

Community Forest Public Information Sessions Summary

Sandspit Thursday March 24

Public Attendance – 21

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Does Community mean Haida, Non-Haida or both?”

- This question came up a couple of times at the beginning of the meeting. There was some skepticism that the support of a community forest from CHN would mean another advantage for Haida but not for non-Haida island residents.

“Locals should have first opportunity to bid on blocks.”

- The idea that cut blocks should be sold to local operators and not off-island harvesters was a recurring point throughout the meeting.

“A need for smaller cut blocks geared towards local manufacturing.”

- Again, the need to supply local manufacturers and other value-added operations was a key point brought up by locals.

“There should be a push to keep timber on island to provide opportunities for local operations.”

- A concern over a loss of jobs and a declining population in Sandspit and the effect both have on future generations was widely shared among the attending group.

“Who will be in charge of reforestation?”

- Another concern voiced at the meeting was the reforestation of the proposed Community Forest. More precisely, who will manage and pay for the reforestation. By what method will it be done? Will it be put to bid to local and non-local companies?

“Sandspit is a small community that is shrinking and has little to no infrastructure.”

- The concern from the community had to do with current forestry practices, what they do for the local economy and quality of life, the costs and work involved in maintaining current infrastructure and creating new infrastructure. How a community forest would influence these concerns was voiced on many occasions during the meeting.

“Virtually all labor from harvesting done by locals.”

- Some attendees noted that even though non-local companies do a lot of the harvesting, it is still local workers doing the actual harvesting.

“Will the Community Forest build the community and attract new people?”

- Many attendees were curious about how a Community Forest would attract new business and people to their community.

“Concern that proposed areas prohibit bids from small local operations.”

- Here, the feeling was that the areas proposed at the meeting were too isolated or difficult to get to which would prevent smaller, local operators from being able to access those areas. They would not be able to afford the infrastructure (roads) to be able to access those areas which in turn would limit their ability to bid on those cut blocks.

“Community Forest should concentrate on direct benefits to locals.”

- The attendees generally felt that a Community Forest should focus on delivering benefits to the local communities. These benefits should include access to timber for operators and consumers and creation of jobs and income.

“Evaluation of cut block to harvest – 1 to 2 years (unforeseen changes could occur in this time and affect harvest.)”

- Concern was raised over time scales from harvest feasibility to actual harvest. Because the time from identifying harvestable timber to actual harvesting could range from 1 to 2 years, market price changes and operating costs could fluctuate to the point where small operators would be placed in difficult financial situations. There was some discussion that a Community Forest Management Plan should incorporate ways of protecting the smaller operators from these concerns.

“Strong local need for a community operated log yard.”

- This was an almost unanimous feeling among the attendees in all locations. The Community Forest should provide for the community a log sort for locals to come and purchase local timber. There were suggestions that a log yard could also include firewood.

“Community wants guaranteed jobs and opportunities.”

- Again, this was a very vocalized concern. Any Community Forest Model should provide jobs, and perhaps more importantly, opportunities for locals to have access to logs for value-added purposes.

“Status of Peel Inlet Road? A lot of industrial and local interest in keeping road maintained.”

- The question of road infrastructure and maintenance was raised throughout the meeting. Would a Community Forest provide a way of maintaining these roads for harvesting purposes as well as recreational purposes?

“Strong local concern for plans for harvesting byproduct/waste.”

- Would a Community Forest address the issue of the current timber byproduct left behind on cut blocks? Would a Community Forest allow for locals to access this byproduct and use in ways that would benefit them?

“Wood lot for local sales and firewood opportunities.”

- As discussed previously, the idea of a wood lot for local sales of logs and perhaps other opportunities such as firewood came up often.

“Local contractors want access to salvage.”

- Local contractors felt they could benefit from being able to access wood left behind on cut blocks. Could the Community Forest Management Plan allow for this?

“Concern over waste and whether it can be reclaimed for economic benefits.”

“Who will maintain and control logging roads?”

- How will a Community Forest Management Plan deal with this?

“A need to diversify local economy.”

- Many people in the group voiced a concern over their community being so dependent on timber harvesting as their only, or main source of income. They wanted to know how or if a Community Forest would help diversify their economy.

“Interest in salvage opportunities in Cumshewa Head.”

- Could the Community Forest Area Tenure include Cumshewa Head or salvage opportunities in this area?

“Concern for conservancy.”

- Would a Community Forest Management Plan allow for restricting access to areas that a community felt should not be logged?

“Should be local input for optimum logging locations.”

- There was a lot of discussion that the communities and their members should have a greater say over which areas should be included in the Community Forest.

“Innovation and research.”

- The Community Forest generated revenue should allow for some research into innovative forestry practices.

“Is there money available from ATHLII Trust for forestry road maintenance?”

From a follow up meeting with Doug Gould (Sandspit)

- Get decent maps of individual Community Forest cut blocks.
- Wants block access for Community Forest to provide for local loggers with work when other, off-island companies are not logging.
- Requesting 120,000m³ per year.
- “Ecologically Based Management (EBM) is killing us.”
- Concerns over road maintenance, infrastructure and drainage.
- Put the “controversial” stuff in the community’s lap.
- Problem with “selective logging” is access – works better in a second growth forest.
- Need forest renewal money to keep local crews working.
- Proposes good mechanized de-limbing for invigorating growth of forests.
- Look into more innovative forestry techniques.
- Aerial nitrogen fertilization.
- Concern over long-term strategies and practices.
- When negotiating the area-based tenure, stress the importance of access for local benefits.
- Lean on Husby and Taan to provide local jobs.
- Look at the past forestry practices of Western Forest Products.

Old Masset
Public attendance – 4

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Can we get Husby off island? (Or at least out of Collison point?)”

- The area of Collison Point was brought up many times. There was anger that Husby had the rights to log this area. Those in attendance felt this area was extremely important to the Haida for both it's cedar and it's medicinal plants.

“Strong distrust of MIEDS and BCTS”

- Both BCTS and MIEDS (Go Haida Gwaii) elicited feeling of distrust among the attendees. There was a voiced concern that both of these organizations would be operating with their own interests in mind and not the interests of the communities on Haida Gwaii. It was not clear where these feeling were originating.

“Strong feeling that Old Masset does not currently benefit from any logging on island.”

- Those in attendance voiced their concern that in the current model, logging on Haida Gwaii has no financial or economical benefit to Old Masset. They also do not benefit in terms of access to local timber and timber products. There was skepticism that a Community Forest would change this.

“What are we ultimately working towards?”

- The attendees wanted to know more about what ultimate vision does a Community Forest hold for Haida Gwaii and Old Masset.

“Concern over availability of cedar and cultural wood.”

- It was made clear by the attendees the importance and value of cultural timber products to Old Masset. Would a Community Forest address this need and there access to these products?

“Want to see more local milling options for local companies and the public.”

- Again, the issue of providing timber for local milling and other value-added endeavors was raised.

“What Community Forest model will help encourage local milling and manufacturing?”

- Wanted to know details of how a Community Forest would address these issues.

“What method will be used to hold loggers accountable to the standards set out in the Community Forest management plan?”

- Accountability of operators and the standards set by the communities in the Community Forest Management Plan were a big issue voiced by all the attendees from Old Masset.

“Interest in being able to track wood from Community Forest to its eventual use.”

- This concern was address by the representative from BCTS. The tracking of timber from harvest to end-use is currently tracks by BCTS.

“Want Community Forest management model to be driven by community input.”

- There was a strong emphasis that input by the residents of Old Masset was essential to the success of a Community Forest.

“Want more area in Community Forest tenure to come from Collison Point.”

- Collison Point contains a diverse and special inventory for the people of Old Masset and should be represented in the proposed area tenure for a Community Forest.

Village of Masset

Public attendance – 15

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Interest in whether there can be an increase in category 2 licensing for local milling.”

- Representatives from Abfam enterprises voiced a strong concern for supplying local mills with affordable timber to process locally. Although a category 2 license stipulates milling within the province of BC, the representatives want to see a Community Forest Management Plan that address the need for some portion of locally harvested timber be mandated to stay on island for local milling.

“Confusion over relationship between MIEDS and CHN.”

- There was confusion among some of the attendees over the relationship between MIEDS and CHN as it relates to a Community Forest. The relationship was clarified to that of a supporting role by the CHN for a Community Forest as opposed to working relationship between MIEDS and the CHN.

“What percentage of harvest will stay on island?”

- Again, there was a request from the attendees that there be a mandate written into the Community Forest Management Plan that a certain percentage of the timber harvested out of the Community Forest stay on island for local milling.

“Who will get to cut it?”

- The perception by the attendees was that a Community Forest would be accessible to local operators for local use only. Allowing non-local operators the right to bid on cut blocks within the community forest was a violation of their perception of a community forest.

“Can’t compete with off island sales and volume.”

- The concern with allowing off-island operators to bid on community forest cut blocks allowed for an unfair advantage as the off-island operators were much larger companies and could underbid local companies.

“Concern over high cost of road development.”

- How would the proposed “hard to access” portions of the community forest be made accessible to locals? Who would pay for the construction and maintenance of logging roads?

“Cost of freight/shipping too high to support local milling.”

- How would a community forest address the issue of high shipping costs to Haida Gwaii and the disadvantages that these costs pose to local saw millers?

“How will small operators afford to ship product to Vancouver?”

- Would a Community Forest Management Plan outline ways to help local operators competitively ship their product to Vancouver and other area in BC?

“Need changes to how we access logs to stimulate secondary manufacturing.”

- This concern was related to accessing isolated cut blocks, and making local timber available to local mills and other value-added operations.

“Better and more affordable access to timber.”

- Specifically, the Community Forest should reflect better access in terms of location and road infrastructure.

“Companies with forest licenses need to change their forestry practices.”

- How can a Community Forest help set an example for logging operators to change their logging practices to address the issues of long-term logging sustainability?

“Need to supply local mills not Vancouver mills.”

- The Community Forest Management Plan needs to include policies that ensure support of local mills as opposed to off-island mills.

“Local mills currently buy logs at Vancouver prices less barging costs.”

- This cost saving still does not allow local mills to be competitive. There needs to be a greater financial incentive for supporting local manufacturing of local timber.

“Why should Masset pay Howe Sound prices for logs?”

- Can a Community Forest Management Plan provide ways for local value-added operations to access locally harvested timber at “better than” Howe Sound Prices?

“Logs to sawmill at logging costs plus 10%.”

- Attendees put this simple equation forth as a guide for an equitable pricing system for locals.

“Something in Category 2 license designed to encourage on-island milling (Tariff?)”

- A suggestion put forth by some attendees.

“Log sorts for locals.”

- A common theme heard in all communities. Providing a log sort for locals to buy local timber and possibly other products such as firewood.

“BCTS – can they change? How?”

- Stemming from skepticism based on previous dealing by BCTS from locals, the concept was raised that BCTS could change how they operate to support more local use of the proposed Community Forest. The representative from BCTS was unable to comment on this specifically but did comment that it could be possible to work towards some changes.

“Local mills would need 5-8% of AAC to operate at sustainable capacity.”

- This number was provided by the representatives from Abfam. It was unclear whether the number reflected keeping only the Abfam mill running or if it included other on-island milling operations.

“Timber sales have to be productive.”

- A Community Forest would need to predictably produce timber sales to sustain jobs and communities.

“Cost of manufacturing much higher on Haida Gwaii.”

- Haida Gwaii’s isolation and high shipping costs mean manufacturing costs here are also higher. How would a Community Forest Management Plan address these higher costs when trying to increase local manufacturing?

“50 – 60 thousand m3 would support local milling across Haida Gwaii.”

- Another number put forth by attendees as a guide to supporting local manufacturing.

Skidegate

Public Attendance – 10

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Relationship between CHN and BCTS for Community Forest not yet clearly defined.”

“50/50 revenue split not good enough. Higher revenue split should go to the islands.”

- There was dissatisfaction from attendees that there should be a 50/50 split in revenue with BCTS. Attendees felt that there should be a much larger portion of the revenue going to the communities.

Sonya – Old Masset Councilor – “Why wasn’t Taan consulted? What is Old Masset’s position on revenue sharing? There is no official position from Old Masset.”

- Sonya from Old Masset voiced concerns over the exclusion of Taan from the Community Forest Consultation process. She was also concerned about what percentage of revenues generated from a Community Forest would go directly to Old Masset.

“Too difficult for BCTS and Taan to work together (historically.)”

- A common theme in all communities was a historically based distrust of BCTS.

“BCTS needs the model of auctioning timber sales. They are required to set market price for stumpage fees.”

- The representative from BCTS iterated the need to collect data in order to determine and set stumpage fees. This was in response to the concerns raised previously with dealing with BCTS, or why there needed to be a partnership with BCTS.

“A lot of concern over potentially problematic harvesting in the Honna unit from Queen Charlotte to Miller Creek.”

- The concern raised was whether there was any harvestable timber in the area, the affect any harvesting would have on the stability of the terrain and the close proximity of the area to populated areas (view-scape.)

“Will the Community Forest area tenure have no-go zones?”

- Would the proposed Community Forest include areas that would be exempt from logging? Would there be the ability within the Management Plan to designate areas as un-loggable?

“Teal-Jones was tasked with creating a watershed advisory board – could a Community Forest Management Plan serve to protect these watersheds?”

- As currently proposed, would there be room within the Community Forest and the Community Forest Management Plan to have a viable public process to protect these watersheds or to create committees to manage these watersheds?

“Concerns regarding – geomorphic stability, view-scape and water quality.”

- Referring to the Honna Unit specifically, there was discussion as to how a Community Forest would address issues of geomorphic stability, view-scape and water quality. Would these issues take precedence over harvesting?

“Where are the cedar stewardship areas?”

- There was a request to have cedar stewardship areas highlighted in the proposed Community Forest Areas Tenure highlighted.

“How will the THLB change as better DATA comes in?”

- The question focused on whether the THLB would increase or decrease and how would the DATA support the decision.

“Need a map that provides more detail.”

- This was regularly brought up. The map that was provided to attendees was lacking in detail. Requests were made for better maps that would provide more detail of the areas being proposed by BCTS.

“Access to top quality cedar for locals very important.”

- The concern here was that the inventory for high-grade cedar was in decline and that locals should get access to cedar through a Community Forest.

Sonya – “Are there meetings directed toward community leadership?”

- This question was directed more toward the authorship of a Community Forest Management Plan and whether there would be acceptable levels of community input towards the creation of the plan.

Sonya – “1/7th or revenue split to Old Masset is inappropriate.”

- An interpretation of the proposed Community Forest Model of “All communities receiving a 1/7th share of the revenue generated by the Community Forest was premature and inaccurate. The current proposal has MIEDS and BCTS sharing the revenue 50/50 with this figure and how the money gets divided among the communities very much open to negotiation.

“Who will be paying for bridges and roads?”

- A common concern in all the communities.

“Who gets the bill for “timber sales” that don’t sell?”

Sonya – “A better understanding of who does what would be helpful.”

- A more detailed description of the roles people and communities play in the development of a Community Forest Management Plan was not the point of the meetings. Such discussions would take place at a later date.

“Will the Community Forest be just about logging and nothing else?”

- The concern here was that traditionally, a community forest focuses on the immediately adjacent communities, leaving the question of “How to use a community forest?” up to the communities

themselves. The Community Forest as proposed on Haida Gwaii has an emphasis on harvesting with revenues going to the communities of Haida Gwaii.

**Port Clements Village Council
Public Attendance –**

Comments and questions from the attending public

“50/50 not high enough for CHN and communities.”

- Common theme from all the meetings

“Forestry Management Principals should direct how the forest is used and harvested, stewardship and benefits to communities.”

- The Forestry Management Principals were created through both the CHN and MIEDS and will be used to create the Community Forest Management Plan.

“BCTS – new data will likely see a decrease in the TSA AAC (harvest) levels.”

- Representatives from BCTS backed this statement from Mark Salzl.

“Want to see cedar stewardship areas on the map.”

- Attendees asked that the maps provide enough detail to highlight areas where cedar stewardship areas and cultural modified trees (CMTs) were located.

“What are the volume estimates derived from? What is the soil science that is used?”

- Concerns were voiced regarding how the estimates for the THLB, TSA and the timber inventory were arrived at.

“What are the little red dots on the map provided?”

- The little red dots on map refer to non-productive areas.

“Is there data to show the timber inventory of the proposed Community Forest?”

- Mark Salzl from MOFNR assured the attendees that dependable data would soon be available to come up with a timber inventory of the proposed Community Forest.

“Want a breakdown of who is cutting what (percentages.)”

- A Request was made for a breakdown of harvesting totals for each company currently logging on Haida Gwaii.

“Cut blocks along view-scape – can this be dealt with by a Community Forest Management Plan?”

- There were many times when the issue of cut blocks along the Highway 16 corridor came up. Questions raised included: Why do these cut blocks exist and are so immediately visible from the main highway? What is their impact to local tourism? And, Would they be allowed under a Community Forest Management Plan?

“Cut blocks being forced into visible corridor.”

- Questions regarding cut blocks in visible corridors centers on whether logging companies were being forced to log these areas because of lack of harvestable timber in other areas.

“Want to see second growth in Community Forest. Would like to know areas where second growth regeneration is strong/weak.”

- Many attendees requested 2nd growth forest be included in the proposed Community Forest. There was also requests for data for BCTS showing where 2nd growth regeneration was strongest or weakest on Haida Gwaii.

“How can a Community Forest help with – trail access, residuals and value added endeavors?”

- There were many attendees who wanted more information on how a Community Forest Management Plan would help develop non-logging opportunities for communities. Opportunities such as trail creation, management and rehabilitation and other timber related value-added economic opportunities.

“How would BCTS and a Community Forest work together?”

- More clarification was requested regarding the relationship between these two organizations and their proposed partnership.

“Can BCTS realistically work with the Community Forest to coordinate harvesting?”

- There was some skepticism regarding the viability of such a relationship.

“Will BCTS be delivering timber sales as per the status quo?”

- More skepticism that the currently proposed model for a Community Forest would procure any tangible benefits or innovation to the industry or whether it would simply be “business as usual.”

“Would the communities decide the size of sales?”

- A direct question that was unanswered due to the “as-yet” unwritten Community Forest Management Plan.

“How will a Community Forest Management Plan be different than standard practices? Can it increase category “2” sales?”

- This question was referring to ensuring that timber harvested in a Community Forest be made available to local operators for milling and other value-added opportunities.

“Can milling be defined differently to create inclusivity of category “2” sales?”

- Category 2 licenses specify that timber must be milled in BC. Could this be amended in a Community Forest Management Plan to specify milling on Haida Gwaii?

“Can the pole peeling plant in Port Clements be considered “milling”?”

- Can pole stripping and other similar types of value-added operations fall under the definition of milling as described in category 2 licenses?

“Can deposits be waived for smaller bids? (Perhaps collecting stumpage on logs as logs leave the islands.)”

- Deposits on cut blocks could deter smaller operators from bidding on cut blocks. Can this policy be changed to attract more bids from smaller local operators?

“What about companies that want to bid but can’t log as fast as bigger companies – will there be timelines from successfully bidding to logging? Will a Community Forest Management Plan address this?”

- Another question relating to making it more attractive for local operators to bid on cut blocks.

“Is it logical to take one large area and split into smaller lots for smaller companies to log?”

- Could the idea of “mini lots” be incorporated into a Community Forest Management Plan?

“What are the timelines for creating a Community Forest?”

- Realistically, when could Haida Gwaii have a Community Forest?

Will a reduction in the AAC hinder negotiations for a Community Forest?

Port Clements

Public Attendance – 27

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Has to be the community’s decision as to what makes financial sense for selling lots and determining lot sizes”

- Public input is key to formulating the Community Forest Management Plan.

“What would be the profit to communities per 50m³?”

- This question was too difficult to answer based on the current information.

“Impossible to mill here and compete with Vancouver prices.”

- The large-scale mills in Vancouver create an unfair advantage to local millers wanting to buy timber from local logging companies.

“There should be more opportunity to do secondary manufacturing here.”

- Somehow, a Community Forest should provide residents with increased opportunity to manufacture products with local timber.

“Can de-barking and canting be done on island?”

- Process specific. Would require analyses and investment from local entities.

“Is the revenue share with BCTS negotiable?”

- CHN and BCTS representative believes that this is still negotiable.

“Is there dissention within the CHN? Will Masset leave the CHN? Will it affect the Community Forest?”

- Representatives from CHN assure attendees that there is no dissention within the CHN.

“Will there be areas withdrawn from the proposed Community Forest map?”

- The proposed map does not reflect a concrete proposal and the area it defines is still being negotiated.

“Based on the current market price, will the proposed Community Forest tenure be profitable?”

- Representatives from BCTS, MOFLNR, MIEDS and CHN all believe that the proposed area can be profitable.

“A Community Forest could benefit low-value stands by declining bids until value increases.”

- BCTS representative.

“Logging profits should stay on island, not leave the island.”

- Historically, the bulk of logging profits have left the island. Attendees wanted to see a much higher percentage of profits stay on Haida Gwaii.

“What are the overhead/administrative costs associated with a Community Forest? Who pays this cost?”

- Administrative costs would come out of the generated revenues. Administrative costs would be a small percentage of these revenues.

“Who will pay for signage?”

- Signage would most likely come from revenue generated by the Community Forest.

“Could a Community Forest Management Group bid on their own wood?”

- Yes. (BCTS representative.)

“Benefits of partnership with BCTS is the inherited infrastructure.”

- BCTS and MIEDS representatives.

“Does the 50/50 revenue share reflect the inclusion of developmental costs?”

- It does not. BCTS and MIEDS representatives.

“What is the proposed rotation time from harvesting to the next rotation of harvesting?”

- To be determined based on data from BCTS and MOFLNR. Could community have more input regarding this decision?

*“What happened to the reinvestment deal of 20% of harvested timber? (Refers to a previous agreement from 2004)”

- Was not able to get a clear answer.

“Can there be a guarantee that locals will be the only ones that can log the Community Forest?”

- At this point, no. Could it be a part of the deal in the future?

“Can there be a guarantee that a certain percentage of the timber harvested in the Community Forest be milled on island?”

- This question is raised throughout the meeting and in other communities also.

“Will there be small enough sales to support local, smaller operators?”

- This question is raised many times and in all of the communities.

“Harvesting of smaller trees devalues product – can infrastructure be developed to support the harvesting of smaller trees?”

- This question would be addressed in the creation of a Community Forest Management Plan.

“Can current license be amalgamated? (TSA and TFL60)”

- Not within the existing regulatory framework.

“Small operators create a lot of negativity because of the logging going on in view/sight lines.”

- The issue of logging in highly visible areas and along transportation corridors comes up often.

“Why is Husby allowed to log in Collison Point but there is no proposed Community Forest tenure there?”

- Currently, the proposed Community Forest has no representation in the Collison Point unit. Could be renegotiated with BCTS.

“A Community Forest must address the loss of jobs, declining populations and depressing industry outlooks for locals.”

- A common theme in all the meetings. Attendees voiced a need for a Community Forest to address these areas.

“Lack of small sales for small local operators.”

- Another common concern in all communities.

“Current model doesn’t give access to logs, just access to revenue.”

- The concern is that although the proposed Community Forest would provide some revenue for the different communities, it would not address the greater concern of a lack of access to local timber for smaller, local logging companies.

“What problems are you solving if you can’t process timber locally?”

- Again, locally processed timber seemed to be one of the greatest concerns at all of the meetings.

“Perception of BCTS is that of distrust. Responsible for billions in revenue leaving Islands with very little being invested back into communities.”

- A historical skepticism of BCTS has created a distrust by some community members of any deal involving BCTS.

“Can we free up more local wood?”

- Requests for providing more local timber to local manufacturers.

“Regarding a Community Forest – ‘Might as well get something instead of nothing.’”

- Common in all communities was an eventual acceptance of the proposal as opposed to an outright refusal.

“How will the communities be represented in a Community Forest Management Plan?”

- What representation would the communities have when it comes to allocating revenues throughout the islands?

“Which communities are involved?”

- What is considered a community on Haida Gwaii and how will they all be represented in a Community Forest Management Plan?

“A governance structure needs to be determined.”

- What will the committee created to administer the Community Forest look like? How will it be determined?

“Will there be stumpage breaks for locals?”

- Another question relating to the Community Forest creating opportunities for local manufacturers and logging operators.

“Too many politicians involved.”

- Skepticism towards political entities was a common theme during the meeting in Port Clements.

“Is there an inventory breakdown for the proposed Community Forest area?”

- The representative from MOFNLR responded that an inventory would be available as new timber supply analysis data is available.

Queen Charlotte

Public Attendance – 22

Comments and questions from the attending public

“Need to renegotiate the proposed area fro BCTS – especially Honna.”

- There was great concern over the proposed Honna Unit on the map provided to the attendees. The area lies directly behind Queen Charlotte and Skidegate. The concerns included geomorphic stability, destruction of view-scapes and the presence of culturally modified trees (CMTs).

“Could Rennel sound be included in the Community Forest?”

- Rennel sound and the potential recreational development of the area as well as it’s harvesting potential were brought up in regards to a Community Forest. Many felt that this area should be included in a Community Forest.

“ A perception that there ‘Isn’t much left out there.’”

- Comments from representatives regarding how much timber inventory was left on Haida Gwaii and the rate this inventory was depleting were met with cynicism from attendees.

“Harvest levels are trending down.”

- Another comment from MOFLNR and BCTS that was questioned by attendees.

“A Community Forest offers opportunity to control view lines of cuts.”

- The issue of logging close to transportation lanes and the impact that it has on tourism and industry perception was a commonly visited issue in all meetings.

“If the Community Forest is rejected, are the blocks still up for auction by BC Timber Sales?”

- Yes – BCTS representatives

“What kinds of dollars are coming back into the community?”

- An accurate prediction of revenues is impossible based on the current information.

“Are the consultants the only ones making money? What will administrative costs be? What percentage of the proposed revenue split will this eat up?”

- Another comment related to administration costs and other fees.

“Is there marketable or profitable wood still available?”

- Yes – MOFLNR and BCTS representatives.

“Markets are trending up. Last 5 years have been much better.”

- MOFLNR representatives

“Is it necessary to have the partnership with BCTS?”

- More skepticism toward the BCTS organization, but also referring to revenue generated by the Community Forest and its impact on local communities.

“Concerns about watersheds. Will the Community Forest be responsible for this?”

- Will the Community Forest Management Plan address these issues or will there be committees created for this purpose? Who will comprise these committees?

“Can costs assumed by BCTS be out-sourced on island? Can the Community Forest help train locals to take over these jobs? Would this change the 50/50 revenue split in the Island’s favor?”

- Another comment aimed at distancing the Community Forest from BCTS but also aimed at developing programs to train locals for long-term infrastructure needs.

“CMT’s heavy in Honna Unit.”

- Concern over the timber inventory and how it is affected by many culturally modified trees within the proposed Honna Unit.

“A Community Forest could monitor and enable areas for non-timber forest products, currently not done by BCTS.”

- Harvestable products currently not monitored by BCTS – mushrooms, plants, animals etc...

“A Community Forest has more flexibility concerning meeting the AAC.”

- Could a Community Forest Management Plan be more flexible and take into account other factors when setting an ACC?

“Woodlot – Could an undercut be redistributed to a local wood lot?”

- Another comment regarding wood lots, how to stock them and how to use them. A common theme in all communities.

“Who loses in an undercut? Can a Community Forest determine whether an area can be undercut or not?”

- A comment referring to the creation of a Community Forest Management Plan and making it work best for local interests.

“Can we mandate reinvestment opportunities for developing value-added manufacturing opportunities?”

- The issue of developing local, value-added manufacturing was brought up several times in all communities. It was recommended several times to include content to this effect in a Community Forest Management Plan.

Additional feedback subsequent to public meetings

Concern about the tenure being called a Community Forest

- Suggestion to not call the tenure a community forest but name it something unique as it does not follow the criteria nor does it embrace the "community" management aspect that comes with it. Names such as "Haida Gwaii Municipal Timber Co-operative", "Misty Isle Timber Co-operative" and "Municipal Forest Share" were suggested

Several emails and phone calls expressing support for having a Haida Gwaii Community Forest Tenure despite its perceived deficiencies

Several phone calls expressing concern about revenue share proposed that would diminish financial returns to the people of Haida Gwaii

Conversations that the public meetings were a start of what was hoped for as a very inclusive public engagement over time about the proposed Community Forest tenure with publicly posted information on a website.