

State-of-the-Art of Landslide Site Monitoring in Europe: Preliminary Results of the SafeLand Questionnaire

I. BAROŇ & R. SUPPER

Geological Survey of Austria, Neulinggasse 38, 1030 Vienna, Austria.

Inventory, complex investigation and monitoring of high-risk slope failures are essential tasks for any effective early warning and risk management worldwide. Different approaches are being applied for different sites regarding the affected mass parameters, behaviour, activity state and national tradition as well. However, a summarizing study to compare approaches throughout Europe is still missing. Therefore we prepared a **Questionnaire on National State of Landslide Site Investigation and Monitoring**, which was disseminated among European institutes and representatives within the frame of the SafeLand project.

The principal goals and expected output of the questionnaire study were:

- Assessing **general state** of the slope-instability investigation and monitoring in different (all) European countries
- Assessing **effectiveness / reliability** of each method for slope-instability investigation and monitoring
- **Applicability** of the monitoring techniques **for early warning**.

This was done through tick-answering and was an input for the statistical assessment.

The **general information on monitored mass movement** (slope failure typology, activity state and recent movement rates) was expressed relative to the total number of phenomena. The **investigation methods** (testing, mapping, ground-based geophysical surveys and remote-sensing data) were assessed by relative occurrence (%) per total number of case sites and their relative reliability (%), evaluated by authors of the answers. **Methods of landslide monitoring** (monitoring of displacement and deformation, hydrometeorological factors, and geophysical factors) were assessed by their relative occurrence (%) per total number of case sites. Another parameter, the index of early warning potential of each method, was given by positive answers on the possibility to use the method for EW relative to occurrence of the method, divided by total number of sites. General outlines and graphical outputs of the study are presented in Table 1 and Figures 2–11.

The most abundant slope failures that have been monitored were active translational and rotational slides with recent movement rates less than 10 mm/month. The most frequently applied **investigation methods** were geological, geomorphic and engineering-geological mapping and core drilling, testing of strength properties / deformability and clay mineralogy, studying of aerial photographs, LiDAR airborne laser scans (ALS), radar interferometry, resistivity measurements and refraction seismic.

Aerial photographs, satellite optical very high resolution (VHR) imagery, LiDAR ALS, radar interferometry and measuring of resistivity, reflection and refraction seismic, time-domain electromagnetic, passive acoustic emissions, geophysical logging were **the most reliable investigation methods**.

Monitoring of movement and deformation was most frequently done by repeated orthophotos, radar interferometry, differential LiDAR ALS, webcam, dGPS, total station, inclinometer (classical) and wire extensometers. Most frequently **monitored hydro-meteorological factors** were precipitation amount, pore-water pressure and air temperature; the most frequently monitored **geophysical parameters** were passive seismic/acoustic emissions, electromagnetic emissions and direct current resistivity. However, distinct differences in application of individual methods, especially in the case of remote-sensing data and new technologies, were observed between the countries of the former eastern and western block. Also, different slope failures need different investigation and monitoring approaches. The study will be finalized in the near future, after evaluating more answers from other countries.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL MASS-MOUMENT SITE INVESTIGATION & MONITORING

SafeLand

Study site: [Redacted]

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Country:	[Redacted]															
Location:	[Redacted]															
WGS coordinates:	[Redacted]															
Responsible institutions:	[Redacted]															
Email contacts:	[Redacted]															
Date of the answering:	[Redacted]															
Type of slope failure: (modified classification of Cruden & Varnes 1996)	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Topple and initial fall:</td> <td>in rock <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>in soil <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lateral spread:</td> <td>in rock <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>in soil <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slide - translational:</td> <td>in rock <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>in soil <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slide - rotational:</td> <td>in rock <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>in soil <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flow:</td> <td>in rock <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>in soil <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Topple and initial fall:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>	Lateral spread:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>	Slide - translational:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>	Slide - rotational:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>	Flow:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>
Topple and initial fall:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>														
Lateral spread:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>														
Slide - translational:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>														
Slide - rotational:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>														
Flow:	in rock <input type="checkbox"/>	in soil <input type="checkbox"/>														
Complex failure:	<input type="checkbox"/>															
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>															
Present maximum movement rates (within past 12 months)	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> < 10 mm/month</td> <td rowspan="4">Present activity state <i>(within past 12 months)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> < 10 cm/month</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> < 100 cm/month</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> > 100 cm/month</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maximum expected future rate: [Redacted]</td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Active <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended <input type="checkbox"/> Reactivated <input type="checkbox"/> Dormant <input type="checkbox"/> Stabilized <input type="checkbox"/> Relict </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maximum estimated thickness: [Redacted] m</td> <td>Estimated volume: [Redacted] m³</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> < 10 mm/month	Present activity state <i>(within past 12 months)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> < 10 cm/month	<input type="checkbox"/> < 100 cm/month	<input type="checkbox"/> > 100 cm/month	Maximum expected future rate: [Redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/> Active <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended <input type="checkbox"/> Reactivated <input type="checkbox"/> Dormant <input type="checkbox"/> Stabilized <input type="checkbox"/> Relict	Maximum estimated thickness: [Redacted] m	Estimated volume: [Redacted] m ³						
<input type="checkbox"/> < 10 mm/month	Present activity state <i>(within past 12 months)</i>															
<input type="checkbox"/> < 10 cm/month																
<input type="checkbox"/> < 100 cm/month																
<input type="checkbox"/> > 100 cm/month																
Maximum expected future rate: [Redacted]	<input type="checkbox"/> Active <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended <input type="checkbox"/> Reactivated <input type="checkbox"/> Dormant <input type="checkbox"/> Stabilized <input type="checkbox"/> Relict															
Maximum estimated thickness: [Redacted] m	Estimated volume: [Redacted] m ³															

QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL MASS-MOUMENT SITE INVESTIGATION & MONITORING

SafeLand

AVAILABLE INVESTIGATION:

Mapping:	<input type="checkbox"/> Geological (lithology, stratigraphy, joint and fault pattern) <input type="checkbox"/> Geomorphic (topography, geomorphic features, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering-geological (landslide regions, strength properties, vectors of movement, infrastructure, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Hazard, risk, element at risk, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrogeological (drainage network, underground drainage, aquifers, etc.) Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]				
Drilling:	<input type="checkbox"/> Core <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [Redacted] Max. depth: [Redacted] m Max. depth: [Redacted] m				
Testing:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strength properties/ deformability <input type="checkbox"/> Clay mineralogy <input type="checkbox"/> Penetration <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrochemical tracing <input type="checkbox"/> Hyperspectral satellite data <input type="checkbox"/> Field dilatation tests (pressuremeter) <input type="checkbox"/> Borehole testing Please specify: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]				
Remote sensing data:	<table border="0"> <tr> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Aerial photographs and orthophotographs <input type="checkbox"/> Satellite optical very high resolution (VHR) imagery (<1m pixel) <input type="checkbox"/> Hyperspectral satellite data <input type="checkbox"/> Airborne Geophysics <input type="checkbox"/> LIDAR ALS (Airborne Laser Scanning) <input type="checkbox"/> Radar Interferometry Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] </td> <td> Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Resistivity <input type="checkbox"/> Self potential (SP) <input type="checkbox"/> Induced polarization (IP) <input type="checkbox"/> Reflection seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Refraction seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) <input type="checkbox"/> Frequency-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Time-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Proton (nuclear) magn. resonance (PMR) <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrophysical logging in boreholes Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] </td> <td> Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes] </td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial photographs and orthophotographs <input type="checkbox"/> Satellite optical very high resolution (VHR) imagery (<1m pixel) <input type="checkbox"/> Hyperspectral satellite data <input type="checkbox"/> Airborne Geophysics <input type="checkbox"/> LIDAR ALS (Airborne Laser Scanning) <input type="checkbox"/> Radar Interferometry Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes]	<input type="checkbox"/> Resistivity <input type="checkbox"/> Self potential (SP) <input type="checkbox"/> Induced polarization (IP) <input type="checkbox"/> Reflection seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Refraction seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) <input type="checkbox"/> Frequency-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Time-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Proton (nuclear) magn. resonance (PMR) <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrophysical logging in boreholes Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes]
<input type="checkbox"/> Aerial photographs and orthophotographs <input type="checkbox"/> Satellite optical very high resolution (VHR) imagery (<1m pixel) <input type="checkbox"/> Hyperspectral satellite data <input type="checkbox"/> Airborne Geophysics <input type="checkbox"/> LIDAR ALS (Airborne Laser Scanning) <input type="checkbox"/> Radar Interferometry Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes]				
<input type="checkbox"/> Resistivity <input type="checkbox"/> Self potential (SP) <input type="checkbox"/> Induced polarization (IP) <input type="checkbox"/> Reflection seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Refraction seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) <input type="checkbox"/> Frequency-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Time-domain electromagnetics <input type="checkbox"/> Proton (nuclear) magn. resonance (PMR) <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrophysical logging in boreholes Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Technique assessment Effectiveness/ Reliability of the method for landslide investigation high low [Grid of checkboxes]				

© Geological Survey of Austria – I. Baron, R. Supper 2

QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL MASS-MOUMENT SITE INVESTIGATION & MONITORING

SafeLand

MONITORING OF MOVEMENT AND DEFORMATION:

Remotely sensed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Satellite optical VHR image (type: [Redacted]) Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted] <input type="checkbox"/> Satellite near infrared image (type: [Redacted]) Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted] <input type="checkbox"/> Orthophoto Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted] <input type="checkbox"/> InSAR (Radar Interferometry) Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted] <input type="checkbox"/> LIDAR ALS (Airborne Laser Scanning) Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Duration: [Redacted] years Number of scenes: [Redacted]		
Ground based:	<table border="0"> <tr> <td> GB InSAR (Radar interferometry) LIDAR TLS (Terrestrial Laser Scanning) Optical image Near infrared image dGPS (Global Positioning System) Total station Inclinomter (classical) Automatic inclinometer (DMS, etc.) Tape extensometers Wire extensometers (automatic) TM 711 (opto-mechanical extensometer) Optical Fibres (FOC) </td> <td> Active? Duration Permanent X Regular X Sporadic Potential for EW? [Grid of checkboxes] </td> </tr> </table>	GB InSAR (Radar interferometry) LIDAR TLS (Terrestrial Laser Scanning) Optical image Near infrared image dGPS (Global Positioning System) Total station Inclinomter (classical) Automatic inclinometer (DMS, etc.) Tape extensometers Wire extensometers (automatic) TM 711 (opto-mechanical extensometer) Optical Fibres (FOC)	Active? Duration Permanent X Regular X Sporadic Potential for EW? [Grid of checkboxes]
GB InSAR (Radar interferometry) LIDAR TLS (Terrestrial Laser Scanning) Optical image Near infrared image dGPS (Global Positioning System) Total station Inclinomter (classical) Automatic inclinometer (DMS, etc.) Tape extensometers Wire extensometers (automatic) TM 711 (opto-mechanical extensometer) Optical Fibres (FOC)	Active? Duration Permanent X Regular X Sporadic Potential for EW? [Grid of checkboxes]		

Explanation:
 Active: Is the monitoring still in use? (tick = yes)
 Duration: Please write duration of monitoring (in years)
 Permanent: Is the monitoring (usually automatic) continuous and regular with periodicity shorter than 1 week?
 Regular: Is the monitoring continuous with regular periodicity > 1 week and < 1 year?
 Sporadic: Is the monitoring with periodicity irregular: on > 1 year?
 Potential for EW: Could be the monitoring technique used for Early Warning?

© Geological Survey of Austria – I. Baron, R. Supper 3

QUESTIONNAIRE ON NATIONAL MASS-MOUMENT SITE INVESTIGATION & MONITORING

SafeLand

MONITORING OF FACTORS:

Hydro-meteorological:	Precipitation amount Snow cover thickness Solar radiation Air temperature Air humidity Pore-water pressure Soil temperature Soil humidity Water temperature Fluid conductivity In / outflow (discharge) Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Active? Duration Permanent X Regular X Sporadic Potential for EW? [Grid of checkboxes]
Geophysical:	Passive seism./acoustic emission Electromagnetic emissions Self potential (SP) Induced polarization (IP) DC (Direct Current) resistivity Other: [Redacted] Other: [Redacted]	Active? Duration Permanent X Regular X Sporadic Potential for EW? [Grid of checkboxes]

NUMERICAL MODELING:

Method 1: [Redacted]	Code name: [Redacted]	Studied behavior: [Redacted]
Method 2: [Redacted]	Code name: [Redacted]	Studied behavior: [Redacted]
Method 3: [Redacted]	Code name: [Redacted]	Studied behavior: [Redacted]

RELEVANT PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS:

[List of publications and reports]

© Geological Survey of Austria – I. Baron, R. Supper 4

Fig. 1: General appearance of the Questionnaire on National State of Landslide Site Investigation and Monitoring.

- 16 -

Table 1: Review of the number of sites and countries included in the study.

No.	Country Code	Country	Number of Sites
1	AD	Andorra	1
2	AT	Austria	7
3	CH	Switzerland	3
4	CZ	Czech Republic	11
5	ES	Spain	1
6	FR	France	5
7	GB	Great Britain	1
8	IT	Italy	22
9	KG	Kyrgyzstan	8
10	NO	Norway	3
11	RU	Russia	1
12	SI	Slovenia	3
13	SK	Slovakia	16



Fig. 2: Reviewing map of countries included in the study (source of map: GoogleEarth).




Fig. 3: Review of monitored slope failures included in the study (modified classification of CRUDEN & VARNES, 1996).




Fig. 4: Review of slope failures included in the study by their activity state (after WP / WLI, 1993) and actual movement rates.




Fig. 5: Review of relative occurrence of different mapping approaches (per number of sites) applied in the case sites.




Fig. 6: Review of relative occurrence of different testing approaches applied in the case sites.




Fig. 7: Review of relative occurrence (blue) and relative reliability (red) of different remote-sensing data applied for investigating or monitoring of the case sites.




Fig. 8: Review of relative occurrence and reliability of different geophysical methods applied for investigation of the case sites.




Fig. 9: Review of relative occurrence and index of early-warning potential of ground-based techniques applied for displacement and deformation monitoring of the case sites.




Fig. 10: Review of monitoring of hydrometeorological factors at the case sites, and their index of early-warning potential.




Fig. 11: Review of monitoring of geophysical factors at the case sites, and their index of early-warning potential.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to **acknowledge everyone who helped through discussions to improve the form** to be as comprehensive and "user-friendly" as possible. Special thanks go to all the local national coordinators who helped to disseminate the questionnaire effectively and to obtain as many answers as possible; and, of course all specialist and responsible persons, who filled in the form, must be thanked, i.e.: **M. Bil, P. Blaha, J. Blanc, L.H. Blikra, M. Broccolato, S. Cardellini, M. Carman N. Casagli, J. Corominas, C. Foster, S. Garambois, W. Gasperl, V. Hanzl, F. Hartvich, A. Helmstetter, Ch. Ihrenberger, M.M. Ilyin, D. Jongmans, V. Kaufmann, J. Klimes, S. Kumelj, M. Lovisolo, J.-F. Malet, S. Novosad, A. Passuto, L. Picarelli, J. Rybar, S. Springman, I. Torgoev, G. Truffelli, G. Urciuoli, Z. Varilova, P. Wagner, and M. Wöhrer-Alge.**

The study was supported by the European 7th FP project "SafeLand – Living with the landslide risk in Europe".

References

CRUDEN, D.M. & VARNES, D.J. (1996): Landslide types and processes. In: Landslides, Investigation and Mitigation. Special Report 247, Transportation Research Board, Washington, 36–75.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Berichte der Geologischen Bundesanstalt](#)

Jahr/Year: 2010

Band/Volume: [82](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Baron Ivo, Supper Robert

Artikel/Article: [State-of-the-Art of Landslide Site Monitoring in Europe: Preliminary Results of the SafeLand Questionnaire 15-21](#)