

Summary Document of Cost Benefit Analysis for Two Scenarios
Contributors: Cyril Egar, Tymon Mphaka, Julia Dupuis

Given the two scenarios for this property, the second scenario is the most viable. The second scenario involves developing the land to include a few cottages and operate it as a small resort. This scenario requires a fair bit of funds initially, but the resulting income will make the investment worthwhile. The first scenario does not change the land at all, but also does not garner any income for the property owners or the community.

Currently, the only income from the land comes from carbon sequestration. If the land was developed, the amount of carbon that would be sequestered would decrease, but given the size of the land only a small fraction would have to be developed. The current scenario also does not require any funds to maintain the property, making it seem like the better scenario in the short term (less than four years). The cost-benefit analysis was done over a four year period and after those four years, it is more beneficial to develop the land. The large initial investment would allow cottage to be built that would later be rented out, livestock to be purchased that will be used for breeding as well as for a food source. With proper management of the resort, and a viable ratio of gardens and livestock to cottages the land could be self-sustaining in a matter of years, i.e. extra food would not have to be purchased for those renting cottages and the income from cottage rentals could be used to pay wages. This was not considered in the cost-benefit analysis, but will benefit the property financially if it is feasible.

Not included in the assessment was the environmental value of the land.. By developing the property to include a few cottages, more people will be using the property which can lead to habitat disruption and degradation. Trail guides can limit this by ensuring visitors stay on the trails instead of wandering off and maintaining the current ecosystem.