

As requested, I have read the four expert reports by Johal, Swadi, Johnston & Gordon. I have read the reports in both my capacity as a geotechnical expert and as a parent, the latter giving me an important perspective where I can empathise with the school's parents from a position of having a good knowledge of the natural environment – which is a key goal of effective communication promoted by the experts.

Overall, I have picked up the experts' strong consensus themes regarding:

- No reason Redcliffs School cannot return to the Main Road site
- The importance of trust & empowerment, parent/family concerns and methods of risk communication

I found some of the topics discussed and technical descriptors used in parts of the experts' reporting to be somewhat misleading, in my opinion. However, overall each report essentially lands on the same positive conclusions for the Main Rd site.

Examples of parts that I suggest be revised to give a fuller picture, include:

Johal states:

*The children and families that attend Redcliffs School are not only exposed to potential rockfall should the school be re-opened on the Main Road site, but there is also the continuing underlying risk of further earthquakes affecting the entire region.*

I suggest this comment be tempered by the fact that with the mitigation in place, the rockfall risk is virtually nil. Also, the experience of earthquake shaking in a regionally significant event will likely override any visual or auditory awareness of rockfall.

Harith states:

*It is not possible to rule out 100% any possible effect because:*

1. *There is always the possibility of rockfalls no matter how minimal it is,*

I suggest this comment be augmented with fact that with the mitigation in place, rockfall risk is virtually nil.

It is very useful that the experts provide advice on how to develop effective communications. The ES technical reporting, images and 3D viewer developed as part of the Board's submission has already proven to be powerful in technical communication, so MoE and the Board are not starting from scratch on that front.

In this context, Harith's comment is very informative: *On a personal level, I would feel it is safe to send my children to school there. However, that is largely because I had the opportunity to see the evidence, weigh it and discuss it with the experts. Any concerned parent should be able to have a similar experience.*

Some messages from me that I would like recognised in reporting to the Minister, include:

1. The school left the Main Road as a prudent risk management response given (i) the uncertainty regarding the stability of the cliff and (ii) the uncertainty regarding rockfall exposure on the school land.
2. We now know that the school land has a rockfall risk rating much lower than for the residential land risk threshold, and also well within the rockfall risk rating for school land.

3. It is highly likely that had we known in 2011 what we know now about the rockfall risk environment, the school would not have had reason to leave the Main Rd site.

Should you require I would be happy to review your draft report to the Minister to ensure that geotechnical content is correctly portrayed.

