This decision tool is intended as guidance for BCTS staff and consulting professionals. Users should apply judgement. Exceptions may exist and indicated actions may be over-ruled, based on professional judgement and with rationale. Consultation with a qualified registered Terrain Specialist is always an option.

Instructions
Completion of this form is mandatory for all BCTS proposed forest development within the Skeena Business Area.
1) Determine Consequence Rating using criteria on the reverse (Page 2) of this form.
2) Check-off all decision points on the above flow diagram (refer to notes on Page 2 for clarification).
3) Attach additional relevant information or rationales.
4) Identify other related assessments required (Page 2).
5) Sign and date this form.
6) If a Site Review or TSA is planned, provide a copy of this form to the Terrain Specialist.
7) File on secure Block / Road file.

Location: __________________________
Evaluated by: ______________________
Rationale(s) attached? YES □ NO □
Signature: _________________________
Approved by: ______________________
(If evaluation was completed by non-BCTS employee) 
Signature: _________________________
Date: ______________________________
#1 Preliminary Consequence Rating
The Coordinating Professional determines a preliminary consequence rating for applicable elements which could potentially be at risk from proposed forest development. (See 2002 Forest Road Engineering Guidebook (Appendix 10) for additional information and factors to consider in rating consequence.)

a) Human Life / Bodily Injury
   i) People living in the “Zone” (dowslope or potentially affected)
      (Residence, Yard, Public or Commercial Buildings, etc) Y H N
   ii) High-Use Transportation Corridor Y H N
   iii) Other High Use Area Y H N
   iv) N/A (none of the above) L N

b) Private Property (not Human Life)
   i) Cultivated / Cleared Property (consider level of use) M H N
   ii) Outbuildings M H N
   iii) Vacant Private Land (also consider future development potential) L M N
   iv) N/A (none of the above) L N

c) Utilities
   i) Gas Pipeline, High-Voltage Power Line, Other: H N
   ii) Low Voltage Power Line, Telephone Line, Other: L M N
   iii) Other: L M N
   iv) N/A (none of the above) L N

d) Transportation Infrastructure (not Human Life)
   i) Highway, Railway, High-Use Road Y H M
   ii) Secondary Public Road (consider level of use) Y M N
   iii) Very Low-Use Road L N
   iv) Other L N
   v) N/A (none of the above) L N

e) Water Supply
   i) Community Watershed H N
   ii) Domestic Consumptive Water User(s) downstream/dowstream M H N
   iii) Irrigation System(s) downstream/dowstream (consider use & # of users) L M N
   iv) N/A (none of the above) L N

f) Fish Habitat
   i) Fish habitat within development area or directly downslope Y N
   ii) Fish habitat downstream of development (consider distance, stream order) Y N
   iii) N/A (none of the above) L N

g) Visuals (consider location, visual sensitivity, prominence of viewpoints)
   L M N

h) Other Values / Elements at Risk (specify) L M N

#2 Development with Moderate or High Consequence on Steep Terrain, Uplifts of Steep Terrain, <200 Above Sea Level (glaciomarine hazard), or where Karst Terrain Potential is Present.

Professionals should use judgement in applying the above criteria (e.g., consider extent of slopes, if isolated occurrence, etc.)

#3 Development with Low Consequence on Steep Terrain, Uplifts of Steep Terrain, <200 Above Sea Level (glaciomarine hazard), or where Karst Terrain Potential is Present.

Professionals should use judgement in applying the above criteria (e.g., consider extent of slopes, if isolated occurrence, etc.)

#4 Signs of Instability in the Field
Fast indicators of potential slope instability (e.g., recent or revegetated landslide scars, curved or sweeping trees, tension fractures, mixed or buried soil profiles, poorly drained slopes, springs/wet areas, gulpy headwall areas, exposed soil on gulpy sides, displaced stream channels, step-like benches or small scars, etc.). (Refer to references in Practices Document for more information on field indicators.)

#5 Uplift Development Concerns
Evidence of concern that existing uplift development may be affecting the subject area (e.g., drainage diversion / concentration).

#6 Type & Extent of Instability or Uplifts Concerns
The person making this determination must have an understanding of the issues and must provide a rationale for not completing an assessment, based on technical and/or risk management factors (e.g., The potential instability is located well below the planned development & there is no drainage being directed onto the area / there is a bench downslope / consequence is low / etc).

#7 Site Review
A preliminary (office and/or field) review by a Terrain Specialist to determine if, and where (locations), further investigation or assessment (e.g., TSA) is required and the nature of the assessment including the need for specialty services. See Quick Guide Table for full description of a Site Review and other types of assessment.

#8 Overriding an Indicated Assessment
Similar to Note #6 above, overriding an assessment that the Tool indicates is “required” must include a written rationale and be based on specific technical and/or risk management factors. This rationale is to be signed and recorded in the Block/Road file.

#9 Complete TSA
Through a Work Assignment, the Terrain Specialist is provided with critical information (e.g., scope of assessment required, specific areas of concern, known elements at risk, copy of this form, any other supporting documents or information). See Quick Guide Table for full description of this level of assessment.

#10 Coordinating Professional Evaluates Report Findings
(See Practices Document (Risk Criteria & Decision Making section) for more detail)

For a Site Review, results are reviewed and recommendations implemented as appropriate. For a TSA, the Residual Partial Risk analysis is also considered in relation to the value of the element at risk. Where the value of an element and estimated potential consequences are high, a decision to proceed to a Specific Risk Analysis is usually warranted. Specific Risk Analysis will consider consequences, including the vulnerability of the element at risk. This may require the involvement of other specialists with expertise related to the element (e.g., a biologist for fish habitat or a utility engineer for a transmission line, etc.)

#11 Management Review
(See Practices Document (Risk Criteria & Decision Making section) for more detail)

The decision to undertake a Management Review should be based on the value of the element and the results of the Residual Partial Risk or Specific Risk analysis. Each situation must be considered on its own merits. For example, where a residence is the element, a management review should occur whenever risk is greater than very low, while for a single water user POD a management review is probably not warranted unless risk is moderate or higher.