



1 UAV-enabled reconnaissance and trajectory modeling 2 of a co-seismic rockfall in Lefkada

- 3 Charalampos Saroglou^{1*},
- 4 Pavlos Asteriou¹
- 5 Dimitris Zekkos²
- 6 George Tsiambaos¹
- 7 Marin Clark³
- 8 John Manousakis⁴
- 9 ¹Department of Geotechnical Engineering, School of Civil Engineering, National Technical
- 10 University of Athens
- 11 ²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan, USA
- 12 ³Department of Earth and Environmental Science, University of Michigan, USA
- ⁴Elxis Group, S.A, Athens, Greece
- 14 * corresponding author: <u>saroglou@central.ntua.gr</u>
- 15 16

17 Abstract

18 The paper presents the field evidence and the kinematical study of the motion of a 19 rock block mobilised by an earthquake-induced rockfall in Ponti area in the island of 20 Lefkada during a M_w 6.5 earthquake on 17th November 2015. A detailed field survey 21 was deployed using an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) with an ultra-high definition 22 (UHD) camera, which produced a high-resolution orthophoto and a Digital Surface 23 Model (DSM) of the terrain. The sequence of impact marks from the rock trajectory 24 on the ground surface was identified using the orthophoto and verified through a 25 detailed field survey. Additionally, the earthquake characteristics were determined in 26 order to define the acceleration on the rock slope and the initial conditions of the 27 detached block. Using the impact points from the actual rockfall trajectory, an 28 analytical approach to reconstruct the trajectory was implemented, which led to some 29 insights on the coefficients of restitution. In order to match the actual trajectory, 2D 30 and 3D rockfall analyses were performed using the recommended set of parameters.





- 31 However, the actual trajectory could not be accurately predicted, revealing limitations
- 32 of existing models.

33 Keywords

34 Rockfall, earthquake, DEM, modelling, restitution, UAV

35 **1.** Introduction

36 Active faulting, rock fracturing and high rates of seismicity contribute to common 37 rockfall hazards in Greece. Rockfalls primarily damage roadways and houses 38 (Saroglou, 2013) and are most often triggered by rainfall and secondly seismic 39 loading. Additionally in recent years, some rockfalls have impacted archaeological 40 sites (Marinos & Tsiambaos, 2002, Saroglou et al., 2012). The Ionian Islands, which 41 includes Lefkada Island, experience frequent M_w 5-6.5 earthquakes, as well as less 42 frequent larger (up to 7.5) earthquakes. The historical seismological record is 43 particularly well constrained with reliable detailed information for at least 23 events 44 since 1612, which induced ground failures at the island of Lefkada (Papathanasiou et 45 al. 2005) and an average of a damaging earthquake every 18 years. In the recent 46 past, a M_w 6.2 earthquake occurred on August 14 2003 and was located offshore the 47 NW coast of Lefkada. Significant damage was reported, particularly in the town of 48 Lefkada, where a PGA of 0.42g was recorded. Landslides, rockslides and rockfalls 49 occurred along the western coast of the island (Karakostas et al. 2004, 50 Papathanasiou et al., 2012).

51 On November 17th 2015, an M_w 6.5 earthquake struck the island of Lefkada and 52 triggered a number of landslides, rockfalls and some structural damage. The most 53 affected area by large rockslides was the west coast of the island, especially along its 54 central and south portion which are popular tourist destinations (Zekkos et al., 2017). 55 The landslides completely covered the majority of the west coast beaches and 56 damaged access roads.





A rockfall in Ponti village, which lies in the southeast side of Lefkada near the Gulf of Vassiliki, was triggered during this earthquake and was responsible for one of two deaths caused by the earthquake. Of particular interest is the very long travel path of the rock block, which was about 800 m in plan view from the point of detachment to the end of its path. Near the end of the rock fall path, the block impacted a family residence, penetrated two brick walls and killed a person in the house. The block exited through the back of the house and came to rest in the property's backyard.

The Ponti village rockfall site is characteristic of earthquake induced rockfall and an 64 65 example of how seismically-induced rockfall impacts human activities. It also exemplifies the limitations of common 2D rockfall analysis to predict specific aspects 66 67 of the rockfall trajectory as measured by field evidence. In order to create a highly 68 accurate model of the rockfall propagation in 2D and 3D space, the rock path and the 69 impact point on the slope was identified by a field survey. The study was performed 70 using an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) with an ultra-high definition (UHD) camera, 71 which produced a high-resolution orthophoto and a Digital Surface Model (DSM) of 72 the terrain. The orthophoto was used to identify the rolling section and the bouncing 73 points of the rock along its trajectory. The high-resolution DSM made it possible to 74 perform kinematical rebound analysis and a 3D rockfall analysis.

75 2. Ponti rockfall - site conditions

The slope overhanging Ponti village is formed in limestone and has a maximum height of 600 m and an average slope angle of 35[°] to 40[°] (Figure 1). The geological formations at the Ponti rockfall site are limestones covered by moderately cemented talus materials. The thickness of the talus materials ranges between 0.5 and 4.0 to 5.0 m. A few fallen limestone blocks were identified on the scree slope, with volumes between 0.5 and 2 m³. Based on the size distribution of these rocks on the slope, the average expected block volume would be in the order of 1 to 2 m³.





- The rockfall release area was at an elevation of 500 m, while the impacted house at an elevation of 130 m (Figure 2). The volume of the detached limestone block was approximately 2 m³ and its dimensions equal to 1.4 m x 1.4 m x 1 m. There was no previous rockfall incident reported for the specific slope that impacted the road or house.
- 88 3. UAV mapping

89 3.1. Introduction

90 A quadrotor UAV (Phantom 3 professional) was deployed to reach the uphill terrrain 91 that was practically inaccessible. The UAV was equiped with an Ultra-high definition 92 (UHD) 12 MP camera and has the capacity to collect 4K video. The first objective of 93 the UAV deployment was to find the inititiaion point of the rock and then identify the 94 rockfall path (shown in Fig. 1). A particular focus on that part of the task was the 95 identification of rolling and bouncing sections of the rockfall path. In addition, in order 96 to generate a high-resolution orthophoto of the rockfall trajectory, aerial video 97 imagery was collected, and the resulting digital surface model (DSM) was used to 98 perform rockfall analysis. Structure-from-Motion (SfM) methodologies were 99 implemented to create a 3D point cloud of the terrain and develop a 3D model by 100 identifying matching features in multiple images. Compared to classic photogrametry 101 methodologies, where the location of the observing point is well established, SfM 102 tracks specific discernible features in multiple images, and through non-linear least-103 squares minimisation (Westoby et al., 2012), iteratively estimates both camera 104 positions, as well as object coordinates in an arbitrary 3D coordinate system. In this 105 process, sparse bundle adjustment (Snavely et al., 2008) is implemented to 106 transform measured image coordinates to three dimensionl points of the area of 107 interest. The outcome of this process is a sparse 3D point cloud in the same local 3D 108 coordinate system (Micheletti et al., 2015). Paired with GPS measurements of a 109 number of control points (in this case 10 fast-static GPS points) at the top, middle

4





- 110 and bottom of the surveyed area, the 3D model is georeferenced to a specific
- 111 coordinate system.

112 **3.2.** High-resolution Orthophoto

113 A 5cm pixel size orthophoto was generaated based on thhe methodology outlined 114 earlier. As showin Fig. 3, the rolling section and the bouncing locations of the rock 115 block throughou its course were identified. The rolling section is discerned as a 116 continuous and largely linear mark left in the densely vegetated terrain that is 117 indicative of the damage caused. Impact points that are part of the bouncing section 118 of the rock, are identified as circular to ellipsoidal bare earth craters with no 119 disturbance in between. The last bouncing point before impacting the house is clearly 120 identified on the paved road. The plan view ortho-imagery, along with the original 121 footage of the video collected was crucial to the qualitative identification of these 122 features. The alternative, i.e., land-based, conventional field reconnaissance was 123 practically impossible tto perform in the the densely vegetated and steep terrain.

124 3.3. Digital Surface Model

125 A profile section and a 10 cm Digital Surface Model (DSM) paired with the plan view 126 orthophoto were first developed (Manousakis et al., 2016) and made possible the 127 identification of terrain features such as structures, slope benches or high trees, that 128 could affect the rock's path downhill. However, this resolution of the DSM proved to 129 be not only unnecessarily high and thus difficult to manipulate in subsequent rockfall 130 analyses, but also resulted in numerical instabilities during the rockfall analyses. 131 Therefore, a downscaled 2 m DSM was produced for the rockfall analysis. This was 132 implemented through an aggregate generalization scheme where each output cell is 133 assigned the minimum of the input cells that are encompassed by that cell. In 134 addition, noise filtering and smoothing processing were implemented to reduce the 135 effect of construction elements and vegetation in the final rasterized model. Note that





- 136 this resolution is still higher than the resolution of DSM that are used in rockfall
- 137 analyses.

4. Earthquake characteristics – Initial conditions

139 4.1. Seismic acceleration

140 The epicenter of the earthquake according to the National Observatory of Athens, 141 Institute of Geodynamics (NOA) is located onhore near the west coast of Lefkada. 142 The causative fault is estimated to be a near-vertical strike-slip fault with dextral 143 sense of motion (Ganas et al., 2015, 2016). Based on the focal mechanism study of 144 the earthquake it was determined that the earthquake was related to the right lateral 145 Kefalonia-Lefkada Transform Fault (KLTF), which runs nearly parallel to the west 146 coasts of both Lefkada and Kefalonia island, in two segments (Papazachos et al. 147 1998, Rondoyanni et al. 2012). The previous earthquake in this zone occurred in 148 August 2003 with a magnitude of 6.2.

A strong motion station recorded the ground motions in the village of Vasiliki located at a distance of 2.5 km from the site. The ground motion characteristics of the recording are summarized in Table 1 and are presented in Figure 4, according to an ITSAK preliminary report (ITSAK, 2016). In comparison with the recordings at other locations in Central Ionian, it was evident that the strongest acceleration was encountered in Vasiliki area.

155 **4.2.** Topography effect

Peak ground acceleration along the rock slope is the intensity of base shaking modified by site and topographic effects (Mavrouli et al., 2009). In the present case, local shaking intensity in terms of horizontal PGA was considered. The E-W component of acceleration was considered for the determination of the initial velocity. The peak ground acceleration (PGA) on the slope face (PGA_{sf}) was obtained by linear interpolation between the acceleration at the base (PGA_b) and at the slope





- 162 crest (PGA_{cr}). The acceleration at the base was equal to 0.32g and thus at the crest
- 163 PGA_{cr}= 1.5 PGA_b equal to 0.48. Therefore, the seismic acceleration on the slope at
- 164 the detachment point was calculated equal to 0.45 g.

165 4.3. Assessment of rock block's initial velocity

- 166 The initial horizontal velocity of the block, at the time of detachment, was calculated
- 167 considering equilibrium of the produced work and the kinetic energy according to168 equation 1.

169
$$\upsilon = \sqrt{2 \cdot PGA_{sf} \cdot s}$$
 (1)

170 where PGA_{sf} is the acceleration on the slope at the location of detachment and s the

171 initial displacement of the block in order to initiate its downslope movement.

The initial horizontal velocity was calculated equal to 0.67 m/sec, considering a
displacement in the order of s = 0.05 m. The vertical component of the initial velocity
is assumed to be zero.

175 **5.** Trajectory analysis

In order to estimate the possible rock paths and design remedial measures, simulation programs are used in design practice, which are mostly based on the lumped-mass analysis model. The trajectory of a block is modelled as a combination of four motion types; free falling, bouncing, rolling and sliding (Descoeudres and Zimmermann, 1987).

181 **5.1.** Modelling the response to an impact

The most critical input parameters are the coefficients of restitution (COR), which control the bouncing of the block. In general, the coefficient of restitution (COR) is defined as the decimal fractional value representing the ratio of velocities (or impulses or energies; depending on the definition used) before and after an impact of two colliding entities (or a body and a rigid surface). When in contact with the slope,





- the block's magnitude of velocity changes according to the COR value. Hence, COR
 is assumed to be an overall value that takes into account all the characteristics of the
 impact; including deformation, sliding upon contact point, transformation of rotational
 moments into translational and vice versa (Giani, 1992).
 The most widely used definitions originate from the theory of inelastic collision as
- 192 described by Newtonian mechanics. For an object impacting a rocky slope (Figure 5),
- 193 which is considered as a steadfast object, the kinematic COR (v_{COR}) is defined
- according to Eq. 2.

$$v_{COR} = \frac{v_r}{v_i}$$
195 (2)

where v is the velocity magnitude and the subscripts i and r denote the trajectorystage; incident (before impact) and rebound (after impact) respectively.

Two different mechanisms participate in the energy dissipation process; energy loss normal to the slope is attributed to the deformation of the colliding entities, and in the tangential direction is due to friction between them. Therefore kinematic COR has been analyzed to the normal and tangential component with respect to the slope surface, defining the normal (n_{COR}) and the tangential (t_{COR}) coefficient of restitution (Eq. 3 and 4 respectively).

$$n_{COR} = \frac{v_{n,r}}{v_{n,i}}$$
204 (3)

205 and

$$t_{COR} = \frac{v_{t,r}}{v_{t,i}}$$
206 (4)

where the first subscript, n or t denotes the normal or the tangential components ofthe velocity respectively.





209 Normal and tangential COR have prevailed in natural hazard mitigation design via 210 computer simulation due to their simplicity. Values for the coefficients of restitution 211 are acquired from values recommended in the literature (Azzoni et al. 1995; 212 Heidenreich 2004; Richards et al. 2001, RocScience, 2004). Those are mainly 213 related to the surface material type and originate from experience, experimental 214 studies or back analysis of previous rockfall events. This erroneously implies that 215 coefficients of restitution are material constants. However, COR values depend on 216 several parameters that cannot be easily assessed. Moreover, the values suggested 217 by different authors vary considerably and are sometimes contradictory.

Usage of the lump-mass model has some key limitations; the block is described as rigid and dimensionless with an idealized shape (sphere); therefore the model neglects the block's actual shape and configuration at impact, even though it is evident that they both affect the resulting motion.

222 5.2. Rockfall path characteristics

223 23 impact points were identified on the slope surface (Figure 6). Their coordinates
224 are presented in Table 2, along block's path starting from the detachment point
225 (where x=0).

226 The apparent dip of the slope at impact positions was measured from the 227 topographic map; on each impact point a line was set with a length twice the block's 228 mean dimension, oriented according to preceding trajectory direction. Moreover, the 229 impact point was expanded on the topographic map to a rectangular plane with a 230 side twice as much the mean dimension of the block (Figure 7). This plane was then 231 oriented so that one side coincides with the strike direction and its' vertical side 232 toward to the dip direction. Thus, direction difference, $\Delta \phi$, was measured by the 233 strike direction and the preceding path and deviation, e, was measured as the angle 234 between pre and post impact planes (Asteriou & Tsiambaos, 2016).





- 235 Having a detailed field survey of the trajectory path, a back analysis according to the
- 236 fundamental kinematic principles was performed in order to back-calculate the actual
- 237 COR values.

238 5.3. Kinematic analysis and assumptions

The 23 impact points identified on the slope comprise a rockfall path of 22 parabolic segments. The vertical and horizontal length of each segment is acquired by subtracting consecutive points. Since no external forces act while the block is in the air, each segment lays on a vertical plane and is described by the general equation of motion as:

$$y = x \tan \vartheta - \frac{gx^2}{2v^2} \sec^2 \vartheta$$

where: θ the launch angle from the horizon and v the launch (initial) velocity (Figure8).

(5)

Since no evidence can be collected regarding launch angle and velocity, innumerable parabolas satisfy Eq. 5. However, θ is bound between $-\beta$ and 90° , so in order to acquire realistic values for the initial velocity, its sensitivity for that given range was addressed (Figure 9).

For the case presented in Fig. 9 (the first parabolic segment) it is seen that for the majority of the release angles, initial velocity variation is low and ranges between 7.2 and 12ms^{-1} . Additionally, the relationship between release angle and initial velocity is expressed by a curvilinear function, thus a minimum initial velocity value along with its release angle (denoted hereafter as θ_{cr}) can be easily acquired.

Given the minimum initial velocity and the critical release angle for each parabolic segment, the impact velocity and angle can be calculated. Afterwards, normal and tangential velocity components according to the apparent dip of the impact area, are calculated in order to evaluate COR values. Results are summarized in Table 3.





260 5.4. Coefficients of restitution

1 It is observed that v_{cor} (Table 3) is slightly greater than one in 5 out of 22 impacts. According to Eq. 3, this can only be achieved when impact velocity is less than rebound velocity. However, this indicates that energy was added to the block during contact, which is not possible according to the law of conservation of energy. Thus, impact velocity should be greater, which is possible if the launch velocity of the previous impact was more than the minimum, as assumed.

267 Omitting the impacts with V_{cor} >1, it is observed that kinematic COR ranges between 268 0.55 and 1.0 and presents smaller variation compared to normal or tangential 269 coefficient of restitution, similar to what was previously reported in relevant literature 270 (i.e. Asteriou et al, 2012; Asteriou & Tsiambaos, 2016).

The considerably wide scatter of normal COR implies that the restitution coefficient cannot be a material constant. Yet, in most relevant software, normal COR is defined solely by the slope material. Moreover, normal COR values higher than one were calculated in 11 out of the 15 remaining impacts. Normal COR higher than one have been observed in both experimental (e.g. Asteriou et al., 2012) and back-analysis studies (e.g. Paronuzzi, 2009). However, in relevant software normal COR values are bounded between 0 and 1.

Moreover, it is observed in Fig. 10 that normal COR increases as the impact angle reduces, similarly to previous observations by Giacomini et al. (2012), Asteriou et al. (2012) and Wyllie (2014). The correlation proposed by Wyllie (2014) is also plotted in Figure 11 and seems to describe consistently, but on the unconservative side, the trend and the values acquired by the aforementioned analysis and assumptions.

283

284 6. Rockfall modelling

285 6.1. 2-D software





286 Initially, a deterministic 2D rockfall analysis was performed using Rocfall software 287 (RocScience, 2004). Considering an initial velocity of 0.67 m/sec, the falling rock 288 primarily rolls on the slope and stops much earlier than its actual run out distance, 289 approximately 400 m downslope from its starting point (Fig. 6; case 1). The restitution 290 coefficients were $n_{COR}=0.35$, $t_{COR}=0.85$, which represent properties of bedrock 291 outcrops according to the suggested values provided in the documentation of the 292 software. The friction angle was set to zero. If the friction angle is set to φ =32⁰ (as 293 suggested by the software documentation), the rock travels downslope only 50 m.

A separate analysis was performed, with lower coefficients of restitution, resembling that of talus material on the slope ($n_{COR}=0.32$, $t_{COR}=0.82$, $\phi=30^{\circ}$) as proposed by the suggested values provided in the documentation of the software. In this case, the rock block rolled only a few meters downslope. Therefore, it is evident that the actual rock trajectory cannot be simulated.

In order to simulate the actual trajectory as much as possible, various combinations of restitution coefficients and friction angle were considered. The closest match occurred for n_{COR} =0.60 and t_{COR} =0.85, while the friction angle was set to zero and no velocity scaling was applied. Only in such an analysis, the rock block reaches the house; with a velocity equal to v=18 m/s approximately (Fig. 6; case 2). According to the suggested values, these values for the coefficients correspond to a bedrock material (limestone).

In this case, the modelled trajectory is significantly different from the actual one. The main difference is that the block is rolling up to 200 m downslope while the actual rolling section is 400 m (as shown in Fig. 6). Furthermore the impacts on the ground in the bouncing section of the trajectory are considerably different in number (14 versus 23) and in location from the actual ones. Finally, the bounce height of some impacts seems unrealistically high.

312 6.2. 3-D rockfall analysis





313 The rockfall trajectory model Rockyfor3D (Dorren, 2012) has been used in order to 314 validate the encountered trajectory and determine the reach probability of the falling 315 rock (from the specific source area) on the impacted house.

The 3D analysis was based on the down-scaled 2 m resolution Digital Elevation Model (DEM) that was generated from the 10 cm DSM. The terrain features such as low vegetation (e.g. bushes) and the trees were removed from the DEM as they affected the rock's path downhill. The following raster maps were developed for the 3D analysis: a) rock density of rockfall source, b) height, width, length and shape of block, c) slope surface roughness and d) soil type on the slope, which is directly linked with the normal coefficient of restitution, n_{COR} .

323 The slope roughness was modeled using the mean obstacle height (MOH), which is 324 the typical height of an obstacle that the falling block encounters on the slope at a 325 possibility percentage of 70%, 20% and 10% of the trajectories (according to the 326 suggested procedure in Rockyfor3D). No vegetation was considered in the analysis, 327 which favours a longer trajectory. The parameters considered in the 3D analysis for 328 the different formations are summarised in Table 4. The spatial occurrence of each 329 soil type is shown in Figure 11 and the assigned values of n_{COR} are according to the 330 Rockyfor3D manual. The values for soil type 4.1 are slightly different from soil type 4 331 (proposed in the manual), denoting talus with a larger percentage of fallen boulders. 332 The block dimensions were considered equal to 2 m³ and the shape of the boulder 333 was rectangle. In order to simulate the initial velocity of the falling rock due to the 334 earthquake an additional initial fall height is considered in the analysis, which for this 335 case was equal to 0.5 m.

The energy line angles were recalculated from the simulated trajectories and it was determined that the energy line angle with highest frequency (39%) was 30-31⁰. Based on the 3D analysis no rock blocks would impact the house, although the rock





339 paths are closer to the actual trajectories compared to RocFall software. The reach

probability of the falling rocks, initiating from the source point, is shown in Figure 12.

341 6.3. Lateral dispersion & Deviation

342 Lateral dispersion is defined as the ratio between the distance separating the two 343 extreme fall paths (as seen looking at the face of the slope) and the length of the 344 slope (Azzoni and de Freitas 1995). According to Crosta and Agliardi (2004) the 345 factors that control lateral dispersion are classified in three groups: macro-346 topography factors, factors related to the overall slope geometry; micro-topography 347 factors controlled by the slope local roughness; and dynamic factors, associated with 348 the interaction between slope features and block dynamics during bouncing and 349 rolling. Assessing the results of an experimental investigation, Azzoni and de Freitas 350 (1995) commented that the dispersion is generally in the range of 10% to 20%, 351 regardless of the length of the slope and that steeper slopes present smaller 352 dispersion. Agliardi and Crosta (2003) calculated lateral dispersion to be up to 34%, 353 via high-resolution numerical models on natural rough and geometrically complex 354 slopes.

355 Lateral dispersion cannot be defined from the actual rockfall event in Ponti since only 356 one path is available. Using the simulated trajectories from RockyFor3D, which are in 357 the 3d space (Figure 13), a lateral dispersion of approximately 60% is shown in the 358 middle of the distance between detachment point and the house. This is significantly 359 higher compared to the findings of Azzoni and de Freitas (1995) and Agliardi and 360 Crosta (2003). Moreover, based on the actual event and intuition, the lateral dispersion computed by RockyFor3D is extremely pronounced. Examining Figure 13, 361 362 it is notable that the rock paths are severely affected by the topography factors. 363 Therefore, assessing lateral dispersion seems to be a case specific task.

Asteriou & Tsiambaos (2016) defined deviation (e) as the dihedral angle between the
 pre- and post-impact planes that contain the trajectory. They found that deviation is





366 controlled by the direction difference $\Delta \varphi$, the slope inclination and the shape of the 367 block. For a parallel impact (i.e. $\Delta \varphi = 0^{\circ}$) a spherical block presents significantly less 368 deviation compared to a cubical. Additionally, deviation is equally distributed along 369 the post-impact direction and reduces as the slope's inclination increases. On oblique 370 impacts the block's direction after impact changes towards the aspect of slope and 371 as $\Delta \varphi$ increases this trend becomes more pronounced.

372 Figure 14 presents deviation as a function of direction difference. It is noted that for 373 parallel impacts deviation is also equally distributed along the post-impact direction. 374 As direction difference increases, deviation becomes positive, which means that the 375 change of direction is following the direction of slope's aspect. These finding are in 376 line with trends described by Asteriou & Tsiambaos (2016), but the deviation of the 377 actual trajectory is significantly lower. This can be attributed to the different 378 conditions (i.e. block shape, slope material, slope roughness, incident velocity and 379 angle, and scale) between the experimental program conducted by Asteriou & 380 Tsiambaos (2016) and the Ponti rockfall event.

381 **7. Discussion - conclusions**

382 UAV-enabled reconnaissance was successfully used for the identification of the 383 origin of the detached rock, the rockfall trajectory and the impact points on the slope, 384 emphasizing on the motion types of the trajectory (rolling and bouncing sections). A 385 drone with an ultra-high definition (UHD) camera was deployed to reach the 386 inaccessible, steep and vegetated uphill terrain. A high-resolution orthophoto of the 387 rockfall trajectory and a 10 cm DSM was prepared, which formed the basis for an 388 analytical 2D kinematic analysis and a comparison with the outcomes of 2D and 3D 389 rockfall analysis software.

390 The initial velocity of the detached rock was estimated based on site conditions and 391 amplification of the ground acceleration due to topography. It was found that the





- 392 estimation of the initial velocity of the blocks plays a significant role in the accurate
- 393 re-production of the rockfall trajectory.

Based on the analytical analysis performed, it was found that the coefficients of restitution cannot be directly connected to the material type, nor can be considered as constants. The impact angle seems to pose a consistent effect on normal COR, which has been seen also in other recent relevant studies, but has not been incorporated yet on analyses models.

399 Performing a 2D rockfall analysis with the set of parameters recommended by the 400 developers, was impossible to replicate the actual trajectory revealing some 401 limitations in the present formulations. In an attempt to match the actual rock path to 402 the analysis output, the friction angle of the limestone slope was considered equal to 403 zero. However, the falling rock rolled on the slope and stopped much earlier than its 404 actual runout distance while the impacts on the ground in the bouncing section of the 405 trajectory were considerably different in number and in location compared to the 406 actual ones.

407 Using the 3D analysis software, some rock trajectories better approximated the
408 actual trajectory using the suggested values by the software developers, testifying
409 that the 3D analysis can be more accurate than the 2D analysis.

410 Based on the aforementioned analyses it becomes evident that engineering 411 judgement and experience must accompany the usage of commercial rockfall 412 software in order to acquire realistic paths. One should never rest on the suggested 413 set of parameters since the actual outcome can differ significantly, as demonstrated 414 by this case study.

415

416 **References**

16





417	1.	Agliardi	F,	Crosta	GB	(2003)	High	resolution	three-dimensional	numerical

- 418 modelling of rockfalls. International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining
- 419 Sciences 40:455-471. doi: 10.1016/S1365-1609(03)00021-2
- Asteriou P, Saroglou H, Tsiambaos G (2012). Geotechnical and kinematic
 parameters affecting the coefficients of restitution for rock fall analysis.
 International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences 54:103-113.
 doi:10.1016/j.ijrmms.2012.05.029.
- Asteriou P and Tsiambaos G. (2016). Empirical Model for Predicting Rockfall
 Trajectory Direction. Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering 49.3, pp. 927–
 941.
- 427 4. Azzoni A, de Freitas MH (1995). Experimentally gained parameters, decisive
 428 for rock fall analysis. Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering 28:111-124. doi:
 429 10.1007/BF01020064
- 430 5. Crosta GB, Agliardi F (2004) Parametric evaluation of 3D dispersion of
 431 rockfall trajectories. Natural Hazards and Earth System Science 4:583-598.
 432 doi:10.5194/nhess-4-583-2004
- 433
 6. Descoeudres F, Zimmermann TH. Three-dimensional dynamic calculation of
 434 rockfalls. In: Proceedings of the 6th International Congress on Rock
 435 Mechanics. Montreal; 30 August -3 September 1987. p. 337–42.
- 436
 7. Dorren, L.K.A., 2012. Rockyfor3D (v5.1) revealed Transparent description of
 437 the complete 3D rockfall model. ecorisQ paper, 31 p.
- Ganas, A., Briole, P., Papathanassiou, G., Bozionelos, G., Avallone, A.,
 Melgar, D., Argyrakis, P., Valkaniotis, S., Mendonidis, E., Moshou, A. and
 Elias, P. (2015). A preliminary report on the Nov 17, 2015 M=6.4 South
 Lefkada earthquake, Ionian Sea, Greece, Report to EPPO, December 4
 2015.





443	9.	Gana	s A., E	lias P.,	Bozion	ielos G	., Papa	thanassiou	ı G.,	Avallone	Α.,
444		Papa	stergios	P. Valka	aniotis S	5., Parch	naridis I.	, Briole P	. (201	6). Coseis	smic
445		defor	mation, fi	eld obse	rvations	and sei	smic fau	It of the 17	7 Nove	ember 201	5 M
446		= 6.5,	, Lefkada	Island, (Greece e	earthqua	ike. Tect	onophysic	s 687,	pp. 210–2	222.
447	10.	Giani	GP. Roc	k Slope S	Stability	Analysis	s. Rotter	dam: Balke	ema A.	A; 1992.	
448	11.	Giaco	omini A, T	Thoeni K	, Lambe	ert C, Bo	ooth S, S	Sloan SW	(2012)	Experime	ental
449		study	on rockf	all drape	ry syste	ms for c	pen pit l	nighwalls.	Interna	ational Jou	irnal
450		of	Rock	Mecha	anics	and	Mining	Scien	ces	56:171-	181.
451		doi:10	D.1016/j.ij	rmms.20)12.07.0	30					

- 452 12. Heidenreich B (2004) Small- and half-scale experimental studies of rockfall 453 impacts on sandy slopes. Dissertation, EPFL.
- 454 13. ITSAK (2016). Preliminary presentation of the main recording of ITSAK -OASP accelerometer network in Central Ionian. Earthquake M6.4 17/11/2015. 455 456 Thessaloniki, 11 pp.
- 457 14. Karakostas, V. G., Papadimitriou, E. E., and Papazachos, C. B. 2004. Properties of the 2003 Lefkada, Ionian Islands, Greece, Earthquake Seismic 458 459 Sequence and Seismicity Triggering. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 94 (5), 1976–1981, October 2004 460
- 461 15. Manousakis J., Zekkos D., Saroglou H., Clark M. (2016). Comparison of UAV-462 enabled photogrammetry-based 3D point clouds and interpolated DSMs of 463 sloping terrain for rockfall hazard analysis. Proc. Int. Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, Vol. 464 XLII-2/W2, p. 71-78. 465
- 466 16. Marinos P, Tsiambaos G., 2002. Earthquake triggering rock falls affecting 467 historic monuments and a traditional settlement in Skyros Island, Greece.





468	Proc. of the Int. Symposium: Landslide risk mitigation and protection of
469	cultural and natural heritage, Kyoto, Japan, pp. 343-346.

- 470 17. Mavrouli O., Corominas J., Wartman J. (2009). Methodology to evaluate rock
 471 slope stability under seismic conditions at Sol`a de Santa Coloma, Andorra.
- 472 Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 9, 1763–1773.Micheletti N., Chandler J., Lane
- 473 S., 2015. Structure from Motion (SfM) Photogrammetry. British Society for
- 474 Geomorphology. *Geomorphological Techniques*, Chap. 2, Sec. 2.2 (2015)
- 475 19. Papathanassiou, G., Valkaniotis, S., Ganas, A. and Pavlides, S. 2012. GIS476 based statistical analysis of the spatial distribution of earthquake-induced
 477 landslides in the island of Lefkada, Ionian Islands, Greece, Landslides,
 478 Journal of the International Consortium on Landslides,DOI 10.1007/s10346479 012-0357-1
- 20. Papazachos B.C., Papadimitriou E.E., Kiratzi A.A., Papazachou C.B., Louvari
 E.K. 1998. Fault plane solutions in the Aegean sea and the surrounding area
 and their tectonic implication. Bull Geof Teor Appl 39(3), 199–218.
- 483 21. Paronuzzi P. (2009) Field Evidence and Kinematical Back-Analysis of Block
 484 Rebounds: The Lavone Rockfall, Northern Italy. *Rock Mech Rock Eng*,
 485 42:783–813
- 22. Richards LR, Peng B, Bell DH (2001) Laboratory and field evaluation of the
 normal Coefficient of Restitution for rocks. Proceedings of ISRM Regional
 Symposium EUROCK2001:149-155
- 489 23. RocScience, 2004. Rocfall Manual.
- 490 24. Rondoyanni T, Sakellariou M, Baskoutas J, Christodoulou N (2012)
 491 Evaluation of active faulting and earthquake secondary effects in Lefkada
 492 Island, Ionian Sea, Greece: an overview. Nat Hazards 61(2), 843–860.





- 493 25. Saroglou, H. 2013. Rockfall hazard in Greece. Bulletin of the Geological
 494 Society of Greece, vol. XLVII, no3, 1429-1438.
- 495 26. Saroglou, H., Marinos, V., Marinos, P., Tsiambaos, G. 2012. Rockfall hazard
 496 and risk assessment: an example from a high promontory at the historical site
 497 of Monemvasia, Greece. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 12,
 498 1823–1836. doi:10.5194/nhess-12-1823-2012.
- 27. Snavely N., Seitz S.N., Szeliski R., 2008. Modeling the world from internet
 photo collections. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 80: 189210.Westoby M.J., Brasington J., Glasser N.F., Hambrey M.J., Reynolds
 J.M., 2012. 'Structure-from-Motion' photogrammetry: A low-cost, effective tool
 for geoscience applications. *Geomorphology* 179 (2012) 300-314.Wyllie, D.
- 504 C. (2014). Calibration of rock fall modeling parameters. International Journal
- 505 of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences 67: 170-180
- 30. Zekkos D., Clark M., Cowell K., Medwedeff W., Manousakis J., Saroglou H.
 Tsiambaos G. (2017). Satellite and UAV-enabled mapping of landslides
 caused by the November 17th 2015 M_w 6.5 Lefkada earthquake. Proc. 19th Int.
 Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, Seoul 2017
 (accepted for publication).
- 511





TABLES

511 512

Table 1. Accelerometer recordings

Component	Acceleration (cm/sec ²)	Velocity (cm/sec)	Displacement (cm)
NS-comp	363	59.3	21.27
EW-comp	327	34.1	14.01
Z-comp	256	17.7	6.56

513

514 Table 2. Impact points characteristics

Impact point	X (m)	Y (m)	app_dip (⁰)	Δφ (⁰)	e (º)
1	287.63	338	39.0	0	0
2	298.38	329.68	16.3	33	0
3	305.48	324.5	27.9	27	-1
4	321.54	314.83	41.0	11.6	0.5
5	365.34	287.6	30.4	11.9	0.3
6	373.32	284.85	39.7	10.6	1.8
7	425.1	261.64	14.7	6.6	-1.3
8	464.43	251.13	18.4	33.3	0.8
9	472.06	248.81	14.0	19.1	2.3
10	495.29	243.81	7.5	52.3	0.9
11	515.31	240.8	7.9	51	0.6
12	535.56	238.31	9.1	46.7	3
13	562.11	232.22	8.7	47.3	2.1
14	605.51	211.12	16.9	25.6	-1.7
15	619.1	204.48	27.1	4.6	-3
16	639.13	196.96	21.2	8	4.7
17	662.41	184	23.3	28.5	5.2
18	688.4	169.3	27.4	0.3	-2.5
19	712.23	157.67	25.4	0.5	0.1
20	745.28	143.16	21.9	0.5	-0.1
21	762.9	137.01	22.0	0.7	2
22	789.23	125.98	21.6	1.4	-0.8
23	801.53	132.75	8.4	0.2	0.1





						r			
Segment	∆x(m)	Δy (m)	$\theta_{cr} \left(^0 ight)$	V _{r,min}	V _{impact}	a _{impac} t	R	Rn	Rt
1-2	10.75	-8.33	26.8	7.19	13.19	44.5	0.55	0.71	0.31
2-3	7.1	-5.18	25.7	5.95	9.51	27.8	0.63	0.90	0.53
3-4	16.07	-9.66	31.5	9.45	12.68	9.6	0.75	3.86	0.38
4-5	43.79	-27.23	27.7	15.46	23.13	23.3	0.67	1.57	0.26
5-6	7.98	-2.75	35.7	7.47	10.49	14.9	0.71	2.52	0.30
6-7	51.78	-23.21	34.8	18.15	21.61	31.7	0.84	1.54	0.26
7-8	39.33	-10.5	35.9	17.23	24.01	36.1	0.72	0.94	0.56
8-9	7.63	-2.32	35.9	7.45	10.54	41.1	0.71	0.87	0.55
9-10	23.23	-5	40.5	13.58	13.12	30.7	1.03	1.65	0.70
10-11	20.02	-3.01	41.1	13.00	11.57	24.2	1.12	2.06	0.82
11-12	20.25	-2.49	40.9	13.26	11.22	17.6	1.18	2.94	0.82
12-13	26.55	-6.1	38.0	14.40	14.25	28.5	1.01	1.55	0.78
13-14	43.41	-21.1	32.9	16.33	25.70	40.9	0.64	0.64	0.63
14-15	13.59	-6.64	30.7	9.13	12.81	25.1	0.71	1.24	0.53
15-16	20.03	-7.52	33.8	11.67	15.42	29.8	0.76	1.33	0.42
16-17	23.27	-12.96	31.9	11.59	15.89	28.5	0.73	1.22	0.50
17-18	25.99	-14.7	29.9	12.20	20.11	30.9	0.61	0.95	0.42
18-19	23.83	-11.63	32.2	12.08	17.10	27.9	0.71	1.30	0.40
19-20	33.05	-14.51	33.6	14.55	20.62	32.1	0.71	1.14	0.43
20-21	17.62	-6.15	34.5	11.08	11.99	18.4	0.92	2.44	0.54
21-22	26.33	-11.03	35.1	13.11	16.33	27.3	0.80	1.47	0.49
22-23	12.3	6.77	58.1	14.30	13.97	48.9	1.02	1.34	0.28

515 Table 3. Parabolic paths characteristics for the minimum release velocity

516

517





	517	Table 4.	Restitution	parameters	for R	lockyfor3E
--	-----	----------	-------------	------------	-------	------------

Geological formation/ other	Mean		MOH		Soil type
	n _{COR}	rg70	rg20	rg10	(Rockyfor3D)
Scree (Ø < ~10 cm), or medium	0.33	0.03	0.05	0.05	3
compact soil with small rock fragments					
Talus slope ($\emptyset > \sim 10$ cm), or compact	0.38	0.05	0.1	0.2	4
soil with large rock fragments					
Talus with fallen boulders	0.42	0.15	0.15	0.2	4.1
Bedrock with thin weathered material	0.43	0	0.05	0.1	5
Asphalt road	0.35	0	0	0	7

518







FIGURES

Figure 1. Orthophoto of study site showing known trajectory and impact on house.



Figure 2. Impact of rock on house in Ponti, Lefkada, Greece.







Figure 3. Top view orthophoto denoting rolling section, bouncing positions and closeups of impact points.







Figure 4. Acceleration recording at Vassiliki site (ITSAK, 2016)



Figure 5. Coefficients of restitution







Figure 6. Plan view and cross section along block's path (units in m); 2D rockfall trajectory analysis results are plotted with green and blue line



Figure 7 : Out of plane geometry







Figure 8. Parabolic segment



Figure 9. Release angle versus initial velocity for the first parabolic section (δx =10.75m, δy =8.33m)



Figure 10. Normal COR versus impact angle







Figure 11. Soil types for 3D rockfall analysis (according to Rockyfor3D)



Figure 12. Reach probability graph calculated from 3D rockfall analysis







Figure 13. 3D trajectory analysis (from RockyFor3D analysis)



Figure 14. Deviation as a function of direction difference.