

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

3 April 1971

Francis Walcott

Dear Francis,

subject: San Joaquin Wilderness  
& Sierra Nat. Forest timber  
sales.

Thanks for the copies of letter and clipping which Craig Hermsmeyer sent to the Sierra Club office, and which had been referred to Gordon Robinson, thence to you.

Upon reading the clipping I can certainly see the reason for concern, as the quotation makes it sound as though the Indian Timber Sale will encroach upon the proposed San Joaquin Wilderness. Actually it will not, although it does adjoin the western boundary; fortunately the boundary lies along a ridge crest in that area, so the influence of the timber sale would be reduced to some extent.

The main objection to the Indian sale is that it is giving some impetus to a Forest Service road project (5S30) in the Granite Creek area, including a high standard concrete bridge across the creek. Because the name assigned to this project is "5S30" instead of "Forest Highway 100", the Forest Service seems to think we should have no objection to it. But of course it would constitute a defacto link in F.H. 100 regardless of what label they put on it.

We have taken the position that we will tolerate logging on the west side of Granite Creek, but that we would oppose logging on the east side of the creek if the Forest Service insists on putting in the permanent bridge. We would tolerate logging on the east side of the creek only if the logs were taken out via a temporary bridge or a "dry ford", or any means other than a permanent crossing.

We have been in touch with Mike McCloskey, Ray Sherwin, and others on this, and our feelings have been communicated to the USFS Regional Office. There was some risk that Project 5S30 might be funded this year, and apparently the decision is still pending. Perhaps it would be appropriate for Gordon Robinson, upon his return, to check with Ray Sherwin on this problem.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore  
Conservation Chairman, Tehipite Chapter

cc. Ray Sherwin  
Jim Easton  
Luis Ireland  
Gordon Robinson  
Craig Hermsmeyer



# SIERRA CLUB

TEHIPITE CHAPTER P. O. BOX #102 FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93744  
5396 93755

P.O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

17 May 71

Lloyd Tupling  
Sierra Club  
235 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20002

Subject: San Joaquin Wilderness bills  
(HR 4270, Waldie)  
(HR 6857, Hanna )

Dear Tup,

Much to our surprise, we have just learned that a second San Joaquin Wilderness bill has been introduced in the House, this being Mr. Hanna's HR 6857.\* The new bill is apparently identical to Mr. Waldie's bill with the exception of the acreage called for. Because the acreage is different, we are assuming the boundaries called for are different, although this is far from being clear.

As a start toward clarifying the situation, it should be remembered that Mr. Waldie's bill in the 91st Congress (HR 15019) contained an error which was never corrected. Waldie's old bill called for "43,000" acres, whereas the map which accompanied that bill outlined an area of 48,000 acres. We always assumed the 5,000 acre discrepancy was due to clerical or typographical error.

Prior to introduction of Waldie's new bill in the 92nd Congress, we requested a boundary adjustment which resulted in the addition of 2,500 acres. This raised the total correct acreage to 50,500. This is the figure specified in Waldie's HR 4270, so we are assuming that he altered the map to reflect the boundary change we requested.

But now Mr. Hanna has introduced a bill (HR 6857) which contains the old figure of "43,000" acres, even though this figure was erroneous right from the start. Just as with Waldie's bill, Hanna's bill also refers to "the map entitled 'Proposed Minarets Summit Wilderness'". In the case of Waldie's bill, we can surmise that the referred to map shows the boundary which we recommended since the acreage figure agrees with ours. But in the case of Hanna's bill we haven't the faintest idea whether the referred to map shows the old boundary or the new one which we are now recommending, since the figure of "43,000" acres refers to neither.

Normally we would write to Mr. Hanna to seek clarification. But, and this is the crux of this whole letter, we do not know what our position should be with regard either to Mr. Hanna or to his bill. We are hoping you can advise us on the following:

1. Why did Hanna introduce his bill? (The answer to that may also provide the answers to the following questions.)
2. Is it possible that we would alienate Waldie by giving support to Hanna's bill?
3. Does good legislative strategy call for acknowledging and supporting identical bills, or should we single one out and ignore the other? (This is assuming that Hanna amends his bill so it is truly identical.)
4. Is there any reason to think that Hanna's bill might stand a better chance than Waldie's bill?
5. In essence, we need your advice on how we should respond to this situation. (The Wilderness Society is wondering, also.)

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

*George Whitmore*

cc. Ray Sherwin  
Mike McCloskey  
Francis Walcott

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

George W. Whitmore  
Conservation Chairman

\*Mr. Hanna is a co-sponsor of Mr. Waldie's bill.

Additional distribution:  
Tony Chasteen  
Barbara Johnson  
Anton Nelson

Luis Ireland  
Jim Eaton  
Larry E. Moss

Harry B. Crandell  
Harold Basey  
Phil DeBoer  
John Anderson



# SIERRA CLUB

TEHIPITE CHAPTER P. O. BOX 41023 FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93755  
5396

P. O. Box 485  
Kingsburg  
California 93631

30 May 71

Joe Fontaine  
Star Route, Box 1142  
Tehachapi  
California 93561

Dear Joe,

Many thanks for the excellent coverage given the San Joaquin Wilderness in the June Roadrunner. Someone did an excellent job of summarizing the issues, and even improved upon Barbara Johnson's original article in some ways. And I was especially pleased to see Bev's photo on the cover--this alone undoubtedly induced many to read the article who would otherwise not have done so.

If Aspinall is ever to schedule hearings on the San Joaquin Wilderness bill, it will be only because people from all over the country have written their congressmen in support of the bill. Aspinall is quite indifferent to letters written him by citizens outside his own constituency, but he might be more receptive to pressure brought upon him by his own colleagues. This is why we feel it is absolutely essential for wilderness advocates throughout the country to enlist the support of their own congressmen on this issue.

Thanks for doing your part to save the John Muir Trail and the Sierra crest through which it passes.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore  
Conservation Chairman

cc. Glenn Beerline  
Micki Burcher  
Bill French  
Bob Thomas  
Bev Steveson

(When our Tehipite Topics comes out in a week or so, I expect to see at least three scheduled outings into the San Joaquin Wilderness for the summer months. We certainly hope to see some Kern-Kaweah members joining us on these trips.)