

MEMO

FROM

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA FEDERAL SAVINGS

Auburn Davis Vacaville Woodland Fairfield West Sacramento Tahoe City  
Susanville Oroville Truckee Willows Loomis Paradise Burney Chester Alturas  
Lincoln Kings Beach Colusa Winters Rocklin

To \_\_\_\_\_ Date 26 Jan 78  
Re. \_\_\_\_\_

L.A. Triner called H. Thorne yesterday asking for his comment on news that OMB would support ~~the~~ addition of MK to Park, so presumably LA Triner of 26 Jan has an article.

H. Thorne called today - said Ma Erickson was at hearing and reported that Rupert Cutler (!) testified for the administration, stating that since addition of MK to the Park was OMB policy, it is now also Dept. of Agriculture policy (!).

See today box on article, but it doesn't say much except that OMB support makes passage of Keebs' bill more likely.

Glenn

P.O. Box 310  
Selma  
California 93662

28 April 1978

Honorable Henry M. Jackson, Chairman  
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Mr. Chairman:

The following are my comments on S. 88, a bill to add Mineral King to Sequoia National Park. I would appreciate inclusion of these comments in the record of the hearing which is being held today.

I strongly support inclusion of Mineral King within the national park, and therefore I support S. 88 in its present form.

I have visited Mineral King numerous times over the years, and have hiked and backpacked many of its trails. I have been impressed by its exceptional beauty, and especially by its uniqueness. Although I have backpacked extensively throughout the Sierra Nevada for the past 26 years, I have never found another alpine valley which resembles Mineral King---it is truly one of a kind. Its particular combination of topography, geology, flora, and fauna is not to be found elsewhere in the Sierra Nevada. The testimony of others will elaborate on various aspects of this uniqueness, so I shall not go into detail. Suffice it to say that Mineral King's unique features, combined in exceptional beauty, make the area highly deserving of national park status.

While it might, in theory, be possible to preserve Mineral King "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" under S.U.S. Forest Service jurisdiction, long experience has demonstrated quite convincingly that it simply would not happen. Over a period of many years local Forest Service administrators repeatedly have stated that they are mandated to develop their lands, unlike national park lands which are to be preserved. Since the Forest Service perceives their role---in all areas and at all times---as being grossly different from that of the National Park Service, it is apparent that the two agencies cannot be expected to manage a single ecological unit, such as the watershed of the Kaweah River's east fork, in a harmonious manner. There would inevitably be conflicts, with one agency managing with one set of goals in mind while the other agency is managing for a different set of goals.

Mineral King is naturally a part of Sequoia National Park, forming as it does the final headwaters of the Kaweah River's east fork and being surrounded on three sides by the National Park. In the interests of sound, rational, land management planning and administration, it should be placed under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

To this end I strongly urge passage of S. 88. I further urge that you not adopt any weakening amendments which might bypass or nullify established Park Service planning procedures. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*George W. Whitmore*  
George W. Whitmore