

From: Bryce, Mark
Sent: Monday, 7 June 2021 11:07 AM
To: Daniel Hackett [REDACTED]
Cc: Jacobi, Jason <Jason.Jacobi@parks.tas.gov.au>
Subject: RE: viewfield info

Hi

The original report was aimed at presenting impacts according to the wilderness quality (WQ) model. There has been little attempt by PWS at this stage to take into consideration actions or factors that mitigate the modelled impacts on WQ.

PWS will do this once the final RAA is submitted.

As you know recreational settings are made up of the biophysical, social and managerial conditions which comprise the following elements:

▪ Biophysical	Vegetation, landscape, wildlife, topography, scenery, space (size) naturalness, remoteness, viewfields, appearance, water quality, human induced noise, sounds, light and smells.
▪ Social	Level of use, type of use, group size.
▪ Managerial	Development that directs and controls use and impacts. Access facilities – walking tracks, roads, signs. General recreational facilities – toilets, barriers, signage, fencing. tracks and roads) levels of servicing, presence of management, interpretation, information. Regulation of use e.g. booking or permit systems.

While WQ model does not directly take into account the social conditions, helicopter access does influence the level of use and group sizes (social conditions).

As the level of use increases so too does the impact on biophysical conditions.

The motorised access (in this case helicopter) generally allows a social gathering and level of use that would otherwise not be typical of an area that is not easily accessed by foot. The number of people in a remote area negatively impacts wilderness quality, but is not measured by the computer model. Depending on the activities of the group, human sights, sounds, and informal trampling and track formation can adversely impact biophysical conditions relevant to wilderness recreational settings.

When the camp is not operating (and no people are on site) there would be no change to the social conditions of the area.

So while the WQ model also does not take into account visitor numbers (the social settings), impacts from increased usage, noise and other factors that may add to the impact. Conversely the model will tend to overestimate impacts on the biophysical setting from built infrastructure as it assumes that any infrastructure will be visible given it assumes a flat topography and no vegetation screening.

Temporal influences such as noise from helicopter landings are not measured by the WQ model. The fact that the helicopter and camp will be only operated for certain periods of the year will mitigate the social impacts on wilderness recreational settings.

Feel free to present the email exchange as PWS acknowledgment of the limitation to WQ modelling.

Mark Bryce
Director Landscape Programs

Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service
03 616 54272 | [REDACTED]
Mark.Bryce@parks.tas.gov.au
Level 6, 134 Macquarie St Hobart TAS 7000
GPO Box 1751 Hobart TAS 7001



From: Daniel Hackett [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 20 May 2021 1:46 PM
To: Bryce, Mark <Mark.Bryce@parks.tas.gov.au>
Cc: Jacobi, Jason <Jason.Jacobi@parks.tas.gov.au>
Subject: RE: viewfield info

Thank you for the information Mark.

Would you be able to collate the additional WQ information re viewfields and the temporal nature of impacts (including no flights for 300+ days per year, and no commercial operations for ~240 days per year) into a brief addendum to be attached to the original PWS report? It is obviously important and appropriate that these mitigation strategies are presented with the overall PWS WQ report, which to date shows a report on impacts of the action *without* the prescribed mitigation or avoidance measures being applied.

I would then supply this to the Fed Minister to consider with other materials.

Appreciated, Daniel Hackett
Wild Drake P/L

From: [Bryce, Mark](#)
Sent: Thursday, 20 May 2021 1:31 PM
To: [Daniel Hackett](#)
Cc: [Jacobi, Jason](#)
Subject: RE: viewfield info

Hi Daniel

Sorry about the delay in getting this to you.

Thanks for the information around viewfields – this will reduce the impact on wilderness quality within the wilderness zone (and will factor this into the final analysis that PWS undertakes).

Moving the helicopter landing site does not see any measurable drop in the impact on WQ. This is due to the fact that the model is not measuring the factors that helicopter access would have on wilderness quality

If any hardening of the helicopter landing area is required or track construction between the landing sites and Halls Island may (according to the model) offset any benefits in moving the landing area.

Your point about the temporal nature of helicopter access and use is acknowledged. Consequently there will be a **reduced chance of helicopter access and associated impacts occurring while others are walking in the area. During the time when the helicopter visits the site and the standing camp is occupied** the increased number of people will change the social conditions of the recreational setting, and the human induced noise (people and helicopter) will change the biophysical conditions of the setting.

Regards

Mark Bryce
Director Landscape Programs

Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service
03 616 54272 | [REDACTED]
Mark.Bryce@parks.tas.gov.au
Level 6, 134 Macquarie St Hobart TAS 7000
GPO Box 1751 Hobart TAS 7001



From: Daniel Hackett [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 27 April 2021 3:53 PM
To: Bryce, Mark <Mark.Bryce@parks.tas.gov.au>
Subject: viewfield info

Hello Mark,

For your information, please see screenshot insert for viewfield details. This was taken from RMPAT evidence provided by Cumulus Studio. The camp is not viewable beyond these parameters as a result of appropriate design and siting.

- Discrete positioning of the Standing Camp amongst natural features will ensure the infrastructure when viewed from the original Halls Hut is minimized. Furthermore, possible views of the infrastructure from the shoreline of Lake Malbena is restricted to a narrow field of between 45 and 90 degrees, at a distance ranging from 175-280 metres. (refer fig. 2) Muted non-reflective dark grey cladding and the small scale of the 'pods' ensure the infrastructure is recessive and will blend with the surroundings when viewed across these distances.



Figure 2.

Regards,

Daniel Hackett
Wild Drake P/L



Virus-free. www.avg.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER:

The information in this transmission may be confidential and/or protected by legal professional privilege, and is intended only for the person or persons to whom it is addressed. If you are not such a person, you are warned that any disclosure, copying or dissemination of the information is unauthorised. If you have received the transmission in error, please immediately contact this office by telephone, fax or email, to inform us of the error and to enable arrangements to be made for the destruction of the transmission, or its return at our cost. No liability is accepted for any unauthorised use of the information contained in this transmission.