APPENDIX C

Visual Assessment Package Summary Table

Licensee Name: **Lakeside Pacific Forest Products Ltd.**

Licence Number: **Fl A19207, Chilliwack Forest District**

Location: **West Harrison Lake**

Preliminary VAP ☐ **Final VAP** ☒

Cut Block ☒ Road ☐

Block No.	3113	3118	3126B	3128	3136	3137	3138	3139	3140	3141	3142	3143	3144	3145	3204
Proposed Silviculture System	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Clear cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut	Partial Cut
Gross Block Size (ha)	10.6	10.3	2.7	34.3	7.4	32.0	25.4	15.8	19.6	63.1	30.1	65.6	47.6	4.2	14.7
Road Length (km)															

VISUAL LANDSCAPE INVENTORY LABELs

(Source: Chilliwack Forest District
Date Inventory Completed: 1996
with rVQC updated 1999)

Refer to Appendix 1 for definitions of terms

Visual Sensitivity Unit (VSU#)	***Visual Sensitivity Class (VSC)***	***Existing Visual Condition (EVC)***	***Recommended Visual Quality Class (rVQC) From VLI***	***Proposed Visual Quality Class used in VAP for VSU's not in VLI***
137	*3*	*R*	*PR-L*	
144	*3*	*M*	*PR-L*	
155	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	
161	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	
165	*3*	*R*	*PR-M*	
174	*3*	*R*	*PR-L*	
VSU NR	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	*Not Rated*	***PR-L (same as VSU 174)***
197	*3*	*M*	*PR-L*	
208	*2*	*M*	*PR-M*	

DOES EVC EXCEED THE RECOMMENDED rVQC ?

Note: EVC is based on 1996 MOF VLI data.

VSU# 137	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☒	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐
VSU# 144	***Yes***	☒	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐
VSU# 155	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☒
VSU# 161	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☒
VSU# 165	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☒	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐
VSU# 174	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☒	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐
VSU# NR (next to VSU 174)	*Yes*	☐	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☒
VSU# 197	***Yes***	☒	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐
VSU# 208	***Yes***	☒	*No*	☐	*Not Rated in VLI*	☐

Has this VAP submission incorporated all known alterations proposed within the visual sensitivity unit for the next 5 years? (i.e. all blocks proposed by the same or different licensees) **Yes** ☒ No ☐ ***VAP incorporates cutblocks from Interfor adjacent harvesting.***

VIEWPOINT & PHOTOGRAPH INFORMATION

Viewpoint Information	**Viewpoint Number & Name of Viewpoints from which the proposal is visible & photos have been taken.***					
	VPT # 468A 20 Mile Bay Recreation Site	**VPT # 489A Harrison Lk: N. Towboat Straight**	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island**	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck**	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel North of Kirkland Ck**	**VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel North of Davidson Ck**
Viewpoint Importance. (Major/minor/potential)	MAJOR (Recreation Site)	MINOR (Boating Corridor)	MINOR (Boating Corridor)	MINOR (Boating Corridor)	MINOR (Boating Corridor)	MINOR (Boating Corridor)
Viewing Distance (Foregrd, Middlegrd or Backgrd.)	Middleground	Foreground	Middleground & Background	Middleground & Background	Middleground & Background	Middleground & Background
Focal Length of Camera lens	138? rendered pan (similar to 3 x 50mm camera images)	184? rendered pan (similar to 4 x 50mm camera images)	138? rendered pan (similar to 3 x 50mm camera images)	184? rendered pan (similar to 4 x 50mm camera images)	138? rendered pan (similar to 3 x 50mm camera images)	184? rendered pan (similar to 4 x 50mm camera images)
Direction of View (Express as degree bearing)	236? Southwesterly	259? Westerly	251? Westerly	245? Southwesterly	230? Southwesterly	228? Southwesterly
Computer Rendering Completed With VAP?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Photograph from or near this Viewpoint provided with VAP?	VP 468 Photos from Lakeside 2001	VP 489 Photos from Lakeside 2001	VP 492 Photos from MOF 1996 VLI	VP 493 Photos from MOF 1996 VLI	VP 494 Photos from MOF 1996 VLI	VP 495 Photos from MOF 1996 VLI

* Note: Viewpoints are located in relation to the nearest viewpoint used in the 1996 Chilliwack Forest District Visual Landscape Inventory, using similar viewpoint numbers.

VSU# 137 rVQC = Partial Retention-Low

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck** ***Subordinate to dominant***

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:
All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblock and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 137 Cutblock ID: 3204

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO** ☒ *
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO** ☒

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☐ **NO** ☒ N/A ☐

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Transmission lines that might impact on the visual quality are not significantly evident from this view.***
3. ***Proposed cutblocks have good organic shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
4. ***All proposed category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblock and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 137

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck
1. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	12,302
2. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	211.8
3. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	299.6
4. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	**4.1%**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**PR-M**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments:

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

Yes. PR-Low will result due to visible scale, although the % alteration indicates PR-Moderate.

Comments: *The cutblock 3204 will meet the rVQC of PR-L. Some retention patches would prove beneficial for Blk 3204 to lessen the concentrated impact and break up the visible alteration.*

All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblock and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.

VSU# 144 rVQC = Partial Retention-Low

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** ***Dominant***	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** ***Dominant***	**VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck** ***Dominant***

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ **M** ☐ MM ☒ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:
All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting & will require substantial levels of retention to meet rVQC.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 144 Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3137; 3138; 3140; 3141; 3142; 3144; 3145

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO ☒***
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)
Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES ☒** NO ☐
Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES ☒** NO ☐
Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO ☒**

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A ☐

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Transmission lines that might impact on the visual quality are not significantly evident from these views.***
3. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
4. ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 144

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck	VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck	VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck
5. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	3835	10,216	6256
6. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	269	531.7	171.3
7. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	207.3	283.8	463.6
8. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	**12.4%**	**8.0%**	**10.2%**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**M**	**M**	**M**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ **M** ☒ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut / variable retention silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?
No – Maximum Modification will result due to concentration of cutblocks, although the % alteration will be modification.

Comments: ***New development in combination with non-VEG will exceed the rVQC unless blocks can be designed with more retention to break up the visible alteration.***

All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.

Since the Existing Visual Condition exceeds the recommended Visual Quality Class, significant levels of retention are required.

VSU# 165 rVQC = Partial Retention-Moderate

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island** **Subordinate**	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Subordinate**	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Dominant**

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ **M** ☒ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:

The VSU has recent harvested areas, which have resulted in the dominant level of existing impact at the north end. The proposed new cutblocks will not significantly alter the existing visual condition since cutblock 3113 is a proposed partial cut with 40% retention, only partially visually evident. The other two cutblocks are only marginally visible as oblique slivers.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 165 Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3113; 3126B; 3145

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ NO ☒ *
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? YES ☒ NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? YES ☒ NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☒ NO ☐

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining 40% on Blk 3113
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A ☐ BC Hydro Line is partial visible

Comments:

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Transmission lines that might impact on the visual quality are not significantly evident from these views.***
3. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
4. ***Cutblock 3113 is rendered as a partial cut. All other Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact*** of harvesting.

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 165

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island	VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck	VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck
9. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	1635	5749	1981
10. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	41.6	22.9	3.4
11. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	37.9	132.3	128.7
12. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	**4.9%**	**2.7%**	**6.7%**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**PR-M**	**PR-H**	**PR-L**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***Cutblock 3113 is rendered as a partial cut, assumed to be 40% visible for % alteration calculations. All other Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?
No – PR-Low will result, mainly from previous development.

Comments: ***The block shapes fit the landform, though in combination with non-VEG will exceed the rVQC.***

Cutblock 3113 is rendered as a partial cut. All other Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting. New proposals will not result in a significant increase in disturbance levels.

VSU# 174 rVQC = Partial Retention-Low

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island** **Subordinate**	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Subordinate**	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Subordinate**	**VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck** **Not visible**

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:

All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting. The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 174 Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3128; 3136; 3143

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO ☒***
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES ☒** NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES ☒** NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO ☒**

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A ☐

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
3. ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting. The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 174

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island	VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck	VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck	VPT # 495A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Near Kirkland Ck
13. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	1332	3024	1252	NA
14. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	11.2	50.0	73.8	NA
15. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	50.8	35.1	12.3	NA
16. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)÷#1]÷100=#4**	**4.7%**	**2.8%**	**6.9%**	**NA**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**PR-M**	**PR-H**	**PR-L**	**Not Visible**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?
Yes, rVQC will be achieved.

Comments: ***The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.***
Some retention or a patch would prove beneficial for Blk 3143 to break up the concentration.
Note that in deriving VSU 174 in perspective, a small potion of the area of VSU 180 has been included. VSU 180 was rated as not visible, though a small sliver is visible from VP 494, and has been included into VSU 174 as this is a logical extension of the VSU.

VSU# NR West of VSU 174 **rVQC =** Not Rated on VLI – **Proposed Management = PR-L (same as VSU 174)**

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island** **Not Visible**	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Not Visible**	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Subordinate**

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ **R** ☒ PR (H,M,L) ☐ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:

The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# NR Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3143

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO** ☒ *****
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO** ☒

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A ☐

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
3. ***The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# NR

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)	**VPT # 494 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck**
17. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	
18. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	
19. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	
20. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	Negligible; added to VSU 174
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ **R** ☒ PR (H,M,L) ☐ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***The proposed cutblocks will meet rVQC. See VSU 174***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint? ***See VSU 174***

Comments***: See VSU 174***

VSU# 197 rVQC = Partial Retention-Low

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 468A 20 Mile Bay Recreation Site** **Out of scale**	**VPT # 489A Harrison Lk: N. Towboat Straight** **Dominant**	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island** **Dominant**	**VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck** **Dominant**

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ M ☐ **MM** ☒ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:
All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 197 Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3136; 3139

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO** ☒ *
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO** ☒

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? **YES** ☒ NO ☐ N/A ☐ **BC Hydro Transmission Line above Blk 3110**

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
3. ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design for Blk 3139 is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 197

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 468A 20 Mile Bay Recreation Site	VPT # 489A Harrison Lk: N. Towboat Straight	VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island	VPT # 493 Harrison Lk: Mid Channel Between 20 Mile & Kirkland Ck
21. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	6531	1939	2573	2074
22. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	187.2	77.2	84.4	32.6
23. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	858.8	70.2	198.5	107.9
24. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	**16.0%**	**7.6%**	**11.0%**	**6.8%**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**M**	**M**	**M**	**PR-L**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ **M** ☒ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?
No – Maximum Modification will result visually due to the concentration of cutblocks. The % alteration is Modification.

Comments: ***New development in combination with non-VEG will exceed the rVQC unless blocks can be designed with more retention to break up the visible alteration.***

All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting, particularly as viewed from VP 468A (RecreationSite)

Since the Existing Visual Condition exceeds the recommended Visual Quality Class, significant levels of retention are required.

VSU# 208 rVQC = Partial Retention-Moderate

1. ASSESSING BASIC rVQC DEFINITION:

Describe the level of impact that the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-Veg alterations will have on the landscape from each viewpoint using one of the following terms: ***Not visible, Not visually evident, Subordinate, Dominant, Out of scale***	**VPT # 468A 20 Mile Bay Recreation Site** **Dominant**	**VPT # 489A Harrison Lk: N. Towboat Straight** **Dominant**	**VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island** **Subordinate**	**VPT #538A Harrison Lake: Deer Island/Long Island** **Not Visible**

Which basic rVQC definition would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ PR (H,M,L) ☐ **M** ☒ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: *See below*

If applicable state reasons why the proposal does not achieve the basic definition for recommended VQC:
All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.

2. ASSESSING VISUAL DESIGN: VSU# 208 Proposed Category A Cutblock ID: 3118

Have major lines of force been identified and used to develop the size and shape of the proposed operation? YES ☐ **NO** ☒*
(If yes attach visual force analysis to this form)

Has the proposed operation borrowed from the natural character of the landscape? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have edge treatments been incorporated into the design of the proposed operation (e.g., feathered edges, irregular cutblock design.)? **YES** ☒ NO ☐

Have islands or patches of trees been maintained to mitigate visual impacts and meet other resource management objectives? YES ☐ **NO** ☒

Do the remaining trees from Partial Cutting (evenly distributed) mitigate the visual impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒ Viewslope % _____ Stems Remaining ___%
See comments below.

Are there existing human made alterations visible in the unit that exhibit poor design? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A ☐

*** Comments:**

1. ***Lines of Force have been completed and will be used in the final design of cutblocks.***
2. ***Proposed cutblocks have good shape, matching the natural topography of the area.***
3. ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

3. ASSESSING NUMERICAL DATA: VSU# 208

Percent Alteration Worksheet for Clearcutting (see attached calculation details)

(Use photographs or computer simulation output for calculations)

	VPT # 468A 20 Mile Bay Recreation Site	VPT # 489A Harrison Lk: N. Towboat Straight	VPT # 492A Harrison Lk: Mid Channel NE of Long Island	VPT #538A Harrison Lake: Deer Island/Long Island
25. Total area of landform/VSU in perspective view as seen from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	5767	15096	1281	
26. Visible portion of proposed alteration(s) in perspective from each viewpoint.(measured in mm^2)	61.3	386.7	29.1	
27. Visible Ground area of all existing alterations in Non-VEG state in perspective view from each viewpoint.	304.8	532.6	24.4	
28. Total % alteration of the viewshed in perspective view from each viewpoint. **[(#2+#3)**? **#1]**? **100=#4**	**6.4%**	**6.1%**	**4.2%**	**0%**
Identify for each viewpoint which rVQC will be achieved based on percent alteration.	**PR-L**	**PR-L**	**PR-M**	**No Visible Proposed Cat A Blks**

Which rVQC would the proposed alteration in combination with any existing Non-VEG alterations meet from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?

N/A ☐ P ☐ R ☐ **PR (H,M,L)** ☒ M ☐ MM ☐ EM ☐

Comments: ***All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

Given the three assessment criteria listed above, does this proposal meet the recommended VQC from the most sensitive view/viewpoint?
No - Modification will result visually due the dominant total visible scale, although the % alteration is PR-L.

Comments: ***New development in combination with non-VEG will exceed the rVQC unless blocks can be designed with more retention to break up the visible alteration.***

All Proposed Category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblocks and reduce the visual impact of harvesting, particularly as viewed from VP 489A.

VLI indicates that the Existing Visual Condition exceeds the recommended Visual Quality Class; significant levels of retention are required.

Closure Statement

Completed By: *Mike Greig, RPF, P.Eng* **Date Completed:** *May 8, 2002*

NOTES:

1. ***All proposed category A cutblocks are portrayed here in the rendered views as clearcuts, except Blk 3113 which is shown as a partial cut, to show the outer limits of development since final block design is not complete; the final block design is proposed to be based on a partial cut silviculture system to provide small patches and tree retention to break up the appearance of the proposed cutblock and reduce the visual impact of harvesting.***

2. ***A follow-up visual analysis will be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Silviculture Prescription to confirm that the rVQCs have been achieved.***

3. ***Lakeside Forest Products Ltd completed the VEG assessment.***

Appendix 1 Visual Landscape Inventory Terms

Visual Landscape Inventory Label	Term	Definition	
VLI	**Visual Landscape Inventory**	Inventory of visual resource values and attributes on visually sensitive landforms.	
VSU	**Visual Sensitivity Unit**	A distinct landform unit visible from key viewpoints, defined by the Visual Landscape Inventory or as determined by visual landscape analysis. Numbered VSUs are described in the VLI.	
rVQC	**Recommended Visual Quality Class**	Range of Acceptable % Alteration in Perspective Views	Measure of the ability of proposed activities, in combination with non-VEG alterations, to achieve the basic rVQC definition (see below). Range of acceptable % alteration in perspective views
??P	Preservation	0	No visible activities.
??R	Retention	0-1.5%	Activities are not visually evident.
??PR	Partial Retention	1.6-7.0%	Activities are visible but remain subordinate
??M	Modification	7.1-18.0%	Activities are visually dominant but have natural appearing characteristics.
??MM	Maximum Modification	18.1-30.0%	Activities are dominant and out of scale, but appear natural in the background.
??N	Not Rated		Not rated in the Visual Landscape Inventory
rVQC sub	**Partial Retention Subdivision**		Subclasses of partial retention
??PR-H	Partial Retention High	1.6-3.4%	Activities are visible but remain subordinate – higher level of retention end of the PR spectrum
??PR-M	Partial Retention Moderate	3.5-5.2%	Activities are visible but remain subordinate –middle level of retention end of the PR spectrum
??PR-L	Partial Retention Low	5.3-7.0%	Activities are visible but remain subordinate – lower level of retention end of the PR spectrum
EVC	**Existing Visual Condition**	Existing human made landscape alterations caused by forestry, mining, roads, utility corridors, and agricultural activity. Expressed in similar terms of the visual quality class categories of Preservation, Retention, Partial Retention, Modification, Maximum Modification, Excessive Modification.	
VSC	**Visual Sensitivity Class**	Rating of the sensitivity of the landscape to visual alteration based on biophysical characteristics, as well as viewing and viewer-related factors. (1=very high sensitivity to 5=very low sensitivity).	
VEG	**Visually Effective Green-up**	The stage at which regeneration on a cutblock is perceived by the public as a newly established forest. Forest cover should be of sufficient height to block stumps, logging debris and bare ground.	

References

1. Chilliwack Forest District Standard Operating Procedure for Visual Resource Management, January 27, 2000.

2. Chilliwack Forest District Visual Landscape Inventory, 1996.
3. Visual Impact Assessment Guidebook