

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

9 July 1973

Larry E. Moss
Sierra Club
2410 West Beverly Boulevard, Suite 2
Los Angeles
California 90057

Dear Larry:

Re. Your pending trip into the Rancheria Creek area.

As near as we can see, the USFS environmental analysis contains a significant error when it states that the grazing permittees have jeep trail access to Statum Meadow. The analysis makes repeated references to this, but we have found no evidence that such access exists.

We recently hiked up the jeep trail as far as Garlic Meadow, getting numerous photos as you suggested. This portion had previously been hiked in the dark only. We found the ruts less significant than they had seemed in the dark--not really significantly more apparent than those from Garlic Meadow to Chain Lakes.

We did discover that there has been a modest amount of blading in the area by Garlic Meadow, perhaps about a mile. This is the only section in the entire trail where we have observed any blading at all.

Statum Creek is quite attractive, and I suggest that you hike this route if you have not previously done so. At Statum Meadow you should make a circuit of the developed area to determine once and for all whether there is in fact a jeep trail entering it. If you find one, it would be helpful if you could walk it in order to determine its location.

The spur running north from near the summit of Spanish Mountain (immediately east of Twin Lakes, in section 2) appears to be an excellent point from which to get a comprehensive view of the basin, and you might want to make a point of getting that view.

We found the view from Spanish Mountain to be excellent. It shows how the Rancheria and Crown drainages ~~KKK~~ really comprise an integral unit, and the present John Muir Wilderness boundary appears to be rather illogical and artificial. But I had the feeling that the spur east of Twin Lakes might illustrate it even better.

We also found a (unauthorized?) jeep trail from Garlic Meadow almost to the summit of Spanish Mountain. Hope you don't find any more, but would like to know about it if you do.

Have a good trip.

Sincerely.

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

23 July 1973

Jack Raftery, Assistant Superintendent
Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks
Three Rivers, California 93271

Dear Jack:

It was good to talk with you on the phone last week. You will recall that one of the items I mentioned was our discovery of the fact that the Sequoia National Forest people are asking for input regarding future management of the Jennie Lake roadless area.

I have transcribed that information into a legible format, and thought that you would like to receive a copy. One is enclosed.

Because Forest Service management of the Jennie Lake roadless area can and does affect the adjoining National Parks, I am sure you will want to give the Forest Service the benefit of your thinking.

We found that motorcycle traffic authorized by the Forest Service does intrude within the Park. But, even if it did not, the propriety of permitting it along the Park boundary seems highly questionable.

There are several reasons for this, but the most obvious one is the fact that the sight and sound of the machines impinges on the Park regardless of whether there is an actual physical intrusion. This is especially true along the ridge east of Stony Creek campground, directly above the Cabin Creek drainage. Much of that ridge is quite open (and scenic), and it lacks the screening and softening effect which a heavy forest cover might offer in other areas.

There appears to be little, if any, justification for permitting motorcycle traffic on those trails which head directly into the Park from the Rowell Meadow-Marvin Pass area. These trails appear to have no purpose other than to provide access into the Roaring River country. It seems to be a standing invitation to enforcement problems to permit motorcycles to start out on these trails, but then to require them to stop cold in their tracks after the first mile.

It should also be noted that, since absolutely every trail in the Jennie Lake roadless area is open to motorcycles, it is impossible for hikers or horsemen to have practical access to the Roaring River country without sharing the first part of the trail with motorized traffic. Surely the Forest Service would be responsive to the idea of providing at least one trail route into the Roaring River country which would be for hikers and horsemen only.

This begins to verge on the question of whether motorcycles should be permitted in the Jennie Lake roadless area at all. I have purposely avoided that question at this time, although it certainly must be dealt with in due course.

There are many other considerations. But I have limited my remarks to the motorcycle problem as it relates most directly to the Parks, since that was the main subject of our telephone conversation. I hope you find the comments of value, and I look forward to talking with you again.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P.O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

23 July 1963

Joe Fontaine

Dear Joe,

Hope the enclosed item re. Jennie Lake area is of interest.

It appears that the best way to handle the situation is to give copies of it to those who have actually been in the area, but NOT to others. And those few who do receive copies of it would be encouraged (coerced?) to write to the Sequoia N.F. with their recommendations.

The reason that I suggest not giving general distribution to this document is primarily twofold:

1. Putting articles in newsletters, etc, arouses the opposition and gets them out in force, while netting very few additional letters for our own side. I am becoming more and more convinced that we must become much more selective in our appeals for letters in order to avoid this hazard (and also in order to reduce the dollar cost per letter obtained).
2. The USFS apparently is not interested in hearing from anybody except the actual users of the area, judging from their handling of the request for comments to date. If I am correct in surmising this, then they would discount letters which espoused views which we might promote in a newsletter or special mailing, even though those views would be expressed in letters from individuals. They would also discount views which might be construed as being "party line" (ie. pro-wilderness or anti-motorcycle) if they thought the Sierra Club was trying to get people to write.

You might feel that such views are not warranted as far as the Sequoia N.F. administration, and that I have been unduly influenced by our present problem with the Sierra N.F. But I would point out that my conclusions would increase the effectiveness of our voice in dealing with any national forest, even though my thinking was brought to those conclusions as a result of experiences with a particular situation.

Of course everything hinges on the "coercion" mentioned above. Without it we are lost. But I really feel that we can score some good points with the USFS if we make a strong effort to get those people who actually know the area (and say so in their letters) to write.

Perhaps we should be scheduling some Chapter trips into the area before the snows come, so we will increase the number of instant experts we have in our ranks. Can you work on that through K-K?

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

Shelley McIntyre, Sierra Club
1050 Mills Tower, 220 Bush Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94104

23 July 1973

Dear Shelley:

Re. the enclosed copy of the Sequoia National Forest announcement requesting public input on future management of the Jennie Lake roadless area.

Of course I don't mean to imply that anyone at your level should (or would have the time to) get involved in this specific issue. The reason I am sending the announcement is because I am intrigued by the glimpse into Forest Service procedures which it provides, particularly as these procedures relate to the Roadless Area Review which is supposedly still ongoing.

First, I fail to see how the Sequoia N.F. can be "currently developing a plan" for the management of this area until the question is settled as to whether or not the area will end up on the Chief's New Study Area list. This line of questioning could obviously be elaborated.

Second, note that they do not acknowledge the existence of the New Study Area list which the Chief is supposedly working on, or the review procedure which the establishment of that list was to have put in motion. Does this mean that the New Study Area concept has been abandoned?

Note the relationship between the first and second points. It appears to me that they tend to corroborate each other and reinforce my suspicions.

Third, note that one of their "backcountry" concepts allows for the use of motorcycles.

Fourth, note that they apparently are seeking input only from those people who are actually using the area at present. (The announcement was posted on a sign along the trail, and I have not heard of their requesting input by any other means.) This procedure, if that is truly what they are doing, certainly would ensure a bias toward the status quo. For example, we had never gone into the area previously because we had often heard that it was overrun with motorcycles, garbage, etc. We recently went there only as part of a field survey trip. Unless our aversion to motorcycles and garbage is unique, it would appear that other would-be hikers probably have been avoiding the area also--and thus do not know that the Sequoia N.F. is requesting public input.

I am bringing the specific issue of future management of the Jennie Lake roadless area to the attention of local people.

But I thought you might be interested in the broader considerations which may or may not be implicit in the Sequoia N.F. procedure.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

23 July 1973

Joe Fontaine

Dear Joe,

Re. motorcycles in and around the Jennie Lake roadless area.

This calls for fairly close interchapter coordination Because some of the motorcycle trails straddle the chapter boundaries.

The roadless area (Sequoia N.F.) is and the Roaring River area (Kings Canyon N.P.) are in Tehipite territory, but Sequoia N.P. is in Kern-Kaweah turf.

You will note in my letter to Jack Raftery the rather close intermingling of the problem as it relates to the various administrative jurisdictions of the federal lands.

The motorcycle trail from Stony Creek campground up the ridge to the east crosses into the Sequoia N.P., and stays there quite a bit of the way.

The motorcycle trail from Jennie Lake to J.O. Pass does the same thing, except perhaps more flagrantly because the Park boundary is much more closely signed along that stretch. Rather interestingly, we found that whoever signed the boundary did not always use the watershed divide as the line, although surely the ~~law~~ law specifies the divide as being the authorized boundary. In any event, the motorcycle trail is inside the signs for much if not most of the distance.

The main purpose of this letter is informational, but you may want to initiate some action from the K-K side. If you do, I would appreciate being kept informed. Thanks.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

30 July 1973

Sotero Muniz, Supervisor
Sierra National Forest
Federal Building -- 1130 "O" Street
Fresno, California 93721

Dear Sotero:

I have had the pleasure of listening to a tape of the recent KMJ "Encounter" program in which you participated. I found the program to be quite interesting.

Although several questions were raised in my mind, one stands out so conspicuously that I feel I simply must ask you for clarification of it.

Toward the end of the program, you said,

"...to what resource do we give priority?

"Right now we have one acre out of four of the Sierra National Forest that's dedicated Wilderness now. That's 25 per cent of our total acreage is in Wilderness now. We have another 330,000 acres, which is about another quarter, that is in roadless area.

"Okay, we have some options to exercise in that roadless area. On one hand we have some groups that are telling us every single acre should be in Wilderness, which would mean that one acre in two would be in Wilderness on the Sierra National Forest..."

The question in my mind is, who are the "groups" who are saying that "every single acre" of the roadless inventory "should be in Wilderness"?

I belong to, and am familiar with the policies and objectives of, quite a number of organizations, groups, etc. None of those I am familiar with have taken the position that all of the roadless inventory area "should be in Wilderness."

Even considering the views of individuals, I am extremely hard pressed to think of people who hold such a view. Just off hand, I can recall only two such individuals, and neither lives on the West Coast.

I am wondering whether the problem perhaps lies in a failure to distinguish between a recommendation for Wilderness classification as opposed to a recommendation for a study procedure.

Of course, the difference is vast. Honest men will sometimes differ on a specific Wilderness classification proposal. But it is difficult to see how a refusal even to consider (ie. study) the proposal can be justified.

In any event, I really would appreciate clarification of your statement that "some groups are telling us that every single acre should be in Wilderness."

Thank you for your trouble.

Sincerely,

cc. John Konior

George W. Whitmore

letterhead

31 July 1973

Your File: 2720

Roy E. Droege, District Ranger
Pineridge Ranger District
Sierra National Forest
P. O. Box 38
Big Creek
California 93605

Dear Roy:

Regarding your letter of April 5, addressed to John Konior, Chairman of the Tehipite Chapter. This letter was referred to me for response, and I am sorry to be so late in giving you that response.

You described various possible alternatives for expanding the capacity of the China Peak Winter Sports Area. We found these to be quite interesting, and we especially note that you are not considering enlargement of the permitted area.

We trust you will keep us informed of any significant changes in your thinking, and truly appreciate the opportunity to review your ideas at a relatively early stage in the development of the proposal.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. John Konior

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

Margaret Arp
7837 Fairview Road
Boulder
Colorado 80303

3 August 1973

Dear Margaret:

Our plans have been revised for the umpteenth time. The way things now stand is thus...

I have reviewed the batch of 38 papers which you mailed July 20. I am enclosing my scoring sheet for those.

In the morning I will check our Canadian mail box to see whether the late~~x~~ papers have arrived yet. If they have, I will review them immediately and include them on my scoring sheet.

If they have not arrived, I will be unable to get comments on them to you. This is because we are going into the mountains later than first planned, and will be coming out later.

If you wish to contact me, drop a note to my Canadian P. O. box and if need be I could phone you from Canada as soon as we come out of the mountains. This would be about the 15th. But we will definitely be coming out late enough that I would not be able to get a letter response to you before you leave on your trip.

Regarding the papers, I must say I was disappointed in the general lack of quality and/or failure to address the theme of the Conference. I reviewed all the papers at least three times, and some of them a fourth time. I thought I must be missing something, but finally concluded that I was not.

There were five papers that I considered to be in the "acceptable/" range. Another four papers were somewhat marginal. And I felt that 22 25 of the papers were simply not acceptable. This was because they were unintelligible, irrelevant, poorly organized, etc. Within the "not acceptable" category I included several papers which were quite well prepared, and a few which were even quite interesting. But I placed them in the "not acceptable" category because they did not seem to me to be relevant to the purposes of the Conference.

There were three papers which I felt deserved a special category, but instead I arbitrarily placed them in between "marginal" and "not acceptable" on the scale. These were not innovative or new, and they have the fault of being factual in nature, rather than emphasizing ideas. If you are willing to accept this type of material, then I would recommend consideration of these three papers ahead of those which I placed in the "marginal" category. It might be worth giving a fairly high rating/the paper "Q" (Wilderness of Western Canada) in order to stimulate interest in that subject; I feel that interest in and awareness of Canadian wilderness problems is long overdue--the stakes are exceedingly high, and the outlook seems very poor.

Sincerely, George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

11 October 1973

Dennis R. Gagnon, Trail Coordinator
Kelty Pack, Inc.
1807 Victory Boulevard
Glendale
California 91201

Re. "The Kelty Trail"

Dear Mr. Gagnon:

Thank you for your note of September 20, in which you asked for comments on "The Kelty Trail" proposal.

You asked for impressions, suggestions, and recommendations. The implication was that you would take these into account. But in the very next breath you stated that you would be going to press on December 1!

In my mind, this raises a question as to the seriousness of your request for comment. If you were really concerned about getting meaningful input from others, it seems to me that you would have requested it long before this.

Under these circumstances, I really cannot bring myself to spend much time and energy spelling out and discussing the numerous ramifications of your project. However, I will single out for comment a few of the more obvious aspects of this situation.

First, let me make it abundantly clear that I share your feeling that the John Muir Trail is excessively used and abused.

But, I also feel that one of the biggest reasons for this, perhaps the single most important reason, lies in the fact that the route was given a name and then abundantly promoted over the years.

This is why I read your proposal for a "Kelty Trail" with considerable misgiving--ranging all the way from antipathy to outright hostility.

If you give the route a name, and then proceed to promote it, how do you expect that it will not ultimately suffer the same fate which has befallen the John Muir Trail?

The idea of promoting a second trail more or less parallel to but west of the John Muir Trail is certainly not a new idea. I have heard it discussed repeatedly over the years, and the conclusion of those discussing it invariably has ended up something to the effect of, "One John Muir Trail is enough. Let's keep all our problems in one place, and not encourage their proliferation."

This conclusion has been reached, at various times, by the Sierra Club's Tehipite Chapter, the Club's Northern California Regional

Conservation Committee, and the Club's Sierra Nevada Task Force. I have also heard the same idea expressed by various U.S. Forest Service personnel, and by other individuals.

Certainly we must find ways of relieving the human pressure on the John Muir Trail, and we must avoid the regimentation and policing problems inherent in any "wilderness permit" system.

I am convinced that appropriate and effective methods exist, but the federal bureaucracies are so obsessed with the idea of managing by fiat that they appear incapable of thinking creatively.

I would have been interested in discussing some of these ideas with you, but--as I note above--the fact that you are about to publish a book makes any further investment of my time appear pointless.

I regret that you have chosen to make it so.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P.S. I might also note that the idea of taking the old California Riding and Hiking Trail and now promoting it as "The Kelty Trail" is going to rub a lot of people the wrong way. Isn't the reason rather obvious to you?

P.S.S. If you are really concerned about minimizing human impact in fragile alpine areas, why are you proposing to designate the route through the Dinkey Lakes area? It would be less damaging to go from Rock Meadow straight down Helms Creek. I have the same comment regarding your proposed loop up Fleming Creek and down Meadow Brook Creek. It would be less damaging to go straight from Post Corral to Big Maxson without making the "scenic loop." (You must be aware that the California Riding and Hiking Trail does exactly what I am suggesting.)

P.S.S.S. And why in hell are you proposing to terminate your trail at Cottonwood Creek? Are you not aware of the extremely adverse effect such action would have on the problem of preserving the viability of the golden trout? Or of the other land management problems you would be precipitating?

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

13 October 1973

Honorable Raymond J. Sherwin
727 Ohio Street
Vallejo
California 94590

Dear Ray:

At the Wilderness Conference last week end knowledgeable sources informed me that the Sierra Club has given testimony at Congressional hearings in support of legislation to eliminate from the Wilderness Act the present provisions for mining operations.*

The implications of any such amendment of the Wilderness Act have been discussed from time to time by Tehipite Chapter and by the NCRCC. A definitive position was stated by the NCRCC on 8 January 1972, and this was relayed to you, Mike McCloskey, and others in a letter from Lowell Smith on 12 January 1972.

The gist of the NCRCC statement was that, while they are opposed in principle to mining within Wilderness areas, they nevertheless felt that for the time being it would be very unwise in a political sense to attempt to achieve a blanket prohibition on mining, particularly if this would involve opening the Wilderness Act to other amendments. (On the other hand, I have never heard any objections to legislation directed toward control of mining in a specific Wilderness area--such as the Three Sisters problem in Oregon.)

What this boils down to is that attempts to "purify" the existing National Wilderness Preservation System would make it all the more difficult to achieve classification of the millions of acres of presently unprotected de facto wilderness lands.

Surely I don't need to point out to you the implications for the San Joaquin Wilderness proposal if the Sierra Club persists in pursuing this quest for a Pyrrhic victory. If we were forced to expunge the Iron Mountain intrusions from the San Joaquin proposal, our would-be Wilderness would be thoroughly gutted, and we would apparently be forced to leave a non-Wilderness corridor for access. Such a corridor would provide continuing impetus for a Minaret Summit Highway. Deletion of the Mark Mine would utterly destroy the integrity of the western boundary; and deletion of the Pincushion Mine and its access "road" would effectively gut the entire South Fork, making Wilderness classification of those 60,000 acres extremely difficult.

Even if such a disastrous "purifying" amendment were not imposed upon the Wilderness Act, our very attempts to achieve it would arouse even more intense opposition from the mining interests and their allies. The present level of hostility toward us seems more than adequate, and I just don't see that we can afford to generate any more.

In this vein, did you note the October 5th National News Report in which Peter Borrelli was quoted as saying that "We are witnessing a backlash from Congress, industry and the Administration regarding wilderness withdrawals...?"

Except in certain limited portions of the country, Wilderness is not yet a motherhood issue. A blind refusal to accept that reality is causing us needlessly to stir up the opposition.

There are times when we can strengthen our cause by accepting a low profile on certain issues. At present, one of those issues is the Wilderness Act's toleration of mining activities.

Under the Wilderness Act, I feel that we have a choice of preserving large amounts of land in a relatively natural condition, or of saving small amounts of land in a pristine condition. Certainly we need some of the latter, but attempts to subvert the Wilderness Act to achieve that end run counter to the intent of Congress and counter to the wishes of the society in which we must function. I would like to suggest that the purists go out and get themselves a new law. Meanwhile, the rest of us can be using the Wilderness Act for what it is--a very effective tool for achieving the preservation of large amounts of land which would otherwise be lost to the developers.

If you agree with the essence of my argument, as I trust you do, perhaps at the coming Board meeting you can delve into the problem of the staff's efforts to open the Wilderness Act to amendments.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Larry I. Moss
Holway Jones
Mike McCloskey

* The bill was apparently one of Senator Jackson's, but I do not know which one. Nor do I know which Sierra Club staff member(s) testified.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

19 October 1973

Gerald H. Meral, Chairman
NCRCC Water Resources Committee
2728 Durant
Berkeley
California 94704

Dear Jerry:

This is to bring to your attention a matter which has been getting considerable local interest, but which I feel might have regional implications as well.

This is an application for a conditional use permit to establish a tomato processing plant on the west side of Fresno County, adjacent to the Mendota Wildlife Management Area. The applicant is Goodman Traction (Traction) Ranch, for the Carnation Company of San Francisco. Contadina, a division of Carnation, is one of California's largest processors of tomato products.

The permit was granted by the Planning Commission on a very close vote, and has been appealed to the Board of Supervisors. The appeal hearing will be held by the Supervisors on October 30.

Carnation estimates the processing plant would use about 3 to 3.5 million gallons per day of water. I am guessing that an even greater increase in water use would come from the conversion to tomatoes from the present crops grown in that area.

I believe that all of this water (both for processing and for irrigation) would come from underground pumping. It appears that this, in turn, would lead to increased demands for water importation in order to minimize depletion of the water table. This is why I feel there might be regional implications.

So far as I can determine, none of the opposition to the tomato plant has considered this aspect. The concerns to date seem to be centering primarily around possible impact on the wildlife, especially the potential for botulism outbreaks caused by spray disposal of the effluent. There are other concerns having to do with noise levels, traffic congestion, growth inducement, and conflicts with the County General Plan, the County Regional Open Space Plan, and the County Recreation and Park Plan.

Do you know where we can get information regarding the relative water consumption of various types of crops?

Is 3 to 3.5 MGD for processing a lot of water, looking at it from a regional point of view? (Acre feet would be more meaningful to me, but I don't know how to make the conversion without getting bogged down in research.) This would apparently be for about a three month operating period.

Do you feel that my concern about increased pressure for water importation is valid, or is it simply the consequence of insufficient knowledge on my part?

If the water importation concern is valid, do you know whether anyone (perhaps yourself) would want to come to Fresno to testify at the hearing on October 30? Some people feel the Supervisors will grant the appeal (ie. oppose the application) by a 3 to 2 vote, but I have always had great misgivings about taking such matters too casually.

I am not personally involved in this particular project, and your response would probably best be directed to John Konior as he is coordinating the Tehipite Chapter efforts. However, I would appreciate receiving a copy of your response, especially since I might possibly be at the hearing. Bill Tanner would probably also appreciate seeing your response.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. John Konior, 6543 N. Ferger, Fresno 93704
William H. Tanner, 203 N. College, Fresno 93701 (new address)

Bcc: Luis Delord

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

20 October 1973

Barbara Chasteen

Dear Barbara,

I have just noted that the mailer sent out by The Wilderness Society and others (but not including the Sierra Club) regarding the Wilderness hearing on Glacier N.P. contains a recommendation for retention of the NPS proposed enclaves around two existing backcountry huts or chalets.

The NPS proposes enclaves of 100 acres each, while the mailer recommends cutting this to "no more than nine acres each."

Your initial reaction might be that if The Wilderness Society et al want to make such a recommendation, that is their business. But is it really? I am really concerned that ~~this~~ such a policy position for Glacier NP will end up being used as a precedent for Yosemite.

Even though Sierra Club policy for Yosemite clearly spelled out the desirability of including the High Sierra Camps within the Wilderness as pre-existing, non-conforming uses, it appears that not everyone is in agreement with the principles on which that ~~new~~ policy decision was based.

As I have mentioned previously, even within the SC I have experienced some difficulty in getting people to acknowledge the official Sierra Club policy and reasons therefore. And I really fear that these same people will be the ones who end up testifying before the Congressional committees--and this could come up at any moment. So we have some strictly internal problems, right within our own house. I trust you have been making some effort to solve this particular problem.

But back to The Wilderness Society. I thought that you and Doug Scott had an exchange of correspondence, in my absence during the summer, which would have straightened out the situation. The first I saw on it was right when we were in the throes of leaving, so I was unable to respond then. By the time we got back it appeared that further exchanges had settled the problem.

Was I wrong in drawing this conclusion? What actually was the upshot of the exchanges between you and Doug? Could it be that he left the WS before anything was really settled?

The Merced Lake HSC is in the wrong place! And I think you feel the same about the May Lake HSC. It is simply intolerable for the Sierra Club to stand by and let Congress perpetuate these abominations by an act of law! What can be done to prevent it? Have you consulted with Lowell or anyone ~~else~~ else on this?

I assume you will be giving a report to Luis' committee next Saturday

Sincerely, G & F

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

24 October 1973

Ted Snyder
P. O. Box 232
Greenville
South Carolina 29602

Re. National Wilderness Committee
Tapoco meeting

Dear Ted,

I will be arriving at Knoxville on Friday November 2 at 5:01 p.m. on United Air Lines flight #610 (via Memphis and Chattanooga).

Presumably this would mean arrival at Tapoco too late for Friday supper. Perhaps scheduling of transportation from Knoxville to Tapoco, and supper time at Tapoco, is such that I would not be too late. In that event, you could put me down for Friday supper.

Because of the uncertainty, I will leave this to your judgment. I presume the arrangements will be coordinated with the Harvey Broome people, so I will know whether or not to eat before leaving Knoxville.

Regarding departure on Sunday, I have a reservation for United flight #815, leaving Knoxville at 3:05 p.m. To my knowledge, that was the latest schedule available.

But it appears that this would put a crimp in Sunday activities. I could delay my departure until Monday, provided there would be some practical way of getting from Tapoco to Knoxville. Because of this possibility, and because he mentioned that he might be renting a car and staying over one or more days, I am sending a copy of this letter to Holly Jones.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Holly Jones

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

26 October 1973

Eugene E. Zumwalt, President
Frésno Audubon Society
4535 East Rialto
Fresno, CA 93726

Re. EIS on North Shore Huntington Lake
Timber Sales

Dear Gene:

I hope the enclosere is of value to you. I asked Larry Moss to send you a copy, and you might already have redeived it. But since time is so critical, I made a copy for you just to make certain you have it before the week end.

My own comments on the EIS are not yet in such a form that I can copy them for you. Thus I am grateful to Larry for having come to the rescue.

The main thrust of my comments will rest on the fact that the Sierra National Forest is seriously in violation of at least two major provisions of NEPA and the CEQ guidelines thereupon.

Larry's second paragraph explains one of these violations quite clearly.

His second to last paragraph (top of last page) alludes to the other major violation, but doesn't come through as clearly as it might. This is the fact that CEQ guidelines require that an EIS be done on the overall, long-range, or cumulative effects of a project, and it must not address itself merely to the first step or increment in what will actually be a series of projects.

To illustrate, the present EIS with ~~which~~ which we are concerned basically addresses itself to the matter of four specific timber sales. By doing so, it misses the mark completely. The real question which is involved here is that of the opening up of a previously unroaded and undeveloped area in such a way that there would be a long series of projects, including additonal timber sales, well into the foreseeable future.

To take an example, the FS states that degradation of water quality would be only a temporary concern, because the vegetation would eventually grow back and the ~~inundum~~ soil would eventually stabilize. This would be true only if they were to cut the trees from those four timber sales, close all roads and put them to bed, and then leave the area alone for many years. But the very fact that they are planning to leave a permanent road network shows quite clearly that they do NOT intend to stop their activities upon the conclusion of these first four timber sales.

Water quality would in fact be permanently degraded because of the continuation of other activities, including additional timber sales, essentially in perpuity.

In essence, the subject of the EIS should have been "The Opening Up and Development of the North Shore Huntington Lake Defacto Wilderness."

To address the EIS only to the matter of the first four timber sales is a gross violation of the CEQ guidelines. (And perhaps of NEPA itself--although I have not yet checked that out.)

It is easier to take a document such as the present EIS and simply nitpick. Indeed, that type of criticism certainly is of value and does have its place.

But I feel that it is risky to start out that way, because broad principles which are sometimes of tremendous importance will often then be overlooked.

Also, nitpicking doesn't bother the Forest Service, since they know they won't get dragged into court over trivia. But if it can be pointed out that they are in violation of actual laws and regulations, they are much more likely to listen.

I'm sorry this is not better organized, but I am in great haste in the midst of departing for a week end meeting. Hope it is of some use to you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

To: Sotero Muniz, Supervisor, Sierra National Forest

From: George W. Whitmore, Co-Chairman of the Wilderness Committee of the Sierra Club's Northern California Regional Conservation Committee

Subject: Draft Environmental Statement on the North Shore of Huntington Lake Timber Sales (prepared June 1973, transmitted to CEQ 13 September 1973)

Date: 29 October 1973

You will be receiving written comments from the Sierra Club's Southern California Representative, and also from the Tehipite Chapter. You should consider those comments, as well as mine, collectively to represent Sierra Club thinking. Time constraints have prevented us from compiling the various Sierra Club statements into a single presentation.

Regarding time constraint I might note that, although the EIS was reportedly made available to the public on September 13, you mailed a copy to the Sierra Club president on September 19. This was received by Sierra Club headquarters on September 24, and they mailed it to me on the same day. I received it on September 26 or 27. My purpose in mentioning these dates is to let you know that your method of distribution of the EIS was such that I did not receive it until almost one-third of the total time available for comment had already elapsed.

I would request that in the future either the method of notification be improved, or else a longer time period be allowed for public comment. In this regard I might note that my immediate predecessor, Luis G. Ireland, had asked you to send him materials such as the present EIS, and that you had refused his request. I strongly urge that you seriously reconsider your earlier action.

Regarding the EIS, I will start by commending you at least for having expended considerable effort in attempting to comply with NEPA and the CEQ guidelines. You appear to have made a serious attempt at producing an adequate EIS, and it is obvious that you have put much thought into it. Unfortunately, I don't feel that you have succeeded.

In numerous places throughout the EIS it is apparent that you had already decided on a particular plan of action, and then you wrote the EIS after you had already made your policy decision. This is, of course, in direct violation of the CEQ Guidelines. I refer you to Sections 1500.2(a) and 1500.7(a) in particular. I fully realize that this is a generalization, but time constraints do not permit me to start citing the specific examples which will illustrate my charge. This could be done later, if it would serve any useful purpose.

The EIS is also in violation of CEQ guidelines in that it deals primarily with the effect of four specific timber sales. In reality, the four sales described are merely the first phase of what would be a completely new activity which would continue in perpetuity. Taking a long-term view, the impact of the first four timber sales would be relatively insignificant. The impact to which the EIS should have directed itself is that which would result from the roading and opening up to development of a previously pristine region. Cf. Section 1500.6(d)(1) of the Guidelines.

I realize that some of the EIS does direct itself to such considerations. But the fact remains that there are numerous instances wherein long-term environmental degradation is glossed over or ignored by speaking only in terms of the four timber sales immediately in question. I will briefly give just a few examples.

Cf. page 21, 3. b. "...Harvesting timber may cause the fisher habitat to dwindle in the short run." This and the succeeding paragraph ignore the fact that fisher and marten habitat would be permanently impaired because timber sales and other human activities related to the road network would continue in perpetuity. The second paragraph (regarding martens) states that "only about one-third of the Study Area will be logged." This statement assumes a project of limited duration, and is amply contradicted throughout the rest of the EIS.

Cf. page 41, 8., paragraph 2. "...logging will not affect the entire area under study..." Again, this is true only if all human activity were to cease upon completion of the first four timber sales.

Cf. page ii, V. B. 1. "Some short-term soil erosion and water sedimentation before new plant cover established." This assumes that the disruption caused by the original four timber sales would eventually become stabilized, which is perhaps correct. However, in the meantime there would be additional timber sales, and other human activity pursuant to the presence of the road network. These later activities would result in a continuing degradation of water quality. The degradation would thus, in fact, be permanent and not temporary. The EIS fails to address itself to this long-term consequence of the roading and opening up to development of the Study Area.

I cite these three examples only to illustrate my point. The list is not intended to be exhaustive. You will find other examples if you look for them.

The EIS also has failed to broaden its scope even to the modest extent of considering the fate of the entire Kaiser Roadless Area as a single entity. Since the entire area is only 23,020 acres in extent, it appears that this would not have been too much of a burden. Instead, we find that part of the Kaiser Roadless Area will be included in the Aspen-Horsethief Study Area. (Cf. page 3, paragraph 3.) When a roadless area is fragmented into two different Study Areas, it makes meaningful consideration of the Wilderness or roadless alternatives rather awkward. Again, this piecemeal approach is prohibited by the CEQ guidelines.

Regarding a comment on page 57, paragraph 1. "...no group has proposed the area for wilderness designation." It appears that you are not aware

that the Sierra Club has proposed this area for inclusion on the New Study Area list. If you were aware of this, it seems that you would have acknowledged the fact. We happen to feel that such a recommendation implies the possibility of future endorsement of actual Wilderness classification, and should be acknowledged as such.

Regarding a comment on page 75, paragraph 3. "Except for the Huntington Lake Association, Inc., none of the above people or organizations have expressed major objections to the proposed timber sales." It appears that you have overlooked the Tehipite Chapter's position on the Home Camp sale. This was that they would not oppose the sale provided certain conditions were met. The Sierra National Forest has chosen not to meet those conditions in its proposed sale plan. For all practical purposes, you have thereby placed the Sierra Club in opposition to the Home Camp sale.

There have been other Sierra Club communications to the Forest Service which have the same effect. In particular, the Tehipite Chapter's statement to John McGuire when responding to the draft EIS for the Roadless Area Review. (This called for inclusion of the Kaiser unit on the New Study Area list.) There was also a resolution of the Board of Directors calling for study of all roadless areas. There was also a letter from Larry E. Moss to you stating our objections to extending the Line Creek sale so far up the mountainside. (Subsequent resolutions calling for study of that area superceded Larry's letter, but I mention it because it shows our concern for the area at an early date.)

In view of this extensive history of Sierra Club input, I find the statement that no one except the Huntington Lake Association has "expressed major objections" to be unacceptable.

I repeat my statement that time constraints are preventing us from giving you the in-depth comment which is warranted. I urge that you note the reasons for that situation, and that you take appropriate steps to prevent recurrences.

TO: Marge Sill

FROM: George Whitmore

SUBJECT: Toiyabe Chapter resolution re. Mt. Whitney trail.

DATE: 1 November 1973

I phoned Mike Weege, chairman of the Eastern Sierra Task Force (formerly Owens Valley Subcommittee of SCRCC), at Lowell's request.

ESTF passed a couple resolutions 8 Sep 73. Both resolutions were passed, essentially as written by ESTF, by SCRCC on 15 Sep 73.

These were essentially:

1. Opposition to removal of Whitney trail from Wilderness System.
2. "Support concept of limitation of use" as needed to preserve the wilderness character of the trail.

Re. No. 1, there is obviously no problem.

Re. No. 2, it is one of those resolutions which will mean different things to different people, including those who wrote and passed it.

For what it is worth, Mike Weege does not appear to interpret it as meaning endorsement of restrictive permits as a first, ~~max~~, or only method. (I imagine some of the people involved had that in mind, however.) (Ie. as a first and/or only method.)

When I pointed out to Mike that there are many different ways of achieving limitations, he seemed to accept that quite readily. There apparently had been discussion within the SCRCC re. the desirability of not getting involved in "the numbers game" which the NPS is playing with the various Sequoia-Kings CanyonNP entrances.

Briefly, I don't think there would be any philosophical conflict with Mike Weege. There are obviously others of whom this could not be said. Although their resolutions, in themselves, are not objectionable, it is nevertheless quite possible that some people will place objectionable interpretations on Number Two.

Some people have asked for copies of the Toiyabe Chapter resolution; these people are marked (#) below. I suggest the others receive it anyway.

Others are receiving copies of this letter; they are marked (*) below.

* George Whitmore
* Lowell Smith
* June Dailey
* Luis Ireland
~~✉~~ Mike Weege
Joe Fontaine

*Mike said he would send me their exact wording.
I will forward it upon receipt from him.*

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

1 November 1973

John Moore
Mathematics Department
U.C. Davis
Davis, CA 95616

Dear John:

We discussed something which seemed quite worthwhile, but I don't think we ever got around to doing anything about it.

This was for you to copy a few pages from the Dinkey Lakes (Quadruple Divide) study report you are working on, and give these to Eileen Devine. In this way she could easily see what I have been talking about when I have tried to explain to her the most useful way in which a report can be done. (One example is worth a thousand words, or something to that effect.)

In particular I want her to see how you have broken your report down into various sub-topics, for ease both of writing and of reading. And for ease of adding additional material as we acquire it.

Also your style of writing seems to me to be ideal. It contains much detail, and still manages to keep the verbiage to a minimum.

If you could copy a few of those pages (your handwritten ones would suffice) I certainly would appreciate it. And if you could mail them directly to Eileen I bet she would appreciate it, too.

✓ Thanks.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

cc. Eileen Devine, 1369 North Lucerne, Fresno, CA 93728.

✓ he did it.
by 11-9-73

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

DOCUMENT ROOM

House Bill Room

House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

16 November 1973

Gentlemen:

Would you please send me one copy of each of the following bills --

Pinnacles	— H.R. 1452	(Talcott, Subser)	NOT REC'D
Yosemite	— H.R. 6342	(Mathias)	
Sequoia-Kings	— H.R. 6343	(")	
all three	— H.R. 5474	(Saylor)	REC'D 23-24 Nov 73
Yosemite only	— H.R. 4687	(Whitehurst)	

The last two bills are of the omnibus variety. If they are printed in separate parts, the parts I am interested in are those dealing with Pinnacles National Monument, Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park, and Yosemite National Park.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

George W. Whitmore

16 November 1973

John Konior

Dear John,

Enclosed is a copy of a notice I received today from the Fresno County Supervisors office, regarding a hearing scheduled for November 27 on matters concerning the development of the Westside Freeway interchanges.

This issue is one which the Chapter was formerly involved in. Our interest in it dates at least back to 1964. We have been active on it until the last year or two. As Conservation Chairman, I appeared at a number of hearings, and others also did.

I cannot seem to get Norman interested in this. I really hate to see us drop the ball after having carried it for so long. Especially since this is an issue where we can be involved during the early stages, while it is still possible to accomplish something worthwhile.

I really fear that we are going to end up in the usual situation of saying we disapprove of it after it is already too late to do anything.

Maybe you can get Norman to find someone to look after it. As I said, I tried and failed.

Thanks,

George Whitmore

TO: Luis Ireland * #
Joe Fontaine * #
Larry E. Moss * #
June Dailey #
Jim Eaton
Tony Chasteen

FROM: George Whitmore

SUBJECT: Draft EIS, Huntington Lake North Shore Timber Sales (involves
Kaiser Roadless Area, Sierra N.F.)

DATE: 19 November 1973

This is prompted by Shelley McIntyre's memo to all of us, dated 16 November. I felt that a status report to bring together a lot of loose ends would be helpful.

The Sierra N.F. Supervisor sent a copy of the draft EIS to the Sierra Club president, c/o Mills Tower. At Shelley's suggestion, Louise Nichols immediately forwarded this to me. This was the first I heard about it. I notified eight other people of the availability of the EIS, and suggested that it merited their attention; three of those people are indicated above with a (*). Anyone else who wishes a copy of the draft EIS should try the Sierra N.F. office in Fresno and/or the Regional Office.

Larry E. Moss asked me whether he should coordinate his comments with the Chapter or submit them independently. I told him to go ahead on his own, since time was too short to permit the luxury of a coordinated approach.

Larry sent me a copy of his comments, and I gave a copy to the president of Fresno Audubon, who had requested ideas on how to handle the situation.

In the meantime, Tehipite Chapter was in the process of preparing comments, which they hand-delivered on the last possible day.

I did the same with my own comments, which I signed as co-chairman of the NCRCC Federal Lands Committee. I told the USFS that they should consider Larry's comments, my comments, and the Chapter's comments all to represent the Sierra Club position. I pointed out to them that their obtuse method of notification, combined with a late mailing and a short time period for comments, combined to make a single coordinated statement by us impossible.

I have sent copies of my comments to eleven people, four of whom are indicated above with a (#). I would be happy to send a copy to anyone else who requests it.

I have not yet seen the Tehipite Chapter comments. Anyone who wants a copy should write to Chairman John Konior, 6543 N. Ferger, Fresno 93704.

I presume that Larry would accomodate anyone who asks him for a copy of his comments.

All of which points up that we may be disorganized, and the USFS may try to exploit that, but sometimes things happen anyway. Thank you, Louise and Shelley, for getting the EIS into my hands as soon as you received it!

cc. Louise Nichols
Shelley McIntyre

BCC: Norman Hiel

P.O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

26 November 1973

Marge Sill
720 Brookfield Drive
Reno
Nevada 89503

Dear Marge:

Re. House Subcommittee (National Parks & Recreation) hearings on
Pinnacles N.M., Yosemite N.P., and Sequoia-Kings Canyon N.P.
Wilderness proposals.

I continue to be concerned that we could be hit with these hearings at any moment. It is not clear to me whether you and others realize that the subcommittee chairmen have recently been calling hearings on extremely short notice. The most recent instance is mentioned in the first sentence of the Grand Canyon flier which was enclosed with the National News Report which just arrived (Nov 23 issue); the hearing was held "with less than one week advance notice." (Emphasis provided.)

Given the fact of extremely short notice for hearings, The Sierra Club must develop its testimony in advance. To do otherwise is inviting disaster, and would be imposing a severe and totally unwarranted burden on the individual(s) who might be called upon to testify.

The function and role of the NCRCC National Parks Committee has always been unclear to me, and has recently become even more so. This is particularly true with regard to Wilderness matters within the National Park system.

The above uncertainty notwithstanding, Barbara Chasteen and I agreed at the NCRCC meeting on November 10 that she would assume total responsibility for seeing to it that the Club would be adequately prepared for the Pinnacles, Yosemite, and Sequoia-Kings hearings.

Subsequent to that there has apparently been even further uncertainty raised regarding the status of the National Parks Committee, and I am wondering whether Barbara still considers our agreement valid.

Since I have heard nothing to the contrary, I am assuming that the agreement still stands, that the situation is in good hands, and that someone is ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ writing (or already has written) the appropriate testimony. I am also assuming that arrangements are being made (or already have been made) for individual(s) to testify. A very major concern in this latter regard is where the money will come from; Lowell said that he would check with Mike McCloskey about this, and I assume it has been done.

As NCRCC Vice-Chairman in charge of such matters, ~~xxxxxx~~ you will presumably be checking this out to ensure that things are really happening.
cc. June Dailey, Barbara Chasteen, Lowell Smith

Sincerely, George
Whitmore

TO: Lowell Smith, Marge Sill
FROM: George Whitmore
SUBJECT: Mount Whitney Trail
DATE: 27 November 1973

Enclosed are copies of --

Eastern Sierra Task Force minutes of 8-9 Sep 73 meeting.
Report of the ESTF to the SCRCC, with proposed resolutions.
SCRCC minutes of 9/15/73, with text of resolutions.

All above were sent to me by Mike Weege.

Note that the ESTF resolutions were phrased in general terms, whereas the SCRCC recast them to make them specific to the Mt Whitney trail area.

What is needed now is the text of the Toiyabe resolution(s). As I understand it, Roger Mitchell has the only known copy and Marge has been unable to get any response from him. He apparently does not have a phone at his new location in Sacramento, and had not answered her written request.

When this becomes available I would like to receive a copy, I am sure Lowell would, and Mike Weege specifically requested a copy. Joe Fontaine has not told me he would like a copy of it, but he should receive one anyway.

It is less clear to me whether June Dailey, Luis Ireland, and Jim Eaton should, or want to, receive copies. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~

Except for Jim Eaton's name, I suggested all the above in my memo of November 1. I am suggesting that Jim be included in many communications because he will apparently be serving as a defacto member of any NCRCC Federal Lands Committee steering group or ex comm. Since he will be involved, it appears to me we should make some effort to keep him informed, and thereby increase his usefulness.

summary of distribution of Toiyabe resolution:

requested	George Whitmore Mike Weege Lowell Smith
desirable	Joe Fontaine
less clear, but suggested	June Dailey Luis Ireland Jim Eaton

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

2 December 1973

Barry Fisher
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
311 California Street, Suite 311
San Francisco
California 94104

Re: Rancheria Creek, Sierra National Forest

Dear Barry,

Per our telephone conversation of 21 November 1973, here is a summary of what I told you at that time.

I have been concerned about recent statements made by the Forest Service to the effect that the Sierra Club approved the present boundaries of the John Muir Wilderness when they were established in 1964.

A review of the Sierra Club Conservation Policy Guide seems to be inconclusive. There was obviously much which transpired which does not appear in the Policy Guide.

I have reviewed the minutes of the Tehipite Chapter Executive Committee meetings starting with March 1961. It is quite clear from a review of those records that, as early as 1961, the Chapter favored wilderness classification of the lands immediately east and south of Wishon Reservoir, and passed resolutions to that effect.

It is also clear that the Chapter attempted to persuade the Board of Directors to adopt their views as Sierra Club policy. These efforts apparently met with something less than overwhelming enthusiasm at that time (1961).

Later (apparently starting in 1963) it appears that the National Conservation Committee became interested in the pending revision of the High Sierra Primitive Area (John Muir Wilderness) boundaries, but the nature and scope of their interest is not clear.

The Chapter was also interested in this pending revision, but the record becomes somewhat sketchy at this point. However, by reading between the lines, I get the distinct impression that the Chapter felt the Forest Service proposal left something to be desired.

Beyond this point the only information I have is that contained in the Policy Guide, and it is inconclusive.

During September and October of 1972 we were involved in determining Sierra Club policy on the pending review of the remaining fragment of the High Sierra Primitive Area (USFS Monarch Wilderness proposal).

On 21 October 1972, I spoke briefly with Ed Wayburn about this during the course of a Board meeting in San Francisco. We were concerned about the fate of the large amount of contiguous defacto wilderness which lies to the west of the present High Sierra Primitive Area. Ed mentioned that, at the time the present John Muir boundaries were established, "we" tried to get the Forest Service to bring the western boundary all the way down to the reservoir(s).

Later, I noted that the Policy Guide states that in 1963-64 the Club wanted the John Muir boundary to be brought down to the high water mark of Edison Lake. But since Ed Wayburn and I were talking about the USFS Monarch Wilderness proposal, I assumed that he must have been referring to Wishon, and possibly Courtright Reservoir.

As you will note, if my understanding of Ed Wayburn's comment was correct, it would fill some missing gaps in the record. It would also prove the Forest Service wrong when they contend that the Sierra Club approved of the John Muir boundaries as they were adopted in 1964.

Since a resolution of this uncertainty appears to be fairly important to our appeal proceedings on Rancheria Creek, I hope that you will be able to contact Ed Wayburn and get him to clarify the history of the Club's position(s) on this.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc: Larry E. Moss

Jan 2 copies to Cynthia Wayburn 4-5 May 74 (BoD meeting)

Will Tower letter head

H.E.T. ahorad 20 Dec 73
Just arrived & look in town
and found the letter
will make copy and mail it by next week.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

14 December 1973

Harold E. Thomas
Star Route, Box 18
Clovis
California 93612

Dear Harold:

This will probably strike you as being a rather strange request, and I hope you don't find it too bothersome.

I have been trying to obtain a copy of the comments which you wrote for the Tehipite Chapter in responding to the Forest Service's draft Environmental Impact Statement on the North Shore Huntington Lake Timber Sales. Could you please send me a copy?

After submitting them to the Forest Service, John Konior misplaced his copy, and it has not yet turned up. I could probably get it from the Forest Service, but I feel that for the sake of appearances we should not do that except as an absolutely last resort. You are the only other source I know to turn to, and that is why I am bothering you.

I am especially concerned about getting this fairly soon, as it appears that we are going to have to take definitive action one way or another within a short time. And knowing what we have already said would appear to be essential to determining our subsequent course of action.

In case you are wondering in what capacity I am writing you, it is two-fold. First, as a concerned member of the Tehipite Chapter who wants to see to it that the chapter fulfills its proper role in matters such as determining proper management of the Kaiser-Huntington area. Second, as co-chairman of the Sierra Club's Northern California Regional Federal Lands (Wilderness) Committee. In this latter capacity, I have a responsibility to see to it that such matters are taken care of at the regional level if not locally.

Thanks for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

Wells Tower letterhead

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

14 December 1973

Albert P. Heter
6267 West Camellia Drive
Winton
California 95388

Dear Paul:

I have been studying the final Environmental Impact Statement which the U.S. Forest Service issued to cover their review of roadless areas and their selection of New Wilderness Study Areas. This was issued just this past October 15th.

One section it contains is a listing of all the various organizations which submitted written comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement last spring. Those were the comments which were due no later than April 18th.

Under "Sierra Club", the Forest Service has listed all the individual Sierra Club entities which submitted comments in their own name. One of these entities is listed as "Merced County Group".

Presumably this refers to the Tehipite Chapter's Merced Group. Since you are the Group's conservation chairman, I am hoping that you will know who submitted the comments or at least know who has a copy of them.

If you could locate these comments, I would greatly appreciate it if you would send me a copy of them. It would help us in presenting a more united front to the Forest Service if we knew what our own chapters and groups had said. It is always embarrassing for us to have to ask them what we have said!

I always felt this problem when I was the chapter conservation chairman, and I am even more acutely aware of it now that I am the co-chairman of the regional conservation committee's "Wilderness Committee. I am systematically trying to determine what the various Sierra Club entities in the Northern California Region said in connection with the USFS roadless area review, and I surely hope you will be able to fill the missing gap in the Merced Group area for me.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

Charles M. Clusen

18 December 1973

Re. Cranston-Tunney California wilderness bill(s) / and
USFS Roadless Area Review

Dear Chuck:

Enclosed is a document I have drafted titled "USFS Roadless Area Review - Partial Summary of Computer Printout Data." As you will note, I have marked it "Draft - not for distribution or copying." I labeled it thus because it is incomplete and is subject to correction, some of which may be significant.

But I thought you should have the draft copy immediately. This is because it could be of considerable value in attempting to decide which areas we should be seeking to include in the Cranston-Tunney bill(s).

The main point on this is that the USFS and others are likely to point to the public input on the Kings River unit (#5-76), for example, and say that there was very little interest shown in the area. But a study of the printout data shows that the public interest in this particular area appeared elsewhere--specifically in the huge number of inputs calling for expansion of the High Sierra Primitive Area addition (#5-122). This is because any expansion of area 5-122 would have to include area 5-76.

I cite this as an illustration of my rationale in gathering the data into this particular form. I intend it to be used as a working document, and one which will be essential if we are to understand the actual intent of the public input. That is, as opposed to the distorted interpretations which the USFS and others will probably be attempting to use against us.

Any comments you or others may have as to how the usefulness of this document could be enhanced would be appreciated. For example, it is a selective list; if your favorite area is not included, let me know and I will add it to the next revision.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Shelley McIntyre
Larry E. Moss

Bcc. Phil Farrell (18 Dec 73)

Don Morrell (11 Oct 74)
" " (30 Sep 76)



by Ansel Adams in *This is the American Earth*

SIERRA CLUB

Mills Tower, San Francisco 94104

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

19 December 1973

Charles M. Clusen

Re. Federal wilderness legislation for California.

Dear Chuck:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter I have received from Nick Van Pelt of the San Francisco Bay Chapter's Wilderness Subcommittee. Nick describes the ideas of his committee on the above subject. I felt that you should have a copy of this since it represents a significant element of thinking within the NCRCC.

Nick's committee established two criteria. One was that the selected areas be the "leftovers" from the "original thirteen" list of several years back. Ie. those areas on which the USFS has refused to act, and for which we must therefore seek redress from Congress.

The other criterion that Nick's committee chose was that we should seek action only on those areas which are "immediately threatened" by development.

As you know, there are others within the NCRCC who hold drastically different views as to what our criteria should be. One of the more significant of these views is that we should avoid including within an omnibus bill any area which has been so bitterly contested that its presence would doom the entire omnibus to defeat. This view is certainly a valid one, and happens to be diametrically opposed to the views expressed in Nick's letter.

I feel that this dichotomy is a needless one, and is a direct consequence of our having failed to lay the necessary groundwork before starting to talk about specific areas or the criteria for selection.

As a beginning, I feel that we should have determined whether we were to be talking about a single bill, or several bills, or an unlimited number of bills.

Related to this, we should have determined whether we were to be talking about one or more omnibus, or whether we were to be talking about individual bills only, or whether we were to be talking about a combination of one or more omnibus plus one or more individual bills.

Also related to the above is the fact that we should have decided what our purpose is to be in introducing a bill or bills. Is it to be for "show," primarily to go on record and to get some publicity? Or do we really expect to get some action on the bill(s), with a strong chance of actual passage?

Still another question related to all the above is the distinction between "instant designations" as opposed to pure "study" bills. And of course there are a number of areas which would require "hybrid" or combination "instant-study" bills. Do our would-be sponsors prefer one of these approaches over another? Or do they even understand the distinctions, and implications, of each?

As you know, I have some pretty strong feelings regarding our failure to make these distinctions in our own minds, particularly as it relates to the meaning of the word "study." Until we make these distinctions in our own minds, we can hardly expect the sponsors to understand them. And until we know how the would-be sponsors feel on these issues, we can hardly draft intelligent bills which they will be willing to sponsor.

Until the above questions have been answered, I really don't see how we can be expected to (1) agree on anything, or (2) come up with intelligent choices.

In order for the above questions to have been answered, it seems to me that the legislators should have been asked. Instead, I have the distinct impression that a small handful of Sierra Club people have taken it upon themselves to make certain assumptions (which may or may not be correct) as to just how far our congressional sponsors are willing to go.

There are several problems with this. One of these is that it is doing violence to the Sierra Club's basic concept of widespread membership involvement through established channels.

Another is that those who are making the assumptions are being extremely conservative in their guesses as to how far the would-be sponsors are willing to go. This is extremely hazardous; it means that we are likely to be asking for less than we could have gotten had we taken a more optimistic view and approached the legislators directly.

The word "optimism" is perhaps the key to this whole problem. I strongly feel that optimism is the lifeblood of the environmental movement, and without it we are doomed. And yet, our present attempts to get federal wilderness legislation for California seem to be dominated by those of the opposite persuasion.

Pessimism, combined with a lack of openness in our internal dealings, is doing severe damage both to us and to our cause.

I welcome your recommendations for getting us back on the track!

Sincerely,

George

George W. Whitmore
Co-Chairman
NCRCC Federal Lands Committee

cc. June Dailey (encl.)
Marge Sill "
Lowell Smith "
other involved people (no encl.)