

(1) The broad goals for the Private Managed Forest Land Program are still relevant.

Disagree

Please provide additional information for why you chose your answer above.

"Encourage" needs to be replaced with "must" – strong legislation, clear environmental stewardship objectives, and strict enforcement is needed. The PMFLP has no teeth, little oversight, and no enforcement. Asking TimberWest or WFP to be nice to the environment for future generations is akin to asking an alcoholic not to drink for the sake of his family - he is drunk and doesn't care.

Put teeth in strong environmental legislation and enforce it! Forests are a common good and private owners MUST respect that. Use Sweden and other Scandinavian models to regulate and assist private owners. Small land owners should be included in the act, just like they are in Scandinavia. Use best practices, not the idiot clear-cut simple mentality evident in our government and forestry companies.

Who has been seriously penalized for destroying marbled murrelet or any other critical wildlife habitat? Where is restoration to old-growth conditions or even productive second-growth conditions? Where are the inventories of what is to be cut and what has been cut? Why do communities need to pay tens of millions, even hundreds of millions, to install water filtration plants after logging watersheds and other community water sources? Were the Grand Forks floods just a coincidence post logging or did the logging cause that mess? The answer is obvious, so where is the teeth, oversight, implementation, and enforcement? Like "Professional Reliance", the reality of PMFLP is putting the fox in charge of the hen house. Owners do what they want without consequence, and the environment and public - especially the aboriginal public whose lives are the natural world - suffer. The PMFLA is weak - habitat, wildlife corridors, diversity to support abundant wildlife, water protection, species protection, environmental stewardship and enhancement are missing or merely alluded to - and oversight and enforcement are weaker.

(2) The key public environmental values specified in the Private Managed Forest Land Act are sufficient.

Strongly Disagree

Based on your answer above, please share what key public environmental values you feel are well protected under the Private Managed Forest Land Act and/or those that you feel could be better represented?

We do not know what has been and is being lost, wildlife and much flora is now at risk. Intact forests are vital for a healthy environment. There is no enforcement, so there are no environmental values being "well protected." No attempt to address the vital need of intact forests for ecosystem dependent species. Clear-cutting and glyphosate spraying is turning our forests into desert and intensifying climate change! Science-based forestry practices are lacking -

vital old-growth forests with big productive trees in private managed lands are almost gone. Ecocide has been allowed to happen, even encouraged through unscrupulous deals, privatization of TFLs, generous public subsidies including the government pension buy-out of TimberWest – numerous conflicts of interest that should be illegal and prosecuted. Lack of oversight and a sick social network between business and government. The public has lost productive forest needed for our recreation, therapy, and survival. Privately managed forests are badly managed farms unfit for diverse wildlife and unable to function as real forests (provide habitat, moisture, biodiversity, refuge, clean water, regulate climate, etc.).

The public is even barred from entry although B.C. apparently upholds Right to Roam legislation. The innumerable locked gates with “keep out,” “no trespassing,” “trespassers will be prosecuted” type signs prove the actual utility of the PMFLP: ensure the public is unaware of the clear-cut devastation that will be cumulatively worse for future generations.

Strong legislation to protect ecosystems ensuring intact forest with strong enforcement needed: science-based sustainable management that prioritizes ecology and environmental health.

Forests need to grow back, or ecological catastrophe is imminent. Take reconciliation seriously, First Nations need to be the stewards they once were. Science-based objectives, assessments, and decision-making overseen by the public is needed. FYI, science-based understanding tends to support indigenous knowledge.

(3) The current regulatory framework is effective in supporting achievement of the management objectives specified in the Private Managed Forest Land Act.

Strongly Disagree

Please provide additional information for why you chose your answer above.

Environmental and community values are not being protected. Far too many species are becoming endangered. Intact forests are vital for a healthy environment, and human health is based on the health of the environment. Lots of PR, but little real protection. Tourists come to see our forests but see clear-cuts. We hike mountains and see the clear-cuts below - it is depressing and unhealthy. We need intact forests - they should not be viewed as "fiber" in dollar figures but as life-giving and valued beyond money.

The Private Managed Forest Council (PMFC) is dominated by industry, not the independent body it was meant to be. It serves large forestry corporations at the expense of the public, wildlife, and ecological health.

The BC Forest Practices Board provides sound science-based forestry advice but has no teeth. Replace the PMFC with it as our forests are in crisis.

The public resource needs to be respected and protected. The Private Managed Forest Lands Act needs to be overhauled to properly protect forests with true public oversight and control based on science and First Nations knowledge. Clean water, diverse biology, species habitat, intact forest systems, substantial wildlife corridors, huge areas of undeveloped forests, etc. need to be

prioritized over and above all other decisions and protected in legislation. Completely protect ancient old-growth and second growth forests with old-growth potential along with husbandry to mimic old-growth. All forestry must adhere to science-based sustainable practices, ban clear-cutting! Any remnants of productive old-growth forest must be protected. The bigger the trees, the greater the carbon sequestration and storage and the greater the capacity to retain biodiversity and moisture and fend off, even stop, fire. Taking down ancient old-growth not only removes true forest fire prevention, it removes water filtration forcing communities to buy expensive filtration systems. Forest companies should not be allowed to burn debris – it should be utilized or composted, not wasted. The emissions from forestry burns has a staggering affect on our health – just another forestry elephant in the room.

(4) The current benefits of being in the program are adequate to encourage new entrants into the program.

Agree for large operators, disagree for small operators

Please share how you feel incentives within the Act are working well to encourage landowners to enrol in the program, or any additional incentives you would suggest.

Token tax, industrial free reign with little oversight, the ability to clear-cut then sell for development – this program works extremely well to benefit the short-term big operators that take advantage. The benefits are overly generous: forestry companies log and often, they leave (just look at the history of buyouts and sellouts!) or sell the logged private land for private development. The history is criminal. They pay pennies on the dollar in tax, a fraction of what other land holders must pay (this alone is criminal, a complete tax give-away), and they get substantial tax write-downs and subsidies.

As for encouraging small landholders to join, reduce the land size requirement to an acre or two (like in Sweden). Provide incentives like the generous tax savings the big logging companies get to keep the land as forest and educate land holders in ecology and ecological silviculture. Incentivize to keep forests in place but whatever is offered must be overseen to ensure the incentive isn't accepted without proof of performance.

(5) The current benefits of being in the program are adequate to the continued participation (retention) of currently enrolled land owners.

Disagree

Please share how you feel incentives within the Act are working well to retain landowners currently enrolled in the program, or any additional incentives you would suggest.

Large land owners – especially those who traded TFLs for private land or got in on cheap land (i.e. an E & N Land Grant parcel sold or sold repeatedly) – should have never been allowed to log and sell for development defeating the intention of Privately Managed Forest Lands. Reinstate the Forests Land Reserve Act (FLRA).

Small land holders pay proportionally far bigger fees – big land holders who log should pay the big fees as they make mountainous profit. Small land holders have the expense but the not incentive to keep land forested, so change that fast. Give them the tax breaks and subsidies and remove those breaks and subsidies from the big corporations to make them start paying back. Private forests are just a cash cow to the big land holders; those who have conserved forest should be rewarded for helping the common good, not charged more.

Reduce land holding to one or two acres to get more owners in the program.

(6) The exit fee is an adequate way to persuade landowners to remain in the program and encourage long-term participation in the provincial forest sector.

Strongly disagree

Please share how you feel the use of the current exit fee is working well, or potential new disincentives that could discourage exit from the program.

As it does not apply to land owned longer than 15 years, the exit fee has been incentive to do the opposite of its original intent – it takes decades for a forest to take root, not 1.5 decades. It encourages land holders to profit from logging then sell for real estate (thus TimberWest being the biggest realtor on Vancouver Island – an extreme conflict of interest where the land should have been appropriated as it was no longer used for the forestry assigned, intended, or “encouraged”).

Proper taxes need to be levied with grandfathered legislation to compensate the public for loss (companies have made billions, but government revenues collected have been a trickle). Any land given forest companies through illegitimate deals should be appropriated, even expropriated. Companies that have not followed proper forestry practices should be fined heavily and forced to return the lands.

Reinstate the Forests Land Reserve Act (FLRA) and strongly legislate, regulate, and enforce provision to prevent managed forest land from being sold for development. All privately managed lands should be grandfathered legislatively with the clause to expropriate forests lands inappropriately utilized, not abiding by the FLRA etc.

(7) I have never been informed of forestry activities... on privately managed forest lands in my community or elsewhere.

Strongly Disagree

Getting information on what is going on, where one is locked out, etc. is like pulling teeth. The government doesn't know – it doesn't even keep inventory of what is being logged and lost forever. No business could operate this way, but the Ministry of Forests leaves all trust to big operators, even believing their inventory (and allowing them to cut ancient giants into pieces for lower stumpage). The secrecy around operations in and gated fortresses to our forests have been absurd and mafia-like. Inventory of what exists, what should be harvested, what has been

harvested, what is left, what animal populations existed, how many were injured or killed, where the survivors went to, etc. should all be knowns just like they are in Sweden.

8) No, I have not discussed proposed or completed forestry activities on private managed lands within my community of Nanaimo. It just happens – no opportunity for discussion, certainly no news, obvious notices, or invitation to community meeting.

9) No, I have not contacted FLNRORD regarding forestry activities in my community of Nanaimo because city councillors have more or less told me “[it is private land and there’s nothing we can do]” and others I talked to have who contacted FLNRORD say it is frustrating and useless. All is said and done, and the public and wildlife just have to live with it.

10) No, I have not contacted the Managed Forest Council – I was not familiar with this entity until this process. I have written numerous emails to government and signed innumerable petitions; like most people concerned for the future, I feel completely ignored. Our governments cater to the continued big business liquidation of our biggest asset that can ensure a healthy future for all – our forests. Each day our most powerful combatant to maintain a semblance of past temperate climate is further reduced.

Our privately managed forest lands have been devastated. No consideration for future generations or ecology; the government has been completely negligent in handing over public lands to corporations to manage our public resource as they wish. Liberal premiers accepted graft and ministers made devious deals, this on top of Canada's thievery of indigenous lands as partial payment for an incomplete railway (Dunsmuir - E&N Land Grab). Watersheds, water ways, wildlife, the whole range of flora and fauna (known and unknown - we don't even know what we have lost and are losing to clear-cuts and forestry mismanagement) - everything has been allowed to be degraded, and bad as it is, we are just starting to feel the effects. The climate is changed, we now have drought rather than rainy season - the moisture contained in forests and let loose all over the coast and inland has been cut.

Giant old-growth trees are non-renewable resources - it took tens of thousands of years to build our forests. It took us a century to remove them. Our ancient old-growth forests of giants are almost gone, and this government will oversee removal of the last of them. The NDP have been no better than the Liberals at protecting our forests – turning ancient forests into tree plantations is an ecological crime.

A public resource so integral to our health on private land at the discretion of the owner has been a disaster.