

May 3, 2011

Ms. Keta Kosman
Editor
Madison's Canadian Lumber Reporter
P.O. Box 2486
Vancouver, BC
V6B 3W7

Sent by email: madrep@direct.ca

Dear Ms. Kosman,

I am writing to clarify a number of statements that were attributed to me in your article of April 29th. I believe that one of the key issues that arises is that in our conversation we spoke of forest practices – yet in the article you refer to forest health and forest practices as if they were the same issue. As well, there are a number of statements which you have attributed to me as quoted which I simply did not make.

I will go through each of the statements that I believe should be clarified:

- i) ***“There are ways of measuring forest health, there is compliance and enforcement on the part of government”*** I was referring to forest practices here.. So the statement should have read *“There are ways of measuring forest practices,etc.*
- ii) ***“When looking at the numbers, claims of poor forest health and poor practices are not supported”***. Again, the reference to poor forest health does not belong in the sentence.
- iii) ***“Tenure changes last year are another issue”***. I believe we spoke about tenure, and the way it is structured, and how the different structures can effect forest stewardship.
- iv) ***“There is currently no check by government on a tenure holders obligation to uphold FRPA”***. There is an open ended quote and it is implied that I made this statement. In fact, I did not make the statement as the Compliance and Enforcement Branch of MFLNRO is the branch charged with checking to ensure that tenure holders do uphold their obligations under FRPA.

- v) ***“Foresters provide three options to the tenure holders,...”*** I believe what I said was, for example, our members might provide three different options to tenure holders. Our members provide various options but there is no rule that three options are what they provide.
- vi) ***“In these cases there is no check by the government into forest health”*** I believe we were speaking about whether or not the government ever looked into what choices were made by the tenure holder. I believe I explained that tenure holders needed to be concerned about their obligations under FRPA. Government looks at whether the results and strategies that tenure holders propose are achieving the objectives set by government for stewardship on the forest landscape.
- vii) ***“If the government wants the land to look different then it needs to tell the tenure holders to invest in their financial responsibility”***. I believe what I said was that *“If the government wants the land to look differently, then it needs to change the objectives that are set for the land.* One concern we have is the lack of tactical planning to coordinate the resource work on the ground. We have advocated for a land based management approach to planning. What is needed is land-based management which will provide a clear understanding of the objectives that will achieve a vision for Crown land. In order for the vision to be delivered and carried out, these objectives must be in place and implemented across the province.

I would like to request that these changes be reflected in a corrections section of your next issue so that readers have a clear understanding of what was said.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sharon L. Glover', written in a cursive style.

Sharon L. Glover
Chief Executive Officer