

Seismic Risk Assessment and Management of Transportation Networks

Rapid Stochastic Assessment of Post-hazard Connectivity and Flow Capacity of Lifeline Networks



Junho Song

Assistant Professor

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign



Contents

Needs for rapid stochastic assessment and challenges

- Stochastic assessment in Decision Support System (DSS)
- Needs and challenges
- Matrix-based System Reliability (MSR) method

App1: Post-hazard connectivity of gas pipeline network

- Multi-scale system reliability analysis
- Consideration of spatial correlation of seismic intensity
- Component importance measures and parameter sensitivities

App2: Post-hazard network flow capacity of a transportation network

- Separation between network flow analysis and structural vulnerability analysis
- Uncertainty quantification of network flow quantity
- Efficient time-variant system reliability analysis considering structural deterioration

Summary and ongoing research

Needs for Rapid Stochastic Assessment and Challenges

Stochastic assessment in DSS

Needs for efficient stochastic assessment for lifeline networks

- Hazard mitigation planning (long-term)
 - can have many scenarios or cases
 - time-variant analysis (deterioration, aging, etc.)
- Quick hazard responses (short-term)
 - proximity of damaged components through probabilistic inference
 - immediate responses to minimize socio-economic losses
- Integration with optimization, information technology, monitoring system

Computational challenges

- Complexity of lifeline networks (size, system effect, etc.)
- Spatial correlation of hazard intensities (further increase the system size)
- Importance measures (component, uncertainty, etc.)
- Parameter sensitivities
- Integration with network flow (capacity and/or demand) analysis
- Time-variant analysis (deterioration)

It's system reliability problem!

* Song, J. and A. Der Kiureghian (2003). Bounds on system reliability by linear programming, *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 129(**6**), 627-636.

System reliability analysis (SRA)

• System event E_{sys} : logical function of component events, E_{i} , i = 1, ..., n



 P(E_{sys}): theoretical bounding formulas (Ditlevsen), sampling methods, and direct integration in random variable space

Challenges in SRA

- Complexity of system reliability problems: large number of components, difficulty in identifying critical cut sets or link sets, computational challenges
- Statistical dependence between component states (common source effect)
- Diversity or lack of available information
- Difficult to identify important components or parameters (critical for decision support)

Matrix-based System Reliability (MSR) method

* Song, J. and W.-H. Kang (2009). System reliability and sensitivity under statistical dependence by matrix-based system reliability method, *Structural Safety*, 31(**2**), 148-156.



- Convenient: matrix-based procedures for c and p; easy SRA calculation (inner product)
- General: uniform application to series, parallel, and any general systems
- Flexible: inequality-type information; incomplete information ("LP bounds" method)
- Efficient: no need to re-compute "p"; replace "c" for SRA of a new event
- Common Source Effect: can account for statistical dependence between components
- Decision Support: parameter sensitivities, component importance measure; inferences

App1: Post-hazard connectivity of gas pipeline network

Multi-scale SRA of lifeline networks

* Song, J., S.-Y. Ok, and L.. Chang (2008). Rapid risk assessment and decision support for urban infrastructure networks by MSR method. *Proc. Inaugural International Conference of the Engineering Mechanics Institute*, May 18~21, Minneapolis, MN.



"Divide and Conquer" approach

- Lower-scale system reliability analyses are performed for "supercomponents" and followed by higher-scale system reliability analyses
- Proposed to facilitate the use of LP bounds method (Song and Der Kiureghian, 2003) for large-size systems
- MSR method is a good tool for SRA at multiple scales

Advantages

- Multi-scale modeling of a system seeing big picture without disregarding the details
- Helps identify important components and parameters at multiple scales
- Collaborative risk management
- Facilitates parallel computing

Example: MLGW gas network



- Gas pipeline network of Memphis Light, Gas, and Water (MLGW), Shelby County, TN
- A simplified network in Chang et al. (1996) was modified based on comments from R. Bowker (MLGW)
- 37-node and 40-arc network: nodes representing pipelines and stations
- Earthquake hazard scenarios: Epicenter at N35.54°-W90.43° at Blytheville, AR
- Fragilities of pipelines and stations HAZUS-MH
- PGV and PGA maps from MAEviz



Prob. of Disconnection at Node 2

Risk at multiple scales

Probabilistic inference and sensitivity

Conditional Probabilities

Parameter Sensitivity



- Conditional probability of link failure probability given observed system event (e.g. disconnection)
- Sensitivity of system failure probability with respect to parameters in PGV-based model for failure occurrence rate: $v_i = k \cdot (PGV_i)^{\gamma}$



App2: Post-hazard flow capacity of bridge transportation network

Extension for network "flow" analysis

* Lee, Y.-J., J. Song, and P. Gardoni (2009). Post-hazard flow capacity of bridge transportation network considering structural deterioration, *ICOSSAR2009* (will be presented), Osaka, Japan.



- Multi-state failures: can handle more than two failure/damage states
- Separation between network flow analysis and vulnerability analysis:

No need to repeat network flow analysis (q) for time-varying fragility (deterioration, etc.)
No need to repeat probability calculations (p) for changes in network (new routes, etc.)
Flow analysis for damage scenarios with high likelihood only (for approximation)

Post-hazard flow capacity of a bridge network



Red: bridges; Circles: Starting & Ending points

- Traffic flow capacity between two points in a network → determined by combinations of bridge damages
 - **q** : a vector of network flow capacity for bridge failure combinations (obtained by maximum flow capacity analysis)

 $\mu_{Q} = \mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{p} \quad \text{: average post-hazard flow} \\ \text{capacity}$

$$\sigma_Q^2 = (\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{q})^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{p} - (\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{p})^2$$

: variance of post-hazard flow capacity

$$P(Q < a) = \sum_{\forall i: q_i < a} p_i$$

: probability that flow capacity is lower than *a*

Uncertainty quantification of flow capacity



Time-variant analysis; Reduction factor

Time-variant mean, std., and c.o.v. of flow capacity

Reduction of mean flow capacity by the failure of a bridge



Summary

Research needs and recent developments

Multi-scale system reliability analysis:

- Spatial correlation of seismic intensity
- Large size network
- Control modeling efforts at multiple scales
- Component importance measures
- Parameter sensitivities
- Separation between network flow analysis and vulnerability analysis:
 - Flexible uncertainty quantification of network flow metrics
 - Efficient network flow analysis due to separation
 - Importance measures w.r.t. network flow

Ongoing/future research

- Online integration with information technology including monitoring system
- Near-real-time probabilistic inference through machine learning algorithms

Thank you!