



UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE  
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Evacuation paths in historic city centres: A holistic methodology for assessing their seismic risk

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

*Original*

Evacuation paths in historic city centres: A holistic methodology for assessing their seismic risk / Quagliarini, Enrico; Bernardini, Gabriele; Santarelli, Silvia; Lucesoli, Michele. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DISASTER RISK REDUCTION. - ISSN 2212-4209. - STAMPA. - 31:(2018), pp. 698-710. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.07.010]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11566/259835 since: 2022-05-25T10:42:28Z

*Publisher:*

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.07.010

*Terms of use:*

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. The use of copyrighted works requires the consent of the rights' holder (author or publisher). Works made available under a Creative Commons license or a Publisher's custom-made license can be used according to the terms and conditions contained therein. See editor's website for further information and terms and conditions.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Politecnica delle Marche (<https://iris.univpm.it>). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1  
2  
3  
4 Evacuation paths in historic city centres: a holistic methodology  
5  
6  
7 for assessing their seismic risk  
8  
9

10 Enrico Quagliarini, Gabriele Bernardini\*, Silvia Santarelli, Michele Lucesoli

11  
12  
13 DICEA Dept, Università Politecnica delle Marche, via di Brece Bianche 60131 Ancona, phone: +39 071 220 4246, fax: +39 071 220  
14 4582, \*corresponding author: Gabriele Bernardini, mail: g.bernardini@univpm.it  
15

16 **Abstract**

17  
18  
19 During seismic emergencies in historical urban scenarios, evacuation paths can suffer significant  
20  
21 damages and modifications due to both extrinsic (i.e.: building facing the path) and intrinsic (i.e.:  
22  
23 pavements state, the presence of underground lifelines or hypogeum) vulnerabilities. Such damages  
24  
25 and modifications can hinder the population's evacuation and the first responders' intervention,  
26  
27 mainly because of paths' blockage or unavailability in emergency conditions. Paths' safety is  
28  
29 additionally affected by populations' exposure conditions, also due to individuals' motion in the  
30  
31 post-earthquake environment. Hence, an analysis of factors influencing the seismic risk of  
32  
33 evacuation paths and a consequent evaluation of their safety during the emergency are thus  
34  
35 desirable. This work aims to offer a preliminary and quick holistic method for seismic risk assessment  
36  
37 and damage level estimation of possible evacuation paths. Firstly, data about safety influencing  
38  
39 factors (i.e.: path use and exposure; geometric features; physical-structural features; extrinsic  
40  
41 vulnerability; seismic hazard) are collected, associated to related weights and organized in risk  
42  
43 indexes according to three calculation approaches. Then, according to real-world data, a correlation  
44  
45 about path risk-damage levels is proposed with the additional purpose to evaluate the method  
46  
47 capabilities in describing post-earthquake scenarios. Obtained results evidence that the proposed  
48  
49 methodology could help safety designers in the seismic emergency planning of urban paths (i.e.: by  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

60  
61  
62 means of risk maps) by including the management of population's evacuation routes towards  
63  
64 assembly points, the optimization of rescuers' activities and the promotion of different priorities of  
65  
66 interventions on building heritage.  
67

68  
69  
70 KEYWORDS: Earthquake emergency evacuation, Urban path network, Risk index evaluation, Safe  
71  
72 paths, evacuation path network, urban path damages.  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77

## 78 **1 Introduction**

79  
80

81 Earthquakes in a historical urban fabric can lead to critical situations which affect the built  
82  
83 environment and the exposed population during the event and the following post-event emergency  
84  
85 phases because of built scenario modifications due to earthquake damages [1-3].  
86  
87

88 In fact, earthquake-induced modifications to urban fabric can influence the effective safety levels  
89  
90 for population moving along evacuation paths and the related possibility to reach safe areas (e.g.:  
91  
92 no possibility to reach assembly points because evacuation paths could be blocked by debris) in  
93  
94 which individuals could receive the first responders' support [4-7]. Debris generation from building  
95  
96 collapse could be added to street pavement cracks or land failure by provoking additional risks for  
97  
98 citizens' evacuation and rescuers' access to the damaged scenario [8-11].  
99

100  
101  
102 According to a general risk assessment approach [12-14], the evacuation path risk depends on the  
103  
104 combination between:  
105  
106

- 107 • hazard, mainly in terms of soil category, morphology and topography, local amplification  
108  
109 phenomena also related to the position of the historical urban fabric (e.g.: on the top of a  
110  
111 hill) [15];  
112  
113

- 119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141
- vulnerability as a function of: intrinsic vulnerability, which relates to the elements composing the street itself, the related infrastructural elements (i.e.: street pavements, foundations, embankment, and lifelines) [16] and the interfering elements, such as underground structures) [9,17]; extrinsic vulnerability, which refers to the elements that do not directly belong to the path itself but can compromise or block it (i.e.: buildings that can collapse by blocking facing streets because of debris formation) due to the typical scenario of historic city centres (i.e.: narrow streets with high facing buildings; network complexity);
  - possible exposure conditions (i.e.: high density of citizen, tourists' presence, mass-gathering events) [18,19].

142 From this point of view, the proposal of a holistic risk index concerning evacuation paths network  
143 elements can help safety planners to [2,18-23]:  
144  
145

- 146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158
- understand which factors are effectively able to affect safety conditions (before/during the emergency);
  - design proactive risk-reduction strategies (i.e.: interventions on buildings);
  - design evacuation plans (i.e.: safest path choice) leading to efficient rescue operations' management in historical scenarios.

159 Correlations between risk, event intensity and earthquake-induced damages could be able to offer  
160 additional data for emergency scenario characterization [24]. Such scenarios' predictions could be  
161  
162  
163  
164 also included in models for emergency and evacuation simulation [25-28].  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172

178  
179  
180 1.1 *Background on evacuation path risk analysis*  
181  
182

183 Methods for estimating the influence of extrinsic vulnerability have been largely debated, by  
184 proposing different methodologies for building vulnerability assessment [20,29–31]. Macroseismic  
185 methods seem to be more suitable for urban scale application because their application is based on  
186 easy-to-detect building parameters [32]. Taking advantages of these methods, previous works gave  
187 a quantification of produced debris on path network elements (i.e.: streets) by using **correlations**  
188 between building vulnerability, macroseismic intensity and geometrical aspects [22]. A quick  
189 methodology for assessing **the** seismic vulnerability of paths network by considering interferences  
190 with building heritage damages was also proposed [22].  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200

201  
202 On the contrary, few works inquired about intrinsic path vulnerability. Previous studies principally  
203 focused on paths' network capabilities evaluating earthquake-induced effects in terms of variations  
204 on possible traffic flows or social-economic consequences generated by one or more unusable paths  
205 [33]. Other approaches dealt with particular structural features (i.e.: technical provisions, structural  
206 project, soil compaction rather than liquefaction) of highway networks systems, by focusing their  
207 attention on typologies whose presence in historical urban fabrics is limited (i.e.: trenches,  
208 embankments, bridges) [10,34].  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217

218 Other researches proposed to analyse the paths network by separately considering intrinsic and  
219 extrinsic vulnerabilities for each composing element [16]. The application of this methodology needs  
220 a detailed description of each path link, by including specific local surveys and related data collection  
221 processes that could not be quickly employed in a wide scale assessment. Similar methods adopt  
222 empirical and quick analysis criteria at the overall urban fabric scale, by trying to include hazard  
223 characterization in terms of soil features and response [20].  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239 The intrinsic vulnerability features have been also associated with their seismic response through  
240  
241 fragility curves [35,36]. These curves describe the possibility for buildings, streets and pipelines to  
242  
243 reach a certain damage state in correspondence to specific earthquake severity values (e.g.: Peak  
244  
245 Ground Acceleration - PGA). In this way, the extrinsic vulnerability could be combined to the analysis  
246  
247 of intrinsic one by means of combinations of earthquake-induced effects. Since this approach  
248  
249 associates an own fragility curve for each studied street element, it seems to be quite onerous for  
250  
251 application to a wide-scale urban area. Moreover, it should be precisely calibrated for historical  
252  
253 scenarios. Concerning such description of street damages due to earthquake effects, simplified  
254  
255 methods based on discrete damage scale for paths elements (called "Road Damage Scale" - RDS)  
256  
257 have been proposed [37]. Correlations between variables characterizing a seismic event (i.e.:  
258  
259 magnitude, distance from the epicentre and hypocentre distance) and street damages were  
260  
261 provided on real cases observations. Nevertheless, such an approach seems to overlook the path  
262  
263 risk-affecting factors.  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268

269 Other works related to emergency management issues have considered urban paths as a  
270  
271 cooperating system, and have assessed their physical efficiency in order to guarantee the operability  
272  
273 of the contingency plan [11].  
274

275  
276 Finally, the method for paths risk assessment developed by Task-4 of SAVE project activities [19]  
277  
278 tried to give a preliminary comprehensive overview on the risk-affecting factors concerning the  
279  
280 aforementioned emergency path-related issues. In general terms, this method (called "Cherubini's  
281  
282 method" in the following) is aimed at evaluating the seismic risk of the whole historical centre by  
283  
284 defining the risk of each composing urban paths elements (i.e.: streets; squares; crossroads). To this  
285  
286 end, differently from previous studies, aspects involving paths structure and geometrical features  
287  
288 are merged to the ones referring to paths conditions in terms of traffic and exposure (i.e.:  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295

296  
297  
298 establishing if the path is an interconnection route or an access route, if it is travelled in one-way,  
299  
300 and evaluating its average traffic flow). Such aspects are then combined according to a weighted  
301  
302 approach to define the final path risk index. The Cherubini's method offers wide capabilities on how  
303  
304 to collect and merge the risk-affecting factors and innovatively includes paths exposure issues, but  
305  
306 it should be improved by including the local seismic hazard and the seismic effects on soil related to  
307  
308 the infrastructures.  
309

### 310 311 312 313 *1.2 Work aim and main limitations*

314  
315 As underlined in Section 1.1, current methodologies seem to be affected by different lacks. Firstly,  
316  
317 they seem to overlook aspects related to typical elements of urban fabric (i.e.: the presence of  
318  
319 underground natural or artificial cavities that could influence the frequency spectrum of seismic  
320  
321 waves [38]), local soil response to earthquake shaking (i.e.: liquefaction) and other risk sources  
322  
323 affected by the presence of underground pipelines [39]. These conditions could cause damaging  
324  
325 consequences in case of leakages or explosions triggered by high-severity earthquakes.  
326  
327

328  
329 Secondly, they generally avoid jointly considering causes and features linked with the path network  
330  
331 evaluation. Although some researches [10,19,20] offer reliable bases to this end, no one seems to  
332  
333 involve the analysis of historical centre scenarios by including the effects of intrinsic damaging of  
334  
335 streets.  
336  
337

338  
339 Finally, methods to relate path risk and possible earthquake-induced damage state to safety  
340  
341 planners supporting activities for wide-scale applications in urban paths systems are not currently  
342  
343 available. Therefore, this paper firstly tries to develop a holistic methodology which considers all  
344  
345 the risk-affecting factors to provide path risk indexes in historical city centres. Then, three different  
346  
347 calculation approaches (and so three novel path risk indexes) to combine the risk-influencing factors  
348  
349  
350

355  
356  
357 are proposed and compared. Then, analyses on post-earthquake damage grades prevision are  
358  
359 innovatively included by linking the developed path risk indexes to paths damage scale provided by  
360  
361 previous works [37]. Real-world data are used to this aim. This holistic perspective allows  
362  
363 preventively assessing the path safety, and then evaluating path preservation strategies in the  
364  
365 aftermath of seismic events by considering the different aspects on which designers could  
366  
367 intervene.  
368  
369

370  
371 The classification of risk conditions of each element (and of each composing part) in the evacuation  
372  
373 path network will help safety planners in choosing the better strategies to evacuate citizen and to  
374  
375 direct rescuers' teams in emergency phase, as well as in evaluating the impact of different proactive  
376  
377 strategies of emergency management and risk reduction interventions.  
378  
379

## 380 381 **2 Phases and methods**

### 382 383 384 385 **2.1 Phases**

386  
387 The paper is organised in the following phases:  
388  
389

- 390  
391 • Paths network schematization, to univocally define the requirements for the elements  
392  
393 to be investigated (Section 2.2);  
394
- 395  
396 • Definition of paths risk-influencing factors according to the main parameters  
397  
398 suggested by the whole literature review: path configuration; exposure (Section 2.3.1);  
399  
400 geometrical features (Section 2.3.2); physical-structural features of infrastructural  
401  
402 elements (i.e.: streets) (Section 2.3.3); extrinsic vulnerability (Section 2.3.4); seismic  
403  
404 Hazard influence (Section 2.3.5);  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409

- Definition of the novel holistic path risk assessment methodology based on the influencing factors, which is implemented by proposing three calculation approaches to calculate the risk index (modified Cherubini's method, Expert Judgement, Analytical Hierarchy Process) (Section 2.4);
- Application of the three developed risk indexes to a real-world sample in order to evaluate their capabilities and offer a preliminary validation, through the proposal of a risk index-damage state level correlation (Section 2.5).
- Application of the novel methodology **through** the calculation approach-risk index having the highest coefficient of determination  $R^2$  to a representative case study to preliminarily demonstrate its capabilities, by also means of risk maps representation (Section 2.6).

Notations used in the following sections are resumed in Appendix A.

## 2.2 Path Network schematization

In order to evaluate the path network, this has to be divided into different composing elements univocally determined, called Links and Nodes according to the definitions given in **Table 1** [22,25]. A graphical example is offered by **Figure 1**. Different paths could be traced by connecting consecutive links and nodes, to evidence rescuers' and evacuees' routes within the urban fabric, and from/to specific emergency areas. Since the proposed methodology is based on the risk analysis of the composing elements, the overall evaluation of each path risk can be performed by summing the partial risk indexes.

473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531

**Table 1** Street network schematization; Links definition, *the* subdivision between types of Nodes and related assessment tools.

Path elements	kind	Definition	Assessment tools	Identification code
Nodes	Control point	crossroads, significant plano-altimetric and structural variations (i.e.: pavement features, <i>the</i> presence of structural elements such as retaining walls, protection measurements or bridges and tunnels) along the path network [22]	Control points take the maximum risk index of links converged in it evaluated through <b>Table 2</b>	Numeric code
	Square <sup>1</sup>	Nodes that can be considered assembly points or rescuers' first-aid areas (e.g. wide open spaces, where people spontaneously gather and can safely wait <i>for</i> rescuers' arrival) [25]	See <b>Table 3</b>	Alpha-numeric code
Links	-	Connection between two different nodes. A path composed <i>of</i> segments with different features can be schematized as an ensemble of consecutive links, divided by nodes.	See <b>Table 2</b>	Alphabetic code

<sup>1</sup> A Square is a particular node where building facades projections do not entirely cover the square's area itself. Such condition allows Squares to hold people during *the* emergency. For this reason, Squares need an ad hoc earthquake evaluation.




Figure 1 Example of a graphical representation of the path network scheme in a historical city centre map: Links (black segments) are delimited by Control Points (Nodes) placed in each plano-altimetric or structural variations (grey circles). Squares, defined according to Table 1, are highlighted by grey filled areas.

### 2.3 Risk-influencing factors definition for methodology definition

Starting from the literature discussion presented in Section 1, the proposed methodology tries to collect all the risk-influencing parameters in six influencing factors combined by topics and discussed in the following sub-sections. According to previous works [19,40,41], each parameter can be characterised by different conditions, called “alternatives” (between two and five), which are associated to a numeric value within the risk index, as described in Section 2.4. All the considered influencing factors are defined by considering both the single path network composing elements (intrinsic vulnerability and exposure conditions) and the elements that could directly compromise its state (extrinsic vulnerability and seismic hazard). According to general Table 1 guidelines, the proposed methodology evaluates the factors influencing path risk by means of two similar Assessment Table: Table 2 shows the one related to Links risk assessment; Table 3 summarizes the one for Squares assessment.

In general terms, both **Table 2** and **Table 3** contain information about exposure, geometrical features and physical-structural features, subsoil conditions and vulnerability of facing buildings. The Squares Assessment Table (**Table 3**) includes specific parameters that are proposed in addition to the ones of Link Table or replace some of them because of specific Squares features. Parameters linked to specific street typologies (e.g.: bridges, viaducts and tunnels) are omitted in the current work **proposal because** they are rarely present in historic city centres.

**Table 2** Link Assessment Table: factors, parameters and associated alternatives are reported to evaluate the risk-influencing aspects of links within the urban path network. IDs for factors and parameters are assigned to connect this table with Table 4.

ID	Factors	ID	Parameters	Alternatives	
A	Path analysis	A.1	Link code	-	
			1° Node code	-	
			2° Node code	-	
		A.2	State	Clear	Partially obstructed
				Obstructed	
B	Exposure	B.1	Street type	Interconnection	
				Access	
		B.2	Direction of travel	Single	Double
				B.3	Carriageway
		B.4	Path type	Urban	Suburban
B.5	Average Flow			Low	
C	Geometric features	C.1	Length (m)	$0 < L \leq 0.33 L_{max}$	
				$0.33 L_{max} < L \leq 0.67 L_{max}$	
				$0.67 L_{max} < L \leq L_{max}$	
		C.2	Width (m)	$0.67 W_{max} < W \leq W_{max}$	
				$0.33 W_{max} < W \leq 0.67 W_{max}$	
		$0 < W \leq 0.33 W_{max}$			
D	Physical-structural features	D.1	Finishing surface	Asphalted	
				Paved	
				Rough	
D.2	Potential landslides	No landslide, retaining walls in both sides			
		Landslide, retaining walls in one side			
D.3	Underground elements	Landslide, no retaining walls			
		Low-risk pipes			

650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708

				High-risk pipes Caves, cisterns or cavities
		D.4	Conservation state	High Medium Low
		D.5	Street Typology	Level link Hillside link, with retaining walls Hillside link, without retaining walls Tunnel Bridge and viaduct
E	Extrinsic vulnerability	E.1	$V_{Nlink}$	$0 < V_{Nlink} \leq 25\%$ $25\% < V_{Nlink} \leq 50\%$ $50\% < V_{Nlink} \leq 75\%$ $75\% < V_{Nlink} \leq 100\%$
F	Seismic hazard	F.1	Design ground acceleration ( $a_g$ )	$a_g \leq 0.05g$ $0.05g < a_g \leq 0.15g$ $0.15g < a_g \leq 0.25g$ $a_g > 0.25g$
		F.2	Ground type	A B C D E
		F.3	Topographic amplification factor	T1 T2 T3 T4

**Table 3** Squares Assessment Table: parameters and associated alternatives are reported only for factors B, C and D (and the related parameters) that are different from Links Assessment Table according to how defined in Section 2.3. The other factors (A, E and F) are the same as reported in Table 2.

ID	Factors	ID	Parameters	Alternatives
B	Exposure	B.1	Usage	Wide crossroad Pedestrians' zone Parking area
		B.2	Presence of obstacles	Absence Presence
		B.3	Square type	Urban Suburban
		B.4	Average Flow	Low Medium High
C	Geometric features	C.1		$0.67 A_{max} < A \leq A_{max}$ $0.33 A_{max} < A \leq 0.67 A_{max}$ $0 < A \leq 0.33 A_{max}$

D	Physical-structural features	D.2	Potential landslides	No landslide, retaining walls in more than one sides Landslide, retaining walls in one side Landslide, no retaining walls
		D.5	Square Typology	Level Square Hillside Square with retaining walls Hillside Square without retaining walls

### 2.3.1 Path analysis and Exposure

The Link Assessment Table identifies the inspected street element through a code and their respective nodes; a preventive information about link accessibility is also given to investigate only usable paths in emergency conditions (**Table 2**, ID=A).

For both Links and Squares, the exposure factor (ID=B) is assessed in terms of path role and importance that it assumes within the urban fabric during the emergency.

In **Table 2**, ID=B concerns link exposure-affecting parameters from the point of view of functional analysis. Paths can represent an access route to the urban environment strategic in emergency phases or can constitute an interconnection among safe areas or strategic buildings [11]. Moreover, the link is considered an effective evacuation path in case of absence of barriers, traffic lane dividers, bollards or further obstacles that entirely limit the width of lanes or even prevent the access of rescuers/evacuees. Average flow refers to a semi-quantitative assessment of traffic along the path.

In **Table 3** ID=B parameters are modified so as to consider the specific features of squares and, first of all, their intended use: wide crossroad, characterized by multi-directional movement of both vehicles and pedestrians; pedestrian zone; parking area, characterized by possible available areas limitations due to parked vehicles. In addition, other square-specific parameters refer to the presence of architectural elements like street furniture, fences, low walls, trees which could be

widespread in the square area and could interfere with pedestrians' motion/rescuers' access or emergency operations.

### 2.3.2 Geometric features

As reported in **Table 2** ID=C, the length of the street affects the travel time required to reach a destination, while its width can influence the evacuation flows because of interfering obstacles that could also limit the effective width of the path (i.e.: urban furniture; debris presence due to damaged buildings). The paths sample in the considered urban historical area is organized by following a related dimensional scale in terms of width  $W$  and length  $L$ . Longer and narrower paths in the sample are considered as more hazardous in respect to the others. For Squares, the considered geometrical parameter concerns the area extension (**Table 3**, ID=C).

### 2.3.3 Physical-structural features

The evaluated parameters in **Table 2** ID=D firstly concern street surface (asphalted, paved or rough), that could influence the streets' accessibility also related to its conservation state. Indeed street pavement typologies and their state of conservation could affect the evacuation process causing pedestrians accidents or injuries during the escape [42].

Potential slide down of soil and rocks on both sides of the path and the preventing measures (e.g.: retaining walls) are identified so as to include risks due to the blockage of the path to evacuees and rescuers' vehicles, causing problems and delays to the emergency mobility [15].

A specific parameter is added by this work to include the existence of caves, cisterns and natural or artificial underground structures that are typical of the historical urban environment [17]. These subsoil vulnerable elements could provoke instability leading to local street collapses. Furthermore,

827  
828  
829 pipes placed at scarce depth could be considered as weak points for the street safety. Such lifelines  
830  
831 are distinguished between [39,43,44]: **low-risk** lifelines such as electrical power or water supply  
832  
833 systems with restrained pipes dimension; **high-risk** lifelines like gas and oil distribution networks. In  
834  
835 this way, the study also evaluates the risk connected to pipelines of gas or water supply system that  
836  
837 could lead to cascade effects (i.e.: dangerous gas leaks, fires, local soil destabilization).  
838  
839  
840  
841

#### 842 2.3.4 Extrinsic vulnerability

843  
844 In **Table 2**, ID=E innovatively takes advantage of the street vulnerability method [22] referred to  
845  
846 aspects concerning extrinsic vulnerability assessment by inquiring the building heritage directly  
847  
848 facing paths or squares. Thus, according to a related geometric approach for path blockage [4], if  
849  
850 the width  $W_b$  of the urban space (street/square) facing the building  $b$  is higher than the building  
851  
852 average height  $H_b$  [m], the building is considered as not interfering and hence it is not inquired  
853  
854 [4,22]. Vulnerability Index  $V^{link}$  considers the interfering building and is a function of: building  
855  
856 incidence  $I_b$  on the link defined as the ratio between building  $L_b$  and link  $L$  lengths, respectively ( $I_b$   
857  
858 =  $L_b/L$ ); building vulnerability  $V_b$  expressed according to the macroseismic method to ensure quick  
859  
860 application for historical city centre scale [32] (a probable scenario is given in **Figure 1**). For each link  
861  
862  $j$ ,  $V^{link,j}$  is calculated as shown in Equation (1) by considering the buildings on the link  $j$ :  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867

$$868 \quad V_{link,j} = \sum_{b \in j} V_b * b \quad (1)$$

869  
870  
871  
872 However, within buildings in the same scenario, link vulnerabilities must be normalized by the  
873  
874 maximum  $V^{link,j}$  obtainable in that scenario. According to [20,22], obtained  $V^{N link,j}$  are divided into  
875  
876 four alternatives, as shown in **Table 2** section E.  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885

886  
887  
888 **2.3.5 Seismic hazard**  
889  
890

891 Seismic hazard factors are innovatively introduced by this work on path risk assessment. The  
892 observation of real cases highlights how both base and local features of soil can be relevant for the  
893 paths' damaging, because of cracks or damages occurring on the ground and directly affecting the  
894 carriageway state [15]. Our methodology, taking advantages from Eurocode 8 [45], proposes to  
895 evaluate the seismic hazard basing on the design ground acceleration ( $a_g$ ) [g] related to each seismic  
896 zones, the ground types and also, according to Italian building code, on the topographic  
897 amplification factors [46]. The adoption of the Eurocode 8-based criterion ensures a quick  
898 application even if low-detailed resources and no geotechnical **documentation** or local surveys on  
899 soil (such as microzoning studies) are available [47].  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910

911  
912  
913 **2.4 Risk Index definition**  
914

915 Three different calculation approaches are proposed to combine the risk-influencing factors  
916 described in Section 2.3 and then to obtain the final Risk Index  $I_{R,j}$  for each link. In general terms, a  
917 holistic method can be operatively applied by considering a **Multi-Criteria** Decision Making process  
918 [48] in which the defined risk-influencing factors do not necessarily have the same relevance in the  
919 overall risk index.  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926

927 **Table 4** Features of the three calculation approaches are reported with the aim to compare the introduced modification in respect to  
928 [19].  
929  
930

	[19]	Modified Cherubini's approach	Expert judgement	Analytical Hierarchy Process
Modified parameters and factors	-	Added the parameter "Underground elements" in Physical-structural features factor		
	-	Added the factor "Extrinsic vulnerability" with a single parameter ( $V_{link}$ )		
	-	Added the factor "Seismic hazard" with following parameters: "Design ground acceleration", "Ground type" and "Topographic amplification factor"		
Values	Cherubini's approach	Values are given following Cherubini's approach	Values are given by <b>the</b> Expert judgement	Given through Analytical Hierarchy Process

Weights	Cherubini's approach	approach	Weights are given by the Expert judgement	Two sets of weights are given for each factor and parameters through the Analytical Hierarchy Process
$I_{R,j}$ calculation approach	The weighted sums are firstly normalized on factors maximum obtainable value and then on related weight for each factor	The weighted sum is firstly normalized on factors maximum obtainable value and then on related weight for each factor	The index is obtained through the sum of $Sp_{iK}$ values weighted on related $W_{cK}$ for each factor	The calculation is given by a first weighted sum on $W_{iK}$ for each parameter and then on $W_{cK}$ for each factor
$I_{R,j}$ formulation	$\sum_{K=1}^5 \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} \right)}{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK}^{MAX} \right)} * W_{cK} \right]$	$\sum_{K=1}^5 \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} \right)}{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK}^{MAX} \right)} * W_{cK} \right]$	$\sum_{k=1}^5 \left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} * W_{cK} \right)$	$\sum_{k=1}^5 \left( \left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} * W_{iK} \right) * W_{cK} \right)$

#### 2.4.1 Modified Cherubini's approach

The first calculation approach, based on Task-4 of SAVE project [19], tries to fill its lacks through some changes including influencing factors and parameters defined in previous Section 2.3 and highlighted in **Table 4**. Each factor containing influencing parameters is associated with a weight to establish a hierarchy of influence (values and weights are reported in **Table 5**). In this case, the final Risk Index  $I_{R,j}$  is assessed through the Equation (2):

$$I_{R,j} = \sum_{K=1}^5 \left[ \frac{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} \right)}{\left( \sum_i Sp_{iK}^{MAX} \right)} * W_{cK} \right] \quad (2)$$

where:

- $Sp_{iK}$  is the value conferred to the  $i$ -th parameter of the  $K$ -th factor;
- $Sp_{iK}^{MAX}$  is maximum attributable value to the  $i$ -th parameter of the  $K$ -th factor;
- $W_{cK}$  is the weight related to the  $K$ -th factor;

1004  
1005  
1006 According to [19], Equation (3) permits to obtain the correspondent normalized index for each link (  
1007  
1008

1009  $I_{Rn,j}$ ):  
1010  
1011

$$I_{Rn,j} = \frac{I_R}{\sum_{k=1}^5 Wc_K} \quad (3)$$

1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017

#### 1018 1019 2.4.2 Expert judgement 1020

1021  
1022 The second approach establishes an alternative hierarchy among factors based on an expert  
1023 judgement [49]. Different weights are associated to each factor and different values are associated  
1024 to each alternative according to **Table 5** while considering the Expert Judgement approach, thus  
1025 another formulation for Risk Index  $I_{R,j}$  assessment is defined in Equation (4):  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032

$$I_{R,j} = \sum_{k=1}^5 \left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} * Wc_K \right) \quad (4)$$

1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037

1038 According to the previous definition of  $Sp_{iK}$ ,  $Sp_{iK}^{MAX}$  and  $Wc_K$ , Equation (5) normalizes the obtained  
1039

1040 Risk Index:  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044

$$I_{Rn,j} = \frac{I_{R,j}}{\sum_{k=1}^5 \left( \sum_i Sp_{iK}^{MAX} * Wc_K \right)} \quad (5)$$

1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057

### 2.4.3 Analytical Hierarchy Process

The third proposed way to reach the Risk Index  $I_{R,j}$  can be supported by Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) developed by [41] and used with the same purpose in this field by [50]. This approach needs to introduce a second level of weights to each parameter ( $W_{iK}$ ) establishing an influence scale among them. The AHP considers that the sum of conferred weights must be equal to one both for factors and for each parameter. In this way, the generated Risk Index varies between zero and one and it does not require further normalization. The weight distributions (reported in **Table 5** in AHP section) are obtained through the open source tool AHP Online System<sup>2</sup> and the calculated Ratio of Consistency (lower than 10%) confirms the acceptability of the proposed weights. Equation (6) shows the proposed calculation of the Risk Index, that is gained by defining  $W_{iK}$  as the weight related to the  $i$ -th parameter:

$$I_{R,j} = \sum_{k=1}^5 \left( \left( \sum_i Sp_{iK} * W_{iK} \right) * W_{cK} \right) \quad (6)$$

Regardless of the chosen approach,  $I_{R,j}$  and  $I_{Rn,j}$  can be collected in tables and graphically represented on urban centre maps to directly recognise where most dangerous paths (links) are collocated and how the safe areas (squares) are connected between them.

**Table 5** Weights of factors ( $W_{cK}$ ), weights of parameters ( $W_{iK}$ ) and the related values ( $Sp_{iK}$ ) are reported for the three different considered approaches: Modified Cherubini's approach, Expert judgement and the Analytical Hierarchy Process.

Factor ID	Parameter ID	Modified Cherubini's approach		Expert judgement		Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)		
		$W_{cK}$	$Sp_{iK}$	$W_{cK}$	$Sp_{iK}$	$W_{cK}$	$W_{iK}$	$Sp_{iK}$
B	B.1	0.2	0.4	0.333	0.4	0.045	0.272	0.5

<sup>2</sup> AHP Online System available at: <https://bpmmsg.com/academic/ahp-hierarchy.php> (last access: 2018/04/17).

1122  
 1123  
 1124  
 1125  
 1126  
 1127  
 1128  
 1129  
 1130  
 1131  
 1132  
 1133  
 1134  
 1135  
 1136  
 1137  
 1138  
 1139  
 1140  
 1141  
 1142  
 1143  
 1144  
 1145  
 1146  
 1147  
 1148  
 1149  
 1150  
 1151  
 1152  
 1153  
 1154  
 1155  
 1156  
 1157  
 1158  
 1159  
 1160  
 1161  
 1162  
 1163  
 1164  
 1165  
 1166  
 1167  
 1168  
 1169  
 1170  
 1171  
 1172  
 1173  
 1174  
 1175  
 1176  
 1177  
 1178  
 1179  
 1180

			0.6		0.6			1
	B.2		0.6		0.6		0.272	0.5
			0.1		0.1			1
	B.3		0.2		0.2		0.036	1
			0.1		0.1			0.5
	B.4		0.6		0.6		0.272	1
			0.3		0.3			0.5
	B.5		0.1		0.1		0.147	0.33
			0.3		0.3			0.67
			0.5		0.5			1
C	C.1	0.40	0.1	0.667	0.1	0.067	0.667	0.33
			0.5		0.5			0.67
			1		1			1
	C.2		0.2		0.2		0.333	0.33
			0.4		0.4			0.67
			0.6		0.6			1
D	D.1	0.80	0.3	1.000	0	0.381	0.143	0.33
			0.55		0.3			0.67
			0.8		0.5			1
	D.2		0.1		0		0.429	0.33
			0.8		0.8			0.67
			1		1			1
	D.3		0.1		0.33		0.143	0.33
			0.6		0.67			0.67
			0.8		1			1
	D.4		0.3		0		0.143	0.33
			0.55		0.3			0.67
			0.8		0.5			1
	D.5		0.1		0		0.143	0
			0.4		0.4			0.25
			0.5		0.5			0.5
			0.6		0.6			0.75
			0.8		0.8			1
E	E.1	0.60	0.25	1.000	0.25	0.126	0.126	0.25
			0.5		0.5			0.5
			0.75		0.75			0.75
			1		1			1
F	F.1	1.00	0.25	1.000	0.25	0.381	0.400	0.25
			0.5		0.5			0.5
			0.75		0.75			0.75
			1		1			1
	F.2		0		0		0.400	0
			0.25		0.25			0.25
			0.625		0.625			0.5
			1		1			1
			0.75		0.75			0.75
	F.3		0		0		0.200	0
			0.25		0.25			0.5
			0.25		0.25			0.5
			0.5		0.5			1

1181  
1182  
1183 **2.5 Risk Indexes application and comparison**  
1184  
1185

1186 The three approaches on risk indexes assessment of path network (Modified Cherubini's approach,  
1187 Expert Judgment and the AHP approach) are applied to a real-world sample to evaluate their  
1188 capabilities and offer a preliminary validation of each one. To this aim, a risk index-damage state  
1189 level correlation, based on damage levels given by [37], is also offered in order to demonstrate the  
1190 reliability of the proposed calculation approaches through the comparison between assessed  
1191 normalized Risk Index and damages suffered by links from real cases observation.  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199



1223  
1224 **Figure 2** Urban scenario damages in the Central Italy seismic sequence in 2016: A) street pavement cracking due to *unstable* slopes  
1225 and landslides-induced effects (Intrinsic vulnerability); B) an aerial view of Amatrice (RI, Italy) main street, that is partially blocked by  
1226 ruins formation provoked by buildings collapse; debris impeded rescuers' interventions (Extrinsic vulnerability). Video frames by Corpo  
1227 Nazionale dei Vigili del Fuoco <http://www.vigilfuoco.tv/> (last access 2018/04/17).  
1228  
1229

1240  
1241  
1242 Risk Assessment Tables are compiled for a paths sample<sup>3</sup> concerning Italian historical city centres  
1243  
1244 **struck** by the 2016 Central Italy seismic sequence, the 2012 Emilia Romagna region (Italy) and the  
1245  
1246 2009 Aquila (Italy) earthquake. Most of the considered links are highly affected by street pavement  
1247  
1248 modifications or paths' blockage due to **unstable** slopes, landslide or debris accumulations that  
1249  
1250 contribute to urban scenario modifications as shown by the examples in **Figure 2**. For each link in  
1251  
1252 the sample,  $I_{R,j}$  and  $I_{Rn,j}$  values are calculated following each proposed calculation approach. The  
1253  
1254 damage level of each path is evaluated by comparing photographic documentation of links before  
1255  
1256 and after the earthquake event, and by adopting the description of post-earthquake damages  
1257  
1258 effects according to the Road Damage Scale (*RDS*) [37]. *RDS* can **vary** from 0 to 5 (integer scale). The  
1259  
1260 adopted damage scale for paths considers damages due to landslides, unstable slopes and cracks to  
1261  
1262 **the** street, debris presence along the street and presence of failed external elements that could  
1263  
1264 impede partially or completely the path accessibility. Then,  $I_{Rn,j} - RDS$  pairs are organized to  
1265  
1266 evaluate the risk index capability in describing possible critical conditions in post-earthquake  
1267  
1268 scenarios. The three proposed risk assessment approaches are considered validated if a higher risk  
1269  
1270 index corresponds to a higher link damage level. According to general tri-linear trends in earthquake  
1271  
1272 safety and damage assessment, by including *fragility curves* and studies on seismic vulnerability  
1273  
1274 [8,32,35,51], a linear interpolation between  $I_{Rn,j} - RDS$  pairs is then performed according to  
1275  
1276 previous studies' approaches [37]. Finally, a comparison of produced regression lines is provided  
1277  
1278 through the evaluation of coefficient of determination  $R^2$  to define the more suitable calculation  
1279  
1280 approach (based on data fitting effectiveness) among the considered ones.  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287

---

1288  
1289 <sup>3</sup> The database is uploaded as supporting file and also available at: <https://goo.gl/yzHNTQ> (last access: 2018/04/29)  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298

## 2.6 Application to a case study

Among the three Risk Index calculation approaches, the one having the highest coefficient of determination  $R^2$  is chosen to be applied on a case study referring to an Italian historical city centre, with the purpose to give a real application of the research. This case study (different from **previously** employed sample) is referred to a representative Italian historical centre: Offida (Italy). Offida's city centre has been affected by intense seismic activity over times<sup>4</sup>, including the ones connected to the Central Italy seismic sequence in 2016-2017 (in this case, without reporting considerable damages). Paths network shows a medieval compact and irregular urban fabric due to the hilly site conformation, and it is mainly characterized by historical masonry buildings. Offida also owns particular risk features from a touristic point of view, and so for the exposure-related parameters, because of its significant cultural heritage (religious sites, a theatre hosting exhibitions during the whole year, museums, cultural events in both winter and summer seasons).

Although the methodology could be applied for all the outdoor public spaces in an urban centre, this work would like to focus on paths selected among the network according to the following criteria, so as to evidence the capabilities connected to safety planners application in intervention strategies definition and evacuation plan design:

- only links accessible by vehicles are considered;
- paths involved by the presence of facing masonry buildings are considered to focus literature-supported evacuations on extrinsic vulnerability;
- accessible squares are considered while private courtyards are excluded.

---

<sup>4</sup>Seismic activity of Offida (Italy): [https://emidius.mi.ingv.it/DBMI11/query\\_place/](https://emidius.mi.ingv.it/DBMI11/query_place/) (last access on 2018/04/17).

1358  
1359  
1360 Risk indices are assessed for each link and node.  
1361  
1362

1363 In order to graphically evidence the riskiest paths within the urban fabric, a Seismic Risk Map is  
1364 proposed. This can be a tool for supporting emergency management directly obtained from the  
1365 proposed methodology application (regardless of the calculation approach). In addition, another  
1366 map named Intervention Priority Map is defined to assign resources for risk-reduction strategies  
1367 within the studied urban centre by means of an immediate graphic representation.  
1368  
1369

1370 The Seismic Risk Map is obtained with the following steps:  
1371  
1372

- 1373 •  $I_{Rn,j}$  is calculated in according to Section 2.4.2 for each link;
- 1374 •  $I_{Rn,j}$  values are grouped in a scale composed by four sets also according to literature studies  
1375 [20,40]: Low risk (0%-25%), Medium-Low risk (25%-50%), Medium-High risk (50%-75%), High  
1376 risk (75%-100%);
- 1377 • Each set corresponds to a different colour on the map.

1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390 The Intervention Priority Map follows the following rules:  
1391  
1392

- 1393 •  $I_{Rn,j}$  values are calculated as explained in Section 2.4.2;
- 1394 • the maximum  $I_{Rn,j}$  value is obtained for the studied sample and it is defined as  $I_{max,S}$ ;
- 1395 • Priority Intervention Indices  $I_{IP}$  are obtained according to the Equation (7) below:  
1396  
1397

$$1400 \quad I_{IP} = I_{Rn,j} / I_{max,S} \quad (7)$$

- 1401 •  $I_{IP}$  values are grouped in a scale composed by four sets: Low priority (0%-25%), Medium-  
1402 Low priority (25%-50%), Medium-High priority (50%-75%), High priority (75%-100%) which  
1403 are associated to different colours in the map.  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411

1417  
1418  
1419 **3 Results**  
1420  
1421  
1422

1423 **3.1 Comparisons between Risk Indexes and damage**  
1424  
1425

1426 **Figure 3** shows the linear correlations between noticed damages and assessed Indices obtained for  
1427  
1428 the three proposed approaches. Results show a lower risk index limit (about 20%) that corresponds  
1429  
1430 to no damages for all the three approaches<sup>5</sup>. A Risk Index close to zero is not observed because, in  
1431  
1432 the analysed cases, some risk-affecting parameters are always present (and different from zero),  
1433  
1434 such as the local seismic hazard. At the same time, from RDS=4 to RDS=5 the trend is only traced  
1435  
1436 because of the lack of **real-world** data, due to the **currently** analysed sample characterization.  
1437  
1438  
1439

1440 The graphical comparison and the analytic results (regression equation for each approach) in **Table**  
1441  
1442 **6** underline that:  
1443  
1444

1445 1) For all the three approaches, a trilinear trend is present. The sloped line is similar for each one.  
1446  
1447 **Figure 3** graph B) displays a lower damages **increase** than the other graphs.  
1448  
1449

1450 2)  $R^2$  values are generally acceptable, even if the modified Cherubini's approach has the lowest  $R^2$ ,  
1451  
1452 and it graphically seems to assume a not strictly monotonous linear trend too. The Expert  
1453  
1454 Judgement approach expresses the better regression model in respect to the other two approaches,  
1455  
1456 according to its  $R^2$  value.  
1457  
1458  
1459

1460 3) The AHP-based approach is developed so as to follow an evaluating calculation approach  
1461  
1462 previously applied in other studies (i.e.: [40,50]) that limits subjective interpretations about weights  
1463  
1464 assignment. For these reasons, it seems to be the most rigorous approach. Anyway, appendix B data  
1465  
1466

---


1467  
1468 <sup>5</sup> As reported by grey line in **Figure 3**, it is possible to identify a first segment that represents a step from zero to around  
1469  
1470 20% of  $I_{Rn}$  in case B) and around 24-30% of  $I_{Rn}$  and  $I_R$  in cases A) and C) also according to **Table 5**.  
1471

shows how differences between AHP and Expert Judgement approach predictions are really close one to each other, by confirming their similarities. Anyway, when considering a specific link,  $I_{Rn,j}$  values from the three approaches (see Appendix B) are very similar (average percentage difference equal to 5%).

**Table 6** Comparisons among proposed approaches in terms of trend lines equations. The table also shows data about the domain in terms of Risk Index, and the obtained R-squares for  $I_{Rn,j}$ - RDS pairs correlations.

Compared approaches	Equations	Domains	$R^2$
Modified Cherubini's approach	$\begin{cases} RDS = 0 \\ RDS = 10.13 I_{Rn,j} - 2.24 \\ RDS = 5 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} I_{Rn,j} < 24\% \\ 24\% \leq I_{Rn,j} \leq 73\% \\ I_{Rn,j} > 73\% \end{cases}$	0.57
Expert judgement	$\begin{cases} RDS = 0 \\ RDS = 8.86 I_{Rn,j} - 1.79 \\ RDS = 5 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} I_{Rn,j} < 20\% \\ 20\% \leq I_{Rn,j} \leq 77\% \\ I_{Rn,j} > 77\% \end{cases}$	0.78
Analytical Hierarchy process	$\begin{cases} RDS = 0 \\ RDS = 11.46 I_{R,j} - 3.47 \\ RDS = 5 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} I_{R,j} < 30\% \\ 30\% \leq I_{R,j} \leq 74\% \\ I_{R,j} > 74\% \end{cases}$	0.74

Such results confirm the capabilities of the risk index by means of the related predictions of damages: the higher the  $I_{Rn,j}$  the higher the RDS. A sufficient reliability of the proposed novel holistic method and a satisfied sensitivity of Links Assessment Tables is reached independently from the three approaches involved to elaborate the final  $I_{Rn,j}$ . The choice of a specific risk index, thus, only seems to affect the trustworthiness (in terms of confidence, according to the  $R^2$  values) and the precision of estimations.




**Figure 3** Tri-linear correlation between analysed path risk indices ( $IR_{n,j}$  and  $IR_{j,j}$ ) and related street damages levels (RDS): A) Modified Cherubini's approach; B) expert judgment; C) Analytical Hierarchy process. Dashed lines predict expected trends in domains where data sample are not currently present. Equations for the three regression trends are offered by Table 5.

### 3.2 A historical urban centre

The risk maps in **Figure 4** and **Figure 5** permit to graphically have under control the overall risk situation of the selected paths of Offida (AP), describing the evaluated scenario. Appendix C offers detailed numeric results. It is possible to recognize which parameters influence those values by focusing on links with higher risk. The analysis of the related tables and assigned values to parameters evidence that the case-study paths network is mainly characterized by a Medium-Low risk: this result highlights the homogeneity of the urban fabric. Some other dangerous situations are evaluated. As shown in **Figure 4**, the link "V" is located close to slope edges with possible landslides. Moreover, the risk index is influenced by exposure factors. In fact, the considered paths have an access role to the city centre and it is used as a one-way street. For these reasons, it results in Medium-High risk. Intervention Priority Map in **Figure 5** shows links "S" and "T" with a Medium-High priority level, located near areas with potential landslides. The same level is attributed to links "M" and "R", but they are developed on level ground. A high index is reached because of the


1594 presence of buildings with relevant seismic vulnerability. In addition, the specific situation of the  
1595 segment "V" is remarked, which can represent an access street to the city centre.  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600

1601 Seismic Risk Map and Intervention Priority Map seem to be not so different in terms of outcoming  
1602 results. Nevertheless, while the first allows comparing maps of different city centres thanks to its  
1603 risk index absolute scale representation, the second permits to detect risk variation between paths  
1604 of the same city centre, because of its different formulation (see Equation (7)).  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614



1643 **Figure 4** Seismic Risk Map of the selected part of Offida (AP) paths network. Links are marked with letters, nodes with numbers and  
1644 the wider filled areas are the squares considered in this case study application. According to Section 2.6 definition, such elements are  
1645  
1646  
1647

associated with the four risk levels (represented to the four shades of grey). Squares identified by black circled are considered as not relevant in emergency management for their limited dimension.



**Figure 5** Intervention Priority Map of a portion of Offida (AP) paths network. According to the same map description of Figure 4, and to Section 2.6 definition, the map priority rank is referred to the risk index normalized on the case study maximum risk value.

### 3.3 Holistic methodology capabilities for future applications

The previous methodology for the seismic risk assessment of evacuation paths attempts to provide a new concept to consider all factors influencing the evacuation process. The proposed holistic methodology firstly allows defining a percentage value that gathers risk-affecting factors (i.e.: referring to the normalized risk indexes). Hence, the outcoming overall evaluation does not involve a separate layers description [20]. At the same time, the adoption of quick evaluation methods also

1712  
1713  
1714 guarantees to use it in a straightforward way by detecting wide urban historical areas. In particular,  
1715  
1716 differently from other previous studies, it tries to combine path intrinsic and extrinsic vulnerability.  
1717  
1718 In such a way, unlike previous works [22], this novel method can include obstructions and  
1719  
1720 interruptions not only caused by ruins formation, but also by eventual structural failures, landslides  
1721  
1722 or street pavement cracking. Besides, it can also give significant bases for the integration of  
1723  
1724 exposure factor (inquired by means of quick path related features data collection) in such  
1725  
1726 evaluations.  
1727  
1728

1729  
1730 Secondly, vulnerability assessment, related to the path itself (intrinsic vulnerability), concerns  
1731  
1732 frequent situations belonging to the urban environment, differently from other methodologies  
1733  
1734 referred to particularly typologies of main streets [10,16]. In respect to previous researches, the  
1735  
1736 proposed methodology application could be extended to typical elements present in path  
1737  
1738 infrastructural elements like bridges, viaducts or tunnels that can be also placed outside the urban  
1739  
1740 fabric.  
1741  
1742

1743  
1744 Finally, this work considers important factors that could represent vulnerable elements in historical  
1745  
1746 urban areas, according to the base reference method (i.e.: [19]). Anyway, in respect to such method,  
1747  
1748 caves, cisterns or hypogeum hidden under street pavement or lifelines, pipes and culverts are  
1749  
1750 effectively considered.  
1751  
1752

#### 1753 1754 1755 **4 Conclusion and remarks** 1756

1757  
1758 The risk assessment of evacuation paths in urban areas in case of earthquake emergencies is useful  
1759  
1760 to evaluate the safety of an urban scenario and exposed population, especially during the  
1761  
1762 evacuation process. Particular attention has to be paid to historical urban environment where  
1763  
1764 pedestrians' evacuation can be hardly stressed or impeded by hazards due to the complex urban  
1765  
1766

1771  
1772  
1773 fabric, its composing elements and vulnerabilities, the earthquake effects on them (e.g.: ruins  
1774  
1775 formation from buildings collapse along streets, ground failures or links interruptions due to their  
1776  
1777 damage). To perform such safety evaluation at historical urban scale, rapid methods should be  
1778  
1779 preferred because of the urban scale dimension, while a holistic method should be adopted since  
1780  
1781 many factors (vulnerability, hazard, and exposure) contemporarily affect the safety levels during  
1782  
1783 and in the post-earthquake scenario.  
1784  
1785  
1786

1787 In this paper, a novel methodology for assessing the risk level of the evacuation paths in **the** seismic  
1788  
1789 emergency has been proposed. Buildings collapse and intrinsic vulnerability of street typologies are  
1790  
1791 now considered. The holistic risk assessment also involves different seismic hazard and exposure  
1792  
1793 conditions. Then, each risk-affecting factor (and related parameter) is considered in a weighted  
1794  
1795 manner according to three different approaches. A preliminary methodology validation was  
1796  
1797 performed by applying it to a sample of paths placed in seismic damaged historical urban fabrics  
1798  
1799 and a good agreement was found. The present work relates to a real-world sample (actually limited  
1800  
1801 to significant Italian case studies) selected to apply the proposed methodology, the related  
1802  
1803 calculation approaches and the evaluation of post-earthquake damage. Hence, future activities  
1804  
1805 should enlarge the reference sample so as to increase the method robustness and to improve the  
1806  
1807 risk-damages prediction criteria effectiveness. From this point of view, since the holistic  
1808  
1809 methodology adopts quick characterization criteria due to the possible implementation at a wide  
1810  
1811 urban scale, **method's** verification needs to be supported by samples from several earthquakes  
1812  
1813 databases.  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818

1819 Future researches could also develop a paths damages prediction algorithm towards simulating  
1820  
1821 different scenarios for different macroseismic intensity inputs, so as to consider the effective  
1822  
1823 earthquake severity in damages assessment.  
1824

1830  
1831  
1832 Anyway, according to current results, this novel holistic methodology can be applied to have under  
1833 control the overall risk situation of paths in historical centres and so to provide evaluation tools for  
1834  
1835 control the overall risk situation of paths in historical centres and so to provide evaluation tools for  
1836  
1837 scenario assessment and emergency planning. The damage prevision criterion could also support  
1838  
1839 the development of pedestrians' evacuation simulators in urban outdoor environments. By focusing  
1840  
1841 on debris formation, behavioural aspects and human motion speed, simulation models could take  
1842  
1843 advantages from this study in aspects related to pedestrians' safer path choice and losses of street  
1844  
1845 integrity/capability due to earthquakes. Besides, it could be a first criterion to evaluate and taking  
1846  
1847 into account streets vulnerability and their damages in evacuation procedures.  
1848  
1849

1850  
1851 During the evaluation of evacuation management strategies, results from its application could  
1852  
1853 suggest which links should be excluded from selected paths because of their high-risk level, and  
1854  
1855 which could be considered safer (according to a relative scenario sample-based scale).  
1856  
1857

1858 The proposed seismic risk assessment methodology could be combined **with** simulation tools for  
1859  
1860 analysing the evacuation process and the use of paths in historic city centres. In such way, results  
1861  
1862 could also be useful to local authorities to suggest where directing risk-reduction interventions and  
1863  
1864 resources following an order of intervention priority (e.g.: through a path risk maps of the historical  
1865  
1866 urban fabric: Seismic Risk Map and Intervention Priority Map).  
1867  
1868

## 1872 1873 **Acknowledgements** 1874 1875

1876 The authors wish to thank **Eng.** Teresa Caprini for her valuable help in data collection.  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888

## 5 Appendix A

Table 7 Notation table.

Symbol	Measure	Description
$R$	-	Seismic risk, related to the number of people killed or injured, the damage to property and the impact on economic activity due to the occurrence of the disastrous event
$V$	-	Seismic vulnerability, related to the “weakness” of the element
$H$	-	Seismic hazard, related to the possibility of future seismic actions
$E$	-	Seismic exposure, related to the presence and the “value” of buildings and other objects and to the possible consequences on human life
$a_g$	m/s <sup>2</sup>	Peak ground acceleration (PGA)
$I_{R,j}$	-	Street network Risk index for j-link
$I_{RN,j}$	-	Normalized street network Risk index for j-link
$W_{i_k}$	-	Weigh related to the i-th parameter
$W_{C_k}$	-	Weigh related to the k-th factor
$Sp_{ik}$	-	Value conferred to the i-th parameter of the k-th factor
$Sp_{ik}^{max}$	-	Maximum attributable value to the i-th parameter of the k-th factor
$V_b$	-	Seismic vulnerability index of the considered building through the macroseismic method
$b$	-	Incidence of the building in the link, as the ratio between building and link lengths
$L_b$	m	Building length
$V_{link,j}$	-	Seismic vulnerability of the j-link
$V_{Nlink,j}$	-	Normalized seismic vulnerability of the j-link
$RDS$	-	Road Damage Scale [37]
<i>Average Flow</i>	Veic./h	Number of vehicles that travel across a section per unit time
$L$	m	Link length from node to node
$L_{max}$	m	Maximum link length in the analysed sample
$W$	m	Link width in terms of carriageway average extension
$W_{max}$	m	Maximum Link width in the analysed sample
$A$	m <sup>2</sup>	Area of evaluated Square
$A_{max}$	m <sup>2</sup>	Maximum Square area in the analysed sample

## 6 Appendix B

**Table 8** Method validation sample data. The assessed link is identified through to the relative ID by showing related: location and reference earthquake; evaluated risk index ( $I_{R,j}$ ) and normalised index ( $I_{Rn,j}$ ) according to the three approaches (in the AHP approach, such values are equal); Road Damage Levels (RDS).

code	Location	Earthquake	Modified Cherubini's approach		Expert judgement		AHP	RDS
			$I_{R,j}$	$I_{Rn,j}$	$I_{R,j}$	$I_{Rn,j}$	$I_{R,j}$	
A	Arquata del Tronto (AP)	Central Italy 2016	1.22	41%	3.57	40%	44%	2
B	Pescara del Tronto (AP)	Central Italy 2016	1.65	55%	5.13	58%	58%	3
C	Norcia (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.18	39%	3.36	38%	43%	1
D	Norcia (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.30	43%	3.73	42%	46%	1
E	Norcia (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.50	50%	4.79	54%	56%	3
F	Castelluccio di Norcia (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.51	50%	4.92	55%	60%	2
G	Castelluccio di Norcia (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.54	51%	4.99	56%	60%	3
H	Tra Valli Umbre (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.53	51%	5.18	63%	63%	4
I	Forca Canapine (PG)	Central Italy 2016	1.61	54%	3.17	65%	63%	4
J	Amatrice (RI)	Central Italy 2016	1.16	39%	1.96	36%	45%	1
K	Offida (AP)	Central Italy 2016	0.75	25%	2.00	22%	32%	0
L	Tolentino (MC)	Central Italy 2016	0.76	25%	5.33	22%	31%	0
M	Accumoli (RI)	Central Italy 2016	1.72	57%	4.58	60%	59%	3
N	Amatrice (RI)	Central Italy 2016	1.73	58%	4.83	51%	54%	3
O	Amatrice (RI)	Central Italy 2016	1.83	61%	4.82	54%	58%	3
P	Onna (AQ)	Aquila (Italy) 2009	1.36	45%	4.29	59%	56%	4
Q	Onna (AQ)	Aquila (Italy) 2009	1.32	44%	4.29	48%	53%	2
R	Fossa (AQ)	Aquila (Italy) 2009	1.41	47%	4.86	59%	58%	4
S	Arischia (AQ)	Aquila (Italy) 2009	1.44	48%	4.66	52%	51%	3
T	San Felice sul Panaro (MO)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.28	43%	3.84	47%	44%	2
U	San Carlo (FE)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.24	41%	3.49	39%	47%	2
V	San Carlo (FE)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.29	43%	3.62	41%	48%	3
W	Mirabello (FE)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.33	44%	3.62	41%	47%	2
X	Sant'Agostino (FE)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.40	47%	3.66	41%	50%	2
Y	San Carlo (FE)	Emilia (Italy) 2012	1.29	43%	3.62	41%	48%	3

## 7 Appendix C

**Table 9** Case study application results from the historical centre of Offida (AP) Italy, by collecting obtained values from inquiring parameters according to Section 2 definition for each link and squares. For both paths network elements, the evaluated risk indices ( $I_{R,j}$ ) and the normalised ones ( $I_{Rn,j}$ ) are shown.

ID case	A	B	C	D	E	F	$I_{R,j}$	$I_{Rn,j}$
<b>Links</b>								
A	Clear	0.47	0.20	0.73	0	1.25	2.65	29%
B	Clear	0.50	0.33	0.97	0.25	1.00	3.05	33%
C	Clear	0.43	0.33	0.97	0.50	1.00	3.24	35%
D	Clear	0.50	0.60	0.97	0.50	1.00	3.57	39%
E	Clear	0.60	0.47	1.27	0.50	1.00	3.84	42%
F	Clear	0.50	0.60	0.97	0.75	1.00	3.82	42%
G	Clear	0.60	0.33	1.27	0.50	1.00	3.70	40%
H	Clear	0.50	0.33	0.97	0.75	1.00	3.55	39%
I	Clear	0.50	0.33	1.57	0.50	1.00	3.90	42%
L	Clear	0.50	0.33	1.57	0.25	1.00	3.65	40%
M	Clear	0.50	0.73	1.47	0.50	1.00	4.20	46%
N	Clear	0.50	0.33	1.27	0.75	1.00	3.85	42%
O	Clear	0.60	0.20	1.27	0.50	1.00	3.57	39%
P	Clear	0.67	0.60	1.27	0.75	1.00	4.29	47%
Q	Clear	0.60	0.33	1.27	0.75	1.00	3.95	43%
R	Clear	0.67	0.33	1.27	0.75	1.00	4.02	44%
S	Clear	0.53	0.93	1.63	0.25	1.25	4.60	50%
T	Clear	0.53	0.33	1.93	0.25	1.25	4.30	47%
U	Clear	0.53	0.33	0.63	0.50	1.25	3.25	35%
V	Clear	0.73	0.60	2.47	0.25	1.25	5.30	58%
Z	Clear	0.53	0.33	0.33	0.25	1.25	2.70	29%
<b>Squares</b>								
P1	Clear	0.43	0.07	1.73	0	1.25	2.45	30%
P2	Clear	0.47	0.67	0.33	0.25	1.25	2.96	35%
P3	Clear	0.53	0.07	1.67	0.50	1.00	3.77	45%
P8	Clear	0.67	0.07	1.27	0.50	1.00	3.50	42%

2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124

P10	Clear	0.67	0.07	1.27	0.50	1.00	3.50	42%
P11	Clear	0.50	0.07	0.97	0.50	1.00	3.04	36%

---

## 8 References

- [1] M. D’Orazio, E. Quagliarini, G. Bernardini, L. Spalazzi, EPES - Earthquake pedestrians’ evacuation simulator: A tool for predicting earthquake pedestrians’ evacuation in urban outdoor scenarios, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 10 (2014) 153–177. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2014.08.002.
- [2] R. Maio, T.M. Ferreira, R. Vicente, A critical discussion on the earthquake risk mitigation of urban cultural heritage assets, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 27 (2018) 239–247. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.10.010.
- [3] N. Nikoo, M. Babaei, A.S. Mohaymany, Emergency transportation network design problem: Identification and evaluation of disaster response routes, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 27 (2018) 7–20. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.07.003.
- [4] Italian technical commission for seismic micro-zoning, *Handbook of analysis of emergency conditions in urban scenarios (Manuale per l’analisi della condizione limite dell’emergenza dell’insediamento urbano (CLE); in Italian)*, 1st ed., Rome, Italy, 2014.
- [5] G. Bernardini, M. D’Orazio, E. Quagliarini, Towards a “behavioural design” approach for seismic risk reduction strategies of buildings and their environment, *Safety Science*. 86 (2016) 273–294. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2016.03.010.
- [6] M.A. Zanini, F. Faleschini, P. Zampieri, C. Pellegrino, G. Gecchele, M. Gastaldi, R. Rossi, Post-quake urban road network functionality assessment for seismic emergency management in historical centres, *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*. 13 (2017) 1117–1129. doi:10.1080/15732479.2016.1244211.
- [7] G. Caiado, C. Oliveira, F. Sá, Assessing Urban Road Network Seismic Vulnerability : An Integrated Approach, in: *Proceedings of 15th WCEE*, Lisboa, Portugal, 2012. [http://www.iitk.ac.in/nicee/wcee/article/WCEE2012\\_1105.pdf](http://www.iitk.ac.in/nicee/wcee/article/WCEE2012_1105.pdf).
- [8] E. Quagliarini, G. Bernardini, C. Wazinski, L. Spalazzi, M. D’Orazio, Urban scenarios modifications due to the earthquake: ruins formation criteria and interactions with pedestrians’ evacuation, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*. 14 (2016). doi:10.1007/s10518-016-9872-0.
- [9] A. Goretti, V. Sarli, Road Network and Damaged Buildings in Urban Areas: Short and Long-term Interaction, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*. 4 (2006) 159–175. doi:10.1007/s10518-006-9004-3.
- [10] S. Adafer, M. Bensaibi, Seismic Vulnerability Index for Road Networks, in: *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Industrial Technology and Management Science*, Atlantis

2125  
2126  
2127 Press, Paris, France, 2015. doi:10.2991/itms-15.2015.301.  
2128

- 2129 [11] M. Dolce, E. Speranza, F. Bocchi, C. Conte, Probabilistic assessment of structural operational  
2130 efficiency in emergency limit conditions: the I.OPà.CLE method, *Bulletin of Earthquake*  
2131 *Engineering*. (2018). doi:10.1007/s10518-018-0327-7.  
2132
- 2133 [12] M. Dilley, R.S. Chen, U. Deichmann, A.L. Lerner-Lam, M. Arnold, J. Agwe, P. Buys, O. Kjekstad,  
2134 B. Lyon, Y. Gregory, *Natural Disaster Hotspots A Global Risk*, 2005.  
2135 doi:10.1080/01944360902967228.  
2136
- 2137 [13] P. Mouroux, B. Le Brun, Presentation of RISK-UE Project, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*.  
2138 4 (2006) 323–339. doi:10.1007/s10518-006-9020-3.  
2139
- 2140 [14] A. D’Andrea, S. Cafiso, A. Condorelli, Methodological Considerations for the Evaluation of  
2141 Seismic Risk on Road Network, *Pure and Applied Geophysics*. 162 (2005) 767–782.  
2142 doi:10.1007/s00024-004-2640-0.  
2143
- 2144 [15] L. Xinpo, H. Siming, Seismically induced slope instabilities and the corresponding treatments:  
2145 The case of a road in the Wenchuan earthquake hit region, *Journal of Mountain Science*. 6  
2146 (2009) 96–100. doi:10.1007/s11629-009-0197-1.  
2147
- 2148 [16] G. Tesoriere, G. Marinella, M. Russello, Analisi della Vulnerabilità delle Reti Stradali in Aree  
2149 Soggette a Rischio Sismico, in: XI S.I.I.V, 2001: p. 12.  
2150
- 2151 [17] F.T. Gizzi, N. Masini, Historical damage pattern and differential seismic effects in a town with  
2152 ground cavities: A case study from Southern Italy, *Engineering Geology*. 88 (2006) 41–58.  
2153 doi:10.1016/j.enggeo.2006.08.001.  
2154
- 2155 [18] J. Coutinho-Rodrigues, N. Sousa, E. Natividade-Jesus, Design of evacuation plans for densely  
2156 urbanised city centres, *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Municipal Engineer*.  
2157 169 (2016) 160–172. doi:10.1680/jmuen.15.00005.  
2158
- 2159 [19] A. Cherubini, Progetto: SAVE - Strumenti Aggiornati per la Vulnerabilità sismica del  
2160 patrimonio Edilizio e dei sistemi urbani, TASK 4 - Cap 2. (2003).  
2161
- 2162 [20] R. Ferlito, A.G. Pizza, A seismic vulnerability model for urban scenarios. Quick method for  
2163 evaluation of roads vulnerability in emergency (Modello di vulnerabilità di un centro urbano.  
2164 Metodologia per la valutazione speditiva della vulnerabilità della viabilità d’emergenza),  
2165 *Ingegneria Sismica*. 4 (2011) 31–43.  
2166
- 2167 [21] R. Robat Mili, K. Amini Hosseini, Y.O. Izadkhan, Developing a holistic model for earthquake  
2168 risk assessment and disaster management interventions in urban fabrics, *International*  
2169 *Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 27 (2018) 355–365. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.10.022.  
2170
- 2171 [22] S. Santarelli, G. Bernardini, E. Quagliarini, M. D’Orazio, New Indices for the Existing City-  
2172 Centers Streets Network Reliability and Availability Assessment in Earthquake Emergency,  
2173 *International Journal of Architectural Heritage*. december (2017) 1–16.  
2174 doi:10.1080/15583058.2017.1328543.  
2175
- 2176 [23] Y. Zhang, W.G. Weng, Z.L. Huang, A scenario-based model for earthquake emergency  
2177 management effectiveness evaluation, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 128  
2178 (2018) 197–207. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.12.001.  
2179

- 2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2197  
2198  
2199  
2200  
2201  
2202  
2203  
2204  
2205  
2206  
2207  
2208  
2209  
2210  
2211  
2212  
2213  
2214  
2215  
2216  
2217  
2218  
2219  
2220  
2221  
2222  
2223  
2224  
2225  
2226  
2227  
2228  
2229  
2230  
2231  
2232  
2233  
2234  
2235  
2236  
2237  
2238  
2239  
2240  
2241  
2242
- [24] M. Hadzima-Nyarko, V. Mišetić, D. Morić, Seismic vulnerability assessment of an old historical masonry building in Osijek, Croatia, using Damage Index, *Journal of Cultural Heritage*. 28 (2017) 140–150. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2017.05.012.
- [25] M. D’Orazio, E. Quagliarini, G. Bernardini, L. Spalazzi, M. D’Orazio, E. Quagliarini, G. Bernardini, L. Spalazzi, EPES – Earthquake pedestrians’ evacuation simulator: A tool for predicting earthquake pedestrians’ evacuation in urban outdoor scenarios, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 10 (2014) 153–177. doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.08.002.
- [26] M. Hashemi, A.A. Alesheikh, GIS: agent-based modeling and evaluation of an earthquake-stricken area with a case study in Tehran, Iran, *Natural Hazards*. 69 (2013) 1–23. doi:10.1007/s11069-013-0784-x.
- [27] N. Hirokawa, T. Osaragi, Earthquake disaster simulation system : Integration of models for building collapse, road blockage, and fire spread, *Journal of Disaster Research*. 11 (2016) 175–187. doi:10.20965/jdr.2016.p0175.
- [28] U. Tamima, L. Chouinard, Development of evacuation models for moderate seismic zones: A case study of Montreal, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 16 (2016) 167–179. doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.02.003.
- [29] G.M. Calvi, R. Pinho, G. Magenes, J.J. Bommer, H. Crowley, Development of seismic vulnerability assessment methodologies over the past 30 years, *ISET Journal of Earthquake Technology*. 43 (2006) 75–104.
- [30] E. Foerster, Y. Krien, S. Priest, S. Tapsell, G. Delmonaco, C. Margottini, C. Bonadonna, WP 1: State-of-the art on vulnerability types. Methodologies to assess vulnerability of structural systems, (2009) 1–139. [http://www.ensureproject.eu/ENSURE\\_Del1.1.1.pdf](http://www.ensureproject.eu/ENSURE_Del1.1.1.pdf).
- [31] A. Masi, Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Gravity Load Designed R/C Frames, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*. 1 (2003) 371–395. doi:10.1023/B:BEEE.0000021426.31223.60.
- [32] S. Lagomarsino, S. Giovinazzi, Macroseismic and mechanical models for the vulnerability and damage assessment of current buildings, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*. 4 (2006) 415–443. doi:10.1007/s10518-006-9024-z.
- [33] N. Khademi, B. Balaei, M. Shahri, M. Mirzaei, B. Sarrafi, M. Zahabiun, A.S. Mohaymany, Transportation network vulnerability analysis for the case of a catastrophic earthquake, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 12 (2015) 234–254. doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2015.01.009.
- [34] M.A. Zanini, F. Faleschini, C. Pellegrino, Probabilistic seismic risk forecasting of aging bridge networks, *Engineering Structures*. 136 (2017) 219–232. doi:10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.01.029.
- [35] K. Pitilakis, H. Crowley, A.M. Kaynia, SYNER-G: Typology definition and fragility functions for physical elements at seismic risk, buildings, lifelines, transportation networks and critical facilities, *Geotech.*, Springer Netherlands, 2014.
- [36] A.M. Kaynia, Guidelines for deriving seismic fragility functions of elements at risk: Buildings, lifelines, transportation networks and critical facilities, SYNER-G Reference Report 4, 2013. doi:10.2788/19605.


- 2243  
2244  
2245  
2246  
2247  
2248  
2249  
2250  
2251  
2252  
2253  
2254  
2255  
2256  
2257  
2258  
2259  
2260  
2261  
2262  
2263  
2264  
2265  
2266  
2267  
2268  
2269  
2270  
2271  
2272  
2273  
2274  
2275  
2276  
2277  
2278  
2279  
2280  
2281  
2282  
2283  
2284  
2285  
2286  
2287  
2288  
2289  
2290  
2291  
2292  
2293  
2294  
2295  
2296  
2297  
2298  
2299  
2300  
2301
- [37] P. Anbazhagan, S. Srinivas, D. Chandran, Classification of road damage due to earthquakes, *Natural Hazards*. 60 (2012) 425–460. doi:10.1007/s11069-011-0025-0.
- [38] G. Lancioni, R. Bernetti, E. Quagliarini, L. Tonti, Effects of Underground Cavities on the Frequency Spectrum of Seismic Shear Waves, *Advances in Civil Engineering*. 2014 (2014) 1–17. doi:10.1155/2014/934284.
- [39] S. Menoni, F. Pergalani, M.P. Boni, V. Petrini, Lifelines earthquake vulnerability assessment: a systemic approach, *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*. 22 (2002) 1199–1208. doi:10.1016/S0267-7261(02)00148-3.
- [40] G. Bernardini, S. Santarelli, E. Quagliarini, M. D’Orazio, Dynamic guidance tool for a safer earthquake pedestrian evacuation in urban systems, *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*. 65 (2017) 150–161. doi:10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2017.07.001.
- [41] T.L. Saaty, *The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resource Allocation*, McGraw-Hill, 1980.
- [42] A. Galanis, G. Botzoris, N. Eliou, Pedestrian road safety in relation to urban road type and traffic flow, *Transportation Research Procedia*. 24 (2017) 220–227. doi:10.1016/j.trpro.2017.05.111.
- [43] J. Azevedo, L. Guerreiro, R. Bento, J.M. Proenca, Seismic Impact on lifelines in the great Lisbon area, (2004).
- [44] K. Pitilakis, M. Alexoudi, S. Argyroudis, O. Monge, C. Martin, Earthquake risk assessment of lifelines, *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*. 4 (2006) 365–390. doi:10.1007/s10518-006-9022-1.
- [45] European Committee for Standardization, Eurocode 8: Design of structures for earthquake resistance - Part 1: General rules, seismic actions and rules for buildings, European Committee for Standardization. 1 (2004) 231. doi:[Authority: The European Union per Regulation 305/2011, Directive 98/34/EC, Directive 2004/18/EC].
- [46] Italian Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport, NTC 2008 - Italian Building Code. D.M. 14/01/2008, (2008). doi:10.1515/9783110247190.153.
- [47] F. Bramerini, G. di Pasquale, G. Naso, M. Severino, Indirizzi per la microzinazione sismica, Parti I e II, Conferenza Delle Regioni E Province Autonome-Dipartimento Della Protezione Civile, Roma. 3 (2008).
- [48] T. Kalman Šipoš, M. Hadzima-Nyarko, Rapid seismic risk assessment, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 24 (2017) 348–360. doi:10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.06.025.
- [49] K.J. Wilson, An investigation of dependence in expert judgement studies with multiple experts, *International Journal of Forecasting*. 33 (2017) 325–336. doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2015.11.014.
- [50] S. Adifer, M. Bensaibi, Seismic vulnerability classification of roads, *Energy Procedia*. 139 (2017) 624–630. doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2017.11.263.
- [51] D. Alder, C.J.F.P. Jones, J. Lamont-Black, C. White, S. Glendinning, D. Huntley, Design

2302  
2303  
2304  
2305  
2306  
2307  
2308  
2309  
2310  
2311  
2312  
2313  
2314  
2315  
2316  
2317  
2318  
2319  
2320  
2321  
2322  
2323  
2324  
2325  
2326  
2327  
2328  
2329  
2330  
2331  
2332  
2333  
2334  
2335  
2336  
2337  
2338  
2339  
2340  
2341  
2342  
2343  
2344  
2345  
2346  
2347  
2348  
2349  
2350  
2351  
2352  
2353  
2354  
2355  
2356  
2357  
2358  
2359  
2360


principles and construction insight regarding the use of electrokinetic techniques for slope stabilisation, Proceedings of XVI ECSMGE. (2015) 1531–1536. doi:10.1680/ecsmge.60678.










**A) Modified Cherubini's approach**



**B) Expert Judgement**



**C) Analytical Hierarchy Process**



**LEGEND**

-  Low risk
-  Medium-Low risk
-  Medium-High risk
-  High risk

