

**FORRS – MAY 20, 2010 PUBLIC WORKSHOP  
COMMENTS – ECONOMIC VALUES**

Free to public:

- Very important; the land belongs to all the people.
- Does not have to be free but must be economical (no exclusion)
- It is important but not limiting. Maybe a day-use nominal [fee] would help manage area. No problem paying annual fee or day fee.
- Priceless, incredible value. We don't want to have national park status/designation which would man park usage fee
- Free to public is very important
- Nearly critical. Maybe a waiver/agreement by all users to abide by "the rules."
- Free is a default position; more costly and impossible to charge – voluntary donations?
- Would be great to [have] a means for people to understand costs, have a pay to pay (box a trailhead, join FORRS)
- Critical to long-time users – would be willing to purchase a low cost area pass
- Important, and very difficult to charge for it – people assume it's their right. Crown land belongs to the people. Need them to understand that with rights come responsibilities
- Very important to locals
- This type of recreation is important as it is a no-charge experience families can enjoy together
- Being free to the public is very important because even a small fee will discourage young people from using it and they are the future protectors of the Range
- Very important. Pay for use(though often justified) creates a different experience
- Recreation must be maintained, must remain free to the public
- Best to be free
- Recreational activities should be available to the local public at little or no cost. This is especially relevant to an area where the economic activity is challenged.
- Very important feature to those who can't afford to ski at resort or cat skiing
- Is it free? Who pays rescue costs, maintenance costs, insurance?
- The fact that it is free is important but does this mean it will be taken for granted? Perhaps a fee system may be required in the future to instill ownership and pride.
- Local people are cheap!
- If it's free to the public to use any time, then who pays? Rossland taxpayers?
- Free, unregulated use gives value to the Rossland Range. People stay in Rossland because of this. People may leave if it became regulated. This could be bad for the local economy.

Economic value of Rossland Range to community:

- Large economic driver (reason I moved my family here), tourism
- Amenity migration
- Tourism vs. ecosystem services
- Medium importance now but could increase

- I don't think that many people travel to the Rossland Range for recreation, therefore I don't think it holds much value in tourism dollars. (I could be wrong.)
- Don't know, probably helpful but can't quantify. Quality of life here somewhat widely recognized, so people will live here, maybe even invent new business opportunities.
- Important – It's an asset to bring people in and keep people here
- Huge – Fernie, Smithers, Europe. Clean revenue
- Has become important, mostly summer. Winter value –enhancement of current experience
- Rossland Range is subliminal attractant (except for Red, 7 Summits, Big Red Cats); it's the stuff people love to do because it's open, free, wild
- Indirectly important to the economy – community asset re place to live and work,
- The mountains define the community
- Rossland as a base for recreational users
- Importance recognized but put in context of other economic drivers
- Not a big deal – it's more of an amenity for tourists and residents
- Area brings in tourists and is an incentive to recruit works to Rossland and Trail
- Very important to the economy because many people live and work here because of the Range itself
- Brings backcountry skiers here to buy food, rooms, skis to experience a unique ski experience
- Important to attract people to area and support local business
- Extremely – Natural amenity attracts visitors and makes Rossland a special place to live
- Reason why people live here
- "We" wouldn't be here without it
- Very important in attracting new residents, critical economically, e.g. Red Mountain, Big Red Cats
- Rossland Range attracts residents – maybe not many tourists but I do think it attracts permanent residents
- Must ensure remains Crown land – no sale to industry
- Important to local economy (x2)
- Very important
- Important to more than just Rossland (x2)
- The mountains are an asset – jobs, new residents, lifestyle
- Proposal – a good amenity. Needed for local jobs by attracting new residents and visitors – area will need these in the future
- Outdoor recreation is the main reason why people from outside Rossland come here – drives the local economy
- Differentiate economic input from recreational activities (and trickle-down) and commercial industry (mining and forestry)

#### Costs/management:

- Community support of society/group in charge
- Grassroots

- Membership fee/grants to offset costs
- No user fees!
- No day use fees!
- Fees will have no public support.
- If managed for broad public value, money will come, e.g. foundations supporting wildlife, etc.
- Commercial products - maps, t-shirts, books, website advertising, “sponsorships” – value-added for Red Mountain, Big Red Cats, etc.
- Rental shop? Social enterprise – some business that provides for a need but also has the ability to generate revenue to cover costs. Insurance for backcountry like Chamonix’s *carte de neige*
- Encourage memberships at nominal value. Memberships may bring a sense of ownership and might improve/sustain responsible use. Government grants. Local FORRS and like groups to contract to Ministry of Forests for some maintenance.
- Use some of FORRS’s membership money.
- Organize fundraisers
- Fundraising
- Fundraising events
- Fundraising will be needed. |Volunteers stretched with all the societies in area
- Show me the business plan
- What are we paying for? – person-hours in maintenance, facility upgrade, legal fees?
- Aggressively solicit donations e.g. at trailheads
- Boxes at trailheads
- Donations boxes at cabins
- Membership fees
- Similar to TR Rossland trail head cards to get names and give away t-shirt
- Impossible to manage getting money from individuals in such a large area
- Charging for use would be difficult to manage and detrimental
- Grants (x3)
- Grants – not desirable, but an option
- City taxes, rural taxes
- RDKB funding
- Tax-deductible status for FORRS
- Sponsorship, advertising [on] signage
- Seek out sponsorship (x2) – Atco, outdoor manufacturers, local businesses, Teck, CBT
- CBT has a mandate to support community projects like like
- Province could impose or dedicate a minor amount of gas tax or stumpage to fund citizen groups to manage tenured areas such as the Rossland Range.
- Almost free – grants, memberships, business plan
- Costs are mostly maintenance – user-maintained sites; engage stakeholders to reduce management costs – trails days, pack-in-pack-out, volunteer-maintained facilities
- Keep costs low – user-maintained

- Need to purchase a low cost pass for area to fund tenure or do a work/pass exchange
- Local people who maintain the cabins use their own resources such as gas and oil for chainsaws (so we pay)
- Volunteer labour pool (e.g. firewood, trailbuilding); corporate support (e.g. Emcon plowing parking areas)
- Costs discussed when this occurs
- It is important to the region, not just to Rossland. Management must respect regional values too, to reduce or avoid broader conflicts.
- Look at how other areas cover their costs, e.g. Paulson
- Needs to be part of an overall economic plan for the area – collaborative with Atco, Red Mountain, City of Rossland, etc
- Overall land use plan necessary

#### Relationship with Atco:

- Establish expectations for each group. Keep lines of communication open. Let users know what to expect of each other.
- Atco and [recreational] group must try and work collaboratively when issues arise (will not be easy).
- Co-management; designated areas for each; designated times of year for work
- Local FORRS and like groups seek common grounds with company and government
- Ongoing open communication (x4)
- Ongoing, honest open lines of communication; understanding each stakeholder's needs
- Keep them involved with meetings like tonight
- Best approach is communication – What are Atco's needs? Can Atco provide a service that can benefit the Designated Recreation Area?
- Communication; Find out what FORRS/users can do for Atco; provide opportunities to showcase Atco as cooperative partner
- Note change of ownership – now Atco Wood Products. Communicate re public perception of company ad past history
- Atco must be part of the process. Establish a communication plan, good rapport.
- A plan will help Atco complete their own plans. Small forest companies are unlikely to continue to survive in global market – need to be unique and value-added to survive – community endorsements help
- Be nice to Atco and they might be nice to recreational users – mutual respect
- Co-ordinate uses [and] intent in a clear, simple manner to mitigate operational interruption of forestry activities – season of operation, harvesting and trail plans, parking lots, etc.
- What responsibility does Atco Wood Products have to recreational users and ecological conservation efforts?
- Recreation and forestry working together.
- Logging can take place around high use recreation areas.