

(Eileen Devine; Nancy Brandon;  
Julie Linx (writer))

P.O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

25 July 1973

To: Rowell Meadow study team

The "xerox" copy of the topographic maps which I am enclosing shows the National Park boundary in green, the roadless area boundary (as inventoried by the Forest Service) in yellow, motorcycle trails (as authorized by the Forest Service) in red, and our hiking route of July 14-15 in blue.

The dashed red line is indicated by the Forest Service as being an authorized route for motorcycles, but we found the trail to be practically non-existent. This is something to check further. Does this trail exist or doesn't it?

The dashed black line with a question mark is ~~like~~ what we guessed to be the approximate alignment of a trail which we found (being used by motorcycles) which does not show on any maps. This is something to check further, but only if you are in that area anyway. Don't make a special point of it, as it is of only peripheral concern.

A review of the topographic maps seems to indicate that your best (ie. easiest) point of entry would be from the new road which goes through the Sunset Meadow area. Starting from Horse Corral would work, but would involve more elevation gain, I believe. Check this out first.

I gave Nancy a list of items to look for, via the telephone.

The most important of these deal with motorcycles and their activities.

Which trails are they using most? How much use do the three trails which go up to the Park boundary and then stop receive? (Compared to the other motorcycle trails.) Do the motorcycles actually stop at the Park ~~boundary~~ boundary, or do they go into the Park (even for only a short distance?)

Are all the trails shown on the map actually maintained? (Nancy and we found that one trail marked for motorcycles is not even maintained, let alone used by cycles.)

Are there any trails in existence but not shown on map? Do motorcycles use these unmarked (and unauthorized) trails?

How is the Mitchell Peak lookout serviced? (Stock, cycle, jeep?)

Note timber resources in Rowell Meadow area. From a distance, it appeared that there might be lots of board feet there.

Remember to get photos. Slides preferred, but anything is better than nothing.

Look for more copies of the announcement which we found tacked to a trail signpost earlier. (Copy enclosed.) Where do you find them? Thank you, thank you, thank you. In haste,

George W.

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

31 July 1973

B. F. Sisk Citizens Advisory Committee  
311 North Fulton -- Room 205  
Fresno  
California 93701

Dear Sam, Irene, or Shirley:

In response to the letter you sent just prior to the June 15 meeting, we wish to confirm our previous indications of interest in the Committee.

Although I was at that meeting, my wife was unable to attend because she was out of town at the time.

If a meeting is held in August, it is quite probable that we will both be out of town.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know that we are still interested.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

31 July 1973

Bill Collins  
2933 Yorba Street  
San Francisco  
California 94116

Dear Bill,

Thanks for your letter of May 12. I am sorry to be so late in responding to it.

You commented on the piece which Hasse Bunnelle placed in the Yodeler re. NCRCC action on the hunting resolution, and explained that what she wrote had been based on a conversation with you.

Don't worry about the snafu. These things happen all the time. I often find myself confused about the sequence of events on resolutions. And if you think it is difficult to keep track of some of the NCRCC discussions, what do you think of the Board of Directors? Wow! I don't envy the people who have to straighten out that mess after each of their meetings.

I don't have the resolution in front of me, but it was something to the effect that "We encourage the Board of Directors to publicize the Sierra Club's policies on hunting in order to allay the fears of sportsmen regarding their use of public lands." This was what the NCRCC passed, as they felt it was an improvement over the resolution from the National Wilderness Committee which I had placed before them.

Actually this exact resolution never reached the Board. In fact, the original resolution from the National Wilderness Committee never reached the Board either. Instead, what the Board did consider was still a third version (which I felt was better than either of the other two); NWC chairman Holway Jones had drafted the third version.

There was considerable discussion by the Board, and the resolution was tabled rather abruptly right in the heat of the discussion. I feel this was unfortunate, but apparently some of the Directors didn't even want to discuss the issues. The version which appears in the minutes of the Board meeting is grossly inadequate, and somewhat misleading. But then, as I said, I am glad I am not the one who has to sort out all the confusion and put it down in writing after each Board meeting.

I would like to discuss these issues with you some time soon. They are really too complex to try to handle via correspondence, as it calls for a lot of give and take.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have just written regarding NCRCC awards. I thought you should have it because you and the Mother Lode Chapter Executive Committee apparently share(d) some of the same thinking. Of course we are just getting started on this program, so don't hesitate to put in your thinking. We might end up agreeing with you on this point!

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

25 Sep 73

Wildlife Conservation Coalition  
P. O. Box 14156  
San Francisco  
California 94114

Gentlemen:

This is in response to your August bulletin in which you requested support. Apparently this will give me "membership" status and ensure that I will continue to receive the bulletin.

You might be interested to know that I am supporting you because you speak with reason and moderation, and have not been swept up in the "life is sacred" babel which emanates from so many other wildlife groups.

And because of your recognition that without wildlands there will be no wildlife. I never cease to be amazed at the huge number of people (and organizations) who are so obsessed with the welfare of an individual animal, and yet refuse to involve themselves in battles to preserve habitat necessary to the survival of an entire species.

I also commend you for refusing to join the "hunt the hunters" bandwagon.

Nor have I found you attacking the National Rifle Association, the Second Amendment of the Constitution, or patriotism.

Thank you for sticking to what you set out to do--to protect wildlife and the habitat on which it is dependent.

Sincerely,

encl. personal check

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

9 Oct 73

Victor I. Moore, President  
California Rifle and Pistol Association, Inc.  
5711 Trinette Avenue  
Garden Grove  
California 92645

Dear Mr. Moore:

This is in response to your note in the October CRPA Newsletter in which you asked for information regarding the Wildlife Conservation Coalition.

I assume you are aware that this is not really a new organization, but merely a new name for the old National Coalition Against Poisoning of Wildlife. They felt that they should rename the organization in order more accurately to reflect its broad range of interests in the wildlife field.

The easiest way for you to learn more about the organization would be to subscribe to their newsletter. Just send them five dollars (their address is on my enclosure) and ask to be placed on their subscription list. You could specifically state that you do not wish to be considered a member, but just want to receive the newsletter.

I trust you will find the enclosed copy of a letter, which I sent to the Coalition on September 25, to be of interest.

If you have any reason to think that I have erred in my judgment of the Coalition, I would appreciate hearing your opinion.

I agree with Keith Gaffaney's statement, in the October Newsletter, that the opposition is trying to "lop us off, hunter by hunter...the bowman, the trapper, the handgunner, the shotgunner, and the rifleman."

But I do not agree with that portion of Mr. Gaffaney's statement which claims that they are also trying to lop us off "specie by specie... the mountain lion, the bear, the deer and the dove, etc."

I belong to, and keep track of the policies of, a large number of conservation organizations. There are a few (and these I avoid) which do combine their interests in wildlife with opposition to hunting and firearms ownership. But the vast majority of these organizations do not fall in this category. (Did you note the article on page twelve of the September issue of the American Rifleman?)

In other words, I strongly object to the CRPA tendency to tar and feather all conservation organizations with the "anti-firearms" brush.

If you are to be effective in achieving your stated objectives,

I feel it is imperative that you adopt a more rational attitude toward the great majority of these conservation organizations. Your outlook has tended to be so emotional that the facts have become obscured. Do you really feel you can be ignorant of the truth and still be effective in the legislature? Or in carrying your message to the general public?

There is nothing wrong with emotion as such, but there is a time for it and a place for it. It can be effective only if used selectively. Otherwise it ends up being more of a hindrance than a help.

Incidentally, if you are really interested in trying to preserve the opportunity to continue to hunt cougars and bears, did it ever occur to you to try supporting the efforts that many of us are making toward the preservation of land in its natural state? My personal observation is that the loss of these animals is directly related to the roading, logging, and development of their habitat. Without wilderness preservation, we will lose the cougar and bear--and the opportunity to hunt them.

But I have never heard the CRPA utter so much as one word in defense of cougar and bear habitat.

Why not?

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore  
Member, CRPA, NRA, etc.

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

12 October 1973

To: Bob Board, Pearl Jensen, David Gehrs.

Re: Nominations for forthcoming Tehipite Chapter election.

If you have been observing Executive Committee meetings during this past year, you will have found that the present Committee is not particularly well balanced.

It is fairly heavily weighted with people who lack either the time and/or inclination to help with conservation problems. On the other hand, it is very well represented with people whose primary interest is in giving advice. There is also ample representation from those whose primary interest lies in the outings program.

It is my contention that the Chapter needs more people on the Executive Committee whose primary interest lies in the area of conservation.

To that end, I would suggest the followingP (listed~~Alphabetically~~):

Eileen Devine, 1369 N. Lucerne, Fresno 93728, phone 268-2074

Bill Tanner, 203 N. College, Fresno 93701, no phone

Brian Winter, 5660 N. Woodson, Fresno , 439-0503

Eileen has been extremely active this past year in working ~~on~~ working on wilderness field studies, reports, and in researching material in agency offices. She has an active, inquiring mind combined with generous amounts of intelligence and common sense. She also has tremendous initiative, and doesn't hesitate to wade right into a problem. She has immense potential, and I feel very strongly that the Chapter cannot afford to let her talents escape us. She is a winner.

Bill ~~xxxxxx~~ has been co-chairman of the Committee to Save the Kings River. In this capacity, he has demonstrated an effectiveness which our Chapter sorely needs. He has invested large amounts of time and energy in the fight to save the Kings. My personal involvement in this issue has been peripheral rather than in the thick of it, so I am not familiar with details. But I do know that Bill has appeared at numerous meetings, hearings, consultations with legislators, etc. I saw him in action at ~~xxx~~ a meeting of the Fresno County Supervisors, and was impressed with the efficiency and skill with which he had laid the groundwork, introduced his supporting speakers, and spoke personally--much of it extemporeous. The results he has achieved ~~xxxxxx~~ speak for him better than I can. He has recently talked the Sierra Club Foundation out of \$2,500, which says something for his abilities.

Brian has displayed a persistent interest in the conservation activities

of the Chapter for the past year, but has never been asked to do anything. Consequently, I cannot report on his past performance. (He did volunteer to help with the wilderness studies, but has been unable to do so because of his work schedule.) He was apparently ~~XXXX~~ active with an ecology club at the high school he attended last year, as one of its principal organizers I believe. I have observed the depth of his interest in several ways, one being his willingness to spend a hundred dollars or so of his own money to try to attend the recent Wilderness Conference in Boulder. He made a special trip to Kingsburg to pick up some display materials for Earth Day last spring. But most obviously, he persists in coming to meetings even though the Chapter continues to ignore him. (The Chapter ignores everybody, but most people stop coming after being given the cold shoulder one or two times.) By meetings, I mean Conservation and Executive Committees--the ones people go to if they are concerned about the nitty gritty of conservation work.

All of these people are young. If ~~XXXX~~ their ages are stated on the ballot they will probably all be defeated. This is one reason I feel it is a mistake to put the age on the ballot--it simply is not relevant and gives people an opportunity to vote their prejudices instead of voting on the person's merits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

TO: Lowell Smith  
FROM: George W. Whitmore  
SUBJECT: NCRCC Wilderness Committee chairmanship  
DATE: 1 November 1973

This is in response to your request for a written summary of the reorganization of the NCRCC Wilderness Committee, which took place last week end.

Seventeen people were present. After considerable free-wheeling discussion among all present, Luis finally succeeded in getting three people to take his place as chairman.

Because of the extremely difficult nature of the job, no one was willing to accept sole responsibility for it. It was agreed that the three people selected would form a tri-partite chairmanship, with each person accepting equal responsibility.

Such an arrangement obviously could pose a problem for anyone who wishes to write to "The Chairman." In order to avoid this problem, it was agreed that Luis Ireland would continue to permit his name to be listed as chairman on all mailing lists. All mail will go to his address, and he will distribute it to the appropriate people. Much of the mail probably will require distribution to all three co-chairmen, and the fact that Luis possesses a copy machine was one reason we decided on this arrangement. (Luis was immediately congratulated upon receiving his new title of "Chairman-in-Name-Only.")

The above arrangement was intended primarily for the benefit of those who must rely on the Club mailing lists to determine names and addresses. For those who understand the arrangement and are willing to tolerate it, multiple mailings could be sent directly to the three co-chairmen.

The three new co-chairmen, listed alphabetically, are:

June Dailey, 24 West Elliot, #25, Woodland, CA 95695, (916) 662-5304.  
Marjorie Sill, 720 Brookfield Drive, Reno, NV 89503, (702) 322-2867.  
George W. Whitmore, P.O. Box 485, Kingsburg, CA 93631, (209) 897-3692.

The new "Chairman-in-Name-Only" is:

Luis G. Ireland, 4414 San Ramon Drive, Davis, CA 95616, (916) 756-7479.

Some will undoubtedly feel that this new arrangement is unfeasible. It is my most earnest hope that we will all contribute toward making the system work, thereby proving any such fears to have been ill founded.

cc. June Dailey, Marge Sill, Luis Ireland, Joe Fontaine, Shelley McIntyre, Larry E. Moss.

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

1 November 1973

Joe Fontaine  
Star Route, Box 1142  
Tehachapi  
California 93561

Dear Joe:

Thanks for your letter of October 24 regarding motorcycle tracks at Rock Lake, in the Dinkey Lakes area.

Since you are in the mood to write Sotero about it, I would suggest that this would be appropriate. In fact I would be quite happy to have you write such a letter, especially if I received a copy. I anticipate that Sotero will ignore you, but that's OK. I feel that we should make a point of accumulating written records of his deficiencies. It just might come in handy some day.

Before you write, you should get additional information re. vehicle violations from John Moore. John spent eight days in the Dinkey Lakes area last summer and methodically noted evidence of vehicle violations, as well as studying the area in many other ways. He is still in the process of writing a report on the entire study trip, but I think he would be willing to write down a listing of the various places in which he saw either vehicles, or vehicle tracks, insofar as they were off of the authorized motor vehicle ways.

By providing him a copy of this letter, I am asking John to send you a list of his vehicular observations. (I would like to receive the list, too, John. Thanks.)

I have an observation of my own to give you. In early June this year we found tracks, which had been left the previous season, on the trail between Coyote Lake and Perkins Camp. This was at least a mile beyond the authorized motor vehicle way shown on the USFS map.

As in most such cases, these were motorcycle tracks, not jeep. I am beginning to conclude, as a result of many observations, that the two wheel vehicles are far more objectionable than the four wheel types. I am also wondering whether it might be possible, in some limited areas, to form coalitions with the four wheel people. The purpose would be to try to get tighter restrictions on the two wheelers in those areas where it appears we are stuck with established motor vehicle use. In other words, just because motor vehicles might be allowed is no reason to let the forest service give free rein to the most objectionable types of motor vehicle activity.

I really feel that some sort of accomodation is possible between backpackers and jeepers, largely based upon having separate trails for each within the same general area. But I do not see this being possible in the case of motorcycles, primarily because of noise but also because of other factors. (In this case, "backpacking" has nothing to do with "wilderness".)

Sincerely, George W. Whitmore

cc. John Moore, Mathematics Dept, UC Davis, Davis, CA 95616

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

18 November 1973

June Dailey  
24 West Elliot, #25  
Woodland  
California 95695

Dear June,

**C** This is in response to your letter to me of November 13. I am enclosing separate pages containing suggestions for our position in the Sierra Club hierarchy, our purposes, our problem areas, etc. Here, in the main body of my letter, I will comment on various items which do not lend themselves to consideration on the attached pages. I will also include comments on the enclosures, but these will be ideas which I want to keep separate from the more fundamental ideas reflected in the enclosures themselves.

**O** For lack of time to do it otherwise, my comments on this cover letter will be random and not organized. I trust they will be no less valid for that.

**P** Re. the expenditure of funds, I see nothing inherently wrong in spending per se. It seems to me we should treat conservation spending as we do other kinds--what are we going to get in return for what we lay out? If something is a "good buy", and if funds are available within budgetary guidelines, then why not make the "purchase"?

**V** I believe it has been said by an eminent authority that "Money is the mother's milk of politics." We are engaged in political processes continually, and at all levels. If money is available, why not use it to increase our effectiveness?

We probably agree on the above, but perhaps where we differ might be in our mutual concepts of what constitutes a "good buy."

I strongly feel that there are numerous situations where a half dozen eight cent stamps will give very poor value received when compared with what a single ten dollar phone call can accomplish. (I have purposely used extreme examples. Normally an idea can be conveyed with less than six letter exchanges; it can also normally be conveyed with less than a ten dollar phone call.) ("Numerous" is not to be equated with "most.")

What if the time element is such that we either use the ~~phone~~ phone or else forget it?

What if the subject is of such a nature that it calls for discussion, as opposed to a statement?

What if we want to make a point with someone, but don't know how he will react to it? We might want to alter our approach in midstream in order to avoid misinterpretation.

What if we become swamped, with several deadlines converging on us

all at once? In that case, what if an hour or two on the phone will save a full day of pounding the typewriter.

These are simply the first thoughts that came to my mind. They are not necessarily the most important, and I am sure they are not the only ones in that vein.

In looking back over them, I note that they share one common factor: They all relate to increasing our effectiveness.

**C** This becomes increasingly important in those areas and subjects where we are short on warm bodies--either staff or volunteer. I feel very strongly that money can and should be used to compensate for lack of people. It can greatly increase the effectiveness of the few people we might have in a particular area or subject matter.

**O** As you are well aware, in those geographic areas where the Federal Lands Committee has its greatest problems and greatest opportunities we also happen to be spread extremely thin with people who can or will help.

**P** Your first reaction will be that we need to activate more people. I could not agree more with you on that. But at the same time, remember that proportionately we already have more people active in the small-membership chapters than we do in the large-membership chapters. (At least that is true in Tehipite Chapter, and I have heard that it is so in other small-membership chapters.) Keeping that in mind, I suggest that it is unrealistic to expect any large increase in member participation in our small-membership chapters. We can improve the situation, but let's not anticipate miracles.

**Y** Even if we did achieve a large increase in member participation, I think that it would have to take time. ~~xxxxxxxx~~ In the meantime, why not use money to increase the effectiveness of the few people we do have? To do otherwise is to be losing battles (ie. land), and I think that is a price we are not willing to pay.

So much for generalities. I will take up a few specifics.

You objected to the length of my phone call to you on November 12, which dealt mostly with the issue of attempts by the staff to mount a campaign to amend the mining provisions out of the Wilderness Act. The reasons I phoned were various, and included--

1. Time factor. The Board was meeting five days later, and I wanted to discuss the matter with Lowell (and did so that same night, after talking with you) to see whether he felt that the issue might be dealt with when so many Board, staff, and volunteers would be gathered together in one place. Time did not allow this to be handled in any way other than by phone.

2. Discussion rather than a statement was called for. This turned out to be even much more so than I had anticipated. The issue is complex, and I did not know to what extent you had been following it.

3. The possibility of misinterpretation existed. Again, this turned out to be true to a greater extent than I had anticipated.

You will recall that a significant portion of the conversation dealt with matters other than mining and the Wilderness Act. Inasmuch as I was the one who initiated the call, I will take responsibility for

having let that happen. However, the next time that Joe Fontaine asks me to relay messages to you I will still do so. And the next time that subjects other than those I have on my list beside the phone (yes, I do use such a system) arise, I will still consider the possibility of discussing them right then and there.

You suggest that we should bill the NCRCC for \$2.00, and absorb the balance of the cost of that phone call ourselves. I do not find this acceptable, for the simple reason that the entire call was devoted to NCRCC business. It was not, as you suggested, a matter of "becoming acquainted with each other's philosophies."

You are concerned over the fact that Luis incurred expenses which will be reimbursed out of "the current budget." So long as we operate on a cash basis instead of an accrual basis, this is a perfectly normal situation.. If someone else takes over the committee tomorrow, then we will have incurred expenses which will be reimbursed out of that person's budget. The only way this can be avoided is to convert to accrual accounting, and I don't think the Club is about to do that.

As far as Gary Pichon's phone call to Lowell, I don't have the foggiest notion of what it was about. Also, I don't care. Luis was chairman when that call was made, and if Luis feels that it was NCRCC business and should be reimbursed by the NCRCC, then that is Luis' business. In turn, I hope that others will show us the same courtesy. I feel that the position of a committee chairmanship carries with it a very considerable amount of trust. If the NCRCC is not willing to grant that trust, then they should get themselves a new committee chairman.

As to your broader concern on this particular issue, you will note that I address that on my enclosures.

As to Luis' call to me on October 14, I will agree that \$27.00 is a lot of money. I will also say that, according to my calculations, that represents a phone call more than two hours in length. I don't recall Luis ever talking that long, and I can't help but wonder whether the phone ~~company~~ company made one of its frequent errors in that case.

However, for the sake of discussion let's assume the phone company did not make a mistake. As you know, Luis' visible committee activities occurred ~~explan~~ sporadically rather than regularly. There would be long periods when we would not hear from him, and then there would be spells of intense activity. The phone call in question was made in the midst of one of Luis' more concentrated periods of activity. It is only natural that his expenses would be higher during one of those periods than they were during a relatively quiescent period. I feel that the significant figures are the averages, and not selected ones which are taken out of context. Overall, I think the record would show that the amount of money Luis spent on phone calls to me was rather modest.

You suggest that essentially no phone call could be worth \$27.00. I would differ with that. I think that there have been, and will continue to be, many situations where that amount of money spent on a phone call would be money very well invested. The only catch is that we don't have enough money to be making that type of call very often. Just because we don't do it very often doesn't mean we should never do it.

As to whether this particular call was worth it, I don't know because I don't remember what all it encompassed. Furthermore, I don't care because Luis was the chairman, and if he felt that the call was necessary then I will go along with his judgment. I hope that others will show us the same courtesy.

I guess I have already talked too much about money. But since it is a subject that seems to concern you very much, I felt it deserved fairly intensive treatment. It does seem to be a perennial problem, and I will agree it is better to talk about it before the money is spent rather than afterwards.

Re. the "purposes" of the Federal Lands Committee. On the enclosure I have limited my thoughts to only the broadest outlines. As a consequence, my discussion draft differs drastically from yours.

I feel that our most fundamental (and therefore important) role is to evaluate existing policy, to develop new policy, and to recommend adoption of policy by the appropriate Club entities. In essence, this simply means charting the best possible course before starting the voyage. With many Club policies, I feel that we will be finding ourselves attempting to change course later--but in the midst of perils into which we have sailed through lack of adequate foresight. At that point we may founder, or we may come clear; but why not try to avoid the shoal water in the first place?

I feel there will frequently be difficulty in distinguishing "policy" decisions from "strategy" decisions. This would be of no great consequence except insofar as it is illegal for us to adopt policy; this can be done only by the RCC, ~~or~~ by chapter ex committees, or by the Board. So how do we avoid breaking the law?

My item I.C. (re. the filling of vacuums) is one I consider to be extremely important. It is also an area where it would be very easy to step on someone else's toes. I don't feel that that is sufficient reason for avoiding it.

My item ~~III~~ II. (problem areas) speaks for itself, I believe. I would emphasize that the list is partial; it is just what first came to my mind.

As for attempting to select priorities, I have never yet seen any Sierra Club entity come up with a reasonable and/or effective approach to the problem of "priorities". I think one reason for this is that many of us insist on trying to think of the Sierra Club as a business operation which ~~should~~ be made more efficient by the application of conventional principles of good management. The sticker is that we are a volunteer organization which encourages intensive and extensive participation by our members. We can't tell people what to do, we can't threaten to fire them, and we actually encourage everyone to become a Chief instead of an Indian. These circumstances give us some very severe built-in handicaps, not the least of which is that it makes it almost impossible to arrive at a sense of priorities through any conventional management process.

I do feel that we can attempt to influence the thinking of our members to some extent. Insofar as this is possible, ~~we might~~ there might be some validity to trying to come up with a list of priorities. But I do not feel that this should be one of our foremost concerns, for the simple reason that it is not very productive.

Any discussion regarding priorities should start with the question of what we propose to do with such a list. Only after that has been resolved should we begin making the list itself.

Re. my proposed organizational guidelines in chart form. I found it necessary to develop this in order to see where the Federal Lands

Committee fits into the scheme of things. It is possible that not everyone will agree with it. It may leave some laughing in the aisles, some may say it is illegal, and others may say that I wasted my time in writing it down because it is self-evident and merely repeats established Club policy. If it were spread widely enough, I really think I would get all these reactions, and more besides. That is precisely why I put it down on paper--to generate discussion which will hopefully lead to agreement on just what our guidelines are.

The need for agreement is becoming increasingly self-evident. One more example was in the discussion regarding the role of the Lake Tahoe Task Force last week end. I noticed a number of comments from various people which indicated that those people thought the Task Force had policy making authority. To my knowledge, that is a gross misconception. If I am wrong, I wish someone would tell me so. If others are wrong, I wish someone would tell them. In the meantime, we have a poor situation which is slipping toward the brink of chaos.

You will note that I have not included all Club elements in the chart. That is because I wanted to keep it to fundamentals for a starter. The distinctions between RCC committees and RCC task forces, the role of bi-regional task forces, the role of bi-regional conservation coordinating committees, the role of the CLC, etc. etc. etc. have been left out for the sake of trying to keep the discussion simple. Once we have decided on the basics we can then come to grips with some of these more detailed questions.

Pardon me for bringing up the subject of money again, but one point which I had meant to mention just occurred to me. This is regarding the acceptable procedure(s) for submitting claims for reimbursement. I note that Luis submitted copies of his statements from the telephone company, but did not list his calls or indicate the purpose of the calls. I feel that the procedure should be just the other way around. Ie. calls should be listed by date, person called, location of person called, purpose of call, and dollar amount. I do not feel it is either necessary or desirable to provide copies of the telephone company statements. It is not necessary because the individual is submitting a ~~single~~ signed claim for reimbursement which is actually much more meaningful than copies of the telephone company statements. It is not desirable because of the personal nature of most people's telephone statements. I don't feel that we ~~w~~ should be required to provide the Sierra Club with a permanent record of whether we are faithfully talking with our grandmother in Paducah every week. Some of us transact business with our home phones, and I don't feel that that is any of the Sierra Club's business, either.

Several years ago we had quite a to-do over this in the Chapter. The treasurer felt that getting his hands on people's phone bills was the only way to ensure honesty. It was never clear to me what made him think that a dishonest person would be deterred from claiming that calls which appeared on his bill were Club-related when in fact they were not. Apparently it wasn't clear to anyone else, because the treasurer was a minority of one. He resigned in a huff. (In the meantime he had written Mills Tower in a vein which questioned the integrity of his colleagues. Somebody--I think Rudden--told him it was sufficient to provide a written listing so long as whoever was authorizing payment was not the same person who was submitting claims.) I just thought you would be interested in this aside, which explains why I felt called upon to comment on the procedure.

Also regarding money, I meant to mention that I feel it is reasonable to assume that our start-up costs will be higher than after we are functioning more routinely. My call to you on November 12 was an example.

The fact that this letter has run to six pages, plus attachments, is in itself one indication of the value of the telephone. I could have been accomplishing a great deal toward conservation with the large amount of time I have invested in this letter. For that reason, I hope to keep this type of activity to a minimum.

But you have raised valid questions, and they must be dealt with. I just hope that we can get it over with quickly, thereby clearing the decks for conservation action.

I would like to see more concern with our purposes, organization, and modus operandi--and less emphasis on money.

**C** Marge Sill says the next NCRCC meeting is to be in Davis (January 5). She suggested a Federal Lands meeting that same week end, at the same town. I think that would be a good date to shoot for, and maybe we can be working toward that. She suggested that Luis would probably be happy to offer his facilities. It seems to me a reasonable format would be to have a meeting of the Federal Lands "ex comm" (recognizing that there is none, at least so far) on Saturday evening to take care of internal details and to agree on agenda for the following day. Then on Sunday we would have a full meeting.

**O** **P** As far as an "ex comm", perhaps "steering committee" is a better name. I dislike the "ex comm" name because it implies a degree of authority (even extending to policy making) which is not warranted. If we are to involve more people, we have to let them know that they have some meaningful role to play--and if we can avoid the appearance of having assumed the throne I think that will help.

**Y** I suggest a "steering committee" would consist of the following for starters: You and me  
Lowell Smith (ex officio) (but probably too busy to attend)  
Marge Sill ( " " )  
Luis Ireland

I do not like Luis' old idea of having such a group drawn from people in the Davis area. It might have been convenient, but I don't think it was equitable. If we are to have a regional committee, we are going to have to work at making it so.

Along that line, I would like you to do some thinking about our discussion at dinner after the NCRCC meeting last week end. We tried to think in terms of ~~me~~ assigning different ~~areas~~ geographic areas of responsibility. Because of your background in the Stanislaus N.F. area, you wanted to keep responsibility for ~~think~~ it. This is perfectly understandable, and I would feel the same way if I were in your shoes.

At the same time, it does tend to create a minor difficulty. This is because it means my area of responsibility is cut off at the northern boundary of my own chapter area. (Except for taking in the central coast.) It seems to me that this ~~is~~ might tend to foster a certain amount of provincialism, and that is something which the Sierra Club already has too much of.

Perhaps there is really no problem. As I said, I would simply like you to do some thinking about it.

I feel we should meet sometime in December, to try to get some of these fundamentals ironed out prior to the January 5-6 meetings. Maybe in

7. (good grief)

the Modesto area so neither of us would have too far to drive. Do you know a place? Or maybe on December 16 following the Sierra Nevada Task Force meeting at Millerton Lake. (SNTF is December 15). Millerton Lake is near Fresno just above the valley floor, behind Friant Dam.

There are Sierra Club meetings on December 8-9, so perhaps we should leave those days clear.

Re. Sierra Nevada Task Force, you would probably find it enlightening to take it in. They are meeting at Millerton because of complaints about excessive driving times. The NCRCC area is normally very poorly represented at these meetings. I don't know the reason for this. As I said, you would find a SNTF meeting to be enlightening. Particularly because of the commonality of interest they share with the NCRCC Federal Lands Committee.

The more I think about it, the more it appears to me to highly desirable for us to get together following the SNTF meeting, presumably on Sunday December 16. Could you make this? Maybe Jim Eaton, Luis, and others would be coming too. (Even though he is from Davis, Jim probably should be considered to be a member of a steering committee.)

As you can see, my thoughts are becoming quite random. That is probably a good sign that it is past time to terminate this letter.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Lowell Smith  
Marge Sill

P.S. I am sending this to Marge because of her new role as a Vice-Chairman of NCRCC, in charge of "lands" or something to that effect. As I understand it, most of our dealings with the NCRCC hierarchy are supposed to be through her rather than Lowell.

NCRCC Federal Lands Committee

**C**  
**I.** Purposes

A. Policy evaluation  
    " development  
    " recommendation (adoption is reserved to RCC's, chapters,  
    and to the Board of Directors)

On local, regional, and national levels. (see attached chart)  
(We can evaluate, develop, and recommend policy  
for any level of the Club; whether or not the  
appropriate entity adopts it is their concern,  
not ours.)

**O**  
**B.** Policy implementation (including strategy).

1. By direct action at regional level.
2. By recommendation at other levels.

**P**  
**C.** Seeing to it that vacuums are filled.

1. By direct action at regional level.
2. By recommendation at other levels.

**Y**  
**II.** Problem areas (partial list).

A. Differentiating between local, regional, and national areas  
of concern

Eg. Which Sierra Club entity is responsible for Yosemite?  
Tehipite Chapter, the NCRCC, or all 140,000 members of  
the Sierra Club?

B. If clear distinctions are drawn, then what do we do if the  
responsible entity fails to act, even if action has been  
suggested, requested, or demanded?

C. What do we do if the responsible entity acts in a way we feel  
is contrary to the best interests of the Sierra Club (ie. general  
public)?

D. How is an active Club member to determine the level to which  
a particular activity should be assigned?

Eg. As a ~~member~~ member of the Tehipite Chapter, as a  
chapter delegate to the NCRCC, as a co-chairman of the  
NCRCC Federal Lands Committee, and as the NCRCC delegate  
to the National Wilderness Committee, how do I determine  
which of my activities are local, which are regional, and  
which are national? For example, ~~if~~ if the Yosemite  
National Park administration phones me to get Sierra Club  
cooperation on a particular project, in what capacity  
should I then assume myself to be functioning?

E. To what extent should Sierra Club members be reimbursed for their conservation expenses?

Eg. Assuming I am able to make the above (D.) determinations, how do I decide whether my incurred expenses should be reimbursed by the particular Club entity ~~involved~~ involved?

F. Should we really be trying to find answers to ~~all~~ the above? (I question whether it is either (1.) desirable or (2.) possible.)

C  
O  
P  
Y

hand-delivered to  
J.K. 19 Dec 73 (or. com. intg)  
letter had been mislaid  
by me before being mailed.

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

26 November 1973

John Konior  
6543 North Ferger  
Fresno  
California 93704

Dear John:

Re. NCRCC Consolidated Membership and Mailing List (dated 1 Nov 73).

The above document is the one which was circulated at the NCRCC meeting on November 10, with the request that additions and corrections be noted upon it.

I made a number of notations on it, but refrained from making one because I wanted to check with you first. I have not checked with you about it at our meetings since then, so figured I better do it by mail.

My question is this: Is the NCRCC roster correct when it fails to show Ben Dewell as one of the Tehipite delegates? (It lists Norman Hill's name in place of Ben's name.)

To my knowledge, Ben was appointed as a delegate ~~near~~ in the year, if not before. (I remember he was ~~xxxx~~ an official delegate at the ~~Prunedale~~ Prunedale meeting in January or thereabouts.) He was so listed on an NCRCC roster supplement which was issued as of July 1, 1973.

But now, on the most recent list, his name has been dropped.

Perhaps this helps to explain why Ben has not been attending the NCRCC meetings--maybe he has not been receiving notification of them.

I assume that I would have heard about it if there had been a decision to de-accredit Ben as one of our delegates. For this reason, I am providing copies of this letter to Lowell Smith and to Ramona Wascher and am suggesting that they reinstate Ben's name on the roster unless they ~~hear~~<sup>hear</sup> from you to the contrary. In other words, silence from you will be construed to mean that Ben is still one of our delegates.

It seems that this is the most expeditious way of handling the situation, and trust that all the recipients concur.

Sincerely,

George  
George Whitmore

cc. Lowell Smith  
Ramona Wascher

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

10 December 1973

Al Whitney

Dear Al,

Re. NCRCC reimbursable expenses.

I need some advice on how you would like to handle reimbursement requests for small amounts.

For example, I have a young lady who has accumulated about twelve dollars worth of NCRCC phone calls (for wilderness field studies) over a four month period, totaling twelve different calls.

Should I forward this bill to you as is, or would it be better if I paid her out of my own pocket and then included that in the next batch of bills I send in for myself?

It seems to me to boil down to a question of how small a reimbursement we should be asking the Club to process. There is obviously a point below which individual expenses should be paid out of petty cash, but I have no idea whether such a guideline has ever been established.

In this vein, I have already paid an advance (to the same person) of five dollars to cover some of her miscellaneous expenses such as copying. She has probably used it up by now, and I anticipate including that five dollars in the next batch of bills I send in for myself. Do you see any problem with this procedure? Is there a better way of doing it?

I look forward to your advice so I can get the wheels turning to reimburse the young lady for the twelve dollars she has already spent on phone calls.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P.O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

10 December 1973

Tony Chasteen

Dear Tony,

I don't recall whether or not you belong to the California Rifle and Pistol Association. On the chance that you do not, I relay the following:

CRPA Conservation Committee Chairman Leslie E. Lahr  
1927 Shady Lane  
Redding, CA 96001

has drafted the following questions and requests your reply by 1 Jan 74--

1. Number of days spent hunting deer in California.
2. Number of legal deer seen.
3. Number of legal deer killed.
4. How do you rate California deer hunting?
  - a. Excellent
  - b. Good
  - c. Fair
  - d. Poor
5. What are your reasons for the foregoing rating?
6. Please list your constructive recommendations for improving deer hunting in California.
7. Other remarks.

"The information received will be reported to the State Fish and Game Commission by" Mr. Lahr.

I presume Mr. Lahr is interested in remarks from all qualified citizens, regardless of whether or not they belong to CRPA.

Perhaps you could offer some constructive comments to the CRPA re. conservation in general and how it relates to the quality of hunting.

I recently (9 October) sent a letter to the CRPA president (Victor I. Moore, 5711 Trinette Ave, Garden Grove, CA 92645) suggesting that, since they seemed to be interested in being allowed to continue to hunt cougar and bear, they should concern themselves with preservation of cougar and bear habitat. Ie. to help preserve land in its natural state, either through Wilderness classification or in other ways, and to help stop the destruction of cougar and bear habitat through roading, logging, and development. My letter was never answered.

In addition to being anti-environmentalist in general, and anti-Sierra Club in particular, these guys apparently consider themselves to be more or less in sympathy with conservative Republican causes.

I question how much good they are doing any of their causes.

You want to try your hand at straightening them out?

george

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

10 December 1973

Leslie F. Lahr  
Conservation Committee Chairman  
California Rifle and Pistol Association  
1927 Shady Lane  
Redding  
California 96001

DEar Mr. Lahr:

Herewith are my responses to the questionnaire in the December issue of the CRPA Newsletter.

1. Number of days spent hunting deer in California.  
Too numerous to count.

2. Number of legal deer seen.  
Apparently you mean legal to shoot with a gun.  
The answer is damn few.

3. Number of legal deer killed.  
None.

4. How do I rate California deer hunting? (West slope, central Sierra)  
d. Poor.

5. Reasons for foregoing rating.  
I hunt with my eyes, ears, and other senses, not with a gun.  
All I ever detect is does, many of them scrawny, and sometimes thick as flies. Where in hell are all the bucks? Especially the big ones. The occasional buck I do see spooks. The does do not (some of them come up to me and start salivating). This is not a natural situation. We have so grossly altered the nature and character of the animal population that it is a farce to speak of it as "wildlife." I hope this gives you some insight into the reason for my "poor" rating.

6. Recommendations for improving deer hunting.  
Reduce overpopulation (of deer) where it exists, including does, in an attempt to restore some semblance of a natural population. This might mean smaller numbers, but it would mean higher quality. If we were to start shooting does, perhaps they would stop looking upon us as a source of food. Protect deer habitat, primarily by limiting motor vehicle access. Apparently some of the worst loss of deer hunting opportunities has ensued from building new roads into previously undeveloped tracts of land. Unrestricted motor vehicle access can, and has, converted prime hunting land into a wildlife desert. Ask any old time hunter about Rogers Ridge in the Sierra National Forest--what was it like before the road was built and what is it like now?

7. Other remarks.  
I do not "hunt" in the conventional sense, although sometimes I kill animals--usually when hungry or scared. With varying degrees of success, I have scored with rocks, sticks, and guns. I mention this in the hope that it will establish my credentials.

Sincerely,

BCC: Tony Chostee,

George W. Whitmore

18 Dec 73

TO: Chapter delegates to NCRCC Federal Lands Committee, and other interested friends of the wilderness.

FROM: George Whitmore

SUBJECT: National Wilderness Committee

As the NCRCC's delegate to the National Wilderness Committee, I felt you should receive a copy of the minutes of the NWC's most recent meeting. This was held at Tapoco, North Carolina, on November 3-4, 1973.

The minutes are enclosed. Since they have not yet been approved, they should be considered to be in "draft" form, and are not final. They are not intended for widespread distribution, and your cooperation in preventing indiscriminate distribution will be appreciated.

Since most of our last meeting of the Federal Lands Committee was devoted to Ted Snyder's proposed wilderness omnibus bill, you will find the NWC's discussion of that subject most interesting (item 1, pp 1-5). Note that the NWC arrived at conclusions which were very similar to those we arrived at in our own FLC discussion. (Please consider how these discussions relate to our present attempts to determine what would make a desirable omnibus bill just for California areas alone. This may be a major topic at our January 6 FLC meeting.)

Note also item 6 on p. 8. In case you find the approved resolution difficult to believe, I assure you it is quoted correctly. I abstained, and there was one "no" vote which failed to get recorded in the minutes.

The next meeting of the NWC will be in the San Francisco Bay area. It is presently planned for April 6-7, 1974. This will be the first time the NWC will have met in California. It is unclear to me to what extent attendance by non-members of the NWC will be encouraged, but certainly those who have an exceptional interest in these proceedings should plan on attending. It may be several years before the NWC again meets within our own region.

If you wish certain matters to be brought before the NWC, please see to it that we have an opportunity to discuss the issues in the NCRCC Federal Lands Committee first. You might wish to place such matters on the agenda for our meeting in Davis on January 6. Let us know in advance if at all possible!

Howell Smith  
June Dailey  
Marge Sill  
Luis Delord  
Jim Eaton  
John Moore  
Roy Anderson  
A. & B. Chastain  
Dave Von de Mark

B. and D. Meyer  
Nick Von Pelt  
Phil Farrell  
Eileen Devine  
Eric Gerstung  
Milt Hoehn  
Roger Scholl and Amy  
alison Binder (mailed 3 Jan 74)

TO: Lowell Smith, Ramona Wascher  
FROM: George Whitmore  
SUBJECT: NCRCC membership roster  
DATE: 23 Dec 73

Since you may be in the midst of preparing a revised NCRCC roster, I thought you should receive this information as quickly as possible. You may have received it from some other source, or it may be too late. In either event, either ignore this memo or file it for the next revision.

The Tehipite Chapter ex comm has selected new officers, etc. for the coming year, as follows:

NCRCC delegates -

George Whitmore

E.N. (Bert) Woodruff (replaces Ben Dewell)  
124 East Princeton Avenue  
Fresno 93705  
(209) 222-3935 (home)

chapter chairman -

Norman Hill  
(please use his current address on ~~EAST~~  
EAST Manning Avenue; there has been some  
confusion because his previous address  
was on West Manning Avenue.)

The correct address is 852 East Manning Ave, #15  
Reedley 93654  
(209) 638-1379 (home)

chapter conservation chairman -

To Be Announced.

Special request: Please use some specific and readily apparent method for differentiating between a person's home telephone and his work telephone. Some lists give two numbers, with one in brackets or listed first as opposed to second, but fail to indicate the significance of the brackets or sequence. I feel a preferable method, especially since some people have a work phone and not a home phone, is to indicate by an "H" or an "O" or "W" in front of each number just exactly what it is. Thank you.

cc. Woodruff, Hill