

Service/Assessment	Recommended Application	Level of Field Investigation	Support Materials or Info Required	Standard Report Content	Other Possible Report Adaptations	Relative Cost
Site Review	<ul> <li>As required based on BCTS TSA Decision &amp; Documentation Tool</li> <li>Consider as a preliminary step to identify if further TSA investigations are required</li> <li>May be office and/or field based</li> <li>The Site Review can focus the location of a TSA to those portions of the development area where necessary</li> <li>Guidance on terrain stability considerations prior to layout</li> <li>Can occur at various scales (i.e. broad overview to specific landform)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Low;</li> <li>Approximately 1 development/day</li> <li>Usually involves a field review of proposed or existing layout</li> <li>Coordinating Resource Professional (CRP) should be in attendance</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>General development plans and maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability and Surface Erosion Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments (hydrological or prior geotechnical assessments)</li> </ul>	If a Site Review investigation determines that a TSA is required or the investigation moves directly into a TSA, a Site Review Report is not prepared. Report content is generally very much simplified compared to TSA's. Results can typically be documented by means of a brief memo or email. Objectives Scope Observations Recommendations; proceed, proceed with limitations, or more thorough assessments as warranted Mapping as an option, could be as simple as scanned maps with hand drawn comments		Low - 1 to 2 days





Service/Assessment	Recommended Application	Level of Field Investigation	Support Materials or Info Required	Standard Report Content	Other Possible Report Adaptations	Relative Cost
Terrain Stability Assessment (TSA)	<ul> <li>As required based on BCTS TSA Decision &amp; Documentation Tool and TSP recommendation</li> <li>Focus assessment on specific portions of the development where ever possible – this can come from CRP via assignment or (preferably) from recommendations contained in a Site Review</li> <li>Field layout is complete</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High;</li> <li>Approx. 30 to 60 ha/day for blocks, approx. 2 km to 4 km /day for roads; depends on conditions and extent of down slope work required</li> <li>Include time to assess elements at risk (i.e. site visit to P.O.D's, meet landowners, etc.)</li> <li>Professional field reviews of operations and/or conformance reviews of completed works may be required</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Findings and recommendations of prior Site Reviews</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>General development plans and maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability and Surface Erosion Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments (hydrological or prior geotechnical assessments)</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required for mapping</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Must be consistent with Guidelines for Professional Services in the Forest Sector - Terrain Stability Assessments (ABCFP/ APEGBC, 2010).</li> <li>Introduction and objectives</li> <li>Scope and limitations</li> <li>Background information</li> <li>Methodology and extent of fieldwork</li> <li>Observations (detailed terrain descriptions)</li> <li>Conclusions (including detailed Partial Risk Analysis)</li> <li>Recommendations and options to manage hazards or risks</li> <li>Construction or Prescription Summary tables (for roads)</li> <li>Mapping; specific requirements (i.e. prescription details) are to be detailed in the Work Assignment</li> <li>Definitions of qualitative hazard &amp; risk ratings used</li> <li>Forest development upslope of residential developments can expect to have more detailed assessments, and may warrant quantitative risk analysis and professional peer reviews.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Memos relating to site reviews or pre-layout assessments</li> <li>Memos relating to field reviews</li> <li>Abbreviated reports in areas with low consequences and/or few terrain stability concerns</li> </ul>	Medium to High - depends on terrain complexity, identified hazard, and consequences





Service/Assessment	Recommended	Level of Field	Support Materials or	Standard Report Content	Other Possible	Relative
	Application	Investigation	into Required		Report Adaptations	COSL
	<ul> <li>Where additional</li> </ul>	Moderate;	<ul> <li>Similar to TSA, plus</li> </ul>	Introduction and Scope		Low to
Risk Analysis	detailed or specific risk	<ul> <li>Depends on complexity</li> </ul>	existing TSA reports,	<ul> <li>Background information</li> </ul>		Medium
-	analysis is recommended	of situation and	other specialists' reports	<ul> <li>Observations and extent of fieldwork</li> </ul>		
1. Detailed	by a Terrain Specialist	information available	and/or specialized	<ul> <li>Definitions &amp; Methodology</li> </ul>		
Quantitative	• Where risks,		resource assessments,	Risk Analysis Evaluation		
Risk Analysis	consequences, values or		information on	<ul> <li>Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</li> </ul>		
<ol> <li>Specific Risk Analysis</li> <li>Specific Value of Risk Analysis</li> </ol>	elements at risk, and/or broader program implications are of major importance and will require Manager's decision		vulnerability of elements at risk, etc.	<ul> <li>References (as required)</li> <li>Maps (as required)</li> </ul>		



Service/Assessment	Recommended Application	Level of Field Investigation	Support Materials or Info Required	Standard Report Content	Other Possible Report Adaptations	Relative Cost
Drainage Review	<ul> <li>Development located on "gentle over steep" terrain</li> <li>Often a subset of a TSA</li> <li>Where "gentle over steep" is the only issue, this may be the only component of a TSA</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moderate;</li> <li>Depends on terrain complexity</li> </ul>	• Similar to TSA's	<ul> <li>Similar to TSA's as terrain complexity warrants</li> <li>Recommendations specific to drainage control and management</li> <li>Maps showing prescription elements and notations specific to drainage control</li> </ul>		Low to Medium
Drainage Plan	<ul> <li>Development located on terrain with complex drainage patterns and/or drainage related instabilities</li> <li>Development is upslope of domestic P.O.D's</li> <li>Evidence of significant redirected runoff affecting proposed development</li> <li>Timing – best undertaken during spring runoff</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Very High;</li> <li>Approximately 1km/day if complex conditions</li> </ul>	• Similar to TSA's	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>Introduction and objectives</li> <li>Scope and limitations</li> <li>Background information</li> <li>Methodology</li> <li>Conclusions (generalized Partial risk analysis)</li> <li>Recommendations; reduce the likelihood of redirected runoff and associated terrain stability concerns, and mitigate impact of development on water; timing, quantity, and quality.</li> <li>Prescription Summary Tables</li> <li>Maps to show prescription elements as detailed on the Summary Tables and proposed development, location of PODs, mapped location of streams, NCDs, landforms that may control subsurface flows</li> <li>Definitions of specific terms and rating system applied</li> </ul>	Drainage (upgrade) prescriptions: if down slope elements at risk and/or extent of problem areas on an existing or proposed road do not warrant a detailed drainage plan, then simplified drainage (upgrade) prescriptions can reduce time and cost of assessment while providing professional level recommendations	High - drainage plans tend to be very field intensive



Service/Assessment	Recommended Application	Level of Field Investigation	Support Materials or Info Required	Standard Report Content	Other Possible Report Adaptations	Relative Cost
Soil Erosion Assessment (SEA)	<ul> <li>Development in community watersheds</li> <li>Development in close proximity to domestic water sources</li> <li>Existing development with problematic erosion</li> <li>Complete as a standalone assessment or in conjunction with TSA, as conditions warrant</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Low to Moderate;</li> <li>Can often be completed without any additional field time if a TSA is also required.</li> <li>If no TSA is required, then less field time is required for a SEA than would be for a TSA for a similar sized development</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Similar to TSA's if detailed in scope</li> <li>Basics of mapping and down slope elements at risk if limited in scope</li> <li>Surface Erosion Hazard mapping where available</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>A report may be as simple as a brief memo with recommendations to mitigate hazard, to a more detailed report similar to a TSA dependent on scope and elements at risk</li> </ul>	Memos relating to field reviews of operations or completed works	Low - if completed in conjunction with TSA. (Low to Moderate if completed as a stand-alone assessment)
Snow Avalanche Assessment	<ul> <li>Moderate to steep slopes in high snowfall areas</li> <li>Development is located in potential avalanche start zones</li> <li>Proposed development may create or exacerbate avalanche hazard to down slope elements at risk</li> </ul>	Moderate	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>General development plans and maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability Mapping</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required for mapping</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>A report may be as simple as a brief memo with recommendations to mitigate hazard, to a more detailed report similar to a TSA dependent on scope and elements at risk</li> </ul>		Moderate



Service/Assessment	Recommended	Level of Field	Support Materials or	Standard Report Content	Other Possible	Relative
	Application	Investigation	Info Required		Report Adaptations	Cost
Landslide Investigation	<ul> <li>Landslide has occurred;</li> <li>Legal reporting obligations</li> <li>Prescriptions are required to mitigate further impacts to down slope resources</li> <li>Educational</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High;</li> <li>Typically 1 to 2 days for investigation of 1 slide. May be significantly greater level of investigation if considerable elements at risk.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope – reason for the investigation</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>Maps of existing development</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability and Surface Erosion Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required for mapping</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>Introduction and objectives</li> <li>Scope and limitations</li> <li>Background information</li> <li>Methodology</li> <li>Conclusions (Partial risk analysis)</li> <li>Recommendations for mitigation</li> <li>Mapping</li> <li>Definitions of specific terms and rating system applied Reports may vary from a brief memo to a detailed report dependent on the size and effect of the landslide on down slope elements at risk</li> </ul>		Medium to High - variables include complexity, number of stakeholders, public involvement, C&E MFR issues, hearings, etc.
Road Deactivation Prescriptions	<ul> <li>Road to be deactivated is located on or above potentially unstable or unstable terrain</li> <li>Road contains TSP prescribed design elements (i.e. full bench)</li> <li>Road deactivation complexities fall outside the scope of practise of RFT or RPF</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moderate to Very High;</li> <li>Variable field time dependant on complexity of roads and terrain conditions; avg. 1 to 3 km per day</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Access level required</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>Existing development maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required for mapping</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>Introduction and objectives</li> <li>Scope and limitations</li> <li>Background information</li> <li>Methodology</li> <li>detailed terrain descriptions</li> <li>detailed Partial risk analysis with supporting rational</li> <li>Recommendations for mitigation</li> <li>Prescription Summary Tables</li> <li>Prescription maps</li> <li>Reports may vary from a brief memo to a detailed report dependent on the length and complexity of deactivation works, and down slope elements at risk</li> </ul>		Medium - dependent on size and complexity



Sorvico/Accossmont	Recommended	Level of Field	Support Materials or	Standard Panart Contant	Other Possible	Relative
Service/Assessment	Application	Investigation	Info Required	Standard Report Content	<b>Report Adaptations</b>	Cost
Road Upgrade Prescriptions	<ul> <li>Existing roads on or above potential unstable or unstable terrain where drainage and road prism improvements are required to improve stability or allow for industrial use</li> <li>Roads generally in fair shape but may have insufficient culverts or may require localized improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Low to Moderate;</li> <li>Variable field time dependant on the extent of upgrade works required</li> <li>Field progress between 3 km and 5 km per day can be expected</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Findings and recommendations of prior Site Reviews</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>General development plans and maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>May be a brief memo with tables and map, or a more detailed report if down slope elements at risk warrant it.</li> <li>Prescriptions to be detailed in Tables and included on maps at an appropriate scale</li> </ul>	Brief memos relating to single location prescriptions.	Low to Medium - dependent on extent of work required
Road Reconstruction Prescriptions	<ul> <li>Existing roads on or above potential unstable or unstable terrain where <u>significant</u> drainage and road prism improvements are required to improve stability or allow for industrial use</li> <li>Roads may or may not be drivable and likely require significant road prism reconstruction works to become suitable for industrial traffic</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moderate to High;</li> <li>Variable field time dependant on the extent of upgrade/reconstruction works required</li> <li>Field progress between 1 km and 3 km per day can be expected</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work Assignment to detail:</li> <li>Scope</li> <li>Findings and recommendations of prior Site Reviews</li> <li>Known elements at risk</li> <li>General development plans and maps</li> <li>Air photos as required</li> <li>Terrain Stability Mapping</li> <li>Stream classifications</li> <li>Related assessments</li> <li>*.dgn and *.shp files as required</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No specific professional guidelines to follow; up to professional judgement for appropriate level of assessment and reporting.</li> <li>May be a brief memo with tables and map, or a more detailed report if down slope elements at risk warrant it.</li> <li>Prescriptions to be detailed in Tables and included on maps at an appropriate scale</li> </ul>	Brief memos relating to single location prescriptions or field reviews.	Medium to High - dependent on extent of work required