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ABSTRACT
This paper compares the input required, treatment of uncertainty, output, and limitations of three recently developed rock slope hazard assessment methodologies using the Åknes rockslide in Norway as a case study. The input parameters vary strongly between the methods by using the strain rate, various geological parameters such as development of critical structures and kinematic assessments, or a regional frequency analysis as starting point to which observations of deformation rates and other parameters are added. Consequently, the output varies and is qualitative, qualitative and quantitative, or quantitative, respectively. Only one method includes a consequence analysis. Finally, all methods suggest that the Åknes rock slope is unstable. Thus, results are comparable for this site suggesting that a combination of methods is preferable to ensure the quality of the outcome and the resulting decision making on disaster risk prevention. Additional comparison of other rock slope instabilities in different geological settings would be highly supportive for this conclusion.

RÉSUMÉ
Cet article compare les données requises, le traitement de l’incertitude, et les résultats et les limitations de trois récentes méthodes de l’analyse du danger d’éboulement rocheux. Ces méthodes sont utilisées pour l’évaluation de l’instabilité de Åknes, en Norvège. Les données requises varient d’une méthode à l’autre, selon qu’elles prennent en compte le taux de déformation, certains paramètres géologiques comme le développement de discontinuités défavorables, ou la fréquence régionale comme point de considération initiale. En conséquence, les résultats varient et sont présentés de manière qualitative, qualitative et quantitative, ou quantitative. Seule une méthode considère une analyse des conséquences. Toutes les méthodes suggèrent que le versant rocheux d’Åknes est critique. Les résultats sont donc comparables pour cet endroit, et suggèrent que l’utilisation de méthodes en parallèle garantit une certaine qualité des résultats et de la prise de décisions pour la prévention des risques. Pour confirmer le résultat de cette étude, il serait très utile de comparer ces méthodes sur d’autres instabilités rocheuses, dans des contextes géologiques différent.

1 INTRODUCTION
Rock avalanches usually occur only once at a given location, however, studies have documented that multiple failures from one unstable rock slope can occur. The recurrence interval of rock avalanches relates to the specific geological conditions on each slope. Return periods of 10s of thousands of years in the arid Andes of Argentina (Hermanns et al., 2001), over thousand of years in glaciated Canada and Norway (Mathews and McTaggart, 1978, Schleier et al., 2017), to several decades (Grimstad and Nesdal, 1990) to just weeks as in the case of the Randa failures in 1991 in Switzerland (Sartori et al., 2003) have been reported. Hermanns et al. (2006) discuss that the sudden change of the stress field in the rock slope likely causes new deformation to occur that can eventually result in a subsequent failure. However, the remnants of repeated failure from one slope may no longer be identifiable in the geological record. It is thus impossible to calculate a probability of occurrence for a specific slope based on repeated events, such as commonly done for debris flows, rock falls, or snow avalanches, that are controlled by weather conditions, availability of weathered material on the slope and rock wall characteristics.

It is important, to consider multiple failures at the same slope. These are especially likely to occur on slopes that are divided into domains or zones based on the structural configuration (Booth et al., 2014), where the strain rate within the rock mass and/or the deformation rate varies over the unstable slope (Böhme et al., 2013, Oppikofer et al., 2017). For such slopes, different failure scenarios with different likelihood of failure are possible. Hence hazard, consequence and risk analyses need to be carried out for each possible failure scenario.

Unstable rock slopes can impact an area larger than that of the originating rock avalanche by damming streams in confined valleys or impacting water bodies and thus creating displacement waves. However, in this paper we focus on unstable rock slopes that can lead to rock avalanches as defined by Hungr et al. (2014) as extremely rapid (> 5 m/s), massive, flow-like motion of fragmented rock from a large rock slide or rock fall. Only rock slope failures with a volume greater than 1,000,000 m³ were considered in this project. This corresponds to a volume
threshold commonly used in references for rock avalanches with high mobility (e.g., Hsü 1975).

This paper compares the required input, treatment of uncertainty, output, and limitations of three recently developed rock slope hazard assessment methodologies using the Åknes rockslide in Norway as a case study. This rock slope shows a large variation in strain and deformation rate over the unstable area and makes a definition of different scenarios with different likelihood of failure necessary (Blikra et al., 2006; Oppikofer et al., 2009).

2 ÅKNES ROCKSLIDE

The Åknes rockslide is located on a south-facing, 30° to 40° steep slope in the Sunnylvsfjord, Western Norway (Figure 1A). The rockslide stretches from the up to 30 m wide back-scarp at ~900 m.a.s.l. to the toe at ~100 m.a.s.l. (Figure 1B). A deeply eroded gully along a vertical NNW-SSE fault forms the western flank of the rockslide, whereas the eastern limit follows a moderately SW-dipping fault (Ganerød et al., 2008). The rockslide is mainly composed of medium-grained orthogneiss, which has a well-developed metamorphic foliation and typical mineral banding. The gneiss is affected by several isoclinal folds, but also by large open folds and undulations leading to variable foliation orientations (Jaboyedoff et al., 2011). The failure surfaces of the Åknes rockslide are mainly parallel to the metamorphic foliation dipping between 27° and 34° to the S to SE (Braathen et al., 2004; Ganerød et al., 2008), and are daylighting at the toe of the rockslide. Differences in displacement directions are shown to be related to changes in the orientation of the foliation (Jaboyedoff et al., 2011).

The rockslide can be divided into several sections limited by subvertical N-S fractures and several failure surfaces daylighting at different elevations (Blikra, 2008; Ganerød et al., 2008; Kristensen, 2017; NVE, 2018). Current failure scenarios include the whole Åknes rockslide (scenario A; area: 0.59 km²; volume: 54 million m³), and a failure limited to the western flank (scenario B; area: 0.22 km²; volume: 18 million m³) (Kristensen, 2017) (Figure 1B). Note that scenario A encompasses also scenario B. Other scenarios with different extents and volumes are however also possible (Ganerød et al., 2008; NVE, 2018). The most notable difference between scenarios A and B are the displacement rates measured continuously with a wide range of techniques (Blikra, 2008; Kristensen, 2017). Displacement rates range from not significant to <0.5 cm/year at the toe of scenario A, and from 1.5 to 3.5 cm/year in the middle and upper eastern part. Fastest displacement rates are recorded on a ridge in the upper western part with 6 to 8 cm/year (uppermost part of scenario A and B), whereas the middle and lower part of the western flank (scenario B) moves by approximately 5.5 cm/year (Kristensen, 2017) (Figure 1B). At least three smaller rockslides occurred from the western flank of Åknes in the past centuries (Kveldsvik et al., 2008) (Figure 1B).

Figure 1. Location map and photograph of the Åknes rockslide: A) The rockslide is located in the Sunnylvsfjord, western Norway; B) The picture shows the main rockslide features and current failure scenarios (A and B). The extent of historic rockslides (Kveldsvik et al., 2008) and current displacement rates of different parts of the slope (Kristensen, 2017) are shown (Photograph: L.H. Blikra).

3 Methodology

3.1 Assessment method by Jaboyedoff et al. (2012)

Where possible, a large rock slope instability assessment should include the following: 1) Delineation of the deformed/unstable area; 2) Volume estimates of unstable
mass(es); 3) Structures characterization; 4) Rock mass quality estimates; 5) Failure mechanisms descriptions; 6) Characterization of ground water conditions; 7) Estimates of the degree of stability or state of activity; 8) Measurements of deformation velocity. This can only be performed at regional scale with significant effort and associated cost.

Jaboyedoff et al. (2012) simplified the criteria using two types of observations:

1. The existence of a deformed zone (or volume), and the type of deformations.
2. The evidence of present or past activity as demonstrated by rock falls or displacements.

On this basis, the susceptibility can be assessed. The type of instability depends on how the intensity of deformation is distributed, at the top, the toe and within the body of the rock instability (Figure 2). The activity is quantified by rockfall activity and/or by deformation of the whole body using the concept of strain rate similar to the scarp ratio of Chigira (2009). It quantifies the total displacement over the original length of the landslide (Figure 3). The average velocity to obtain a strain rate is deduced either from direct observations or dating, or by indirect evidence such as the estimate of the age of movement initiation.

The existence of a deformed zone, type of deformation and evidence of rock falls activity or displacement are used as the input for the activity-deformation chart (Figure 4). The types of instabilities are ordered in increasing hazard potential on the horizontal axis (left to right) and the activity is introduced vertically decreasing downward. Using this chart, each box can be filled by additional criteria to assess the susceptibility in more detail, depending on the scale of the study and the available data (Jaboyedoff et al., 2012).

Figure 2. Types of instability and distribution of deformation. A) Large deformation where internal deformation is mainly by extension. B) The displacement at the slope toe and crest are similar and of intermediate magnitude. C) Deformation is localized at the slide toe. D) The deformation is not visible at the slope toe, but the slope has experienced a large internal deformation. E) Large displacements at the slope crest and the slope toe linked to significant internal deformation.

Figure 3. Qualification of the strain rate at different stages and of the activity deduced from the observed rate of deformation.

Figure 4. Activity-deformation chart for susceptibility assessment (red: high, orange: moderate, yellow: low). The numbers 1 and 2 in the left indicate if one or two criteria of activity are observed (rockfall and sufficient strain rate). The two scenarios for Åknes landslide are represented. The scenario A is evaluated as a medium to high hazard and the scenario B as a high hazard.

3.2 Assessment Method by Hermanns et al. (2012)

This hazard assessment method was developed at the Norwegian Geological Survey in collaboration with a panel of national and international experts (Hermanns et al. 2012, 2013) to provide a systematic framework to evaluate the hazard and risk from unstable slopes that have been compiled in a national database (Oppikofer et al., 2015).
The panel concluded that with today's scientific knowledge a large rock slope failure cannot be determined quantitatively (e.g. the rock slope will fail with a specific annual likelihood). It can, however, be predicted qualitatively. Therefore, the hazard and risk classification system was developed qualitatively, even though the consequence assessment is quantitative (Oppikofer et al. 2016a).

The hazard assessment is based on three geomorphological observations on the unstable rock slope (development of back scarp, lateral release surface, and underlying sliding surface), two engineering geological and structural criteria (orientation of penetrative sliding structures and kinematic feasibility tests), as well as replacement rates, acceleration of displacement rate, past events along the slope and other signs of activity (Figure 5, summarized from Hermanns et al. 2012, 2013). Scores are defined for each of these observations. The classification also allows to define the uncertainty of each observation relatively or normalized. The combination of the 9 criteria scores is summed and the uncertainty assessments are combined to yield an uncertainty estimate for the hazard assessment (Figure 5).

The Norwegian building codes guidelines are quantitative and defined in safety classes S1-S3 which dictates what kind of building can be constructed in an area with a yearly landslide likelihood of 1/100 (S1), 1/1,000 (S2), and 1/5,000 (S3). Therefore, the qualitative hazard assessment was divided into four hazard classes > 1/100 (S1), >1/1,000 (S2), > 1/5,000 (S3), and <1/5,000 by definition (Blikra et al., 2016). This definition is based on three considerations: 1) Norway has experienced historically 2-3 larger rock slope failures per century with loss of life, thus the number of sites plotting in the highest class should be lower. 2) the risk matrix is logarithmic and the values for the classes S2 and S3 can be calculated from the definition of class S1. 3) a slope that is not deforming today should have a yearly likelihood of failure >1/5,000 following the classification.

The consequence assessment is focused on loss of life. It combines volume estimation for the unstable rock slope and its scenarios, a run-out analysis, a landslide dam analyses that includes the assessment of the upstream and potential downstream flood in cases where a rockslide dams a valley, a stability assessment of the potential dam and a displacement wave analysis in cases where a rock slope failure could impact a water body. In both the run-out and the displacement wave propagation area the possible loss of life is considered following a standardized procedure (Oppikofer et al. 2016a, 2016b, 2018). Also, the consequence analyses include an uncertainty analysis as the exposure of people in the hazard zone varies. The result of the combined hazard and risk analysis is plotted in a risk matrix which provides uncertainty margins for hazard and risk (Figure 6).

Figure 5. Nine criteria are categorized for the hazard assessment. The first 5 focus on morphological signs of deformation and rock slope engineering observations. The next two consider deformation rates and the changes of these rates over time, and the last two focus on the activity of the rock slope. Uncertainties can be given to all these observations. The data shown here represent Åknes scenario B.

The consequence assessment is focused on loss of life. It combines volume estimation for the unstable rock slope and its scenarios, a run-out analysis, a landslide dam analyses that includes the assessment of the upstream and potential downstream flood in cases where a rockslide dams a valley, a stability assessment of the potential dam and a displacement wave analysis in cases where a rock slope failure could impact a water body. In both the run-out and the displacement wave propagation area the possible loss of life is considered following a standardized procedure (Oppikofer et al. 2016a, 2016b, 2018). Also, the consequence analyses include an uncertainty analysis as the exposure of people in the hazard zone varies. The result of the combined hazard and risk analysis is plotted in a risk matrix which provides uncertainty margins for hazard and risk (Figure 6).
3.3 Assessment Method by Brideau et al. (2017)

The methodology proposed by Brideau et al. (2017) is based on desktop, field and laboratory analyses to estimate a range of rock avalanche frequencies for a specific slope. The first step consists of compiling a regional inventory of rock-avalanche deposits within an area of approximately 1,250 km² centered on the slope of interest and encompassing a variety of geological groups and formations. The area of terrain with a slope less than 20° (as it has a low potential to generate rock avalanche) is subtracted from the total inventory area to estimate a regional rock avalanche frequency (f-regional) over a series of concentric circle with radii of 5, 10, 15, and 20 km (Figure 7 and Table 1). The variation of rock avalanche intensity between the different circle area provides a first-order characterization of the influence of the regional-scale geology or tectonic structures on the spatial distribution of rock avalanches (i.e. is the study area located in a region with above average rock avalanche density?). Fjord regions such as the Storfjord study area have a subaerial and a submarine component to their inventory (Figure 7).

In regional-level study, it is not possible to review whether the submarine landslide deposit is the result of a rock avalanche that initiated subaerially or from submarine sediment.

![Figure 7. Distribution of rock avalanche with volume greater than 1 Mm³ in the area around the Åknes rockslide. The concentric circles were used to calculate rock avalanche density as a function of distance around the study area (Table 1).](image)

### Table 1. Large (> 1 Mm³) landslides (terrestrial and marine) density as a function of the distance from the Åknes rockslide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radius of circle centered on Åknes rockslide (km)</th>
<th>Number of large terrestrial landslides</th>
<th>Number of large terrestrial and submarine landslides</th>
<th>Area minus slope less than 20° (km²)</th>
<th>Large terrestrial landslide density (event / km²)</th>
<th>Large terrestrial and submarine landslide density (event / km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exhaustion, steady-state decline and constant frequency are the three main models that have been used to describe the temporal distribution of landslides after the last deglaciation (Cruden and Hu, 1993; Ballantyne et al. 2014). The recent work of Böhme et al. (2015) and Hermanns et al. (2017) in Norway suggest that, based on carbon and cosmogenic dating along with stratigraphy of landslide deposits, landslides were more frequent in the first 1,000 to 3,000 year after deglaciation (with large portions of the fjords being ice free starting around 12,500 years B.P.) but have since an approximately constant probability of occurrence. The work of Böhme et al. (2015) in the Storfjord region, which includes the study area for this project, suggests that 80% (16 of 20 landslides in their inventory) occurred in the last 10,000 years.

In the next step, the f-regional is scaled for the area occupied by the slope of interest providing f-specific. For the Åknes rockslide these two areas correspond to scenario A and scenario B.

In the final step, the f-specific values are further adjusted, if necessary based on field observations and measurements, to account for site specific kinematics conditions, evidence of recent or ongoing large-scale deformation, and evidence for the presence of potential permafrost (permafrost degradation over time due to climate change could decrease overall rock slope stability). The information available based on desktop analyses (literature review, geomorphic mapping, potential failure scenario, and kinematic analyses), fieldwork (borehole log, photogrammetry, outcrop mapping, geomorphic observations, displacement monitoring) and laboratory testing (shear strength, uniaxial compressive strength, along with cosmogenic and radiocarbon dating) is subsequently used for adjusting the f-regional to the slope-specific conditions.

The magnitude of the potential adjustments below is subjective and should reflect the observed site conditions and knowledge of the important regional controls on rock slope stability. It should also be carried out by a team of experts, rather than a single researcher or practitioner. In this paper, the site-specific conditions considered include:

- Increasing f-specific by a factor of five when a feasible failure mechanism has been identified on a non-pervasive and persistent discontinuity set.
- Increasing f-specific by one order of magnitude when a feasible failure mechanism has been
4 RESULTS

4.1 Results for method by Jaboyedoff et al. (2012)

Two different scenarios for Åknes rockslide are assessed with this method. Scenario A corresponds to the larger rock avalanche volume. The rock mass considered is 937 m long and moves at 1.5 to 3.5 cm/year (Figure 1). Scenario B moved by 16 cm over a 520 m long scarp in one year. For both cases, movements occur at the top and at the toe. It is unclear if the whole movement at the top is matched by the same rate of movement at the toe. Some of the deformation appears to develop internally. In this case, the classification would be between the case next to last and last columns (2-1 and 2-2 in Figure 2). For scenario B the strain rate is 0.03% and for the scenario A 0.003%. In Figure 4, scenario A is located in the zone of High Medium-High scenario, and scenario B is High.

4.2 Results from the Method by Hermanns et al. (2012)

A statistical distribution is used to represent the variability of the calculated hazard score (Figure 6). This variability represents the combination of uncertainty estimated for each of the 9 input parameters (Figure 5). The results of the risk matrix (Figure 6) show that scenario A has a medium to high hazard with a mean likelihood that fails in class S3 (1/1,000 to 1/5,000) but the range of uncertainty reaches into class S2 (1/100 to 1/1,000). Based on the input shown in Figure 5, scenario B has a high to very high hazard with a corresponding mean yearly likelihood just above 1/100 years.

The consequence for both scenarios A and B is considered to be very high due to the displacement wave potential to be generated by the debris entering the fjord. Scenario A, with its greater volume, can generate a larger wave which can potentially lead to a greater number of fatalities. This is reflected by scenario A plotting to the right of scenario B on the consequence axis. The uncertainty associated with the consequence is related to uncertainty of exposure of person that might be in the area of impact during the event and is represented by a minimum, mean, and maximum estimate for the potential loss of life for each scenario. This estimation is for an event without warning and evacuation as a baseline. A continuously monitoring early warning system now exists at Åknes that will lead to warning and timely evacuation in case of rock mass movement acceleration (Blikra 2008).

The combination of the hazard and consequence assessment suggests that both rock avalanche scenarios are considered to represents a high risk.

4.3 Results for the Method by Brideau et al. (2017)

The regional rock avalanche inventory highlights that the Åknes rockslide is within a rock avalanche “hot spot” as suggested by the increasing density per decreasing area of the concentric circles (Table 1). Using the temporal relationship by Böhme et al. (2015) and the rock avalanche density in the 5 km circle, a f-regional value of approximately $5 \times 10^6$ event/km$^2$/year (3 rock avalanche x 0.8 / 46 km$^2$ / 10,000 years) is estimated for the area nearest to Åknes rockslide. This value is multiplied by the area of Scenario A (0.22 km$^2$) and Scenario B (0.59 km$^2$) to provide a first estimate of the f-specific.

For both scenarios A and B, the f-specific is then adjusted by three orders of magnitude because there is a kinematically feasible failure mechanism on a pervasive and persistent discontinuity set, and documented ongoing movement over most of the extent of the potentially unstable rock mass. Accounting for the area of each scenarios, the estimated f-specific (or probability of occurrence) is between 1/150 and 1/300 for scenario A and 1/450 and 1/900 for scenario B. A probability range is reported using only the terrestrial rock avalanches as the lower bound and the combined terrestrial and submarine large landslides as the upper bound. The large submarine landslide deposits could include subaerial rock avalanche that entered the fjord and large landslides that initiated in fine-grained submarine sediment at this level of analysis it is not known how many of each is present in the inventory.

Table 2. Summary of the rock slope assessment based on the three methods considered in this paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock Slope Assessment Method</th>
<th>Hazard Rating</th>
<th>Probability of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaboyedoff et al. 2012</td>
<td>High-medium (A)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanns et al. 2012</td>
<td>High (B)</td>
<td>1/1,000 to 1/5,000 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blikra et al. 2017</td>
<td>Very-high (B)</td>
<td>1/100 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brideau et al. 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/150 to 1/300 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/450 to 1/900 (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 DISCUSSION

The results from the Jaboyedoff et al., (2012) and Hermanns et al., (2012) are consistent for both rock avalanche scenarios with scenario B representing the higher hazard while the method by Brideau et al. (2017) suggest that scenario A has the higher probability of
occurrence. The difference in these results is due to the greater sensitivity of the method by Hermanns et al. (2012) to the displacement rates whereas the method by Brideau et al. (2017) has a greater sensitivity to the area which could generate a rock avalanche greater than 1 Mm². The methodology by Hermanns et al. (2012) leverages the available displacement monitoring data by having five displacement rate classes versus the two landslide activity classes in the method by Brideau et al. (2017). The methodology by Brideau et al. (2017) was developed to provide probability of occurrence estimate for slopes that did not have monitoring data available and instead leverages the regional history of rock avalanches.

The method by Hermanns et al. (2012) provides a more complete characterization of a potentially unstable slope by evaluating its hazard, consequence (including those associated with secondary hazards), risk, and provides an estimate of the probability of occurrence. This method can be applied in different stages of an investigation to assess which geological condition requires additional attention to reduce uncertainties. So far, this method has been applied at various potentially unstable slopes to evaluate their hazard and risk (Blikra et al., 2016; Hermanns et al., 2016). That said the method by Hermanns et al. (2012) does not consider the spatial distribution of the deformation like in Jaboyedoff et al. (2012), nor the spatial distribution of nearby post-glacial rock avalanches like in Brideau et al. (2017). A comparison of the results from the three methods can provide an additional characterization of parameters that could influence a potentially unstable slope.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper compared the hazard assessment and probability of occurrence estimates for the Åknes rockslide in Norway using three methodologies. The input for each methodology included geomorphic mapping, geological model, kinematic analysis, rock fall activity, displacement monitoring, deformation pattern, regional DEM, and regional inventory of rock avalanche. The analysis considered two failure scenarios (A: whole slope failure, B: failure of fast moving section of the slope). The three methodologies found both scenarios to represent a medium high to very high hazard and the probability of occurrence to be greater than 11,500 for scenario A and greater than 11,000 for scenario B. We conclude that for locations with high risk of life loss or severe potential for infrastructure damage or loss, a combination of methods discussed will provide a range of results that could inform a hazard and risk assessment. This range is preferable than reliance on a single method, as rock avalanches do not lend themselves to traditional frequency analysis based on repeat events at the same location. The range in outcomes also provides a convenient sensitivity analysis that can be carried through a risk assessment and which would add credibility to the expert’s judgement. Ultimately, we hope that combining these methods in decision making will reduce potential life loss by supporting monitoring and early warning systems for high risk situations.
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