

Hanne Hendrickx, Reynald Delaloye, Jan Nyssen, Amaury Frankl



#### **RECENT GEOMORPHIC DESTABILIZATION OF MOUNTAIN** SLOPES, A POSSIBLE LINK TO CLIMATE CHANGE? TWO CASE STUDIES FROM SWITZERLAND













a) The study object: geomorphic processes



GIS

### FRAMEWORK OF THIS STUDY

- Geomorphic destabilisations in high mountain areas are often linked to change.
- were investigated with regard to their possible causes (2017 – 2019).

Figure 1. a) the studied high alpine environment with the different geomorphic processes observed, b) the used methods for monitoring these landscapes (technical specs at the end of the slides).

permafrost degradation and changing precipitation intensities, induced by climate

Keeping in mind the complex interaction between meteorological and geological conditions, two alpine mass movements



# CASE STUDY 1





#### CASE STUDY 1: GROSSE GRABE ROCK FACE













Europaweg



#### CASE STUDY 1: GROSSE GRABE ROCK FACE



#### Figure 2. Observed winter rock fall.

(Fig. 3).



- Isolated rock fall started in January 2017 (webcam observations)  $\rightarrow$  launching the TLS campaign (Fig. 2).
- The next two summers the rock face had been tilting at an increasing rate:1 - 3,3 cm/month

Figure 3. Observed summer deformation.



### CASE STUDY 1: GROSSE GRABE ROCK FACE

- Summer 2019, consecutive large rock fall events (> 10,000 m3) lead to the complete collapse of the rock face with a total volume of more than 60,000 m3 (Fig. 4, Fig. 5, Fig. 6).
- The wet rock fall scar probably indicates permafrost thawing (Fig. 6). Besides the geological characteristics, which are favouring the rock wall instability, multi-decennial warming of the permafrost is presumably an implicated factor.





See figures on the next slide





1 21/01/201 21/ 2 3 20/05/201 4 30/05/201 5 13/01/201 6 16/04/201 15, 27 8 9 28 10a 02 02 10b 05 11a 11b 05 12 22 13 23/ 14 23/10/201 15 27/10/201 16 30/1



Rock fall dates	Volume in m <sup>3</sup>	
17 17h – 22/01/2017 10h (UTC+1)	Est. 500	
1/05/2017 20-21h (UTC+2)	Est. 500	
18 18h – 21/05/2018 07h (UTC+2)	513	
18 20h – 31/05/2018 07h (UTC+2)	318	
19 13h - 14/01/2019 11h (UTC+1)	346	
19 17h – 17/04/2019 08h (UTC+2)	756	
5/07/2019 16-17h (UTC+2)	Est. 1000	
7/08/2019 18h46 (UTC+2)	Est. 15 000	
8/08/2019 00h10 (UTC+2)	Est. 30 000	
2/09/2019 04h53 (UTC+2)	Est. 10 000	
2/09/2019 12h49 (UTC+2)		
5/09/2019 06h33 (UTC+2)	Est. 5000	
5/09/2019 12h50 (UTC+2)		
2/10/2019 13h19 (UTC+2)	Est. 1000 - 2000 ??	
3/10/2019 13-14h (UTC+2)	Est. 100-500	
19 17h – 24/10/2019 12h (UTC+2)	Est. 50-200	
(various)		
19 17h – 28/10/2019 10h (UTC+1)	<25	
10/2019 10h – 12h (UTC+1)	<25	

#### Figure 5. Rock fall dates from webcam imagery and volumes from TLS.



# CASE STUDY 2\*



\*Hendrickx et al. "Exploring sequential high resolution topographic surveys on active alpine talus slope geomorphology." Submitted to Earth Surface Processes and Landforms







16°20'30"N





- RTK Base Station
- Laser scan position
- Fixed GCPs
- GCPs 2017
- GCPs 2018
- GCPs 2019
- ▲ Arpelistock (3035 m a.s.l.)

800 m

#### Survey Extent

- 2017-2018
- 2019

0



 General geomorphic processes on the studied talus slope are dominated by debris flow scour and deposits, snow push phenomena (ridges and flutes) and occasional rill erosion (Fig. 8).





**Figure 8**. Talus slope geomorphology shown by the 10 cm resolution hill-shade and orthophoto derived from the UAV data of 2019, a) debris flow deposit, b) arched snow creep ridges, c) boulder pushed by slide/creep of the snow pack, here named as snow creep flutes, d) rill erosion in the more fine grained parts of the talus slope.





Hendrickx et al. Submitted

50 m

Figure 9. Volumes per main geomorphic reworking process per year on a logarithmic scale.



UNIVFRSITY

- Annual sediment rates consist of
- debris flow channel erosion and fill
- (~10 100 m3 per channel) and
- material displaced by snow
- creep/push (~1,000 2,000 m3)
- (Fig. 9) and are the most important
- sediment redistribution actor on the
- talus slope in years when no debris flow activity is observed





**Figure 9.** The estimated debris flow volume for the different time periods, based on historical aerial photographs dating back until 1946 (see examples at the end of the slides)



In 2019, the largest debris flow event in the last 70 years was observed (Fig. 9), with a displaced volume > 20,000 m3.

Most of the mobilized sediments originated from incision of the talus apex area, while only a small part came from intermediate debris storage within rock wall couloirs.





This debris flow event is linked to an intense prefrontal thunderstorm, causing a rainfall intensity of almost 10 mm/10 min for the study area (Fig. 10) (MeteoSwiss station VSTSN, 3 km from the study area).

Figure 10. Radar data on August 11, 2019



Future climate predictions show an increase in these events in the region, potentially altering the debris flow frequency and the dominant geomorphic process active on such slopes.









### PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS



In a time-span of 3 yrs we observed the destabilization and the failure of an entire rock face. Permafrost was present, but it remains unclear if its degradation is an explanatory factor, rather than a geological predisposition.



dominated by snow push phenomena.

Intense rain fall events have the potential to mobilise a lot of sediment in an otherwise relatively stable talus slope environment,



Hendrickx et al. Submitted



Hanne Hendrickx Research and teaching assistant

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

Е hanne.hendrickx@ugent.be Т +32 9 264 46 19

f Geografie UGent @HendrickxHanne y /Hanne\_Hendrickx RG Project: Talus slope dynamics in a permafrost environment Sketch**fab**/hannehendrickx

www.ugent.be www.geoweb.ugent.be











### MEASURING EQUIPMENT GROSSE GRABE



- Long range Riegl-V6000
- Scanning from a distance of ~ 1 km
- Accuracy: 3 cm (after coarse and fine (MACA) comparison interaction in
  - fine (MSA) co-registration in
  - RiScanPro based on stable areas)
- Resolution: downscaled to 10 cm using an octree filter





## MEASURING EQUIPMENT COL DU SANETSCH

Hendri	ckx et al. Submitted	Hexacopter DJI F550	DJI Phantom 4 pro
	Camera :	Panasonic Lumix DMX-GM5	Integrated
		Zoom lens	Prime lens
	Sensor size (pixels)	4592 x 3448	5472 x 3648
	Sensor size (mm)	17.3 x 13	13.2 x 8.8
	Aperture	Varied	F/5.6 - 6.3
	Shutter speed (s)	> 1/500	1/200 – 1/800
	Shutter type	Global	Global
	ISO	400	100
	Focal length (mm)	12-20	8.8

Table A1. Characteristics of Uncrewed Aerial Vehicle(UAVs) cameras used in this study

Hendrickx et al. Submitted	2017	2018	2019
Used UAV	Hexacopter DJI	Hexacopter DJI	DJI Phantom 4
	F550	F550	Pro
Flight planning software	Mission Planner	Mission Planner	UgCS
Number of flights	18	25	15
Survey days	4	3	3
Covered area in km <sup>2</sup>	1.2	1.3	2.0
GSD in cm/pixel	3.5 - 5.3	3.5 – 5.3	2.0
Used dGNNS system	Trimble RTK v4	Leica RTK GPS	Leica RTK GPS
Number of GCPs (& CPs)	10(4)	20(6)	24(15)



GHENT f UNIVERSITY

Table A2. Characteristics of the survey datafor the three years





ch



### DATA PROCESSING COL DU SANETSCH

Hendrickx et al. Submitted

	Registration error (RMSE on 25 CPs)	LoD <sub>95%</sub>	LoD <sub>80%</sub>
UAV $\sigma_{seperate alignment}$	0.120	0.273	0.178
UAV $\sigma_{co-alignment}$	0.071	0.196	0.128
TLS σ	0.023	0.065	0.042

 
 Table A3. Registration error (RMSE) per 3D model
and the calculated level of detections in m. UAV = Uncrewed Aerial Vehicle, TLS = Terrestrial Laser Scanner, LoD = Level Of Dectection

UAV Survey 1 (2017) UAV Survey 2 (2018) # 1088 Quality check photos, remove < 0.7 Align Photos – High quality Add and indicate GCPs – Set Marker accuracy to measurement precision Indicate stable remarkable points UAV Survey 1 (2017) Build dense point cloud – Medium quality (Hendrickx et al. 2019) SOR filter (treshold 2.2\*stdev of 12 nearest points) IDW interpolation (radius 1.0 m)

**Fig A1.** Workflow in Metashape and GIS environment, adopting co-alignment methodology (Cook & Dietze, 2019).







# 2493

Hendrickx et al. Submitted

UAV Survey 3 (2019) # 3053



Split all surveys again based on images



## DATA PROCESSING COL DU SANETSCH

UAV data is prone to deformations, especially if the ground control points (GCPs) are not evenly distributed. We confirm that the co-alignment approach (Cook & Dietze, 2019)\* is useful to improve the comparative accuracy when GCPs do not have an optimal spatial distribution.

\*Also view EGU abstract EGU2020-11735 from the same authors in the session GI1.3 and GM2.3



























Fig A3. Historical aerial imagery used in this study © Swisstopo

