



Cape Kidnappers landslide risk management options analysis

From: Steve Sutton, Senior Visitor Advisor,
Lynnell Greer, Manager Visitor Advice, Heritage and Visitor Unit

To: Steve Taylor Director Heritage and Visitor Unit
Bruce Parks, DDG Policy & Visitor
Mike Slater, DDG Operations

6/7/2020

Contents

Executive summary	2
Purpose.....	3
Decision-making criteria.....	3
Context	3
Legislative context.....	3
Department's Visitor Risk Management Policy, Guideline and Standard Operating Procedure....	4
Background.....	4
QRA risk assessment.....	7
Walker Individual risk of one trip	8
Another representation of the risk level	9
Gannet Beach Adventures passenger individual risk of one trip	10
Societal risk.....	10
Discussion	11
Management issues.....	11
Options overview	12
Options assessment.....	13
Interpreting the tables	14
<i>Consulting on any proposed change</i>	15
<i>Facilities and services appropriate to managing the risk</i>	17
Conclusion	18
Actions required to achieve option number 2	21
Appendix I: Glossary of terms	22
Appendix II: Visitor Groups.....	23
Appendix III: Option description and compatibility assessment.....	25



Executive summary

The current situation of people using the beach route to access the Cape Kidnappers gannet colonies has been assessed as having an intolerable risk to the existing independent walkers and to people who go with the transport operator¹.

There are also serious risks for locals using the beach, and for DOC and HDC staff who use the beach while undertaking work tasks. The risk to DOC staff can be managed through established work health and safety procedures and priority setting.

Managing the whole Cape Kidnappers experience (visiting the gannet colonies) to a tolerable level of risk would be by treating this destination for backcountry adventurers² or remoteness seekers. This is the equivalent of people taking on nature on nature's terms, where natural hazards such as rockfalls or steep and unstable terrain are likely to be encountered. People are responsible for their decisions about the risks they are prepared to take and for those in their care, and the department will provide information to inform people of those risks.

For people who are not prepared to take on that type of experience and the inherent risks, this is not a suitable trip. For these people there is the option of going with a commercial transport operator overland by bus.

However, experience over the past year has shown that some people will continue to ignore warning signs and track closure signs. Due to the location and nature of access to Cape Kidnappers via the beach, people without the necessary skills and experience will continue to be exposed to intolerable risk. This suggests that to effectively manage the risk to visitors, clear and unambiguous signals about the hazards should be used.

DOC should seek to discourage rather than encourage people from using the beach, reduce the standard of the DOC track from the beach to the gannet colonies (i.e consistent with and adventurous high-risk site), provide more compelling information about the risks of landslide, and manage negative public comment about the loss of formed access. This is the second option outlined in this report. This is the recommended management approach DOC should take, and will be reported in the recommendation paper to the decision-maker ([DOC-6144749](#)).

Consultation with Iwi, the neighbouring landowner and the transport concessionaire has commenced, and is required prior to making any decision public.

¹ See Appendix I for a glossary of terms

² These visitor groups are characterized as having a higher level of skills and experience than day visitors. They seek an experience that has challenge and a sense of freedom and they accept a degree of risk and discomfort.



Purpose

This report;

- describes the context and critical issues in managing visitor access at Cape Kidnappers and the risks to visitors,
- presents options for the future of Department of Conservation (DOC) assets that facilitate public access, and
- applies criteria to test options for the future management of the DOC track at Cape Kidnappers and make a recommendation.
- Provides background to the recommendation paper for the DDG Operations ([DOC-6144749](#))

Decision-making criteria

In developing options and recommending an option to the decision maker, the policy context and critical issues provide the basis for a set of criteria against which to assess options.

Some criteria will be mandatory – DOC or Hastings District Council (HDC) have no choice. This is where the legislative and policy position are clear.

Some criteria require judgement on factors that may range from incidental to critical, tolerable to intolerable. These criteria are explained in the ‘options’ section.

Context

Legislative context

DOC’s management of access at Cape Kidnappers is governed by various Acts of Parliament.

Relevant are the Conservation Act (1987), the Reserves Act (1977), and the Health and Safety at Work Act (2015), including the provisions relating to a person conducting a business or undertaking or PCBU, the National Parks Act (1980), the Building Act (2004), the Health Act (1956), the Occupiers Liability Act (1962), and the Land Transport Act (1998).

For the Conservation Act 1987, The Conservation General Policy applies. Relevant sections of policies include:

8 (a) Management for natural hazards on public conservation lands and waters:

- i. should be undertaken with minimal interference to natural processes, natural resources, and historical and cultural heritage;
- ii. should be consistent with the purpose for which the land is held; and
- iii. will include an assessment of the risks to people, places and property.

8 (b) When a high level of risk to people, places or property from a natural hazard on public conservation lands and waters has been identified, a hazard and risk management plan should be developed by the Department, identifying options to address risks, and interested people and organisations will be informed of any proposed actions.

8 (c) The Department should provide information to enable people to assess the risks from natural hazards that may occur on public conservation lands and waters.

8 (d) People will be responsible for their own decisions on the risks that they are prepared to take arising from natural hazards on public conservation lands and waters.



Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

8 (e) The Department may notify the closure of any part of public conservation lands and waters to public entry when it considers there to be imminent danger to people and property that cannot be reasonably avoided by other means.

9.1 (b) The recreational opportunities and the outcomes planned for different places will be identified in conservation management strategies and plans and will be consistent with the statutory purposes for which the place is held.

9.1 (c) Identification of the outcomes planned for different places and the range of recreational opportunities available should include an assessment of the following:

- v. suitability for people with different capabilities, skills and interests;

9.2 (a) A range of information should be provided to:

- ii. enable people to assess the risks from hazards that may occur on public conservation lands and waters.

9.3 (a) People are responsible for their own decisions on risks they are prepared to take on public conservation lands and waters and for ensuring that they and, generally, those in their care, have the level of skill and competence and the equipment required to cope with those risks.

9.3 (b) Recreational activities that create hazards for other people should be managed to reduce the risk of harm.

The Hawkes Bay Conservancy Conservation Management Strategy 1994 – 2004 (CMS) identifies Cape Kidnappers as an important regional attraction because the gannet colonies are ‘one of the world’s most accessible’. The CMS also provides for DOC to restrict activities and access “where it is necessary ... for public safety....”

Department’s Visitor Risk Management Policy, Guideline and Standard Operating Procedure.

The department also uses the Visitor Risk Management Policy,³ Visitor Risk Management Guideline and Visitor Risk Standard Operating Procedure to ensure that risks to visitors associated with new and existing hazards can be identified, evaluated, managed, monitored and communicated so that visitors can enjoy Public Conservation Lands and Waters to the level of safety that they prefer.

Background

Rockfall January 2019 severely injured two Korean Tourists

In January 2019 a rockfall occurred on common marine and coastal area leading to Cape Kidnappers Government Purpose Gannet Reserve. Two Korean tourists were severely injured in this event. Although the area where the rockfall occurred is not managed by DOC, the visitors were using it to get access to gannet colonies. Cape Kidnappers and the gannet colonies is a destination that has been actively promoted by Hawke’s Bay Tourism, DOC and the commercial transport operators providing services there.

³ DOC Visitor Risk Management Policy <https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/managing-conservation/recreation-management/visitor-risk-management/docs-visitor-risk-management-policy/>



In response to this event DOC closed the track on the Government Purpose Reserve (see the description in the following section) that provides access from the beach to the plateau where the main gannet colony is located. This track remains closed while a QRA has been undertaken.

HDC closed the beach and Councillors voted to open it again at a meeting in June 2019.

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/113269087/cape-kidnappers-beach-path-reopened-but-council-chief-cant-say-hed-walk-it>

Land Jurisdictions and Responsibilities Cape Kidnappers

DOC's jurisdiction at Cape Kidnappers (Public Conservation Lands and Waters – PCL&W) comprises the three reserves at Cape Kidnappers, the Government Purpose (Facilities Associated With the Protection of Gannets) Reserve (commonly called the Cape Kidnappers Gannet Protection Reserve) and two areas of Nature Reserve as shown in the following map. The gannet colonies are located both on and off PCL&W, with the plateau colony located off PCL&W on private land.

Beach

DOC's jurisdiction over areas commonly considered as beach is limited to two areas of Government Purpose Reserve.

The remainder of beach access (approximately 6km) is Common Marine and Coastal Area under the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 (MACA). This area is under the control of the Hastings District Council – referred to as Council beach. HDC closed this beach on 1st May 2020 following another large landslide, and they are awaiting a geological report before making a decision on opening the beach again.



DOC Walking Track

DOC has 1.5km of walking track from the beach part of the Government Purpose Reserve up to the main Cape Kidnappers Gannet Colony situated on the Nature Reserve.

- 490m of this track is on Government Purpose Reserve, 680m is on private land.
- This track has been closed since February 2019 pending outcome of the QRA as noted above.



Visitor risk management response

DOC's visitor risk management policy and procedures were used following the February 2019 landslide event at Cape Kidnappers.

Following the landslide at Cape Kidnappers in June 2019, which occurred on land administered by HDC, HDC and DOC jointly commissioned a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) using Stantec a geotechnical consulting firm. An incident investigation team was set up and an investigation report⁴ produced.

⁴ Incident Investigation Cape Kidnappers 23 January 2019 <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/about-doc/conservation-management/cape-kidnappers-investigation-final-26-june-19.pdf>



Department of Conservation

Te Papa Atawhai

The beach access and DOC track were both closed at the request of the NZ Police. DOC has continued to keep its track closed awaiting the results of the QRA.

QRA risk assessment

The QRA was completed by GNS in May 2020 to provide advice to DOC and HDC on the level of risk from future landslides from the cliffs that border the beach access for 9km ([DOC-6298812](#)). The QRA provides information about a very high level of risk of potentially fatal landslides for the beach access, and some landslide risk associated with the DOC track.

The following table sets out the main results from the GNS report⁵. The risk of a fatality is displayed in scientific notation (a standard convention for risk reporting) as well as the as 1 chance in "X" (eg the chances of having your birthday on February 29 are 1 in 1461⁶.

Person at Risk	From (Lower)	To (Upper)	From (Lower)	To (Upper)	Risk Units
	Neap Low Tide		Spring Low Tide		
Walker (individual risk)	8.20E-06	3.00E-05	5.70E-06	2.10E-05	Per trip
	1 in 122000	1 in 33000	1 in 175000	1 in 48000	Per trip
Gannet Beach Adventure (GBA) passenger (individual risk)	4.10E-06	1.50E-05	2.90E-06	1.10E-05	Per trip
	1 in 244000	1 in 67000	1 in 345000	1 in 91000	Per trip
DOC (person most exposed)	1.9E-05	2.10E-04	1.30E-05	1.50E-04	Per year
	1 in 53000	1 in 4800	1 in 77000	1 in 6700	Per year
GBA (person most exposed)	6.40E-04	2.40E-03	4.50E-04	1.70E-03	Per year
	1 in 1600	1 in 400	1 in 2200	1 in 600	Per year
Local (a representative local)	4.70E-05	5.20E-04	3.30E-05	3.60E-04	Per year
	1 in 21300	1 in 1900	1 in 30300	1 in 2800	Per year

The 'Lower' and 'Upper' risk ratings show the range of likely risk due to the level of uncertainty involved in a calculation. For instance, if the likelihood of a rockfall from a particular area of cliff has a range of between once every year and once every two years this flows through into the risk calculations.

The 'Neap Low Tide' risk is higher than the 'Spring Low Tide' risk as there is more beach exposed during spring tides, so people travelling the beach can be further away from the cliffs than during neap tides.

This is a risk assessment of rockfall and landslides only. It does not include debris flows, tsunami or being caught by the incoming tide. It also doesn't factor in individual walkers getting the tides wrong

⁵ see Table 4.1 of the Cape Kidnappers Landslide Risk Assessment QRA GNS Final Report May 2020 (page 76).

⁶ An example of probability <https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-probability-of-being-born-on-February-29>



Department of Conservation

Te Papa Atawhai

and having to spend extra time close to the base of the cliffs. Therefore, the actual total risk will be higher.

Walker Individual risk of one trip

The risk profile can also be represented by the different sections of the route taken to reach the main gannet colony via the beach.

	% of total risk	Risk to a walker (High) 1 chance in per trip	Risk to a walker (Low) 1 chance in per trip	Tolerance as per consultant TTAC ⁷ guidance document
Public beach	82%	40,000	210,000	Intolerable for low and medium risk takers. Tolerable ⁸ for high risk takers
DOC beach ⁹	16%	210,000	1,100,000	Intolerable for low risk takers. Tolerable for medium and high-risk takers
DOC track	< 1%	3,800,000	20,000,000	Tolerable for low risk takers
Farm track	< 1%	5,700,000	30,000,000	Tolerable for low risk takers
Full walk	100%	33,000	175,000	Intolerable for low and medium risk takers. Tolerable for high risk takers

The risk level identified by GNS is equivalent to be at the same level as the overall risk rate that mountaineers face in New Zealand, where they have the hazards of rockfall, snow and ice avalanches, crevasses, falls and weather. Note that this excludes climbing Aoraki the mountain which has a much higher death rate. Comparing the risk of the Cape Kidnappers walk with doing the glacier walk up to the Franz Josef Glacier, Cape Kidnappers is up to 30 times risker than Franz Josef when DOC controls are being applied at Franz Josef.

The level of risk is described using the ‘user group’ definitions used by DOC and underpinning the New Zealand Handbook Tracks and Outdoor Visitor Structures SNZ HB 8630:2004¹⁰ (see Appendix II for these visitor groups and definitions).

The main users of the beach access at Cape Kidnappers are Day Visitors DV. These are people seeking an experience in a natural setting with a sense of space. The least mobile are commonly families with

⁷ TTAC are an international consultancy specialising in risk management. <http://www.ttac.co.uk/> providing advice to DOC on risk in the outdoors.

⁸ Tolerable means tolerable if reduced to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)

⁹ The section called DOC beach is mainly a 10 m wide strip of DOC reserve that starts around the 5.6 km mark on the trip and appears to sit between the low and high tide marks. Walkers and tractors would not be in it all the time so the actual percentage of the risk associated with this section would be lower than shown. However as users would not know whether they are in it or out of it for this section of the walk it is all shown here as DOC beach.

¹⁰ See Standards New Zealand <https://shop.standards.govt.nz/catalog/8630%3A2004%28SNZHB%29/view>



Department of Conservation

Te Papa Atawhai

young children, school parties and elderly people. (see Appendix II for more detailed descriptions of the visitor groups).

Mr Bogie advises that the level of risk is **intolerable** for the majority of users of the beach expecting a relatively safe day visitor experience.

The overall risk of serious harm or fatality resulting from landslide or rockfall while travelling along the beach is far higher than had previously been assumed. This is the first completed QRA of the landslide hazard, and other risk assumptions were based on the views of people familiar with historical events.

The level of risk has been described for the different sections of the trip from Clifton to the plateau gannet colony. The most risk (82%) is associated with the beach under HDC jurisdiction ('public beach') because this makes up the greatest length of the trip sections and has the potential for the larger landslides. Anyone making a trip down the beach must pass over this section of beach first. The section of beach under DOC jurisdiction has a lower level of risk from landslides associated with it (16%), but still presents as a very risky site for people to use.

A better understanding of the occurrence of landslides can be achieved through more systematic monitoring, and DOC should be encouraging HDC to do this as part of its hazard management plan. It will take several years to build up a better body of knowledge on landslide events, and any improvement in our understanding of landslide events will depend on the nature of any monitoring undertaken.

Another representation of the risk level

This risk to individuals walking the beach is presented in the following table to show the relative risk to people making the trip depending on which visitor group those people individually might be classified as. The pink band reflects extremely dangerous settings, the yellow bands settings with high risk which may be tolerable if appropriate management actions can be taken, and the green reflects lower risk settings, similar to many DOC visitor sites managed for Day Visitors. The reference to ALARP is where the risk should be reduced 'as low as reasonably practicable'.

Fatality risk per trip

Significance level	Evaluation category	Action required	Lower Risk Short Stop Travellers Day Visitors	Medium Risk Day Visitors, Backcountry Comfort Seekers	Higher Risk Backcountry Adventurers, Remoteness Seekers
Extreme	Intolerable	Halt until risk reduced	H D C		
High		Continue ONLY after corporate review etc	D O C	H D C D O C	
Substantial	Tolerable if reduced to ALARP	Explore practicable risk reduction options (prioritise SUBSTANTIAL)	H D C	D O C	H D C D O C
Significant					
Insignificant	Tolerable	None			



There are no management actions that will reduce the risk profile for Short Stop Travellers or low risk-taking Day Visitors to ‘Tolerable’ levels for Cape Kidnappers beach access route.

Backcountry Adventurers and Remoteness Seekers would be taking on a tolerable risk when using the beach access to get to the gannet colonies, and hazard warnings would be expected to be provided.

Gannet Beach Adventures passenger individual risk of one trip

Doing the trip with GBA has around half the risk of doing a freedom walk. This is due to less exposure time and the local knowledge of the tractor drivers who can if they do things well on the day, know when to turn back or possibly get out of the way of an event as it occurs. It is however still a relatively high level of risk. It is still within the range of the risk rate that mountaineers face in New Zealand. It is a significantly higher risk by more than an order of magnitude than most common sports activities. It has similar risk levels to many activities considered adventure activities.

Comparing the risk of the trip travelling with GBA with doing the glacier walk up to the Franz Josef Glacier, Cape Kidnappers is up to 15 times risker than the controlled risks of walking on the DOC track to view the glacier at Franz Josef.

The risk for the trip by tractor is similar to the split of risk for walkers. 82% of the risk is associated with the public beach, and 16% on DOC administered beach, although the time (and therefore risk) on DOC beach may be lower if people stay off the parts of the 10m wide strip of PCL&W that runs along the beach. This doesn’t lower the overall risk, just the risk associated with PCL&W.

	% of total risk*	Risk to GBA passenger (High) 1 chance in per trip	Risk to GBA passenger (Low) 1 chance in per trip	Tolerance as per TTAC guidance document
Public beach	82%	81,000	420,000	Intolerable for low and medium risk takers. Tolerable for high risk takers
DOC beach	16%	420,000	2,100,000	The risk range crosses into intolerable for low risk takers. Tolerable for medium and high-risk takers

*the remaining 2% of risk is associated with the DOC track and the access through the private land

Societal risk

Societal risk is the risk of an event happening during a defined time period to one or more people. The GNS QRA gives a societal risk figure of 1 chance in 90 to 100 per annum (approx. 1% pa) for 10 to 20 deaths. This is a high level of societal risk. This is most likely to be a GBA trip as it has sizeable groups exposed. While individual walkers have a higher individual risk than a tractor passenger, it is less likely that there would be an event as big as this with walkers, as they do not tend to walk in large groups.



Discussion

Management issues

The most fundamental critical issue at Cape Kidnappers in relation to the beach access to the gannet colonies is ‘how to manage visitor access to the gannet colonies so associated risks are tolerable’?

Other critical issues to consider when assessing options for visitor management are:

- How to meet DOC’s responsibilities with our Treaty partner?
- What if most users of the beach are not familiar with the nature and scale of the risk from landslides?
- How to account for other risks to users making the journey to the gannet colonies via the beach?
- How to balance the risk to personal safety with the desire that people have to make the trip to the gannet colonies?
- How to account for the different types of people who use the beach access route; independent walkers, clients of the beach transport operator, employees of the transport operator, employees of DOC and HDC, and locals recreating at the beach?
- How to account for the interests of local community and businesses gaining personal, social and/or financial benefit from the trip to the gannet colonies being accessible?
- What if there are other reasons for using the beach access route that would be impacted by a change in access provision (eg coastal research, marine mammal rescue)?

Hastings District Council has decided that their risk management will be to continue their landslide hazard management plan which includes periodically closing the beach through signage when the risk of landslide is elevated (after earthquakes, after large landslides and after storm events).

Otherwise they do not restrict access. A large landslide was reported on 1/5/2020, and HDC closed the beach by way of the ‘beach access open/closed’ sign and the beach was still closed at the time of completing this report¹¹.

DOC can make potential users more aware of the nature of the hazards of the trip and the level of risk, and then people can make their own choice as to whether or not to make the trip.

Having a managed walking track at the far end of the beach is an invitation to complete the journey, and contradicts having signs warning of serious risk from landslides.

Within this context, DOC is considering appropriate decisions on the following:

- The visitor experience being provided.
- Visitor risk information provided for potential visitors
- The provision of a track from the beach to the top of the escarpment
- The provision of toilets and a shelter near the gannet colonies.

¹¹ See HDC website <https://www.hastingsdc.govt.nz/hastings/beaches/cape-kidnappers-landslide/article/1627/clifton-beach-closed-due-to-slip>



Options overview

The options for managing the risk for people interested in visiting the main gannet colony at Cape Kidnappers via the beach route can be described across a continuum from no intervention through to preventing people from accessing the beach.

Three options are described below, reflecting the different levels of risk that people using the outdoors for recreation are generally exposed to. These range along a continuum from easy access - low risk opportunities through to situations with much higher levels of inherent risk. These are described drawing on the 'user group' definitions used by DOC and underpinning the New Zealand Handbook Tracks and Outdoor Visitor Structures SNZ HB 8630:2004¹².

These options are also described in the context of the 'whole visitor experience'. Visitors using the beach access to the gannet colonies are subject to hazards along that journey, and managing visitor risk requires considering the whole trip.

Each option describes a different level of service provision and a different level of visitor risk tolerance. The risk management approach appropriate to each option is then described. These options are then assessed in the following section of this report, to determine which options are achievable, and then which option has the most appropriate risk management approach.

1. **Manage as a day visitor site.** The characteristics of a day visitor site include being a relatively safe experience. As this site is associated with a road-end situation, users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk.
To manage visitor risk we seek to discourage rather than encourage people using the beach by providing more compelling information about the risks of landslide, but continue to provide the facilities and information that make it relatively easy for people to get to the gannet colony. This option can be expected to achieve a high level of public acceptance, but the level of associated risk if understood would not be accepted.
2. **Manage as a remote site.** The characteristics of a remote site include being a relatively risky experience. These places attract visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.
To manage visitor risk we seek to discourage people using the beach by maintaining the DOC track to a lower standard (tramping track or route), and by providing more compelling information about the risks of landslide and only basic navigation information. We expect to manage some public fallout at the lower standard of formed track, as the expectations of most current visitors will not be met.
3. **No visitor management at site.** The characteristics of sites with no visitor management include deliberately not providing facilities to assist people to use that place. Such places can be an extremely risky experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.
To manage visitor risk we seek to strongly discourage using the beach by closing the DOC track (ie no longer provide formed access), provide more compelling information about the risks of landslide, and no navigation information. We expect to manage public fallout at the loss of formed access.

¹² See Standards New Zealand <https://shop.standards.govt.nz/catalog/8630%3A2004%28SNZHB%29/view>



Options assessment

The options are outlined in more detail in the following tables.

- The first table compares the visitor management option with the risk profile presented in the QRA report.
- The second table identifies other risks or opportunities that come from seeking to manage to each option.
- These headline ratings are more fully explained in the tables in Appendix III.

The colour convention with the table is as follows:

For this option, the factor is consistent or there is a benefit	For this option, the factor is unclear, or neutral, with no notable benefit or risk	For this option, the factor is not consistent or presents notable risks	There is insufficient information to rate this issue at present
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

The predicted level of risk to people

Risk type	If the option to manage the experience is... then	Manage as a Day Visitor site	Manage as a Remote site	No visitor management at site
Visitor safety	Is the individual risk for a visitor doing one trip tolerable?	No - Intolerable	Yes – with hazard warning	Yes - with hazard warning
Visitor safety	Is the level of societal risk acceptable	No	Yes – only if numbers drop to very low	Yes
DOC and HDC staff safety	Is the level of risk to staff who maintain the experience tolerable?	Able to be managed	Able to be managed	Able to be managed

Assessment of other factors of public and operational interest for Cape Kidnappers and likely stakeholder support.

Risk type	If the option to manage the experience is... then	Manage as a Day Visitor site	Manage as a Remote site	No visitor management at site
Visitor safety	Is the level of individual risk from tide hazard tolerable?	Yes - Tolerable with hazard warning	Yes - Tolerable with hazard warning	Yes - Tolerable with hazard warning
Iwi	Is there Treaty Partner support?	Treaty partner is aware DOC is making a decision and supports the process		
Legal	Is this consistent with CGP & CMS, CMP?	No – not safe for visitors	Yes	Yes
Visitor satisfaction	Is there good visitor access to the gannet colonies?	Yes- but unsafe via the beach	Reduced	Reduced
Operational other agency	Is Police Search and Rescue activity low?	No - Moderate	Yes	Yes
	Are there low visitor risk management costs for HDC?	No- Moderate	Yes	Yes
Public Interest	Is there local resident and business support?	yes	Likely to be limited	Likely to not be supported



While the QRA has quantitatively assessed the risk of landslides, the other risks listed are typically qualitatively assessed, and have a range of potential consequences (positive and negative).

There is no formula being used with the risk tables to determine the best option.
Also, there is no intention that this shows how factors relate to each other in importance or intensity.

Interpreting the tables

Visitor risk assessment

Managing as a Day Visitor site provides an intolerable level of risk to the majority of people who use the beach.

Managing as a site for high risk takers, including clear messaging about the landslide risks, should mean general users expecting safe experiences are less likely to feel encouraged to undertake the journey. Less people would be expected to make the trip, thus reducing the likelihood of a landslide causing a fatality. Managing for high risk takers could mean retaining a track of some sort (tramping track or route) from the beach through the DOC reserve to the plateau. This may still encourage people with limited experience or skills to undertake the trip, hence a higher degree of risk remaining than for the third option of ‘having no visitor management at site’ (ie no track or other facilities).

The significant societal risk is if a large group of people or people that society deem vulnerable (such as children) get killed in one incident. This is most likely to be a GBA trip as it has sizeable groups exposed to the risk. While each walker has a higher individual risk than each tractor trip passenger, it is less likely that there would be a big multiple fatality event with walkers as they do not tend to walk in large groups. Societal risk will only reduce if there are less visitors exposed to the hazard.

An additional level of risk is identified where no track is retained. The erosion associated with the DOC track can be expected to eventually render that accessway unsafe due to periodic slips and rockfalls. Retaining a managed route would allow DOC to respond to deterioration and keep the route somewhat safer. This may be appropriate if access were required from the plateau down to the beach for other purposes (such as responding to exposure of archaeological sites through coastal erosion).

Alignment with statutory documents

Should DOC choose to close the formed track through the DOC Cape Kidnappers Gannet Protection Reserve, this is consistent with the authority DOC has under Conservation General Policy (CGP) and the current Hawkes Bay Conservation Management Strategy (CMS). Advice on this is provided in ([DOC-6308838](#)).

In terms of CGP and CMS there is nothing that precludes DOC from making a decision to permanently close the existing walking track at Cape Kidnappers to address the risks to visitor safety from landslides or rockfall from the cliffs, provided that DOC has:

- Developed a hazard and risk management plan that identifies options to address risks;
- Demonstrated that the risks to public safety cannot be reasonably avoided using other means/measures and that closure is necessary; and
- Take all reasonable steps to make the public, interested people and organisations aware of the closure and reasons for it.



The hazard and risk management plan is contained in the Draft Cape Kidnappers Visitor Experience Management Plan ([DOC-6102833](#)), a joint DOC and HDC plan, that includes both DOC and HDC hazard identification and risk management intentions. This plan is intended to be made operative once a decision has been made, and will reflect the decision.

The demonstration that the risks to public safety cannot be reasonably avoided using other means/measures and that closure is necessary is done through the GNS QRA report ([DOC-6298812](#)), the advice provided by Principal Advisor Visitor Risk ([DOC-6272755](#)), and this options paper.

Caught by the tide risk

There are some of these ‘other’ factors that align more with managing the site as a remote site, or with no visitor management at site, than with a day visitor site.

- The risk of incidents due to people misjudging the tides should reduce with less people using the beach and those people that do use the beach being more familiar with these sorts of hazards.
- This is directly related to the reduced demand for NZ Police Search and Rescue operations.

Public interest

It is assumed that the public and stakeholder groups expect that DOC will seek to ensure the safety of people who wish to experience Cape Kidnappers and the gannet colonies, and do this through the way the access is managed, rather than preventing access. Such stakeholders include neighbouring landowners, local residents, local businesses, residents of the Hawkes Bay region and Hawkes Bay tourism interests. There have already been concerns raised in the media and through letters to the Minister of Conservation, regarding the closure of the DOC track in January 2019 and the suspension of the transport concession in 2020.

It is therefore likely that public support will be least for closing the track, and most for continuing to maintain a walking track, and letting people make up their own minds about using the beach access. The beach is an iconic spot in Hawke’s Bay with a long history of being used for general recreation by locals and visitors. It also plays an important role in regional tourism.

Managing this public opinion risk relies on being able to help people to understand the scale of the risk (and that DOC is acting in people’s best interests). People should also be made aware there remains access to the main gannet colony via the commercial transport operator using the overland roads through the private land. This access is permitted through an agreement with Cape Kidnappers Station. Access for the public to the last section of the coastal route, that crosses private land past the DOC reserve to get to the main gannet colony, is currently granted by an informal agreement.

Consulting on any proposed change

The direction of Conservation General Policy and relevant statutory documents (Hawke’s Bay Conservancy CMS and Cape Kidnappers CMP) requires DOC to consult with, and have regard to the views of the relevant hapu and iwi before making a decision. The CMP also identifies that the owners of the nearby Summerlee Station (now Cape Kidnappers Station, on which a larger part of the gannet colony is located) have a level of interest higher than the general public, as would concessionaires who to date have been transporting the majority of visitors who go to Cape Kidnappers gannet colonies.



Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

Jenny Nelson-Smith Operations Manager Hawkes Bay has contacted by email Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust (HTST) on 26/5/2020 advising them DOC is now looking at options to address the visitor safety risk. They expressed support for retaining the track from the beach to the plateau.

Cape Kidnappers Station are being contacted to inform them of the options being considered.

The transport operator Gannet Beach Adventures has been kept informed there is a decision process underway. The Operations Manager has broadly discussed the options being considered with GBA on 15th June 2020.

DOC has discussed the options for management with HDC on 19 June 2020. The best alignment in principle with their intended visitor management is the second option, to acknowledge the higher level of risk, enhance the messaging around the risk but retain a visitor access track from the beach to the plateau. The joint Cape Kidnappers Experience Management Plan (currently in draft) would need to be updated to outline the management actions needed to reflect this approach.

DOC at work risk

There are DOC management functions that may require using the beach for purposes other than managing visitor facilities or visitor access issues, including responding to marine mammal strandings. The safety of DOC staff is managed under existing health and safety procedures and all situations that require access the beach or passing through the DOC reserve will be assessed on a case by case basis. There are few activities that require travelling along the beach beside the cliffs.

DOC and Crown asset management needs and costs

The visitor assets/facilities currently in place (track, toilets and shelter) are all subject to coastal erosion, so options for retaining or no longer managing these assets must be considered in this context.

Also to be considered is the security of access to complete the journey over the private land to the gannet colony, which is currently by informal agreement.

There is an expected reduced asset management costs to DOC with either reduced service standards or no track at all through the DOC reserve.

The provision of toilets and a shelter for people visiting the main gannet colony needs further consideration. There may be no need to provide a toilet for the overland bus trip as there is no facility currently at site for these people – that trip being a lot shorter in time than travelling the beach route. There is probably a need to continue to provide a toilet near the gannet colonies even if catering for Backcountry Adventurers, given the whole trip via the beach can take 6-7 hours.

There is Crown revenue that has been provided from the transport concession, which would be expected to reduce if the numbers of people wanting to travel the beach with this service are reduced.

These financial factors are not considered integral to making a decision on visitor risk for the Cape Kidnappers beach access route.



Facilities and services appropriate to managing the risk

This table shows the facilities and services appropriate to each option.

Facility or service	Manage as a Day Visitor site	Manage as a Remote site	No visitor management at site
Pre-trip information provided	Website. Two webpages; one with detail about the site, and points of interest, the other for the track, navigation, hazards and how to manage risk. Brochures in visitor centres	Website. One webpage, with detail about the site, basic navigation, emphasis on the hazards and how to manage risk. No DOC brochures in visitor centres.	Website. One webpage, with detail about the site, strong emphasis on the hazards and how to manage risk. No DOC brochures in visitor centres.
Information provided at site	Orientation, notable features, hazards explained	Orientation, hazards made very clear	Hazards made very clear
Access tracks	Walking track	Tramping track or route	No maintained track
Toilets and shelters	Toilet design and number to suit a popular site	Basic toilet to suit low numbers	No toilet unless fouling is happening
Concession activity	Any activity consistent with the CMS policy and concession agreement.	Dependent on risk management approach in concession agreement.	Dependent on risk management approach in concession agreement.

The current facilities and services are largely incompatible with a high-risk site where a larger number of visitors will mean a higher likelihood of fatal landslides occurring.



Conclusion

The current situation of people using the beach route to access the gannet colonies comes with a high level of risk to independent walkers and to people who go with the transport operator. There are also serious risks for locals using the beach, and for DOC and HDC staff who use the beach while undertaking work tasks.

Managing the whole Cape Kidnappers experience (visiting the gannet colonies) to a more tolerable level of risk to people is best achieved by treating this as an adventurous or remote experience. This is the equivalent of people taking on nature on nature's terms, where natural hazards such as rockfalls or steep and unstable terrain are likely to be encountered. For people who are not prepared to take on that type of experience and the inherent risks, this is not a suitable trip. There is the other option of going with a commercial transport operator overland by bus, which avoids the risks of the beach entirely.

If DOC manages the visitor experience for Remoteness Seekers (either with or without a track), DOC should not put resources into monitoring rockfalls and landslides on the public beach. Given the majority of the risk is associated with the HDC managed section of beach, and this section must be traversed first, it is appropriate that monitoring be continued through the HDC Landslide Hazard operations manual. DOC can contribute to the information gathering through seeking reporting on events through the transport concession, should that service continue. Recording any rockfall or landslides on the DOC track should occur if the track stays.

In order to manage the trip to the gannet colonies via the beach as a remote experience, the following facility and service issues need to be considered:

- The information provided about the landslide risks and the facilities provided should not be encouraging people to use that route. Information should be focussed on how a potential user of the site can achieve a level of safety they prefer.
- The new signs should have something added to them that compares the risk to other activities with a similar amount of risk and a warning advising people to only consider going onto the beach if they are comfortable with this level of risk.
- Having the walking track through the DOC reserve is an invitation to people to make the journey. A low standard tramping track or route would be much less of an invitation, potentially putting off a number of people contemplating this trip. Having no formed track at all would be even less of an invitation.
- Also, having no toilet or shelter (whereas these are now provided on the DOC reserve) would be more of a signal that DOC is not expecting many people at this place and it is not being offered as a fun day out. However, if a track is retained, then a toilet located somewhere at the gannet colony end of the peninsula is still appropriate.

Experience over the past year has shown that some people ignore warning signs and track closure signs, and this behaviour has been seen at other scenic spots with natural hazards. This suggests that clear and unambiguous signals to potential visitors should be used. Having no track at all is the strongest signal DOC can provide.

A reduction in services at the DOC reserve may be considered by some members of the public to be an over-reaction by DOC, given the long history of public use of the beach and visitation to the gannet colonies. The preference for continued provision of a track is likely to be a point of focus for the community and media.



Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

There are very few similar cases where DOC has taken the step of closing tracks because the associated access carries an intolerable risk, and any decision to do so will need to be explained in that context. Hastings District Council will continue to manage the risk of landslides on the section of beach under their authority (from Clifton to near Black Reef) using its Landslide Hazard Operations Manual, which includes periodic beach closure when landslides occur or conditions assumed to raise the risk of landslides occur (eg earthquakes, storm events). This may be perceived as HDC not taking as strong a position on the landslide risk as DOC if DOC were to keep the track closed. Locals, associated businesses and the wider Hawkes Bay community are likely to be unsympathetic to DOC's position.

Any actions taken to reduce the scale of use of the beach should get support from NZ Police because of a history of rescue operations for people who have misjudged the tides.

The options that DOC can take in managing visitor access to Cape Kidnappers gannet colonies are to manage for the following experiences:

1. **Manage as a day visitor site.** The characteristics of a day visitor site include being a relatively safe experience. As this site is associated with a road-end situation, users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk.
To manage visitor risk we seek to discourage rather than encourage people using the beach by providing more compelling information about the risks of landslide, but continue to provide the facilities and information that make it relatively easy for people to get to the gannet colony. This option can be expected to achieve a high level of public acceptance, but the level of associated risk if understood would not be accepted.
2. **Manage as a remote site.** The characteristics of a remote site include being a relatively risky experience. These places attract visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.
To manage visitor risk we seek to discourage people using the beach by maintaining the DOC track to a lower standard (tramping track or route), and by providing more compelling information about the risks of landslide and only basic navigation information. We expect to manage some public fallout at the lower standard of formed track, as the expectations of most current visitors will not be met.
3. **No visitor management at site.** The characteristics of sites with no visitor management include deliberately not providing facilities to assist people to use that place. Such places can be an extremely risky experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.
To manage visitor risk we seek to strongly discourage using the beach by closing the DOC track (ie no longer provide formed access), provide more compelling information about the risks of landslide, and no navigation information. We expect to manage public fallout at the loss of formed access.

Key considerations for selecting the best option are:

- The general right for people to have access to PCL&W is implied through the functions of the Department in the Conservation Act 1987. DOC can close any part of PCL&W when it considers there is imminent danger to people and property that cannot be reasonably avoided by other means.
- The majority of the risk associated with the beach access route to the gannet colonies is not on PCL&W, but under management of HDC.
- There is a strong expectation from many stakeholders including the local community that DOC will continue to enable access from the beach to the plateau gannet colony.



Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

- The strongest message that the beach trip has a high level of risk is to close the beach, which HDC have said they will only do as part of the Landslide Hazard Operations Plan – which means periodically, not permanently.
- The HDC Landslide Hazard Operations Plan can now be informed by the GNS QRA.
- DOC is seeking alignment with HDC in managing the visitor experience to Cape Kidnappers gannet colony.

While the strongest message about the scale of risk for the trip to the gannet colonies is through option 3, consideration of the factors above leads to recommending option 2 to the decision maker, to manage as a remote site and to manage visitor risk through discouraging people using the beach by maintaining the DOC track to a lower standard (tramping track), and by providing more compelling information about the risks of landslide and only basic navigation information.



Actions required to achieve option number 2

1. Manage the DOC track to a Tramping Track standard in future.
2. The DOC website and associated GIS data be updated to reflect the agreed track standard.
3. Hazard signs should remain in place.
4. Information signs and website should be adjusted as described above to tell a stronger story about the hazards, and limit information that promotes the site.
5. The communication plan should be updated to ensure all reasonable steps are taken to make the public, interested people and organisations aware of the change in track standard and reasons for it.
6. The Draft Cape Kidnappers Visitor Experience Management Plan ([DOC-6102833](#)) will be updated to reflect the decision, and to function as the hazard and risk management plan for this site
7. The toilet block and shelter should be decommissioned as per the current Indicative Business Case, and a replacement toilet be sought using a revised Indicative Business Case.
8. HDC/DOC should monitor the numbers of people who continue to walk the beach to the gannets. There should also be a visitor survey in the 2020/21 season to gain understanding of the visitors' risk perception. Further follow up surveys should occur if the use levels stay strong or increase. Consideration should be given to altering safety messages depending on what the surveys learn.
9. While we shouldn't be promoting the site, we should still have a web page for visiting the gannets that shows the safe options available to people and the associated risks with the beach access. This should include a downloadable pdf with the risk information on it written in a way that emphasises all risks, what to do to keep risks as low as possible, and the risk comparators so people can make fully informed choices.
10. The intolerable level of risk for the majority of users of the beach and a decision by DOC to manage the track to a lower standard has implications for the transport concession. This needs to be factored into the separate decision process that is needed to review the suspension of the current transport operation by GBA.
11. All management decision should be done in discussion with HDC in line with the agreement to present a joint management approach.
12. Staff risk on the beach should be considered a critical risk. Any staff access to the beach landslide zones should only be done in accordance with a site-specific safety plan that requires manager approval for each visit. The plan needs to ensure that natural hazard risks to staff are tolerable under the staff natural hazard risk thresholds. Until such time as they are confirmed the proposed threshold of a maximum risk for any one trip of 1 in 330,000 should be applied.



Appendix I: Glossary of terms

Source: DOC visitor Risk Management Policy¹³

Term	Definition
Hazard	A source of potential harm or a situation with a potential to cause loss
Monitor	To check, supervise, observe critically or record the progress of an activity, action or system on a regular basis in order to identify change
Risk	The chance of something happening that will have an impact upon objectives. It is measured in terms of consequences and likelihood.
Risk identification	The process of determining what can happen, why and how.
Risk management	The culture, processes and structures directed towards effective management of potential opportunities and adverse effects.
Risk management process	The systematic application of management policies, procedures and practices to the tasks of establishing the context for, identifying, analysing, evaluating, treating, monitoring and communicating risk.
Risk treatment	Selection and implementation of appropriate management actions for dealing with risk.
Stakeholders	Those people and organisations who may be affected by, or perceive themselves to be affected by, a decision or activity.

¹³ DOC Visitor Risk Management Policy <https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-role/managing-conservation/recreation-management/visitor-risk-management/docs-visitor-risk-management-policy/>



Appendix II: Visitor Groups

These Visitor Group definitions used by DOC are reported in the New Zealand Handbook Tracks and Outdoor Visitor Structures SNZ HB 8630:2004¹⁴.

Short Stop Traveller SST

Visitors, including both local and international, travelling either the main tourist highways and access roads, or visiting places in local areas. They utilise the natural edge along these roads or in these local areas for visits of up to one hour return. The least mobile are commonly young families (parents and toddlers), Younger age school parties, elderly people and, in some cases, people with disabilities.

Short Walks

Tracks that take no longer than 1 hour return to walk. Easy tracks catering for all ages and most walking abilities. All watercourses bridged or culverted. Good track surface. Low risk track.

Day Visitor DV

Visitors, including both domestic and international, and local community visitors seeking an experience in a natural setting with a sense of space.

This is normally associated with a road-end situation or scenic attraction with recreational opportunities for up to a full day's duration.

The least mobile are commonly families with young children, school parties and elderly people.

Walking Tracks

Tracks from a few minutes to a full day return. Relatively easy day walks.

Tracks of a high standard that enable use by relatively inexperienced visitors with a low level of backcountry skill.

Low level of risk with all but the smallest watercourses bridged or culverted and a reasonable track surface.

Back Country Comfort Seeker BCC

Visitors seeking a low risk, relatively comfortable experience in the backcountry. People who are generally inexperienced in a backcountry setting with a wide age range. They require easy access and want comfortable accommodation. The least mobile are likely to be families and school parties with older children and teenagers, visitors who require guides and first-time trampers.

Easy Tramping Tracks and Great Walks

Well constructed tramping tracks with a track surface and bridges across rivers and major streams. Low risk backcountry experience with facilities to ensure a relatively comfortable visit.

Back Country Adventurer BCA

Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience.

They require only a basic track and access is largely on foot except where air or boat access is permitted.

¹⁴ See Standards New Zealand <https://shop.standards.govt.nz/catalog/8630%3A2004%28SNZHB%29/view>



Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

Tramping Tracks.

Tracks have bridges at key river crossings. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort. These tracks generally follow the lie of the land and are commonly not formed. Includes day visits but ranging further into the back country and not requiring the standard of tracks for day visitors.

Remoteness Seekers RS

Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a high level of backcountry skills and experience seeking a wilderness experience with limited interaction with other parties. Access is largely on foot except where air or boat access is permitted, and activities are carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.

Route.

The route follows the lie of the land and is not formed.

Few facilities



Appendix III: Option description and compatibility assessment

Information relating to the landslide risk

Option	Current information is appropriate	Further risk management actions using information
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	In part The description of the level of risk from landslides and rockfalls does not convey the seriousness of the risk. Current Landslide Hazard Operations Plan will alert people to any new events or conditions that might increase the risk of an event.	Given the seriousness of the risk, information needs to avoid encouraging people to use the beach, and convey the seriousness of the risk in a meaningful way.
Manage as a remote site A relatively risky experience. Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	In part The description of the level of risk from landslides and rockfalls does not convey the seriousness of the risk. Current Landslide Hazard Operations Plan will alert people to any new events or conditions that might increase the risk of an event.	Information needs to convey the seriousness of the risk in a meaningful way.
No Visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	In part The description of the level of risk from landslides and rockfalls does not convey the seriousness of the risk. Current Landslide Hazard Operations Plan will alert people to any new events or conditions that might increase the risk of an event.	Information needs to convey the seriousness of the risk in a meaningful way.



Facility provision

Option	Current infrastructure is appropriate to the risk profile	Further risk management actions relating to facility provision	Level of risks to staff who maintain the experience
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	No The track that is to a Walking Track standard and the provision of a shelter implies that DOC is managing the experience for Day Visitors. This will attract people with low levels of experience of risk.	Reduce the standard of the track or keep the track closed so as not to encourage people to use the beach access to the gannet colony.	Some risk where staff are exposed to the cliffs to inspect signs. The hazard signs in place are at either end of the cliffs, so there is only a short time required to be in the landslide hazard zone.
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	Yes This visitor group do not require a track to the Walking Track standard. A track to Tramping Track standard would suffice and also a Route. Such facilities would not appeal to a wide audience.	Reduce the standard of the track to be consistent with the experience. Retaining a formed and managed track has the potential to continue to signal DOC is encouraging use.	Some risk where staff are exposed to the cliffs to inspect signs. The hazard signs in place are at either end of the cliffs, so there is only a short time required to be in the landslide hazard zone.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	Yes This visitor group do not require a track to the Walking Track standard. No track at all would suffice. Having no facilities appeals to a narrow audience of remoteness seekers.	Decommissioning the track will be consistent with this experience. Retaining a formed and managed track has the potential to continue to signal DOC is encouraging use.	Some risk where staff are exposed to the cliffs to inspect signs. The hazard signs in place are at either end of the cliffs, so only a short time is required in the landslide hazard zone.



Option description and other risks / benefit change

Option	Level of individual risk for a visitor doing one trip	Level of individual risk for a client of the transport operator doing one trip	Level of societal risks
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	High residual risk. Similar to mountain climbing, but people don't know that. Risk is variable depending on speed of walking and how far from the cliffs people can stay, as well as where they choose to take a rest.	High residual risk. About half the risk to individuals but still intolerable (15x higher than Fox Glacier with controls). The risk is the same for all clients.	High residual risk. If the number of people using the beach remains at the scale it was before January 2019, and groups travel together down the beach, there is the potential for multiple fatalities.
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. People with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. People accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	High residual risk Similar to mountain climbing. Risk is variable depending on speed of walking and how far from the cliffs people can stay, as well as where they choose to take a rest. People with experience with the NZ backcountry may avoid the trip, and may be able to escape a small event.	High residual risk. If only people with awareness the trip has high risk travel the beach, then it can be said that they made this choice in full knowledge of the risk. Having a track at the far end may still give the impression of safety.	Low residual risk. The numbers making the trip along the beach should reduce significantly from pre-Jan 2019 numbers. Group sizes should mostly be small, reducing the potential for multiple fatalities.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.	High residual risk Similar to mountain climbing. Risk is variable depending on speed of walking and how far from the cliffs people can stay, as well as where they choose to take a rest. People with experience with the NZ backcountry may avoid the trip, and may be able to escape a small event.	High residual risk. If only people with awareness the trip has high risk travel the beach, then it can be said that they made this choice in full knowledge of the risk.	Low residual risk. The numbers making the beach trip should reduce significantly from pre-Jan 2019 numbers. Group sizes should mostly be small, reducing the potential for multiple fatalities.



Option description and other risks / benefit change

Option	Conservation goals – eg research and marine mammal rescue	Visitor risk traversing the PCL from the beach to the escarpment	Level of individual risk from other site hazards	Police Search and Rescue activity
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	The conservation related activity is currently minor, but all beach access brings risk. Normal Job Safety Analysis JSA procedures apply.	Low Track management standards should provide a good formed track and continue to warn of rock fall hazards at 'the gallery' section of the track.	Moderate Risk of being caught by the tide remains.	High - Moderate Ongoing incidents of people misjudging tides and resulting search and rescue operations
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. People with a reasonable level of back- country skills, who accept a degree of risk and discomfort. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	The conservation related activity is currently minor, but all beach access brings risk. Normal Job Safety Analysis JSA procedures apply.	Low Track management standards provide a marked route or formed track and continue to warn of rock fall hazards at 'the gallery' section of the track.	Low While the hazard of being caught by the tide remains, the users of the beach should be more familiar with these sorts of outdoor risks.	Low There should be a much lower number of call-outs, as people more familiar with these sorts of outdoor risks should be less likely to misjudge the tides.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	The conservation related activity is currently minor, but all beach access brings risk. Normal Job Safety Analysis JSA procedures apply.	Potentially high With no ongoing maintenance the track will degrade and may become dangerous. While consistent with a remote setting, it is less safe than if DOC were continuing to manage a track for access for other reasons.	Low While the hazard of being caught by the tide remains, the users of the beach should be more familiar with these sorts of outdoor risks.	Low There should be a much lower number of call-outs, as people more familiar with these sorts of outdoor risks should be less likely to misjudge the tides.



Options description and other risks / benefit change

Option	Treaty Partner support	Good visitor access to the gannet colonies	Asset cost implications to DOC	CMS alignment
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	Yet to be fully assessed. Iwi uncomfortable with people wandering through sand dunes where koiwi have been unearthed through erosion. Our Treaty Partner may prefer any settlement to include facilities suiting general use and in good condition.	Good Allows continued (but unsafe) access via the beach to Black Reef gannet colony and the main gannet colony. Access remains via the overland commercial operator.	Highest cost Retaining a walking track, toilets and shelter requires an annual operating budget of \$47,200. Replacing the toilets and shelter is estimated to cost \$300,000, plus additional costs to establish a new track further from the beach to avoid erosion.	Consistent with the existing Conservation General Policy (CGP), Hawkes Bay Conservancy Conservation Management Strategy 1994-2004 (CMS), and the Cape Kidnappers Conservation Management Plan 1998 (CMP)
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort.	Yet to be assessed. Iwi not keen with people wandering through sand-dunes where koiwi have been exposed through erosion. Our Treaty Partner may prefer any settlement to include facilities suiting general use and in good condition.	Reduced Discourages access via the beach to Black Reef gannet colony and the main gannet colony. Access remains via the overland commercial operator.	Reduced cost Retaining the site as a tramping track would have an annual cost of approximately \$1,000 to 3,000 per annum. There is still the risk of coastal erosion.	Consistent with the CGP, existing Hawkes Bay Conservancy CMS, and Cape Kidnappers CMP.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance.	Yet to be assessed. Our Treaty Partner may prefer any settlement to include facilities suiting general use and in good condition.	Reduced Discourages access via the beach to Black Reef gannet colony and the main gannet colony. Access remains via the overland commercial operator.	Minimal cost Not retaining a track at this location would have 'write-off' costs and then no asset management costs.	Consistent with the CGP, existing Hawkes Bay Conservancy CMS, and Cape Kidnappers CMP. Track closure for reasons of public safety is consistent.



Options description and other risks / benefit change

Option	Alignment with commercial interests	Crown revenue impact	Alignment with local authority policy
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk. The equivalent of day visitor experience.	Most aligned Businesses reliant on high volume of visitors to the location will benefit from continuing to provide a day visit type experience.	Limited impact on transport concession activity and resulting fees	Aligned Keeping the track open and accessible matches the HDC approach that the beach should remain open unless there has been a landslide event or there is a heightened risk of one.
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back-country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort.	Less aligned Businesses reliant on high volume of visitors to the location will not have the same level of visitors as they will not be encouraged to visit. There may still be business opportunities not reliant on people going to Clifton, but not going down the beach	Moderate Likely drop-in transport concession activity would mean less activity fees. If the fees from the transport concession reduced considerably or completely it would be an insignificant loss of Crown revenue nationally.	Less aligned Reducing the promotion of the trip to Cape Kidnappers and having only a basic track from the beach to the plateau is somewhat at odds with Cape Kidnappers being seen as a place of importance in the region.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	Least aligned Businesses reliant on high volume of visitors to the location will not have the same level of visitors as they will not be encouraged to visit. There may still be business opportunities not reliant on people going to Clifton, but not going down the beach	Moderate Likely drop-in transport concession activity would mean less activity fees. If the fees from the transport concession reduced considerably or completely it would be an insignificant loss of Crown revenue nationally.	Least aligned Reducing the promotion of the trip to Cape Kidnappers and having no track from the beach to the plateau is at odds with Cape Kidnappers being seen as a place of importance in the region.



Options description and other risks / benefit change: Likely public view

Option	Neighbouring landowners support	Local residents' support	Public access advocates support	General public acceptance
Manage as a Day Visitor site Should be a relatively safe experience. Normally associated with a road-end situation. Users expect relatively easy day walks and a low level of risk.	Supported Support for this existing access as this does not require a shift from the existing arrangements and this option is good for community relationships.	High High level of support for continuation of existing access. Probably a sense that DOC has been interfering where it didn't need to (but this has not been tested).	High Expect support for continuation of access for the public.	Expect a high level of public acceptance – more or less 'back to normal' access, and tourism profile is retained. There could be more risk-averse attitudes given Whakaari-White Island fatalities, and Covid-19.
Manage as a Remote site A relatively risky experience. Visitors, usually New Zealanders, with a reasonable level of back- country skills and experience. Visitors accept a degree of risk and discomfort.	Neutral or not supported The local landowner can be expected to want to be seen to support the local community interests.	Limited Limited support expected for changing the standard of the track, which some will be using occasionally. Locals understand there are landslides and rockfalls, but that is a part of their beach. Likely concern for the impact on local businesses if visitor numbers drop.	Little Likely little support for seeking to discourage people using the beach access.	Likely limited public acceptance – with concern at DOC / HDC over-stating the risk and creates problems for local businesses with reduced trade. There could be more risk-averse attitudes given Whakaari- White Island fatalities, and Covid-19.
No visitor management at site An extremely risky experience. People with a high level of backcountry skills seeking a wilderness experience. The trip is carried out with a high degree of self-reliance. The equivalent of a remoteness seeker.	Neutral or not supported The local landowner can be expected to want to be seen to support the local community interests.	Little Little or no support for not having a track which some will be using occasionally. Locals understand there are landslides and rockfalls, but that is a part of their beach. Likely concern for the impact on local businesses if visitor numbers drop.	Little Likely little support for seeking to discourage people using the beach access.	Likely limited public acceptance – with concern at DOC / HDC over-stating the risk and creates problems for local businesses with reduced trade. There could be more risk-averse attitudes given Whakaari- White Island fatalities, and Covid-19.