

Challenges for selecting earthquake ground motion estimates for rock slopes stability

Dr Bill Murphy

Rock Mechanics and Engineering Geology Research Group School of Earth and Environment University of Leeds





- Landslides caused by earthquakes
- Shaking of slopes and topographic response
- Approaches to assessing stability
- Summary but not conclusions
- Questions

Newton Fund Award (NE/N000315/1) is acknowledged for project funding







Landslides caused by earthquakes



Below top: Earthquake induced landslide in Baltistan, Pakistan, April 2016. Below bottom: earthquake induced landslide from the Kumamoto Earthquake Japan, April 2016.



- Earthquake triggered landslides show nonlinear behaviour – in most cases a softening model
- The most common analytical method assumes bi-linear conditions.
- Landslides accumulate strain which may allow them to progress towards failure under ambient stress







Landslides are a common secondary effect of strong shaking. In order of frequency of occurrence:

- 1. Rock fall / rock topple (M>4.0)
- 2. Rock slides / debris slides (M>5.0)
- 3. Debris avalanches (M > 6)
- 4. Rock Avalanches (M > 6.5)

Multiple block rock fall in Taroko Gorge, Taiwan, triggered by the M_W =6.8 Hualien Earthquake in 2002. Note the landslide scar on the slope to the right (north) of the dust cloud (epicentral distance c. 30 km)









The Chuifenershan Landslide, a dip slope failure sliding on a bedding plane triggered by the 1999 M_W =7.6 Chi Chi earthquake.





A simple model

School of Earth and Environment UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS



Real conditions vs design conditions



- Design PGAs are based on freefield motions
- Slide geometry is governed by ambient effective stress state
- Slide material properties are static during the shaking.

- Accelerations on slopes are different from freefield motions.
- The geometry of earthquake induced landslides do not match "critical slip surfaces" from slope stability analysis.
- Stiffness degradation is well established

From: Massey et al (2018). Landslides Triggered by the 14 November 2016 M_w7.8 Kaikōura Earthquake, New Zealand, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 108, No. 3B, pp. 1630–1648, July 2018, doi: 10.1785/0120170305







Shaking on slopes and topographic response



The Aysen Fjord Earthquake









Amplifications behind the crest for vertically incident SH waves (top left), vertically incident SV waves (top right) and vertical ground motions from a SV wave (bottom right).

From Ashford et al (1997). Topographic Effects on the Seismic Response of Steep Slopes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 701-709.





Key observations:

- Crest accelerations are a function of:
 - Wave type
 - Wave polarisation
 - Wave frequency / wavelength
 - Slope height / angle.
- A de-amplification effect occurs at the foot of a slope
- There is a decrease in amplification patterns behind the crest.





Ground shaking





1585000

How is shaking measured?



Accelerograms recorded on rock from the 22nd February 2011 earthquake in Christchurch.



Conceptual model of slopes in the Port Hills: topographic amplification in creating spatial variations in ground shaking away from a rock slope.

School of Earth and Environment UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS



Slopes, ground motion and topographic amplification

School of Earth and Environment UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS





(Glendevere Terrace above Redcliffs School, Redcliffs: photo by G. Hancox)



(Photo courtesy Graham Hancox GNS Science)













From Stolte et al (2017). An Experimental Topographic Amplification Study at Los Alamos National Laboratory Using Ambient Vibrations. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 107, No. 3, pp. 1386–1401, doi: 10.1785/0120160269





Landslides in rock







Assessing the stability of slopes





Hazard Identification



- Field survey and mapping:
 - Geomorphological mapping.
 - Conceptual models
 - Hazard mapping.
- Calculations:
 - Limit state calculations
 - Probabilistic & reliability methods.
 - Design charts
- Numerical models:
 - Finite and distinct element codes
 - Particle flow codes



Top left: field survey of landslides in North Yorkshire. **Top right**: comparison of limit state models from Liu et al (2015) *Computers and Geotechnics* 63, 291–298. **Bottom**: example of finite element model from Tschuchnigg et al (2015) *Computers and Geotechnics* 70, 178–189

The Meson Alto Landslide, Chile

School of Earth and Environment UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS



A large rock slide/avalanche

- Geomorphologically it has a minimum of 2 phases of movement
- C. 4.7 km³.
- Using a limit state model F > 2.5, using an anisotropic conditions from autobrecciated layers F > 1.7.
- Smaller blocks F varies from 1.1 to 1.6

Rockslide / wedge at Zuma Beach in Malibu, California at Point Dume 25, March 2018 filmed by Lloyd Eric Cotsen





processes UNIVERSITY OF LEE Events causing disturbance in slopes Slope Erosion – especially movement deglaciation weathering Landslide activity **Changes** in **Creation of** earthquake disturbed zone σ_2 and σ_3 Elastic response

 Joint dilation and loss of frictional strength

Time dependent

- Changed dynamic properties
- Disturbance zones

School of Earth and Environment

Joint

dilation

From: Moore et al (2011) Site Effects in Unstable Rock Slopes: Dynamic Behaviour of the Randa Instability (Switzerland). Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 101, No. 6, pp. 3110–3116, doi: 10.1785/0120110127





From: Moore et al (2011) Site Effects in Unstable Rock Slopes: Dynamic Behaviour of the Randa Instability (Switzerland). Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 101, No. 6, pp. 3110–3116, doi: 10.1785/0120110127





Top left: Computed response spectra for the Randa Landslide from inside and outside the area of instability.

- Higher ground velocities showing the response to the rock mass in the area around the zone of instability
- The increased strain within the slide mass due shows even higher seismic response.

Bottom left: calculated responses represented as instability ratios for stiff (rough, closed) vs seismically compliant (smooth, open) joints.





Images courtesy British Geological Survey

Right: From: Crosta, Imposimato, Roddeman, Chiesa, Moia (2005) Small fast-moving flow-like landslides in volcanic deposits: The 2001 Las Colinas Landslide (El Salvador). *Engineering Geology.*



(above) The landslide at Las Colinas and Las Barioleras were caused by the differences in seismic properties between the underlying Balsamo Formation and the overlying Tierra Blanca.















General observations

School of Earth and Environment UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

- We have a vastly better understanding earthquake induced landslides
- Topographic amplification is better understood - how that can be used is less clear.
- Seismic response of rock masses varies with joint dilation / rock mass disturbance
- With so many uncertainties are we any closer to having a reliable predictive tool?











Questions

