

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

5 February 1975

Osmond Molarsky  
P. O. Box 286  
Ross, CA 94957

Dear Osmond,

Sorry I haven't been responding to your inquiries and requests. I have been extremely pressed for time starting late last October, but things are looking a little better now.

Enclosed is a copy of material which I described to you over the phone some time back, and which you wanted me to send you. It details a very serious error which appeared in the final EIS for the North Shore timber sales. The summary page tells the story in full, although I have included the tabulation sheets on which it was based so you can see how our conclusions were arrived at. I have also included a copy of a letter I wrote to Roy Droege, the district ranger, notifying him of our findings; he has never responded to this letter.

I doubt that this error, gross as it is, would be meaningful in attempting to challenge the final EIS. But insofar as it is part of a pattern of prejudicial attitudes by the USFS, then I believe it is meaningful. Not so much for attempting to challenge the final EIS as for the ammunition it gives us in showing the public and Congress that the USFS approaches the whole question of land management from a biased point of view, so much so that they are probably in violation of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.

In particular, I feel that John Krebs should be made aware of the USFS's misrepresentation of public opinion. Surely it would help to turn him against the USFS, and make him realize that they are not to be trusted. In other words, that the USFS is not fit to make the final judgment regarding ~~xis~~ management of the Kaiser Roadless Area, but that this decision must be made by Congress.

I feel that you are on the right track with your economic analysis, and would urge that you not be dissuaded from pursuing this. I would simply caution that you recognize the limitations of using numbers over which there is much disagreement. Most of the figures available regarding forest inventory and ~~xis~~ what the allowable cut should be are in this category. (We know what the allowable cut is, but there are strong indications that this is greater than the sustained yield principle would permit.) The whole subject is very complex, and I think the only way you can approach it is to recognize that you are not likely to find absolute answers. In order to avoid jeopardizing your case, I feel it is important to stick within one set of figures and not bounce around from the USFS figures to the industry figures to the conservationist figures. I believe this is the approach you were using--to simply stick with the USFS figures and use them to rebut the Forest Service's own arguments. (Acknowledge the existence of other figures and other management philosophies, but beware of plugging them into computations which are based on USFS figures.)

I think there might have been some confusion over my remark that the Sierra N.F. is running out of trees. Obviously there are plenty of trees still standing. But my point was that the Forest Service is cutting at a rate in excess of what sustained yield would permit. In order to meet their "allowable cut" (a figure arrived at through political processes), they are being forced to push logging activity into the more remote, higher elevation, less productive areas. In other words, they are dipping into capital instead of living off of the interest. You found that the inventory of trees in the Sierra N.F. had dropped from 12.5 to 12 billion board feet in just the last few years, as I recall. If the inventory continues to decline at that rate there would be a drastic reduction in the amount of timber available for sale each year. In other ~~mean~~ words, what I meant by saying that the Sierra N.F. is "running out of trees" is that their management is leading toward either:

1. A smaller number of marketable trees on the stump, or
2. A reduced annual cut, or
3. Both.

In other words, long-term productivity is being sacrificed for short-term (political) production goals.

I personally feel that the only viable solution to this problem is for the Forest Service to be directed (since they don't seem to be doing it voluntarily) to manage the more productive timber lands for greater growth of timber. (I emphasize growth because to some people "production" means cutting, and never mind increasing the growth.) (If you grow more, obviously you can cut more.) If this were to be done, then the less productive lands (which comprise most of the National Forest System) could be spared the horrors of attendant upon large-volume-per-acre logging operations. This idea is certainly not ~~mean~~ new, although it is receiving considerable discussion lately.

I recently ran across an interesting ~~statement~~ statement; it appears on page 120 of Battle for the Wilderness (1974) by Michael Frome, and is Frome's paraphrase of an idea expressed by Aldo Leopold back in the early 1920's.

"Logging under intensive forestry and sustained yield would be restricted to the richest and most accessible forest regions, which (are) capable of producing high-quality timber, while the remaining regions of the total land organism would be dedicated to varying forms of recreation, game management, and wilderness." (I have provided the emphasis.)

I emphasized "sustained yield" because a failure to emphasize it is causing some people to equate "intensive forestry" with an excessive rate of cutting which would leave us with no forests, except for poles and saplings. ~~By~~ I might mention that Hal Thomas is one of those people, but it appears to be because he is hung up over the label ("intensive forestry") and the bad connotations it has in his mind. In my mind it ~~px~~ happens to have good connotations. That is why it is essential to spell out what we mean, and not use words which mean different things to different people unless we take care to say what they mean to us. The term "intensive forestry" has almost gotten to the point where it cannot be used at all for fear that we will be quoted out of context in a harmful way. That is why I said "manage the more productive timber lands for greater growth of timber." (above)

If this were done I feel that it would not be necessary for the

Sierra N.F. to invade any further roadless areas with logging operations. (The reason these areas are still roadless is precisely because they are either less accessible or less fit for growing timber; the more accessible, more appropriate areas have already been developed.)

I know that the Western Timber Association feels this way, although they state it only in private conversations. Publicly, their position is that they are opposed to any more Wilderness anywhere; this is apparently based on strategic considerations (ie. ~~will~~ wear their opposition down even by fighting over things they have no ~~interest~~ concern ~~over~~ for, and preserve ~~some~~ as much ground as possible for "bargaining").

You mentioned that you have written material from the Western Timber Association in which they ~~might~~ address the above subject (managing the good lands more productively, while leaving the less productive lands alone). I would like very much to see any such materials, as it might ~~mean~~ indicate a weakening of their heretofore total and absolute hostility toward any new Wilderness anywhere.

Our Sierra Club staff people in Washington D.C. inquired of Krebs' staff as to his intentions on Kaiser. They did not receive any commitment to introduce the bill, but characterized the discussion as "positive and somewhat promising." They felt that some mail ~~was~~ is called for. Krebs is apparently consulting other congressmen in a search for co-sponsors. In this context Krebs' staff mentioned B.F. Sisk; apparently they want him as a co-sponsor. In view of the violence of Sisk's reaction when Cranston and Tunney introduced the bill last December, I cannot understand why Krebs would even talk to him about it. I feel that there is a considerable risk that Sisk will talk Krebs out of it; this was also a concern expressed by our Washington staff, and that is why they feel that letters are necessary.

Of course letters are more effective if they do not have the appearance of being part of a planned campaign. One of the easiest ways of accomplishing this is to spread them out over a period of time, and avoid having them all come in in one (or more) batch(es).

However, since the Fresno Bee will be running a major article on the Kaiser Ridge issue, it would perfectly natural for Krebs to receive a number of letters shortly after publication of the Bee article. So if the SKRC asked for a lot of letters right after the Bee article appears, that could have the appearance of a perfectly natural public reaction, and would minimize the risk of looking like a put-up job. I trust that the SKRC will take advantage of this unique opportunity to create the illusion of a groundswell of public opinion.

Of course a failure to do so would be disastrous, as it would then appear to Krebs that nobody really cares about Kaiser Ridge except the small handful of people he has been dealing with and has already heard from. I feel very strongly that the Bee article, and subsequent public reaction to it, will make or break the Kaiser Wilderness Study proposal. If we fail to get an affirmative response to it, or if it results in a strong negative response, then the damage done to our cause will probably be irreparable.

It appears that I cannot be at your meeting next Sunday, but I trust that you and others will have the situation well in hand.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

10 February 1975

TO: Paul Deauville, Charlie Hull  
FROM: George Whitmore

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to Osmond Molarsky last week. Although the letter contained some material which was directed more personally to Osmond, it also contained a fair amount of material which you would be interested in. I had assumed that Osmond would be at your meeting yesterday, and that my ideas would have found their way to you via Osmond. Since he was not at the meeting, I am sending you a copy of my letter to him.

I would suggest that you give serious consideration to the idea, expressed in my letter to Osmond, that if the Forest Service would manage their more productive timber lands for greater growth (and thereby a higher permissible level of cutting), then it would not be "necessary" for them to continue to invade the more remote, higher elevation stands such as are found in the Kaiser Roadless Area.

It should not be necessary for them to desecrate some other roadless area just because they might be forced to leave Kaiser alone! I am concerned over the fact that some people seem to be assuming that that is the only alternative, and they don't recognize that a more reasonable alternative would be more productive management of the better quality timber lands which have already been roaded and developed.

Of course another alternative would be to adjust the allowable cut to a more reasonable figure (ie. lower than it is presently set). Of course this would probably contribute to higher lumber prices, and it might contribute to lower wages, or fewer jobs, or the closing of one or two mills. But these things are going to come to pass in any event. The Forest Service is simply trying to avoid the inevitable by cutting at a rate which cannot be sustained. It gets down to a question of whether we are going to come to grips with these facts of life now, while we still have a National Forest, or later, when the area might be more appropriately called the Sierra National Sand Pile.

Because our democratic society doesn't like to accept unpleasantries such as lower wages or fewer jobs, I think it unlikely that we could succeed in getting the allowable cut set at a realistic (lower) level. This is why I feel perhaps our only viable alternative is to seek greater productivity from the better quality lands. It seems to me that this is an ideal time to promote such a concept, because it would be ~~an excellent~~ an excellent way of creating "public service jobs", which seem to be quite a popular concept at this time. In other words, public funding could create more jobs oriented toward making each acre of prime timber land grow more trees faster, in turn making more trees available for cutting, thereby keeping the mills operating and helping to keep the cost of lumber within reason. The only patch to this is that the drain on public funding is going to bankrupt the national economy; but ~~six~~ if public service jobs are going to be created, it seems to me we might as well try to get something in return for our investment--in this case it would be more trees and more recreational lands at the same time.

cc. Osmond Molarsky

Tehipite Chapter letterhead

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

10 February 1975

Jan Gengenbach  
12147 Woodley Avenue  
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Dear Jan:

Thank you for your letter of November 14. You expressed concern over "plans...being made to greatly alter this area", referring to "Jackass Meadows, a few miles from Huntington Lake."

I am at a complete loss to know what plans you are referring to, or even what area you are speaking of. I know of two different Jackass Meadows in the Sierra National Forest, but wouldn't consider either of them to be near Huntington Lake. Are you perhaps referring to the Jackass Meadow at Florence Lake?

If you identify the area more precisely, and describe for me the nature of the proposed alterations, perhaps I would be able to respond more satisfactorily. Do you know what agency, business firm, or individual would implement the proposal? In other words, whose plan is it that concerns you? Where did you get the information? Who told you that the Sierra Club approved of the project and was pushing it?

Even though you might not know some of the details, I assume you could tell me what type of project you are referring to. Is it a road, a dam, a timber sale? Without such information, I simply have no way of beginning to respond to your inquiry.

We certainly share your concern for the Sierra Nevada, and appreciate your taking the trouble to write. I hope you will provide me with the missing information so that we can pursue this matter. It is entirely possible that you have learned something that we are not yet aware of, and that is why I am hoping that you will describe more precisely for us just what it is that you have learned and which concerns you.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

bcc. Joe Fontaine  
Hal Thomas } incl copies of  
                  all preceding  
                  correspondence

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

27 March 1975

Charles M. Clusen  
Sierra Club  
324 "C" Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dear Chuck:

After trying to reach you by phone today, I picked up my just-arrived copy of Not Man Apart and discovered 95% of the things I wanted to discuss with you have apparently already become moot.

From NMA I learned that citizen omnibus wilderness bills have already been introduced, apparently one in the House and one in the Senate. That the ~~proposals~~ bills apparently deal exclusively with areas for which the President has already forwarded administration proposals to Congress. That they cover 50 wildlife refuges and ranges, 42 national park areas, and 15 national forest areas. And that we are urged to support the bills.

Great! All we need to know now is:

1. The numbers of the bills (H.R. \_\_\_\_\_, S. \_\_\_\_\_).
2. The authors and/or sponsors of the bills.
3. The names and acreages of the wilderness areas proposed.

Being a little more specific, how did we do in northern California/Nevada? I hope you can provide us with ~~xxx~~ the information for the NCRCC area immediately. Don Morrill is organizing a major effort in connection with Kings River/Canyon (Monarch). This starts off with a field trip on April 5-6, and it certainly would be much easier for all concerned if we knew prior to our field trip whether or not we have a bill for the area; and, if so, what ~~xxx~~ portion of the total possibility does it cover? Also, did anyone (in Washington or elsewhere) talk to John Krebs about the area? It would certainly help us in our contacts with him if we knew what other people have or have not done.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from John Melcher re. the Kaiser Wilderness Study Bill (H.R. 3656). I find Melcher's statement extremely disturbing, as it seems to imply that he will not take up any ~~xxxx~~ bills for areas not proposed by the administration until all the administration proposals have been acted on. In view of the large number of administration proposals, this would seem to doom Kaiser to defeat, as all the trees would be cut before Melcher ever get around to hearing the bill. This would ~~sixx~~ also apply to any other area where timber sales are scheduled but which lacks an administration-~~proposai~~-proposed core or contiguous area...in other words, practically everything in the NCRCC area.

Does this mean that Melcher is forcing us to drop all proposals except Kings River and Trinity Alps? As far as national forest possibilities, those are the only administration proposals that I am aware of for northern California. An answer to this question seems essential before we can take action on anything.

In addition to Melcher's statement implying that he will act on the administration proposals before taking up anything else, he also seems to be saying that he will not act on Kaiser until he has a recommendation from the Forest Service. As you know, the Forest Service is bitterly opposed to the Kaiser proposal. Is Melcher really giving them the power of veto? This is what it sounds like to me, but I would be happy to learn that I am wrong.

In essence, Melcher's letter sounds like it was written by Wayne Aspinall. I would appreciate any clarification that you may be able to provide.

There is a very practical consideration as far as Kaiser, and this is that we are on the verge of spending a very sizeable sum of money to try to get the bill moving. If the cause is hopeless, please let us know immediately so we won't be wasting our money, and so we can apply it where it might do some good. We were about to place/printing order amounting to around three hundred dollars, with postage and labor on top of that. Please let us know immediately as to whether or not we should ~~makixeffxkkz~~ cancel our plans, as we are ready to roll right now.

You have a message on your desk asking you to phone me Monday morning. Please delay your call until you can give me the ~~numbexxks~~ answers to at least the more urgent questions I have raised above. In particular, we must know prior to the end of the week whether a bill was introduced for Kings River/Canyon, and whether we should proceed or call off our effort on Kaiser. Since John Krebs is home now, it would help if we could get this information very early in the week, while he is still around.

Since I will be ~~makikngxmu~~ sending a mailing to the NCRCC National Forests Committee members very shortly, I would like to be able to state the bill numbers, author/sponsors, wilderness area names and acreages for our area. But this is not as urgent as the other information I have requested.

If you phone me before 9:00 a.m. our time (12:00 noon your time), you should be able to reach me even if I expect to be gone during the day. It is OK to call as much prior to that time as may be necessary to suit your own schedule.

Thanks for your help, Chuck. And I do hope the Club can get some of these communication problems straightened out. It has really been raising hob with our effectiveness, both because of inefficiency and because of loss of morale among the troops.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Don Morrill

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

13 April 1975

Lewis E. Carpenter  
815 West Gettysburg Avenue  
Fresno  
California 93705

Dear Lew,

Hal Thomas has given me a copy of your letter of April 1 to Don Morrill. You covered quite a bit of ground in that letter, and I hope that I can provide answers to some of the questions you raised.

I. Regarding the proposal for wilderness in the Kings River area.

A. Boundaries.

Before we can talk about boundaries, it is first necessary to distinguish between areas which are proposed for wilderness classification as opposed to areas which are proposed for wilderness study. A failure to make this distinction has resulted in considerable misunderstanding by others of what the Sierra Club is seeking.

I assume the terms "classification" and "study" are self-explanatory, and that the only problem is in getting people to realize that there are two distinctly different categories and that it is necessary to distinguish between them.

Having made the above distinction, we are ready to turn to the enclosed Sierra N.F. map on which I have marked various lines in red:

"A" is the existing High Sierra Primitive Area, proposed by the administration for addition to the Wilderness System.

"B" is the additional land proposed by the administration for addition to the Wilderness System.

"C" is proposed by the administration as a Wilderness Study Area.

"D" is the additional land proposed by the Sierra Club for addition to the Wilderness System (ie. "classification" as Wilderness). Regarding the jeep trail in this area, note other material and maps which I am enclosing. Our original proposal called for pulling back the terminus of this route from Chain Lakes to Spanish Lakes, NOT for a complete closure of the route. This is illustrated and explained in the enclosed copy of the Tehipite Topics. Although the Sierra Club--like most other organization--has its share of zealots, they are definitely in the minority; I am confident that the Club as a whole is still willing to negotiate this issue with the jeep people.

"E" and "F" are lands which were almost all inventoried by the Forest Service as being "roadless and undeveloped," and therefore as qualifying for possible addition to the Wilderness System. The Sierra Club position is that these lands ("E" and "F") should receive a formal study under the terms of the Wilderness Act in order to determine whether they should be added--either in whole or in part--to the Wilderness System.

"G" is roadless and undeveloped land which probably should have been inventoried by the Forest Service, but which was not. As such, it is in a special category, but probably should be studied along with "E" and "F" to see whether it should be added to the Wilderness System.

Regarding these boundaries, you will note that we have not

advocated, or even considered, closure of the road along the north side of the river to Garnet Dyke Creek, or of the road along the south side of the river to Mill Flat and Davis Flat. As a matter of fact, we have not advocated the closure of any roads anywhere.

Regarding the jeep trail to Spanish Lakes and Chain Lakes, see the other material and maps which I am enclosing. (The distinction between "road" and "trail" is important. The former normally disqualifies an area from consideration; the latter should not, but the Forest Service claims that it does.)

B. North Kings Deer Herd management.

I see no conflict whatsoever with wilderness classification. There seems to be general agreement that a long history of fire suppression has contributed significantly to the decline of the deer herd. Since fire was a natural force in the ecology of this area, wilderness classification would mendate that it be reinstated. Not only would wilderness classification be beneficial to the deer in this way, it would also benefit the herd by preventing construction of a vast network of permanent, surfaced public roads. In this regard, please note the enclosed map of the road network the Forest Service planned to construct in the Rancheria basin. If the Sierra Club had not appealed the timber sales, this road network would already be well on the way to completion--and the deer herd would be well on the way to further decline because of the vastly increased road-oriented hunting pressure.

This whole question of management of the deer herd is related to the more fundamental issue of the Forest Service and its "purity" argument versus the law of the land (Wilderness Act of 1964). I am enclosing material on this subject.

C. Beauty, snakes, and rafting on the river.

Yes, I agree wholeheartedly that Kings Canyon is "really a pretty area." During the middle of August most people would find the foxtails, heat, and snakes a little distracting. But summer is the "off season" for the lower canyon, just as winter is the "off season" for the high country. The fact that practically all of our existing Wilderness Areas are closed by snow during the winter is one very major reason why we need to get some low-elevation lands protected as classified wilderness. The Kings Canyon area presents a unique opportunity in this regard.

Since wilderness classification would not affect the existing road system, there would be no interference whatsoever with the existing use of the river by rafters, kayakers, and all the others who prefer motorized access. Of course the rafting itself is permissible in Wilderness Areas. If a person wanted to put a raft in at Cedar Grove and come all the way down, that would be perfectly consistent with wilderness classification.

II. Regarding wilderness management.

I have addressed this to some extent in my above remarks. In order to provide you with further insight, I am enclosing three different documents.

A. Reprint from "The Living Wilderness," Winter 1974-75 issue.

I assume this is mostly self-explanatory. I have marked references to wildlife, since that is of especial interest to you. In addition, I have marked various sections which speak to the issue of the "purity" argument versus the law.

On page 38, note that "the citizens' key argument (is) the Wilderness Act itself." I cannot emphasize this too strongly. Read the law, and read it in its entirety. Also, take a look at the legislative history of the law.

Did you know that the Wilderness Act passed the House of Representatives with only one (!) dissenting vote? I think that vote, in itself, is a pretty good indicator that Congress could not possibly have intended what the Forest Service (and Interior Department) is now trying to tell us they meant. If the law had been intended to be as restrictive as the Forest Service tells us it is, then there would most certainly have been considerably more than one Congressman voting against it.

If you will read the law in its entirety, you will see why there was only one dissenting vote. By the time it finally came to a vote it was so watered down that even Wayne Aspinall voted for it.

On page 42, note that "Congress has consistently overruled... the Forest Service." The Forest Service fought the law before it was passed, and has continued to fight it to this day. Since they hate the law so bitterly, it is hardly surprising that they misinterpret, misrepresent, and undercut it in every way they can. They don't like the law that Congress passed, and they have consistently tried to "re-write" it through their administrative actions. But "Congress has consistently overruled...the Forest Service" in these attempts.

On pages 43-46, note the references to the "flexibility... for proper management" which the law provides. Also note the reason for citizen opposition to writing special management provisions into the bill for each individual area. To do so would be to imply that the Wilderness Act prohibits the management activity in question. A history of such management provisions would, in effect, make the Wilderness Act a more restrictive than was originally intended, and would necessitate running to Congress every time the managing agency wanted to repair a sheep watering device or conduct a prescribed burn. It is obviously preferable to retain the flexibility which exists in the present law.

On page 47, I marked the section about the Wildlife Refuge System to emphasize that wilderness classification is compatible with wildlife management. Otherwise it seems highly unlikely that the Fish and Wildlife Service would be recommending wilderness classification for the refuges and ranges. Note that FWS found that 14 (out of 113) of the units are not suitable for wilderness, and citizens agreed with them except in three cases. I point that out to emphasize that we do not automatically insist that all qualifying land be included in the Wilderness System--we believe in taking a look at each area and judging it on its merits.

B. Reprint from Sierra Club's Mother Lode Chapter newsletter, March 1975 issue.

Note that the Sierra Club, under the ~~the~~ direction of California DFG, constructed a fish barrier dam within the Carson-Iceberg Wilderness Study Area. (I presume this was done with the permission of the Stanislaus N.F.)

The significance of this is that Forest Service regulations prohibit any action which would prevent a Wilderness Study Area from being classified as Wilderness. Apparently the Forest Service agreed that construction of this barrier dam was consistent with future wilderness classification. Most certainly the Sierra Club did. I trust you will agree that actions speak louder than words, and that the parties

involved in this project quite clearly found it to be consistent with wilderness classification.

C. Reprint of "Toward an Understanding of the Wilderness Act."

This document provides a good overview of the Wilderness Act as a whole. I hope it makes it clear that the Wilderness Act has many different purposes, and consequently it permits many different uses. The general thrust of the Act is drastically different from what the Forest Service keeps trying to tell us.

Our only protection against the prevarication of the USFS (and other agencies) is to read the Act, to know what it permits and what it does not permit, and not to rely for our information on the opinions of those who hate the Wilderness Act and who are seeking to destroy it.

I am glad to know that you are searching for documentation as to the intent of the Wilderness Act. I would appreciate knowing what you are able to turn up. I would be especially interested in material which you say you have found which supports the idea that "habitat work" cannot be done in wilderness. My guess is that the key lies in your definition of "habitat work," and it is possible that you have in mind things which the Wilderness Act really does prohibit. We need more dialogue on all of this in order to clear up the misunderstandings.

III. Regarding the April 17th meeting of Fresno County Sportsmen's Club.

The problem of not really understanding what the different groups are seeking is certainly widespread. I am wondering whether we could take a step toward seeking greater understanding right away.

I note that you believe the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club will be discussing wilderness proposals for Kaiser Ridge and the Kings River areas this coming Thursday night. Would it be possible for me to attend that meeting as a guest? I would not expect to give a "pitch", but would like to make myself available for the questions which I am sure members of the Club would have. This could be with regard to Sierra Club positions, goals, etc.; or it could be in regard to wilderness in general. At the same time, I would like to learn more about the positions, goals, etc. of the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club. If the meeting format is such that it would be preferable, I could be present for only part of the meeting.

I realize that the Sierra Club has an "image" problem in some areas. I also realize that, to a considerable extent, the Sierra Club has brought this upon itself through a failure to make known the great diversity of opinion and philosophy which are found within its ranks. If it would mean anything to the members of the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club, I would note that I have belonged to the National Rifle Association and the California Rifle and Pistol Association for many years, and I have more recently taken out an individual membership in the California Wildlife Federation.

I hope to hear further from you, especially regarding the meeting of the Fresno County Sportsmen's Club.

Sincerely,

*gw* George W. Whitmore

cc. Don Morrill  
Hal Thomas  
Dan Smith