

SAMPLE TESTIMONY OF CRNP MEMBERS

The following two copies of testimony by CRNP members are reprinted here with the permission of the writers - who will be presenting this testimony at the House hearings. CRNP members are requested to use these letters as a guide only. Please do not copy them. The Congressmen will be willing to hear each and every CRNP member express his feelings in his own manner.

(1)

Gentlemen:

In certain places in the Eastern Hemisphere sacred cows are common. We think that this practice is absurd. But did you ever stop to think that the reasons given against a Redwoods National Park may be equally as unreasonable? Such a park would take only about three years off the total lumbering time for the big trees.

If we are going to save enough redwoods for a first class national park, we must do it almost at once. If we don't establish a Redwoods National Park, the best possible, on Redwood Creek, we will be condemned by posterity and rightly so.

We are told on the North Coast that people are out of work and that Del Norte County is in a depression because lumber is not in demand. If this is true, it is not because we have a national park! I can't see how redwoods could be cut faster as indicated by the number of lumber trucks on the highway. How many trees do they have to cut to maintain prosperity?

If cutting is to continue, the big trees are DOOMED. Then what about the economy? A Redwoods National Park is vital to the prosperity of the North Coast of California. It is vital to round out our system of national parks. The magnificent redwood forests grow only here and here they must be saved. A park will bring in millions of tourist dollars which we will need as the logging industry moves into a second growth economy.

Gentlemen, we need a Redwood National Park, the best possible on Redwood Creek in Northern Humboldt County. Don't fail the Nation, do it now.

Sincerely,

/s/

Robert Vernon Kirby
Resident and property owner,
Klamath, California 95548

(2) Sample testimony

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES W. BLOOM

Redwood National Park hearing, April 18, 1968.

My name is Charles Bloom. I have been a resident of Arcata for some 15 years, and in that period have spent a great deal of time in Humboldt County's woods and along her streams, hiking, fishing, looking about, and chaperoning several local hiking groups. This experience has led me to feel strongly that there is a need for a redwood national park, and not merely one which renames present state parks, or which adds to them (as in the Clausen plan) some miscellaneous ribbons of seashore, and a few other shoestring corridors and oddments, but which enlarges present parks by significant acreages of old growth forest and combines them into a logical and coherent unit.

I believe we need such a unit for several reasons:

- (a) First, existing state parks, magnificent as they are, do not provide sufficient space to wander for a day or overnight in close contact with the trees, in a variety of settings, and substantially out of sight and sound of highway traffic. Judging by the reactions of the many groups I have led into the redwoods, I can tell you that the opportunity for such an experience is essential.
- (b) We should also provide if possible the opportunity for an approach by water--for floating down one of our fine North Coast streams through relatively undisturbed forest. As highways follow all major streams in existing parks, this is now possible only in non-park areas where the untouched forest will soon be removed.
- (c) Next, for both scenic and ecologic reasons, we need a place where the untouched forest extends from ridgetop to ridgetop. Somewhere in the redwoods, you ought to be able to look out over a vista substantially like that you would have seen before the white man came. Corridors and isolated small groves simply do not provide this opportunity.
- (d) We should also not forget that we need--crucially--additional old growth forest for the additional millions who will be visiting the redwoods in the future. These people will need more than merely the possibility of camping in vast acreages of what some of our friends in the timber industry would consider "fully developed" park--that is, acreages of tents spread out over mile after mile, vast, crowded tent slums. Now is the last opportunity to provide this for the crowds of the years 2068, 2568, or as far beyond that as any man can see.
- (e) Finally, we need federal protection as unfortunately the state park system, with all the dedication and devotion of its personnel, simply is not politically strong enough to resist the freeway builders and others who are making serious and destructive inroads into its forests.

I hope these observations will suggest some of the reasons I feel we need a federal park, and perhaps also the kind of federal park we should have. To this oral testimony I would like to add for the record a written statement which expands on these and suggests further points.