

Ranger,

Thank you for sending me your article as requested and thank you for the acknowledgement at the end. However, I do take issue with your having sent it out without knowing the full story. Your points could have been made just as well by referring to us a local store without naming us.

As soon as our telecon was over I went to the tackle manager's office and saw that he has 39 fishing rods in various stages of being processed for return to their respective vendors.

I also advised the manager that I wanted his entire staff in my office this morning at 8:00 AM for a meeting. The results of that meeting are as follows.

Three of our staff remember this incident clearly.

One of them was on the creek bank fishing on his own time and heard the whole thing, but chose not to intervene, believing that the people at the store would handle it .

The first person your fisher talked to was our newest employee in the department, He did not refuse to take back the rod. He simply told the customer that he was unsure of what to do but that the department manager would be back in an hour to take care of him. The customer left the rod with the associate, then went back to the stream and told his version of the story up and down the stream bank, apparently more interested in being the center of attention for a few minutes than telling the truth about what happened at the store.

When he later returned to the store, the rod was replaced. At that time, the third associate who remembered the incident also pointed out that this particular rod was too light for combat fishing for chum. The customer then related that he knew that but had loaned his other beefier rod to his friend.

So, the impression your article leaves with readers is inaccurate.. I

wish that you had allowed us to investigate this incident before you put it out to the world however remote your constituency.

Thank You