Case study: The Åknes rock slope

Vidar Kveldsvik NGI



Content

- Overview of the situation
- Tsunami modelling: numerical and experimental
- Monitoring and early warning system
- Geological and geotechnical investigations
- Slide models

Several communitites along the fjord Geiranger is one of Norway's most visited tourist attractions, most arriving on cruise ships



Artist's depiction of tsunami at Geiranger





Flooding in Hellesylt with run-up 25 – 35m



Overview of the Åknes rock slope





Rock slides on the sea bed



Tsunami in 1934 caused by a 3E6m³ rock slide killed 40 people. Max. run-up≈60masl.



Number of rock slide events and the volume distribution in the entire Storfjorden

Storfjorden

Rock volume exceedance probability



Present situation: no construction in the Hazard zone

Tsunami modelling - The simulations of the rock slide and the tsunami are based on different slide scenarios and various numerical models:

- Numerical rock slide models
- Numerical wave models
- Laboratory experiments 2D (completed) and 3D (ongoing) in scale 1:500 for input to and verification of numerical models
- The purpose of the 2D experiments was also to investigate the possible instrumentation for the 3D experiments

Modelling of a complex problem

- Large volume and high impact velocity
- Shape of the slide when hitting the water?

2D experimental setup



- Surface elevation measured at gauges 1-3
- Velocity field measured

Glide plane, slide and conveyor belt

- The slide consists of boxes connected together _____
- Frontal angle of slide 45°-
- Inclination of 35° —
- Velocity controlled by the conveyor belt

Ongoing 3D laboratory experiments

- Coast and Harbour Research Laboratory at SINTEF, Trondheim
- Instrumentation based on numerical simulations and 2D experiments



Slide scenarios

Akneset - Terrengprofil A



Scenario 1: Volume 35E6m³, average length 1000m, start 150masl.

Scenario 2:

Volume 18E6m³, average length 500m, start 400masl.

Scenario 3:

Volume 10E6m³, average length 800m, start 340masl.

Impact velocities: 45 or 65m/s

Results from initial numerical modelling – assumed worst case scenario





Future work on tsunami

- Calibration of numerical model
 - Compare to historical events
 - Compare to 3D laboratory experiments
- 12 scenarios (including historical events)
- Updating of hazard zoning

Monitoring systems

- At the slope surface:
 - Permanent GPS network with 8 antennas
 - Total station with 30 prisms
 - Ground-based radar with 8 reflectors (radar located accross the fjord)
 - Five surface rod extensometers
 - Surface crackmeters
 - Surface tiltmeters
 - Two single lasers measuring distances across the upper tension crack
 - 8 geophones: micro-seismic network



Monitoring systems

- <u>Climate station:</u>
 - Temperature
 - Precipitation
 - Two snow-depth sensors
 - Wind speed
 - Ground temperature

Monitoring systems

• In boreholes:

- Two 50 m long DMS systems with 50 inclinometers
- One 100m long DMS (not installed yet)
- Pietzometers, conductivity and temperature sensors in 3 boreholes



Monitoring: overview



Early warning centre: now in operation 24hrs a day

Alarm tresholds criteria based on:

- Total displacements
- Velocity inn defined time periods
- Acceleration
- Treshold values need to be defined and updated



Sirens in all the villages located in the tsunami hazard zone

Phone messages

Evacuation procedures and routes

The police responsible for the evacuation

Prediction of catastrophic failure





Displacements 1993.08.28 - 2007.01.04



Displacements across the upper tension fracture: 2004-2007



Displacements 2004.11.25 - 2007.01.04 (adjusted start values for Ext. 1 and Ext. 2)



Displacements per year - horizontal component shown on a possible block model



More displacements in the NW part from 1961 to 1983 than later



LISA Radar



LISA Radar results



Example from monitoring data during snowmelt in spring 2006 show also seismic recordings

Laser measurements in the upper western flank



Water level in the middle borehole





Displacements in the upper borehole





Geological and geotechnical investigations

Geophysical surveys: resisitivity, georadar and seismic



2D resistivity: Interpretation of depth of unstable rock mass



Boreholes

- Core logging
- Samples for lab testing
- Optic televiewer and borehole logging
- Instrumentation





Core loss/crushed core and fractures



Field mapping of rock outcrops



- Orientation of fractures
- Fracture spacing
- Fracture length
- Shear strength parameters (Barton – Bandis shear strength criterion)



Figure 12: Surface roughness amplitude measured on meter-scale in the field.



Results of field mapping: fracture orientation



895200

Fol. frac. downslope the upper tension fracture: mean dip 32deg.



Fractures non-parallel with the foliation



Geological model



Block model based on <u>surface displacements</u> using Discontinious Deformation Analysis (DDA) – Backward modelling mode

2004-06 displacements: not so good model of the upper part of the slope

2004-06 displacements: more appropriate model of the upper part of the slope



Block model: possible block boundaries based on all three displacement data sets



Stability analyses: static



Stability analyses: static

•One major conclusion from the numerical modelling: Instability at great depth agrees with the back-calculated limiting friction angle of the unstable area

Instability at 120m later indicated by borhole measurements



Stability analyses: static



Stability analyses: dynamic



The analyses indicate that an earthquake with a return period of 1000 years is likely to trigger a slide to great depth at the present ground water conditions and that the slope will remain stable if it is drained.

An earthquake with a return period of 100 years is not likely to trigger a slide at the present ground water conditions.