P. O. Box 485 Kingsburg California 93631

11 January 1971 February

Terry Maltby 26435 Chatham Court Hayward California

Dear Mr. Maltby:

Your letter of January 14 addressed to Sierra Club headquarters in San Francisco has been referred to me since Yosemite National Park lies within Tehipite Chapter's territory. (Your letter was apparently not received in Club headquarters until February 9.)

There are many objectionable things which are done in Yosemite with the acquiescence, if not actual approval and encouragement, of the National Park Service. But I would guess that drilling for oil is not one of these--and the main reason I would guess that is because the geology of the Yosemite area is not at all favorable for the occurence of oil deposits.

But the rumor you have heard very possibly has some basis in fact. For example, perhaps there is some other type of drilling activity which was being conducted last spring and is possibly still continuing. But if this is so, I must admit we have not heard of it.

It is entirely possible that the young people you speak of had some differences with the Yosemite administration concerning over-development or over-mechanization of the Park. But everything I heard about the confrontation indicated that the flifferences of opinion had to do more with social problems. There were widely conflicting reports as to who was at fault--the young people or the rangers. Drawing upon myown personal experiences with the Yosemite administration, I would guess that the rangers really would have to share a mizeable portion of the Blame for the confrontation. But at the same time it appeared that the young people went out of their way to ask for trouble.

Perhaps you could write the Yosemite administration and ask them whether the young people were concerned about over-development or over-mechanization of the Park. I would be very interested in seeing what the administration's response to such a question would be. If you do write them, I would appreciate knowing what they tell you. The address is Mr. Wayne Cone, Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, Calif. 95389.

Very frequently the first we learn of some particular problem in Yosemite, or elsewhere, is from someone such as yourself writing us a letter. We appreciate the additional "eye" and "ears" we gain in this way, for the task of looking after Yosemite and the rest of the Sierra is enormous. Thank you. Sincerely,

latter hand

P. O. Box 485 Kingsburg California 93631

7 March 1971

Toni Allen P. O. Box 187 Gonzales California 93926

Dear Toni Allen:

In response to your request of February 21, I am enclosing two reprints. These are copies of statements presented at the Yosemite National Park Master Plan public hearing held three years ago--one was by the Sierra Club's national headquarters and the other was by our own Tehipite Chapter.

The statements deal more with proposed solutions to problems than they do with the problems themselves, although by reading between the lines I believe you will be able to gain some insight into the problems.

The proposed master plan which was the subject of that hearing has actually never been released to the public, even to this day. Apparently this is, at least in part, because the Park Service has not yet decided upon final recommendations for some aspects of the plan.

The Park Service's deliberations regarding the Master Plan would probably be relevant to your interests, and I suggest you write the Yosemite administration if you have not already done so. The address would be Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, California, 95389.

Thank you for taking the trouble to inquire, and I hope this is of some value to you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore Conservation Chairman

## SIERRA CLUB

TEHIPITE CHAPTER P. O. BOX 4102 FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93744
5396 93755

P. O. Box 485 Kingsburg California 93631

29 November 1971

Don and Marty Barcus 4210 Baldwin Avenue Culver City California 90230

Dear Don & Marty Barcus,

Barbara Chasteen has provided me with a copy of your letter to her of November 10, in which you describe the imminent formation of an Angeles Chapter Yosemite Subcommittee.

I was quite pleased to learn that such a group is being organized, as I have long felt the necessity for greater involvement in Sierra Nevada problems by Sierra Club members from the state's metropolitan areas. Tehipite Chapter may have the problems, but the manpower needed to resolve many of those problems lies within the larger chapters. We welcome all the help we can get in seeking wise management of Yosemite. (And all the rest of our natural mountain areas, for that matter.)

At the same time, I urge that our welcoming of help from other chapters not be construed as being an invitation for a "free for all", with each group flying off on its own particular tangent and not bothering to let anyone else know what it is doing. Although the stultifying effect of over-organization is to be avoided, still a certain adherence to basic ground rules is necessary if we are to present a united front. That doesn't mean we won't have differences of opinion, but let's keep that internal to the Club and not start taking public positions before we have agreed upon what they are to be.

As a start, I would suggest that the px local chapter's opinion on specific issues always be solicited. That means actively sought out. If they don't have an opinion, perhaps there is a perfectly good reason for it which you would find relevent to your own thinking.

If the local chapter does have an opinion or position which differs from that which your group has arrived at, I feel that the next step should be to seek agreement between those two bodies. It may or may not be achieved at that level.

Only after the first steps mentioned above have been followed should a matter be referred to the regional committee.

Judging by their actions, there are some within the Club who apparently do not agree with the above suggested procedure. I would be interested in hearing your reaction to it. Perhaps you would want

to discuss it at your organizational meeting.

Aside from the obvious necessity of coordinating development of the official "Sierra Club policy" on specific issues, I have found there can easily be a problem if contacts between the various elements of the Sierra Club and public officials or agencies is not coordinated. In particular, I recall a fairly recent incident in which three different Sierra Club members—each one acting in an official capacity—contacted the Yosemite superintendent on the same issue but at different times and quite independently of one another.

Outwardly, the superintendent seemed amiably tolerant of the situation. But he nevertheless felt called upon to comment upon it. And I cannot help but feel that the Sierra Club lost a few points in that official's mind.

Again, I would suggest that the answer k is to have an agreed upon procedure which everyone will adhere to. On this one I am not so certain of the best procedure and would be interested in hearing your ideas on how best to coordinate agency contacts. Is a rule of thumb, I am guessing that the most workable procedure would be to ensure that the local chapter is always informed in advance of any planned contacts with the agency of official by another element of the Sierra Club, and that the local chapter be given the opportunity to be included in the meeting or correspondence.

I hope all this doesn't sound too formidable, and I most certainly hope it doesn't tend to discourage you in the formation of your new subcommittee. As I said earlier, I firmly believe in keeping protocol to a minimum. And it can be minimized if we could just agree on a few basic ground rules, and then stick with them.

I will be looking forward to hearing further from you, and hope to see you in due course. Thanks for your interest and help.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore Conservation Chairman

(You had several specific questions regarding Yosemite. I am including my comments upon those as an enclosumeto this letter.)

In response to your letter of 10 Nov 71, addressed to Barbara Chasteen:

1. Current Club position on the (Yosemite) wilderness proposal and master plan.

I trust that Barbara has sent you the relevant statements and position papers I was gone during the critical two months between release of the proposals and the dates of the public hearings, and basically the only information I have is that which Barbara has sent me. (This is a beautiful illustration of the necessity for having greater numbers of Club people involved in matters such as Yosemite—Barbara's NCRCC Yosemite Coordinating Committee saved the day in the absence of local impetus.)

2. Club policy toward the new Yosemite administration.

I am not sure what this means, except perhaps you are wondering how we propose to approach them. My own personal feeling on this is that any new administration should be approached in a low-key manner. Eg. slowly (not in haste), cautiously, listening ranter than telling, asking rather than demanding, and obviously with courtesy. Trying to establish the kunixxium opportunity for personal friendship to develop if it will, but not forcing the issue. This includes trying to avoid confrontations, but facing them head-on if necessary. I do NOT believe in looking upon every public official as an opponent who is to be dealt with on an adversary basis. But if he wants to put it on that basis, then so be it; but I want the choice to be his.

The second page of my cover letter is quite relevant to this matter of how to approach an administration.

If all this seems quite obvious, I would comment that, judging by the performance(s) of some of our colleagues, it may not be as obvious as it seems.

3. Club policy toward the proposed bridge across the Merced River near Yosemite Lodge.

To my knowledge, the NPS has decided against implementing this idea, apparently largely as a consequence of public outery. If you know differently, please let me know. I am sure we would oppose it, but have not discussed it because it appears to be a non-issue at this point.

4. Club policy toward "the increased function of Curry Company".

Apparently you know something I do not. This is hardly surprising, as I do not profess to be a specialist on Yosemite. Please let me know what it is that concerns you.

As an item of information, I understand that the NPS is now leaning toward the idea of abandoming the concept of centralized administration and servicing of the Valley from the Foresta/Big Meadow area! Since this seemed to be central to most of the thinking in the master plan, it would appear that they would have to throw the whole thing out and start over again. Do you have any thoughts on this?