THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 19, 1969

TO: John Ehrlichman

THRU: Bryce N. Harlow

FROM: Bill Timmons 67

SUBJECT: Rep. Jim Utt (R-Calif)

I talked again with Jimmy Utt regarding the proposed State Park on Camp Pendleton property.

Mr. Utt feels he must continue to urge approval of a state park in the San Onofre area because:

- 1. it is needed;
- 2. popular among voters; and
- 3. President will be blamed if parcel not transferred.

However, Jimmy understands problem and wants to be helpful. He suggests either (1) extending coast guard station to the ocean along lines of the San Mateo creek, which would give substantial fenced-in buffer zone; or (2) starting park at Basilon's Road and moving south to the Atomic Energy Park, providing miles of buffer.

The Congressman felt either approach could be worked out with the governor. He said the Basiloni-Atomic plot is actually better anyway. If you will take a look at Utt's alternatives, I'll give Jim the final word. However, Utt wants us to know that RN will be severely and publicly criticized if the park is denied because of the President's new home.

On a related matter, the natives are upset over a army signal tower being constructed on the only hill in the San Clemente area. This hill was refused use by CATV but President now has it for his communications.

4

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

JULY 14, 1969

TO:

BILL TIMMONS

FROM:

JOHN EHRLICHMAN

Herewith is a Xerox of a map showing the relationship between Jim Utt's state park and the President's house.

As you see, they actually abut.

This proposed 'San Onofre State Park' would be totally incompatible with the President's use of his property and I think this should be explained to Congressman Utt so that he will lay off.

Your memorandum of June 28 totally misunderstands the relationships of these two properties, I am sure.

cc: Bryce Harlow

