

Claude Boisvert wrote:  
Hello Kevin;  
Thanks for the update.

Claude's Question:

1. *What does "we have to move to next level of consultation" mean as far as the committee that has been meeting on this issue?*

Kevin D. Answer:

**The original intent of this committee was to discuss means of further consultation after the application was submitted and/or approved. However, at the outset of the first meeting it quickly became a forum to discuss details of the plan. While we received excellent input into some of the components of the application, it got mired down in the debate of who should be applying DoS or SCR D, what is consultation and no watersheds. We now should look at developing a advisory process that will be used to further develop how the business operates and manages the forest that includes representation from all stakeholders so they can talk substantively without getting mired in arguments or positions.**

Claude's Question:

2. *Is there another meeting scheduled with this same group, of which I was a participant?*

Kevin D. Answer:

**There will be no meeting Tuesday.**

Claude's Question:

3. *Who are those being consulted when you move on to "next level"?*

Kevin D. Answer:

**"We" have to sit down and discuss how we will ensure that a consultation meeting just does not represent those who turn up for meetings, but identifies all the stakeholders and how they would be represented.**

Claude's Question:

4. *After reading the Reporter, the proposal seems to be drawing a fair bit of flack with regards to the watershed being included in the proposal. Is the SCR D going to insist the watershed be removed before giving their blessing, or do you sense they may see this as an opportunity to gain a measure of control over the area? (This last point seems to be vigorously contested in the press by the Sunshine Coast Conservation Association.)*

Kevin D. Answer:

**The Sunshine Coast has a history of people who rightfully or wrongfully oppose change. We think that a CFT has more management control over forest resources than either BC Timber Sales or other licensees because it is an area based tenure. Not only that, the directors are appointed by a publicly elected body and the public itself. To some people that may mean that they will lose the ability to use certain portions of the forests as a means to achieve other objectives.**