

**Canterbury Earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills Slope
Stability: Risk assessment for Redcliffs**

C. I. Massey
B. Lukovic
G. Archibald

F. Della Pasqua
W. Ries

T. Taig
D. Heron

**GNS Science Consultancy Report 2014/78
August 2014 FINAL**



DISCLAIMER

This report has been prepared by the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Limited (GNS Science) exclusively for and under contract to Christchurch City Council.

The report considers the risk associated with geological hazards. As there is always uncertainty inherent within the nature of natural events GNS Science gives no warranties of any kind concerning its assessment and estimates, including accuracy, completeness, timeliness or fitness for purpose and accepts no responsibility for any actions taken based on, or reliance placed on them by any person or organisation other than Christchurch City Council.

GNS Science excludes to the full extent permitted by law any liability to any person or organisation other than Christchurch City Council for any loss, damage or expense, direct or indirect, and however caused, whether through negligence or otherwise, resulting from any person or organisation's use of, or reliance on this report.

The data presented in this Report are available to GNS Science for other use after the public release of this document.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCE

Massey, C. I.; Della Pasqua, F.; Taig, T.; Lukovic, B.; Ries, W.; Heron, D., Archibald, G. 2014. Canterbury Earthquakes 2010/11 Port Hills Slope Stability: Risk assessment for Redcliffs. *GNS Science Consultancy Report* 2014/78. 123 p. + Appendices

REVIEW DETAILS

This report in draft form was independently reviewed by Dr L. Richards and Dr J. Wartman. Internal GNS Science reviews of drafts were provided by N. Litchfield, J. Carey, D. Mieler and R. Buxton.

Risk calculations were checked by R. Buxton (GNS Science).

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | VIII |
| ES 1 INTRODUCTION | VIII |
| ES 2 INVESTIGATION PROCESS AND FINDINGS | VIII |
| ES 3 CONCLUSIONS | XI |
| ES3.1 Hazard | xi |
| ES3.2 Risk | xi |
| ES 4 RECOMMENDATIONS | XII |
| ES 4.1 Policy and planning | xii |
| ES4.2 Short-term actions | xii |
| ES4.3 Long-term actions | xiii |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND | 1 |
| 1.2 THE REDCLIFFS MASS MOVEMENTS | 5 |
| 1.2.1 Context and terminology | 5 |
| 1.2.2 Local and random cliff collapse source areas | 6 |
| 1.3 PREVIOUS WORK AT THE REDCLIFFS SITE | 9 |
| 1.4 SCOPE OF THIS REPORT | 13 |
| 1.5 REPORT STRUCTURE | 14 |
| 1.6 METHODS OF ASSESSMENT | 14 |
| 1.6.1 Engineering geology assessment | 14 |
| 1.6.2 Hazard assessment | 15 |
| 1.6.3 Risk assessment | 17 |
| 2.0 DATA USED | 21 |
| 3.0 SITE ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 25 |
| 3.1 SITE HISTORY | 25 |
| 3.1.1 Aerial photograph interpretation | 25 |
| 3.1.2 Before the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes | 26 |
| 3.1.3 During the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes | 27 |
| 3.1.4 After the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes | 28 |
| 3.2 SITE INVESTIGATIONS | 29 |
| 3.2.1 Geomorphological mapping | 29 |
| 3.2.2 Subsurface trenching and drilling | 29 |
| 3.2.3 Surface movement | 30 |
| 3.2.4 Subsurface movement | 43 |
| 3.2.5 Groundwater | 44 |
| 3.3 ENGINEERING GEOLOGICAL MODEL | 45 |
| 3.3.1 Slope materials | 45 |
| 3.3.2 Geotechnical properties | 48 |
| 3.3.3 Rainfall and groundwater response | 52 |
| 3.4 SLOPE FAILURE MODELS | 56 |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 3.4.1 | Landslide types affecting the site | 56 |
| 3.4.2 | Cliff collapse failure mechanisms | 57 |
| 4.0 | HAZARD ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 61 |
| 4.1 | SLOPE STABILITY (SOURCE AREAS 1–3) | 61 |
| 4.1.1 | Slope stability – Static conditions (deep-seated failures) | 62 |
| 4.1.2 | Slope stability – Dynamic conditions | 68 |
| 4.1.3 | Slope stability – Summary of results | 77 |
| 4.2 | RUNOUT DISTANCE | 78 |
| 4.2.1 | Potential future source volume estimation | 78 |
| 4.2.2 | Runout modelling | 83 |
| 5.0 | RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 91 |
| 5.1 | TRIGGERING EVENT FREQUENCIES | 91 |
| 5.1.1 | Frequency of earthquake triggers | 91 |
| 5.1.2 | Frequency of rainfall triggers | 95 |
| 5.2 | DWELLING OCCUPANT RISK | 96 |
| 5.2.1 | Variables adopted for the risk assessment | 96 |
| 5.2.2 | Debris avalanche | 97 |
| 5.2.3 | Cliff-top recession | 104 |
| 5.3 | ROAD USER RISK | 106 |
| 6.0 | DISCUSSION | 111 |
| 6.1 | DWELLING OCCUPANT RISK | 111 |
| 6.2 | RISK TO THE ROAD USER | 111 |
| 6.3 | RISK ASSESSMENT SENSITIVITY TO UNCERTAINTIES | 112 |
| 6.3.1 | Debris volumes | 112 |
| 6.3.2 | Area of cliff-top lost | 112 |
| 6.3.3 | Debris runout | 113 |
| 6.3.4 | Other sensitivities and uncertainties | 113 |
| 6.3.5 | How reliable are the results? | 113 |
| 7.0 | CONCLUSIONS | 115 |
| 7.1 | HAZARD | 115 |
| 7.2 | RISK | 115 |
| 7.2.1 | Dwelling occupant | 115 |
| 7.2.2 | Road user | 116 |
| 8.0 | RECOMMENDATIONS | 117 |
| 8.1 | POLICY AND PLANNING | 117 |
| 8.2 | SHORT-TERM ACTIONS | 117 |
| 8.2.1 | Hazard monitoring strategy | 117 |
| 8.2.2 | Monitoring alerts and early warning | 117 |
| 8.2.3 | Surface/subsurface water control | 117 |
| 8.2.4 | Pavement closure | 118 |
| 8.3 | LONG-TERM ACTIONS | 118 |
| 8.3.1 | Engineering measures | 118 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| 8.3.2 Reassessment..... | 118 |
| 9.0 REFERENCES | 119 |
| 10.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | 123 |

FIGURES

| | | |
|------------------|--|----|
| Figure 1 | Location map..... | 3 |
| Figure 2 | The Redcliffs mass movement location map showing the assessed source areas 1 and 2. | 7 |
| Figure 3 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 4 September 2010 (Darfield) earthquake and before the 22 February 2011 earthquakes..... | 9 |
| Figure 4 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 4 September 2010 (Darfield) earthquake and before the 22 February 2011 earthquakes..... | 10 |
| Figure 5 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and before the 13 June 2011 earthquakes. | 11 |
| Figure 6 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and before the 13 June 2011 earthquakes. | 11 |
| Figure 7 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and before the 13 June 2011 earthquakes. | 12 |
| Figure 8 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs mass movement area after the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and before the 13 June 2011 earthquakes. | 12 |
| Figure 9 | Aerial view of the Redcliffs rock slope after the 13 June 2011 earthquakes. Photograph taken by C. Massey. | 13 |
| Figure 10 | Main features identified at the site from field mapping and the interpretation of historical aerial photographs..... | 27 |
| Figure 11 | Engineering geological map. | 31 |
| Figure 12 | Site investigation map. | 32 |
| Figure 13 | Engineering geological cross-sections 1–6. | 33 |
| Figure 14 | View to the west onto the main cliff at Redcliffs..... | 48 |
| Figure 15 | Geological Strength Index plot for volcanic breccia and lava at Redcliffs (modified after Hoek 1999)..... | 49 |
| Figure 16 | Daily rainfalls at Christchurch Gardens and landslides in the Port Hills. | 53 |
| Figure 17 | Rainfall depth-duration-return period relations estimated for Christchurch Gardens by Griffiths et al. (2009) using recorded rainfall data. | 55 |
| Figure 18 | Engineering geological model. | 59 |
| Figure 19 | Schematic diagram showing the increasing frequency of defects in the slope in response to the successive 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes..... | 61 |
| Figure 20 | Example of limit equilibrium and finite element modelling results for cross-section 2 representing assessed source area 2, and adopting model 3 material parameters. | 65 |
| Figure 21 | Example of limit equilibrium and finite element modelling results for cross-section 4, representing assessed source area 1, and adopting model 3 material parameters. | 66 |
| Figure 22 | Example of limit equilibrium and finite element modelling results for cross-section 6, representing assessed source area 3, and adopting model 3 material parameters. | 67 |
| Figure 23 | Modelled Slope/W decoupled displacements of cross-section 4 for the 22 February 2011 earthquake and adopting variable estimates of the material strength. | 71 |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Figure 24 | 13 June 2011 earthquake, modelled Slope/W decoupled displacements for cross-section 4, and adopting variable estimates of the material strength. | 71 |
| Figure 25 | Results from the seismic slope stability assessment for cross-section 4, for the 22 February 2011 earthquake, adopting model 1 material strength parameters. | 72 |
| Figure 26 | Results from the seismic slope stability assessment for cross-section 4, for the 22 February 2011 earthquake, adopting model 2 material strength parameters. | 72 |
| Figure 27 | Decoupled Slope/W displacements calculated for cross-section 4, for different ratios of yield acceleration to maximum average acceleration of the mass (K_y/K_{MAX}), and maximum acceleration of the mass (K_y/A_{MAX}), for selected slide-surface geometries, and given material shear strength parameter models 2 and 3. A_{MAX} is the peak acceleration of the input earthquake time acceleration history. | 74 |
| Figure 28 | Relationship between free field peak ground accelerations at Redcliffs and the volume of debris leaving the Redcliffs slope. | 78 |
| Figure 29 | Proportion and cumulative proportion of volume from cliff collapses in the Port Hills greater than or equal to a given volume. | 80 |
| Figure 30 | Estimation of landslide volume assuming a quarter-ellipsoid shape. | 80 |
| Figure 31 | Proportion of debris volume passing a given fahrboeschung angle (F-angle) line, from debris avalanches triggered during the 22 February and 13 June 2011 earthquakes at Redcliffs. | 83 |
| Figure 32 | The empirical fahrboeschung relationships, expressed as the ratio of height (H) to length (L) for debris avalanche talus and boulder roll (rockfalls), recorded in the Port Hills. N = 45 sections. | 84 |
| Figure 33 | Range of parameters used to back-analyse the runout of debris avalanches in the Port Hills triggered by the recent earthquakes using the RAMMS software (RAMMS, 2011). | 85 |
| Figure 34 | Range of parameters for different mass movement processes: a) debris flows, b) snow avalanches, c) snow avalanches, d) ice avalanches, e) debris floods. | 86 |
| Figure 35 | Mean volume difference between the RAMMS modelled volumes and the actual recorded volumes per 1 m ² grid cell. N = 23 debris avalanches triggered by 22 February and 13 June 2011 earthquakes. | 86 |
| Figure 36 | Comparison between the RAMMS modelled and the empirical-modelled debris runout (Figure 32, and the actual recorded runout for debris avalanches triggered by the 22 February and 13 June 2011 earthquakes. N = 23 debris avalanches. | 87 |
| Figure 37 | Debris avalanche hazard maps. | 89 |
| Figure 38 | Cliff collapse annual individual fatality risk (scenarios A–C). | 99 |
| Figure 39 | Cliff collapse annual individual fatality risk (scenario B 100% distributed). | 102 |
| Figure 40 | Results from the debris avalanche risk assessment per scenarios A, B and C (dwelling occupant). | 103 |
| Figure 41 | Results from the cliff top recession risk assessment, per scenarios A, B and C (dwelling occupant). | 105 |
| Figure 42 | Road user risk maps (the contribution to road user risk per journey from individual grid cells along the road edges). | 107 |
| Figure 43 | Road user risk per journey, central source volume estimates. | 109 |
| Figure 44 | Road user annual fatality risk, central source volume estimates. | 109 |
| Figure 45 | Risk per journey; lower assumed debris source volumes. | 110 |
| Figure 46 | Risk per journey; upper assumed debris source volumes. | 110 |

TABLES

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----|
| Table 1 | Assessed mass movement relative hazard exposure matrix (from the Stage 1 report, Massey et al., 2013). | 5 |
| Table 2 | Risk scenarios used in the modelling of cliff collapses. | 19 |
| Table 3 | Summary of the main data used in the analysis. LiDAR is Light Detecting and Ranging. | 21 |
| Table 4 | Summary of observations from aerial photographs used to assess the site history at Redcliffs..... | 25 |
| Table 5 | Summary of the ground investigations carried out at the site by Aurecon NZ Ltd. (Pletz and Revell, 2013) and Tonkin and Taylor Ltd. (Tonkin and Taylor, 2012a). | 29 |
| Table 6 | Measured total cumulate crack apertures (measured normal to the slope), which formed during the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes (mainly during the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and less so during the 13 June 2011 earthquakes). | 39 |
| Table 7 | Measured cumulate crack apertures, horizontal only, which formed during the 13 June 2011 earthquakes, measured by M. Yetton (Geotech Ltd.; Appendix 4). | 40 |
| Table 8 | Inferred cumulative crack apertures for the 22 February 2011 earthquakes. | 40 |
| Table 9 | Estimated volumes lost from the cliffs calculated from the terrestrial laser scan (TLS) and LiDAR surveys..... | 42 |
| Table 10 | Summary of drillhole inclinometer surveys. | 44 |
| Table 11 | Engineering geological descriptions of the main geological units forming the cliffs (descriptions as per New Zealand Geotechnical Society, 2005). | 47 |
| Table 12 | Range of adopted bulk soil strength parameters for Redcliffs soils. | 48 |
| Table 13 | Range of adopted rock strength parameters (for cross-section 4)..... | 50 |
| Table 14 | Shear wave velocity data and shear modulus used for modelling. | 51 |
| Table 16 | Annual frequencies of given rainfall in the Christchurch for four main events following the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes (rainfalls are calculated daily from 09:00 to 09:00 NZST). | 54 |
| Table 17 | Material strength parameters used for modelling for cross-section 4 (similar parameters were adopted for sections 2 and 6, but the actual values used varied due to the different lithostatic stress range of the materials in the slope. | 62 |
| Table 18 | Example results from slope stability assessment of source area 1 (cross-section 1). | 64 |
| Table 19 | Results from the dynamic modelling of cross-section 4. | 70 |
| Table 20 | Forecast modelling results from the dynamic slope stability assessment for cross-sections 2, 4 and 6, adopting model 3 material parameters, and no water in tension cracks. Estimated displacements are rounded to the nearest 0.1 m. | 76 |
| Table 21 | The volumes of debris leaving the slope during each of the 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes and the earthquake's estimated peak ground acceleration, at the Redcliffs site – horizontal (H) and vertical (V) peak ground acceleration (PGA) components are listed separately. | 78 |
| Table 22 | The estimated volumes of debris leaving the slope for different bands of peak ground acceleration (PGA). | 79 |
| Table 23 | Example of estimated source volumes (the first digit in the number is significant) and fahrboeschung angles. | 81 |
| Table 24 | Information used to estimate event volumes contributing to the total risk from non-seismic rockfall triggering events, all sites. | 82 |
| Table 25 | The annual frequency of a given peak ground acceleration (PGA) band occurring on rock (Site Class B) for different years from the 2012 seismic hazard model for Christchurch (G. McVerry, personal communication 2014). | 91 |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|-----|
| Table 26 | Proportion of the total debris volume per peak ground acceleration band allocated to distributed and local failures, for upper, central and lower estimates of volume (rounded to the nearest 100 m ³). | 92 |
| Table 27 | Forecast modelling results from the dynamic slope stability assessment for cross-sections 2, 4 and 6, adopting model 3 material parameters, and no water in tension cracks. Estimated displacements are rounded to the nearest 0.1 m. | 94 |
| Table 28 | Representative annual event frequency of debris avalanches occurring, and the representative volume of the avalanche, for each time-period band. | 95 |
| Table 29 | Area of cliff top lost per peak ground acceleration (PGA) band for upper, middle and lower volume estimates | 104 |
| Table 30 | Volume of debris and area of cliff top lost per non-seismic band (based on historical rockfall rates in Massey et al., 2012a). | 104 |
| Table 31 | Uncertainties and their implications for risk. | 114 |

APPENDICES

| | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| A1 | APPENDIX 1: METHODS OF ASSESSMENT..... | A1-1 |
| A1.1 | HAZARD ASSESSMENT METHOD | A1-1 |
| A1.1.1 | Slope stability modelling | A1-1 |
| A1.1.2 | Risk assessment | A1-6 |
| A1.2 | ROAD-USER RISK ASSESSMENT | A1-14 |
| A1.2.1 | Background and Context..... | A1-14 |
| A1.2.2 | Risk Modelling Approach..... | A1-15 |
| A1.2.3 | Traffic Parameters on Main Road at Redcliffs | A1-16 |
| A1.2.4 | Individual Risk per Journey – Hazard 1 (Impacted/Inundated by Debris).. | A1-19 |
| A1.2.5 | Road user risk per journey and risk parameters derived from it | A1-22 |
| A2 | APPENDIX 2: RESULTS FROM AIRBORNE LIDAR SURVEYS | A2-1 |
| A3 | APPENDIX 3: RESULTS FROM TERRESTRIAL LASER SCAN SURVEYS | A3-1 |
| A4 | APPENDIX 4: RESULTS FROM SURVEYS OF CADASTRAL AND MONITORING SURVEY MARKS | A4-1 |
| A5 | APPENDIX 5: FIELD MAPPING OF CRACKS FOLLOWING THE MAIN EARTHQUAKES (CARRIED OUT BY M. YETTON, GEOTECH LTD) | A5-1 |
| A6 | APPENDIX 6: RESULTS FROM THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL SITE RESPONSE ASSESSMENT FOR CROSS-SECTION 4..... | A6-1 |
| A7 | APPENDIX 7: RAMMS MODELLING RESULTS FOR SOURCE AREAS 1–3. ESTIMATED LANDSLIDE RUNOUT HEIGHT..... | A7-1 |
| A8 | APPENDIX 8: RAMMS MODELLING RESULTS FOR SOURCE AREAS 1– 3, ESTIMATED LANDSLIDE RUNOUT VELOCITY | A8-1 |
| A9 | APPENDIX 9: ROCFALL MODELLING RESULTS FOR CROSS-SECTIONS 2, 4 AND 6 | A9-1 |
| A10 | APPENDIX 10: STEREONET KINEMATIC ANALYSIS OF REDCLIFFS DISCONTINUITY DATA | A10-1 |

APPENDIX FIGURES

| | | |
|--------------------|---|-------|
| Figure A1.1 | Expanded calculation of the probability of each local source area "scoop" occurring..... | A1-9 |
| Figure A1.2 | Main Road section modelled (opposite Redcliffs Park). | A1-14 |
| Figure A1.3 | View northwest along the Main Road section assessed for Redcliffs (image taken from Google Earth). | A1-15 |
| Figure A1.4 | Possible boulder/road user collision configurations. | A1-20 |
| Figure A6.1 | Amplification relationship between the synthetic free-field rock outcrop input motions (A_{FF}) and the modelled cliff crest maximum accelerations (A_{MAX}) for cross-section 4..... | A6-2 |
| Figure A6.2 | Modelled peak horizontal ground acceleration contours for the 22 February 2011 earthquake at Redcliffs, cross-section 4, adopting the 2003 airborne LiDAR slope surface geometry..... | A6-3 |
| Figure A6.3 | Relationship between the modelled horizontal and vertical maximum accelerations modelled at the convex break in slope (A_{MAX}) for cross-section 4, using the synthetic free-field rock outcrop motions for the Redcliffs site by Holden et al. (2014) as inputs to the assessment. | A6-4 |

APPENDIX TABLES

| | | |
|----------------------|--|-------|
| Table A1.1(a) | Estimated westbound traffic on Main Road at Redcliffs. | A1-17 |
| Table A1.1(b) | Estimated eastbound traffic on Main Road at Redcliffs. | A1-18 |
| Table A1.2 | Correlation between traffic levels and average speeds/separations..... | A1-18 |
| Table A1.3 | Summary of road user numbers and average speeds..... | A1-19 |
| Table A1.4 | Road user speeds and times per journey within 2 m cell..... | A1-21 |
| Table A1.5 | Calculation of risk parameters of interest from single cell risk per journey. | A1-23 |
| Table A6.1 | Results from the two-dimensional site response assessment for cross-section 4, using the out-of-phase synthetic free-field rock outcrop motions for the Redcliffs site by Holden et al. (2014) as inputs to the assessment. PGA is peak ground acceleration..... | A6-1 |

EQUATIONS

| | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Equation 1 | | 17 |
| Equation 2 | | 51 |
| Equation 3A | | A1-10 |
| Equation 3B | | A1-10 |
| Equation 3C | | A1-10 |
| Equation 4A | | A1-11 |
| Equation 4B | | A1-11 |
| Equation 5 | | A1-12 |
| Equation 6 | | A1-15 |
| Equation 7 | | A1-20 |
| Equation 8 | | A1-20 |
| Equation 9 | | A1-21 |
| Equation 10 | | A1-21 |
| Equation 11 | | A1-21 |