



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

LANDSLIDE HAZARD ANALYSIS USING FREQUENCY RATIO MODEL

MEHRNOOSH JADDA

ITMA 2009 1



LANDSLIDE HAZARD ANALYSIS USING FREQUENCY RATIO MODEL

By

MEHRNOOSH JADDA

**Thesis submitted to the School of Graduates Studies, University Putra Malaysia, in
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science**

August, 2009



*I would like to dedicate this thesis with love to
the memory of my father "Mohammad Jadda"
to keep his spirit alive*

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of University Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science.

**LANDSLIDE HAZARD ANALYSIS USING
FREQUENCY RATIO MODEL**

By

MEHRNOOSH JADDA

August, 2009

Chairman: Dr Helmi Z. M. Shafri, PhD

Faculty: Institute of Advanced Technology (ITMA)

In the north part of Iran (Alborz Mountain belt), landslides occur frequently due to climatologic and geologic conditions and high tectonic activities, that results, annually, millions of dollars financial defect excluding casualties and unrecoverable resources. The reliable hazard map would help to mitigate the consequences of landslide occurrences by land-use management and other strategies. This paper evaluates the hazardous area in Marzan Abad (Central Alborz, North part of Iran) using probabilistic–Frequency ratio (PFR) model, Geographic Information System (GIS) and Remote sensing techniques. Hazardous areas have been analyzed and mapped using the landslide occurrence factors by frequency ratio model.



In GIS platform, layers such as geology, geomorphology, soil, slope, aspect, elevation, annual precipitation, land use, distance from faults, lineaments, roads and drainages were displayed, manipulated and analyzed. The validation of hazard map has been estimated with the validation group of actual landslides and rate curves method. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) evaluates how well the method predicts landslides. The results have shown satisfactory agreement between prepared hazard map and existing data on total landslide locations (93.60%) and validation group of landslide locations (91.68%) So, the methodology used in this study was validated.

Final hazard map classified in five hazardous classes (very high, high, moderate, low and non hazardous area). Receiver Operating Characteristic curve method (ROC curve) was used to validate the classification and based on its area under the curve value, final classification was evaluated as excellent classification (AUC=0.94).

This study evaluates geology, soil and distance to road networks as the most effective factors on landslide analysis and deep valleys, old landslide traces, area near the roads and faults as the most hazardous areas for landslide occurrence in Marzan Abad area.

Abstract tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra
Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah

**ANALISIS BAHAYA TANAH RUNTUH MENGGUNAKAN
MODEL NISBAB FREKUENSI**

Oleh

MEHRNOOSH JADDA

Ogos, 2009

Pengerusi: Dr Helmi Z. M. Shafri, PhD

Fakulti: Institute of Advanced Technology (ITMA)

Di bahagian utara Iran (Alborz Mountain belt), tanah runtuh kerap berlaku disebabkan oleh keadaan iklim dan geologi, aktiviti tektonik tinggi yang memberi hasil tahunan, masalah kewangan yang berjuta dolar tidak termasuk kecelakaan dan sumber tidak berganti. Peta risiko yang dipercayai dapat membantu untuk mengurangkan akibat kejadian tanah runtuh daripada pengurusan guna tanah dan strategi lain. Kertas ini mengkaji kawasan berisiko di Marzan Abad (Pusat Alborz, bahagian utara Iran) menggunakan contoh nisbah kekerapan-kebarangkalian (PFR), GIS dan remote sensing. Kawasan berisiko dianalisa dan dipetakan mengguna faktor kejadian tanah runtuh dari contoh nisbah kekerapan.



Di dalam GIS, lapisan seperti geologi, geomorfologi, tanah, kecerunan, aspek, ketinggian, hujan tahunan, guna tanah, jarak dari gelinciran, raut, jalan raya dan lembang saluran dipapar, dimanipulasi dan dianalisa. Pengesahan peta risiko dianggarkan dengan menggunakan pengesahan daripada kumpulan tanah runtuh sebenar dan kaedah kadar lengkungan. Kawasan di bawah lengkungan (AUC) menilai betapa baik kaedah ini meramal tanah runtuh. Keputusan menunjukkan persetujuan memuaskan antara peta risiko yang dibuat dan data yang sedia ada pada jumlah lokasi tanah runtuh (93.60%) dan pengesahan kumpulan lokasi tanah runtuh (91.68%). Oleh itu, metodologi yang digunakan dalam kajian ini adalah disahkan.

Peta risiko terakhir dikelaskan dalam 5 kelas risiko (sangat tinggi, tinggi, sederhana, rendah dan kawasan bukan risiko). Kaedah lengkungan ROC digunakan untuk mengesah pengkelasan dan berdasarkan pada keputusan AUC, pengkelasan terakhir dinilai sebagai pengkelasan unggul (AUC=0.94). Bagaimanapun analisis faktor digunakan untuk mengkaji kesan faktor in pada risiko tanah runtuh.

Kajian ini menilai geologi, tanah dan jarak ke jaringan jalanraya sebagai faktor yang sangat efektif pada analisa tanah runtuh dan lembah dalam, kesan tanah runtuh lama, kawasan berhampiran dengan jalan dan gelinciran sebagai kawasan yang sangat berisiko untuk kejadian tanah runtuh di kawasan Marzan Abad

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah

I would like first to thank Dr Helmi Z. M. Shafri and Prof. Dr. Shattri B. Mansor, for serving on my dissertation committee and providing me with the guidance, advice and direction during this dissertation. Their helps and contribution makes this dissertation possible. A special gratitude is expressed to my advisor Dr. Helmi Z. M. Shafri for his invaluable advice, invariable encouragement and guidance. His patience and kindness will never be forgotten.

I would like to thank Dr Biswajeet Pradhan, Dr Saeid Pirasteh and Mr. Mohsen Dadras for their helpful advice, direction and answering my questions during this dissertation.

Special thanks and appreciation go to Dr Mohammad Sharifikia for his great helps through data collection and preparation and his valuable advice through my study.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my husband, Dr. Fariborz Ehteshami, for his helps, understanding and love during the past years. His support and encouragement was in the end what made this dissertation possible. My mother, Parichehr Nilipoor, who always play the most important part in my life, receive my deepest gratitude and love for her dedication and support.

Additional thanks are given to all my friends for their friendship and I wish the best of luck to everyone. Finally, every sincere and special appreciation is extended to all my family, specially grandmother and grandfather, who gave effortlessly their love, support and prayers throughout my academic career.



I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 27th August 2009, to conduct the final examination of Mehrnoosh Jadda on her thesis entitled "**Landslide hazard analysis using frequency ratio model**" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the master degree).

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Abdul Rashid Bin Mohamed Shariff, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
University Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Ahmad Rodzi Mahmud, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Engineering
University Putra Malaysia
(Internal examiner)

Saeid Pirasteh, PhD

Institute of Advanced Technology
University Putra Malaysia
(Internal examiner)

Ibrahim Busu, PhD

Professor
Remote Sensing Department, Faculty of Geoinformation Science and
Engineering
University Technology of Malaysia (UTM)
Malaysia
(External examiner)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 16 November 2009



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of University Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of **Master of Science**. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Dr. Helmi Zulhaidi Bin Mohd Shafri, PhD

Senior lecturer
Faculty of Engineering
University Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Shattri Bin Mansor, PhD

Professor
Institute of Advanced Technology
University Putra Malaysia
(Member)

HASANAH MOHD GHAZALI

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
University Putra Malaysia

Date: 16 November 2009



DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at University Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

Mehrnoosh Jadda

Date



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| ABSTRACT | I |
| ABSTRAK | III |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | V |
| APPROVAL | VI |
| DECLARATION | VIII |
| LIST OF TABLES | XII |
| LIST OF FIGURES | XIV |
| | |
| CHAPTER | |
| | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of problem and justification | 3 |
| 1.3 Study area | 7 |
| 1.3.1 General description | 7 |
| 1.3.2 Stratigraphy and tectonic setting of the Central Alborz | 9 |
| 1.3.3 Study area selection | 15 |
| 1.4 Objectives | 17 |
| 1.5 Organization of the thesis | 17 |
| | |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW | 18 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 18 |
| 2.2 Different types of landslide | 19 |
| 2.3 Effective factors on landslide | 22 |
| 2.3.1. Categorizing factors based on effect | 23 |
| 2.3.2. Categorizing factors based on origin | 26 |
| 2.4 Data acquisition | 32 |
| 2.4.1 Remote sensing and landside (general concept) | 32 |
| 2.4.2 Remote sensing and Image classification techniques | 34 |
| 2.4.3 Remote sensing in landslide detection | 36 |
| 2.4.4 Remote sensing in landslide monitoring | 41 |



| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.4.5 Remote sensing in landslide spatial analysis and hazard prediction | 42 |
| 2.5 Data analyzing | 43 |
| 2.5.1 Input data layers | 46 |
| 2.5.2 DEM generation | 47 |
| 2.6 Scale Scheme | 48 |
| 2.7 Weight and rating scheme | 50 |
| 2.8 Basic assumptions | 52 |
| 2.9 Landslide susceptibility models for landslide hazard | 53 |
| 2.9.1 Landslide inventory based approach | 58 |
| 2.9.2 Heuristic approach | 58 |
| 2.9.3 Deterministic or engineering approach | 60 |
| 2.9.4 Statistical approach | 63 |
| 2.10 Landslide prediction models | 65 |
| 2.10.1 Multiple linear regression model | 66 |
| 2.10.2 Discriminate factor model | 67 |
| 2.10.3 Logistic regression model | 68 |
| 2.10.4 Fuzzy logic model | 69 |
| 2.10.5 Artificial neural network model | 70 |
| 2.10.6 Probabilistic-frequency ratio model | 71 |
| 2.11 Summary | 74 |
| 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS | 76 |
| 3.1 Hardware and software | 76 |
| 3.2 Methodology | 76 |
| 3.2.1 Data preparation | 77 |
| 3.2.2 Probabilistic frequency ratio model | 89 |
| 3.2.3 Hazard map preparation | 93 |
| 3.2.4 The rate curve for model validation | 94 |
| 3.2.5 Receiver operating characteristics curves for evaluation of classification | 98 |
| 3.2.6 Factor effect analysis | 103 |



| | |
|---|-----|
| 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 105 |
| 4.1 Frequency ratio and landslide hazard index values calculation (Numerical analysis) | 105 |
| 4.1.1 Geology | 106 |
| 4.1.2 Geomorphology | 112 |
| 4.1.3 Slope | 114 |
| 4.1.4 Aspect | 118 |
| 4.1.5 Land use/land cover | 120 |
| 4.1.6 Elevation | 122 |
| 4.1.7 Soil | 125 |
| 4.1.8 Distance from lineaments | 131 |
| 4.1.9 Distance from drainages | 133 |
| 4.1.10 Distance from road network | 135 |
| 4.1.11 Faults and Precipitation (triggering factors) | 136 |
| 4.2 Landslide hazard map | 141 |
| 4.3 Model validation | 143 |
| 4.4 Factor analysis | 145 |
| 4.5 Landslide hazard map classification | 147 |
| 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 157 |
| 5.1 Conclusion | 157 |
| 5.2 Recommendations for future study | 158 |
| REFERENCES | 160 |
| APPENDIX | 179 |
| BIODATA OF STUDENT | 181 |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | 181 |



LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.1 Stratigraphic characteristics of the area | 12 |
| 2.1 Abbreviated version of Varnes (1978) Landslide Classification | 20 |
| 2.2 Landslide classification based on Dikau et al. (1996) | 22 |
| 2.3 Main parameter of current and forthcoming optical /IR satellite and micro satellite system of medium to high spatial resolution | 35 |
| 2.4 Image characteristics of mass movement types | 38 |
| 2.5 Input data for landslide hazard analysis | 47 |
| 2.6 Summary of the feasibility and usefulness of applying remote techniques for landslide hazard zonation in three working scales | 62 |
| 3.1 List of collected data | 78 |
| 3.2 List of input data layers | 78 |
| 3.3 Average of annual precipitation of the nearest climatologic stations to the study area and their coordination | 87 |
| 3.4 Format of a Confusion Matrix | 99 |
| 3.5 Format of table to make a Confusion Matrix in five classes | 102 |
| 3.6 Constructed table to draw ROC curve | 103 |
| 4.1 Fr values Calculation for geology factor's classes | 109 |
| 4.2 Fr values calculation for geomorphology factor's classes | 113 |
| 4.3 Calculated Fr values for slope factor's classes | 115 |
| 4.4 Fr values calculation for aspect factor's classes | 119 |
| 4.5 Fr values calculation for Land use/cover factor's classes | 121 |
| 4.6 Fr value Calculation for elevation factor's classes | 123 |
| 4.7 Fr value Calculation for soil factor's classes | 126 |
| 4.8 Fr value calculation for lineament factor's classes | 132 |
| 4.9 Fr value calculation for Drainage factor's classes | 133 |
| 4.10 Fr value calculation for road net work factor's classes | 135 |
| 4.11 Fr value calculation for Precipitation factor's classes | 137 |
| 4.12 Fr value calculation for Fault factor's classes | 140 |



| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| 4.13 | Statistical values of LHI values in prepared Hazard map | 142 |
| 4.14 | Success and prediction results of hazard assessment | 143 |
| 4.15 | Area under the Curve for each factor exclusion | 147 |
| 4.16 | Confusion Matrix in five classes (Pre-calculations for sensitivity and specificity) | 148 |
| 4.17 | Sensitivity and specificity calculation | 149 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 1.1 Landslide in Atashgah-e- Karaj 2008 | 5 |
| 1.2 Iran in Middle East | 7 |
| 1.3 Digital geological map of the area | 11 |
| 1.4 Main Faults in Central Alborz | 14 |
| 1.5 Study area in Central Alborz | 16 |
| 2.1 Different landslide types based on material | 20 |
| 2.2 Major landslide types | 21 |
| 2.3 Stability states and destabilizing factors based on Crozier (1989) | 23 |
| 2.4 Different components related to the use of Geo-Information tools and methods for Risk analysis | 44 |
| 2.5 Relationship between Landslide Frequency and Slope Gradient | 51 |
| 2.6 Qualitative map combination utilizing the experience and knowledge of landslide causal factors in combination with parameter maps | 57 |
| 2.7 A schematic illustration of landslide susceptibility mapping methods used commonly at present and the corresponding references | 61 |
| 2.8 Structure of neural network for obtaining the factor of safety | 70 |
| 3.1 Schematic methodology | 79 |
| 3.2 Landslide locations map overlaid on TIN map of the study area | 80 |
| 3.3 Distance from road network map in six classes (left) and distance from drainages map in five classes (right) | 82 |
| 3.4 DEM (left) and elevation map of area (right) | 82 |
| 3.5 Slope and aspect maps of the study area | 83 |
| 3.6 Thematic maps of soil and geomorphology of the area | 83 |
| 3.7 Settlement and road map of the area overlaid on Landsat TM image (left), prepared land use map in seven classes (right) | 85 |
| 3.8 Multiple ring buffers on faults map (left) and lineaments map (right) | 86 |
| 3.9 Climatologic stations around Marzan Abad area | 88 |
| 3.10 Precipitation map of Central Alborz | 88 |
| 3.11 Thematic map of average annual precipitation of the area | 89 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.12 Landslide location map overlaid on TIN map of area | 93 |
| 3.13 Area under the curve calculation | 97 |
| 3.14 Regions of a ROC graph | 100 |
| 3.15 Three ROC curves representing excellent, good, and worthless tests | 101 |
| 4.1 Overlaying of land cover classes with K12 (series 2) and K1 classes (series 1) | 110 |
| 4.2 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on Geology factor | 112 |
| 4.3 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on geomorphology | 114 |
| 4.4 Relationships between slope angle and Fr values | 116 |
| 4.5 Geomorphologic class distribution in the area with slope > 40 degree | 117 |
| 4.6 Landslide susceptibility map of the area, base on Fr values of slope different classes | 117 |
| 4.7 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence base on aspect factor | 120 |
| 4.8 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence base on land use/cover factor | 122 |
| 4.9 Areas with 800-2000m heights, comparing with slope classes | 124 |
| 4.10 Areas with less than 800m heights comparing with geomorphology | 124 |
| 4.11 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence base on elevation factor | 125 |
| 4.12 “Medium soil from alluvial” (series 2) and weathered soils classes (series 1) comparing with land use | 127 |
| 4.13 Geomorphologic characteristics of “Medium soils over the rocks” class | 128 |
| 4.14 Distribution of slope classes in fine alluvial soil group | 128 |
| 4.15 Geomorphologic characteristics of “deep soil from alluvial” class | 129 |
| 4.16 Distributions of slope classes in “Medium soil over colluviums” class | 130 |
| 4.17 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence base on Soil factor | 131 |
| 4.18 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on Distance from Lineaments | 132 |
| 4.19 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on Distance from Drainage | 134 |
| 4.20 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on Distance from Road | 136 |
| 4.21 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on precipitation factor | 138 |



| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.22 Slope distribution in the 727-823mm class of precipitation | 139 |
| 4.23 Comparisons between vegetation cover of 1019-1145mm (series 1) and 921-1019mm (series 2) precipitation classes | 139 |
| 4.24 Susceptibility map of landslide occurrence based on distance from faults | 141 |
| 4.25 Non-classified landslide hazard map of Marzan Abad area | 142 |
| 4.26 Success and prediction rate curve based on total and validation group of landslide locations | 144 |
| 4.27 Cumulative frequency diagram showing landslide hazard index rank (x-axis) occurring in cumulative per cent of landslide occurrence (y-axis) | 146 |
| 4.28 Defined landslide hazard classes according to breaks of slope of prediction rate curves | 149 |
| 4.29 Comparison between three ROC curves | 150 |
| 4.30 Classified landslide hazard map based on equal area classifier | 152 |
| 4.31 Classified landslide hazard map based on visual judgment | 153 |
| 4.32 Final classification of landslide hazard map based on break values | 154 |
| 4.33 Landslide occurrences in three classified map | 154 |



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Natural hazards like landslides, avalanches, floods and debris flows can result in a lot of property damage and human losses in mountainous regions. Landslides are among the most hazardous natural disasters and during the years, landslide hazard and risk have been attempted to be assessed and its spatial distribution to be portrayed (Metternicht *et al.*, 2005). This geological phenomenon includes a wide range of ground movement and generally defined as a down slope movement of a mass of soil and rock material (Cruden, 1991).

Landslides are very common geological slope failure phenomenon in some countries like Brazil, Peru, Malaysia and Iran. Generally, lots of their areas have been subjected to slope failure under the effect of numerous factors, and triggered by events such as extreme rainfall or earthquake or both.

Landslides result from interdependent spatial-temporal processes, including hydrology (rainfall, evaporation, transpiration and groundwater), vegetation surcharge (weight of vegetation), root strength, soil and bedrock condition, topography, and human activities (Wu and Sidle, 1995). Human activities, such as urban expansion and deforestation, also increase the potential for landslides and result in adverse impacts to the environment



(Burton and Bathurst, 1998). The recent increasing of land-use changes has raised the level of landslide susceptibility, particularly in mountainous regions.

In the US alone, landslides cause an estimated annual average economic cost of \$1.5 billion. In Japan, annual losses are \$2 billion and in Italy, annual losses are more than \$2.6 billion. Worldwide in the 20th century the Asian continent has experienced the most landslide events (220 reported), the Americas reported the most deaths and injuries (25,000+) while Europe had the highest average damage per single event (\$23 million) (Gorsevski and Jankowski, 2008). In Iran also, because of its climate and heavy rain falls, landslide has a high level occurrence and makes a lot of losses and economic. Therefore more attention needs to be paid to the people who live within landslide-prone areas. And more available database about them and the measures taken are needed to avoid loss.

Mapping areas susceptible to landslides is essential for land-use management and should become a standard tool to support land management decision-making. Consequently, the need for methodologies which guide managers to choose the best management strategies while minimizing impacts from land-use activities in vulnerable slope areas is increasing (Gorsevski *et al.*, 2006). The spatial prediction of landslide hazards is one important field of geo-scientific research in which statistical classification rules have been applied. As noted by Uromeihy and Mahdaviifar (2001), the preparation of a landslide hazard zonation map is the first step in assessing the degree of hazard and evaluating its potential.



The aim of the zonation methods is, to identify areas that are susceptible to future landslides, based on the knowledge of past landslide events and terrain parameters, geological attributes and other possibly anthropogenic environmental conditions that are associated with the presence or absence of such phenomena (Brenning, 2005). During the recent decades, the use of landslide susceptibility and hazard maps for land use planning has increased significantly. These maps rank different sections of land surface according to the degree of actual or potential landslide hazard, thus, planners are able to choose favorable sites for urban and rural development. The reliability of these maps depends mostly on the applied methodology as well as the available data used for the hazard risk estimation (Parise, 2001).

In recent years, the use of GIS for landslide hazard modeling has been increasingly used. It is because of the development of commercial systems, such as ArcGIS (ESRI) and the quick access to data obtained through Global Positioning System (GPS) and remote sensing. Moreover, GIS is an excellent and useful tool for the spatial analysis of a multi-dimensional phenomenon such as landslides and for the landslide susceptibility mapping (Carrara *et al.*, 1999; Lan *et al.*, 2004; Van Westen *et al.*, 1999).

1.2. Statement of problem and justification

Recently, South Asia has suffered extensive loss of life and colossal damage to property as a result of geo-hazards such as tsunami, earthquake, floods, cyclones and landslides. In short, it is notable that the Asia itself, as the most hazardous and vulnerable continent, has been suffering more than 50 per cent of events, 90 per cent of casualties and 49 per

cent of the losses of natural disasters in the globe, leading to an average rate of 41 thousand tolls and 29 billion dollars loss a year. The maximum economical casualties caused by natural disaster within 1900 to 2005 occurred in Asia and Pacific (www.unescap.org).

Landslides pose a serious threat to natural resources, human lives and property. Landslides have represented 4.89% of the natural disasters that occurred worldwide during the years 1990 to 2005 (Kanungo *et al.*, 2006). This trend would be continued in future if unplanned urbanization and development be increased and/or irregular deforestations be continued.

Landslide is one of the main natural hazards in Iran that annually makes great economic and personal defect. Primary estimations show that annual fiscal defects of landslide are about 500 billion Rials (about \$600 Million) which does not involve the loss of unrecoverable resources (Nasiri, 2005).

Mountainous feature, high tectonic activity, geological and climatologically variety make the Iranian plateau capable for the occurrence of various kinds of landslides (especially in Alborz and Zagros active mountainous belts). Concerning climate condition, economy, and tourist attractions, the landslide risk along Alborz range specifically in central Alborz has a higher risk than other regions (Shoaei *et al.*, 2005).

Although, there are some studies such as Uromeihy and MahdaviFar (2001), Moghadas and Ghafoori (2007) and Tangestani (2009), that tried to evaluate landslide hazard in

some study areas of Iran, but there is not enough attention to evaluate the landslide hazardous areas in Iran, especially in central Alborz. Consequently, landslide losses continue to grow at an ever-increasing rate as human development expands into unstable hillside areas. As an example, in Iran's northern province of Mazandaran (January 2007), a landslide has inflicted heavy damages on the water, power, communication installations, utilities and a large number of residential units in the stricken area. This incident started initially with a slow landslip in the area, which has accelerated and turned into a landslide, damaging 20 villages. The costs of damages have been estimated about \$5,000,000. Landslides at the Hajiabad- Oshan road (2003), Fasham- Meygon road (2006), Atashgah-e-Karaj (2008) (Figure 1.1) and several landslides and rock falls that occurred on the Chalus–Tehran road (induced by Baladeh–Kojour earthquake on 28th May 2004), also have indicated what can happen when things go wrong.

It is difficult to ignore the huge losses to buildings, roads, rails, power lines, water lines, mineral equipments, oil industry, urban infrastructures, dams, forests, natural resources, farming lands and rural areas caused by landslide. In addition to physical losses, landslides cause environmental damage. When debris flows, generated by landslides entering rivers, lakes or other water bodies negatively affect water quality.

Seeing the need of resolving and minimizing such untoward incidences, the aim of this study is to test of frequency ratio model in the study area to identify areas that are more susceptible to future landslides and preparation of landslide hazard map of the area. Final hazard map will be used to do the best decisions about land use management in the future and avoid more losses.

Frequency ratio model was recently used by some researchers (Lee and Dan ,2005; Lee and Pradhan, 2006; Lee *et al.*, 2004 and Yilmaz 2008) in Vietnam, Malaysia, Korea and Turkey. The achieved results are completely satisfiable and comparable with the more complicated statistical models. Despite the success of this model it has never been applied for landslide studies in Iran. In this study, this model is going to be tested and used for the first time in Iran.

This model is based on the observed relationships between each factor and the distribution of landslides. Hazardous areas can be identified based on the knowledge of past landslide events, terrain parameters and other effective factors on landslide to do the best decisions about land use management in the future and avoid more losses. In this study landslide hazard map of the area has been prepared, its validity verified and effect of each factor was evaluated.



Figure 1.1 Landslide in Atashgah-e- Karaj 2008