

# PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

The individual risk, as determined by summing the risk, for the person most at risk, from all the landslide hazards, is used for comparison with the tolerable risk criteria.

**b) For situations where there is a potential for large numbers of lives to be lost in a single landslide event, estimate the frequency (f) –number (N) of lives lost pairs and total annual risk.**

If the possible loss of large numbers of lives from a landslide incident is high, society will generally expect that the probability that the incident might actually occur should be low. This accounts for society’s particular intolerance to incidents that cause many simultaneous casualties and is embodied in the criteria for tolerable societal risk. Societal Risk is discussed further in the Commentary.

In many cases there will be more than one landslide hazard (e.g. rockfall, which may lead to one or two lives lost; medium volume rapid landslide which may lead to several lives lost; and large rapid landslide which may lead to many lives lost). The frequency (annual probability, “f”) of the “event” and the number of lives lost (N) should be estimated for each landslide hazard.

The total annual risk =  $\sum (f \times N)$  should also be estimated.

## 8 RISK ASSESSMENT

### 8.1 RISK EVALUATION

**Evaluate the risks against Tolerable Risk Criteria for loss of life and property loss.**

**Accept the risks if tolerable, or seek to reduce risks to tolerable levels by risk mitigation.**

The main objectives of risk evaluation are usually to decide whether to accept or treat the risks and to set priorities. The Tolerable Risk Criteria are usually imposed by the regulator, unless agreed otherwise with the owner/client

Non- technical clients may seek guidance from the practitioner on whether to accept the risk. In these situations, risk comparisons, discussion of treatment options and explanation of the risk management process can help the client make his decision.

It is desirable, if not essential, that the practitioner who prepared the risk assessment be involved in the decision making process because the process is often iterative, requiring assessment of the sensitivity of calculations to assumptions, modification of the development proposed and revision of risk mitigation measures.

Risk evaluation involves making judgements about the significance and tolerability of the estimated risk. Evaluation may involve comparison of the assessed risks with other risks or with risk acceptance criteria related to finance, loss of life or other values. Risk evaluation may include consideration of issues such as environmental effects, public reaction, politics, business or public confidence and fear of litigation.

In a simple situation where the client/owner is the only affected party, risk evaluation may be a simple value judgement. In more complex situations, value judgements on acceptable risk appropriate to the particular situation are still made as part of an acceptable process of risk management.

### 8.2 TOLERABLE RISK CRITERIA

**The regulator is to establish the Tolerable Risk Criteria for loss of life and property loss.**

As discussed in Section 3.5, the regulator is the appropriate authority to set standards for tolerable risk which may relate not only to perceived safety in relation to other risks, but also to government policy. Implementation of a tolerable risk level has implications to the community at large, both in terms of relative risks or safety and in terms of economic impact on the community.

The Commentary provides discussion and gives the AGS recommendations in relation to tolerable risk for loss of life. These are summarized in Table 1

Table 1: AGS Suggested Tolerable loss of life individual risk.

Situation	Suggested Tolerable Loss of Life Risk for the person most at risk
Existing Slope (1) / Existing Development (2)	$10^{-4}$ / annum
New Constructed Slope (3) / New Development (4) / Existing Landslide (5)	$10^{-5}$ / annum

# PRACTICE NOTE GUIDELINES FOR LANDSLIDE RISK MANAGEMENT 2007

Notes:

1. "Existing Slopes" in this context are slopes that are not part of a recognizable landslide and have demonstrated non-failure performance over at least several seasons or events of extended adverse weather, usually being a period of at least 10 to 20 years.
2. "Existing Development" includes existing structures, and slopes that have been modified by cut and fill, that are not located on or part of a recognizable landslide and have demonstrated non-failure performance over at least several seasons or events of extended adverse weather, usually being a period of at least 10 to 20 years.
3. "New Constructed Slope" includes any change to existing slopes by cut or fill or changes to existing slopes by new stabilisation works (including replacement of existing retaining walls or replacement of existing stabilisation measures, such as rock bolts or catch fences).
4. "New Development" includes any new structure or change to an existing slope or structure. Where changes to an existing structure or slope result in any cut or fill of less than 1.0m vertical height from the toe to the crest and this change does not increase the risk, then the Existing Slope / Existing Structure criterion may be adopted. Where changes to an existing structure do not increase the building footprint or do not result in an overall change in footing loads, then the Existing Development criterion may be adopted.
5. "Existing Landslides" have been considered likely to require remedial works and hence would become a New Constructed Slope and require the lower risk. Even where remedial works are not required per se, it would be reasonable expectation of the public for a known landslide to be assessed to the lower risk category as a matter of "public safety".

Acceptable risks are usually considered to be one order of magnitude lower than the Tolerable Risks.

It is important to distinguish between "acceptable risks" and "tolerable risks".

*Tolerable Risks* are risks within a range that society can live with so as to secure certain benefits. It is a range of risk regarded as non-negligible and needing to be kept under review and reduced further if practicable.

*Acceptable Risks* are risks which everyone affected is prepared to accept. Action to further reduce such risk is usually not required unless reasonably practicable measures are available at low cost in terms of money, time and effort.

AGS suggests that for most development in existing urban area criteria based on Tolerable Risks levels are applicable because of the trade-off between the risks, the benefits of development and the cost of risk mitigation.

The Commentary discusses Individual and Societal risk to loss of life. Usually Societal risk need not be considered for a risk evaluation in relation to a single dwelling. Societal risk should be evaluated for buildings having high numbers of occupants, such as schools, hospitals, hotels or motels where many lives are at risk. This then addresses society's aversion to loss of many lives from single landslide events.

The Tolerable Risk Criteria for property loss may be determined by the Importance Level of the development (Appendix A) as discussed in the Commentary.

## 9 RISK MANAGEMENT

### 9.1 RISK MITIGATION PRINCIPLES

#### 9.1.1 Feasible options for risk mitigation for each risk assessment are to be identified and discussed including the reduced risk by adoption of those options.

Alternative methods to be explored include:

- a. **Accept the risk**, which is only an option subject to the criteria set by the regulator. Where the risk is not tolerable then risk mitigation measures are required.
- b. **Avoid the risk**, such as relocation of the site of proposed development, or revise the form of the development, or abandon the development (though this may still require some risks to be controlled due to possible effect on third parties adjacent or nearby).
- c. **Reduce the frequency of landsliding**, by stabilisation measures to control the initiating circumstances, such as by re-profiling the surface geometry where existing slopes are 'over steep', by provision of improved surface water drainage measures, by provision of subsurface drainage scheme, by provision of retaining structures such as retaining walls, anchored walls or ground anchors.
- d. **Reduce the consequences**, by provision of defensive stabilisation measures or protective measures such as a boulder catch fence, or amelioration of the behaviour of the landslide, or by relocation of the development to a more favourable location.