SUBJECT: Kings River road/trail upstream from Garnet Dike Campground.

TO: Tony Chasteen (cc. Barbara Johnson)

FROM: George Whitmore

REFERENCE: Your letterx to Zane Smith(2 Mar 70) and response from his office (9 Mar 70).; Patterson Mountain quadrangle.

SOURCE OF FOLLOWING INFORMATION: Conversation with trail crew foreman (USFS) while hiking out on 2/3Feb 70.

Although only one mining operation shows on the map, there are apparently a number of claims (all tungsten) throughout this entire area. (I understand from another source that tungsten occurs commonly where granite intrusions have contacted limestone, and there does seem to be a lot of this in this general area.) Our guess is that, in addition to the Garnet Dike Mine high in Fox Canyon, there are other claims lower in Fox Canyon. The high road goes to Garnet Dike Mine (which employed 50-60 people at one time), while the low road, which is in the procews (slow!) of being pushed around Rocky Point by tungsten claimants is ultimately destined for claims which are lower in Fox Canyon. The Acting Supervisor states in his letter to you "The rock outcrop (Rocky Point) just west of Fox Canyon has been an obstacle in the past. The claimant now feels he has located a route through this barrier." This is a rather peculiar way of saying that the claimant has decided to spend a few more dollars on dynamite, as that is all that is involved. The USFS trail crew foreman referred to this extension of the low road by claimants, and this is entirely a separate matter from what we observed and were wondering about.

What we were assuming to be a new road in progress is said to be merely an upgrading to present standards of the foot trail. It seems that present standards call for a four foot right of way; it is not clear to us why the blasting holes have to be drilled ten feet apart if a four foot right of way is all that is desired.

There is apparently some thought of eventually extending the trail all the way to Garlic Falls in order to "open it up" for tourist travel. This idea extends back some years. I rember Walt Puhn talking about it as much as six years ago. I intend to discuss it with Zane Smith, as I feel the wisdom of facilitating access to a feature of the character of Garlic Falls is highly questionable--the fatality rate would surely be a factor to reckon with, as people would be lured into dangerous places in their zeal to see more of the falls. If access to the falls is to be made easy, then I think they would have to spend quite a bit of money with a local network of trails, signs, and railings to keep people from coming to grief, (in the immediate vicinity of the falls). At present, the only people who get in that far are likely to have a certain minimum amount of common sense regarding self-preservation, but easier access can change that.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

9 March 1973

Barry Fisher
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
311 California Street, Suite 311
San Francisco
California 94104

Re. Rodgers Crossing dam
(Kings River, Monarch Wilderness)

Dear Barry:

Your recent inquiry about hydroelectric developments in the vicinity of Rancheria Creek reminded me that I should bring this one to your attention.

The enclosed clipping from the Fresno Bee of 31 December 1972 is quite detailed and should provide a good introduction to the issue.

Note that as recently as last summer we were confronted with a completely different situation...specifically a smaller dam and little likelihood that it would ever come to pass. Now the proposal is for a higher dam, fifty per cent larger reservoir, and a serious possibility that it might come to fruition. This is because of the involvement of the Southern California Edison Company, and their proposal for a scheme which seems to offer something for everybody. Except the environmentalists.

I have enclosed a Sierra National Forest map on which I have marked the general area which would be involved. The earlier proposal would have backed water up almost to Garlic Falls; I have no idea how much farther the presently proposed reservoir would go because increased height of the dam has not been specified. The red lines indicate the earlier proposal, and the dark blue lines suggest the proposed expansion; these lines are to indicate locale only--I have made no attempt to trace the actual reservoir contours.

The important thing to note is that practically any dam at Rogers Crossing would back water into defacto wilderness which was inventoried as such by the USFS last spring. In particular, even the lower (570 foot high) dam would back water into the Garlic Falls area, which the Sierra Club recommended for wilderness classification (not merely study) in at the Monarch Wilderness hearing. (I think it quite likely that we will eventually be recommending wilderness classification still farther west, although we have not yet gone on record for that.)

I hope this is of some value to you. If you have questions I would be happy to try to provide answers.

Sincerely,

George

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

9 March 1973

Barry Fisher
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
311 California Street, Suite 311
San Francisco
California 94104

Re. Rodgers Crossing dam
(Kings River, Monarch Wilderness)

Dear Barry:

Your recent inquiry about hydroelectric developments in the vicinity of Rancheria Creek reminded me that I should bring this one to your attention.

The enclosed clipping from the Fresno Bee of 31 December 1972 is quite detailed and should provide a good introduction to the issue.

Note that as recently as last summer we were confronted with a completely different situation...specifically a smaller dam and little likelihood that it would ever come to pass. Now the proposal is for a higher dam, fifty per cent larger reservoir, and a serious possibility that it might come to fruition. This is because of the involvement of the Southern California Edison Company, and their proposal for a scheme which seems to offer something for everybody. Except the environmentalists.

I have enclosed a Sierra National Forest map on which I have marked the general area which would be involved. The earlier proposal would have backed water up almost to Garlic Falls; I have no idea how much farther the presently proposed reservoir would go because increased height of the dam has not been specified. The red lines indicate the earlier proposal, and the dark blue lines suggest the proposed expansion; these lines are to indicate locale only--I have made no attempt to trace the actual reservoir contours.

The important thing to note is that practically any dam at Rogers Crossing would back water into defacto wilderness which was inventoried as such by the USFS last spring. In particular, even the lower (570 foot high) dam would back water into the Garlic Falls area, which the Sierra Club recommended for wilderness classification (not merely study) in at the Monarch Wilderness hearing. (I think it quite likely that we will eventually be recommending wilderness classification still farther west, although we have not yet gone on record for that.)

I hope this is of some value to you. If you have questions I would be happy to try to provide answers.

Sincerely,

George

George W. Whitmore

George - He made copies of both letters from Ray for you. Also did a resolution from Nev. Senate regarding Minaret Summit Hwy. We'll try to get to legislatures on this.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

6 April 1973

Marge Sill
720 Brookfield
Reno
Nevada 89503

Dear Marge,

Two requests; could you please send me:

1. A copy (approximate) of the resolution which you amended and seconded re. NCRCC action on the Rodgers Crossing (Kings River) dam proposal. This is the one where Hackamack moved that it be referred to the Water Committee. When you seconded it you made an amendment which Hackamack indicated he was agreeable to, but I failed to catch it. I am not concerned about words--I just want to know what we did!

2. A copy of Ray Sherwin's response to Dick's letter of resignation. You indicated that it was published in the Toiyabe newsletter, but I never see the newsletter.

Thank you, and I will try to listen more closely next time.

George

George Whitmore

George - I believe this was the resolution where it was felt that some action had to be taken before next NCRCC meeting. My amendment was approximately to the effect that if the Water Com. studied the situation & concurred with Chapter position that the Exec. Com. of NCRCC be empowered to take appropriate action. (To be truthful, I have forgotten what this specific action was to be but you probably know that.)

I'll ask RCS to make you copy of Ray's letter!

Thanks for stuff on wilderness.

Marge.

To: Jerry Meral, Jake Miller, Herb Joseph, Ken Turner

From: George Whitmore

Subject: Rodgers Crossing dam (proposed) on Kings River

Date: 15 April 1973

Enclosures: Fresno Bee clipping, 31 Dec 72
Fresno Bee clipping, 25 March 73
leaflet being distributed by Fly Fishermen for Conservation
copy of Sierra Nevada Task Force resolution of 7 Apr 73
Fresno Bee clipping, 19 Aug 70

The Bee clipping of 31 Dec 72 is a basic document. It outlines the current situation in depth, and is ~~xxxix~~ recommended for its lucid description of the threat. The author did not write from that point of view, but the facts speak for themselves.

The other items are useful, but not vital.

The current position of the Tehipite Chapter is as follows:
(SB 1028)

1. The Chapter supported Zenovich's bill/last year. This would have included the Kings in a State Wild River system. This was prior to passage of SB 4 (Collier) and SB 107 (Behr), and signing of SB 107 by the governor; thus the exact nature of such a system was not known at the time SB 1028 was endorsed. But the intent to endorse free-flowing status for the Kings was quite clear.

2. The Chapter has called for Wilderness classification for some of the land which would be inundated, and has called for Wilderness study for much of the remainder.

3. In support of the above two principles, already incorporated into Chapter policy, the Chapter chairman and conservation chairman attempted to have the executive committee oppose the Rodgers Crossing dam proposal. They failed in this effort. Their opposition stated that the Chapter should not take a position on such a matter until it had been adequately studied; this same idea was interjected when the Rodgers Crossing proposal was brought up at the last NCRCC meeting. (The chapter ex comm meets again April 18.)

The issue perhaps boils down to, "What constitues a 'study'?" My own view is that an understanding of the background and a review of the enclosed documents is the only "study" needed, and is in fact the only one which we can afford. A cumbersome "study" procedure, culminating in an impressive printed report, would undoubtedly come to the same conclusion which can be reached right now. But the conclusion would be moot, because in the meantime the S.C. Edison Company and the irrigation districts would already be committed. At this point in time they are not committed. We should express ourselves vigorously now, before they have invested large amounts of money and ego in the project.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg, CA 93631

2 February 1974

Bill Tanner

Dear Bill,

At the most recent meeting of the PGE with various local conservationist-type ~~xxxxx~~ individuals, someone asked PGE whether the Helms Pumped Storage Project would result in greater storage capacity on the Kings River, and if so of course the individual was all for the Helms Project.

PGE stated that the project would indeed increase the storage capacity on the Kings.

Have you checked into this aspect of the Kings River situation?

Perhaps the operation of Wishon-Courtright as a pumped storage facility would result in enough increase in storage capacity that the supposed benefit from Rogers Crossing (or Mill Creek?) would be <u>even less</u> than heretofore claimed by KRCD.

I have not attempted to reason out, or to inquire as to, how the Helms Project would result in greater storage. I am merely taking PGE's word for it that this would happen.

You might want to take in the PGE program which is being put on by them this coming Wednesday night, as described in the Topics. Perhaps this would be something you could pursue at that meeting.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

(Do you know what the status of the federal wild rivers legislation is? I haven't heard anything recently. Last I know was that there had been a subcommittee hearing. Norman Hill's letter regarding the Kings was made a part of the hearing record, but there was no mention of letters from anyone else. I am wondering whether that means that Norman's letter was the only one. If so, then we certainly blew a wonderful opportunity.)

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
CA 93631

27 March 1975

Dr. Edwin H. Daubs
2711 East Simpson
Fresno, CA 93703

Dear Ed,

I hope the enclosed flyers are self-explanatory. Don Morrill, the Sierra Club's Wilderness Coordinator (staff position) for northern California is trying to get some activity going on our Kings Canyon/River problems. He will be down here from Chico for the week end of April 5-6, and will be running the show. But he needs help from us locally to try to get some troops out for the hike. Hopefully from those who go on the outing there will be a significant number of individuals who will be willing to help save the area.

Could you get these distributed at the FSU campus? Thanks.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

cc. Don Morrill

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg, CA 93631

27 March 1975

Rob Hansen
665 West Dovewood Lane
Fresno
CA 93704

Dear Rob,

I hope the enclosed flyers are self-explanatory. Don Morrill, the Sierra Club's Wilderness Coordinator for northern California, will be down here from Chico on April 5-6. (He talked with Gene Zumwalt and Elfoy Robinson a few weeks ago--he did not have your name at that time.) He is trying to get some activity going in connection with the problems in the Kings River area. He will be running the show on April 5-6, but he is dependent on us locally to get the word out that it is going to happen. He hopes to get a sizeable number of individuals out on the trail, and hopefully from that group there willbe a significant number who will be willing to help save the area.

Could you get these distributed at ~~the~~ your college campus? Thanks.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

cc. Don Morrill

(If you would like further information, please feel free to call me, 897-3692.)

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
CA 93631

27 March 1975

Dr. Eugene Zumwalt
4535 East Rialto
Fresno, CA 93726

Dear Gene,

I hope the enclosed flyers are self-explanatory. Don Morrill will be down here from Chico on April 5-6. He is trying to get some activity going in connection with the problems in the Kings River area. He will be running the show on April 5-6, but he is dependent on us locally to get the word out that it is going to happen. He hopes to get a sizeable number of individuals out on the trail, and hopefully from that group there will be a significant number who will be willing to help save the area.

Could you get these distributed at the college campus? Thanks.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

cc. Don Morrill

(If you would like further information, please feel free to call me, 897-3692.)