## APPENDIX 1: LITERATURE **REVIEW**

 $\Delta$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

## 'THE EFFECT OF SOIL AND WATER ON SLOPE STABILITY'

Appendix 1: Content page

 $\hat{ }$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

ÿ

# **CONTENT PAGE**





Investigation of land stability at Windermere, Northern Tasmania

# *chapter AI:* **THE EFFECT OF SOIL AND WATER ON SLOPE STABILITY**

#### *Al.llntroduction*

Characterisation of potential regions for slope failure is a complicated and often uncertain process due to the great variety of slope morphologies, slope geology (Gerrard, 1992), and the effect of water on soil moisture and soil properties. Because of the complexity of the slope erosion system, large numbers of slope stability studies have been carried out. Norton and Smith (1930) were amongst the first to recognise an inverse relationship between slope angles and the textural B-horizon; and later identified a correlation between slope and soil structure, texture and consistency.

Technological development has since included improved methods of identifying and describing properties, which influence land stability. Three main factors influence slope stability: 1) gravity and therefore the gradient of the slope; 2) troublesome earth materials and the occurrence of triggering events; and 3) water and the hydrologic characteristics of the slope (Murch et al, 1995). This chapter considers a number of models that have been introduced to make correlations between soil characteristics and slope stability. The effects of water on sediment strength, and of how such changes can be calculated in terms of increasing the likelihood of failure, are also described.

The term 'soil' in this paper is not restricted to the usual definition of the surface layer. Instead, soil means particulate matter including clay, silt, sand or gravel (essentially unconsolidated, or lightly consolidated material, without cement). Terminologies associated with soil mechanics referred to in this paper are defined in table A1.1.





#### *A1.2 Sediment strength*

The nature and extent of forces acting on slopes and the extent of slope stability is influenced by such inter-related variables as geology, slope gradient, climate, vegetation, hydrological characteristics and time (Murch et al., 1995). Although slopes often appear stable and static, they are in fact, active parts of the dynamic, evolving pattern of landscape formation (Keller, 1992). Slope stability is commonly expressed by equations involving the critical shear stress required for movement and the angle of response (Ulrich, 1987). As illustrated in figure A.l.1 (Lowe, 1966), steep slopes are generally more prone to failure than flat slopes due to the topographically induced gravitational shear strength. Two opposing forces act on a body at rest on a slope: shear stress and shear strength (Murch et al., 1995). In general, steepening slope gradients reduce the shear strength by changes in cohesion, pore pressure and normal stress, thus allowing the body to move (Carson and Kirby, 1972).

#### A1.2.1 Shear stress

)

D

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

The stress that controls changes in the volume and the strength of soil is known as the effective stress. When a load is applied to a saturated soil it will be carried by the water in Appendix I: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

the soil voids (causing an increase in pore water pressure) or by the soil skeleton in the form of grain to grain contact (Smith, 1971). Thus, stress is a function of particle friction and weight (mass x gravity).



**Figure Al.l: The force acting on a typical sliding** mass. **For equilibrium to be reached force such as Er and El must be equal, P must equal and oppose the weight force (W). The tangential component T, of the weight force W, must resist the developed shear strength, Sd. Where**  $\phi$ **is the angle of internal friction and i is the slope. (Source: Lowe, 1966)** 

#### **A1.2.2 Shear strength**

 $\lambda$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

 $\mathcal{I}$ 

Shear strength is the internal resistance of soils to movement (Murch et al., 1995). Resistance to shear is made up of two parts: particle friction and cohesion. Frictional resistance varies with the level of normal stress applied on the shear plane, whereas cohesive resistance is assumed to be independent of the applied stress, ie it is a constant value (Smith, 1971). The strength envelope of a soil can be expressed by the Mohrcoulomb equation:

### 't = c + **cr tan<!>** . equation 1

 $\tau$  is the shear stress at failure,  $\sigma$  is the normal stress on the shear plane, c the cohesion and  $\phi$  is the angle of internal friction (Bryant, 1993). This equation states that shear stress will equal cohesion when no normal stress is acting on the shear plane. If shear strength Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

exceeds shear stress, movement will not occur. If failure has occurred previously, the shear strength will be reduced resulting in residual strength, not peak strength.

### A1.2.2.1 Cohesive soils

')

 $\mathcal{E}$ 

)

 $\cdot$ 

Cohesive soils exhibit inter-particle attraction and possess inherent strength due to surface tension of capillary water. Most cohesive soils contain about 10 % or more of clay particles (Hail, 1977). Differences between the properties of cohesive clays and noncohesive soils  $\ll 10\%$  clay) are outlined in Table A1.2. The level of compaction of cohesive soils is important, because slightly compressed soils (normally consolidated) have a high water content.

In contrast, highly compressed clays (over-consolidated clays) have much lower water carrying capacities. The compaction process gives stability to materials on slopes (Bryant, 1993). The friction angle for cohesionless soils increases by 6 to 8 ° from loose to dense particle arrangements (Bell, 1992). Differences between clays in these two states are often paralleled by being present with non-cohesive soils in their loose and dense states respectively (Keller, 1992). The sediment strength of cohesive soils figure Al.3 is much less then that of gravel and sand soils, due to Vander Waal-type bonding (Bryant, 1993). Therefore the angle at which the sediment are stable is much lower. This angle is known as the angle of response (Murch et al., 1995)

### A1.2.2.2 Frictional Forces

Frictional forces resist shear stress and contribute to sediment strength, through the interaction of individual grains within the sediments (Montgomery, 1997). Frictional resistance is a function of density, size and shape of sediment particles, combined with the level of particle compaction (Keller, 1992). Since most soils are mixtures of coarse and fine-grained particles, soil strength is usually the result of both cohesion and internal friction.

### Table A1.2.1: Selected engineering properties of soils



Source: Keller, 1992; Smith, 1968; Mitchell, 1976; Smith, 1968.

#### Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

### **A 1.2.3 Soil Types**

 $\tilde{\phantom{0}}$ 

€

Ĵ

In general each soil type exhibits different properties and can be divided into four main groupings according to structure and composition: (1) gravels, (2) silts, (3) sands and (4) clays (see figure A1.2).

Coarse grained granular soils and, to some degree sands lack cohesion and rely on densely packed interlocking grains to create frictional resistance at the grain contacts. This results in a large  $\phi$  value, when compared to clay rich soils, thus giving high strength. The presence of water in the voids of granular soil does not usually produce significant changes in the value of internal friction. However, if pressures develop in the pore water there may be changes in the effective stresses between particles, and shear strength may be reduced. If the pore water can readily drain from the soil mass during the application of stress, granular material behaves as it does when dry.

Young (1972) noted that the friction angle for pure clay is as low as 5°, but increases with the inclusion of coarser grained particles. Soils composed primarily of gravels may be stable at angles as great as 15°, providing the matrix is not made up of clay. Even the largest friction angle for clay minerals is much less than those for cohesionless soils, which are generally in the range of 10 to 15 degrees (Mitchell, 1976). Consolidated rocks have much greater friction angles, e.g. sandstone >21°.

However, the mineral and particle size distribution in itself is only part of the equation. As shown in figure A1.2, other essential properties are the liquid limit and the plastic (Atterberg) limit. In general, the greater the quantities of clay minerals in soil, the higher the plasticity, and the greater the potential for shrinkage and swell. The lower the porosity the higher the compressibility, the higher the cohesion and the lower the angle of internal friction. These properties are exhibited, primarily, because water is strongly attracted to clay mineral surfaces and promotes plasticity: whereas the non-clay minerals have little affmity for water and do not develop significant plasticity, even in a fine grained form. It is probable, therefore, that most soil water is associated with the clay phase (Smith, 1971 ).

#### Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

 $\tilde{ }$ )

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

ŷ

The liquid limit is the moisture content of a soil; above which it behaves as a fluid and below which it behaves as a plastic. The Atterberg limit defines the plastic limit of clay below which, at the shrinkage limit it becomes fragmented and crumbly. The characteristic positions of organic, inorganic silts and clays, with reference to the level of activity (A line) figure A1.2 have been well established (Mitchell, 1976). Activity is a measure of soil susceptibility to changes in exchangeable cations and pore fluid composition.



Figure A1.2: Atterberg Plasticity Chart (Source: Mitchell, 1976)

 $\overline{7}$ 

### *Al.3: The effect of water on soil strength*

)

 $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ 

Water is present in most rocks and sediments near the Earth's surface, and strongly influences the effective stress states of soils (Iverson & Major, 1987). Soil strength is generally reduced by water content and can result in slope instability (figure Al.3). Marshall et al. ( 1996) proposed that cohesion is weakened as water content is adsorbed into the soil structure. However, increasing the water content changes the load and the gravity component may be more important.



Figure A1.3: Effects of water content on the cohesive strength of soil (source: Marshall et al., 1996).

The addition of small quantities of water to dry (unsaturated) soils increases adhesion and the soils become plastic due to the presence of moisture films between grains (Montgomery, 1997). Thus shear strength, due to chemical bonding (Van der Waals bonds), is greater than shear stress. In contrast, the saturation of soils decreases shear strength due to particles losing contact, because of increases in pore pressure (Keller, 1992; Terlien, 1997), and hence loss of sediment strength. Slope failure may also occur under self-weight, if sediments are saturated.

Appendix l: The effect of soil and water on slope stability





#### A1.3.2 Adsorption by soils

 $\mathcal{E}$ 

Ĩ)

Ĵ.

A substantial amount of movement is associated with the expansion and contraction of soils as the result of adsorption (Young, 1972). Adsorption in this context is the process of taking up water at the surface of soil particles, thereby changing their effective volumes. Such volume changes are caused by chemical attraction and addition of water layers into the chemical structure of sediments (Keller, 1992). This process is particularly common in clay rich sediment, where water molecules are inserted between submicroscopic clay plates that have high plasticity indices as illustrated in figure AL5 (Murch et al., 1995). Sediment expansion due to water drastically reduces the shear strength of soils, and often contributes to slope movement.

Ć

Ĵ.



## Figure Al.S: Diagram illustrating the expansive nature of clays (Murch et al., 1995).

Thomas, in 1928, demonstrated that the type of clay mineral was also an influencing factor (in Marshall et al., 1996). Montmorillonite is the most expansive clay mineral due to its expanding crystal lattice, which adsorbs more water at a given value of  $e/e_0$ , expanding by as much as 15 times its original volume (Keller, 1992). In contrast, kaolinite has relatively large crystals and thus a smaller surface area available for adsorption. Illite has similar crystal dimensions to montmorillinite, but does not exhibit the expanding lattice, and has been categorised between montmorillinite and kaolinite in terms of adsorption potential (Marshall et al, 1996). The bonds between the adjacent silicate layers of illite are affected by the potassium ions, thus resulting in greater strength and tighter packing (Smith, 1971). These effects of clay properties on adsorption are illustrated in figure A1.6.

The transition from open to compact arrangements causes a sudden loss in residual shear strength: montmorillonite has the lowest value ( $\phi_R = 5$ ), illite ( $\phi_R = 10$ ) and kaolinite the highest value ( $\phi_R = 15$ ) (Walker & Fell, 1987). The values for  $\phi_R$  are generally related to particle shape and inter-particle bonding hence, the  $\phi_R$  angle decreases with increasing liquid limits. However, not all clays have plate like structures, amorphous clay minerals have granular structures which lead to much higher residual friction angles; commonly greater than 25 $\degree$  (Walker & Fell, 1987).

Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability



Figure A1.6: Adsorption of water vapour by different clays (Source Marshal et al., 1996).

#### A1.3.3 Hydro-compaction of soils

A decrease in the volume of expansive clays (drying out) is referred to as hydrocompaction. This occurs when water is removed from the soil structure, leaving behind a porous medium. At low water contents, ionic hydration can be a strong force which tends to separate particles (Graham, 1964). Defmite cracks are formed in the soil during the contracting phase (Barlow & Newton, 1975). In general, the swelling and shrinkage properties of clay minerals follow the same pattern as their plasticity properties. The more plastic the mineral the greater the potential for swell and shrinkage.

The obvious mechanism for this process is the presence of expanding clays under the influence of seasonal inequalities in rainfall. Each time expansion takes place, the soil tends to be pushed outwards at right angles to the slope, and the soil mass is weakened. On shrinkage, the soil settles back into its original state, but tends to be moved down slope by gravity. Creep rates are generally proportional to the sine of the angle of the slope (Graham, 1964). It has been suggested, however, that expansion and contraction does not always occur normal to the slope because up slope movements have been noted in practical experiments. Such changes in water content change the load of the soil on a slope: saturated soil, by weight alone may cause slope failure due to the increase of shear stress.

#### Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

When a layer of soil is loaded, some of the pore water is expelled from its voids, moving away from the region of high stress (hydrostatic gradients are created by the load). Terzaghi (1943) showed a relationship between the unit load and the void ratio for a sediment by plotting the void ratio, e, against the logarithm of the unit load, p (Bell, 1992). The shape of the resultant curve indicates the stress history of the sediment. The curve is linear for normally consolidated clays and curved for over-consolidated clays. Over-consolidated clays are considerably less compressible than normally consolidated clays.

### **Liquefaction**

 The transformation of sediments from solid to liquid state is called liquefaction (Murch et aI., 1995). The point at which transition takes place from a solid to a liquid state is called the liquid limit and is dependent on sediment characteristics, as illustrated in figure AI.7. Materials with high liquid limits, such as clay, remain plastic over a broad range of water content. The strength or shear resistance of the soil at the base of a slide is largely determined by the angle of slope down which sliding may occur (Hail, 1977).

Hutchinson (1968) noted that loss of shear strength due to high water-soil ratios leads mass transport, not mass movement because the soil particles are contained within stream flow and not in contact with other soil particles. As sediment concentrations increase progressively from a viscose to a plastic flow, the liquidity index falls well below the liquid limit.

The process of soil liquefaction results in changes to granular soil assemblages, due to the disturbance of the internal structure of soil by water. By converting the soil into a flowing fluid mass there is no minimum angle for flow (Murch et al., 1995). Liquefaction results in sediments flowing rather than sliding along a failure surface (Iverson & Major, 1996). Static liquefaction conditions are expressed as:  $z = \cos[(\lambda + \phi) + (\theta - \phi)] = 1$ . Hydraulic gradients greater than 2 are generally required to cause liquefaction, which cannot take place if water does not move towards the surface (Iverson & Major, 1986).

J

Ù

Appendix I: The effect of soil and water on slope stability



Figure Al.7: Consistency state and shrinkage stage of remoulding soil illustrated by values appropriate to soil high in clay content. (Source: Marshall et al., 1996).

#### Al.3.5 Mathematical modelling for slope failure

)

€

J.

)

Various analytical techniques exist for assessing slope stability. The reliability and quantity of the soil data, knowledge of the slope geology and the consequence of failure (Walker & Fell, 1987) should always govern selection of particular method for analysis. Analytical results are usually presented in the form of safety factors, where the safety factor is the relationship between the ratio of shear resistance to shear force (Young, 1972). Examples of the most widely used methods for predicting slope failures, and assessing risk are outlined in table Al.4.

Two principal methods are used to measure the shearing resistance of soils: (a) direct shear tests and (b) the triaxial test. The triaxial test is the most common means of obtaining the shear strength parameters, c' and  $\phi'$  (Walker & Fell, 1987). It involves subjecting a cylindrical soil sample contained within a rubber membrane to an axial load while confined laterally by water or air at a pressure  $(\sigma_3)$ . The load is increased until the soil fails at an axial stress  $(\sigma_1)$  (Marshall et al., 1996). Illustrated in figure A1.8, when equilibrium is reached a Mohr circle can be drawn through the two points (Habibi, 1983).

Appendix I: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

The envelope of Mohr's circles is the curve, which in soils, is the Coulomb's line, defmed by Huorslev's Law for cohesive soils:  $\tau = c' + (\sigma_n - u) \tan \phi'$ : in cohesionless soils, this curve is rectilinear.

### Table 1.4: Types of stability analysis

Ć





Figure Al.8: Method of obtaining the failure envelop from. measurements by triaxial compression. (Source: Walker & Fell, 1987)

Studies by Henkel and Skempton (1955) and Skempton (1964) appeared to demonstrate the accuracy of the infInite slope method where a slide is long compared with its depth. (Hail, 1976). However, more recent works (eg Hutchinson, 1967 and Hail, 1976) suggest that field and laboratory correlations by Skempton were fortuitous, because pore water pressure must be measured at the surface using piezometers. With tips carefully located on the base of the slide, and not estimated from observations of the level of standing water borings. Furthermore, the rings shear apparatus (Bishop et al., 1971) is thought to provide lower residual strength measurements than would be obtained from limited displacement of direct shear apparatus. The triaxial compression method (Marshall et aI., 1996) is a more accurate technique.

Accurate and reliable predictions of stability cannot always be made on the basis of limiting equilibrium studies. The concept of limit equilibrium is not fundamental to phenomena concerning stability, but is only a device for determining the safety factors for a soil or rock mass. The state of critical or limiting equilibrium should not be confused with the concept of limiting equilibrium.

#### Al.3.S.l Application to shallow and deep landslides

Reid (1994) found a direct correlation between brief periods of rainfall and shallow landslides. Deeper landslides were triggered by prolonged rainfall (> 200mm in 25 days);

 $\supset$ 

#### Appendix I: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

)

-1

this was later supported by Terlien (1997). Reid (1994) also noted that large rainstorms induced a wide range of slope movements, such as creep and solifuction movements, that do not require inclined slopes for movement (Kirkby, 1967; Reid, 1994). According to the principal of effective stress, landsliding may occur in response to locally elevated pore pressure along the failure surface. Prior to Terlien's investigation, such links between rainfall and landsliding were based upon statistical correlations or empirically fitted models which were limited by available data.

In the case of deep landslides on slopes possessing appreciable cohesion there is no single angle of stability, but a height angle relation as in the upper curve of figure A1.8. In general, for a given geology and climatic conditions, surface landslides occur on gentler slopes than deep landslides (Terlien, 1997). Two explanations have been proposed for the lower limiting angles for surface landslides: (1) the observed limiting angle for claydominated soils; this generally corresponds with stability conditions calculated by using the residual shear strength; (2) The relationship of deep slides to peak strength (Hutchinson, 1967), unless a deep failure had occurred previously. However, this explanation does not apply to soils that are made up of large portions of sand, gravel or stones. These soil types exhibit only small differences between peak and residual shearing strength. Equation 9 (from the infmite stability model) can be applied to shallow slides, provided that the angle of the failure plane is approximately equal to the slope of the ground surface.

During the early to mid 1980's, quantitative analytical processes were introduced to study the role of recharging ground water flow on the destabilising of slopes. Leach & Herbert (1982), Kenney & Lau (1984), and Reid and others (1985) focused attention on shortterm fluctuations in the water table that may cause abrupt failures in static slopes (Hanegerg, 1991). Terlien (1997) later followed up such investigations to reach four main conclusions. Firstly, positive pressure heads are not capable of triggering landslides, but failed slopes are often located in such areas. Secondly, depths of failure depend on the geotechnical properties of the silt/sand content of the soil and the slope angle. Thirdly, failure will occur only when the soil becomes saturated from the surface to the depth of

### Appendix 1: The effect of soil and water on slope stability

the potential slip surface (Terlien, 1996). Fourthly, the depth of saturation is dependent upon soil profile, the vertical soil moisture distribution prior to intense rainfall and the amount and intensity of rainfall. Terlien also recognised that perched water tables act as triggering mechanisms for landslides, where water is in contact with potential failure ...... surfaces, thereby reducing frictional strength.

### A1.3.6 Problems associated with water models

 $\bigg)$ 

The first simplifying assumption made by Terzaghi in the 1950's is that slope failures are initiated, primarily, by water infIltration into hill slopes. However, although such infiltrations result in increased pore water pressure within the slope material, before pore pressure can be increased, capillary pores must be full of water and have sufficient volume to counteract soil suction (negative pore pressure).

The second assumption was that, for any given slope, a critical level of pore water pressure  $(u_{wc})$  acting on a slope exists where the potential failure surface develops (Keefer et al., 1987). This assumed that the failure surface and piezometric surfaces are parallel to the ground surface, which is rarely the case.

A third assumption that there is no surficial run-off (i.e. that all rain falling onto the slope infIltrates), at least initially into a saturated plane above the potential failure plane. However, the total rate of drainage is proportional to the thickness of the saturated zone (Keller et al, 1987) and care must be exercised, however, when using the infmite slope model. The magnitude of  $\phi'_r$  is often different in laboratory and field experiments, and appears to fall as the normal stresses increase. This occurs because the residual strength failure line is in fact a curve, and not straight. This is of fundamental importance on clay slopes, where landsliding occurs deep into the slope and the range of normal stress is large due to the amount of overlying sediments, so that a unique value of  $\phi'_r$  will not apply. In this case large rather than minor landslides will move on flatter slopes.

#### *Al,4 Conclusion*

•

 $\,$ 

The stability of slope surfaces is dependent upon the factors affecting the slip surface. This conclusion appears to be dependant upon: strength parameters  $(c', \phi')$  of the slope material; the height and inclination of the slope, the density of the slope material (which determines  $\sigma_n$ ) and the distribution of pore water on the slope.

> The models discussed in this literature review are constrained, primarily, by the number and variety of assumptions made by various authors to simplify the equations. However, while they provide locally practical and reasonably realistic data for calculating angles of response for particular soils, on a regional scale such generalisations are not without risk. No two-soil types are exactly the same and, the potential for failure must always be examined closely on a local scale.

o Soil mechanics technology applied to the study of slopes is concerned primarily with processes that lead to slope failure by landsliding and with the stability analysis of the failure. However, much remains to be discovered before the degree of stability of any previously stable slope can be accurately predicted in either its natural state or after modification by natural or artificial processes.

## **APPENDIX 2: CLIMATIC RECORDS**

٠,

 $\bigl)$ 

 $\big)$ 

## **BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY, ACACIA HOUSE**

Rainfall data obtained from Acacia House and Temperature data from Tea Tree Bend (Launceston)

 $\bar{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\,$ 



### **Table A2.1:** Table illustrating the total monthly precipitation (mm) for the Windermere area (top no.) and the number of rain days (bottom no.)

### Appendix 2: Climatic records

### **Table A2.! continued**

)

Ĵ



I

### Table A2.1 continued





 $\cdot$ 

Geological investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

 $\gamma$ 

Appendix 2: Climatic records

 $\sim$ 

Table A2.3: Maximum and minimum temperature range for the Launceston area, including long term averages

### Maximum Temperature from 9am (°C)

### Minimum Temperature to 9am (°C).



 $\sim$  $\frac{1}{M}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\smile$ 

Appendix 2: Climatic records

Table A2.2: Daily amount of precipitation in the Windermere area during 1998

 $\mathbb{C}$ 

### Precipitation to 9am (mm)

### Period over which Precipitation has accumulated (days)



---

 $\cup$ 

## APPENDIX 3: GRID METHOD RESULTS

Dates of measuring:

-)

 $\mathcal{C}$ 

2

- 1) 23<sup>rd</sup> April 1998 2)  $8^{\text{th}}$  June 1998 3) 11<sup>th</sup> July 1998
- 4) 29<sup>th</sup> August 1998

The method by which this data was derived is outlined in section 6.3

Appendix 3: Recording 1: 23rd April 1998

 $\left\langle \right\rangle$ 

 $\, )$ 

 $\dot{\mathcal{I}}$ 







### Appendix 3: Recording 2: 8th June 1998



*Geological investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania* 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\mathsf I$ 

 $\hat{\phantom{a}}$ 

### Appendix 3: Recording 2: 8th June 1998



 $\bar{t}$ 

 $\,$   $\,$ 



 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 



*Geological investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere. northern Tasmania* 

 $\cdot$ 

### Appendix 3: recording 4: 29th August a998

 $\mathfrak{z}$ 

 $\hat{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\big)$ 

 $\overline{D}$ 



 $\hat{J}$ 



## **APPENDIX 4: LANDSLIDE CLASS GUIDELINES**

The following document is the official classification for landslip risk zoning in the Launceston area, obtained from Mineral Resources Tasmania

### **LANDSLIP RISK ZONING - LAUNCESTON AREA 1996**

The landslip risk zoning is a revision of the zoning undertaken for the Launceston area in 1974 by the Department of Mines. The earlier surve' extended over the whole Tamar region of some 800km<sup>2</sup>, whereas the newe version is derived from a detailed study of about 145km2 and covers the Greate: Launceston area and surrounding land.

The classification closely follows the former system of zonation. The availability of more accurate base maps, combined with the collection of more detaile( surface and subsurface geological information, has made it possible to refine the accuracy of the zoning over that produced previously. Even so, the zoning is stil relatively broad scale in nature, but it should give a good indication of the landslip risk in most areas. Locations on or near the zone boundaries may need more precise determination by field inspection for particular developments in some cases. The zoning is advisory in nature.

As with the former survey, five classes have been used in the zonation system Subclasses have been introduced in Classes  $\Pi$  and  $\Pi$  on the latest maps Additional information may be obtained by reading the land stability zonation maps in conjunction with examination of contour information and the detaile( geological and engineering geological maps. The classes are arranged in increasing order of risk in a general sense from Class I to Class V.

### **Class I** - *Generally stable ground on 'hard'*, *weathered 'hard' rocks.*

This zone comprises areas underlain by Tertiary basalt, Jurassic dolerite and Triassic and Permian sandstone, siltstone and mudstone. Of these dolerite is far the most common in the Launceston area.

These rocks have been subject to weathering resulting in variable depths of soil loose rock and weathered rock overlying hard *in situ* rock. Where the depth o weathering is shallow, i.e. in place competent rock is, say, less than one metre from the surface, the risk of landslip is regarded as very low. In areas where weathering is deeper, the risk of landslip on sloping land may be a little greate: under some circumstances, but is still generally low. Areas with known thicke: weathering profiles on these rocks (usually dolerite) have been placed in Classe: Il and III depending on slope angle.

Occasional small areas with deep weathering will not have been identifie< during the mapping process and such areas will have been placed in Class I Steep land with loose boulders or jointed cliff faces may present hazards fron rolling boulders or rock falls.

Appendix 4: Landslide class guidelines

,

)

-)

Areas underlain by these rocks are regarded as generally having very low landslip risk. Steeper sloping areas should be examined to assess depth of weathering and hazards from boulders and rock falls. If deeply weathered zones are located in such areas they should be treated as Classes II and III, depending on slope angle. Very rarely a higher zone may be considered.

Developments in steeper areas should follow good hillside development practices.

**Class 11 -** *Generally stable ground on 'soft' rocks, deep soil on 'hard' rocks (11a), selected reclaimed areas* (lIb), *all on slopes* < *7°.* 

This class comprises land underlain by relatively unconsolidated units of Quaternary age, other more consolidated but poorly indurated units of Quaternary to Tertiary age, deeply weathered hard rock areas and selected manmade fill areas.

The lowest angle on which a landslide is known to have occurred in recent times in the Tamar area is 7°. As a result, land underlain by the above materials with slopes of less than 7° is regarded as generally stable. This conclusion appears to be valid for undeveloped land with a low slope angle where there are no signs of previous landslips visible and for well managed developed' land of a similar nature where there is an absence of excessive loading.

The 7° slope angle has been determined using maps with a five metre contour interval and because of this interval, small errors may occur on the zonation maps where steeper slopes of less than 5 metres in height are present. These errors are likely to be rare, as in cases where such slopes are known to occur from field, observation or air photo interpretation, the land has been assigned to ' the appropriate zonation class. Small areas of land with a slope of <7° that could be affected by landslips on adjacent steeper slopes have been placed in a higher class.

Although Quaternary estuarine and alluvial deposits of the Tamar and North Esk river valleys have been classified as Class II, narrow zones adjacent to water bodies may be prone to landslip into those water bodies at some locations. Some of these deposits and some selected reclaimed areas (llb) could be subject to significant settlement under load.

### Recommendation

Landslip risk for this class is regarded as low. Excessive loading or deep excavation, combined with poor drainage practices, could induce unstable conditions under some circumstances. Some attention should be given to these factors when development is proposed. Strict adherence to building codes is recommended.

Geological investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

**Class III -** *Potential landslip areas on 'soft'rocks, deep soil overlying 'hard' rock (IIIa)* (slopes in both cases  $\geq$  7°).dolerite gravel areas on slopes 7-10° *(IIIb)*, *dolerite gravel areas on slopes> 10° (lIIc).* 

This class is comprised largely of land underlain by similar material to that underlying Class II areas, but with a greater slope angle. The land in this class exhibits no obvious signs of past movement, but because of the slope angle, there is some potential for landslip to develop under some circumstances. Excavation and placement of fill may have obliterated old landslip features in some of the developed areas that have been placed in this class, but this is not expected to be common.

There is a range of risk in this zone. The limited amount of subsurface information does not allow more subdivision into subclasses than indicated. A small section of flatter land above and below the steeper slopes has been included in this class to act as a buffer.

The landslip risk for Class IIIb (dolerite gravel on slopes  $7^\circ$ -10 $^\circ$ ) is regarded as low. The risk for IIIa (deep soil overlying 'hard' rock) and IIIc (dolerite gravel on slopes  $> 10^{\circ}$ ) is regarded as similar to the remainder of Class III.

### Recommendation

 $\vdash$   $\supset$ 

Ć

It is recommended that a land stability assessment for land in this zone be undertaken before development proceeds. This assessment will often involve a field inspection and sometimes subsurface investigations and should be undertaken by a competent geotechnical practitioner. In many Class III areas it is expected that land in this class will be suitable to develop, provided some precautions are taken and these should be outlined in a specific site report that deals with the development of the land. These precautions will usually relate to factors such as siting of the development, excavations, drainage and vegetation removal.

### **Class IV -** *Old landslip and adjacent areas.*

Land in this class shows signs of definite and probable old landslip movements with no apparent movement in recent times, i.e. there are no landslip related cracks or bare soil associated with landslip visible and long term residents are unaware of movement. As well, some adjacent land with similar conditions (e.g. geology and slope angle) has been included in this class.

## **APPENDIX 5: DRILL CORE LOGS**

 $\tilde{z}$ 

 $\rangle$ 

Specific locations are illustrated in figure 3.1

Data has been derived from previous data and drill and auger hole logging

Chapter 4: Previous Work

<b>Drill core</b>	<b>Depth</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Moisture</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Reference</b>
no.	(m)		content	symbol	
$\overline{P1}$	$\mathbf{0}$	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	0.305	Talus of hard angular basalt boulders in basalt clay matrix, became hard to			
		dig at 1.9m.			
P <sub>2</sub>	$\mathbf{0}$	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	< 0.305	Weathered basalt talus with some hard boulders, too hard to dig at 3.05 m.			
P <sub>3</sub>	0	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	0.305	Talus of weathered basalt, mainly clay with a few basalt boulders at 3.3m			
<b>P4</b>	$\Omega$	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	$0.3 - 0.6$	Brown plastic clay			
	>0.6	Deeply weathered basalt talus with occasional boulders to 2.9m becoming			
		difficult to dig.			
P <sub>5</sub>	0	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	.30	Brown sandy clay			
	.60	Weathered basalt talus becoming too hard to dig at 2.7m			
<b>P6</b>	$\bf{0}$	Top soil	Unknown		Leaman & Stevenson, 1972
	.3	Brown sand			
	$\cdot$ .9	Weathered basalt talus passing into fresh basalt rubble at 2.7m.			
P7	$0 - 0.2$	Dark brown, dry and fractured silty clay soil, some basalt boulders			Stevenson, 1973
	$0.2 - 0.5$	Porous silty and pisolitic (iron oxide) soil			
	$0.5 - 2.3$	Mixture of plastic clay and basalt boulders, some basalt weathered some			
		unweathered.			
	$2.3 - 3.2$	Light grey-brown medium hard plastic clay, fissured with shiny surfaces			
P8	$0 - 0.6$	Dark brown clay and basalt boulders grading into dark brown soil.		CH	Stevenson, 1973
	$0.6 - 1.5$	Light brown clay with basalt boulders.			
	$1.5 - 1.8$	On north side of pit grey silty clay; a thin fine, even-grained quartz sand			
		beds; some wood fragments. Zones of clay extending into basalt boulder			
		zone. Other parts of pit consist of clay and basalt boulders which proved			
		too difficult to excavate.			
P <sub>9</sub>	$0 - 0.3$	Dark brown soil and sandy silty clay, dry and fractured.			Stevenson, 1973
	$0.3 - 1.8$	Hard brown plastic clay and basalt boulders. Towards bottom light grey			
		and brown mottled silty and sandy clay with plastic clay and basalt			
		boulders intermixed. Unable to dig any deeper.			
P <sub>10</sub>	$0 - 0.8$	Dark brown to black silty clay, dry and fractured, a few small basalt			Stevenson, 1973
		fragments.			





 $\sim$ 





### Chapter 4: Previous Work



 $\bar{)}$ 

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ 

 $\cdot$ 





ÿ

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\hat{D}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\big)$ 



 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ 





Geological Investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

 $\mathcal{I}$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 



Geological Investigation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

 $\bigcup$ 



 $\bigcirc$ 



 $\bar{z}$ 

## **APPENDIX 6: CLAY ANALYSIS**

 $\tilde{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\cdot$ 

 $\tilde{C}$ 

## **COMPLETED BY MINERAL RESOURCES TASMANIA**

### **MINERAL RESOURCES TASMANIA**

### **Client:** R. Macdonald **Sample Location:** Windermere

#### **Soil Mechanics Testing Whole Sample X-Ray Diffraction Analyses (Approx. Wt. %)**



Atterberg Limits tests performed without pre-drying samples Minerals present in trace amounts, or amorphous minerals, may not be detected ECN = Emerson Class Number Peak overlap may interfere with identifications (e.g. K-Feldspar may mask the LL =Liquid Limit presence of Rutile; Goethite may mask the presence of Hematite; large PL = Plastic Limit contracts amounts of Kaolinite may mask the presence of small amounts of Ilmenite) LS =Linear Shrinkage Major Goethite peak in S41 and S42 occurs at 4.17A-4.16A (normal Goethite  $\varnothing$ ' = Residual Angle of Internal Friction  $\varnothing$  + 4.183Å) - may indicate some replacement of Fe by AI c' =Residual Cohesion Smectite content in S11 and S22 rounded-down to 10% Smectite content in S23, S24, S25 rounded-up to 10% Smectite content in S26 rounded-up to 15%

KhWoolly

**Analyst:** Richie N. Woolley **Date:** 24 September 1998



 $\sim 10^4$ 

 $\smile$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{I}}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\bar{\nabla}$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, \mathrm{d} \mu \, \mathrm$ 

## **APPENDIX 7: OVERVIEW OF SHEAR BOX TESTS**

### **The shear box test**

Ď

(.,

The test consists of a brass box, split horizontally at the centre of the soil specimen (illustrated in figure A7.1), where the soil is gripped by metal grilles. A vertical load is applied to the top of the sample by means of weights. As the shear plane is predominately in the horizontal direction the vertical load is also the normal load on the plane of failure. Having applied the required vertical load a shearing force is gradually exerted on the box, usually from a proving ring – annular steel ring that has been carefully machined and balanced. When a load is applied to such a ring a deflection will take place that can be measured on a dial gauge, enabling the causative force to be obtained from the ring calibration supplied by the manufacturer.



**Figure A7.1: Diagrammatic sketch** of the **shear box apparatus** 

A second dial gangue (fixed to the shear box) is used to determine the strain of the test sample. At any point during the shear, the proving ring reading is taken at fixed strain intervals (strain = movement of box / length of box) and failure of the soil specimen is indicated by a sudden drop in the magnitude of the proving ring reading or a levelling off in successive readings.

Geological interpretation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

Appendix 7: Shear box tests

1-

 $\hat{A}$ 

 $\big)$ 



**Figure A7.2 illustrates the soil classification according to the shear strength of sediments.** 

## **APPENDIX 8: DESCRIPTIONS** OF SLOPE **STABILITY MODELS USED**

)

 $\tilde{z}$ 

 $\tilde{\tilde{A}}$ 

Bishop's Simplified Method

Cousin's Method of Tables

Galena

### Bishop's Simplified Method

Bishop's Simplified Method is a simplistic means of calculating the stability of slopes, in terms if the factor of safety (Fs). The model uses a number of in parameters (equation A8.1), which are applied to circular slip failure planes. This model is renown for producing realistic results and it is relatively easy to calculate.

Fs =L{[c'b + W (l-r) tanep'] (l/m)}! *LW* sina. ...•...•...••.•...••.•.••.••.•..equation AS.l

Where,

)

D

- r pore pressure  $\tau$  - Shear stress  $\phi'$  - Residual angle of internal friction  $c$  – Cohesion
	- $W$  sediment weight
	- $\alpha$  angle between the slope and the normal

### Cousins Stability Charts

Cousins through extensive computer analysis has identified that specific average pore pressure ratios relate to a slope angle, I, and a stability number, Nf, where  $r = Y/Wh$ . This method depicts the relationship between slope angle and the co-ordinates of the critical slip circle for a number of pore pressure ratios. Such a relationship can be derived from the tables illustrated in figure A8.1, providing the correct input parameters are available. From this the stability number or factor of safety can be derived.

Geological interpretation and slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania

"





### Galena Slope Stability Analysis System

Galena is a computerised slope stability-modelling package, which incorporates three methods of calculating slope stability, Bishop's Simplified Method, Spenser-Wrigth and Samara Method. The model used is depends on the type of failure plane, i.e. if failure is circular or non circular. This model is user friendly and produces results rapidly. The model enables failure surface to be defined in terms of the actual slope rather than as abstract point in space (Galena, 1998).

## **APPENDIX 9: ROCK CATELOGUE**

 $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ 

 $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ 



Ň,

### Geological investication, slope risk assessment at Windermere, northern Tasmania Honours 1998

 $\zeta_{\mu\nu}$ 

ني



ो

## **REFERENCES**

Barlow, M.H. & Newton, R.G. (1975), *Patterns and processes in man's physical environment,* McGraw-Hill, Sydney, 250 p.

Baillie et.al. (1987), *Late Cambrian to Devonian:* In Burrett, C.F. and Martin EL. (eds), Geology and Mineral Resources of Tasmania, Geological Society of Australia, Special Pub 15.

- Bell, F.G. (1992), *Engineering properties of soils and rocks*, third ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, 345p.
- Berkman, D.A. (1976), *Field Geologists Manual,* The Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy Australia, 295pp.
- Blatt et. al. (1980), *Origin of sedimentary rocks*, Prentice Hall Inc., New Jersey, 783p.
- Bryant, EA. (1993), *Natural Hazards,* Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 236- 256.
- <sup>2</sup> Bureau of Meteorology (1998), *Climatic records, Acacia House*, Commonwealth of Australia, Bureau of Meteorology.
	- Burrough, P.A. (1986), Principals of geographic information systems for land resource assessments, *Monographs on Soil and Resources Survey,* 12, 194p.
	- Carson, M. & Kirby M. (1972), *Hillslope processes,* Cambridge Uni. Press, London, 260pp.
	- Cernica, IN. (1995), *Geotechnical Engineering, Soil Mechanics,* John Wiley & Sons Inc., Brisbane, 449p.
	- Clarke, G.M. (1986), Debris slide & Debris Flow Historical Events in the Appalachians, South of the Glacial Border: in Costa, lE, & Wieczorek, G.F., editors, Debris Flows/Avalanches: process, recognition and mitigation, *Geol. Soc. America Rev. Eng Geology* 7, pp. 125-137.
	- Direen, N.G. (1995), *Geophysical Modelling of the Longford Basin*, Honours thesis, University of Tasmania.
	- Donaldson, RC. (1991), Rosetta Landslide, Geological investigation and slope risk assessment, *Dept. of Mines and Mineral Resources Tasmania*, Report 1991/20, 80pp.

-1

 $\hat{C}$ 

- Eckel, (1958), Landslides and engineering practice, *National Academy of Science*, *Special report* 29, 232 p.
- Elmer, S. (1971), Slope stability at Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1971/10*
- Forsythe, S.M. (1989), *Late Carboniferous Triassic*, In: Burrett, C.F. and Martin E.L. (eds), Geology and Mineral Resources of Tasmania, Geological Society of Australia, Special Pub 15,309-333.
- Forsythe, S.M. (1996), Land stability zonation map, Launceston Area, Urban Engineering " Geology Series, *Tasmanian Geological Survey.*
- Galena Slope stability model, online: http://www.rockware.com/catalog/galena
- Gerrard, J. (1992), *Soil Geomorphology, An Integration of Pedology and Geomorphology,* Chapman and Hall, Great Britain, 269p.
- Graham, J (1964), *Mechanisms ofsoil stabilisation,* CSIRO Pub., Melbourne, D5-1 to D5-30.
- Gray et. al. (1974), Complex history of Badger Head area, Northern Tasmania, *Aust. J. Earth Sci,.* vo140(2), 155-168.
- Gulline (1973/81), *Frankfort sheet, Geological Survey Explanatory Report*, Geological Atlas 1 mile series, zone 7, sheet 38 (8215s), Tasmanian Department of Mines.
- Gulline, AB. (1981), Frankford Sheet. *Geological Survey Explanatory Report, Tasmanian Department of Mines, zone 7, sheet 38 (8215s), 25pp.*
- Habib, P. (1983), *Soil and rock mechanics,* Cambridge University Press, London, 135 p.
- Hail, 1.R. (1977), *Applied Geomorphology,* Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, pp. 157-181.
- Haneberg, W.C. (1991), Pore pressure diffusion and the hydrological response of nearly saturated, thin landslide deposits to rainfall, *Journal of Geology*, vol. 99, pp. 886-892.
- Heath, R. (1997), *Geotechnical risk assessment of the Claremont area*, Hobart, Tasmania, Honours Thesis, 92pp.
- Herbert (1982) in: Haneberg W.C. (1991), Pore pressure diffusion and the hydrological response of nearly saturated, thin landslide deposits to rainfall, *Journal ofGeology,* vol. 99, pp. 886-892.

Hutchinson, J.N. (1967), The free degradation of conference on shear strength

References

े

أر

properties of natural soils and rocks, *Norwegian Geotec. Institute,* vol. 1, 113 - 118.

Ingles, O.G. (1991), *Land stability, Windermere Farm, East Tamar*, Technical report for T. Hodgman, Unisearch Limited.

Iverson, R.M. & Major, 1.J. (1986), Groundwater Seepage Vectors and the Potential for Hillslope Failure and Debris Flow Mobilisation, *Water Resources Research,* vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1543-1548.

Iverson, R.M. & Major, J.1. (1987), Rainfall, ground-water flow, and seasonal movement at Minor Creek landslide, *Geological Society ofAmerica Bulletin,* vol. 99, pp579-  $\rightarrow$  594.

- Keefer et al. (1987), Real-Time Landslide Warning During Heavy Rainfall, *Science,* vol. 238, pp. 921-925
- Keller, E.A. (1992), *Environmental Geology*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., Macmillian Publishing Corp., New York, pp. 48-55.
- Knight, C.J. (1973), Stability of Land at Windermere, East Tamar, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1971/91.*
- Knight, C.J. & Matthews W.L. (1976), A Landslip Study in Tertiary Sediments, Northern Tasmania, *Bulletin of the Association of Engineering Geology*, 14, pp. 17-22.

Leaman et. al. (1973), Gravity Survey of the Tamar Region, Northern Tasmania, Tasmanian Department of Mines, *Geological Survey Paper, no. 1.* 

- Leaman D.L: & Stevenson P.C. (1972), Proposed Subdivision at Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1972/23.*
- Leopold et al (1964), *Fluvial processes in geomorphology,* Freeman, San Francisco, 280pp.
- Longman, M.T. (1964/6), Explanatory Report of the Launceston Quadrangle, 1 mile Geology map series (K/55-739), *Tasmanian Department of Mines.*
- Longman, M.T. & D.E. Leaman (1968), Gravity Survey of the Tertiary Basin, in Northern Tasmania, Tasmanian Department of Mines, *Geological Survey Bulletin,* no. 51.
- Londe, P. (1973), The role of rock mechanics in the reconnaissance of rock foundations, water seepages in rock slopes and the analysis of the stability of rock slopes, *J*. *Eng. Geology,* vol. 5, pp. 57-127.
- Lowe, J. (1966), *Stability and performance of slopes and embankments*, American Society of Avile Engineering, pp. 1-35

References

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

- Luck, D.P. (1997), *Site classification report for Payne's property*, Consulting Engineers Report, D. P. Luck and Associates.
- Lupini et. al (1981), The strained residual strength of cohesive soils, *Geotechnique* 31, no. 2, p.  $181 - 213$ .
- Matthews W.L. (1976), Test pit's on R. Ambrose's property at Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1976/32*
- Marshall, T.J, Holmes, J.W., & Rose, C.W. (1996), *Soil Physics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, Cambridge Uni. Press, USA, 450 pp.
- $\sim$  M<sup>e</sup>Clenagan & Baillie (1975), Geological Survey Explanatory Report, Geo atlas 1:25,000 series, sheet sk-55/4 Launceston, *Tasmanian Department of Mines*.
	- MitchelI, lK. (1976), *Series in soil engineering,* John WilIey and Sons, New York, 422p.
	- Moon, A. (1984), *Investigation of Bovilis Landslide, near Devonport*, Masters thesis, University of Tasmania, 66p.
	- Moore, W.R. (1981), Slope Stability of Lot 1, Adams Subdivision, Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1981/52.*
	- Moore, W.R. (1982a) Slope Stability Investigation of Archer's proposed Subdivision at Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1982/22.*
	- Moore, W.R. (1982b), Slope Stability Investigation of a Proposed Subdivision at Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1982/88*
	- Moore, W.R. (1985), Propose House Site 3, High Level Block, Ambrose's Subdivision, Windermere, council recommendations, *Tasmanian Department of Mines*.
	- Moore, W.R. (1986), Investigation of Cracking Pickett's House, Windermere Road, Windermere, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1986/83.*
	- Moore, W.R. (1988), Investigation of cracked house on Windermere Road, East Tamar, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1988/21.*
	- Montgomery, C.W. (1997), *Environmental Geology*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed, WCB McGraw-Hill, New York, pp 171-191.
	- Murch, et al. (1995), *Environmental Geology,* John WilIey & sons, Inc. New York, pp. 145-160.
	- Partion et. al. (1974), General report on mass movements, 2<sup>nd</sup> International Congress of *the International Association ofEngineering Geologists,* Sao Paulo, Brazil, Proceedings, Vol 2.

References

Reid, M.E. (1994), A Pore Pressure Diffusion Model for estimating landslide-influencing rainfall, *The Journal of Geology*, vol. 102, pp. 709-717.

Ritter, D.F. (1986), *Process Geomorphology,* 2nd ed, Southern Illinois Uni., Carbondale.

Sama, S.K. (1979), Stability analysis of embankments and slopes, ASCE, *geotechnique, vol.* 23, 4, pp. 423-433.

Schmidt, et al. (1995), Limits to Relief, *Science,* vol. 270, pp. 921-925.

- Skempton, A.W. (1964), Long-term stability of slopes, *Geotechnique,* vol. 14, no. 2,77- 101
- Smith, G.N. (1971), *Elements of soil mechanics for Civil and Mining Engineers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Crosby and Lockworld, London.

Stevenson, P.C. (1973), Stability of Land at Windermere, East Tamar, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report, 1973/91.* 

- Stevenson, P.C. & Sloan, D.J. (1980), The evolution of a risk-zoning system for landslide areas in Tasmania, Australia. In: Webster, J.A. (convenor), *The third Aust.* - NZ *conference on geomechanics,* vol 2, Proceedings of Tech. Groups - NZ Institute of Engineers, Wellington, NZ, 6 (1) 2.73-2.79.
- Sutherland, F.L. (1971), The Geology and Petrology of the Tertiary Volcanic rocks of the Tamar Trough, Northern Tasmania, *Rec.* Q. *Vie. Mus.,* 36, 58pp.
- Telfer, A.L. (1988), Landslides and landuse planning, Tasmanian Dept. of Mines, *Geological Survey Bulletin,* 63, 62p.
- Terlien, M.TJ (1996), Modelling Spatial and Temporal Variations in Rainfall-Triggered landslides, *ITC Publications,* no. 32, ITC, Enschede, 254 p.
- Terlien, M.TJ (1997) Hydrological landslide triggering in ash-covered slopes of Manizales (Colombia), *Geomorphology* 20, pp. 165-175.
- Terzaghi, K. (1950), Mechanism of landslides, in application of geology to engineering practice, *Geol. Soc. Am.* Berkey Volume.
- Ulrich, T. (1987), Stability of rock protection on slopes, *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering,* vol. 113, pp. 879-891.
- Walker et.al (1985), Geotechnical Risk associated with hill side development, *Aust. Geomech. News,* vol 10, pp. 29-35.

Walker, B. & Fell, R. (1987), *Soil slope stability instability and stabilisation,* AA Balkema Pub., Netherlands, 440 p.

Walker, M.B. (1991), *Chambers science and technology dictionary,* W & R Chambers,

*Geological Investigation and Slope Risk Assessment at Windermere, Northern Tasmania* 

S)

ξ

New York, pp. 35

- Wells, P.M. (1988), Palynology of Tertiary sediments from Windermere, Drill holes 1 & 3, Tasmanian Department of Mines, *Unpublished Tasmanian Mines Department Report,* J*988/05.*
- Wu et. al., Risk of landslides in shallow soils and its relation to clear cutting in SE Alaska, *Forest Science,* Vol26, p. 495-510.
- Yong, R.N. & Selig, E.T. (1980), Application of plasticity and generalised stress-strain in Geotechnical engineering, *American Soc. Civil Eng.,* New York, 351 p.

Young, A. (1977), *Slopes,* I & A Constable Ltd, Great Britain, 288p.