IN REPLY REFER TO:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR
Anchorage Region
P. O. Box 166
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

March 10, 1971

Memorandum

To: State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Alaska

From: Assistant Regional Solicitor, Anchorage

Subject: Small Tract Patent Correction - Reservation of Right-of-Way
Your Ref. No. 1860 (930), Pat. No. 1138099

You have requested our opinion as to the effect of correcting a patent as to an easement reservation where the affected lands have been subsequently subdivided so that there is now more than one fee owner.

It appears that the lands in question are Lots 45 and 46, Sec. 14, T. 6 S., R. 13 W., S.M., near Homer, and were patented on March 3, 1953, under the Small Tract Act (53 Stat. 609; 43 U.S.C. sec. 682a), with the following right-of-way reservation, to wit:

> "This patent is issued subject to a right-of-way reservation not exceeding 33 feet in width to be constructed across said land or as near as practicable to the exterior boundaries."
> (Emphasis supplied)

As you have noted, the patent appears to allow for either of the following two kinds of rights-of-way: (1) anywhere through the two-lot tract, or (2) on all four sides of such tract. You point out that the reservation is contrary to the intent disclosed by the public record developed in this case. What then does such record show with respect to such right-of-way reservation? An examination of the case file shows the following right-of-way provisions:

(1) Small Tract Classification Order No. 7 (11/24/48):

> ". . . Applications under the small tract act of June 1, 1938 shall be governed by the regulations contained in Part 257 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations."

Comment: There is no specific provision in the order for the reservation of a right-of-way for street and road purposes.

(2) Lease with Option to Purchase (5/24/49):

"That this lease is taken subject to the rights of others to cross the leased premises on, or as near as practicable to, the exterior boundaries thereof, as a means of ingress or egress to or from other lands leased under authority of this act. Whenever necessary, the Regional Administrator may make final decision as to the location of right-of-way. This lease subject to a right of way 33 feet in width on the side or sides contiguous to the quarter section lines and/or section lines."

Comment: The underscored language was typed onto the lease form and is contradictory to the printed language. The typed language, if at all meaningful, would relate to the north and south boundaries which intersect the quarter section line.

(3) Final Certificate (9/15/52):

". . . the Director, Bureau of Land Management will issue a patent subject to reservations Nos. four, six, twelve and fourteen described on the reverse side hereof . . . ."

Comment: None of the enumerated reservations relates to a right-of-way reservation under the Small Tract regulations.

If the patent in question had been issued under the present Small Tract regulations (43 CFR Part 2730), we would have to conclude that the right-of-way reservation was an improper one and that, in the absence of conflicting claims or interests or of any possible disturbance of rights, you have authority to correct it so as to conform to the following right-of-way requirement of 43 CFR 2731.6-2 (formerly 43 CFR 2233.5(b)), to wit:

"The classification order may provide for rights-of-way over each tract for street and road purposes and for public utilities. If the classification order does not so provide, the rights-of-way will be 50 feet along the boundaries of the tract." (eff. 1/15/55, Cir. 1899, 20 F.R. 366)1/

1/ With respect to the operation of 43 CFR 2731.6-2, it was said in Associate Solicitor's memorandum of August 5, 1957, to Director, BLM, re: elimination of R/W reservation from Small Tract patent, as follows:

Such authority to correct the patent would stem from the necessity of making the patent conform to the record which discloses that the applicable classification order does not provide for any rights-of-way for street and road purposes and for public utilities. Secretary's Instructions, 36 L.D. 243 (1908); and Frederick H. Barnes, 36 L.D. 202 (1907).

The patent in question, however, was not issued under the present regulations, but was issued under those contained in Circular No. 1764, published on September 16, 1950 (15 F.R. 6222). The applicable right-of-way regulation (43 CFR 257.16(c)) provided as follows:

> "Unless otherwise provided in the classification order, the leased land will be subject to a right-of-way of not to exceed 33 feet in width along the boundaries of the tract for street and road purposes and for public utilities. The location of such access streets or roads may be indicated on a working copy of the official

---

1/ Continued

"There was no actual platting out of the precise boundaries of the area set apart for public use as a right-of-way. . . . The intent of the provision in the patent, which names no specific grantee or beneficiary of the right-of-way, seems clearly to effectuate a dedication of a right-of-way for public use. . . .

"An actual platting out of the area dedicated is not necessary, if the dedicator's intent is clear. . . .

. . . .

"Under a common-law dedication, fee title lies with the owner of the land subject to the easement of the public for the use of the land. . . . In this case, the Government seems clearly to have intended to transfer all its interest in and jurisdiction over the lands as completely as if the patent had been made subject to a right-of-way in favor of a named holder of such right-of-way. . . . The Government has no legal power, therefore, except under eminent domain proceedings for some governmental purpose, to eliminate this restriction from the patent.

"Since this Department has lost all jurisdiction over the lands, any question concerning the transfer or release of rights in the patented lands would be subject to determination in the local courts under state law."

plat maintained in the land office; or where the land has been classified for lease and sale, the right-of-way may be definitely located prior or subsequent to the issuance of patents; and an appropriate clause reserving the easement for such right-of-way will be incorporated into each lease or patent."

In reviewing the specific provisions of the above regulation, including the one relating to location of the access streets and roads on a "working copy" of the official plat maintained in the land office, the Acting Assistant Solicitor has said:

". . . As stated the tracts were sold in conformity with the plats and the easement reservations have been incorporated in the patents.

"The intent and purpose of the regulations and of the procedures thereunder is to affect a dedication of the platted streets and alleys to public use, if not in accordance with local statute, at least common law. . . .

"It has long been the rule of the Department that the adoption of a townsite plat and the sale of lots by reference thereto, constitutes actual dedication to public use of the tracts or strips designated thereon as streets and alleys. Q. P. Pesman, 52 L.D. 558; Gamble v. Sault Ste. Marie, 10 L.D. 375, subject to local use and control in accordance with applicable state law; and the interest and control of the United States thereover ceases upon such dedication. See United States v. Illinois Central R.R., 154 U.S. 224, 237. The same rule applies to the sale of lots in a platted small tract area.

"In view of the Department's rule and the cited court holdings, I believe the County could proceed to improve the streets and alleys, with assurance that the easements are perpetual in nature inuring to the benefit of the public, and that the United States could not revoke them except as provided by state law. . . ." (Memorandum of Acting Assistant Solicitor to Director, BLM, approved by Associate Solicitor, Div. of Pub. Lands on May 9, 1955).

(Emphasis supplied)

The field report and maps on which Classification Order No. 7 was based indicate the intended location of the rights-of-way to be reserved from the various small tract disposals made pursuant to the order. The "working copy" of the official land office plat, which accompanied your request for the instant opinion, shows the intended location of rights-of-way for lots 45 through 53. We are informed that,

with the exception of lots 45 and 46 now under consideration, all of these lots were sold in conformity with such working copy, including the insertion in the patents of reservations describing the rights-of-way at locations shown on the working copy. Thus, the rights-of-way designated on the working copy of the platted small tract area and reserved in the patents of tracts in such area are dedicated to public use for road and public utility purposes. They are no longer under the ownership or control of the United States but are subject to local use and control in accordance with applicable state law, including the provisions thereof relating to vacation of public rights-of-way. Under Alaska state law, the procedure for vacating a street, alley, or public thoroughfare may be initiated by filing with the borough clerk a petition of the owners of the majority of the front feet of the land fronting upon the part of the street, alley, or public thoroughfare sought to be vacated (AS 40.15.140). Such procedure would entail publication for three (3) consecutive weeks of a notice of hearing on the petition to be held before the borough planning commission (AS 40.15.070, -.150,-.160).

The above-mentioned field report and working plat underlying Classification Order No. 7 and small tract disposals made thereunder indicate that the intended location of any rights-of-way across lots 45 and 46 was only a 33-foot strip along the north boundary of such lots. Notwithstanding such intended location, the tract consisting of lots 45 and 46 was, unlike other tracts on the same working plat, leased and patented in a manner completely inconsistent with such plat. Ordinarily, such an inconsistency can be corrected by issuance of another patent which is more in conformity with the record insofar as it discloses the intended location of the right-of-way. As stated by the Assistant Solicitor, Branch of Lands, in a memorandum of Oct. 28, 1958, to Mr. Nichols, Branch of Facilitating Services, BLM, re: R/W in Small Tract Patent 1157369, Nev. 02244, Garnett Myars (E-58-2099.10):

> ". . . The Department has held that where mistakes were made in the execution of patents and where it was shown that the patent did not conform to the record upon which the right was based, the Department has authority to accept a surrender thereof for the purpose of amendment. See Eddy v. University of Illinois, 14 L.D. 50; Frank L. Sullivan, 14 L.D. 389; Hans P. Hansen, 20 L.D. 376; Owens v. Killeran, 29 L.D. 160; Frederick H. Barns, 36 L.D. 202.
>
> "However, the Department in discussing its power to correct mistakes of the character in question has indicated that such corrective action cannot be taken where there are conflicting claims or interests or the proposed amendment would disturb or be destructive of any legal rights. See Secretary's Instructions, 36 L.D. 243, 246.

"As stated in the Acting Associate Solicitor's memorandum of August 5, 1957, to the Director, the intent of the rights-of-way reservations in small tract patents was to effectuate a dedication of these rights-of-way to public use. Consequently, it is my opinion that before the proposed amendment can be made, notice of such must be given to all the parties in interest in order that they may file any objections they may have. Actual notice should be given to all known parties in interest, that is, the adjoining patentees and any other known present users of these rights-of-way.

"Publication of the proposed amendment should also be made in order that any potential users of these rights-of-way such as public utilities, government bodies, etc. can have an opportunity to assert any objections they may have.

"If all the parties in interest consent to the proposed amendment, there seems to be no reason why the patent could not be amended."

If all parties in interest do not consent to the proposed amendment, then the only recourse the patentee or his successors in interest have available is to initiate the previously described proceeding under state law for the vacation of streets, alleys, or public thoroughfares (AS 40.15.140 et seq.)

In the matter at hand, we would have no reluctance in concluding that the Land Office could correct the patent to lots 45 and 46 in the manner above described by the Assistant Solicitor if both lots were owned by one and the same person. However, subsequent to patent, both lots were subdivided in an east-west direction so that the north half and south half are owned by two different persons, neither of whom is the original patentee. Therefore, if the established BLM procedure implementing the Assistant Solicitor's opinion, supra, were to be followed (i.e., surrender of original patent, separate reconveyances from owners of N 1/2 and S 1/2 of tract, and evidence of clear titles to both parcels), it would be impossible to issue a corrected patent for the entire original tract to either owner without destroying the proprietary rights of the other owner in the half tract reconveyed by him. Similarly, the property rights of both owners in their respective parcels would be diminished by a corrected patent to them jointly since each would be a tenant in common in the whole original tract and to that extent have an undivided one-half interest in the half tract reconveyed by the other owner. Since the proposed patent correction would "disturb or be destructive" of the property rights of one or both of the owners of the north and south halves of the tract originally patented, such corrective action cannot be taken so as to render the

patent more conformable to the record insofar as it indicates the proper location of the right-of-way to be reserved. Secretary's Instructions, 36 L.D. 243, 246 (1908). In the absence of BLM's authority to make a patent correction, either or both of such parcel owners will have to avail themselves of the previously described remedy under State law (AS 40.15.140 et seq.) for vacating all or a portion of the rights-of-way reserved in the patent to lots 45 and 46.

If there is no opposition from adjoining landowners or others who may be actual or potential users of the reserved rights-of-way across or along the outside boundaries of lots 45 and 46, it would appear quite possible that the costs of vacating all or a portion of such rights-of-way in the manner prescribed by State law would be less expensive than the costs of obtaining a patent correction (if it were possible) in the manner prescribed by BLM for implementing the Assistant Solicitor's opinion, supra. The State procedure requires publication for three consecutive weeks and the BLM procedure requires publication for five consecutive weeks. Under the State procedure, it may be quite possible to selectively vacate in such a way as to obviate any controversy with other interested parties (e.g., vacate rights-of-way through the interior of the tract but not along the boundaries). In such event, the necessity for extensive legal services may be greatly minimized. The State procedure will result in a determination which is binding on all interested parties; whereas, the BLM procedure merely apprises the BLM as to whether there might be objections involving factual questions over which it has no jurisdiction, and does not in any way bind non-objecting interested parties to recognize the validity of the patent correction after it has been made. In order to clear title of an unwanted right-of-way encumbrance, the most assured way of binding all interested parties to such a clearance is by following the procedure above described under State law for vacation of streets, alleys, and public thoroughfares. This method has been used quite frequently in eliminating rights-of-way reserved in small tract patents. For examples, see attached legal notices.

In summary, it is concluded that (1) the patent to lots 45 and 46 cannot be corrected by BLM so as to reflect that the intended right-of-way reservation was to be located along the north boundary of such lots, and that (2) the remedy for terminating all or a portion of any rights-of-way which were mistakenly included in the patent is to initiate and complete proceedings under State law for the vacation of streets, alleys, and public thoroughfares (AS 40.15.140-.180).

If you need any further assistance in this matter, please so advise.

James R. Mothershead

James R. Mothershead

Enclosure:
BLM file for Pat. No. 1138099

Legal Notice

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

On Wednesday, March 17, 1971, the Greater Anchorage Area Borough Platting Board (Planning and Zoning Commission) will hold public hearings at 7:30 P.M. in the Board Room of the Anchorage Borough School District Administration Building, 670 Fireweed Lane, Anchorage, Alaska (near Arctic Boulevard) to consider the following:

A petition of Francis A. and Gertie Andersen, and Alex D. and Muriel Combs, received February 1, 1971, for the vacation (elimination) of the east 20 feet and the west 20 feet of a 100-foot right-of-way reserved by BLM patent between Section Lot 30 on the west, and Section Lots 31 and 32 on the east, SE¼ of Section 2, T12N, R4W, S.M., Alaska and the resubdivision of Section Lots 28, 30, 31 and 32 in Section 2, T12N, R4W, S.M., Alaska (located east of Arlene Street and north of West 72nd Avenue). S-2238

A petition of Don E. Norman and H. Dean Briske, received February 16, 1971 for the vacation (elimination) of a 33-foot BLM patent road reservation along the west property line of Section Lots 1 and 8, the vacation of approximately the westerly 140 feet of East 34th Avenue in Glenn-Don Subdivision and the adjacent 3-foot road reservation along the south side of the westerly 140 feet of East 34th Avenue in Glenn-Don Subdivision, and vacation of the adjacent 33-foot reservation in Section Lot 8 along the north side of the westerly 140 feet of East 34th Avenue; the subdivision of Section Lots 1 and 8 in the NW¼ of Section 26, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska, and the resubdivision of Lots 1 and 2, Glenn-Don Subdivision, NW¼ of Section 26, T12N, R3W, S.M., Alaska (located between East 32nd Avenue and Tudor Road west of Campbell Field Road.) S-2263

A petition of Louie and Milanka Gavrilovich, received February 11, 1971, for the resubdivision of Lots 8 and 9, Block 14, College Village Subdivision, Addition No. 9, NE¼ of Section 29, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska (located on the east side of Princeton Way and north of East 36th Avenue) S-2250

A petition of G&V Developers, received February 11, 1971, for the resubdivision of Lots 1 and 2, Block 13, Castle Heights Subdivision, Addition No. 3, SE¼ of Section 27, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska (located at the northwest corner of Tudor Road and Checkmate Drive, west of Boniface Parkway). S-2251

A petition of Clapper and Thiel Developments, Inc., and the Baptist General Conference, received February 17, 1971, for the resubdivision of Whispering Pines Subdivision, Unit No. 1, and a parcel approximately 158 feet by 200 feet south of Lot 6 and east of Lot 5, Block 1, Whispering Pines Subdivision, Unit No. 1, SE¼ of Section 3, T12N, R4W, S.M., Alaska (located west of Jewel Lake Road and south of West 72nd Avenue). S-2264

A petition of Golden North Developers, received February 17, 1971, for the resubdivision of a portion of Blocks 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, Emerald Hills Subdivision, SW¼ of Section 12, T12N, R4W, S.M. Alaska (located north of Dimond Blvd. and east of Northwood St.). S-2267

A petition of G&V Developers received February 11, 1971, for the resubdivision of Lots 14 and 15, Block 14, Castle Heights Subdivision, Addition No. 3, SE¼ of Section 27, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska (located at the northwest corner of Boniface Parkway and East 42nd Avenue). S-2249

Planning Department
Greater Anchorage Area
Borough

P. O. No. 01024
Publish March 1, 8 and 15, 1971
Legal Notice No. 7026

Purchasing Director

DATED: February 16, 1971
PUBLISH: February 17, 22, 25, 1971
Legal Notice No. 7003
Purchase order No. 25907

INVITATION TO BID

Sealed bids for the construction of TWO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS to be built at Palmer and Wasilla, Alaska, will be received by the Mat-Su Borough School District at the Board Room, Palmer High School, Palmer, Alaska, until 8:00 p.m. (Alaska Standard Time), March 9, 1971, and then publicly opened and read aloud.

The contract will require complete construction of two buildings comprising 29,903 and 46,192 square feet of floor area respectively plus fan rooms and associated site development. The buildings may be bid jointly or severally.

Plans, specifications and contract documents may be examined at the offices of: Kenneth Maynard, Architect 746 'F' Street, Anchorage, Alaska; Associated General Contractors 1515 Tudor Road, Anchorage, tors, 3451 Airport Way, Fairbanks, Alaska; Construction Plan Bureau, 801 Barnette St., Fairbanks, Alaska; Associated General Contractors, 1200 Westlake Ave., N. Seattle, Washington; The Plan Bureau, 824 5th Avenue N, Seattle, Washington; SCAN, 5815 6th Avenue S, Seattle, Washington; The Superintendent of Schools, Mat-Su Borough School District, Palmer High School, Palmer, Alaska; Associated General Contractors, 38th & Pine, Tacoma, Washington.

Copies of the documents may be obtained from Kenneth Maynard, Architect by depositing $50.00 per set (Checks to be made payable to Kenneth Maynard, Architect). Upon request, sets of documents will be sent by air parcel post upon receipt of deposit, and $8.00 of the deposit will be withheld to cover mailing and handling costs. Each deposit, or the balance thereof, will be refunded if the documents are returned prepaid and in good condition within 15 days of bid opening. Failure to return documents on time will result in forfeiture of deposit.

Each bidder will be required to submit copies of his current Alaska Business License and Alaska Certificate of Registration. A postal money order, cashiers check, certified check or bank draft, payable to The Matanuska-Susitna Borough, or satisfactory Bid Bond, executed in the amount of 5% of Base Bid shall be submitted with each bid.

The successful bidder will be required to furnish a Contract Performance and Payment Bond in the amount of 100% (one hundred percent) of the contract sum.

The right is reserved to waive any informality in, or to reject any or all bids. No bid shall be withdrawn for a period of 30 (thirty) days subsequent to the opening of the bids without the consent of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly.

Sealed envelopes containing bids must be marked in the lower left-hand corner: BID FOR IDITAROD and / or PIONEER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. Address envelopes to:

MR. V. PAGE, SUPERINTENDENT
MAT-SU BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
BOX AB, PALMER, ALASKA.

Publish: Feb. 11, 12, 15, 18, 22 & 25; Mar. 2, 1971
Legal Notice No. 6092

Plaintiff against the above named defendant in the original amount of $7,773.40 and on which there now re[illegible]s owing the sum of $7,773.40.

(1) I have levied upon all the right, title and interest of said defendant in and to the following described property:

Lot 1 of the land embraced in U. S. Survey No. 3466 situated 2¼ miles northeast of Kodiak, Alaska, in the Kodiak Recording District, Third District, State of Alaska.

(2) In order to satisfy said execution, together with interest and costs thereon, I will sell said property to the highest bidder for cash at Judicial Services Alaska State Troopers Office, 941 Fourth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, on the 5th day of March, 1971, at the hour of 1:30 P.M.

DATED: January 27, 1971.

EMERY W. CHAPPLE, JR.
Commissioner
Department of Public Safety

By Cpl. Norwood A. Long No. 14

Publish: Feb. 1, 8, 15 & 22, 1971.
Legal Notice No. 6071

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

On Wednesday, March 3, 1971, the Greater Anchorage Area Borough Platting Board (Planning and Zoning Commission) will hold public hearings at 7:00 P.M. in the Board Room of the Anchorage Borough School District Administration Building, 670 Fireweed Lane, Anchorage, Alaska (near Arctic Boulevard) to consider the following:

A petition received February 1, 1971 from the Congregation for Jehovah's Witnesses, owner of Lot, 44, Jack N. Parret, owner of Lot 43, Clifford Hartman, owner of Lot 53, and Mrs. Omega Abraham, owner of Lot 54, for the vacation (elimination) of a BLM patent road reservation along the east property line of Section Lots 44 and 53, and along the south property line of Section Lot 44, and for the resubdivision of Section Lots 44 and 53, NW¼ of Section 33, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska (located between East 48th and East 50th Avenues between Laurel and Folker Streets). S-2239

A Petition of George Hammond, received January 27, 1971, for the resubdivision of Lots 10, 11 and 12, Block M, Newland Subdivision, SW¼, Section 7, T12N, S.M., Alaska (located between West 86th and West 87th Avenues, east of Vernon Street). S-2233

A petition of Glen and Mary Tuttle, received February 1, 1971, for the resubdivision of the E½ of Lot 11, William Lloyd Subdivision, NW¼, Section 14, T12N, R4W, S.M., Alaska (located south of Dimond Boulevard between Blackberry and Cranberry Streets). S-2234

A petition of Collegegate, Inc., received February 2, 1971, for the resubdivision of BLM Lots 49, 50, 63 and 64, SE¼, Section 22, T13N, R3W, S.M., Alaska, located at the Northwest corner of East Northern Lights Boulevard and Boniface Parkway). S-2242

Planning Department
Greater Anchorage Area Borough

Publish: Feb. 15 and 22, and March 1, 1971
P. O. No. 00787
Legal Notice No. 6090

by the plaintiff.

This is an action for divorce.

The relief demand[illegible]s an absolute decree of divo[illegible] child custody for plaintiff and child support from defendant.

You have been made a party to this action because you are the husband of plaintiff herein and because this is an action for divorce.

DATED this 11th day of December, 1970.

A.M. Vokacek
Clerk of the Superior Court
By: Marilyn Ray-Deputy

Publish: Feb. 1, 8, 15, 22, 1971
Legal Notice No. 6072

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT
FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ANNIE JACOY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICHARD MORGAN JACOY,

Defendant.

No. 70-3454

NOTICE TO ABSENT DEFENDANT

TO: RICHARD MORGAN JACOY

YOU, a defendant in the above-entitled action, are hereby summoned and required to serve upon ALAN G. SHERRY, whose address is Alaska Legal Services Corporation, 308 "G" Street, Suite 313, Anchorage, Alaska, an answer to the complaint filed in the above-entitled action. If you fail to do so within thirty (30) days of the last publication of this notice, judgment by default may be rendered against you for the relief demanded by the plaintiff.

This is an action for divorce.

The relief demanded is a decree of divorce, and custody and support of minor children of the parties.

You have been made a party to this action because of your marriage to the plaintiff on January 12, 1967 at Anchorage, Alaska.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this the 19th day of January, 1971.
A.M. VOKACEK,
Clerk of Superior Court

(Seal) By S. Schaefer
Deputy Clerk

Publish: Feb. 8, 15, 22, March 1, 1971
Legal Notice No. 6086

Classified Office Hours
Monday thru Friday
8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Saturday 8 a.m. - 5 p.m.

Run 3 lines (approx. 10-14 words)

For 4 days	$1.80
For 7 days	$2.55
For 10 days	$3.15
For 1 month	$6.75

- Deadline for Ordering Ads To Appear the following day: 12 noon.

ings of 10%.

- Deadline for can[illegible] Ads: 12 noon day p[illegible] ing publication.

Please check your a[illegible] first day it appears. If a[illegible] take has been made, yo[illegible] will be scheduled one [illegible] day without additional c[illegible] cepts responsibility for [illegible] one incorrect insertion [illegible] only to the extent of [illegible] the ad requires.

- Classified Display Dea[illegible] —12 noon Two Days to Publication.

1. Homes For Sale

BANNER HOMES
EXCLUSIVELY
CHESTER HEIGHTS
333-6877

DUPLEX
New, 2 bedrooms each side, car[illegible] W/W carpeting, fireplace, gas [illegible] Close to College Gate Sub. [illegible] financing. Will consider land [illegible] as down. 272-5692 days, 279-[illegible] after 5.

SHENNUM AGENCY
REAL ESTATE & INSURANCE
279-0414 5206 Arctic B[illegible]

PUG DAVIS & ASSOC.
Real Estate & Insurance
423 G St. 279-[illegible]

LOVELY 3-bedroom ranch, 1½ b[illegible] family room, W/W carpeting, [illegible] tached garage. 321 Ray Street. [illegible] 6000.

WILL PAY
CASH
FOR your equity in home, escrow [illegible] contract. Call:
523 W. 8th 272-7[illegible]
METROPOLITAN MORTGA[illegible]

SPENARD REALTY
2300 Spenard Road 272-[illegible]

HOME listings wanted in Roger's P[illegible] Have buyers willing and able. [illegible] Realty, 272-3581.

DO YOU need Tenant for Hous[illegible] Apartment — Office — Warehou[illegible]
CONSOLIDATED REALTY
277-7100 25 yrs. 272-[illegible]

CUSTOM home, 4-bedroom, 14'X26' sunken living room, [illegible]thedral ceiling, 2 baths, 26'X30' [illegible] room with wet bar, 2 firep[illegible] custom kitchen, utility room, [illegible] heated garage, completely f[illegible] yard. 333-4836.

DOW
REAL ESTATE
Alaska's Oldest
Brokerage Agency
505 W. No. Lights 277-3[illegible]
HEAR THIS! HEAR TH[illegible]
WE ARE SELLING!
TIRED OF WAITING FO[illegible]
BUYER — IF YOU WAN[illegible]
IT SOLD BE BOLD
CALL DOW NOW!