



SIERRA CLUB

5396 93755
TEHIPITE CHAPTER P. O. BOX ~~482~~ FRESNO, CALIFORNIA ~~93744~~

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

21 January 1970

Honorable Raymond Sherwin
727 Ohio Street
Vallejo
California 94590

Dear Ray,

I have today mailed to you by parcel post the following:

- 2 copies - Transcript of oral testimony on Forest Highway 100, August 20, 1969, public hearing held at Mammoth Lakes.
- 2 ----- pressboard Redi-Covers in which above are mounted.
- 2 copies - contract between Madera County and Bureau of Public Roads regarding Forest Highway 100. (Also F. H. 74)
- 2 ----- maps showing Forest Highway 74 and Forest Highway 100; the end of county maintenance is indicated by a green line across the F.H. 100 route only about three miles out of town of South Fork!

Labels to be applied to the transcripts are enclosed with this letter in order to comply with postal regulations; they are ready to be pasted onto the transcript covers.

Total cost of the transcripts (including covers) came out to \$8.98 each, or a total of \$17.96. Receipts are enclosed. This came out of my own pocket, so I could be reimbursed directly.

The Madera/BPR contracts were copied from our "original" through the courtesy of one of the major oil companies, which also happens to be the major polluter of the Santa Barbara Channel! Thus there is no cost to you for those.

One set of the above is contained within a cardboard box for your convenience in forwarding it to Ike Livermore.

The written testimony is more difficult to deal with--there is too much of it and some of it would not copy very well, if at all. I intend to wade through the whole mess at the Div. of Highways office and tabulate it so we will know who is on our side and who is on the other side. This will give us figures we can use to show the preponderance of testimony in our favor. It will also give us an address list which we can use for future mailings. I will obtain copies of selected statements, and these can be inserted into the Redi-Covers along with the oral transcripts at a later date.

app I have further information regarding Madera County gas tax

--- To explore, enjoy, and protect the natural mountain scene ---

apportionment. I have also been talking with Sierra National Forest personnel to determine why Madera does not maintain any more than three miles of the existing F. H. 100. But I do not have time to go into this now. I will send the information later.

I talked with the Fresno Bee yesterday to see why they have not run anything on H. R. 15019. It was quite obvious that they have not done so because they don't like it, although of course they didn't say it flat out. Instead they took the tack that unless the S.C. Board of Directors took action on the matter, then it wasn't ~~k~~ newsworthy. Perhaps you could take action to remedy this situation.

I hope to make an announcement re. H. R. 15019 at the meeting of the NCRCC at Mills Tower this Sunday, distribute our newsletter, ask for assistance from other chapters, etc.

Thank you for sending the material re. truck rates and the Delta Lines letter. This appears to be extremely valuable in rebutting our opponents' major argument.

Sincerely,

George

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

Letterhead

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

13 Feb 70

Honorable Raymond Sherwin
727 Ohio Street
Vallejo
California 94590

Dear Ray,

I presume I will see you this week end, but because of the importance of the enclosed letter from B. F. Sisk, I am mailing it ~~So~~ you will be sure to receive it in one way or another.

Sisk is apparently giving widespread distribution to this letter. He has had it mimeographed, and is enclosing it, along with a brief cover letter, by way of response to people who write him regarding H. R. 15019. Within the past week I have learned of three people who have received it. (I have no idea who Mr. Cecere is.)

Thus his gross abuse of fact and good judgment is being made repeatedly, and is not just an isolated instance. In view of this, it would appear that some formal renunciation of the letter and its contents should be made. Perhaps you would know how best to go about this.

Because one paragraph consists of a personal attack upon Norman Livermore, I have sent a copy of the letter to him. I included a cover letter in which I suggested a public statement might help.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

Letter head

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

13 February 1970

Norman B. Livermore, Jr.
Secretary, The Resources Agency of California
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento
California 95814

Dear Mr. Livermore:

Regarding the Minaret Summit highway proposal, and H.R. 15019 which would establish a portion of this area as the San Joaquin Wilderness under the terms of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

The enclosed letter from Congressman B. F. Sisk has just been brought to my attention. You will be quite interested in the entire letter, but I particularly draw your attention to the third paragraph from the end. This consists of a personal attack upon you, and I felt it should be brought to your attention.

We have a copy of the transcript of the Public Hearing of August 20, 1969 which was held at Mammoth Lakes, and thus are aware of the facts which Mr. Sisk is choosing to ignore.

However, Mr. Sisk is apparently giving widespread distribution to the enclosed letter. He has had it mimeographed, and is enclosing it, along with a brief cover letter, by way of response to people who write him regarding H. R. 15019. Within the past week I have learned of three people who have received it. (I have no idea who Mr. Cecere is.)

Thus, Mr. Sisk's attack upon you (along with other abuses of fact contained in his letter) is being made repeatedly, and is not just a single instance.

We trust that you will find some appropriate means of responding to this attack. We feel it would be very helpful if this were in the form of a public statement, since there would be no other way of reaching the many people who have received and will be receiving Mr. Sisk's letter.

Perhaps such a statement from you could be one way in which the public could be made aware of H. R. 15019. In spite of personal contacts I have made, our local newspapers have refused to run an article on the San Joaquin Wilderness bill, and consequently the general public is quite ignorant of the bill or its implications.

I am enclosing several copies of our January newsletter. This

contains a major article regarding the San Joaquin Wilderness, including two maps. Perhaps I should have sent these to you previously, and I apologize for the oversight.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

letter head

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg,
California 93631

17 February 1970

Zane G. Smith, Jr.
Supervisor, Sierra National Forest
Federal Building - 1130 "O" Street
Fresno
California 93721

Subject: San Joaquin Wilderness

Dear Zane,

During the past week both Tehipite Chapter and the Sierra Club's Board of Directors took formal action in support of wilderness classification for the area we have been referring to as the San Joaquin Wilderness. I am enclosing copies of the resolutions for your file.

You will notice that the resolution of the Board of Directors uses a figure of 48,000 acres, instead of the 43,000 acre figure specified in H. R. 15019. It was discovered that, either through a clerical or typographical error, the lower figure had been used in the bill. Actually, the area encompassed by the boundaries on the map you have (the same as the one specified in the bill) is closer to 48,000 acres. It is my understanding that steps are being taken to correct this error in the wording of H. R. 15019.

We need more definitive information than we now have regarding the nature and extent of the timber resources in this area. When I saw you in early January you mentioned that introduction of H. R. 15019 had prompted one or two timber associations to contact you seeking the same information. I am wondering whether the easiest way for you to give us the information would be to provide us with a copy of whatever answer you gave the timber associations.

There are a number of things I would like to discuss with you in person. I have a rather poor work schedule at present, but have hopes that we can arrange a meeting again fairly soon. I will probably be calling your office to try to arrange this, and will look forward to seeing you before too long.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

17 Feb 70

George Gruner
City Editor, The Fresno Bee
1559 Van Ness Avenue
Fresno
California

Dear Mr. Gruner:

At the suggestion of Mr. Conger, I am sending you copies (enclosed) of material which has also been sent to Karl Kidder. (When I phoned yesterday morning, neither you nor Karl was in.)

When I talked with you last month, you were under the impression that an article had already been run on the San Joaquin Wilderness proposal. It later occurred to me that you had probably remembered seeing a letter-to-the-editor which was published January 8. The only other item I have seen was a piece run on December 17; this was not particularly informative, and the inclusion of a highly erroneous statement by B. F. Sisk resulted in the public being misinformed.

At the time he made the statement referred to above, Mr. Sisk apparently was completely ignorant of the boundaries proposed in Mr. Waldie's bill. In talking with Glenn Dorfmeier of the Minaret Summit Coordinating Committee, I have found that a similar situation exists.

It would appear that the time is over due for the Fresno Bee to inform everyone, including the general public, as to the existence of the bill, its provisions, and the implications of these provisions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

17 February 1970

Karl M. Kidder
The Fresno Bee
2559 Van Ness Avenue
Fresno
California

Dear Karl:

As anticipated, both Tehipite Chapter's Executive Committee and the Sierra Club's Board of Directors have gone on record as favoring wilderness classification for the area encompassed by Congressman Waldie's bill, H. R. 15019.

Copies of the resolutions are enclosed.

For your convenience, I am also enclosing copies of the material which I had sent you earlier, including another copy of our chapter newsletter which contains a major article and maps which describe the proposed San Joaquin Wilderness.

Possibly you have obtained a copy of H. R. 15019. If so, you will note a discrepancy regarding acreage. The figure of 48,000 acres is correct; the figure of 43,000 acres appeared in the bill through either clerical or typographic error, and steps are being taken to correct the error.

If you desire to contact me for further information, I could be reached at home in Kingsburg early Friday morning, say before 10:00 a.m. (897-3692). It is possible I will be in Fresno later in the day Friday, although I would not plan on contacting you unless I had heard from you first.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

26 March 1970

The Honorable Jerome R. Waldie
Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

SUBJECT: San Joaquin Wilderness
H. R. 15019

Dear Mr. Waldie:

Enclosed you will find a recent clipping from the Fresno Bee which misrepresents the position of the Sierra National Forest with regard to the San Joaquin Wilderness proposal. I delayed sending this clipping to you until I could obtain clarification of the Forest Service position.

Other enclosures provide this clarification. You will notice in the letter to Anthony Chasteen from Sierra National Forest Supervisor Zane G. Smith, Jr. that Smith neither favors nor opposes wilderness classification, although he does perhaps feel that it is not necessary.

This position is consistent with the Forest Service position regarding the proposed trans-Sierra highway, a copy of which is enclosed.

In his letter to Chasteen, Supervisor Smith mentions his decision to manage the area encompassed by the San Joaquin Wilderness proposal as a Frontier Management Unit. I am enclosing a letter from Smith to his Regional Forester in which Smith describes his management intentions for this area, and provides a map of the management unit boundaries.

I have prepared for you a color-coded map which perhaps shows more clearly the relationship of the Frontier Management Unit boundaries to the San Joaquin Wilderness boundary proposal. You will notice that the two coincide rather closely. The Forest Service has included one area which we had not recommended, and they have deleted an area which we had proposed; the total area involved is roughly the same.

Since this is a Sierra National Forest management unit, its boundary stops at the Inyo National Forest boundary. It is possible that Inyo N. F. Supervisor Joseph Radel might be induced to adopt similar management criteria for his portion of the corridor area.

Of course we are quite pleased that Supervisor Smith has made this management decision, as it will help to protect the area from undesirable development which might otherwise preclude wilderness classification. However, this administrative decision would be

reversed at any time, particularly if Smith should be replaced. To guard against this contingency, we have no choice but to seek inclusion of the area within the National Wilderness Preservation System.

And, most importantly, the Forest Service management objectives for this area do not preclude a trans-Sierra highway. As Smith has indicated, both in letters and to me personally, completion of such a highway would necessitate a complete re-evaluation of their management objectives for this area, and would probably involve the construction of a network of Forest Development roads for logging and other purposes.

Two other points raised by the Fresno Bee article are Supervisor Smith's attitude regarding the "need" for more classified wilderness, and whether or not the proposed area qualifies. Both of these questions are answered in Smith's letter to Chasteen.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

cc. Zane G. Smith, Jr.

(Although you had not heard from me recently, I assure you that the need for action on H. R. 15019, and the means of achieving it, is foremost in our minds. I have more material which I will be forwarding to you. Mr. Aspinall and Bizz Johnson will be receiving more letters, and I have requested that copies be sent to you. Those of us who reside in Mr. Sisk's district are weary of his unremitting hostility toward the Sierra Club and that which it stands for, and have concluded that we are wasting our breath by talking to him.)

cc. Michael McCloskey
Raymond Sherwin
Norman B. Livermore, Jr.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

27 March 1970

Norman B. Livermore, Jr.
Secretary, Resources Agency of California
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento
California 95814

Dear Norman Livermore,

Thank you for your letter of March 3, in which you requested further information on the letter to Frank A. Cecere which is being distributed by B. F. Sisk.

We have been given one of the originals of this letter. It is enclosed, and you may keep it. I thought you would like to see the method of reproduction, which appears to me to be mimeograph. This seems significant, as it indicates that Sisk anticipated distributing it rather widely.

I am also enclosing a copy of a cover letter which accompanied the "Dear Frank" letter. This seems to typical of the others I have seen and heard of--they are very brief, with the arguments being presented in the "Dear Frank" letter.

Besides Frank A. Cecere (and I have no idea who he is), I know of six other people who have received the "Dear Frank" letter--one in Bakersfield, one in Kingsburg (my wife), one in Dinuba, two in Fresno, and one in Merced. My wife received hers just last week, so you can see that Sisk is distributing it over a period of time, it being two months from the date of his writing to Frank Cecere.

Of the seven total letters I now know of, it might be noted that three of them are to people outside of Sisk's district.

I think it safe to assume that there have been others that I am not aware of.

I will continue to make an effort to learn who is getting distribution on the "Dear Frank" letter. Please let me know if there is some other way in which I could help.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

cc. Ray Sherwin

6 April 1970

I am told this piece was written by Frank Knebel, publisher of the Enterprise, and a member of the Minaret Summit Coordinating Committee.

Contains incredible distortions.

Am sending a copy to Waldie. Has Waldie been provided with enough background to be able to evaluate clippings such as this which he sees?


In particular, does he have a copy of the two Division of Highway reports, the yellow cover and the blue cover?

If not, it would seem we should provide him with a Xerox copy of each; if this has not already been done, please let me know so I can try to do it down here. Drop a card. (enclosed)

Thanks, Ray.

George
George Whitmore

Panalba[®]


Capsules

Upjohn

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

6 April 1970

The Honorable Jerome R. Waldie
Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

SUBJECT: San Joaquin Wilderness
H. R. 15019

Dear Mr. Waldie:

As you will note from the enclosed clipping, it appears that H. R. 15019 is getting enough attention that the opposition feels compelled to fight it.

This article was apparently written by the publisher of the Los Banos Enterprise, Frank Knebel; he is a member of the Minaret Summit Coordinating Committee, which is pushing for the road.

Most of the so-called arguments for the road are thoroughly rebutted by the two feasibility reports of the California Division of Highways. One of these (blue covers) was dated March 1966; the other (yellow covers) was dated December 1966. Both reports are quite lengthy, but I will attempt to have copies made if you do not already have them. Please let me know.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631
19 April 1970

Charles Lowrie
Miramonte
California 93641

Dear Mr. Lowrie:

Thank you for your inquiry of April 1 in which you asked for information on the San Joaquin Wilderness proposal and the Minaret Summit highway proposal.

I am enclosing an issue of our newsletter which gives some background on the former, and a summary sheet we have prepared which gives some background on the latter.

As with all material of this nature, limitations of time and space prevent giving the subject really adequate coverage. If you wish more complete information, perhaps the best way would be to try to get together with us sometime. If we knew in advance when we might be seeing you, we could ensure the presence of one of our members who is knowledgeable on these particular subjects.

We appreciate your interest, and hope to hear further from you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore
Conservation Chairman

12 May 70

(Patient's name)

Rav, ↓

Perhaps Waldie should be informed of this. I trust you will contact him if you feel it desirable.

I am puzzled over the fact that friend Dorfmeier does not seem to be involved, nor anyone else from the Fresno-Madera area. We will keep our ears open and try to make some sense out of it (of course there may not be any!)

George Whitmore

Letter head

special delivery

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

23 June 1970

Julie Cannon, Editor
National News Report
Sierra Club
1050 Mills Tower
San Francisco
California 94104

Subject: San Joaquin Wilderness
(H. R. 15019)

Dear Mrs. Cannon:

Thank you for your interest in the San Joaquin Wilderness which you expressed in our telephone conversation this morning.

I am sending you the enclosed material on the chance that Tony Chasteen's material may not reach you by Wednesday.

I feel the main point is that, since Waldie has asked Aspinall for "immediate consideration", we had better get out the letters to back Waldie up in his request.

You will notice in our brochure we request that letters be sent to two separate people: 1. Wayne Aspinall 2. the reader's own Congressman. Copies of the foregoing letters should be sent to Waldie. This procedure is the one suggested by Mr. Waldie.

Again I would like to suggest that the San Joaquin Wilderness must be promoted on its own merits. Any attempt to promote it as a road-stopping measure must surely be foredoomed to failure.

The fact that a road has been proposed for this area has to be acknowledged, and the proposal's viability rebutted. But the main thrust must be pro-wilderness, not anti-road.

Thank you for helping to give this measure the national support it must have if it is even to get out of committee.

encl: Waldie's letter to Aspinall, 8 June 70
" " " Volpe, 8 June 70

H.R. 15019

Waldie's press release

" statement to congress

Tehquite Chapter brochure, 5/2/70

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore