SPATIALLY EXPlicit SHALLOW LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBILITY MAPPING OVER LARGE AREAS
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ABSTRACT
Recent advances in downscaling climate model precipitation predictions now yield spatially explicit patterns of rainfall that could be used to estimate shallow landslide susceptibility over large areas. In California, the United States Geological Survey is exploring community emergency response to the possible effects of a very large simulated storm event and to do so it has generated downscaled precipitation maps for the storm. To predict the corresponding pattern of shallow landslide susceptibility across the state, we have used the model Shalstab (a coupled steady state runoff and infinite slope stability model) which susceptibility spatially explicit estimates of relative potential instability. Such slope stability models that include the effects of subsurface runoff on potentially destabilizing pore pressure evolution require water routing and hence the definition of upslope drainage area to each potential cell. To calculate drainage area efficiently over a large area we developed a parallel framework to scale-up Shalstab and specifically introduce a new efficient parallel drainage area algorithm which produces seamless results. The single seamless shallow landslide susceptibility map for all of California was accomplished in a short run time, and indicates that much larger areas can be efficiently modelled. As landslide maps generally over predict the extent of instability for any given storm. Local empirical data on the fraction of predicted unstable cells that failed for observed rainfall intensity can be used to specify the likely extent of hazard for a given storm. This suggests that campaigns to collect local precipitation data and detailed shallow landslide location maps after major storms could be used to calibrate models and improve their use in hazard assessment for individual storms.
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INTRODUCTION
Downscaling of climate model precipitation predictions can now generate spatially detailed (i.e. at a scale of kilometres to tens of kilometres) maps of storm rainfall that include orographic and wind effects (e.g. GRELL et alii, 1995; GIORGI et alii, 2001; MICHALEKES et alii, 2001; WIDMANN et alii, 2003; SALATHE, 2003; ROE, 2005; ANDERS et alii, 2007; DETTINGER et alii, in press). Such climate models typically operate over large areas (regional to continental to global). This allows an exploration of the effects of extreme storm events on hazard generation (through flooding and landsliding) and emergency response over these large areas. Landslides are always local, that is they are spatially discrete events, and from a management perspective the more spatially explicit the landslide susceptibility can be delineated, the more useful it is for planning. Gross maps based on threshold slopes derived from coarse grained digital elevation data (e.g. 30 m grid), for example, provide limited guidance. The increasing availability of higher resolution topographic
data (10m grid to 1 m (LiDAR-based)), the grid size of which approaches the scale of common shallow landslides (typically involving just the soil mantle), invites more mechanistic landslide models which have the potential to be broadly applicable. Such models, however, typically use hydrologic models to predict potential destabilizing pore pressure, and this means that drainage area to every cell must be determined. For small areas, this is readily accomplished, but for large areas (e.g. > 100 km² for 1 m data or 10,000 km² for 10 m data) conventional algorithms will not work efficiently because they cannot address the necessary amount of memory. This is because the computation of drainage area is a global operation (i.e. the information needed may theoretically come from any part of the landscape) and thus particularly challenging to implement seamlessly and efficiently.

Here we report the successful development of a parallel framework for large-scale spatially explicit landslide susceptibility assessment, and the implementation of an efficient seamless parallel drainage area algorithm. Our drainage area algorithm, available online at the National Center for Earth-surface Dynamics (http://www.nced.umn.edu/), is not dependent on the choice of landslide model and stands separately from its application to this problem.

This algorithm development was motivated by a challenge. As described in Stock et alii (this volume), the United States Geological Survey (USGS) is conducting a study of the emergency preparedness in the state of California (414,000 km²) for the effects of extreme storms. A storm, their emergency-preparedness scenario, is intended to represent the most extreme storm events that have struck California (analogous to the state in 1861–62), as it is assumed such events will now increase in likelihood with global warming effects on climate. Recent work by Dettinger et alii [in press] and Ralph et alii [2006] has illustrated that some of California’s most damaging storms are atmospheric rivers of moisture that originate in the tropics and convey vast amounts of water vapour towards California in a narrow jet (e.g., 100-200 km wide) of moisture. When they strike California, these jets can deliver record rainfalls over the course of 1-3 days. Combining data from California’s last two major storms (1969 and 1985) Dettinger et alii [in press] simulated an atmospheric river storm in a dynamic meteorological model (see http://meteora.ucsd.edu/cap/arkstorm.html for details). They provided hourly rainfall simulation for all of California with resolution ranging from 2 to 6 km. The challenge here is can we predict shallow landslides across the entire state using the highest resolution state-wide topographic data (10m cells) and assess not only the potential location by the also the magnitude (number of landslides) for a given area given the predicted rainfall patterns.

There are many approaches for mapping shallow landslide potential across a landscape, ranging from purely empirical statistical approaches to process based models (e.g. review in Casadei et alii, [2003]). There are insufficient studies in California to map the shallow landslide risk solely on statistical relationships. We elect as a first step in using the new drainage area algorithm to use the Shalstab model [Montgomery & Dietrich, 1994; Dietrich et alii, 1995; Dietrich et alii, 2001] which couples a steady state shallow subsurface flow model (to predict pore pressure distribution) with an infinite slope model. This model does not allow us to relate storm magnitude to landslide frequency, but its simplicity allows it to be applied across the entire state of California in the absence of spatially explicit data on such controlling factors as soil depth, root strength, soil saturated conductivity, and soil friction angle. Landslide susceptibility maps produced using the Shalstab model (or other hydrologically dynamic models), which successfully delineate areas of failure tend to also greatly over predict the extent of landsliding for a given storm event (e.g. Casadei et alii., [2003]). Following Stock et alii [this volume] we suggest that this problem can be addressed empirically by relating the proportion of unstable cells that fail in a given storm to some measure of that storm magnitude.

This first application of the slope stability model in a parallelized framework points to a need for systematic data collection on precipitation and landslide locations for a wide range of storms and across the diverse landscape found in a large area such as California. It is not clear to us at this point whether more mechanistic landslide models will be able to overcome the problem of over prediction and without considerable local calibration successfully delineate specific areas of instability for a given storm.

**METHODS**

**TOPOGRAPHIC DATA**
Basic topographic data for California were obtained from USGS’s National Elevation Dataset (http://ned.usgs.gov/). The data are gridded at a resolution of 1/3 arc-second (approximately 10 m). Preprocessing consisted in assembling the data into larger tiles (1000 tiles, 972 km² each) and removing depressions using the standard ArcGis Fill tool. Depressions greater than 1.5 m were ignored, effectively preventing closed basins (e.g. Death Valley) from being filled. During the pre-processing steps the data were resampled at exactly 10m resolution, and saved in standard binary IEEE 32-bit floating point format for compatibility and efficiency.

**SHALLOW LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBILITY MODEL**

We adopted the widely used shallow landslide susceptibility model Shalstab [Montgomery and Dietrich, 1994; Dietrich et alii, 1995; Dietrich et alii, 2001] to estimate relative potential of shallow landslides initiated by storm rainfall. Shalstab couples a hydrological model to a limit-equilibrium slope stability model to calculate the critical steady-state rainfall necessary to trigger slope instability at any point in a landscape. Rainfall is assumed to infiltrate to a lower conductivity layer and flow along topographically determined paths above an impermeable layer. Under the simplifying assumption that soil transmissivity does not vary with depth, the degree of saturation of the soil profile can be written as

$$\frac{h}{z} = \frac{qa}{Tb \sin \theta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where \(h\) (m) is the height of the saturated soil above the impermeable layer, \(z\) (m) is the total height of the soil, \(q\) (m/day) is the effective steady-state precipitation, \(a\) (m²) is the upslope drainage area, \(b\) (m) is the grid cell width, \(T\) (m²/day) is the depth-integrated soil transmissivity and \(\theta\) (degrees) is the local slope. For the general (and conservative) case of cohesionless soils, the one-dimensional infinite slope stability model can be expressed as:

$$\rho_s g z \sin \theta \cos \theta = \left( \rho_s - \rho_w \right) z g \cos \theta \tan \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where \(\rho_s\) and \(\rho_w\) are the bulk densities of soil and water, \(z\) is the soil thickness, \(g\) is gravity and \(\phi\) is the soil friction angle. Combining the two above equations we obtain the Shalstab equation in its simplest form:

$$\frac{q}{T} = \frac{h \sin \theta}{a} \left[ \frac{\rho_s - \rho_w}{\rho_s} \left( 1 - \frac{\tan \theta}{\tan \phi} \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

In essence, this model captures the topographic (i.e. area and slope) control on the spatial variability of pore pressures, and expresses the relative potential for shallow landsliding in terms of the ratio of the effective (steady-state) precipitation and the capability of the soil to conduct water, in a spatially explicit fashion. In this simple model, the only parameters are the friction angle \(\phi\), and the (saturated) soil bulk density \(\rho_s\), which we set to values of 45° and 1.7 g/cm³, fairly typical of unconsolidated cohesionless soils.

Two important issues arise in the application of this model. The first is that mostly due to the hydrological simplifications, the model can not be linked to specific storm events. The second is that as mentioned above, this model tends to over-predict the landsliding potential [Dietrich et alii, 2001]. These issues point to the need for a calibration procedure discussed in a following section.

With respect to parallelization, it is important to note that computing the right hand side of equation (3) is a purely local operation: every grid cell has a local slope \(\theta\), and a drainage area \(a\), both already assigned. This is what is referred to as an “embarrassingly parallel operation” [Foster, 1995], as no communication is required between any two cells. The computation of slope is performed on a 3 by 3 neighborhood, using a moving window. Communication in this case is required only when operating at the boundary of a processor’s data domain. Thus, the real challenge for the parallelization of Shalstab lies entirely in the area computation, which is made possible by our new parallel algorithm.

**PARALLEL FRAMEWORK**

We utilize the Unified Parallel C (UPC) language [Carlson, et alii, 1999], an extension of the C language based on the Partitioned Global Address Space (PGAS) parallel programming model. UPC offers programming abstractions similar to shared memory (where any process can read/write data allocated by another process), while allowing control over data layout that is critical to high performance and scalability [Yelick et alii, 2007]. UPC offers the program-
upstream tiles which may not be identifiable a priori. This presents a significant obstacle for parallelization, as it is not possible to determine a partitioning scheme for the grid such that communication and cross-thread dependencies are minimized during this computation. For this reason we develop a new efficient parallel drainage area algorithm.

The grid over which upslope area information must travel to each cell can be viewed as a connected directed graph [Dasgupta et alii, 2006], with the nodes representing the grid cells and with edges representing flow from uphill to downhill neighbours (figure 1). The graph construction procedure comes at no cost, as it can be inserted in the flow direction and partitioning procedure that requires a complete pass over each grid cell. Pointers to nodes which have no incoming edges (corresponding to local maxima in the

DRAINAGE AREA ALGORITHM

Generally, slope stability calculations, when implemented on a grid or a mesh, operate on information (such as topographic attributes) that is assigned to each cell, and thus are trivial to parallelize by using spatial domain decomposition of the (tiled) datasets [Wilkinson & Allen, 1999]. Most of the attributes that may be assigned to each grid cell (for example topographic slope) are also local in nature, requiring information only from pre-defined neighbourhoods of the target cell. Drainage area to a point, a fundamental landscape attribute, is defined as the total basin area above a specific point from which flow can reach such a point. The computation of drainage area is a global operation, as information is needed from all other
relationship between a metric of rainfall and the fraction of unstable grid cells predicted by Shalstab that actually failed in historic storms (equation 1, Stock et al., this volume). This relationship accounts for the effect of rainfall intensity and duration on landslide abundance. They used digital landslide inventories mapped from air photographs taken after storms to construct storm-specific landslide catalogs for two southern California sites (Sunland and Santa Paula) and one northern California site (Montara). In the Santa Paula area they isolated landslides triggered by storms that occurred in 1969, 1998, 2001, and 2005; in the Sunland area they isolated landslides which occurred after storms in 1998 and 2005; in the Montara area they isolated landslides which occurred in 1955, 1982, and 2005.

Nearby rain gages recorded hourly rainfall data for all the storms of interest, with the exception of the 1955 and 1982 Montara storms (which were thus excluded from their study). Using the Santa Paula data as a training dataset, they found that the fraction of unstable cells that actually failed increased as a power law with the maximum 6-hour averaged rainfall intensity (unstable fraction = 0.00001 * $I_{6-hr}^{2.7}$). The 1998 and 2005 Sunland events fell nicely on this curve (figure 6, Stock et al., this volume), suggesting that such a metric could be applied regionally. However, the 2005 Montara event in northern California had more than an order of magnitude lower fraction of unstable cells for similar 6-hour intensities. This points to the need for further region-specific calibration is needed if one wishes to apply such a method state wide.

STORM SIMULATION

Dettinger et al. [in press] simulated an atmospheric river storm (ARStorm) combining data from two of California’s most intense storms on record (January 1969 in southern California and February 1986 in northern California) as initial conditions in a spatially explicit dynamic meteorological model to describe a rapid sequence of several major storms over the state, yielding precipitation totals that go well beyond what actually occurred during the two separate events. They used a General Circulation Model (GCM) that depicts the world’s climate over time at a coarse scale (hundreds of kilometres), coupling it over California with the state-of-the-art Weather Research and Forecast (WRF) model. WRF down-scales weather in a nested fashion down to a 2-km grid size, thus capturing the

**Fig. 3 - Flow chart of processing phase of the drainage area algorithm**

This algorithm is general, in other words it does not depend on the choice of flow partitioning. In our application we implement the multi-direction slope-dependent flow partitioning scheme, in which flow is distributed to all neighbouring downhill cells proportionately to the local slope [Quinn, et alii, 1991].

**STORM INFLUENCE ON LANDSLIDES**

Stock et al. [this volume] found an empirical relationship between a metric of rainfall and the fraction of unstable grid cells predicted by Shalstab that actually failed in historic storms (equation 1, Stock et al., this volume). This relationship accounts for the effect of rainfall intensity and duration on landslide abundance. They used digital landslide inventories mapped from air photographs taken after storms to construct storm-specific landslide catalogs for two southern California sites (Sunland and Santa Paula) and one northern California site (Montara). In the Santa Paula area they isolated landslides triggered by storms that occurred in 1969, 1998, 2001, and 2005; in the Sunland area they isolated landslides which occurred after storms in 1998 and 2005; in the Montara area they isolated landslides which occurred in 1955, 1982, and 2005.

Nearby rain gages recorded hourly rainfall data for all the storms of interest, with the exception of the 1955 and 1982 Montara storms (which were thus excluded from their study). Using the Santa Paula data as a training dataset, they found that the fraction of unstable cells that actually failed increased as a power law with the maximum 6-hour averaged rainfall intensity (unstable fraction = 0.00001 * $I_{6-hr}^{2.7}$). The 1998 and 2005 Sunland events fell nicely on this curve (figure 6, Stock et al., this volume), suggesting that such a metric could be applied regionally. However, the 2005 Montara event in northern California had more than an order of magnitude lower fraction of unstable cells for similar 6-hour intensities. This points to the need for further region-specific calibration is needed if one wishes to apply such a method state wide.
relevant orographic and wind controls on precipitation. They provided hourly rainfall totals on a 2-km grid in southern California, and a 6-km grid over the whole state, effectively simulating the “perfect storm” scenario for the state of California (figure 4).

An example of the seamless drainage area computation resulting from the application of our parallel drainage area algorithm is shown in figure 5. The results of the application of the parallel Shalstab to the State of California are shown in figure 6. They are classified based on their \( q/T \) value (eq. 3), the ratio of effective steady-state precipitation and soil transmissivity required for instability. Two additional classes are also shown, representing areas having too low a gradient (unconditionally stable), and those with too high a gradient (unconditionally unstable). Table 1 illustrates the number of square kilometres and the percent area belonging to each class, for the entire state, reflecting the underlying distributions of steep and convergent areas. The results indicate that landslide susceptibility is generally focused in these steep convergent areas, and that while landslides pose a significant hazard in the state of California, the susceptible areas are a relatively small fraction of the entire landscape. For example, using a \( \log(q/T) \) threshold of -2.8, as suggested by Dietrich et al., 2001 (for 10m data), 5.42% of the landscape would be considered to be susceptible to shallow landsliding. Assuming a soil transmissivity value of 65 m²/day [Montgomery and Dietrich, 1994], a \( \log(q/T) \) threshold of -2.8 threshold would be equivalent to a critical rainfall rate of 103 mm/day.

The regression derived by Stock et al. [this volume], relating the fraction of unstable cells (calculated using our parallel Shalstab run), which may actually fail under the ArkStorm scenario, show that within the areas having similar lithology as the Santa Paula training site, the abundance of landslides under the ArkStorm scenario reflect the abundance of failures observed after the extreme winter storms of 1969.

All values of \( q/T \) above the “unconditionally stable” value were used by Stock et al. [this volume] to
The stock et alii [this volume] findings suggest that a systematic effort be made across the state to collect local rainfall data and map landslide scars for specific storm events and then compute the proportion of failed to predicted cells for a given area. Different slope stability models could be used in such regressions. This approach has the advantage over the now widespread use of intensity-duration precipitation threshold plots for landsliding (e.g. Rossi et alii, 2006; Guzzetti et alii, 2008; Baum & Godt, 2009) in providing estimates of the number of landslides in an area. Given the complex legacy of land use effects, uncertain fire history, and the presently unknown influence of bedrock type (and its tectonic history) there are good reasons to question whether this approach can be successful in general. Nonetheless, such data would prove invaluable in evaluating models and, hopefully, improving hazard prediction. Some simple steps can be taken to explore if improvements can be made in shallow landslide prediction at the state level using more mechanistic models. Data on soil thickness, vegetation cover, soil material properties, and geology (glaciated versus unglaciated) could be used to parameterize models that include root strength. Models that predict parameters such as soil depth (e.g. Dietrich et alii, 1995) could exploit the parallelized framework and possibly improve estimates of the spatial structure of soil depth. Hydrologically dynamic delineate areas likely to fail in the storm. However, experience with Shalstab suggests that, when using 10m data, a log(q/T) threshold value of -2.8 will capture the vast majority of shallow landslide scars [Dietrich et alii, 2001]. Figure 7 shows in red all the area of California that would be potentially unstable using this threshold.

DISCUSSION

Despite its simplicity, the application of Shalstab over the entire state of California at 10 m cell size required the development of a parallelized form of the drainage area determination for each cell. As topographic resolution increases further (from 10 m to 1 m data spacing) through airborne laser mapping, our ability to map landslides will greatly improve, but to make spatially explicit landslide predictions over large areas, parallelization of computation algorithms will be necessary. The largest area that a modern desktop computer can load into memory ranges from 100 km² for 1 m data to 10,000 km² for 10 m data. This implies that larger areas must be processed on a distributed memory architecture. Thus for seamless results over areas such as California, the only alternatives to parallelization are databases which are not practicable in terms of speed. Nevertheless, our scaling tests suggest that if we had 1 m data for all of California, even using all of the 9572 nodes available on Franklin (one of the world’s most powerful computers) would still require several hours for Shalstab to run.

The stock et alii [this volume] findings suggest that a systematic effort be made across the state to collect local rainfall data and map landslide scars for specific storm events and then compute the proportion of failed to predicted cells for a given area. Different slope stability models could be used in such regressions. This approach has the advantage over the now widespread use of intensity-duration precipitation threshold plots for landsliding (e.g. Rossi et alii, 2006; Guzzetti et alii, 2008; Baum & Godt, 2009) in providing estimates of the number of landslides in an area. Given the complex legacy of land use effects, uncertain fire history, and the presently unknown influence of bedrock type (and its tectonic history) there are good reasons to question whether this approach can be successful in general. Nonetheless, such data would prove invaluable in evaluating models and, hopefully, improving hazard prediction. Some simple steps can be taken to explore if improvements can be made in shallow landslide prediction at the state level using more mechanistic models. Data on soil thickness, vegetation cover, soil material properties, and geology (glaciated versus unglaciated) could be used to parameterize models that include root strength. Models that predict parameters such as soil depth (e.g. Dietrich et alii, 1995) could exploit the parallelized framework and possibly improve estimates of the spatial structure of soil depth. Hydrologically dynamic
models which can route water and include the effects of vegetation at the spatial scale of DEM’s (e.g. Wig-mosta et alii 2002) could similarly exploit the parallelized framework and improve the spatial structure of the pore pressure field.

CONCLUSION

Detailed precipitation predictions now available at the large scale allow and invite the assessment of the effects of extreme storm parallel version of Shalstab allow for fast seamless results even when applied to large areas. We applied the algorithms to the state of California (414,000 km²) using 10 m resolution topographic data, but tests show that our application could process in a few hours all of the United States (9,830,000 km²) or all of Europe (10,180,000 km²) with similar data resolution.

To contribute to the USGS ArkStorm emergency preparedness study we ran Shalstab for the entire state. The extent of landsliding for any given storm will be greatly over-predicted by this model. Empirical relationships between the percent of predicted unstable
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