

TO: Barbara Chasteen, Marge Sill
FROM: George Whitmore
SUBJECT: Legislative committee wilderness hearings: Yosemite, Sequoia-Kings, Pinnacles.
DATE: / 6 Feb 74

Re. Yosemite:

I am informed by June Dailey that Melcher is being asked by the Wilderness Society to postpone hearings on Emigrant, and being urged to take up Yosemite first.

The only problem I see with this information is that Yosemite, being a national park, would go to Roy Taylor's committee, not Melcher's. (At least that is my understanding; am I wrong?)

Aside from this inexplicable point, the fact remains that someone (Wilderness Society ? and others ?) are continuing to talk up early hearings on Yosemite.

Is Sierra Club testimony ready to roll for this?

Re. Sequoia-Kings:

Is Sierra Club testimony ready to roll for this?

Re. Pinnacles:

Is Sierra Club testimony ready to roll for this?

It is my understanding that Loma Prieta, S.F. Bay, and Ventana are trying to form a Pinnacles "coalition." It is also my understanding that the person(s) who are behind this are somewhat inept at formulating policy, and that someone else had better be riding herd on them. Who will be doing this?????

(John Moore says he has sent out FLC meeting notices for Sunday, March 3 in Davis.)

TO: Harold Thomas, John Konior, Bert Woodruff
FROM: George Whitmore
SUBJECT: Sotero Muniz
DATE: 17 Feb 74

Just a few random thoughts prompted by our discussion last Wednesday.

I was Tehipite's conservation chairman during 1968, '69, '70, and '71. The Sierra N.F. Supervisor during 1968 was Walter Puhn; there was no difficulty whatsoever. The Supervisor during 1969 and 1970 was Zane Smith; we got along fine. Sotero Muniz became Supervisor early in 1971; you are aware of some of the problems which then ensued. I emphasize "some" because the list of grievances is endless--you have seen only the tip of the iceberg.

The list of people whom Sotero has managed to offend continues to grow. It includes Luis Ireland, who is about as mild-mannered a person as you are likely to encounter. It includes Chuck Clusen, who made the mistake of sending Sotero a copy of a new policy on off-road vehicles which the Board of Directors had just passed; for his trouble, Chuck received a real lambasting. It includes Lowell Smith, Larry E. Moss. I don't know whether Norman Hill or Joe Fontaine felt offended, but having seen the way Sotero has acted in their presence I feel they had ~~xxxx~~ reason to be offended. There is the case of the professor out at Fresno State. And B. F. Sisk. And the Madera County Board of Supervisors. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Considering the great diversity of personalities and philosophies involved here, I really feel that inclusion on the list is more of a reflection upon Sotero than it is upon the honored individual.

As I have previously described it to one of your colleagues, there are two kinds of people whom Sotero gets along with:

- ix 1. Those who agree with him.
2. Those who may or may not agree, but who are weak and ineffectual in any event.

It is my personal opinion that we cannot afford to pay either of those prices.

Perhaps we can continue to work with the Sierra N.F. provided we are able to deal with individuals ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ other than Sotero. But at the time I was conservation chairman, Sotero started off (while we were still on speaking terms) by making it clear than he wanted all contacts to be with him. Specifically, we were discouraged from talking to his district rangers. I also have reason to believe that he later told his staff they could talk to us, but only so long as matters of philosophy were avoided! In other words, nothing of substance was to be discussed except with him.

Perhaps circumstances have changed. I would appreciate hearing of it if you learn that the situation is not as bad as I have been led to believe.

Harry Crandell, 17 February 1974

As a footnote, I might mention that we were not pushing the San Joaquin bill during the last year. There were two reasons for this.

One was that we were waiting to see the outcome of the USFS Roadless Area review process. We now have this.

The other reason was that we had been led to believe that Governor Reagan would come out with a specific boundary proposal of his own, and that Craig Hosmer would introduce a bill reflecting the Governor's proposal. It now appears that neither of these events is going to take place. I do not know what went wrong, but something clearly did. (Perhaps Tony Chasteen can enlighten both of us on this point.)

As a second footnote, I am enclosing an acreage tabulation on which I have marked those roadless areas which Sisk will have and those which Mathias will have. Mathias' district will be far more important to us than Sisk's. Not only will it contain the better part of four times more roadless acreage, but Mathias' areas also happen to be the ones which we are most concerned with, aside from the instant San Joaquin area.

I mention this in order to reinforce the idea that Mathias is very important to us, and to emphasize the desirability of getting further concessions from him now, while his political future is in question.

G.W.W.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

17 February 1974

Harry Crandell
The Wilderness Society
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re. San Joaquin Wilderness (proposed)

Dear Harry:

Tony Chasteen has sent me a copy of the letter Jim Eaton wrote you on November 26. The letter was apparently in response to an inquiry which you had made. I am enclosing a copy of Jim's letter to save you the trouble of looking it up.

Jim's letter was more or less correct as far as it went, but I would like to clarify some points and to add further information. In addition to this letter, I am enclosing a map of the area and a descriptive summary.

The map shows the differences between McGuire's New Study Area, the area we are requesting for instant designation, and the area for which we are requesting study designation.

The descriptive summary was prepared specifically for the benefit of the Sierra Club staff to assist them in showing Cranston and Tunney what we are asking for and why. It was purposely kept very brief. If you want or need further information I suggest that you contact Tony Chasteen and/or myself.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter Cranston wrote me last March in which he clearly states that he will co-sponsor a bill to classify this area as Wilderness. If Cranston is dragging his feet, as Jim feared he might, then you could show him a copy of his own letter.

Since Jim wrote you, there have been some major changes in the House situation. The re-districting which Jim spoke of has been settled by the Court.

Sisk will gain essentially all of the area which we are recommending for instant designation (Madera County). This is very bad news.

But he will lose most of the area for which we are recommending study designation (the South Fork, in eastern Fresno County). This is very good news.

Bob Mathias will gain eastern Fresno County (ie. the South Fork area). I do not share the dour view of Mathias which some of my colleagues hold. I do feel that he will be a big improvement over what we have been up against with Sisk.

As an illustration, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which Mathias sent to McGuire last June. In it, Mathias urged McGuire to retain the North Fork San Joaquin roadless unit on the final New Study Area list, and to expand it into the Inyo National Forest and into the South Fork of the San Joaquin!

Mathias wants to avoid having to make a choice either for or against Wilderness designation. That is why he endorsed the study concept--it keeps him off the hook for a few years.

I think he deserves our gratitude for having gone as far as he did, and I wish more of us would take a more constructive attitude toward the man.

Now is an opportune time to try to get further concessions from Mathias. This is because of a considerable change in the nature of his constituency.

He will be acquiring a very substantial block of more urban, intellectual, and "liberal" constituents. This is something he has not previously had to contend with. I feel that he will have to become more environmentally oriented if he is to survive the next election.

I hope you will be working on Mathias at your end in order to exploit this new opportunity. We will be working on him out here. If you can offer any suggestions which might make our task easier, I would certainly appreciate hearing from you.

One additional factor has developed since last November. It turns out that a number of present and past friends of the San Joaquin will not be returning to Congress next year. Of course that includes Waldie himself. It also includes Teague (deceased) and Maillard, both of whom have been sponsors of Waldie's present bill. Although not sponsors of the present bill, Hosmer, Hanna and Holifield had been sponsors of previous bills; all of these men are leaving Congress.

I would be interested in knowing your opinion regarding the significance of these losses. Perhaps it really does not matter.

Chuck Clusen feels that the San Joaquin might be ripe for action, and that perhaps a major push would be in order. He will be transferring to the Sierra Club's Washington office next month, and I hope that between the two of you we can get a good strategy developed.

At the moment, we seem to be lacking direction. We don't have a bill in the Senate, and the House bill covers only the instant area. If we don't get the South Fork included in a House bill, we would have severe problems trying to work up a separate campaign on it by itself. I really would appreciate your advice as to the chances of our getting the kind of bill we need, and what we ought to be doing to achieve it.

Thanks for your interest and your help.

Sincerely,

cc. Jim Eaton

Chuck Clusen

Tony Chasteen (2104 Blucher Valley Road, Sebastopol, CA 95472)

George W. Whitmore

(I have two additional thoughts which I am appending to this letter.)

TO: Barbara Chasteen, Marge Sill
FROM: George Whitmore
SUBJECT: ~~xxxxxx~~ National Park wilderness hearings.
DATE: 27 Feb 74

I talked to Chuck Clusen today. He is in Washington. He had just learned that the following areas are to be heard in committee in March:

Yosemite
Sequoia-Kings
Pinnacles
Point Reyes
Joshua Tree

He said money would probably be available to send "two or three" people.

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

28 February 1974

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

Dear Sotero:

Re: Timber Management Plan, and Sale Programs.

Early last year John Underwood kindly placed my name on your lists for distribution of certain types of information. This included, at least in part, announcements of the following:

1. Periodic Sale Programs (firm and tentative), Preliminary Advertisements, and Preliminary Prospectuses.
2. Annual Sale Program Review.
3. Timber Management Plan development.

I have found all of this material to be extremely interesting and useful, but it now appears that my name has been deleted from the distribution lists. I would greatly appreciate reinstatement of my name on these lists.

Since many other people, particularly within the industry, routinely receive distribution of this material, I trust that having my name included on the lists will not inconvenience you.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

28 February 1974

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

Dear Sotero:

Enclosed you will find my requests for several different types of information. I have written each request as a separate letter in order to facilitate your processing, action, and filing.

In these letters I have asked to receive your announcements on:

1. Land Use Planning (Unit Planning).
2. Timber Management Plan, and Sale Programs.
3. Environmental Impact Statements.

All of these are areas in which you are presumably encouraging public information and participation. As a member of the public, I am simply requesting the opportunity to be kept informed and to participate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

28 February 1974

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

Dear Sotero:

Re: Environmental Impact Statements, draft and final.

I would greatly appreciate receiving copies of draft and final EIS's directly from you as soon as they are released.

As you may recall, I learned of the existence of the North Shore Huntington Lake Timber Sales draft EIS only second or third hand. In the meantime, much of the very brief period allotted for comment had already elapsed. As a consequence, it was impossible for me to comment on the document in the depth which I'm sure you would have preferred.

Since the Sierra N.F. apparently will be producing EIS's on only a very limited number of projects, I don't see that my request will work any hardship on you. Furthermore, it is entirely in line with the intent of Congress and the implementing council and agencies for you to facilitate public knowledge of, and participation in, the NEPA process for your projects.

I look forward to receiving future draft and final EIS's from you.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

28 February 1974

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

Dear Sotero:

Re: Land Use Planning (Unit Planning).

Doug Leisz' "to whom it may concern" letter of January 1974 on the above subject stated that, if I "would like to participate in land use planning for (the Sierra N.F.)," then I should contact you. Therefore, I am hereby doing so.

Doug's letter emphasizes "the importance of active public participation in (your) land use planning." He states that you "need and want (my) help," and that your "experience indicates that this participation (will be) most effective if it starts at the beginning of the planning activity..." (emphasis added).

I trust we all agree with this philosophy, and I look forward to an early response from you indicating how these ideas are to be implemented.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

Dave Van de Mark

5 Feb March 1974

Dear Dave:

In response to your phone calls to June Dailey and me last Sunday morning re. Siskiyou, Marble Mountains, and Yolla Bolly--Middle Eel.

I feel that your concerns are a natural outgrowth of the inadequacy of the procedures which were followed in developing the legislative proposal. Because of severe communications failures, there has been little understanding either of what we are trying to accomplish, or of what we should be trying to accomplish.

I think it has finally become fairly clear that what we are trying to do is merely get some publicity. There seems to be little thought that we will be seriously seeking passage of this legislation.

Whether this is what we should be trying to do is another matter, and one which nobody seems to be willing to discuss.

The reason I say this is to suggest that you may be taking the problems more seriously than the circumstances warrant. I would suggest that you might well adopt a more low-key approach to the problems you perceive. The reason is that this legislation apparently just is not going to make that much difference either one way or another.

I understand that you were considering telling the Redwood Chapter members that they should ignore possible additions to the Marble Mountains and Yolla Bolly--Middle Eel Wildernesses. If this is true, I would suggest that you seriously reconsider the wisdom of such action.

I have always felt that there is much to be said for getting as many people as possible interested and involved in Wilderness matters. And one of the easiest ways of doing this is to have many different projects going in different areas. That way you will increase the number of opportunities to get new people involved. And those who start out through an interest in Yolla Bolly--Middle Eel or in Marble Mountains just might end up helping you on Siskiyou, especially if you have encouraged them in their original interest.

In particular, I would urge that you not refer to Chuck Clusen's proposed omnibus in any communications you may have with either Cranston or Tunney. (It was the consensus of the Federal Lands Committee that this would be premature, and that we should wait until legislation is actually in the hopper.)

On the other hand, it seems entirely appropriate to write to the senators requesting that they introduce a bill for some particular area--just as though you were unaware of Chuck's proposal. If you want to get a campaign going for Siskiyou, that is fine. We need

more such campaigns. But, for God's sake, please don't try to promote Siskiyou by poor-mouthing other peoples' favorite areas! (Perhaps you have been misunderstood, but some people have had ~~the~~ the impression that that is what you had in mind.)

If you can get something going on Siskiyou, I would imagine the Northern California chapters would be glad to help out by running your material in their newsletters. Have you considered expanding the Siskiyou's "sphere of consciousness" by conducting trips in it for people from outside your area? I know I would be interested in seeing it, but wouldn't know how to plan my itinerary for maximum effectiveness. Have you ever put out a flyer on it? Such material could be distributed at meetings.

And of course there would be many other positive ways in which you could promote the Siskiyou. My point is that it should not be necessary to discourgae interest in other areas, and that such a negative approach would very likely be counterproductive.

I hope the gasoline situation makes it easier for you to get to our meetings in the future, and I would hope that we might be able to have meetings much farther north from time to time. But that will have to await the resolution of present uncertainties over gasoline availability.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

cc. Chuck Clasen
Marge Sill

8 March 1974

TO: Charles Magneson, Max Sherrill, Paul Heter, Jake Kirihara

FROM: George Whitmore

RE: Merced River Canyon below Briceburg

I trust you will find the attached to be of interest. Although I am not aware that the Sierra Club has ever taken a position on the bicycle trail proposal, I have seen it promoted in the Yokut ~~Acorn~~ Acorn in the past, and I have heard other friendly noises being made about it.

The enclosure casts an entirely new light on it, to my knowledge. Perhaps the Merced Group would want to check this out and come up with a recommendation. In view of the agitation for a bicycle trail, it seems as though we should be making up our minds one way or another at an early date.

I hope to hear further from you on this.

also sent the basic document, but without this
cover memo, to: Bert Woodruff (re vote re. outings)
Harold Thomas
Eileen Devine

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

12 March 1974

John A. Leasure, Supervisor
Sequoia National Forest
P. O. Box 391
Porterville
California 93257

Dear Mr. Leasure:

In accordance with the "to whom it may concern" letter which Doug Leisz sent out in January of this year, I am hereby contacting you to let you know that I "would like to participate in land use planning" for at least some of your planning units.

Listing the units in chronological sequence, I would like information on

Little Kern
Hume
Plateau
Tule
Western Divide
Kern River
Desert Mountains.

More specifically, I presume that you have developed some method of facilitating citizen involvement at fairly early stages in your planning--that is, long before you write the draft EIS. Whatever method you have devised, I certainly would appreciate being plugged in.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

12 March 1974

Gary E. Cargill, Supervisor
Stanislaus National Forest
175 South Fairview Lane
Sonora
California 95370

Dear Mr. Cargill:

In accordance with the "to whom it may concern" letter which Doug Leisz sent out in January of this year, I am hereby contacting you to let you know that I "would like to participate in land use planning" for your national forest.

More specifically, I presume that you have developed some method of facilitating citizen involvement at fairly early stages in your planning--that is, long before you write the draft EIS. Whatever method you have devised, I certainly would appreciate being plugged in.

In particular, I am curious to know the rationale behind designating the entire Stanislaus N.F. as a single planning unit. Your N.F. and the Sierra N.F. are quite noticeable as being the only ones in the California Region where this was done. Perhaps another way of phrasing the question would ~~be~~ be to ask why all the others did it differently from the way you and Mr. Muniz have done it. Whichever direction you choose to approach it from, I really would appreciate some enlightenment.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg, CA 93631

16 March 1974

John Moore

Dear John:

Comments on minutes:

p. 1

Next meeting place. Upon studying a California-Nevada road map, I have concluded that Clair Tappan is not a satisfactory place to meet. Compared to other possible locations, it is considerably more distant for everyone except those in Nevada. It would entail almost six hours of driving for us, and more than that for others. This would normally be undesirable; given the gasoline situation, it is unacceptable.

Next meeting date. May 18 or 19 preferred.

Chairmanship. / ^{Previous.} June Dailey's resignation was omitted.

New. GWW and MS are listed as "co-chairpersons."

1. I resent being called a "chairperson," as I consider it to be a sexist and demeaning term.
2. I was not aware that Marge had been re-appointed to the co-chairmanship. When did this happen? I must have sneezed at the wrong moment.

VIII.C. Management of Sequoia gigantea groves.

Our discussion should have mentioned that the resolution had been approved by both SC and NCRCC.

p. 2

III. National Parks. I don't recall any such consensus. Specifically, item B. was left hanging. No conclusion was reached, nor was any attempt made to reach one. I purposely passed over it lightly because of the sensitive nature of the issue.

p. 3

I. Federal legislation for California Wilderness areas.

The situation re. Yolla-Bolly-Middle Eel additions could be misunderstood. Our discussion should have referred to the fact that the NCRCC seemed to express considerable interest in having this area included in the legislation. At the NCRCC meeting the Redwood Chapter delegation stated their case, but ~~no~~ no one else appeared to be convinced of its validity.

It was largely as a result of this show of interest that Chuck Clusen included the area on his recommended list. (It is misleading to refer to this as a "bill." We will not have a bill until the senators introduce something, and I am confident that whatever they introduce will bear little resemblance to Chuck's proposal.)

- - - - -

Re. Your questions.

1. Sending post cards with first meeting notice.

Why don't we continue this for the time being? I have not been close enough to the operation to be able to judge its value, but expect to be able to form a judgment in due course.

2. To whom should agenda ideas be sent.
I would suggest myself.

- - - - -
Thirty additional copies of previous agenda are enclosed. I hope we can get out the Sheldon mailing soon. As I understand the situation, the deadline (ie. point beyond which letters are of no value) could occur at any moment.

- - - - -
Thanks for the work on getting unit planning information from the RO. It appears that this is quite valuable, and timely. I trust we will achieve the necessary followup.

Thank you for getting out the minutes. Also, thank you for sending Frances' rain bonnet. I guess we are going to have to leave a postage deposit and supply of pre-addressed labels with you if we are to stay at your place again. This is beginning to be embarrassing.

Sincerely,

George Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
CA 93631

29 April 1974

Jake Miller
Chairman, NCRCC

Dear Jake:

Re. reimbursement for Jim Snyder's trip to Washington to testify on Yosemite Nat'l Park wilderness legislation, and other matters, during week of 25 - 29 March.

You will recall that we discussed whether or not Jim should go and, if he did go, how his trip might be funded. This was in my phone call to you on March 18.

As a result of commitments made in this phone conversation, I had assumed that I would be responsible for seeing to it that Jim was reimbursed.

However, shortly after my return from Washington I learned that Barbara Chasteen planned to make these arrangements herself, and in fact she may already have done so.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know that the matter is out of my hands, that I have no idea what is happening or has happened, and that I am assuming that I have no further responsibility in the matter of arranging Jim Snyder's reimbursement.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

24 May 1974

Cynthia Wayburn
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund Re: Rancharia Creek, Sierra N.F.

Dear Cynthia:

In my files I have a note which I thought I should bring to your attention because of its possible relevance to the Rancharia proceedings.

This is that on June 16, 1973 the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors authorized legal action in the matter of the Cold Springs Timber Sale, Gifford Pinchot N.F., Washington.

What caught my attention is that this is "in an uninventoried roadless area of 3,200 acres immediately adjacent to the proposed southern extension of the Mount Adams Wilderness." (emphasis provided)

This appears to parallel the Rancharia situation on several counts, and might be of some interest for that reason.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

24 May 1974

Cynthia Wayburn
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund

Dear Cynthia:

Re: Rancheria Creek, Sierra N.F.

Enclosed are several items you asked for, plus some additional material.

- copy of undated letter of 31 March 1972 from Larry E. Moss to Sotero Muniz.
- summary of trips by Tehipite Chapter members into or through Rancheria area. These are recent trips only; I am sure the list could be expanded by doing further research. This is especially true of national Sierra Club outings, which I did not attempt to research at all.
- copy of article from October 1959 Summit magazine. Contains interesting remarks regarding historic interest in the area. Note the glowing description of Summit Meadow (first paragraph, second column of first page). Note also the last paragraph-- the author clearly was quite taken with the area.
- maps and sale data, including dates of public meetings at which the 5-year programs were announced and discussed. Combined with the maps which I already sent you for the current 5-year program, you now have the complete sequence of maps for the past three years.
- summary of changes in the Rancheria area sales from one 5-year program to another. Some of these changes are significant. For example the Ranspan sale has been pushed right back to the edge of the Crest Zone, after having been pulled away from it earlier. Note drastic changes in sale volumes.
- copies of maps published in back issues of Tehipite Topics. Note that road system published in the environmental analysis shows a through road connecting across the south side of the basin. We had been told this would not be done because of unstable soils, and the maps they had previously shown us indicated there would not be a through road. The significance of the maps published in the Topics is that they tend to corroborate ~~this~~ that the final plan was in excess of what we had been led to expect.

Let me know what further information I might be able to provide.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

24 May 1974

Cynthia Wayburn
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund

Re: Rancheria Creek, Sierra N.F.

Dear Cynthia:

This is to let you know that we have a relief model of the Rancheria Creek-Kings River-High Sierra Primitive Area.

It measures 34 inches by 48 inches, and has a vertical exaggeration of 1.8 to 1. Although the vertical exaggeration is rather modest, it still makes a very impressive demonstration of the ruggedness of the Kings River area.

I do not know the scale, although this could be determined.

Perhaps the model would be of some use either now or at some point in the future of the appeal process.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore

P. O. Box 485
Kingsburg
California 93631

27 June 1974

Cynthia Wayburn
Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
311 California Street, Suite 311
San Francisco
CA 94104

Re: Rancharia Creek, Sierra N.F.

Dear Cynthia,

Here is my signed and notarized affidavit.

Per our phone conversation yesterday, there are three corrections which must be inserted. These are as follows:

Page 2, paragraph 6, line 4.

"...down hill bank side of the road and appears..."
should be changed to read

"...down hill bank side of the track and appears..."

Page 3, paragraph 8, line 1.

"...consisting of about 20,000 acres..."
should be changed to read

"...consisting of about 14,000 acres..."

Page 5, paragraph 12, line 5.

"In March 1972, the Tehipite Chapter..."
should be changed to read

"In June 1971, the Tehipite Chapter..."

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the corrected affidavit for my files, so that I can destroy the copy of the uncorrected one which ~~ixxxxxxxx~~ I made as a temporary record.

I guess it goes without saying that I would also appreciate copies of the other affidavits, statements of fact, etc.

Thanks for your good help.

Sincerely,

George W. Whitmore