## **BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT ENV-2020-AKL-000064 AT AUCKLAND**

## **I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA TĀMAKI MAKAURAU ROHE**



## **BETWEEN AWATARARIKI RESIDENTS INCORPORATED**

Appellant

## **AND BAY OF PLENTY REGIONAL COUNCIL**

First Respondent

## **AND WHAKATĀNE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Second Respondent and Requestor of Plan Change 17

# **STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CHRIS MASSEY ON BEHALF OF WHAKATĀNE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

# **LANDSLIDE RISK ANALYSIS AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS**

**10 August 2020**

**BROOKFIELDS LAWYERS**

A M B Green / R H Ashton Telephone No. 09 379 9350 Fax No. 09 379 3224 Email: [green@brookfields.co.nz](mailto:green@brookfields.co.nz) P O Box 240 DX CP24134 **AUCKLAND**

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**



## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- $1.1<sub>1</sub>$ My evidence relates to:
	- (a) The landslide risk analysis methods and approaches used to quantify the risk to people living on the Awatarariki fan from debris flow hazards; and
	- (b) The efficacy of landslide early warning systems to reduce the risk to the people exposed on the debris fan.
- $1.2.$ Based on the information presented in my evidence before the Hearings Commissioners and the key documents I have used, or referred to, it is my opinion that a multi-staged debris flow early warning system – based on the potential design and effectiveness framework – adopting any of the scenarios discussed, is unlikely to allow ALL potential people present in the hazard zone at the time that a debris flow event is initiated, to evacuate to safe areas, irrespective of where they are on the fan. Therefore, people who don't notice the alert, or do not/or cannot evacuate would continue to be exposed to the risk levels given in Tonkin & Taylor (2015), depending on their location on the fan.
- $1.3.$ Given the uncertainties associated with a debris flow early warning system as listed in my evidence, adopting such a system as the means to mitigate the risk to people living on the fan is, in my opinion, not aligned with taking a precautionary approach, as stated in Section 1.7 of the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement (**BOPRPS**).
- $1.4.$ The BOPRPS and AGS (2007) methods to calculate the annual individual fatality risk are comparable, but they do differ based on their calculation routes. The results from the two methods can give similar values if similar inputs are used.

# **2. INTRODUCTION**

- $2.1.$ My full name is Christopher Ian Massey.
- $2.2.$ My evidence is given on behalf of the Whakatāne District Council (the **District Council**) in relation to:
- (a) Proposed Plan Change 1 (Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā) to the Operative Whakatāne District Plan; and
- (b) Proposed Plan Change 17 (Natural Hazards) to the Bay of Plenty Regional Natural Resources Plan (a private plan change request from the District Council)

(together referred to as the **Proposed Plan Changes**).

- $2.3.$ My evidence relates to:
	- (a) The landslide risk analysis methods and approaches used to quantify the risk to people living on the Awatarariki fan from debris flow hazards; and
	- (b) The efficacy of landslide early warning systems to reduce the risk to the people exposed on the debris fan.
- $2.4.$ My evidence will cover:
	- (a) An overview of landslide risk analysis methods, approaches and practice, risk tolerability thresholds, and the role of landslide early warning systems (**EWS**) as a method to mitigate risk; and
	- (b) The potential design and effectiveness framework of a publicfacing EWS for debris flows onto the Awatarariki fan, as an option to reduce the risk to people living in properties on the fan.
- 2.5. I attended the public hearing of submissions to the Proposed Plan Changes held in March 2020 and presented expert evidence to the Hearing Commissioners.

# **3. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE**

 $3.1.$ I hold the position of Principal Scientist at the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Limited (**GNS Science**). I have been a scientist at GNS Science since February 2006. My experience is in engineering geology and I have 23 years of consultancy and research experience in the investigation and analysis of complex geological and geotechnical data for landslide and slope stability including landslide monitoring, foundation design, underground/surface rock support and groundwater problems. I have applied these skills to geohazard and risk assessments, oil and gas

pipelines, highway, railway, mining engineering and town planning projects in Malawi, Bhutan, Nepal, Ethiopia, Russia (Sakhalin Island), Tajikistan, Hong Kong, Australia, Europe, UK and New Zealand. I have **attached** a copy of my CV as **Appendix 1**.

- $3.2.$ I hold the following qualifications:
	- (a) PhD (Engineering Geology) from Durham University, UK. 2010;
	- (b) MSc (DIC), (Engineering Geology) from Imperial College, London, UK. 1999;
	- (c) BSc Hons (Geology) from Leeds University, UK. 1996; and
	- (d) Chartered Geologist from the Geological Society of London. 2005.
- $3.3.$ I am also a member of New Zealand Geotechnical Society, the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering and a Fellow of the Geological Society of London, UK.
- $3.4.$ My current responsibilities include managing many of the engineering geological consultancy projects carried out by GNS Science, the most recent being landslide and rockfall risk assessments for the Department of Conservation and Franz Josef Glacier Guides for staff and visitors to the Fox and Franz Josef Glacier Valleys.
- $3.5.$ I also conceived and led an assessment of the landslide hazards and route resilience of the main road and rail corridors situated on the Kaikoura coast that were badly affected by the 2016 earthquake.
- $3.6.$ I have provided peer review services to Hastings District Council and Queenstown-Lakes District Council on several landslide risk assessments carried out for them by consultants.
- $3.7.$ I manage the landslide research for GNS Science, which involves setting the research strategy and goals and building relationships with other partners and collaborators in New Zealand and overseas.
- $3.8.$ I recently led a Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (**MBIE**) funded 4-year project investigating the impact of anthropogenic slopes in Wellington, which was completed in 2019.
- $3.9.$ I am currently leading a 5-year MBIE funded Endeavor Programme investigating earthquake induced landscape dynamics.
- I'm also leading GeoNet projects to establish near-real time landslide forecast tools for New Zealand. These tools would provide stakeholders with rapid advisory information on landslide locations and their severity in response to strong earthquakes and significant rain events, such as the 2016 Kaikoura Earthquake and July 2020 Northland storm.
- 3.11. I have more than 20-years' experience responding to landslide events, many of which have involved setting up landslide monitoring systems to provide hazard warning. I was involved with the 2007 Ruapehu Lahar and helped the Department of Conservation monitor the stability of the tephra dam at the crater lake, as part of the Eastern Ruapehu Lahar Warning System. I managed GNS Science landslide response to the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes and the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake.
- 3.12. I have been pioneering landslide modelling and quantitative landslide risk assessment methods and practices in New Zealand since the 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes, and have provided expert witness advice on such matters in the Environment Court on behalf of local and central government agencies.

## **4. MY ROLE**

- $4.1.$ I was asked by the District Council to give expert advice on landside risk analysis and landslide EWS. As part of this work I authored GNS Science Consultancy report CR 2019/77, listed in the key documents below, which describes an effectiveness framework, for a public-facing EWS for debris flows onto the Awatarariki fan.
- $4.2.$ Throughout my statement of evidence, I refer to "my opinion", it should be noted that "my opinion" is based on the results of my review of the information provided by the District Council (items 4.4(a) to (h) below) and other information listed below.
- $4.3.$ I have also relied on observations I made during a field visit to the Awatarariki catchment and fan on 15/08/2019. The field visit comprised aerial reconnaissance of the fan and catchment via helicopter.
- $4.4.$ The key documents I have used, or referred to, in forming my opinions while preparing this brief of evidence are:
	- (a) Hegan. B., Johnson, D., Severne, C. 2001. Landslide risk from the Hipaua geothermal area near Waihi village at the southern end of Lake Taupo. Proceedings of New Zealand Geotechnical Society Symposium, Christchurch, August 2001. Pp439–448;
	- (b) 06/2005: Davies, T.R.H., 2005. Debris flow emergency at Matatā, New Zealand, 2005. Inevitable events, predictable disaster. Report Natural Hazards Research Centre, Department of Geological Sciences, University of Canterbury, New Zealand;
	- (c) 2005: McSaveney M.J., Beetham, R.D., Leonard, G.S., 2005. The 18 May 2005 debris flow disaster at Matatā: causes and mitigation suggestions. Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Client Report 2005/71 prepared for Whakatāne District Council;
	- (d) AGS. 2007c. Guideline for landslide susceptibility, hazard and risk zoning for land use planning. In Australian Geomechanics. Australian Geomechanics Society;
	- (e) 2007: AGS. 2007d. Practice Note Guidelines for Landslide Risk Management. In Australian Geomechanics. Australian Geomechanics Society;
	- (f) 2009: AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009. Risk Management Principles and guidelines is a joint Australia/New Zealand adoption of ISO 31000:2009;
	- (g) Massey, C. I., Beetham, R., Severne, C., Archibald, G., Hancox, G. T. H., Power, W. 2009. Field investigations at Waihi Landslide, Taupo 30 June & 1 July 2009, GNS Science Report 2009/34;
	- (h) 2011: Taig, T., Massey, C.I., Webb, T., 2012. Canterbury Earthquakes Port Hills Slope Stability: Principles and criteria for the assessment of risk from slope instability in the Port Hills, Christchurch. GNS Science Consultancy report 2011/319;
	- (i) 2012: Taig, T., Massey C.I. 2012. Understanding life-safety risk concepts for rockfall and cliff collapse in the Port Hills,

Christchurch (Summary Series 1/3): [https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Environment/Land/gns-ph-](https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Environment/Land/gns-ph-Summary1-3web.pdf)[Summary1-3web.pdf](https://ccc.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Environment/Land/gns-ph-Summary1-3web.pdf)

- (j) 11/2013: Tonkin & Taylor Ltd., 2013. Quantitative Landslide and Debris Flow Hazard Assessment Matatā Escarpment. November 2013: Report 29115;
- (k) 10/2014: Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement. Appendix L Methodology for risk assessment;
- (l) 2015: Tonkin & Taylor Ltd., 2013. Supplementary Risk Assessment Debris Flow Hazard Matatā, Bay of Plenty: Report 29115.1000;
- (m) 10/12/2015: Email from Nicola Litchfield (GNS Science) to Jeff Farrell (the District Council), RE: Matatā early warning system;
- (n) 2016: United Nations report of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology Related to Disaster Risk Reduction (OIEWG), adopted by the General Assembly on 2 February 2017 (A/RES/71/276). A/71/644;
- (o) 23/02/2016: Whakatāne District Council: Mitigation of debris flow risk – Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā – Updated 23 February 2016;
- (p) 2017. Potter S.H., Scott B.J., Fearnley C.J., Leonard G.S., Gregg C.E., 2017. Challenges and benefits of standardising Early Warning Systems: A case study of New Zealand's Volcanic Alert Level System. In: Fearnley CJ, Bird D, Jolly G, Haynes K, McGuire B, editors. Observing the Volcano World: Volcanic Crisis Communication. Springer. p. 350. (Advances in Volcanology;
- (q) 12/2017: Davies, T.R.H., 2017. Awatarariki Fan, Matatā: Debris flow early warning systems feasibility study. 19 December 2017;
- (r) 2018: United Nations Development Programme (**UNDP**): Five approaches to build functional early warning systems;
- (s) 11/2019: Blackwood, P., Bassett, T., 2019. Matatā Flooding 18 May 2005: Meteorology Update. November 2019;
- (t) 31/10/2019: Technical Assessment: Debris Flow Risk Management Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā, Bay of Plenty. GHD;
- (u) 01/2020: GNS Science Client report: Massey, C.I., Potter, S.H., Leonard G.S., 2019. Design and effectiveness-evaluation framework of a public facing Early Warning System for debris flows on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā. (GNS Science report; 2019/77). doi:10.21420/8D3K-HD78;
- (v) 01/2020: Statement of evidence of Tim Davies, on behalf of the District Council;
- (w) 01/2020: Statement of evidence of Kevin Hind, on behalf of the District Council;
- (x) 01/2020: Statement of evidence of Chris Phillips, on behalf of the District Council;
- (y) 01/2020: Statement of evidence of Mauri McSaveney, on behalf of the District Council; and
- (z) Massey, C.I., Lukovic, B., de Vilder. S., Archibald, G.C., Abbott, E.R. 2020. Landslide risk analysis for Clifton Beach, Cape Kidnappers, Hawke's Bay. Lower Hutt (NZ): GNS Science. 101 p. Consultancy Report 2020/28.

## **5. CODE OF CONDUCT**

 $5.1.$ I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014. I also agree to comply with the Code when presenting evidence to the Court. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state that I rely upon the evidence of another expert witness. I also confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions.

## **6. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- $6.1.$ This statement of evidence covers the following:
	- (a) A summary of my evidence (**Executive Summary**);
- (b) An overview of the landslide risk analyses, landslide early warning systems and issues and risk tolerability thresholds relevant to the Plan Changes;
- (c) Appendix L of the BOPRPS and AGS 2007;
- (d) Variability in debris flows;
- (e) Response to the grounds of appeal (**Response to Appeal**); and
- (f) Conclusions.

# **7. LANDSLIDE RISK ANALYSIS AND EARLY WARNINGS**

- $7.1.$ Risk means many things to different people, so it is important always to define what is meant by the term. The general framework for managing risk is that:
	- (a) Hazards with potential to harm people are identified;
	- (b) The associated risk is then estimated in quantitative terms; and
	- (c) Criteria are established as to what level of control over risk is appropriate at what risk level.
- $7.2.$ It is the role of the technical expert to provide information relating to bullets 7.1(a) and (b). It is not the role of the technical experts to make decisions about how risky is too risky, e.g., setting risk tolerability thresholds, bullet 7.1(c). Such thresholds and levels of control should be set by the decision makers in consultation with those at risk and the technical experts who quantified it. This process is outlined on behalf of the District Council in Mr Farrell's evidence.
- $7.3.$ Landslide risk is defined as a measure of the probability of a landslide hazard occurring and severity of a consequence to life, health, property, or the environment (Corominas et al., 2015). Landslide risk needs to be analysed first in order to:
	- (a) Assess it; and
	- (b) Determine if the risks are too risky, manage it.
- $7.4.$ Risk management addresses the following questions (adapted from Ho et al., 2000; Lee and Jones, 2014):
	- (a) What can cause harm (Landslide Characterisation, e.g., the type and nature of the landslide)?
	- (b) How often does this occur (Frequency Analysis)?
	- (c) What can go wrong and how bad could it be (Consequence Analysis)?
	- (d) What is the probability of damage occurring (Risk Estimation)?
	- (e) So, what (Risk Evaluation)?
	- (f) What can be done, at what cost, to manage and reduce unacceptable levels of damage (Risk Treatment)?
- $7.5.$ The overall risk management framework, adapted from AGS (2007c) and AS/NZS (ISO 31000:2009) is shown in Figure 1, which comprises:
	- (a) Risk analysis, bullets 7.4(a) to (d);
	- (b) Risk assessment, bullet 7.4(e); and
	- (c) Risk management, bullet 7.4(f).





- 7.6. Quantitative risk analysis is systematic, objective and reproducible (Corominas et al., 2014). This enables the risk from multiple hazards, spanning the full range of severity (from small to large) that could feasibly occur at the site, at the same location or various locations, to be compared. This allows risk tolerance and acceptability levels to be more readily determined, and provides stakeholders, planners and policy makers (the decision makers) with an objective foundation on which to base their decisions.
- $7.7.$ The risk to people living on the Awatarariki Fan has been analysed by Tonkin and Taylor (2013, 2015) by quantifying the landslide risk to a single individual adopting the annual individual fatality risk as the metric of choice.
- $7.8.$ The main landslide hazards – defined as the probability of a given type of landslide occurring within a defined time period and area (Corominas et al., 2015) – identified and analysed by Tonkin & Taylor (2013, 2015) as affecting the site are debris flows, initiated by high intensity rain. I refer to the evidence of Professor Davies for the definition of a debris flow. Other types of landslide from different types of trigger, such as earthquakes, have not been analysed by Tonkin & Taylor (2013, 2015).
- 7.9. The risk from debris flow hazards to people living on Awatarariki Fan was calculated by Tonkin & Taylor (2013, 2015) following the AGS (2007c) guidelines, and adopting the following equation in AGS (2007d):
	- (a)  $R_{(D)} = P_{(H)} \times P_{(T:S)} \times P_{(S:H)} \times V_{(D:T)}$  where:
		- (i) *R(D)* is the annual risk (probability) of loss of life (death) of a person from landslides, the annual individual fatality risk (**AIFR**);
		- (ii)  $P_{(H)}$  is the annual probability of the initiating event (rain), and the likely size of the debris flow(s) initiated by the event, spanning the range of events and debris flows from small to large, which could feasibly occur at the site;
		- (iii)  $P_{(T:S)}$  the probability that an element at risk is present at that location when the debris reaches/passes through it;
- (iv)  $P_{(S:H)}$  is the probability that the element at risk, if present, is in the path of the debris at a given location; and
- (v)  $V_{(D:T)}$  is the vulnerability of the element at risk to the debris, or in this case the probability that a person is killed if present and in the path of debris.
- 7.10. The AIFR estimates produced by Tonkin & Taylor (2013, 2015) were peer reviewed by Dr McSaveney and Professor Davies who identified an area on the fan that was considered unsuitable for residential use. This area reflected the area bound by the Tonkin & Taylor (2013, 2015) modelled AIFR contour line of 0.001 % (10<sup>-5</sup>) which the peer reviewers' considered better reflected an AIFR level of  $0.01 \%$  (10<sup>-4</sup>). The District Council accepted the advice of Dr McSaveney and Professor Davies. An AIFR of 0.01 % (10<sup>-4</sup>) was adopted as "intolerable for existing development" by the District Council. I refer to the evidence of Mr Farrell for these details. This is also the level recommended by the Australian Geomechanics Society for contexts including slope collapse, and it roughly corresponds to the lifetime average risk faced by New Zealanders from road accidents. This is also the risk level adopted by the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority and Christchurch City Council for their decision-making post 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes (e.g., Taig et al., 2011). In Section 8.0 of my evidence I discuss risk tolerability thresholds further.
- The District Council reviewed various risk treatment (mitigation) options to try to reduce the AIFR to below  $0.01\%$  (10<sup>-4</sup>). These included the EWS, catchment management options and the relocation of people.
- 7.12. In 2015, Mr Farrell of the District Council contacted GNS Science to discuss the feasibility of installing a landslide EWS as a potential option that could reduce the risk to tolerable levels. A meeting between Mr Farrell, Dr McSaveney (GNS Science), Dr Litchfield (GNS Science) and me was held in Wellington on 7/12/2015. In this meeting Mr Farrell requested that GNS Science provide information to the District Council on how they would go about designing a debris flow EWS for the Awatarariki catchment and fan. These discussions were summarised in a memo emailed to Mr Farrell from Dr Litchfield on 10/12/2015.
- 7.13. Professor Davies was commissioned by the District Council in 2017 to assess the feasibility of an EWS to reduce the risk to people living on the Awatarariki fan. This work followed the steps outlined in the GNS Science 10/12/2015 memo. The work comprised:
	- (a) The reliability of the debris-flow detection or inference system (false alarms and false negatives);
	- (b) The impacts of a debris-flow on the assets exposed and consequences;
	- (c) The time between the warning being issued and the debris-flow impacting the asset;
	- (d) The time taken to remove assets from the hazard zone when the warning has been issued;
	- (e) The residual risk once the system is operational; and
	- (f) System cost setup, operation and maintenance.
- 7.14. The report focused primarily on items  $7.13(a)$  to (d). The main findings from this report were:
	- (a) It is feasible to develop a reliable debris-flow warning system that will reduce risk-to-life to road and rail users crossing the Awatarariki fan;
	- (b) Trip-wire detectors were the preferred sensor to detect whether a debris flow had been initiated. These would comprise several wires installed across the stream at a height above the channel bed greater than that of the water surface in a flood but lower than the depth of a debris flow. The wire(s) would be connected to an electrical circuit such that an alarm is triggered if a wire breaks: and
	- (c) Other debris-flow warning systems, e.g. those based on rainfall totals and intensities that generate debris-flows or those that infer debris-flow presence via ultrasound or seismic signals, are not feasible in Awatarariki Stream due to the lack of the necessary calibration data and the time (decades to centuries) that would be

required to collect such data, as well as inevitably generating a high proportion of false alarms – when an alert is triggered but no debris flow occurs.

- 7.15. Although Davies (2015) states that it is feasible to develop a reliable EWS, he goes on to conclude that:
	- (a) The trip-wire system cannot provide adequate warning time to guarantee the ability of residents to exit dwellings and reach safety, because of the short distance between the detector sites (tripwires) and the dwellings on the fan and the need to apply a realistic factor of safety to calculations of warning and evacuation times; and
	- (b) Debris flow velocities were estimated to be in the order of 5 m/s in the catchment and 3 m/s on the fan. For the furthest dwelling on the fan the warning time (time from when the trip wire breaks to debris impacting a given location) was estimated to be about 3 to 6 minutes, and 3 to 5 minutes around the road and rail corridors. Evacuation distances for the furthest dwelling to relative safety were assessed as being about 600 m.
- On 1/11/2019 GNS Science was commissioned by the District Council to scope out the potential design and effectiveness-evaluation framework of a public facing (it is designed to notify "warn" those people affected directly) EWS for debris flows on the Awatarariki Fanhead, Matatā, and identify any initially obvious "show stoppers", and whether an EWS would be suitable/unsuitable for Council to consider as an option to manage the risk. The results from this work are contained in GNS Science Client Report 2019/77 (GNS Science, 2019).
- This work built upon the previous advice by GNS Science to Jeff Farrell (10/12/2015) and the subsequent study carried out by Davies (2017) by assessing in more detail the various aspects of an EWS, via the following objectives:
	- (a) Objective 1: How to design and evaluate an EWS;
	- (b) Objective 2: Outline of necessary community consultation;
- (c) Objective 3: Summary of any potential 'show stoppers' identified at this stage, and an assessment of the suitability/unsuitability of an EWS as an option the District Council could use to manage the risk; and
- (d) Objective 4: Recommendations for next steps.
- 7.18. A summary of the approach used, and the main findings from GNS (2019) are set out below.
- 7.19. An EWS is "an integrated system of hazard monitoring, forecasting and prediction, disaster risk assessment, communication and preparedness activities, systems and processes that enables individuals, communities, governments, businesses and others to take timely action to reduce disaster risks in advance of hazardous events" (United Nations 2016).
- 7.20. According to the Sendai Framework, it is best practice to develop an EWS that can be used for multiple hazards (UNDP, 2018). A people-centred EWS (designed to meet the needs of the people relying on it) empowers individuals and communities threatened by hazards to act in a timely and appropriate manner, to reduce the chance of death, injury and illness, and impacts to property, assets, and the environment (UNDP, 2018). There are four key elements of a people-centred, end-to-end EWS: Disaster risk knowledge; Detection, monitoring, analysis and forecasting of the hazards and possible consequences; Warning dissemination and communication; and Preparedness and response capabilities (Figure 2).



- **Figure 2.** Critical elements of people-centred Early Warning Systems. Adapted from GNS (2019), based on the UNDP (2018).
- 7.21. The elements, or components of an EWS need to link seamlessly in order for the EWS to be effective and be flexible to adjust to local events and contexts. Factors which can assist the linkages between the elements are:
	- (a) Establishing effective communication networks between all parties;
	- (b) Empowering the community at risk by making scientific knowledge and risk assessments available and comprehendible;
	- (c) Developing effective decision-making processes, including acknowledging the local context and defining accountability and responsibility;
	- (d) Incorporating elements of behavioural response, such as understanding risk perceptions, levels of awareness, preparedness, and trust; and
	- (e) Considering technocratic and participatory approaches in EWSs (i.e. increasing public participation in processes).
- 7.22. It is also important to allow for the local context to drive warning system design and implementation, as set out in Figure 3.



**Figure 3.** Overview of developing a warning system. Adapted from Potter et al. (2017).

GNS Science (2019) developed an effectiveness-evaluation framework of a public facing EWS for debris flows on the Awatarariki Fan (Figure 4), which considers the context and user needs as set out in Figure 3. It should be noted that it was not the intent of this work to carry out the detailed design of an EWS. GNS Science (2019) relied on information contained in McSaveney et al. (2005), Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015) and Davies (2017) to help set the site-specific context for the EWS. Information with regard to user needs was derived from discussions with Jeff Farrell and others present at the expert's workshop – organised by the District Council and held in Whakatāne on 15/08/2019, and during various other meetings – as community consultation and discussion was not feasible at the time.



- **Figure 4.** Effectiveness-evaluation framework of a public facing Early Warning System (EWS) for debris flows on the Awatarariki Fan (GNS Science, 2019).
- Three different EWS stages typically used for debris flows were adopted and combined as part of the debris flow EWS design. These stages were based around the minimum time between a "positive" on the EWS algorithm (that triggers a warning that a debris flow could potentially occur) and the potential debris flow hitting dwellings on the fan.
- 7.25. In the literature review cited in GNS (2019) most EWS (about 80%), rely on a multi stage approach using different types of data to trigger the alerts. Most EWS adopt rainfall data from synoptic, radar and gauges for the first stages of the EWS (1-24 hours), linked to rainfall intensity/duration thresholds established using precedent and local knowledge of landsliding. Tilt meters and tripwires are then typically used for the later stages, to detect when a landslide initiates or landslide movement exceeds a given threshold.
- 7.26. The stages, and time lines for the alerts, evaluated as part of the debris flow EWS effectiveness-evaluation framework for the Awatarariki Fan are:
	- (a) 24 hours based on Synoptic meteorological data from MetService;
	- (b) 2-7 hours based rain radar (MetService) augmented with onsite rain gauge(s); and
	- (c) About 3-6 minutes based on trip wire(s) located as per those
- The effectiveness framework is based around nine components of an EWS system (shown in Figure 4), along with estimates of their probability of failing. These are:
	- (a) Sensors (and associated technology): 24 hours = synoptic (from MetService); 2-7 hours = rain radar (from MetService) and local rain gauge(s); and 3-6 minutes = trip wire(s);
	- (b) Telemetry: to transfer data from the instruments on site e.g., from the rain gauges and trip wires, and to get it to the place where it's needed. For MetService data, the data is provided via cloud-based data services, thus not requiring any on site sensors or telemetry;
	- (c) Software and computer processing: Data from the various sensors are processed and compared to pre-determined thresholds, typically carried out by an algorithm trained on past events, which then issues the alarm if the threshold(s) are exceeded;
	- (d) Missed alarms: This relates to an event that the algorithm misses and only relates to the rainfall data streams as the trip wires would be linked directly to the public alerting technology, thus not needing any data processing algorithm;
	- (e) Telemetry: to issue alerts e.g., satellite, cell, wifi and wifi and cell combined, to trigger the public alerting technology. For example, in the case of Stage 3, the trip wire would be linked by wifi to e.g., the siren and lights with less than a minute for siren/lights to operate after the trip wire triggers. This time might be slightly longer for text messages to be issued;
	- (f) Public alerting (technology): e.g. door knocking, voice sirens (with instructions about what to do), US Federal audible sirens, homemade sirens and flashing lights;
	- (g) Public don't notice: the public might not see the alert e.g., text message or flashing lights, or hear the sirens;
	- (h) Public don't act, including the effect of false alarms: the public decide not to act e.g., 24 hours prior, there will be a low certainty about the event (rain) occurring that could trigger the debris flow.

There would be many false alarms and thus a fostering of a low threat perception and decrease in trust of the warnings. The rate of false alarms will depend on the sensor type/data used. Even at the 3-minute stage, people tend to delay acting in order to confirm the threat, which leaves very little time to respond; and

- (i) Public not safe fast enough: From international literature, at the 2 or 24-hour stages there is typically a low evacuation rate (if not mandatory and forced) due to many reasons. High rates of evacuation don't usually occur until the 3-minute stage, because of the certainty at that time about the hazard. However, if people leave it too late, e.g., at the 3-minute stage, then flooding may prevent them from evacuating.
- This framework was applied to the 7.26(a)-(c) stages by adopting three scenarios across each, where: (1) is Good, (2) is Middle and (3) is Bad. Varying estimates of the probability of failure – for each of the 9 components set out at 7.27 – were adopted for each scenario (1)-(3). For the Bad scenario, the more pessimistic assumptions and values relating to the probability of failure for each component, were adopted. For the Good scenario, the more optimistic assumptions and values were adopted, whilst the Middle scenario adopted assumptions and values in between those adopted for the Good and Bad scenarios. The middle scenario should therefore be viewed as the most likely performance of the EWS.
- Estimates of the probability of failure of each of the 9 components, for each of the 3 scenarios, were based on: i) the experience of the authors; ii) the relevant literature; and iii) other technical experts with hands on knowledge of such issues. These probabilities of failure were then combined to derive a combined probability of failure for each scenario (1)- (3) under each stage (a)-(c), which were combined, assuming the EWS comprises all three stages.
- 7.30. These probabilities of failure were then used to estimate the long-term average number of people who could be exposed to the hazard in each event, for scenarios (1)-(3), expressed as a percentage of all the people living on the fan. This was done to indicate the range of likely effectiveness of the EWS.
- 7.31. Based on the GNS Science (2019) report and information in the previous sections of my evidence in chief, my opinion of the main findings/show stoppers relating to an EWS to manage the risk to people on the fan from debris flow hazards are:
	- (a) For stages 7.26(a) and (b)  $(2 7)$ , and 24 hours lead time): The *"public don't act"* component dominates the probability of failure of the EWS under scenarios Bad and Middle.
	- (b) The Good Scenarios all rely on mandatory forced evacuation at least 24- to 2 - hours ahead of a potential debris flow, which may or may not be feasible from logistical or legal perspectives (such perspectives are outside the scope of my technical expertise). In the Good scenario it could be that 50-60% of the people in the hazard zone are still present when the hazard occurs. This is because there is still a residual risk that an alarm is not given, if for example an event is missed, or equipment fails.
	- (c) The Middle and Bad scenarios rely on people making the decision to act for themselves. If the alert is given with a long lead time (and high uncertainty), then most people won't leave, and/or would leave it too late to leave, and then will not be able to leave due to e.g., flooding or even smaller debris flows that may not threaten life but impede evacuation. In these scenarios, it could be as high as 90% of the people in the hazard zone are still present when the hazard occurs.
	- (d) For stage 7.26(c) (3-6 minutes and adopting trip wire sensors) and assuming some people are evacuated during stages 7.26(a) and (b): The *"sensor"*, the "*public don't notice*" the alert and *"public not safe fast enough*" are the components that dominate the probability of failure of the EWS. This is because the trip wire has up to a 25% failure rate and has a very "short fuse" – short fuse means minimal time between the event occurring and the debris impacting the fan, which hampers awareness, decision making and evacuation – so some or many people would not be able to move fast enough to evacuate from the hazard zone, especially if the area is flooded by water preceding the first surge of a debris flow.
- (e) In the Good scenario which assumes most people who are still present in the hazard zone even after being issued with alerts 24 hours and 2 hours prior, based on the rain radar and rain gauge and synoptic data – there is a relatively high probability that the trip wire could fail (up to 25% failure rate based on precedent) to initiate the siren alerting people to evacuate.
- (f) In the Good scenario, it could be that 10-20% of the people in the hazard zone are still present when the hazard occurs because either the trip wire fails, the two phases of mandatory warning – in stages 7.26(a) and (b) – still don't get triggered in a subset of cases, and finally, even if the EWS works people may have to run through flood waters to evacuate to safe areas.
- (g) In the Middle scenario, the more realistic scenario, it could be that up to 80% of the people in the hazard zone are still present when the hazard occurs, especially if most people cannot run or evacuate due to flooding.
- (h) The length of the evacuation route i.e., shorter distances allowing people to get to safety quicker – is not a significant factor for those in the hazard zone. This is because there is still a residual risk that the sensor fails or the public don't notice the alert.
- (i) Other factors that might prevent people from evacuating at the different stages are e.g.: missed alarms, which will vary for sensor types; and the number of false alarms, which would be higher at the 2 to 24-hour stages, thus fostering a low threat perception and lack of trust in the warning system.
- (j) Flooding is a potential impediment for people evacuating. According to the evidence of Mauri McSaveney, flooding occurred several hours prior to the debris from the 2005 debris flow reaching the fan. Flooding may also be accompanied by relatively small volume debris flows, which may not threaten life but could impede evacuation.
- 7.32. Section 1.7 of the BOPRPS calls for a 'precautionary approach' where uncertainty exists. Given the uncertainties associated with a debris flow EWS as listed in my evidence, adopting an EWS as the means to mitigate

the risk to people living on the fan is, in my opinion, not aligned with taking a precautionary approach.

## **8. RISK TOLERABILITY THRESHOLDS**

- $8.1.$ The risk values presented by Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015) are relatively small in terms of the likelihood of a particular individual being killed per year. The Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015) reports and those of AGS (2007) make use of terminology which expresses risk as probabilities. I refer to the evidence of Professor Davies who describes the different ways life risk estimates are typically expressed.
- $8.2.$ Whether a particular level of life risk is tolerable/acceptable or intolerable/unacceptable is a matter of debate, as this it is not currently quantified in New Zealand legislation, and adopting one threshold value may not suit all applications. It is my opinion that risk tolerability thresholds and levels of control should be set by the decision makers in consultation with those at risk and the technical experts who quantified the risk, and not by the technical experts alone.
- $8.3.$ Tonkin & Taylor (2013) noted that the calculated annual individual fatality risk for people on the Awatarariki Fanhead was greater than the 0.01 %/annum level (I refer to the evidence of Mr Hind), which is the level adopted by AGS (2007) as being the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable.
- $8.4.$ In 2016, after the Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015) debris flow risk assessments had been completed, the natural hazard provisions of the PRPS were published. In the BOPRPS, an annual loss of life risk of greater than 0.01 %/annum is classified as being "high" – refer to BOPRPS Appendix L, Step 5(b ii).
- $8.5.$ When considering the acceptability or otherwise of a risk associated with a natural hazard, it is appropriate to compare it to other risks that are likely to be more familiar. I have included some examples in the following sections.
- $8.6.$ Example 1: Cliff collapses at Cape Kidnappers, Hawkes Bay and landslides at Fox and Franz Josef Glaciers, compared to the fatality risks faced by people working in various sectors of New Zealand (Figure 5).



**Figure 5.** The total fatalities per employee per year for the Department of Conservation (**DOC**) and Gannet Beach Adventures (**GBA**) staff at Cape Kidnappers, and DOC staff at Fox and Franz Josef Glaciers compared with those from other New Zealand industries (2007–2017 Department of Labour data), shown as dark purple. Notes: Statistics on deaths in workplaces (these include all deaths, not just those of people at work, so they tend to overstate the risk to workers themselves) are collected and published by the Department of Labour (DOL, now part of the MBIE). These have been normalised per employee per year (based on numbers of people employed in each sector published by the Ministry of Economic Development, [MED]). Source: Massey et al. (2020).

- $8.7.$ DOC decided that the levels of risk at Cape Kidnapers, Fox and Franz Josef Glaciers were too high for their employees (>0.01%) and so have put in a place risk mitigation controls to reduce the risks to being as low as reasonably practical (**ALARP**).
- $8.8.$ Example 2: Rockfalls and cliff collapse risk in the Port Hills, Christchurch, and risk thresholds (0.01%) used by the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (**CERA**) for their Port Hills residential red zone offer (Figure 6).



**Figure 6.** Risk comparison, showing the typical range of annual individual fatality risk (**AIFR**) from rockfalls and cliff collapses in the Port Hills of Christchurch following the 22 February 2011, earthquake, compared to the risks from other hazards people are typically exposed to. The adopted threshold for dwellings (0.01%), is the level of AIFR adopted by the CERA as part of their residential red zone offer. Dwellings exposing their occupants to AIFR's greater than the threshold were offered compensation to move. Source: Taig and Massey (2012).

- 8.9. Example 3: Debris flows at Te Rapa (Little Waihi) Lake Taupo, an example where locals made the decision to relocate without the risk being quantified and without government/council intervention.
	- (a) Several large landslides have occurred on the Waihi Fault scarp above the Hipaua thermal field at the southern end of Lake Taupo in the last c. 230 years which have transformed into very large debris flows in Waimatai Stream (Appendix A of Massey et al., 2009).
	- (b) A debris flow (possible landslide dam breach) occurred at night in May 1846 with the loss of 64 lives in Te Rapa (Little Waihi) village, including the chief Te Heu Heu. Another occurred on the morning of 20 March 1910 with the loss of only one life as people were alerted and escaped the debris flow (Figures 2 and 3 in Massey et al., 2009). There is also evidence of an earlier failure in about

1780, which apparently buried a pa at the mouth of nearby Omoho Stream with the loss of possibly 150 lives. The source area of the 1780 landslide is uncertain, but it could have been in the Waihi Fault Scarp just north of the 1910 failure scar, or possibly in Omoho Stream ~500-700 m upstream of SH 41 (Hegan et al., 2001).

- (c) Following the 1846 debris flow the village was relocated but was still near to the old village site. This new village was again partially hit by debris from the 1910 debris flow. Following the 1910 debris flow the village was relocated again, further north outside the main area inundated by debris from the 1910 debris flow<sup>1</sup>.
- (d) Based on the frequency of historical failures from Hegan et al. (2001), I have estimated the annual frequency  $(P_{(H)})$  of a large, rapid debris flow at Waihi in the future, as being somewhere between 0.009 (0.9% chance per year) to 0.016 (1.6% chance per year) with a mean of 0.013 (1.3%). I have simply assumed that the probability of the Te Rapa village (at its original location) being inundated by debris  $(P_{(S:H)})$ , is between 0.9 and 1.0, as most of the area of the original village was impacted by debris on the three historical occasions. For the probability of a person being present (*P(T:S)*), I have assumed values of between 0.4 (typical of a person who works during the day and is away on some weekends) to 0.7 (somebody at home most of the time e.g., young children and older people). I have assumed vulnerability values (V) that also consider a level of protection (or not) a dwelling may give to its occupants. I have assumed V-values of 0.7 (assuming the dwelling offers some protection to the occupant from the debris) to 0.2 (the dwelling offers little protection to its occupant).
- (e) I have estimated the AIFR using the AGS (2007) equation in Section 7.9 (a) of my evidence, assuming: 1) all the pessimistic input variables; and 2) the less pessimistic variables as set out above. Please note that this is a rudimentary risk analysis as I am only estimating the risk for a large debris flow similar to those in

<sup>1</sup> <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/new-zealands-most-devastating-landslide-at-te-rapa-lake-taupo>

1780, 1846 and 1910, and not smaller ones, which could still reach the area of the old village. I have also not assessed the annual frequency of occurrence based on an assessment of the physical reasons that could initiate a failure. Neither have I rigorously assessed the appropriateness of the other variables I have assumed. These variables, are however, similar to those used by Tonkin & Taylor (2013).

- (f) Taking these limitations into account, this rudimentary risk analysis gives a range of AIFR of between 0.5% to 0.05% (5 $\times$ 10<sup>-3</sup> to 5 $\times$ 10<sup>-</sup> 4 ), for dwellings in the main part of the debris fan (assuming the 1910 extent of debris, as per Massey et al., 2009).
- (g) I believe they are useful values to compare against those estimated by Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015), as the people who lived in the village at the time decided to move to a safer location, based on their perception of the risk, i.e., they believed the risk to life and/or their wellbeing, from debris flow hazards in the original village location was too risky. These levels of risk are similar to those risk levels estimated by Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015) for the Awatarariki Fanhead.
- 8.10. These examples show that the level of risk adopted by the District Council as being the threshold for tolerability (0.01%) is consistent with the level adopted by others.

# **9. APPENDIX L BOPRPS AND AGS 2007**

- $9.1.$ This section of my evidence addresses how the application of appendix L of the BOPRPS to assess risk on the fanhead produces essentially the same result as the application of AGS (2007).
- $9.2.$ The AIFR is the annual risk (probability) of loss of life (death) of a person from landslides, refer to Section 7.9 (a) of my evidence for the formula as given by AGS (2007). The AIFR is the product of the probability of the rainfall (or earthquake) event that initiates landslides of a given volume, multiplied by the probability the person is present at the location when the landslide debris reaches/passes, multiplied by the probability that the person is in the path of the debris, multiplied by the probability that the

person is killed. This AIFR formula is similar to that used by BOPRPS in the BOPRPS Appendix L, both are used to derive the AIFR.

- $9.3.$ The BOPRPS and AGS (2007) methods are comparable, but they do differ based on their calculation routes. The formula used in BOPRPS, Appendix L is:  $AIFR = (D \times P)/N$ , which I now refer to as Equation 1. Where:  $D =$  number of anticipated (modelled) deaths from the event if it occurs;  $N =$  population (maximum number of people present within the hazard assessment area at any point in time over a 24 hour period), which is the number of people exposed to the hazard;  $P =$  the computed annual exceedance probability, which is essentially the annual frequency of the event that could kill the given number of people.
- 9.4. The AIFR calculated using Equation 1, is the annual probability of a person being killed by the given event if it were to occur. The AIFR formula given in my evidence (and in the evidence of Mr Hind), which comes from the AGS (2007c) and JTC-1 (Fell et al., 2008) guidelines is given by the formula: AIFR =  $P_{(H)}$  x  $P_{(S:H)}$  x  $P_{(T:S)}$  x V, which is the same formula given in Section 7.9 (a), which I refer to here as Equation 2.
- $9.5.$ Where:  $P_{(H)}$  annual frequency of the event occurring;  $P_{(S:H)}$  is probability of spatial impact  $-$  i.e. the probability of a given location being impacted by landslide debris;  $P(T:SI)$  is the probability of a person (the person most at risk) being present and hit by debris at the given location and is nothing to do with the number of people exposed; V is the vulnerability of the person if present and hit by debris.
- 9.6. If we were to remove the  $P_{(H)}$  part in Equation 2, the result would be the probability of killing an individual if the given event occurred. If we were to multiply this by the number of people exposed to the same level (magnitude of hazard) (N in Equation 1) then the result would be the number of anticipated deaths from the event if it occurs (D in Equation 1). If we were to multiply this result by  $(P_{(H)}$  in Equation 2; or P in Equation 1), the result would be the same as that from Equation 1. Whether or not the two formulas give a similar result would depend on how D in Equation 1 was calculated. If they were calculated using the same inputs, then the results would be the same. I have demonstrated this in a simple spread sheet that I put together which is attached as **Appendix 2** to my evidence.
- $9.7.$ It should be noted that:
	- (a) D (Equation 1) will also vary spatially at the local scale, for example debris from larger landslides will travel further than smaller ones and as a result, the exposure and vulnerability of a person exposed may also change. Such local-scale spatial variations are not captured in Equation 1 but are by Equation 2.
	- (b) To estimate the true annual individual fatality risk (Equation 2), requires an estimate of the time the person most at risk is within the hazard area.
	- (c) AGS (2007) points out that the AIFR should also be calculated for the range of events (spanning the range of magnitude from small to large and severity), which could feasibly occur in the area of interest, and then summed. Where the true AIFR (all events) is the sum of the AIFR calculated for each representative event. This is not the case for the BOPRPS, which adopts a single event as the basis of the risk calculation.
- $9.8.$ In summary, the results from the two equations can give similar values if similar inputs are used. Equation 2, however, does not consider the number of people who may be present and exposed to the hazard, it calculates the annual individual fatality risk for the person most exposed, which is the person who spends the most time in the hazard area. Equation 1, calculates the annual frequency of a single person being killed as a function of the total population exposed to the hazard, based on estimating the total number of people who may be killed by the given hazard, assuming an individual event. Equation 1 therefore, is not really a true calculation of the AIFR as set out in Equation 2 and the AGS (2007c) guidelines. Thus, the results could differ.

## **10. VARIABILITY OF DEBRIS FLOWS**

10.1. I acknowledge the evidence of Mr Hind, the findings of the reports Tonkin & Taylor (2013; 2015), and the evidence of Dr McSaveney and Professor Davies. In my opinion, people present at the time of the debris flow were very lucky not to have been killed or seriously injured. This may have been for several reasons, i.e.: the debris height and velocities meant that the debris could not penetrate all homes that were hit; of those homes hit and

penetrated by debris, people may not have been present, or if they were they managed to get out of the way; and/or people were awake and aware of the situation and thus could take evasive actions? I point to a recent example at Howden Hut<sup>2</sup>, on the Routeburn track in Fiordland, which was hit by a debris flow on the  $4<sup>th</sup>$  February 2020. Two of the occupants of the hut were injured by the impact of the debris on the hut. However, most of the debris was prevented from hitting and entering the hut, as logs and other vegetation in the debris formed a natural dam protecting the hut. I carried out the GeoNet landslide response to this incident and interviewed the hut warden and the two people who were injured.

- 10.2. From what they told me and what I saw on the ground, the hut only received a "glancing blow", but debris heights were in the order of 1 to 1.5 m (against the hut) and there were several large trees that were entrained in the debris, which created a natural dam protecting the corner of the hut from being hit by more debris in the flow. On the other flank of the debris flow trail there was a similar structure (a store constructed in a similar way to the hut), it also had 1 to 1.5 m of debris against it (similar to that of the hut), but here there was no natural dam effect, and the debris entered the structure, damaging it and filling it up. The toilet block, which took the full impact from the debris was in the middle of the debris flow trail, it was destroyed and bits of it carried many tens of meters down slope. The toilet block also appeared to be of a "lighter" construction to that of the hut and store. I believe these observations highlight the importance of the type of building, where it is positioned relative to the debris flow path and where it is hit by debris, on whether debris is able to penetrate a structure. In my opinion, the people in Howden hut were lucky to escape with only minor injuries.
- 10.3. In other cases, people have not been lucky. For example, several debris flows occurred in Southern California in January 2018, northwest of Los Angeles in Santa Barbara County. These debris flows resulted in 23 deaths and injured approximately 167 people<sup>3</sup>. These examples show that there is a certain amount of variability with regards to the impacts from debris flows on dwellings and the people in them.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> [https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=12305926](https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12305926)<br>
https://pubs.goos.ion.co.urcle.org/goosphore/article/15/4/1140/571406/hu

[https://pubs.geoscienceworld.org/gsa/geosphere/article/15/4/1140/571496/Inundation](https://pubs.geoscienceworld.org/gsa/geosphere/article/15/4/1140/571496/Inundation-flow-dynamics-and-damage-in-the-9)[flow-dynamics-and-damage-in-the-9](https://pubs.geoscienceworld.org/gsa/geosphere/article/15/4/1140/571496/Inundation-flow-dynamics-and-damage-in-the-9)

10.4. The point I want to make is that each debris flow is different, and there is a certain amount of variability (randomness) from one to the next, and also between debris-flow pulses during an event, which makes risk analysis of them inexact at best, hence the appropriate range in the risk estimates given by Mr Hind in his evidence.

## **11. RESPONSE TO APPEAL**

- 11.1. I have reviewed the Awatarariki Residents Society appeal and comment as follows on the issues that relate to my expertise.
- 11.2. As a starting point, I refer to the evidence of Mr Hind, which relates to the non- effectiveness of engineering works to reduce the risk. Even if such works were feasible, based on the work by GNS (2019) and Davies (2017), it is my opinion that a debris flow EWS is unlikely to allow all people present in the hazard zone at the time that a debris flow event is initiated, to evacuate to safe areas, irrespective of where they are on it.
- 11.3. Paragraph 17:
	- (a) I am unsure as to which inputs are incorrect and why, as they are not listed. I would like to know what alternative values should be used and on what basis/evidence should they be used? If inappropriate values are used in the risk analysis, it could lead to carelessness, which is the opposite of precautionary. I refer to the evidence of Mr Hind, who states in Section 1.11, "The adoption of unconservative values as input into the calculations was unable to bring the estimated Loss of Life Risk for the affected properties to less than 0.01% per annum, let alone 0.001%." This indicates that even if less conservative values were adopted in the risk assessment, they would have little impact on reducing the risk to tolerable levels.
	- (b) With regards to the scale of the risk assessment, and whether "inner property features" should be taken into account, I refer to the Evidence of Mr Batchelar.
	- (c) With regards to the effectiveness of an EWS, I refer to my Evidence, where I conclude that: an EWS is unlikely to allow a potential people present in the hazard zone at the time that a

debris flow event is initiated, to evacuate to safe areas, irrespective of where they are on the fan.

- $11.4.$ Paragraph 20:
	- (a) I am unsure as to what the question or issue is that is referred to in this paragraph. Based on my understanding, I refer to the evidence of Mr Hind, Professor Davies and Dr Phillips with regards to the appropriateness, or not in this case, of hazard mitigation works to reduce the risk, which also include options other than engineering structures. I agree with Mr Hind, Professor Davies and Dr Phillips that mitigation works have been explored and found not to be viable.
- 11.5. Paragraph  $24$  (c):
	- (a) With regards to the effectiveness of an EWS, I refer to my Conclusions below.

# **12. CONCLUSIONS**

- $12.1.$ Based on the information presented in my evidence in chief and the key documents I have used, or referred to, it is my opinion that a multi-staged EWS – based on the potential design and effectiveness framework – adopting any of the scenarios contained in GNS (2019), is unlikely to allow all potential people present in the hazard zone at the time that a debris flow event is initiated (i.e., the trip wires cut), to evacuate to safe areas, irrespective of where they are on the fan. Therefore, people who don't notice the alert, do not/or cannot evacuate would continue to be exposed to the risk levels given in Tonkin & Taylor (2015), depending on their location on the fan.
- $12.2<sub>1</sub>$ Given the uncertainties associated with a debris flow EWS as listed in my evidence, adopting an EWS as the means to mitigate the risk to people living on the fan is, in my opinion, not aligned with taking a precautionary approach.
- 12.3. The BOPRPS and AGS (2007) methods to calculate the annual individual fatality risk are comparable, but they do differ based on their calculation routes. The results from the two methods can give similar values if similar inputs are used.

12.4. However, AGS (2007) does not consider the number of people who may be present and exposed to the hazard, it calculates the annual individual fatality risk for the person most exposed. The BOPRPS calculates the annual frequency of a single person being killed as a function of the total population exposed to the hazard, based on estimating the total number of people who may be killed by the given hazard.

**Dr Chris Massey**

**10 August 2020**

# **APPENDIX 1 – CV**

[Log off](https://online.gns.cri.nz/online/login?logoff=yes)

8/30/2019 Staff Profile



Keynote speaker 2018 New Zealand Society of Earthquake Engineering Annual Meeting (Auckland, New

Zealand)



# Professional Memberships

**Professional Memberships** Membership of professional societies, institutions, committees



# Present Employment





https://online.gns.cri.nz/online/login/profile/view?profileId=2205&u=0.5157637199953327

![](_page_39_Picture_363.jpeg)

Present Research / Professional Speciality

**Present research/professional speciality**

f

## **Present research/professional speciality: Geology**

![](_page_39_Picture_364.jpeg)

**Present Specialisation**

You can choose one Skill from your Fields of Special Competence

**Present Specialisation: Engineering Geology**

**International Linkages Citizenship**

United Kingdom

## **International Work**

Australia, Bhutan, China, Ethiopia, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Malawi, Nepal, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, United States

Work History (Professional Positions Held) **Employment Record 2005 - 2006 Senior Engineering Geologist/Geotechnical Engineer**

**Employer:** Connell Wagner Ltd, Auckland<br>New Zealand

 **Description of duties:**

Responsible for planning and leading geotechnical investigations and carrying out detailed design for various projects in the Auckland region of New

Zealand. Mr Massey was Involved with a number of projects ranging from: geohazard assessments (landslides and rockfalls) for a new road through<br>unstable terrain; ground investigation and foundation design for numerous comm

![](_page_40_Picture_392.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_393.jpeg)

## **Description of duties:**

Whilst with Scott Wilson Mr Massey worked for their International Division, and was primarily involved with development projects centred in many different countries around the world. He worked on landslide hazard assessments in Bhutan and Nepal, road rehabilitation in Ethiopia and highway<br>upgrading in Tajikistan, to name but a few. During his time at Scott Wilson, knowledge and experience of using specialist geotechnical software including slope stability, rockfall and geographical information systems (GIS). **Consultancy work during employment** 

![](_page_40_Picture_394.jpeg)

project involved researching the main factors that contribute towards the development of landslides in Nepal and Bhutan. Mr Massey was responsible for carrying out detailed landslide hazard assessments for several of the study areas in Bhutan.

## **1999 - 2002 Engineering Geologist**

![](_page_41_Picture_416.jpeg)

#### **Description of duties:**

specialist software, designing slopes, retaining walls and drainage measures as well as supervising construction activities. It was during his time with<br>Fugro that Mr Massey spent two years working on the high profile land Responsible for carrying out aerial photograph interpretations, engineering geological mapping (including geomorphological mapping), landslide<br>hazard mapping, planning/supervising ground investigations and laboratory testi organisation, management and investigation of landslides immediately after the event as well as carrying out the design of any emergency mitigation measures.

![](_page_41_Picture_417.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_418.jpeg)

 **Employer:** Leeds University United Kingdom

## **Description of duties:**

 Rock Deformation Research at Leeds University (UK) Innovation Business Group. Involved in several projects for clients including Shell, BP and Mobil. Primarily responsible for planning and carrying out the fieldwork programmes as well as analysing the field data for several of the projects.

## **1997 - 1998 Assistant Geologist**

 **Employer:** Coal Operations Australia Limited (BHP Billiton) Australia

### **Description of duties:**

 coordinating the exploration program. He was also involved with the underground mining operations where he was responsible for assisting the Primarily involved in the exploration of a coal deposit located 100 km north of Sydney, Australia. Assisted the senior geologist in all aspects of senior engineering geologist in both the underground and exploration aspects of coal mining.

Publications

**Major Publications** Peer reviewed papers currently considered major to your career

**Carey, J.M.; Massey, C.I.; Lydnsell, B.M.; Petley, D.N. 2019** Displacement mechanisms of slow-moving landslides in response to [changes in pore water pressure and dynamic stress.](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2018-73) **Farth Surface Dynamics**, 7(3): 707-722; doi: 10.5194/esurf-2018-73 [Link to electronic copy]

**Allstadt, K.E.; Jibson, R.W.; Thompson, E.M.; Massey, C.I.; Wald, D.J.; Godt, J.W.; Rengers, F.K. 2018** Improving near-real-<br>time coseismic landslide models : lessons learned from the 2016 Kaikoura, New Zealand, earthquak

Grant, A.; Wartman, J.; Massey, C.I.; Olsen, M.J.; O'Banion, M.; Motley, M. 2018 The impact of rockfalls on dwellings during<br>the 2011 Christchurch, New Zealand, earthquakes. *Landslides, 15(1):* 31-42; doi: 10.1007/s10346-

Massey, C.I.; Townsend, D.B.; Rathje, E.; Allstadt, K.E.; Lukovic, B.; Kaneko, Y.; Bradley, B.; Wartman, J.; Jibson, R.W.;<br>Petley, D.M.; Horspool, N.A.; Hamling, I.J.; Carey, J.M.; Cox, S.C.; Davidson, J.; Dellow, G.D.; Go earthquake, New Zealand. [Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 108\(3B\):](https://doi.org/10.1785/0120170305) 1630-1648; doi: 10.1785/0120170305 [Link to electronic copy]

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E.; Richards, L.; Wartman, J.; McSaveney, M.J.; Archibald, G.C.; Yetton, M.; Janku, L. 2017** Rock slope response to strong earthquake shaking. Landslides, 14(1): 249-268; doi: 10.1007/s10346- 016-0684-8 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10346-016-0684-8)

**Massey, C.I.; Abbott, E.R.; McSaveney, M.J.; Petley, D.N.; Richards, L. 2016** Earthquake-induced displacement is insignificant in the reactivated Utiku landslide, New Zealand. p. 31–52; doi: 10.1201/b21520-5 IN: Aversa, S.; Cascini, L.; Picarelli, L.; Scavia, C. (eds) Landslides and engineered slopes : experience, theory and practice : proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on Landslides. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1201/b21520-5)

**Massey, C.I.; Petley, D.N.; McSaveney, M.J.; Archibald, G.C. 2016** Basal sliding and plastic deformation of a slow, reactivated<br>landslide in New Zealand. *Engineering Geology, 208:* 11-38; doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2016.04.01

**Taig, T.; Massey, C.I.; Taig, M.; Becker, J.S.; Heron, D.W. 2015** Validating the rockfall risk models developed for the Port Hills of<br>Christchurch, New Zealand. p. 1353-1361 IN: Cubrinovski, M.; Bradley, B.A.; Price, C.; International Conference on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering, 1-4 November 2015, Christchurch, New Zealand. N.Z.: New Zealand Geotechnical Society (NZGS)

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Taig, T.; Richards, L.; Litchfield, N.J.; Rhoades, D.A.; McVerry, G.H.; Lukovic, B.; Heron, D.W.; Ries, W.; Van Dissen, R.J. 2014** Determining rockfall risk in Christchurch using rockfalls triggered by the 2010-2011<br>Canterbury earthquake sequence, New Zealand. *Earthquake Spectra, 30(1):* 155-181; doi: 10.1193/0 copy]

Massey, C.I.; Petley, D.N.; McSaveney, M.J. 2013 Patterns of movement in reactivated landslides. Engineering Geology, 159: 1-19; doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.03.011 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.03.011)

**Massey, C.I.; Manville, V.R.; Hancox, G.T.; Keys, H.J.; Lawrence, C.; McSaveney, M.J. 2010** Out-burst flood (lahar) triggered

by retrogressive landsliding, 18 March 2007 at Mt Ruapehu, New Zealand : a successful early warning. Landslides, 7(3): 303-315; doi: 10.1007/s10346-009-0180-5 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10346-009-0180-5)

Dunning, S.A.; Massey, C.I.; Rosser, N.J. 2008 Structural and geomorphological features of landslides in the Bhutan Himalaya<br>derived from terrestrial laser scanning. *Geomorphology, 103(1):* 17-29; doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.

**Peer Reviewed Journal Articles** Peer reviewed journal articles

Carey, J.M.; Massey, C.I.; Lydnsell, B.M.; Petley, D.N. 2019 Displacement mechanisms of slow-moving landslides in response to<br>[changes in pore water pressure and dynamic stress.](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2018-73) *Earth Surface Dynamics, 7(3):* 707-722; doi: electronic copy]

**Vick, L.M.; Zimmer, V.; White, C.; Massey, C.I.; Davies, T. 2019** Significance of substrate soil moisture content for rockfall hazard assessment. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 19(5): 1105-1117; doi: 10.5194/nhess-2019-11 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-11) **Allstadt, K.E.; Jibson, R.W.; Thompson, E.M.; Massey, C.I.; Wald, D.J.; Godt, J.W.; Rengers, F.K. 2018** Improving near-realtime coseismic landslide models : lessons learned from the 2016 Kaikoura, New Zealand, earthquake. *Bulletin of the Seismological*<br>Society of America, 108(3B): 1649-1664; doi: https://doi.org/10.1785/0120170297 [Link to el

**Grant, A.; Wartman, J.; Massey, C.I.; Olsen, M.J.; O'Banion, M.; Motley, M. 2018** The impact of rockfalls on dwellings during<br>the 2011 Christchurch, New Zealand, earthquakes. *Landslides, 15(1):* 31-42; doi: 10.1007/s1034

Massey, C.I.; Townsend, D.B.; Rathje, E.; Allstadt, K.E.; Lukovic, B.; Kaneko, Y.; Bradley, B.; Wartman, J.; Jibson, R.W.;<br>Petley, D.M.; Horspool, N.A.; Hamling, I.J.; Carey, J.M.; Cox, S.C.; Davidson, J.; Dellow, G.D.; Go electronic copy]

**Taylor, R.J.; Massey, C.I.; Fuller, I.C.; Marden, M.; Archibald, G.C.; Ries, W.F. 2018** Quantifying sediment connectivity in an actively eroding gully complex, Waipaoa catchment, New Zealand. *Geomorphology, 307:* 24-37; doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.10.007<br>[\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.10.007)

**Chiaro, G.; Alexander, G.; Brabhaharan, P.; Massey, C.I.; Koseki, J.; Yamada, S.; Aoyagi, Y. 2017** Reconnaissance report on<br>geotechnical and geological aspects of the 14-16 April 2016 Kumamoto earthquakes, Japan. *Bulleti* 

Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; Cox, S.C.; Archibald, G.C.; Begg, J.G.; Bruce, Z.R.; Carey, J.M.; Davidson, J.; Della-Pasqua,<br>F.N.; Glassey, P.J.; Hill, M.P.; Jones, K.E.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Lukovic, B.; McColl, S.; Rattenbury, M **J.; Rathje, E.; Sitar, N.; Adda, A.-Z.; Manousakis, J.; Little, M. 2017** Landslides caused by the Mw7.8 Kaikoura earthquake and<br>the immediate response. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering, 50(2* 

Kaiser, A.E.; Balfour, N.J.; Fry, B.; Holden, C.; Litchfield, N.J.; Gerstenberger, M.C.; D'Anastasio, E.; Horspool, N.A.;<br>McVerry, G.H.; Ristau, J.; Bannister, S.; Christophersen, A.; Clark, K.J.; Power, W.L.; Rhoades, D.A **Elwood, K.; Gledhill, K.R. 2017** The 2016 Kaikoura, New Zealand, earthquake : preliminary seismological report. Seismological Research Letters, 88(3): 727-739; doi: 10.1785/0220170018 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1785/0220170018)

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E.; Richards, L.; Wartman, J.; McSaveney, M.J.; Archibald, G.C.; Yetton, M.; Janku, L. 2017** Rock slope response to strong earthquake shaking. Landslides, 14(1): 249-268; doi: 10.1007/s10346- 016-0684-8 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10346-016-0684-8)

**Massey, C.I.; Petley, D.N.; McSaveney, M.J.; Archibald, G.C. 2016** Basal sliding and plastic deformation of a slow, reactivated landslide in New Zealand. Engineering Geology, 208: 11-38; doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2016.04.016 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2016.04.016)

**Voisin, C.; Garambois, S.; Massey, C.I.; Brossier, R. 2016** Seismic noise monitoring of the water table in a deep-seated, slow-moving landslide. Interpretation (Tulsa, Okla.), 4(3): SJ67-SH76; doi: 10.1190/INT-2016-0010.1 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1190/INT-2016-0010.1)

Lar**ose, E.; Carriere, S.; Voisin, C.; Bottelin, P.; Baillet, L.; Gueguen, P.; Walter, F.; Jongmans, D.; Guillier, B.; Garambois,<br>S.; Gimbert, F.; Massey, C.I. 2015 Environmental seismology : what can we learn on Earth sur** 

**Parker, R.N.; Hancox, G.T.; Petley, D.N.; Massey, C.I.; Densmore, A.L.; Rosser, N.J. 2015** Spatial distributions of earthquake-<br>induced landslides and hillslope preconditioning in the northwest South Island, New Zealand.

**Heron, D.W.; Lukovic, B.; Massey, C.I.; Ries, W.; McSaveney, M.J. 2014** GIS modelling in support of earthquake-induced<br>rockfall and cliff collapse risk assessment in the Port Hills, Christchurch. *Journal of Spatial Scien* 

Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Taig, T.; Richards, L.; Litchfield, N.J.; Rhoades, D.A.; McVerry, G.H.; Lukovic, B.; Heron,<br>D.W.; Ries, W.; Van Dissen, R.J. 2014 Determining rockfall risk in Christchurch using rockfalls tri Canterbury earthquake sequence, New Zealand. Earthquake Spectra, 30(1): [155-181; doi: 10.1193/021413EQS026M \[Link to electronic](http://dx.doi.org/10.1193/021413EQS026M) copy]

**Stahl, T.; Bilderback, E.L.; Quigley, M.C.; Nobes, D.C.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Coseismic landsliding during the Mw 7.1 Darfield (Canterbury) earthquake : implications for paleoseismic studies of landslides. Geomorphology, 214: 114-127; doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.03.020 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.03.020)

**Massey, C.I.; Petley, D.N.; McSaveney, M.J. 2013** Patterns of movement in reactivated landslides. Engineering Geology, 159: 1- 19; doi: 10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.03.011 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2013.03.011)

**Van Dissen, R.J.; McSaveney, M.J.; Townsend, D.B.; Hancox, G.T.; Little, T.A.; Ries, W.; Perrin, N.D.; Archibald, G.C.; Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; Misra, S. 2013** Landslides and liquefaction generated by the Cook Strait and Lake Grassmere<br>earthquakes : a reconnaissance report. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineerin* electronic copy<sup>1</sup>

Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Beavan, R.J.; Beetham, R.D.; Benites, R.A.; Celentano, A.; Collet, D.; Cousins, W.J.; Cubrinovski,<br>M.; Dellow, G.D.; Denys, P.; Fielding, E.; Fry, B.; Gerstenberger, M.C.; Langridge, R.M.; Massey, Earthquake of February 2011 : preliminary report. *New Zealand Journal of Geology and Geophysics, 55(1):* 67-90; doi:<br>10.1080/00288306.2011.641182 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00288306.2011.641182)

Dellow, G.D.; Yetton, M.; Massey, C.I.; Archibald, G.C.; Barrell, D.J.A.; Bell, D.; Bruce, Z.R.; Campbell, A.; Davies, T.; De<br>Pascale, G.; Easton, M.; Forsyth, P.J.; Gibbons, C.; Glassey, P.J.; Grant, H.; Green, R.; Hancox Kingsbury, P.; Kupec, J.; Macafarlane, D.; McDowell, B.; McKelvey, B.; McCahon, M.; McPherson, I.; Molloy, J.; Muirson,<br>J.; O'Hallaran, M.; Perrin, N.D.; Price, C.; Read, S.A.L.; Traylen, N.; Van, Dissen, R.J.; Villeneuve,

**Fuller, I.C.; Basher, L.; Marden, M.; Massey, C.I. 2011** Using morphological adjustments to appraise sediment flux. Journal of Hydrology, New Zealand, 50(1): 59-80

**Dunning, S.A.; Rosser, N.J.; Massey, C.I. 2010** The integration of terrestrial laser scanning and numerical modelling in landslide<br>investigations. *Quarterly journal of engineering geology and hydrogeology, 43(2): 233-247* 

**Massey, C.I.; Manville, V.R.; Hancox, G.T.; Keys, H.J.; Lawrence, C.; McSaveney, M.J. 2010** Out-burst flood (lahar) triggered<br>by retrogressive landsliding, 18 March 2007 at Mt Ruapehu, New Zealand : a successful early war

**Hearn, G.J.; Massey, C.I. 2009** Engineering geology in the management of roadside slope failures : contributions to best practice from Bhutan and Ethiopia. Quarterly journal of engineering geology and hydrogeology, 42(4): 511-528; doi: 10.1144/1470-9236/08-004 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1144/1470-9236/08-004)

**Dunning, S.A.; Massey, C.I.; Rosser, N.J. 2008** Structural and geomorphological features of landslides in the Bhutan Himalaya<br>derived from terrestrial laser scanning. *Geomorphology, 103(1):* 17-29; doi: 10.1016/j.geomorp **Dunning, S.A.; Rosser, N.J.; Petley, D.N.; Massey, C.I. 2006** Formation and failure of the Tsatichhu landslide dam, Bhutan. Landslides, 3(2): 107-113

## **Peer Reviewed Books** Peer reviewed books, book chapters, book edited

**Massey, C.I.; Hancox, G.T.; Page, M.J. 2018** TXT-tool 1.064-1.1 field guide for the identification and assessment of landslide and erosion features and related hazards affecting pipelines. p. 209-232; doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-57774-6\_16 IN: Sassa, K.; Guzzetti, F.;<br>Yamagishi, H.; Arbanas, Z.; Casagli, N.; McSaveney, M.J.; Dang, K. (eds) *Landslide dynam* copy]

**Crozier, M.; Hancox, G.T.; Dellow, G.D.; Perrin, N.D.; Massey, C.I. 2015** Slip sliding away. p. 206-209 IN: Graham, I.J. (chief<br>ed.) *A continent on the move : New Zealand geoscience revealed.* 2nd ed. Wellington, N.Z.: G

Massey, C.I.; Hancox, G.T. 2015 Danger in the hills. p. 210-213 IN: Graham, I.J. (chief ed.) *A continent on the move : New Zealand*<br>geoscience revealed. 2nd ed. Wellington, N.Z.: Geoscience Society of New Zealand. *Geosci* publication 141.

## **Refereed Conference Proceedings** Refereed conference proceedings

**Carey, J.M.; Massey, C.I.; Rosser, B.J.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Cosgrove, B.; Norton, K. 2018** Laboratory simulations of debris flow<br>slide mechanisms in Wellington fill slopes, New Zealand. 4 p. IN: *Second JTC1 Workshop, 3 to 5* 

**Chiaro, G.; Umar, M.; Kiyota, T.; Massey, C.I. 2018** The Takanodai landslide, Kumamoto, Japan : insights from post-earthquake<br>field observations, laboratory tests, and numerical analyses. p. 98-111 IN: Brandenberg, S.J.;

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Benites, R.A.; Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J. 2017** Numerical evaluation of 2D versus 3D simulations of<br>seismic slope stability. p. 557-564; doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-53498-5\_64 IN: Mikoš, M.; Tiwari, B.; [Advancing culture of living with landslides. Volume 2: Advances in landslide science.](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53498-5_64) Springer International Publishing [Link to electronic copy]

**Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; Cox, S.C. 2017** Response and initial risk management of landslide dams caused by the 14 November<br>2016 Kaikoura earthquake, South Island, New Zealand. 8 p. IN: Alexander, G.J.; Chin, C.Y. (eds) Geotechnical Society, Napier 2017. Wellington, N.Z.: Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://fl-nzgs-media.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2017/11/NZGS2017-proceedings-1.pdf)

**Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; McColl, S.T.; Townsend, D.B.; Villeneuve, M. 2017** Landslides caused by the 14 November 2016<br>Kaikoura earthquake, South Island, New Zealand. 8 p. IN: Alexander, G.J.; Chin, C.Y. (eds) *20th Sym* 

**Jones, K.E.; Lawson, S.; Asher, C.; Manousakis, J.; Clark, K.J.; Archibald, G.C.; Ries, W.F.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Rapid RS data collection for landslide damage and fault rupture using UAV and structure-from-motion photogra

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Inadvertent engineered activation of Utiku landslide, New Zealand. p. 563-568; doi:<br>10.1007/978-3-319-53487-9\_66 IN: Mikoš, M.; Arbanas, Z.; Yin, Y.; Sassa, K. (eds) *Advancing culture* 3: Advances in landslide technology. Springer International Publishing

**Petley, D.N.; Carey, J.M.; Ng, K.-Y.; Massey, C.I.; Froude, M.J. 2017** Understanding patterns of movement for slow moving landslides. 11 p. IN: Alexander, G.J.; Chin, C.Y. (eds) *20th Symposium of the New Zealand Geotechnical Society, Napier 2017.*<br>Wellington, N.Z.: Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://fl-nzgs-media.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2017/11/NZGS2017-proceedings-1.pdf)

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J. 2016** Geotechnical characterization and seismic slope stability of rock slopes in<br>the Port Hills during the New Zealand 2011 Canterbury earthquakes. p. 335-339 IN: Rotonda

**Janku, L.; Villeneuve, M.; Massey, C.I.; Kaiser, A.E. 2016** Numerical modelling of seismic site effects and their impact on slope<br>stability in Wellington, New Zealand. p. 1153-1157; doi: 10.1201/b21520-139 IN: Aversa, S.; Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1201/b21520-139)

**Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Hamling, I.J.; Hreinsdottir, S.; Horspool, N.A.; Massey, C.I.; Villamor, P.; Rhoades, D.A.; Fry, B.;** D'Anastasio, E.; Benites, R.A.; Christophersen, A.; Ristau, J.; Ries, W.; Goded, T.; Archibald, G.C.; Little, C.; Bannister, S.;<br>Ma, Q.; Denys, P.; Pearson, C.; Giona-Bucci, M.; Almond, P.; Van Ballegooy, S.; Wallace, S. 2 Mw 5.7 Christchurch earthquake : preliminary report. paper no. O-20 IN: Reducing risk raising resilience : New Zealand Society for<br>Earthquake Engineering Technical Conference, 1-3 April 2016, Christchurch. New Zealand Soci

**Massey, C.I.; Abbott, E.R.; McSaveney, M.J.; Petley, D.N.; Richards, L. 2016** Earthquake-induced displacement is insignificant<br>in the reactivated Utiku landslide, New Zealand. p. 31–52; doi: 10.1201/b21520-5 IN: Aversa, S Landslides. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1201/b21520-5)

**Arnold, L.; Wartman, J.; Massey, C.I.; MacLaughlin, M.; Keefer, D. 2015** Insights into the seismically-induced rock-slope<br>failures in the Canterbury region using the discrete element method. p. 1066-1074 IN: Cubrinovski, Christchurch, New Zealand. N.Z.: New Zealand Geotechnical Society (NZGS)

**Massey, C.I.; Richards, L.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; McSaveney, M.J.; Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E.; Archibald, G.C.; Wartman, J.; Yetton, M. 2015** Performance of rock slopes during the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes (New Zealand). paper no. 902 IN: Hassani,<br>F. (general chair) *Proceedings : the 13th International Congress of Rock Mechanics : ISRM Co* theoretical rock mechanics ... May 10-13, 2015 ... Montreal, Canada. [Montreal, Quebec]: Canadian Institute of Mining Metallurgy and **Petroleum** 

**Taig, T.; Massey, C.I.; Taig, M.; Becker, J.S.; Heron, D.W. 2015** Validating the rockfall risk models developed for the Port Hills of<br>Christchurch, New Zealand. p. 1353-1361 IN: Cubrinovski, M.; Bradley, B.A.; Price, C.; Geotechnical Society (NZGS)

**Engl, D.A.; Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J. 2014** CrEAM modelling of groundwater-triggered landslide acceleration at the Utiku<br>landslide (New Zealand). paper 96 (p. 583-5870); doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-09057-3\_96 IN: Lollino,

**Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Observations and analysis of topographic effects in the seismic response of the Port Hills following the 2011 Christchurch earthquake. 10 p.; doi: 4231/D3P843W7W IN: *Proceedings, 10th U.S. National Conference on*<br>*Earthquake Engineering : frontiers of earthquake engineering, July 21-25, 2014, Anchorage, A* 

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Richards, L. 2014** Characteristics of some rockfalls triggered by the 2010/2011 Canterbury<br>earthquake sequence, New Zealand. paper 344 (p. 1943-1948); doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-09057-3\_344 IN:

**Valagussa, A.; Crosta, G.B.; Frattini, P.; Zenoni, S.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Rockfall runout simulation fine-tuning in Christchurch,<br>New Zealand. paper 339 (p. 1913-1917); doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-09057-3\_339 IN: Lollino, G.; J.; Azzam, R.; Wasowski, J.; Sciarra, N. (eds) *Engineering geology for society and territory. Volume 2, Landslide processes*. Cham: Springer [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09057-3_339)

**Archibald, G.C.; Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B.; Carey, J.M. 2013** Terrestrial laser scanning methods to assess rockfall risk. p. 513-520<br>IN: Chin, C.Y. (ed) *19th New Zealand Geotechnical Society 2013 Symposium : Hanging by a* Proceedings of technical groups (Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand) 38(1)GM.

Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Massey, C.I. 2013 Determination of site amplification, polarization and topographic effects in the seismic<br>response of the Port Hills following the 2011 Christchurch earthquake. 8 p. IN: *Same ris* **Engineering** 

**Lukovic, B.; Heron, D.W.; Ries, W.; Massey, C.I. 2013** GIS modelling in support of earthquake-induced rockfall risk assessment in

the Port Hills, Christchurch. 5 p. IN: SIRC NZ 2013 : GIS and Remote Sensing Research Conference. Dunedin, N.Z.: Spatial Information Research Centre [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://otago.ourarchive.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10523/4231/sircnz2013_submission_o0202lukovic.pdf?sequence=1)

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Davies, T. 2013** Evolution of an overflow channel across the Young River landslide dam, New<br>Zealand. p. 43-49; doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-31319-6-7 IN: Margottini, C.; Canuti, P.; Sassa, K. (eds

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Did radiative cooling trigger New Zealand's 2007 Young River landslide? p. 347-353; doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-31337-0-44 IN: Margottini, C.; Canuti, P.; Sassa, K. (eds) Landslide science and practice. Volume 4, global environmental change. Heidelberg: Springer [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31337-0-44)

**Brideau, M-A.; Massey, C.I.; Archibald, G.C.; Jaboyedoff, M. 2012** Terrestrial photogrammetry and LiDAR investigation of the<br>cliffs associated with the seismically triggered rockfalls during the February and June 2011 Chr understanding : proceedings of the 11th International and 2nd North American Symposium on Landslides and Engineered Slopes, Banff, Canada, 3-8 June 2012. CRC Press

**Kailey, P.; Bowman, E.T.; Massey, C.I. 2010** Field investigation of small debris flow events in New Zealand mountain catchments.<br>p. 301-308 (paper 036) IN: Williams, A.L.; Pinches, G.M.; Chin, C.Y.; McMorran, T.J.; Massey .<br>September 2010. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press.

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2010** A micro-mechanics approach to earthquake-triggering of landslides. p. 3341-3347 (paper 400)<br>IN: Williams, A.L.; Pinches, G.M.; Chin, C.Y.; McMorran, T.J.; Massey, C.I. (eds) *Geological* Fla: CRC Press

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D. 2010** Landslide response and monitoring : the New Zealand GeoNet experience. p.<br>443-450 (paper 053) IN: Williams, A.L.; Pinches, G.M.; Chin, C.Y.; McMorran, T.J.; Massey, C.I. ( papers 11th Congress of the International Association for Engineering Geology and the Environment, Auckland, Aotearoa, 5-10 September 2010. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press

**Williams, A.L.; Pinches, G.M.; Chin, C.Y.; McMorran, T.J.; Massey, C.I. (eds) 2010** Geologically active : proceedings of the 11th IAEG Congress, Auckland, New Zealand, 5-10 September 2010. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press. 341 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Manville, V.R.; Hancox, G.T.; Keys, H.; Lawrence, C. 2008** Description of the dam breach sequence that initiated the 18th March 2007 Ruapehu Crater Lake lahar, New Zealand. p. 405-408 IN: Sassa, K. *Proceedings of the First World Landslide*<br>*Forum, 18-21 November 2008, United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan : parallel session volume* Committee of the International Programme on Landslides

**Massey, C.I.; Nelis, S. 2008** Landslide monitoring data and its application to risk management : an example from New Zealand. p. 409-412 IN: Sassa, K. *Proceedings of the First World Landslide Forum, 18-21 November 2008, United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan<br><i>: parallel session volume.* Kyoto, Japan: Global Promotion Committee of the International

**Massey, C.I.; Guest, R.; Clitheroe, G. 2007** Monitoring landslide movement and triggering factors in near real-time : an example<br>from Taihape, New Zealand. p. 242-247 (vol. 2) IN: Ameratunga, J.; Taylor, B.; Patten, M. (e

**Massey, C.I.; Palmer, N.G. 2007** Monitoring landslide movement and triggering factors in near real-time : examples from<br>translational landslides in New Zealand. p. 439-447 IN: Potvin, Y. (ed.) *Slope stability 2007 : proc* Australian Centre for Geomechanics

**Massey, C.I.; Hodgson, I.F.; Petley, D.N. 2006** A rockfall simulation study for housing development in Gibraltar. paper 377 IN:<br>Culshaw, M.; Reeves, H.; Spink, T.; Jefferson, I. (eds) *IAEG2006 : engineering geology for t* 

## **Consultancy Reports** Consultancy reports

**Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B.; Taig, T.T.; Rosser, B.J.; Ries, W.F. 2019** The North Canterbury Infrastructure Recovery Alliance : pilot study for assessing landslide hazards along the road and rail corridors. GNS Science consultancy report 2017/185.

**Massey, C.I.; de Vilder, S.; Taig, T.; Lukovic, B.; Archibald, G.C.; Morgenstern, R. 2019** Landslide hazard and risk assessment<br>for the Fox and Franz Josef Glacier valleys. *GNS Science consultancy report 2018/206.* 79 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Taig, T.; Howarth, J.D.; Ries, W.F.; Lukovic, B.; Archibald, G.C.; McSaveney, M.J.; Ashraf, S.; Hancox, G.T. 2017** Franz Josef guiding area landslide risk assessment. GNS Science consultancy report 2017/56. 77 p. + appendices

**Massey, C.I.; Van Dissen, R.J. 2017** Design of a risk management framework for EDC sites and facilities in the Bacman Geothermal Project from the impacts of landslides and active fault rupture hazards : Phase 1, Activity 3 Scoping Report preparation. GNS Science international consultancy report 2017/02. 44 p.

**Horspool, N.A.; Berryman, K.R.; Mueller, C.; Massey, C.I.; Lin, S.-L.; Deligne, N.I.; Canessa, S. 2016** Estimates of probable maximum loss for the EQC portfolio. GNS Science consultancy report 2016/43. v, 64 p.

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I.; McVerry, G.H.; Abbott, E.R.; Goded, T.; Ries, W. 2015** Examination of the potential effects of abutment topographic amplification at Patea Dam. GNS Science consultancy report 2015/163. 32 p.

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Archibald, G.C. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope<br>stability : earth/debris flow risk assessment for Defender Lane. *GNS Science consultancy repo* 

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Archibald, G.C.; Heron, D.W. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11<br>Port Hills slope stability : risk assessment for Maffeys Road. *GNS Science consultancy report 201* 

**Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Site amplification, polarity and topographic effects in the Port Hills during the Canterbury earthquake sequence. GNS Science consultancy report 2014/121. 33 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Lukovic, B.; Yetton, M.D.; Archibald, G.C.; Ries, W. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11<br>Port Hills slope stability : risk assessment for Clifton Terrace. *GNS Science consultancy report* 

Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Taig, T.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Heron, D.W. 2014 Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills<br>slope stability : risk assessment for Deans Head. *GNS Science consultancy report 2014/77.* 121

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Taig, T.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Heron, D.W. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills<br>slope stability : risk assessment for Quarry Road. *GNS Science consultancy report 2014/75.* 1

Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Taig, T.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Heron, D.W.; Archibald, G.C. 2014 Canterbury earthquakes<br>2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : risk assessment for Redcliffs. *GNS Science consultancy repor* Massey, C.I.; Ries, W.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Heron, D.W.; Lukovic, B. 2014 Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope<br>stability : risk assessment for Cliff Street. *GNS Science consultancy report 2014/73.* 105 p. + 5 a

**Massey, C.I.; Taig, T.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Archibald, G.C. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port<br>Hills slope stability : debris avalanche risk assessment for Richmond Hill. *GNS Science consult* appendices

**Taig, T.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Canterbury Earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : estimating rockfall (boulder roll) risk for the rang, by the begin that the bandward. The window the process of the two consultancy report 2013/30. 35 p.

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Heron, D.W. 2013** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/2011 Port Hills slope stability : life-safety risk from cliff collapse in the Port Hills. GNS Science consultancy report 2012/124. 23 p. + 2 appendices

**Massey, C.I.; Yetton, M.D.; Carey, J.; Lukovic, B.; Litchfield, N.J.; Ries, W.; McVerry, G.H. 2013** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : stage 1 report on the findings from investigations into areas of significant ground damage (mass movements). GNS Science consultancy report 2012/317. 29 p. + appendices

**McVerry, G.H.; Hancox, G.T.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Update of peak ground accelerations for the Transmission Gully Project. GNS Science consultancy report 2013/106. 22 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Gerstenberger, M.C.; McVerry, G.H.; Litchfield, N.J. 2012** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope<br>stability : additional assessment of the life-safety risk from rockfalls (boulder rolls). *GNS Scien* **Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Heron, D.W.; Lukovic, B. 2012** Canterbury Earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : pilot study for assessing life-safety risk from rockfalls (boulder rolls). GNS Science consultancy report 2011/311. 107 p.

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Lukovic, B.; Heron, D.W.; Ries, W.; Moore, A.; Carey, J.M. 2012** Canterbury earthquakes<br>2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : life-safety risk from rockfalls (boulder rolls) in the Port Hills 2012/123. 29 p.

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Yetton, M.D.; Heron, D.W.; Lukovic, B.; Bruce, Z.R. 2012** Canterbury Earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : pilot study for assessing life-safety risk from cliff collapse. GNS Science consultancy report 2012/57. 109 p. **Taig, T.; Massey, C.I.; Webb, T.H. 2012** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : principles and criteria for the

sment of risk from slope instability in the Port Hills, Christchurch. GNS Science consultancy report 2011/319. 45 p. **Browne, G.H.; Massey, C.I.; Perrin, N.D. 2009** Desk top study of the geology exposed at the Locked Gate, Tongaporutu, North Taranaki. GNS Science consultancy report 2009/250. 20 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2009** Assessment of landslide and other erosion hazards along the natural gas pipeline alignment : Palmerston North to Hastings. GNS Science consultancy report 2009/14. 19 p.

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; McColl, S. 2009** Waikorora Bluffs landslide : review of slope stability hazards. GNS Science consultancy report 2009/172. 53 p.

Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Williams, K. 2009 The West Taihape landslide : review of slope stability hazards. GNS Science consultancy report 2009/142. 1 v.

**Massey, C.I.; Palmer, N.G. 2008** Waikorora Bluff landslide, North Taranaki : movement monitoring report, December 2006 to December 2007. GNS Science consultancy report 2008/247. ii, 18 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2007** Waikorora Bluff landslide, north Taranaki : movement monitoring report, May 2006 to December 2006. GNS Science consultancy report 2007/34. [20] p., figs, maps

**Massey, C.I.; Hancox, G.T.; Page, M.J. 2007** Field guide for the identification and assessment of landslide and erosion features and<br>hazards : part of GNS Science Short Course on Landslide and Erosion Hazards for Vector L report 2008/336. ii, 85 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2006** Taihape landslide monitoring report 01 July 2006 to 30 September 2006. GNS Science consultancy report 2006/220. ii, 36 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2006** Waikorora Bluff landslide, north Taranaki, review of surface movement history. GNS Science consultancy report 2006/97. iii, 22 p., figs, apps

#### **Consultancy Letter Reports** Consultancy letter reports

**Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D. 2018** GNS Science review of GeoSolve Ltd. report : Stormwater discharge - detailed hazard assessment. GNS Science consultancy report 2018/38LR. 12 p.

**Massey, C.I.; de Vilder, S. 2018** Landslide risk assessment for the Fox and Franz Josef Glacier Valleys - progress report : Craig Peak and Alpine Gardens landslide and Mills Creek fan. GNS Science consultancy report 2019/80LR. 12 p.

**Archibald, G.C.; Massey, C.I. 2016** Field investigations at the Waihi landslide, Taupo. GNS Science consultancy report 2015/222LR. 7 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2014** 8 Balmoral Lane, Christchurch : land zoning. GNS Science consultancy report 2014/37LR. 10 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N. 2014** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : working note 2013/09 on interim findings from investigation of the Quarry Road mass movement. GNS Science consultancy report 2014/09LR. 12 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N. 2014** Reply to Tony Aldridge comments. GNS Science consultancy report 2014/286LR. 11 p. **Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Carey, J.M.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : Working Note 2013/03 on the interim findings from investigations into the Deans Head mass movement. GNS Science consultancy report 2013/251LR.  $8 p. + 3$  figs

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Canterbury earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills slope stability : Working Note 2013/02 on the<br>preliminary findings from investigations into the Defender Lane mass movement. *GNS Science co* 

**Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N. 2013** Working note 2013/01 : preliminary findings from Akaroa Workshop (16th to 20th September 2013). GNS Science consultancy report 2013/225LR. 17 p.

Massey, C.I.; MacFarlane, D. 2013 Comments on the three dimensional (Hy-Stone) rockfall modelling. GNS Science consultancy report 2013/10LR. 9 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Carey, J.M. 2012** Preliminary hazard assessment for Lucas Lane, Christchurch. GNS Science consultancy report 2012/268LR. 18 p.

Massey, C.I.; Read, S.A.L. 2012 Kayelekera Mine : numerical assessment of plant slope stability update. GNS Science consultancy report 2012/221LR. 28 p.

**Read, S.A.L.; Massey, C.I.; Perrin, N.D. 2012** Kayelekera Mine : geological model for western plant slope : update report (March 2012). GNS Science consultancy report 2012/076LR. 13 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2011** Kayelekera Mine : preliminary numerical sensitivity assessment of plant slope. GNS Science consultancy report 2011/227LR. 10 p.

Massey, C.I. 2010 Maui gas pipeline : field inspection of Smith's site nos. 1 and 2. GNS Science consultancy report 2010/50LR. 8 p. **Massey, C.I. 2010** Maui gas pipeline : field inspection of the Waikorora West Landslide (E 2645760, N 6258678, NZ map grid 1949). GNS Science consultancy report 2010/51LR. 10 p.

**Massey, C.I. 2007** Gibbs Fault : inspection of landslide on access road. GNS Science consultancy report 2007/20LR. 5 p.

**All Other Publications** Science reports, miscellaneous publications, non-refereed conference, journal papers, industry articles etc **Massey, C.I.; Thomas, K.-L.; King, A.B.; Singeison, C.; Taig, T.; Horspool, N.A. 2019** SLIDE (Wellington) : vulnerability of<br>dwellings to landslides (Project No. 16/SP740). Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science*. GNS Science repo* 

Massey, C.I.; Townsend, D.B.; Dellow, G.D.; Lukovic, B.; Rosser, B.J.; Archibald, G.C.; Villeneuve, M.; Davidson, J.;<br>Jones, K.E.; Morgenstern, R.; Strong, D.T.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Tunnicliffe, J.; Carey, J.M.; McColl, S. 201 43 p.; doi: 10.21420/G2FP82 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2018/SR_2018-019.pdf)

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Benites, R.A.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Evaluating the validity of 2D seismic slope stability assessments. Lower Hutt,<br>N.Z.: GNS Science. *GNS Science report 2016/10.* 16 p.; doi: 10.21420/G2W01J [Link to el

**Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Kaikoura earthquake : landslide dams : identifying the hazard and managing the risks. NZ geomechanics news, 93: 22-28 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://www.nzgs.org/library/kaikoura-earthquake-landslide-dams-identifying-the-hazard-and-managing-the-risks/)

Payne, B.; Archibald, G.C.; Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D. 2017 Using imagery to map landscape changes. p. 8-9 IN: Page, S. (ed.)<br>*M7.8 Kaikoura earthquake : one year on.* Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. *GeoNet News 23.* [Link

**Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Townsend, D.B. 2016** Preliminary assessment of some flank-failure scenarios for Mount Taranaki and recommendations for future assessment of the risk from such hazards. Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. GNS Science report 2015/54. 48 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2015/SR_2015-054.pdf)

**Green, R.; Easton, M.; Ewe, E.; Finlan, S.; Howard, M.; Jarvis, J.; Kupec, J.; Massey, C.I.; Scott, J.; Seve, G.; Williams, A.;** Wright, I.; Avery, M.; Bucher, R.; Charters, N.; Farrell, J.; Hutt, D.; Murashev, A.; Price, C.; Ghiacchetti, G.; Hind, K.;<br>Justice, R.; Teen, A.; Traylen, N.; Stannard, M.; Wylie, D.; Graf, K. 2016 Rockfal : design consid

**Litchfield, N.J.; Van Dissen, R.J.; Massey, C.I. 2016** Pre-Christchurch earthquake sequence rockfalls in the Port Hills, Christchurch : Wakefield Avenue trench. Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. GNS Science report 2016/25. iii, 32 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2016/SR_2016-025.pdf)

**Massey, C.I.; Ries, W.F.; Archibald, G.C.; Thomson, J.; Lukovic, B.; Jones, K.E.; Yetton, M.; Mangos, C.; Horspool, N.A. 2016** GeoNet landslide response to the Mw5.7 14 February 2016 (Valentine's Day) Earthquake, Christchurch, New Zealand. Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. GNS Science report 2016/35. 71 p.; doi: 10.21420/G2S881 [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2016/SR_2016-035/SR_2016-035.pdf)

**Orchiston, C.; Davies, T.; Langridge, R.M.; Wilson, T.; Mitchell, J.; Hughes, M. (contributing authors); Townend, J.;** Massey, C.I.; Howarth, J.D.; Berryman, K.R.; Holden, C.; Venkataraman, N.; Bradley, B.; Gerstenberger, M.C.;<br>Chamberlain, C.; Fitzsimmons, S.; McColl, S.; Cox, S.C.; Stirling, M.W.; Hicks, M.; Wotherspoon, L.; Brown, C.; B **M.; Barton, T.; Davies, A.; Baratin, L.-M.; Michailos, K.; Taylor-Silva, B.; Dunant, A. (contributing researchers) 2016<br>Alpine Fault magnitude 8 hazard scenario. 45 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://projectaf8.co.nz/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/project-af8-hazard-model-report-final-october-2016.pdf)** 

**Saunders, W.S.A.; Massey, C.I. 2016** Using quantified risk assessment results in land use plans : a case study of post-earthquake

planning for land instability in the Port Hills, Christchurch. p. 110-115 IN: Johnston, D.M.; Gunn, H.; McSaveney, E.R.; Coomer, M.A.<br>*Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Urban Disaster Reduction (4ICUDR).* miscellaneous series 98. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20miscellaneous%20series/Misc%20Series%2098.pdf)

**Hancox, G.T.; Perrin, N.D.; Lukovic, B.; Massey, C.I. 2015** Quantifying the seismic response of slopes in Christchurch and<br>Wellington : Wellington slope types and characterisation. Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. *GNS Scie* appendices [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2013/SR_2013-058.pdf)

**Massey, C.I. 2015** Rebuttal evidence of Christopher Ian Massey on behalf of Christchurch City Council : Risk modelling by GNS Science. GNS Science internal report 2015/10. 31 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20internal%20report/2015/IR_2015-10.pdf)

**Massey, C.I. 2015** Statement of evidence of Christopher Ian Massey on behalf of Christchurch City Council and the Crown : Risk modelling by GNS Science. GNS Science internal report 2015/09. 58 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20internal%20report/2015/IR_2015-09.pdf)

**Taig, T.; Massey, C.I.; Taig, M.; Becker, J.S.; Heron, D.W. 2015** Survey of Port Hills red zone resident's experience following the<br>22 February 2011 Earthquake. Lower Hutt, N.Z.: GNS Science. *GNS Science report 2015/09.* 

**Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Broadband ground motion modelling of the largest M5.9+ aftershocks of the Canterbury 2010-2011 earthquake sequence for seismic slope response studies. Lower Hutt, NZ: GNS Science. GNS Science report 2014/13. 48 p. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2014/SR_2014-013.pdf)

**Saunders, W.S.A.; Beban, J.G.; Taig, T.; Morris, B.; Mieler, D.H.; Massey, C.I. 2014** Case studies on national and international [approaches to risk reduction through land use planning. Lower Hutt, NZ: GNS Science.](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2014/SR_2014-046.pdf) GNS Science report 2014/46. 67 p. [Link to electronic copy]

**Berryman, K.R.; Gerstenberger, M.C.; Webb, T.H.; Villamor, P.; Massey, C.I.; Fursman, L. 2012** The Canterbury Earthquake [Sequence of 2010-2011, New Zealand : a review of seismology, damage observations and consequences.](http://www.mapfre.com/mapfrere/docs/html/revistas/trebol/n62/en/articulo2.html) Trebol, 62 [Link to electronic copy]

Hancox, G.T.; Massey, C.I.; Perrin, N.D. 2011 Landslides and related ground damage caused by the M<sub>w</sub> 6.3 Christchurch Earthquake of 22 February 2011. NZ geomechanics news, 81: 53-67

**Massey, C.I. 2010** The dynamics of reactivated landslides : Utiku and Taihape, North Island, New Zealand. PhD thesis, Durham University. 338 p.

**Massey, C.I.; Beetham, R.D.; Severne, C.; Archibald, G.C.; Hancox, G.T.; Power W.L. 2009** Field investigations at Waihi<br>Landslide, Taupo 30 June & 1 July 2009. Lower Hutt: GNS Science. *GNS Science report 2009/34.* 23 p. **Massey, C.I.; Beetham, R.D.; Severne, C.; Archibald, G.C.; Hancox, G.T.; Power, W.L. 2009** GeoNet landslide response : Waihi Landslide, Taupo (June/July 2009). NZ geomechanics news, 78: 81-84

**Dellow, G.D.; Joyce, K.E.; Massey, C.I. 2008** Landslides in 2007. NZ geomechanics news, 75: 36-37

**Massey, C.I.; Read, S.A.L.; Nelis, S.B.; McColl, S. 2008** The Utiku Landslide, interim report. Lower Hutt: GNS Science. GNS Science report 2008/38.

**Hancox, G.T.; Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; Perrin, N.D. 2007** Reconnaissance studies of landslides caused by the July-October [2006 rainstorms in southern North Island, New Zealand. Lower Hutt: GNS Science.](https://online.gns.cri.nz/bibinfolibpub/Publications/GNS%20Science%20report/2006/SR%202006-026.pdf) *GNS Science report 2006/26.* 37 p. [Link to<br>electronic copy]

#### **Conference Abstracts**

**Arata, Y.; Massey, C.I.; Rosser, B.J.; Carey, J.M. 2019** Evaluation of fissure formation processes caused by earthquakes using<br>numerical simulations. abstract EGU2019-11366 IN: *European Geosciences Union General Assembly* 2019. Goettingen, Germany: Copernicus Gesellschaft. Geophysical research abstracts 21. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2019/EGU2019-11366.pdf)

**Ries, W.F.; Archibald, G.C.; Jones, K.E.; Massey, C.I.; Glade, T. 2019** Calculating cascading and cumulative error at multiple<br>scales for landslide runout modelling and hazard zonation. abstract EGU2019-7076 IN: *European* electronic copy]

**Jones, K.E.; Massey, C.I.; Howarth, J.D.; Sirguey, P. 2018** Why regional scale data capture is important for dynamic earthquake research. p. 141 IN: Sagar, M.W.; Prebble, J.G. (eds.) Geosciences 2018, 27-30 November 2018, Napier : abstract volume. Wellington, N.Z.: Geoscience Society of New Zealand. Geoscience Society of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 151A. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://db.gsnz.org.nz/assets/Uploads/MP151A-181126-Geosciences-2018-Abstract-Volume.pdf)

**Kellett, R.L.; Lawrence, M.J.F.; Griffin, A.G.; Bruce, Z.R.; Massey, C.I.; Black, J.A.; O'Brien, G.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Brune, R.; Stagpoole, V.M. 2018** Imaging fault zones and fractured greywacke using borehole and surface geophysics. p. 147 IN: Sagar, M.W.;<br>Prebble, J.G. (eds.) *Geosciences 2018, 27-30 November 2018, Napier : abstract volume. Welli* Zealand. Geoscience Society of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 151A. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://securepages.co.nz/~gsnz/siteadmin/uploaded/gs_downloads/Abstracts/2018Napier_abstracts.pdf)

**Massey, C.I.; Carey, J.M.; Townsend, D.B.; Rosser, B.J.; Brideau, M.-A.; Kupec, J.; deVilder, S.; Kellett, R.L.; Upton, P.; Lyndsell, B.M. 2018** Overview of the stability of land in dynamic environment project, Wellington region. p. 180 IN: Sagar, M.W.;<br>Prebble, J.G. (eds.) *Geosciences 2018, 27-30 November 2018, Napier : abstract volume. Well* Zealand. Geoscience Society of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 151A. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://securepages.co.nz/~gsnz/siteadmin/uploaded/gs_downloads/Abstracts/2018Napier_abstracts.pdf)

**Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B. 2018** A prototype earthquake-induced landslide forecast tool for New Zealand. p. 109-111 IN: The abstract book of MEGE 2018 : the 5th International Symposium on Mega Earthquakes Induced Geo-disasters and Long Term Effects. Chengdu,<br>China: State Key Laboratory of Geohazard Prevention and Geoenvironment Protection

**Ries, W.F.; Archibald, G.C.; Jones, K.E.; Massey, C.I.; Howarth, J.D.; Tunnicliffe, J.; Stahl, T.; Glade, T. 2018** Accuracy and<br>quality of remotely sensed data for landslide studies : some challenges in response to the 20 Germany: Copernicus Gesellschaft. Geophysical research abstracts 20. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2018/EGU2018-11348.pdf)

**Ries, W.F.; Massey, C.I.; Glade, T.; Jones, K.E.; Archibald, G.C. 2018** What didn't move? Some challenges with remotely sensed<br>data collected in response to the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake, New Zealand. p. 114-115 IN: *The a* International Symposium on Mega Earthquakes Induced Geo-disasters and Long Term Effects. Chengdu, China: State Key Laboratory of Geohazard Prevention and Geoenvironment Protection

**Allstadt, K.E.; Godt, J.W.; Jibson, R.W.; Rengers, F.K.; Thompson, E.M.; Wald, D.J.; Massey, C.I.; Cox, S.C. 2017** Improving coseismic landslide models : lessons learned from the 2016 Kaikoura, New Zealand earthquake. p. 626 IN: SSA Annual<br>Meeting announcement, Seismological Society of America technical sessions, 18-20 April 2017, Denv Seismological Society of America. Seismological research letters 88(2B). [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://srl.geoscienceworld.org/content/gssrl/88/2B/463.full.pdf)

**Barba, M.; Willis, M.J.; Tiampo, K.F.; Glasscoe, M.T.; Clark, M.K.; Zekkos, D.; Stahl, T.A.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Finite element<br>simulations of Kaikoura, NZ earthquake using DInSAR and high-resolution DSMs. abstract S11B-05

**Grant, A.; Wartman, J.; Massey, C.I.; Olsen, M.J.; O'Banion, M.; Motley, M. 2017** The impact of rockfalls on dwellings during<br>the 2011 Christchurch, New Zealand earthquakes. p. 598 IN: *SSA Annual Meeting announcement, Se* technical sessions, 18-20 April 2017, Denver, Colorado. Albany, Calif.: Seismological Society of America. Seismological research letters 88(2B). [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://srl.geoscienceworld.org/content/gssrl/88/2B/463.full.pdf)

**Lukovic, B.; Heron, D.W.; Ries, W.F.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Rockfall and cliff collapse hazard and risk in the Port Hills following the<br>2011 Christchurch earthquake. p. 27-28 IN: Collen, J. (ed) *STAR 2017 : The Pacific Isla* copy]

Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D.; Cox, S.C.; Archibald, G.C.; Begg, J.G.; Bruce, Z.R.; Carey, J.M.; Davidson, J.; Della-Pasqua,<br>F.N.; Glassey, P.J.; Hill, M.P.; Jones, K.E.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Lukovic, B.; McColl, S.; Rattenbury, M **J.; Rathje, E.; Sitar, N.; Zekkos, A.; Manousakis, J.; Little, M. 2017** Structural controls on the large landslides triggered by the<br>14 November 2016, MW 7.8 Earthquake, Kaikoura, New Zealand. abstract EGU2017-19283-2 IN: [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2017/EGU2017-19283-2.pdf)

McBride, S.K.; Kaiser, A.E.; Gledhill, K.R.; Jolly, G.E.; Fry, B.; Little, C.; Balfour, N.J.; Page, S.; Holden, C.; Ristau, J.;<br>Gerstenberger, M.C.; Leonard, G.S.; Bannister, S.; Rhoades, D.A.; Christophersen, A.; Potter, H.M.; Woods, R.J.; Daly, M.C.; Hamling, I.J.; Hreinsdottir, S.; Berryman, K.R.; Pinal, C.; Bland, L.A.; Villamor, P.; Van<br>Dissen, R.J.; Thomson, J.; Massey, C.I.; Guest, R.; Clitheroe, G.; Townend, J. 2017 Communicating sc

**McColl, S.; Holdsworth, C.; Massey, C.I. 2017** Movement of a large, slow-moving landslide in the North Island, New Zealand,<br>controlled by porewater pressure and river flow. abstract EGU2017-182 IN: *European Geosciences U* copy]

**Rosser, B.J.; Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D.; Cox, S.C.; Archibald, G.C.; Begg, J.G.; Bruce, Z.R.; Carey, J.M.; Davidson, J.; Della-Pasqua, F.N.; Glassey, P.J.; Hill, M.P.; Jones, K.E.; Lyndsell, B.M.; Lukovic, B.; McColl, S.; Rattenbury, M.S.; Read,<br>S.A.L.; Singeisen, C.; Towmsend, D.B.; Villamor, P.; Villeneuve, M. 2017 Landslides triggered by** New Zealand Geomorphology Group [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://www.anzgg.org/images/ANZGG_Program_and_Abstracts_low_res.pdf)

**Wartman, J.; Grant, A.R.; Olsen, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; O'Banion, M.; Motley, M. 2016** Assessment of rockfall impacts on buildings during the 2010-2011 Canterbury, New Zealand earthquake sequence. paper 298-5 IN: *2016 GSA Annual Meeting in Denver,*<br>*Colorado, USA - 2016.* Boulder, Colo.: Geological Society of America. *Abstracts with progra* 

**Janku, L.; Massey, C.I.; Villeneuve, M. 2015** Site effects in the area of the Owhiro Bay Quarry : observations and modelling. p. 70<br>IN: Hannah, M. (convener) *Zealandia in space and time : Geosciences 2015, Geoscience Soc* publication 143a.

**Janku, L.; Villenueve, M.; Hancox, G.T.; Massey, C.I. 2015** Seismic response of a selected site in Wellington, New Zealand.<br>abstract no. 764 IN: Hassani, F. (general chair) *Proceedings : the 13th International Congress o* Institute of Mining Metallurgy and Petroleum

Petley, D.N.; Carey, J.M.; Massey, C.I.; Brain, M. 2015 Insights into the movements of landslides from combinations of field<br>monitoring and novel direct shear testing. abstract NH33D-05 IN: *AGU Fall Meeting, San Francisco* Meeting program. USA: American Geophysical Union [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://agu.confex.com/agu/fm15/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/80191)

**Carey, J.M.; McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; Petley, D. 2014** Dynamic behaviour of quartzo-feldspathic loess slopes in the Canterbury Port Hills, Christchurch, New Zealand. abstract EGU2014-8536 IN: European Geosciences Union General Assembly 2014, Vienna, Austria, 27 April - 02 May 2014. [Goettingen, Germany: Copernicus Gesellschaft.](http://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2014/EGU2014-8536.pdf) Geophysical research abstracts 16. [Link to electronic copy]

Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Massey, C.I. 2014 Seismic site amplification in the Port Hills during the Canterbury earthquake sequence :<br>case study of critical slopes. p. 430; doi: 10.1785/0220140014 IN: *SSA Annual Meeting an* 

Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Massey, C.I.; Benites, R.A. 2014 Site amplification, polarity and topographic effects in the Port Hills<br>during the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence, New Zealand. abstract S12A-06 IN: *AGU* 

**Kaiser, A.E.; Holden, C.; Massey, C.I.; Benites, R.A. 2014** The role of site amplification, polarity and topographic effects in the Port Hills during the Canterbury earthquake sequence. p. 58 IN: Holt, K.A. (ed.) *Geosciences 2014 : Annual Conference of the*<br>Geoscience Society of New Zealand, 24th – 27th November 2014, Pukekura Raceway and Function Cen electronic copy]

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Holden, C.; Kaiser, A.E. 2014** The performance of rock slopes during the 2010/11 Canterbury<br>earthquake sequence, New Zealand. abstract NH43B-07 IN: *AGU Fall Meeting, San Francisco, 15-19 De* Geophysical Union [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://agu.confex.com/agu/fm14/meetingapp.cgi#Paper/19666)

**Power, W.L.; Wang, X.; Massey, C.I.; Lane, E.; Fournier, N. 2014** Understanding the mechanisms for tsunami generation in<br>Taupo Volcano. p. 57 IN: Begue, F. (ed.) *3rd International Course & 5th International Workshop on C* 2014, Taupo, New Zealand : program & abstracts.

**Carey, J.M.; McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; Della-Pasqua, F.N. 2013** Causes and mechanisms of mass movement in loess slopes : a case study from the Christchurch Port Hills, New Zealand. p. 14 IN: Reid, C.M.; Wandres, A. (eds) Geosciences 2013 : Annual<br>Conference of the Geoscience Society of New Zealand : abstracts. [Christchurch]: Geosci Society of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 136A. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://securepages.co.nz/~gsnz/siteadmin/uploaded/gs_downloads/Abstracts/2013Christchurch_abstracts.pdf)

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Carey, J.M.; Richards, L.; Yetton, M. 2013** Mass (slope) movements triggered by the 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence, New Zealand. p. 36 IN: *Long term geo-hazard and risk consequences of areas struck by high*<br>magnitude earthquakes : Proceeding of the International Symposium in Commemoration of the 5th Anni

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Pernicious progressive coseismic rock-mass degradation and rock-avalanche volume. abstract<br>NH31C-08 IN: *[AGU Fall Meeting 2013, 9-13 December, San Francisco California : abstracts.](http://agu-fm13.abstractcentral.com/planner.jsp) Amer* electronic copy]

**McSaveney, M.J.; Van Dissen, R.J.; Townsend, D.B.; Little, T.A.; Hancox, G.T.; Perrin, N.D.; Misra, S.; Archibald, G.C.; Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I. 2013** Landslides generated by the Mw 6.5 July 21, 2013, Cook Strait and Mw6.6 August 16, 2013, Lake Grassmere earthquakes, New Zealand : reconnaissance report. p. 66 IN: Reid, C.M.; Wandres, A. (eds) *Geosciences 2013 : Annual*<br>*Conference of the Geoscience Society of New Zealand : abstracts.* [Christchurch]: Geoscience

**Van Dissen, R.J.; McSaveney, M.J.; Townsend, D.B.; Hancox, G.T.; Archibald, G.C.; Dellow, G.D.; Massey, C.I.; Perrin,<br><b>N.D.; Little, T.A.; Misra, S. 2013** Liquefaction (minor) generated by the M<sub>w</sub> 6.5 July 21, 2013, Cook 2013, Lake Grassmere earthquakes, New Zealand : a reconnaissance report. p.97 IN: Reid, C.M.; Wandres, A. (eds) Geosciences 2013 : Annual Conference of the Geoscience Society of New Zealand : abstracts. [Christchurch]: Geoscience Society of New Zealand.<br>Geoscience Society of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 136A. [\[Link to electronic copy\]](https://securepages.co.nz/~gsnz/siteadmin/uploaded/gs_downloads/Abstracts/2013Christchurch_abstracts.pdf)

**Wang, X.; Power, W.L.; Massey, C.I.; Ries, W.; Andres, N. 2013** Modelling water wave impact in Lake Taupo by Waihi landslides.<br>p. 101 IN: Reid, C.M.; Wandres, A. (eds) *Geosciences 2013 : Annual Conference of the Geoscien* electronic copy]

**Fuller, I.C.; Taylor, R.; Massey, C.I.; Marden, M. 2012** Quantification of process in an actively eroding gully-mass movement<br>complex, Waipaoa catchment, New Zealand. abstract EP31C-0828 IN: *AGU Fall Meeting 2012, 3-7 De* 

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; Wang, G. 2012** Geological controls on hillslope-failure mechanisms during the 2010-2011 earthquake sequence in suburban Christchurch, New Zealand. abstract NH34A-01 IN: *AGU Fall Meeting 2012, 3-7 December, San*<br>*Francisco California : abstracts.* Washington, DC: American Geophysical Union [Link to electronic

Holden, C.; Bannister, S.; Beavan, R.J.; Benites, R.A.; Dellow, G.D.; Fry, B.; Kaiser, A.E.; Massey, C.I.; Motagh, M.;<br>Reyners, M.E.; Ristau, J.; Samsonov, S.; Thomas, J. 2011 An overview of the M<sub>w</sub> 6.3 Christchurch Earth source mechanism. abstract EGU2011-14230 IN: *8th EGU General Assembly, 3-8 April 2011, Vienna.* Goettingen, Germany: Copernicus<br>Gesellschaft. *Geophysical research abstracts 13.* [\[Link to electronic copy\]](http://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2011/EGU2011-14230.pdf)

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J. 2011** Characteristics of some rockfalls triggered by the 22nd February 2011, Mw 6.2 Christchurch<br>Earthquake, New Zealand. abstract NH11B-05 IN: *AGU Fall Meeting 2011, 5-9 December, San Franc* 

**Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Davies, T. 2011** Evolution of an overflow channel across the Young River landslide dam, New<br>Zealand. p. 395 IN: Catani, F.; Margottini, C.; Trigila, A.; Iadanza, C. (eds) *The Second World L* 

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2011** Did radiative cooling trigger New Zealand's 2007 Young River landslide? p. 666 IN: Catani, F.;<br>Margottini, C.; Trigila, A.; Iadanza, C. (eds) *The Second World Landslide Forum, Rome, 3-*

Bilderback, E.L.; Stahl, T.; McColl, S.; Massey, C.I.; Quigley, M.; Villamor, P.; Nobes, D.; Noble, D. 2010 Reconnaissance of<br>an earthquake induced landslide from the Canterbury quake. p. 34 IN: Hoskin, P.; Hikuroa, D.; Ec

**Garambois, S.; Quintero, A.; Massey, C.I.; Voisin, C. 2010** Azimuthal and thickness variabilities of seismic site effect response of<br>the Utiku landslide (North Island, New Zealand). abstract EGU2010-2430 IN: *European Geo* copy]

**Kailey, P.; Bowman, E.T.; Massey, C.I. 2010** Field investigation of small debris flow events in New Zealand mountain catchments. p. 72 IN: *Geologically active : extended abstracts to the proceedings of the 11th Congress of the IAEG : 5-10 September 2010, Active,<br>Auckland, Aotearoa. [Auckland, NZ]: New Zealand Geotechnical Society* 

**Manville, V.R.; Lube, G.; Cronin, S.J.; Doyle, E.E.; Cole, S.E.; Procter, J.; Carrivick, J.; Graettinger, A.H.; Massey, C.I.; Jongens, R.; Watson, J.; Halstead, J.; Keys, H.J.; Lawrence, C. 2010** Anatomy of a basin break-out flood : the 2007 Crater Lake<br>break-out lahar, Mt Ruapehu, New Zealand. abstract EP21C-0755 IN: *2010 AGU Fall Meeting, 13-*

Massey, C.I.; McSaveney, M.J.; Petley, D. 2010 Landslide monitoring and its application to risk management, with reference to the<br>Utiku and Taihape landslides, New Zealand. p. 182 IN: Hoskin, P.; Hikuroa, D.; Eccles, J. (c of New Zealand miscellaneous publication 129A.

McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2010 A micro-mechanics approach to earthquake-triggering of landslides. p. 475 IN: Geologically<br>active : extended abstracts to the proceedings of the 11th Congress of the IAEG : 5-10 September [Auckland, NZ]: New Zealand Geotechnical Society

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I. 2010** Natural hazards at the other extreme : an apparently seasonal hazard at Taihape Landslide,<br>New Zealand. abstract NH11A-1107 IN: *2010 AGU Fall Meeting, 13-17 December, San Francisco, Ca* 

**McSaveney, M.J.; Massey, C.I.; Dellow, G.D. 2010** Landslide response and monitoring : the New Zealand GeoNet experience. p.<br>80 IN: *Geologically active : extended abstracts to the proceedings of the 11th Congress of the I* 

**Fuller, I.; Marden, M.; Massey, C.I. 2009** Connectivity in steepland environments : complex gully-fan interactions in the Tarndale<br>system, Waipaoa catchment, New Zealand. 1 p. IN: *Geomorphology 2009 : 7th International C* electronic copy]

**Massey, C.I. 2009** Engineering geological research at GNS Science. p. 17 IN: The 1st GNS Science and VUW Geological Society Student Symposium, 2009. Lower Hutt: GNS Science

**Massey, C.I.; Fuller, I.; Marden, M. 2009** Slope-channel coupling #8211 : the Tarndale fluvio-mass movement complex, New<br>Zealand. 1 p. IN: *Geomorphology 2009 : 7th International Conference on Geomorphology (ANZIAG) : anc* 

**Stirling, M.W.; Langridge, R.M.; Massey, C.I. 2009** The Alpine Fault : constraints on the upper limits on near-fault earthquake<br>motions from fragile granitic landforms. p. 218 IN: *2009 Southern California Earthquake Cent* 

**Massey, C.I.; Hancox, G.T.; Manville, V.R.; Keys, H.; Lawrence, C. 2007** The 18 March 2007 crater lake dam breach and lahar<br>on Mt Ruapehu, New Zealand. p. 133 IN: McSaveney, E.R. (ed.) *'Dams, securing water for our futur* 33(2LD).

## **In Press** Include current in-press, submitted

Massey, C.I.; Townsend, D.; Lukovic, B.; Jones, K.; Rhoades, D.; Morgenstern, R.; Rosser, B.; Ries, W.; Howarth, J.;<br>Hamling, I.; Clark, M.; Petley, D.; Litchfield, N.; Olsen, M. Submitted Landslide volume-area relationshi

**Townsend, D.B.; Massey, C.I.; Lukovic, B.; Rosser, B.J.; de Vilder, S.J.; Ries W.; Morgenstern, R.; Ashraf, S.; Carey, J.M. In press** SLIDE (Wellington): Geomorphological characterisation of the Wellington urban area. GNS Science report 2019/28.

![](_page_48_Picture_419.jpeg)

**Previous Research Work** 

![](_page_49_Picture_454.jpeg)

Commercial, Social or Environmental Impact

## **Description:**

Describe the commercial, social or environmental impact of your previous research work. Provide no more than 5 examples relevant to your proposal.

1) In 2016, Chris and his team produced the final set of reports in a series of expert analysis on the risk of landslides, cliff collapse, and rockfall for the Christchurch City Council. These reports covered 126 properties where the risk from landslides was considered intolerable. The results from<br>these reports have been used by Council to develop their land use policies rel dwellings in the Port Hills after the 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes. This work resulted in central government offering to purchase about 470<br>eligible dwellings (a cost to government of c. NZ\$300M), where the risks were as earthquake- and rain-induced landslides on infrastructure in the capital city. The results from these reports will be used by Wellington City Council<br>and others to develop their land use policies relating to landslide haza are being used by DOC and FJGG to help them plan the locations of walking routes, roads and guiding areas within these valleys and to manage the risks to their staff and visitors.

![](_page_50_Picture_101.jpeg)

## **Description:**

f

I

Demonstration of relationships with end-users. Provide no more than 5 examples relevant to your proposal.

1) Following the 2016 Kaikoura earthquake, Chris managed GNS Sciences technical response to issues raised by the Department of the Prime<br>Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) and other members of the multi-agency Kaikoura earthquake MBIE's Endeavour Programme. The NAG is chaired by Roger Fairclough (Chair of the NZ Lifelines Council), and comprises senior management and<br>EILD programme and other nationally important landslide research, including: i) ho

![](_page_50_Picture_102.jpeg)

## **Specialist profiles**

To add customised text to your web profile (that is displayed on the public website) create a specialist profile and for the purpose, enter "web".<br>Changes made to your profile are updated overnight each day, so you will no

**Date Author Purpose** (click "Add..." to add a specialist profile)

Add...

**APPENDIX 2**

## **APPENDIX 2 – BOPRPS (2014) and AGS (2007) EXAMPLE RISK CALCULATION**

Equation 1 (E1): BOPRPS (2014) where  $AIFR = (D \times P)/N$ Equation 2 (E2): AGS (2007) where AIFR = P(H) x P(S:H) x P(T:S) x V

![](_page_52_Picture_113.jpeg)

Note the numbers are made up for comparison purposes only