.

Ele G aug 10 notes file

In re: U. S. v. Schooner Davenport.

Dear Sir:-

Your letter of the 31st instant to hand. Replying to same beg to say that a few weeks ago we argued said cases before Judge Call and submitted the same to him on final hearing. He has the case under advisement. As he has so much work to do I cannot give you any idea as to when he will render his decision. If you want to hurry the matter any further you will have to write to Judge Call.

It occurs to me that the government is very much handicapped in these cases since the witnesses who seen the transaction are always against the government.

Yours truly,

/s/ H. S. Phillips

UNITED STATES ATTY

HSP:MAB

Office of Superintendent of Lighthouses
Key West, Fla.

HBH-VAA.

August 7, 1920.

1. Forwarded to Commissioner of Lighthouses, Washington, D.C. for his information and files.

Wm. W. Demeritt

Superintendent of Lighthouses.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
SUPERINTENDENT OF LIGHTHOUSES
KEY WEST, FLA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

LIGHTHOUSES 898

Hydrog.
Engr. Const.
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Contracts
Chf. Clk.
Dep. Commr.
Commr.

1920 SEP 14 AM 8 28
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT, 7TH DISTRICT
KEY WEST, FLA.

WWD-LHP.

Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2.
Decree re destruction of -

September 11, 1920.

Commissioner of Lighthouses, Washington, D. C.

1. There is enclosed what appears to be a copy of the decree of the District Judge in the case of the United States of America versus Schooner WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT. This was received, without any letter of transmittal, in a franked envelope on which was printed the return address of the District Attorney. It is presumed that the Bureau will be fully advised by the Department of Justice of the results of this case, to date.

2. From the enclosed decree, without all the other papers in the case before this office, it appears that the Government has not obtained justice in this instance and it is therefore recommended that an appeal be made.

3. It will be noted that in the first paragraph the destroyed aid to navigation is referred to as "beacon No. 2", "beach No. 2", and in two instances as a "buoy"; in three other instances elsewhere in the document he calls the light a "buoy"; twice it is called a "beacon" and once again it is referred to as "beacon No. 2". There is nothing whatever in this decree to show that he was referring to Hillsboro Bay Light, No. 2. It is evident from the way these words are used that he is laboring under the impression that they are synonymous. This office contends that, notwithstanding what the other qualifications of the learned gentleman may be, any one who does not know the difference between a buoy and a beacon, two types of aids that are diametrically opposite, one fixed the other floating, is certainly not sufficiently informed in the rudiments of navigation to render a just decision as to whether a vessel is correctly navigated or not.

4. The Captain Bie referred to is a nautical expert and an engineer, a man who was practically raised at sea, a graduated 1st Class Navigator in the Norwegian Navy and an officer of sailing vessels in the North and South Atlantic and Indian Oceans for about seven years, and who has been engaged in river and harbor improvements for over thirty years, about twenty of which have been on work in Tampa Bay and vicinity. For the past eleven years he has been an assistant engineer in charge of the United States Engineer Office at Tampa, Fla. and all engineering work under its jurisdiction. In the opinion of this office, there is no one better qualified to give testimony in this case than this efficient engineer. He knows more about the waters under consideration and the channels, obstructions, etc. therein than any one else; yet, notwithstanding this extraordinary knowledge, as he was not present his testimony was not given the same weight as was that of those present, who in this instance, were the interested parties on the offending vessel.

5. It will be noted that it is stated in the first paragraph of the decree "that when some distance to the north of beach No. 2, estimated by the captain and pilot at some four hundred feet, and by Captain Bie from hearing the pilot testify as somewhat further, the vessel came about" that she lost headway and owing to the tide and wind drifted against said buoy and destroyed it". Captain Bie, being thoroughly familiar with the locality, knew from the pilot's own testimony that the vessel had to be more than four hundred feet from the aid which it subsequently destroyed. Notwithstanding this knowledge, the fact that he was not present appears to make it impossible for this nautical expert, this hydrographic engineer, to successfully contravert any statement no matter how inaccurate it may be, if it is made by parties who were present, even though they are interested ones.

a. As a matter of fact the approximate distance of the schooner from Hillsboro Bay Light, No. 2, when the attempt was made to tack, just prior to the destruction of this aid to navigation, is definitely fixed by the pilot and captain in the first paragraph of their joint letter, copy of which is attached, in which they state that the schooner "was heading about east by south, also heading well to the northward of buoy #1, the wind lightened and headed us as we tacked," xxxx. Now with the vessel's course and the fact that it was "heading well to the northward of buoy #1" it is a simple matter for any one, especially a man of Captain Bie's exceptional ability and thorough acquaintance with the locality, where he has been surveying, etc., for many years, to fully realize that the distance was under-estimated. However as he was not present at that particular time, the testimony of the interested witnesses was accepted in preference to this disinterested expert.

b. An examination of attached section of C. & G. S. Chart No. 177 will show that if this vessel was heading east by south and directly for Hillsboro Bay Buoy No. 1, instead of "well to the northward" of it, as stated by the captain and the pilot, even then the vessel would have been some where on a line 1200 feet from the aid which was destroyed.

c. In the fifth paragraph, his honor states: "The captain and pilot both testify that had they anchored when the vessel came about she would have swung into shallow water and gone upon the rocks". Captain Bie on the other hand maintains she had ample space, even with ninety feet of cable to have anchored and avoided damaging the buoy." Now as a matter of fact, with this small light draft vessel, (length 123.5 feet, breadth 30.6 feet and a depth of 8.6 feet) on the course as stated and in the position where the attempt was made to tack, there was no shallow water that would interfere with this vessel within 1200 feet to the Southward or 1000 yards to the Northward and Captain Bie knew this, but his testimony had but little weight with the Court owing to the fact that he was not present at the accident.

6. In the fourth paragraph of the decree it is stated, "I do not think the attempt to beat the schooner up to Tampa against an ebb tide would support the charge of negligence". As it is impossible to beat a schooner the size of the one in question all the way up to Tampa under any condition, and especially with an ebb tide, the pilot was certainly negligent in

taking unnecessary chances in attempting to beat by Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 and up into Hillsboro Bay with baffling winds and ebb tide. The Judge's opinion in this instance is additional evidence of his limited knowledge of nautical affairs and of the locality in question. The logical thing to have done under the circumstances was to have anchored and waited for a tug, or for a change of tide and for the wind to have hauled to and steadied on a more favorable point for working the vessel up to Tampa.

7. This office contends that negligence as defined by the Court was also clearly shown when, under atmospheric and tidal conditions existing at the time, no preparation was made for dropping an anchor should it become necessary to do so, and gross negligence was shown when no attempt whatever was made to anchor and check the vessel when it must have been evident to a reasonably prudent, experienced and cool-headed navigator that the vessel was drifting down on the structure.

a. The pilot and captain in the fourth paragraph of their joint letter state "It may be said - Why did we not drop the anchor and hold her? But if we had done so after tacking and finding it doubtful of clearing the beacon, vessel being to windward in the tide, would have in all probability by the time the anchor "bit in" and held her, have swung around and hit the beacon with her counter." An attempt to anchor under the circumstances was the only logical thing to do and even if the vessel swung around and had hit the beacon with her counter, as the speed of the vessel would have been checked, the force of the blow would have been greatly reduced, and while the structure may have been slightly damaged, it certainly would not have been destroyed and there would have been some evidence of a reasonable attempt to prevent the accident.

8. In the fifth paragraph of the decree it is stated "There does not seem to have been any ground for the belief on the part of the officers of the schooner that she would not come about on the last tack as she had on the course from the Gulf to the location of beacon No. 2, nor no sufficient reason for them to anticipate a change in the direction of the wind, which would prevent the manouver attempted." It may appear as it is stated, to one who does not know the difference between a buoy and a beacon, but any one with a reasonable knowledge of sailing vessels would know that there can be no comparison in beating a vessel from the Gulf twenty three miles up Tampa Bay to the location of Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 and in beating the vessel from the aid in question up to Tampa City. A glance at the chart will show that one presents no difficulties whatever and the other in part is very difficult and in the upper reach it is impossible, especially with baffling winds and an ebb tide.

a. As the wind was"baffling" as stated by the Court in the decree and by the captain and pilot and in their joint letter, that alone certainly was sufficient reason for a reasonably prudent and competent navigator to anticipate a sudden shift of wind; that is exactly what a baffling wind does and failure to be in a position to promptly drop anchor and failure to

actually do so, is prima facie evidence of negligence.

9. Two letters from O. N. Bie, Assistant Engineer, U. S. Engineer Department, Tampa, Fla. are enclosed for the Bureau's information.

Office: Franklin Square Building, [illegible] Fla.
Station: Egmont Key.

Wm W Demeritt

Superintendent of Lighthouses.

September 26, 1917.

AB

Mr. W. W. Demeritt, Inspector,
Seventh Light House District,

DESTRUCTION OF BEACON #2.

Dear Sir:-

I beg to inform you that on September 24th at 10:30 A.M. whilst beating the Schr. "Wm. E. Davenport", Captain Gelebert, bound for Tampa, up the bay, the wind being baffling and light, Northeast at times, and tide being strong ebb tide, whilst on the port tack and heading about East by south, also heading well to the northward off buoy #1, the wind lightened and headed on us we tacked, veering round to westward of north for a few minutes so that vessel beat her way whilst in stays and would neither forge ahead nor keep off sufficiently to clear beacon #2, although we made every endeavor to do so, the master being at the wheel himself.

Seeing that the vessel was not gaining headway enough to go windward of beacon (the tide sweeping vessel towards same all the time) we slacked spanker boom away off and hauled fore-sail and fore staysail to windward, endeavoring to keep off to leeward, but vessel did not answer helm, only in so far as to head right for beacon. The wind somewhat increased in northeast puffs, trimmed all sheets by the wind and tried to luff by to windward, but not having headway enough, the tide swept her broadside onto the beacon and pushed the whole structure over.

It may be said-Why did we not drop the anchor and hold her? But if we had done so after tacking and finding it doubtful of clearing the beacon, vessel being to windward [illegible] the tide, would have in all probability by the time [illegible] bit in and held her, have swung round and hit the [illegible] her counter.

COPY - VAA.

TAMPA BAY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION

Office: Franklin Square Building
Station: Egmont Key.

Tampa, Florida,

September 26, 1917.

Mr. W. W. Demeritt, Inspector,
Seventh Light House District,

DESTRUCTION OF BEACON #2.

Dear Sir:-

I beg to inform you that on September 24th at 10:30 A.M. whilst beating the Schr."Wm. H. Davenport", Captain Gelebart, bound for Tampa, up the bay, the wind being baffling and light, Northeast at times, and tide being strom ebb tide, whilst on the port tack and heading about East by south, also heading well to the northward off bucy #1, the wind lightened and headed us as we tacked, veering round to westward of north for a few minutes so that vessel lost her way whilst in stays and would neither forge ahead nor keep off sufficiently to clear beacon #2, although we made every endeavor to do so, the master being at the wheel himself.

Seeing that the vessel was not gaining headway enough to go windward of beacon (the tide sweeping vessel towards same all the time) we slacked spanker boom away off and hauled fore-sail and fore staysail to windward, endeavoring to keep off to leeward, but vessel did not answer helm, only in so far as to head right for beacon. The wind somewhat increased in northeast puffs, trimmed all sheets by the wind and tried to luff by to windward, but not having headway enough, the tide swept her broadside onto the beacon and pushed the whole structure over.

It may be said-Why did we not drop the anchor and hold her? But if we had done so after tacking and finding it doubtful of clearing the beacon, vessel being to windward in the tide, would have in all probability by the time the anchor bit in and held her, have swung round and hit the beacon with her counter.

COPY - VAA.

#2 Continued.

We are extremely sorry the accident occurred, but do not really feel that it was through any negligence on our part, as we had already made four or five tacks since day-light toward eastward of beacons at extrance of Tampa cut and had made gains every time. I again call to your attention the fact that we were well clear of the beacon at time of tacking.

/s/ ALEX HARVEY, Pilot

/s/ JOHN GELABERT.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
SUPERINTENDENT OF LIGHTHOUSES
KEY WEST, FLA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

LIGHTHOUSES
898
1920 SEP 14 AM 9 16

WWD-VAA.

Ayers
Asst. Comr.
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Contracts
Chf. Clk.
Dep. Comr.
Comr.

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT, 7TH DISTRICT
KEY WEST, FLA.

September 11, 1920.

Hillsboro Bay Light No.2,
Decree re destruction of -

Commissioner of Lighthouses, Washington, D. C.

1. Referring to recommendation for an appeal from the decision of the District Judge in the case of the United States versus schooner WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT (Destruction of Hillsboro Bay Light No.2.).

2. As this schooner was returning from a trip to the West Indies it is safe to say that there was a reasonable quantity of alcoholic beverages on board as is usually the case. This office is of the opinion that the captain, in accordance with prevailing customs was entertaining the pilot, and he was rather liberal, with the results that they both must have been drunk or affected to such an extent that they became negligent.

3. It is further stated for the Bureau's information that Philip Shore, who was managing owner of this schooner is also the owner of the Tug EDGAR F. CONEY and part owner of the two barges which were in tow when one of them struck and destroyed Southwest Channel Light, Tampa Bay, Fla. He is a wealthy and influential citizen of Tampa. The District Attorney who represented the Government in this case was also an influential citizen of Tampa before his appointment to his present position and it is believed that he is still a resident thereof.

Wm. W. Demeritt
Superintendent of Lighthouses.
AB.

898

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TELEGRAM

LIGHTHOUSES

5wuhx 13 Govt

Keywest, Flo. Sep 13,1920. 959am

Lighthouse Commissioner,

Washington

1920 SEP 13 AM 10 42

Hillsboro Bay Light number one destroyed September twelve temporary lann exhibited from wreckage.

Demeritt.

1033am.

N. to M. No 38 1920 par

Engr. Corps.
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Chf. Clk.
Dep. Comsr.
Comsr.

Nothing further

In replying address
Commissioner of Lighthouses

and refer to date of this letter
and file No. 898

CHIEF CLERK 898

McI
SET inclosures.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES
WASHINGTON 1920 SEP 28 AM 9 09

September 25, 1920.

Hillsboro Bay Lt. No 2,
damage.

Secretary of Commerce:

1. Referring to Department letters of March 11, 1918, and August 29, 1919, to the Attorney General, with reference to the destruction of Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2, Tampa, Fla., by the schooner William H. Davenport, on September 24, 1917.

2. Herewith are two letters of September 11, 1920, from the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla., transmitting what purports to be a copy of the decree and other papers in this case, recommending that an appeal be taken from the decision of the Court. The Bureau concurs in the views of the Superintendent and also in his recommendation, and recommends that an appeal be taken, in the event the Department sees no objection thereto. If this recommendation is approved, it is requested that the Solicitor prepare a letter submitting such additional facts to the Attorney General as are deemed proper.

3. With the limited appropriations of the Lighthouse Service it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain present aids to navigation and to establish new aids that are being demanded by reason of increase in navigation, and if the appropriations of this Service are also to be called upon to reconstruct or replace aids lost or destroyed through the carelessness and negligence of navigators, as in this case, it will work a hardship upon the Service that should not be necessary if the responsible parties were brought to justice.

4. The Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 was destroyed on September 24, 1917, and the case has been delayed since that time, and attention is invited to Department letter of August 29,1919, to the Department of Justice on this phase of the question. It may be further stated that due to this delay the cost of replacing this light will be greatly in excess of the cost if it had been replaced immediately or within a reasonable time after its destruction.

1920 SEP 27 PM 4 38

898

898

McI
SET inclosures.

Hillsboro Bay Lt. No 2,
damage.

September 25, 1920.

10/7 Ind to Wilson Dept let to Justice

Secretary of Commerce:

1. Referring to Department letters of March 11, 1918, and August 29, 1919, to the Attorney General, with reference to the destruction of Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2, Tampa, Fla., by the schooner William H. Davenport, on September 24, 1917.

2. Herewith are two letters of September 11, 1920, from the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla., transmitting what purports to be a copy of the decree and other papers in this case, recommending that an appeal be taken from the decision of the Court. The Bureau concurs in the views of the Superintendent and also in his recommendation, and recommends that an appeal be taken, in the event the Department sees no objection thereto. If this recommendation is approved, it is requested that the Solicitor prepare a letter submitting such additional facts to the Attorney General as are deemed proper.

3. With the limited appropriations of the Lighthouse Service it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain present aids to navigation and to establish new aids that are being demanded by reason of increase in navigation, and if the appropriations of this Service are also to be called upon to reconstruct or replace aids lost or destroyed through the carelessness and negligence of navigators, as in this case, it will work a hardship upon the Service that should not be necessary if the responsible parties were brought to justice.

4. The Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 was destroyed on September 24, 1917, and the case has been delayed since that time, and attention is invited to Department letter of August 29,1919, to the Department of Justice on this phase of the question. It may be further stated that due to this delay the cost of replacing this light will be greatly in excess of the cost if it had been replaced immediately or within a reasonable time after its destruction.

LIGHTHOUSES-Bureau's file.

Exact copy as signed by

Bureau of Lighthouses, Washington, D.C., September 25, 1920.

Copy to Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla., for his information, guidance and files. You will be further advised upon receipt of information from the Department.

In replying address
Commissioner of Lighthouses

and refer to date of this letter
and file No. 898

898

McI
SET inclosures.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES
WASHINGTON

Hillsboro Bay Lt.No.2,
damage.

September 28, 1920.

10/7
Ind to
7th on Sept let
to Justice

Secretary of Commerce:

1. Referring to Bureau letter of September 25, 1920, recommending that an appeal be taken from the decision of the Court in the case of the United States against the schooner WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT, arising out of the destruction of Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2, Tampa, Fla., by that vessel on September 24, 1917.

2. Herewith, for consideration in connection with papers transmitted with Bureau's above-mentioned letter, are papers recently forwarded by the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla., containing additional information submitted by an eye-witness of the destruction of the light.

1920 SEP 29 PM 12 50

G. R. Putnam

898

McI
SET inclosures.

10/7 Ind to The on Dept let to Justice 8/24/21 forced 1th

Hillsboro Bay Lt.No.2,
damage.

September 28, 1920.

Secretary of Commerce:

1. Referring to Bureau letter of September 25, 1920, recommending that an appeal be taken from the decision of the Court in the case of the United States against the schooner WILLIAM H. DAVENPORT, arising out of the destruction of Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2, Tampa, Fla., by that vessel on September 24, 1917.

2. Herewith, for consideration in connection with papers transmitted with Bureau's above-mentioned letter, are papers recently forwarded by the Superintendent of Lighthouses, Key West, Fla., containing additional information submitted by an eye-witness of the destruction of the light.

LIGHTHOUSES---Bureau's files

Exact copy as signed by_____

Mailed_____by_____

To Justice ① Supts 9/23 + inclosure
② Copy decree of court
③ O.N. Bie letter 9/8/20 to Supt
④ O.N. Bie letter 8/27/20 to Supt
⑤ Chart

HBH.

Form 80
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Inclosure Received

898

RECOMMENDATION AS TO AIDS TO NAVIGATION

OFFICE OF LIGHTHOUSE INSPECTOR, 7th DISTRICT,

Key West, Fla., Sept. 30, 1920. , 191

LIGHTHOUSES

1920 OCT 4 AM 8 44

THE COMMISSIONER OF LIGHTHOUSES:

The following recommendation is submitted for the consideration of the Bureau:

1. Name of aid: Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2, Fla.
2. Locality: Hillsboro Bay, Fla.

8/24/21 wrote 7th

3. Proposed action: Establish a temporary 5-pile dolphin with LP-150 lantern.
4. Necessity: Aid necessary for safe navigation.

~~Engr. Con.~~
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Contracts
~~Dep. Comm.~~
~~Comm.~~

OK HMD Oct 6/20

5. Total estimated cost: $1000.
6. Appropriation: General Expenses, L:H.Service, 1921.
7. Payment: To be made from funds allotted.
8. Maintenance estimated, annual cost: No additional.
9. Authority is also requested to purchase the material needed, and not now on hand, at an estimated cost of $ 275. , in accordance with law and regulations, and to do the work by ~~contract~~ ~~bond,~~ ~~$~~ ; hired labor and depot force $ 72. ; crew of vessels $ 105. . This method of performance being considered the cheapest and most advantageous to the service.
10. The reasons for requesting authority to do this work partly or wholly by hired labor rather than contract are:

Past experience has shwon that no reasonable proposals can be obtained for doing this small amount of work by contract.

11. Additional description and information:

(a) The Hillsboro Bay Light No. 2 was destroyed on Sept. 24, 1917, by the schr. "Wm. H. Davenport", and a lighted aid is necessary to mark the entrance to the Hillsboro Bay cuts, pending settlement of litigation and the rebuilding of the regular type of structure.

(b) At present the site is marked by a gas buoy, but this buoy is needed for Northwest Channel, Key West Harbor, as the P.& O.S.S.Co. are going to place deeper draft vessels on the run between Key West and Tampa in the course of a few months.

(c) It is therefore recommended that there be established a temporary flashing white light of 20 candlepower, 0.2 sec. flash, .8 sec. eclipse, on a 5-pile dolphin similar to 7th Dist. Drawing No. 351, except that lantern box is to be replaced by a tank house, and focal plane is to be 19 feet above mean high water instead of 15 feet.

(Continued on attached sheet.)

Wm. W. Demerritt
Superintendent of Lighthouses.

OK 10/5/20 MC

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES
Washington, Oct. 7, 1920.

Returned to the Inspector, approved as recommended, except as noted. You will proceed with the work and report its status, until completed, in your Monthly Report of Operations.

WRB

11—4055

HMD
PC

Commissioner.

11. (d) Lantern and accumulators are on hand.

(e) Form 83, estimate of cost, inclosed.

Form 83

HBH.

ESTIMATE OF COST OF PROPOSED WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

898

NAME OF AID: Hillsboro Bay Lt.No.2. OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF LIGHTHOUSES 7th DIST.

PROPOSED WORK: Establish temporary 5-pile dolphin with LP-150 lantern. Key West, Fla., Sept. 30, 1920. , 191

ITEMS, QUANTITIES, AND UNIT PRICES	AMOUNT
5 Creosoted pine piles, 45 ft. long, at $40.	$ 200.
500 bd.ft. Dressed yellow pine lumber at $130. M	65.
50 lbs. iron at .08	4.
Miscellaneous hardware,	4.
3 gals. Paint at $3.	9.
Illuminating apparatus - LP-150 lantern with two accumulators,	500.
Labor, 6 days at $12. per day,	72.
Incidentals,	146.
Total	$1000.

(a) The Hillsboro Bay Light No. 1 was destroyed at midnight Sept. 11,1920, by schr. "S.J.Reyes" in tow of tug "Neptune". The submerged broken piles are a menace, and a temporary lighted aid is necessary for the safety of vessels navigating this channel, pending settlement of litigation and the rebuilding of the regular type of structure.

(b) At present the site is marked by a painted barrel which was the best that could be done at the time. It is recommended that there be established a temporary fixed white light of 60 candlepower on a 5-pile dolphin with lantern box. (7th Dist. Standard Structure No. 1, Drawing No. 351.)

Superintendent of Lighthouses.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES
Washington, Oct 7, 1920.

Returned to the Inspector, approved as recommended, except as noted. You will proceed with the work and report its status, until completed, in your Monthly Report of Operations.

Estimate prepared by HBH.

11—940

HBH.
Form 80
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

RECOMMENDATION AS TO AIDS TO NAVIGATION

898

OFFICE OF LIGHTHOUSE INSPECTOR, 7th DISTRICT,

THE COMMISSIONER OF LIGHTHOUSES: Key West, Fla., September 30, 1920.

The following recommendation is submitted for the consideration of the Bureau:

1. Name of aid: Hillsboro Bay Light No. 1, Fla.
2. Locality: Hillsboro Bay, Fla.

LIGHTHOUSES

3. Proposed action: Establish a temporary 5-pile dolphin with post-lantern light.

1920 OCT 4 AM 8 44

4. Necessity: Submerged wreckage of piles of former structure dangerous and a lighted aid necessary for safely navigating this channel.

Ayres
Engr. Cons
Mar. Engr.
Personnel
Accounts.
Contracts
Dep. Comms.
Comms.

OK
IAD
Oct 6/20

5. Total estimated cost: $400.
6. Appropriation: General Expenses, L.H.Service, 1921.
7. Payment: To be made from funds allotted.
8. Maintenance estimated, annual cost: No additional.
9. Authority is also requested to purchase the material needed, and not now on hand, at an estimated cost of $ 240. , in accordance with law and regulations, and to do the work by ~~contract~~ ~~bond,~~ ~~$~~ ; hired labor and depot force $ 56. ; crew of vessels $ 84. . This method of performance being considered the cheapest and most advantageous to the service.
10. The reasons for requesting authority to do this work partly or wholly by hired labor rather than contract are:

Past experience has shown that no reasonable proposals can be obtained for doing this small amount of work by contract.

11. Additional description and information:

(a) The Hillsboro Bay Light No. 1 was destroyed at midnight Sept. 11,1920, by schr. "G.J.Boyce" in tow of tug "Neptune". The submerged broken piles are a menace, and a temporary lighted aid is necessary for the safety of vessels navigating this channel, pending settlement of litigation and the rebuilding of the regular type of structure.

(b) At present the site is marked by a painted barrel which was the best that could be done at the time. It is recommended that there be established a temporary fixed white light of 60 candlepower on a 5-pile dolphin with lantern box. (7th Dist. Standard Structure No. 1, Drawing No. 351.)

Wm. W. Demerett
Superintendent of Lighthouses. AB

OK 10/5/20 MC

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES
Washington, Oct. 7, 1920.

Returned to the Inspector, approved as recommended, except as noted. You will proceed with the work and report its status, until completed, in your Monthly Report of Operations.

11—4055

Commissioner.