

UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE Repository ISTITUZIONALE

Assessing the flood risk to evacuees in outdoor built environments and relative risk reduction strategies

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Assessing the flood risk to evacuees in outdoor built environments and relative risk reduction strategies / Bernardini, G.; Finizio, F.; Postacchini, M.; Quagliarini, E.. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DISASTER RISK REDUCTION. - ISSN 2212-4209. - ELETTRONICO. - 64:(2021). [10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102493]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11566/291669 since: 2024-04-30T14:37:48Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102493

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.

POSTPRINT OF Bernardini G, Finizio F, Postacchini M, Quagliarini E (2021) Assessing the flood risk to evacuees in outdoor built environments and relative risk reduction strategies. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 64:102493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102493

Highlights

- Flood risk evaluation and reduction in outdoor built environments are investigated.
- The proposed behavioural design-based approach jointly considers evacuation and hydrodynamic scenarios
- Novel Key Performance Indicators are proposed
- Such approach is applied to a significant case study
- Risk reduction strategies are proposed and their effectiveness evaluated

1 Assessing the flood risk to evacuees in outdoor built environments and relative

2 risk reduction strategies

3	Gabriele Bernardini ¹ , Fiorenza Finizio ² , Matteo Postacchini ² , Enrico Quagliarini ^{1,*}
4	
5	¹ DICEA Dept, Università Politecnica delle Marche, via Brecce Bianche 60131 Ancona
6	phone: +39 071 220 4248, mail: g.bernardini@univpm.it; e.quagliarini@univpm.it
7	² DICEA Dept, Università Politecnica delle Marche, via Brecce Bianche 60131 Ancona
8	phone: +39 071 220 4539, mail: m.postacchini@univpm.it

9

10 *Corresponding author: e.quagliarini@univpm.it; phone: +39 071 220 4248

11 Abstract

12 Climate-change induced disasters, like floods, are expected to increase in the future. In outdoor built environments, flood 13 risk to evacuees depends on interactions between floodwater spreading, built environment features, flood-induced 14 modifications, and individuals' reaction in emergency phases. Disaster risk reduction strategies should mitigate the 15 immediate flood impacts and improve the community resilience, while being easy-to-implement and effectively 16 supporting evacuees during the initial phases of the emergency. Simulation-based methodologies could support safety 17 planners in evaluating the effectiveness of such strategies, especially if basing on a micro-scale-oriented approach that 18 represents emergency interactions between each individual and the surrounding outdoor built environment. This study 19 adopts an existing micro-scale simulator (FlooPEDS) reproducing experimental-based flood evacuation behaviours. 20 According to a behavioural design-based approach, simulation results focus on individual responses in the outdoor built 21 environment through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) aimed at providing evidence of critical interactions between 22 evacuees, floodwaters and the outdoor built environment. A case study is selected by considering different flood scenarios 23 to test such KPIs. Risk reduction solutions are then provided, and their effectiveness is checked by simulations. Results 24 show the micro-scale and behavioural design-based approach capabilities in proposing multi-scenarios solutions (e.g.: 25 architectural elements to support evacuees; emergency planning).

Keywords: flood risk; flood evacuation; risk assessment and planning; behavioural design; risk reduction strategies; flood
 hydrodynamics.

29 **1** Introduction

Climate change-induced disasters, such as floods, are significantly affecting built environments and their probability is expected to increase in the future. Thus, disaster risk reduction, which is the series of activities aimed at preventing new and reducing existing disaster risk and managing residual risk¹, is a key challenge for guaranteeing the safety of our communities, especially those placed in urban built environments [1–5]. Floods represent one of the most important disasters in existing and future cities, because of their effects on the built environment (defined as a system of buildings, underground spaces, open spaces such as streets and squares) and the people who live in them [3,6–13]. Flood risk assessment and reduction in urban areas are usually based on three factors [2,7,14–16]:

37

38

• Site hazard, due to both probability of occurrence of flood and location of urban areas in risk-prone regions;

- The vulnerability of the built environment to floodwater;
- Community's exposure, addressed in terms of exposed people (number and characterization) and social-eco nomic factors.

In this general context, the evacuation and loss of life modelling in flood-affected urban scenarios was widely undertaken by previous studies in the last 15 years, due to the critical issues for individuals' safety that appear during the initial phases of such an emergency [17–25]. In fact, although safety planners can usually assume that exposed individuals know "what they must do" and "where they must go", recent research has demonstrated that this assumption is incorrect [26]. During an evacuation, exposed individuals are affected by their own and the floodwaters interaction with the built environment. In addition, some of them could engage in "risky behaviours" during flood events, such as wasting time or trying to cross areas of fast-flowing and/or deep water.

These phenomena are relevant especially considering urban city centres because the number of exposed individuals is higher than in other environments at risk of flooding [8,16,22,24,27,28]. Furthermore, in urban areas, buildings can have a significant impact on floodwater depths and velocities [11,16,29,30]. For instance, where buildings are close together and roads are narrow, this can increase the velocity and depth of the floodwater thus increasing the flood hazard. In

¹ https://www.undrr.org/terminology/disaster-risk-reduction , last access 12/04/2021

addition to damages to buildings and goods [2,7], the following conditions can increase the risk to exposed people
 [10,11,17,20,22,27,31-34]:

54 55 people are located in the outdoor built environment (e.g. the open spaces such as streets, squares) or in underground spaces (e.g. metro systems) at the beginning of the flood event;

56

2. people are evacuating in outdoor areas during the flood;

57 3. when people are not allowed to reach safer places inside a building adjacent to a flooded street.

58 These scenarios imply more significant threats for people due to the possibility to evacuate and to maintain stability 59 while moving, and affect the overall number of casualties, especially in outdoor built environments [18,21,28,35–38]. 60 Technicians of local authorities and Civil Protection Bodies can adopt Decision Support Systems (DSS) and related 61 simulation tools for risk assessment purposes and for suggesting reliable risk reduction strategies [15,22,28,39-42]. 62 Following such demand, many DSS and modelling tools have been provided over the time [9,11,20,24,25,28]. They have 63 moved towards the inclusion of behavioural aspects characterizing experimental-based individual-floodwater 64 interactions, so as to pursue reliable simulation and assessment approaches focusing on the evacuees' safety analysis as a 65 paramount issue for flood risk [1,9,17,19,20,22,42].

66

67 1.1 Modelling flood evacuation for risk assessment and risk reduction strategies

68 The analysis of real-world flood evacuations outlined significant differences between behaviours in flood emergencies 69 and other kinds of disasters (like earthquake, fire, general-purpose) [35,37,43]. From a qualitative point of view, evacuees 70 are more likely to move toward immobile objects such as buildings, fences, handrails, during floods, unlike during other 71 kinds of disasters [17,35,37,44-47]. Meanwhile, social identification issues lead evacuees to remain close to other neigh-72 bouring individuals and to share evacuation path decisions between evacuees in the same group. From a quantitative point 73 of view, experimental activities (with volunteers or mannequins) mainly demonstrated that water depth D [m] and speed 74 V [m] are key factors affecting the evacuees' motion on foot [21,37,48,49]. Individual features in terms of height, body 75 mass, age and gender affect both the motion speed and the stability in floodwaters [21,22,38]. General rules were set to 76 correlate floodwater characteristics and individuals' speed [48,49], as well as human body stability criteria for buoyancy 77 or body failure (sliding and toppling under floodwaters effects) [35,38,50-52]. Such results show that flood risk assess-78 ment needs the adoption of models based on specific flood evacuation behaviours and related motion quantities, as sug-79 gested by behavioural design-based perspectives pursued by recent works [26,43]. Meanwhile, micro-scale modelling approaches [22,53] can be preferred because they are able to represent these experimentally-based behaviours for each involved evacuee. In this sense, results from recent works, e.g. concerning D-V correlations, have been introduced in micro-scale pedestrian evacuation simulators and their capabilities have been thus demonstrated [17,18,22,25,54].

83 As for other kinds of disasters (e.g. earthquake, fire, tsunami) affecting the built environment [55–58], this behavioural 84 design-based and micro-scale approach can support the development of flood emergency and evacuation simulators 85 [22,26,43]. Safety designers can use these tools while performing risk assessment actions to evaluate the probable safety levels for evacuees. In particular, the response of "each individual receptor at risk" [24] can be assessed depending on the 86 87 surrounding hazardous conditions each evacuee should face while moving in the flooded environment. Thus, risk reduc-88 tion strategies aimed at supporting each individual in emergency conditions can be defined and promoted. Combined 89 hydrodynamic-pedestrian evacuation simulators are used to this end [17,18,22,59]. The hydrodynamic model is aimed at 90 reproducing the time evolution of the floodwater spreading (i.e. speed and depth) depending on the type of flood and the 91 layout of the built environment [29,30]. The evacuation model represents individuals' interactions with floodwaters, 92 emergency behaviours and choices of the evacuees, depending on surrounding floodwater conditions [18,22,48].

93 Simulation results are then analysed by Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to evaluate the safety levels of the evacuees 94 in the emergency process [3,16,24,42,60]. Time-depended risk assessment indices and GIS-based implementation were 95 provided [10,34], while additional works also included KPIs relating to flood damage assessment of the built environment 96 [2,16,41,61]. Considering behavioural design-based KPIs, evacuation models are widely used to estimate evacuation tim-97 ing and the loss of life in the urban spaces, according to different Life Safety Models and hazard or risk rating metrics 98 [10,11,22,34,54,62]. However, additional aspects of the evacuation process which are generally assessed by other kinds 99 of evacuations (e.g. fire safety, earthquake), should be included in risk assessment analysis for the definition of risk 100 indices in the outdoor built environment, such as the evacuation curve/flows, the use of open spaces, the presence of spontaneous gathering areas [1,17–19,56]. 101

Outputs from the macro (territorial or urban) to the micro (building, street, square, underground space) scales are used for KPI-based evaluation of the effectiveness of risk reduction strategies aimed at reducing probable outcoming emergency interferences between the evacuees and the surrounding conditions by [1,17,19,22,24,27]:

implementing modifications to the built environment, such as those relating to building components, emergency
 path configurations, and building systems as countermeasures during the flood;

providing exposed people with information such as how to react when they receive a flood warning, where to go in
 case of an evacuation or which flood risk level can occur in the urban spaces, by also using emergency and
 wayfinding signage systems;

adapting emergency management strategies to give direct support to evacuees (i.e. position of gathering areas;
 shelters allocation and relief distribution), if other "preventive" risk reduction solutions (e.g. flood barriers, drainage
 systems, early warning systems) fail.

Furthermore, reliable and widespread micro-scale solutions concerning the built environment elements were provided, including, for instance, stability-increasing solutions such as street furniture and handrails, or areas where to gather and wait for the rescuers' arrival, such as raised platforms² [35,37,45]. Nevertheless, the assessment of their capabilities should be investigated in an organized manner through a KPIs-based approach and considering their impact from both micro and macro-scales.

118 **1.2 Work aims and proposed approach**

119 This work provides a micro-scale-oriented and behavioural design-based methodology for the assessment of flood risk 120 and the evaluation of risk reduction strategies in outdoor built environments, focusing on open spaces such as streets and 121 squares. The methodology investigates the initial phases of a flood emergency, that is the evacuation. According to this 122 micro-scale standpoint [24], the proposed methodology is based on the joint simulation of hydrodynamic conditions and 123 evacuation behaviours of each individual at risk, over space and time. Experimental-based flood evacuation behaviours 124 are included in the evacuation simulation model. KPIs are provided to consider the effects of the interactions between 125 each individual and the conditions of surrounding floodwaters and the outdoor built environment, at the: 1) micro-scale, 126 that is for each street and square composing the analysed built environment, thus identifying homogenous risk areas; 2) 127 macro-scale, that is for the whole outdoor built environment. Finally, the work proposes risk reduction solutions focused 128 on micro-scale interventions that can [9,26,27,42,63]: a) directly support individuals in emergency conditions; b) be easily 129 implemented and architecturally integrated into the outdoor built environment; c) have a sustainable use also in non-130 disaster conditions.

This whole approach is applied to the city centre of Senigallia (Italy), recently hit by a flood induced by long-duration rainfall and levee-failure [16]. Thanking the application to this case study, this work wants to mainly demonstrate the capabilities of the proposed risk assessment and risk reduction methodology, rather than deeply represent a specific realworld scenario.

² see https://www.rogersarchitects.com/mta-flood-mitigation-street-furniture/ for an example of architecturally-integrated solutions in urban areas (last access: 11/03/2021)

136 **2** Phases and methods

This work was organized in three main phases. In the first phase, according to the micro-scale and behavioural designbased approach, criteria for emergency simulations were defined through the use of an existing hydrodynamic-evacuation simulator (Section 2.1). In the second phase, behavioural design-based KPIs were defined to evaluate risk levels in flood scenarios and propose risk reduction strategies (Section 2.2). Finally, a case study application was provided (Section 2.3) by analyzing different flood scenarios. Then, risk reduction strategies were proposed and verified by considering the riskiest scenario.

143 2.1 Simulation modelling

144 The combined simulator (FlooPEDS) is based on a hydrodynamic model which simulates floodwater conditions in an 145 urban environment and a behavioural model which reproduces evacuees' choices (for details, see [17])³. The hydrody-146 namic model is based on the Nonlinear Shallow Water Equations (NSWEs hereafter). It is generally used for the repre-147 sentation of shallow water problems, that typically occur in the coastal area, in rivers or open channels, in the urban 148 environment [64]. The behavioural model for evacuation relies on previous work providing a complete overview of or-149 ganized evacuation behaviours during flood [37]. Starting from literature outcomes, this work included empirical analyses 150 on real flood emergencies and proposed their related general rules for simulation. These rules were implemented in a 151 micro-scale agent-based modelling approach, namely the Social Force Model (SFM) [65]. The SFM was adopted to de-152 scribe the individual's motion in the built environment. In the SFM, attractive and repulsive forces are applied to each 153 simulated individual to represent interactions among them and with the built environment, by also including: 1) attraction 154 forces between the individuals and immobile objects in the built environment; 2) effects of individuals' speed reduction 155 due to floodwaters D and V. The complete model description and the model notations are provided in Appendix A. A 156 summary of the main modelling criteria is discussed in this section. 157 Firstly, it is considered that the maximum simulation time depends on the hydrodynamic conditions. In particular,

158 when (almost) steady conditions within the domain are reached, the evacuation simulation can end. In fact, beyond this

- 159 time limit, the evacuation conditions are not affected by variations in the hydrodynamic conditions during the time.
- 160 The hydrodynamic model provides the time evolution of water depth D(x,y,t) and depth-averaged flow speed V(x,y,t)
- 161 in the outdoor built environment, where evacuees move. Two parameters can be defined, i.e. the specific force per unit

³ The executable file for the behavioural model ("beta version") is available in the journal supplementary materials, by including the case study scenario inputs and output dataset presented by this work.

162	width $M(x,y,t)$ [m ³ /m] = $(D \cdot V^2)/g + D^2/2$ (where g is the gravity acceleration [9.81m/s ²]) and the descriptor of critical
163	surrounding conditions for human body stability $DV(x,y,t) = D(x,y,t) \cdot V(x,y,t)$ [m ² /s] [18,35,38,48]. The SFM-based simu-
164	lator for the evacuation process uses these inputs to determine [17,37,38]:
165	• the evacuees' speed depending on <i>M</i> ;
166	• his/her possibility of body stability loss, depending on <i>DV</i> ;
167	• the path choices, to minimize the <i>M</i> values and the distance towards a safe area where he/she can gather.
168	At the end of the simulation, the model provides data on:
169	• the <i>arrived evacuees</i> , as the individuals who gained a safe area;
170	• the <i>latecomers</i> , as the individuals (located along the outdoor built environment) who are still moving towards
171	a safe area;
172	• spontaneously gathering evacuees, as the individuals who spontaneously gather in groups in areas where M
173	values are lower than the ones of the surrounding outdoor spaces;
174	• the <i>casualties</i> , by considering the individuals who are exposed to floodwater conditions where they become
175	unstable ($DV>1.20 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$). In addition, the other thresholds for adults in good conditions having a height (h_i)
176	and mass (m_i) product $h_i m_i > 50$, that are $D(x,y,t) < 1.2m$ and $V(x,y,t) < 3.2m/s$, are still considered valid [31,38].
177	More details are offered in Appendix A.
178	The model considers a gaussian distribution for $v_{pref,i}(x, y, t)$ (calculated as function of $M(x, y, t)$) considering a stand-
179	ard deviation of 0.2m/s [49,66]. In addition, an error for path selection (10%) is assumed to represent the evacuees who
180	do not decide to select a safe area as an evacuation target because of safer local conditions [37,59]. Therefore, the evacu-
181	ation process in each scenario is simulated more than once, and the mean values (and related standard deviation) are
182	calculated [53,67]. For each scenario, the convergence of simulated behaviours is considered reached if the standard
183	deviation associated with each output is lower than 10% [17]. At least 5 simulations per scenario have been run.
184	It is worthy of notice that the behavioural model assumptions imply some limitations concerning rules for the simu-
185	lation of evacuees' speeds and stability in floodwater. In fact, this work is mainly focused on demonstrating the capabil-
186	ities of the proposed micro-scale and behavioural design-based approach, rather than on representing specific individual
187	features or case study conditions. We simulated the evacuation of adults (having $h_i m_i > 50$) homogeneously defined [38],
188	thus ignoring additional risk affecting individual features. Their safety threshold for stability is homogeneously consid-
189	ered too, thus focusing on the average response of such kind of evacuees. Specific individuals' features such as height,

body mass, age, gender or motion abilities, that affect both speeds and stability [21,22,49], were then not considered in

191 the current simulations.

192 2.2 Behavioural Key Performance Indicators for scenarios comparisons and criteria for risk reduction

193 strategies

Simulations were performed in different *"flood scenarios*" and *"risk reduction scenarios*". Thus, KPIs compared the
 simulation results by considering [18,56,57]:

- different open spaces (such as streets and squares) in the outdoor built environment, within the same "flood
 scenario", to point out where to implement possible risk reduction strategies;
- 198 2. different "risk reduction scenarios", to evaluate their improvement of safety conditions.

Two groups of KPIs were proposed. *KPIs relating to the evacuation process* (Section 2.2.1) represent the effects of individual-floodwater interactions on the evacuation. According to the stochastic evacuation simulation approach described in Section 2.1, each KPI was estimated on the simulation outputs and then it was associated at least to its average value and its standard deviation. *KPIs relates to the built environment* (the whole simulation area or a part of it, e.g. a street or a square) trace the risk levels depending on the specific floodwater characterization and the adopted risk reduction strategies (Section 2.2.2). The KPIs notations are provided in Appendix B.

205 2.2.1

KPIs relating to the evacuation process

206 The overall number of evacuees who have arrived in a safe area within the simulation time P_e [persons] describes the 207 number of people who can reach effective safe conditions within the simulation time. This KPI can be also represented 208 in percentage terms $P_{e,\%}$ [%], with respect to the initial people hosted in the outdoor built environment. P_e should be 209 maximized to improve the evacuees' safety [35,57,68,69]. Pe related to each safe area in the built environment assesses 210 if it is underused/not used at all by the evacuees. The difference in arriving evacuees [%] describes the use of each safe 211 areas depending on the individuals' selection of paths and safe areas. In fact, some individuals can spontaneously try to 212 move towards a safe area different from the initially selected one because of local floodwater levels conditions [37], as 213 reported in the model description in Appendix A. Thus, the *difference in arriving evacuees* [%] was calculated as the 214 percentage difference between the number of evacuees reaching the safe area and the number of evacuees who "initially 215 chose" the safe area.

The evacuation time T_e [s] is linked to P_e [18,70]. The average evacuation time $T_{e,0.50}$ refers to the 50th percentile of evacuation time and represents the median trend in the evacuation process. According to Section 2.1, local conditions altering simulation results for the early and latecomers exist [53,71], e.g. the initial positions of individuals, as well as uncertainties in $v_{pref,i}(x, y, t)$ and in path selection. To avoid such behavioural effects, the first 5% and last 5% of arrived evacuees were excluded in evacuation time estimation. To this end, the evacuation times [s] of the individuals' 5th ($T_{e,0.05}$) and 95th ($T_{e,0.95}$) percentile were additionally calculated.

The *overall average evacuation curve* represents the number of arrived evacuees $P_e(t)$ during the time (graphical visualization) [67,72]. Average, maximum and minimum evacuation curves were assessed to graphically express the deviation within the sample. Moreover, the evacuation curve for each safe area was calculated.

The *effective average flow of evacuees arrived in a safe area* F_e [persons/s] describes the swiftness of the evacuation process [73,74]. F_e was calculated as the ratio between the number of arrived individuals ($P_e=5\%$, $P_e=50\%$ and $P_e=95\%$) and the related time difference between $T_{e,0.05}$ and $T_{e,0.50}$ (for $P_e=50\%$; $F_{e,0.50}$) or $T_{e,0.95}$ (for $P_e=95\%$; $F_{e,0.95}$). $F_{e,0.95}$ resumes the overall process swiftness. $F_{e,0.50}$ shows the median trend in the evacuation flows, determining the slope of the evacuation curve in its central part. These values should be maximized to speed up the evacuation and to increase the safety of individuals (by reducing their exposure to potentially risky floodwaters conditions). The value was evaluated for the whole process and for each safe area.

The number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties) P_0 [persons] shows how many evacuees cannot reach a gathering area within the simulation time. P_0 was also expressed in percentage terms ($P_{0,\%}$ [%]). Moreover, $P_{0,street}$ provides the number of *out-of-time evacuees* for each space (e.g. street) in the outdoor built environment. According to the rules for evacuation stop in the behavioural simulation model (see Section 2.1) [35,68], it could be possible to identify the percentages of *out-of-time evacuees* considering :

- *latecomers* by $P_{O,la}$ [%], which are the evacuees located near a safe area or in not risky condition at the end of the simulation (i.e. lowest *DV* levels);
- 239

spontaneous gathering evacuees by P_{O,sp} [%];

• *casualties* (considering evacuees exposed to *DV*>1.2 m²/s) by *P*_{0,ca} [%].

Such values were calculated for each street (e.g. $P_{O,ca,street}$) in both absolute and relative terms. *Latecomers, spontaneous gathering evacuees* and *casualties* were represented on the outdoor built environment layout to graphically show the areas affected by such phenomena. In general terms, P_O should be minimized as long as it is complementary to P_e . In particular, $P_{O,ca}$ should be primarily minimized. The *street crowding* $P_{cr,street}$ [persons] specifies how many evacuees go through a given street in the urban layout while evacuating [57,73,75]. The higher $P_{cr,street}$, the higher the number of individuals who can be exposed to local floodwater conditions and to possible individual-individual interactions (by including queuing phenomena). $P_{cr,street,\%}$ [%] was normalized by the maximum $P_{cr,street}$ value within the simulated area.

249

2.2.2 KPIs relating to the built environment

The *KPIs relating to the built environment* were calculated for the entire simulation area or for a single outdoor space (i.e. a street, a square). They trace the risk level depending on the main behavioural design-based risk factors (i.e. *out-oftime evacuees*; *DV* levels; crowding levels), and with respect to the whole simulation time. To support the prioritization of interventions in the built environment, they were also offered via risk maps of the built environment [7,60,76].

254 The complete description of these KPIs is reported in Appendix C. The following dimensionless KPIs were considered:

- *Rarea,scen* [-] and *Rstreet,scen* [-] respectively assess the conditions of the whole area and of a single outdoor space.
 They were evaluated considering the following comparable scenarios sets: (a) the same implemented risk
 reduction solutions and different floodwater events; (b) the same floodwater event and different risk reduction
 solutions. They define the worst scenarios within the comparable ones and investigate the effectiveness of
 risk-reduction solutions;
- 260 R_{street} [-] assesses the risk indices of a given outdoor space in comparison to other streets and squares, by 261 considering a given scenario. In particular, it highlights the riskiest parts of the outdoor built environment 262 under certain hydrodynamic conditions. Thus, it points out where risk reduction strategies should be focused. 263 These KPIs were based on three main behavioural design-based factors: (a) the risk for out-of-time evacuees, due to 264 the presence of *casualties*, *latecomers* and *spontaneously gathering evacuees* (e.g., for the whole area $R_{O,area,scen}$); (b) the 265 risk due to the floodwater level in the built environment (e.g., for the whole area $R_{DV,area,scen}$); (c) the crowding risk, which 266 considers how many evacuees can move in the built environment or in a street/square into it (e.g., for the whole area 267 $R_{cr,area,scen}$).
- These risk factors were combined according to the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) methodology [10,77,78], since they do not necessarily have the same relevance. The selected KPIs were pairwise compared in the AHP, basing on Saaty's relative importance scale (1-equal to 9-extreme). This procedure allows calculating the related priority weights, according to the principal eigenvector of the decision matrix in the AHP method. The proposed priority weights were considered acceptable if the Ratio of Consistency RC associated with the performed pairwise comparison was lower than 10%. The

- 273 lower RC, the more confident the priority weight estimation. As a result of the AHP application, KPIs always range from
- 274 0 to 1 (which corresponds to the maximum risk). KPIs were based on a two-level Decision Hierarchy. A similar approach
- was already used in flood risk assessment (e.g. [10]) and also in other kinds of disasters in outdoor built environments
- 276 (e.g. earthquakes [79]).

277 2.3 Case study definition

- An area in the city centre of Senigallia (AN, Italy), recently affected by floods, was chosen as a case study. Senigallia is located along the Adriatic coastline and built on a floodplain, near the estuary of the Misa River. Moreover, it has a compact urban fabric, characterized by scarcely permeable surfaces and narrow streets. As a consequence, the water spreading during floods flows like in an open compound channel.
- 282 Figure 1 shows the location of the area (red dashed rectangle) in the urban fabric. Figure 1 also graphically shows: the 283 main streets along the upstream-downstream direction (yellow arrows); a portion of the Misa River (in blue), which is the 284 flood source; the Anna Frank gardens (red circle), discussed in the following as source locations of the used boundary 285 conditions. This area was chosen because of the relevant inundation that occurred in May 2014, especially affecting the 286 main central street in the built environment (A. Garibaldi street, in Figure 2-A) and the upstream part of the domain. The 287 choice of such a scenario (which is representative of the urban built environment as discussed above) also allowed easily 288 retrieving input data on geometrical, hydrodynamics and exposed people, since it was investigated in previous works (e.g. 289 [17,80]).



Figure 1. Overview of the case-study area: domain limits (red dashed perimeter); main upstream-downstream streets (yellow arrows);
the Misa river as the source of the flood (blue line and red arrows); the place where data were collected during the 2014 flood (red circle, *Anna Frank* gardens). Adapted from Google Maps, last access: 20/10/2019.

295

The geometrical layout of the urban scenario (also used in FlooPEDS preliminary tests [17]) was divided into a series of rectangular subdomains. In each subdomain, floodwaters conditions could be taken as homogeneous, according to the solver structured grid with spatial resolution of $(\Delta x, \Delta y)=(0.8, 0.5)$ m. Figure 2 traces the domain, having an area of about 90,000 m² (x = [0, 350]m; y = [0, 265]m). Figure 2-B also shows the division of the outdoor built environment into streets (dashed lines) and squares (hatched rectangles), and the position of the safe areas. Comparing Figure 2-A and Figure 2-B, the three main streets along the upstream-downstream direction (yellow lines in Figure 1) are: A. Garibaldi street as the outdoor spaces (i.e. streets) J, K and L, Trieste street as B, C, D, A1; Venezia street as S, T, U, A2.

303



Figure 2. Simplified domain modelling: (a) a general overview of the simulation area limits (dashed light grey lines) by including domain origin, metric scale, floodwater flows main direction (arrow on the bottom), place names and safe areas with the related identification number (red circles); (b) streets (dashed lines connecting two grey circles) and squares (hatched areas) with related identification codes, and buildings (grey blocks).

309

Two *flood scenarios* were simulated: (1) levee-failure (Section 2.3.1) and (2) river-overflow (Section 2.3.2). The latter case was based on existing data and statistics, although extreme and precautionary assumptions were made. The hydrodynamic conditions were imposed at the upstream boundary and linearly varied between each of the steps according to the specific assumptions (see *D* and *V* reported in Table 1 and Table 2). A reflecting condition was imposed both laterally
and at the downstream boundary.

The input data about the evacuation scenario are described in Section 2.3.3. Finally, KPIs application for scenarios comparison is described in Section 2.3.4.

317 2.3.1 Levee-failure scenario

318 Information on the levee-failure was collected from analyses on the actual flood features (water depth D and speed V) observed during the event in the case study area. The event time series were reconstructed from videos recorded during 319 320 the 2014 flood in the Anna Frank gardens (red-circled area in Figure 1, located close to both river and study area). A 321 reduced distance (about 300m) exists between such location and the west boundary of the numerical domain. Thus, hydrodynamic simulations used these recorded time series. Input data concerning D and V recorded on May 3rd, 2014 from 322 323 11.30 am to 1.30 pm (see Table 1) were assigned as upstream boundary conditions. Figure 3 shows the hydrograph 324 referring to the most downstream available water level measurements (the hydrometer is located at Bettolelle station, 325 which is about 7 km far from the case-study area).

326 327

t [s]	D [m]	V [m/s]
0	0.02	0.06
720	0.13	0.31
1080	0.20	0.45
1200	0.25	0.57
1440	0.38	0.85
1800	0.40	0.90
3600	0.45	1.01
7200	0.50	1.12

Table 1 Levee-failure input data used as boundary conditions (at y=0 in Figure 2) for the hydrodynamic simulations





Figure 3. Water level evolution during the May 2014flood: hydrograph (dashed line) recorded at *Bettolelle* station; water level chosen as the boundary condition in the case-study domain (solid line), reconstructed using the data recorded at the *Anna Frank* gardens (see red circle in Figure 1; data are offered by Table 1).

333 2.3.2 River-overflow scenario

We assumed that an overflow hazard might characterize a river stretch close to the city centre (see Figure 1) where: (a) the cross-section significantly reduces up to a width smaller than 20m, depending on the flow condition; and (b) the flow reaches the bank almost perpendicularly.

Boundary conditions were based on analyses aimed at identifying the return period of the Misa River discharge. Depending on the method applied for such estimate⁴, the mean discharge ranges between 400 and 600 m³/s for return periods T_R =(100-500) years (e.g., [80]), while the maximum discharge ranges between 300 and 900 m³/s for T_R =(50-200) years. Under the worst-case scenarios, the highest water level can be assumed for this reach of the river (e.g. about 2m over the right bank over which overflow is assumed to occur). Such assumption is consistent with: 1) the features of the left bank, which is some meters higher than the right bank; 2) a discharge related to a large return period, i.e. of the order of 900

Autorità di Bacino Regione Marche, Delibera *C.I.* n. 67/2016, Elaborato *"A"*; website: http://www.regione.marche.it/Portals/0/Paesaggio Territorio Urbanistica/AdB/PAIMarche/DelComIst/allegati/del160325 67 El aboratoA.pdf. Hydrological and hydraulic report for the construction of the hydropower plant "Bettolelle" in the Misa River; website: http://www.ambiente.marche.it/Portals/0/Ambiente/Pubblicazioni/V00508/6fb572e4-92eb-4ba3-b225-314fb2f15852.pdf (last access 21/11/2019)

m³/s. It was thus assumed that the water overflows through a bank length $b=(110\pm120)$ m, with a head over the bank h₁=2m, which was taken as constant along b. As a consequence, the geometry of the bank was provided as almost rectangular. The water discharge Q flowing down from the bank was estimated using the typical law applied to broad-crested weirs. Q was assumed as proportional to both b and $h_1^{3/2}$ as in Equation 12:

347

348
$$Q = 1.7C_d b \left(h_1 + \frac{v_1^2}{2g} \right)^{3/2}$$
(12)

349

where v_l is the flow velocity and C_d is the discharge coefficient. A suitable choice of the involved terms (e.g., $v_l \sim 5$ m/s during flood conditions, $C_d \sim 0.6$) leads to a discharge equal to about 700m³/s.

Finally, the overflowing discharge was completely transferred to the study area (about 600m far from the overflow location), i.e. neglecting dissipation and water infiltration. Although strong, such an assumption represents an ideal extreme condition. It allows properly understanding the benefits of risk reduction strategies when the flood condition is significantly different from the levee-failure one.

The overflow phenomenon can be thought significantly rapid along the rising limb of the hydrograph. Table 2 reports the selected input data (D, v) and the assumed discharge Q at each stage. Depending on the water depth at the upstream boundary (D=1.1m) and domain width (265 m along the *y*-direction), the velocity modulus varies between 2.30 and 2.40 m/s.

360

361

Table 2 River-overflow input data used as boundary conditions (at y=0 in Figure 2-A) for the hydrodynamic simulations

t [s]	Q [m ³ /s]	D [m]	v [m/s]
0	670	1.10	2.30
50	685	1.10	2.35
600	700	1.10	2.40

362

363 **2.3.3** Evacuation simulation setup for the case study

Each evacuation simulation involved 300 individuals to represent the number of individuals located in adjacent buildings In particular, for each building, the building surface $[m^2]$ and the intended use (i.e.: residential, commercial, other public buildings) were assessed through an infield survey. Then, the following occupant load values were applied

- with respect to each intended use according to the Italian Fire Safety Code [81]: residential, 0.05pp/m²; commercial, 0.4 pp/m²; other public buildings, 0.7pp/m². This process allowed calculating the possible occupant capacity for each building. According to a conservative approach, individuals were considered as located outdoor (i.e. near the building access) and not able to enter the nearest building and move vertically.
- When the evacuation started, individuals tried to move towards the safe areas according to the modelling criteria (see
 Section 2.1 and Appendix A). Safe areas were characterized by ground elevations and were placed at the downstream
- area exits, as described in [17,18]. They are shown in Figure 2 and represent the evacuation target for the evacuees.

374 2.3.4 KPIs application for scenarios comparison

KPIs defined in Section 2.2 were firstly applied to derive the outdoor built environment safety in the pre-strategies proposal scenario (in the following, the "*original scenario*"). The most critical floodwater conditions between the analyzed flood scenarios (levee-failure and river-overflow) were retrieved. The outcoming flood scenario was considered for the proposal of risk reduction strategies. Finally, such strategies were implemented within the outdoor built environment and their effectiveness was evaluated by comparing KPIs. Equation 11 shows the percentage difference $dKPI_{red-pre}$ [%] of a given KPI by considering the *original scenario* (KPI_{pre}) in respect to the one with risk reduction strategies (KPI_{red}) [57]:

$$381 \qquad dKPI_{red-pre} = \frac{KPI_{red}-KP}{KPI_{pre}} \cdot 100[\%] \tag{11}$$

382 For risk indices $R_{area,scen}$ and $R_{street,scen}$, negative $dKPI_{red-pre}$ values imply a reduction of the risk levels.

383 **3 Results**

384 3.1 Flood scenarios

Figure 4 shows the hydrodynamic outputs for the levee-failure scenario. In this scenario, the maximum discharge (peak condition) occurs after 7200s. Both panels of Figure 4 refer to this moment in hydrodynamic simulation results. Figure 4-A shows the streamwise evolution of the water-surface profile along the West-East streets of the analysed domain (vellow lines in Figure 1). Figure 4-B illustrates the top view of the *DV* map overlapped to the numerical domain.



Figure 4. Hydrodynamic results of the levee-failure simulation after 7200s (peak condition): a) streamwise sections; b) *DV* map (red
 arrows are the speed vectors; buildings-obstacles are the white areas).

389

In more details, the flow depth is higher along the streets J, K, L, A0 (blue line in Figure 4-A) than along the other two parallel streets, that are streets B, C, D, A1 (red line) and streets S, T, U, A2 (yellow line). The colour map shown in Figure 4-B confirms this result: larger values of *DV* are met along streets J, K, L, A0 (see the lighter colours at y~150m and darker colours at y~11m and y~256m). Concerning the crossing streets, the leftmost one is characterized by the largest flow, as it is the closest to the source/boundary condition, with the water level being the highest (*z*=0.5m) and *DV* reaching the maximum value of 0.8 m²/s. Conversely, *DV* becomes nearly zero downstream, i.e. within the square area located around x = 260 m (square P-p1-p2, indicated by red vertical lines in Figure 4-A).

400 The speed vectors in Figure 4-B shows the main circulation patterns generated within the domain. The speed reduces 401 while moving downstream. Moreover, the water flow entering the crossflow streets (x~115m, x~190m) is visible as bend-402 ing arrows (see also the little perturbations in the water-surface level in Figure 4-A).

403 Figure 5 shows the outputs of the river-overflow tested scenario. In this scenario, the maximum discharge (peak con-404 dition) occurs after 600s. Both panels of Figure 5 refer to this moment in hydrodynamic simulation results. Figure 5-A 405 shows the streamwise section and the water-level profiles relevant to the central section of the streamwise streets. The 406 two lateral streets are illustrated in red (streets B, C, D, A1) and yellow (streets S, T, U, A2), while streets J, K, L, A0 are 407 plotted in blue. As for Figure 4-B, Figure 5-B shows the DV distribution through a colour map. The largest DV values 408 occur at the upstream boundary, where $DV=1.3 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$. In contrast to the levee-failure case, high speeds and reduced depths 409 occur at the intersections between the streets J, K, L, A0 and: (1) the crossflow streets, that are streets F and N, and streets 410 G and O (also see DV at the intersection at about (x,y)=(115,150) m in Figure 5-B); (2) the square (P-p1-p2). Considering

the street intersections, Figure 5-B also shows how speed vectors (red arrows) are not straight but visibly bend towards the crossflow streets. Furthermore, Figure 5-A shows a large perturbation of the water surface just downstream of the intersections (e.g., see the blue line at x~120m and 190m). Such a feature is due to both large flow intensity and rapid friction reduction at the intersections. In particular, the friction changes from a relatively large value (due to both bottom and vertical obstacles/blocks) to a much smaller value (due to the only bottom contribution).

- 416 Given the above, the river-overflow scenario is significantly more severe than the levee-failure scenario, considering
- that it is based on ideal and largely conservative assumptions.
- 418



420 **Figure 5.** Hydrodynamic results of the river-overflow simulation after 600s (peak condition): a) streamwise section; b) *DV* map.

421

419

Hydrodynamic results provided useful insights for the following behavioural simulations. It is observed that the leveefailure case reaches almost steady conditions after 600s, while steadiness is reached after 300s in the river-overflow case.
Thus, the total time of behavioural simulations is respectively assumed equal to 600s and 300s.

425 3.2 Original scenario: simulation results

Table 3 offers the simulation results concerning the evacuation process for the two considered scenarios. The number of arrived evacuees, the related evacuation times and the evacuation flows are compared. Figure 6 represents the related evacuation curves. The two flood scenarios are characterized by significant similarities about: (a) the evacuation path

- 429 selection; (b) the position of *out-of-time evacuees*.
- 430 Regarding the path selection, evacuees prefer to move towards the outdoor spaces which are orthogonal to the flood-
- 431 water direction in both scenarios (streets F and N, streets G and O; squares p1 and p2; streets I and R). In fact, the DV

432 conditions in these areas are less critical (Figure 4 and Figure 5). As shown by Figure 4, this phenomenon is more relevant 433 in river-overflow, because DV values are generally higher in comparison to the levee-failure scenario. This evacuees' 434 choice affects the use of the safe areas. As shown by Table 3, the safe area 0 seems to be the less used one in both 435 conditions, because it is placed in the main floodwater flow direction. Nevertheless, about half of the evacuees can gain 436 a safe area within the simulation time in both cases. In fact, according to Table 3, P_e is similar for both the flood scenarios 437 (percentage difference of about 6% on the average values).

About data on the *out-of-time evacuees*, Table 4 outlines areas and causes that prevent them from reaching a safe area within the simulation time. In general terms, at the end of the evacuation, most *out-of-time evacuees* are located along the streets E and M, streets F and N, streets G and O, and the upstream part of streets J and K. Figure 7 summarizes the positions of *out-of-time evacuees*. In both cases, evacuees located downstream are latecomers influenced by:

442 443 • their initial position, far from the selected safe area;

• floodwater interactions because M values along the chosen paths decrease their speed.

When the simulation ends, most of these evacuees are located in the crossflow streets immediately downstream in the domain. In fact, they remain close to buildings because of attractive forces [17] and because DV levels are lower than in the main streets, which are parallel to the main floodwater flow.

Differences in the evacuation results in each flood scenario are affected by "how" the floodwater events specifically develop during the simulation time depending on the hydrodynamic conditions themselves. In the river-overflow scenario, *DV* values quickly increase during the first part of evacuation time, by immediately reaching critical conditions for individuals' stability. As a result, a significant number of *out-of-time evacuees* (42%) are influenced by critical *DV* conditions, thus provoking casualties (compare to Figure 7-B), too. On the contrary, in the levee-failure scenario, the stability threshold is not reached in the simulation domain, by provoking no casualty.

453 Additional differences are related to "how" the evacuation process develops over time. The overall evacuation curves 454 in both scenarios share the same sigmoidal function trend (compare to Figure 6). However, the evacuation process in the 455 levee-failure scenario seems to be faster than the one in river-overflow, especially in the first part of the evacuation. In 456 fact, according to Table 3, $F_{e,0.50}$ for the levee-failure is at least more than 3 times greater than the one in the river-457 overflow. Such a result is graphically shown by the slope of the overall average evacuation curves, which is higher for 458 the river-overflow scenario, as shown in Figure 6-B. This output is essentially due to the lower DV level in levee-failure 459 when compared to the one observed in the river-overflow (compare to Section Error! Reference source not found. 460 results). Levee-failure scenario implies lower importance of individual-floodwaters interactions while moving (i.e. higher 461 evacuation speeds; lower possibility to stop moving because of critical DV levels). Thus, most evacuees can reach a safe

area within the first 100s in the evacuation simulation. When the evacuation time increases (t > 100s), the levee-failure scenario is mainly characterized by the arrival of *latecomers*. In fact, evacuees can still move in the considered area, but they are slowed down by the *DV* levels. Figure 6 shows a significant asymptotic trend in the evacuation curve essentially due to such a phenomenon. Meanwhile, $T_{e,0.95}$ for the levee-failure scenario increases and the final overall $F_{e,0.95}$ proves to be fairly lower than the one for the river-overflow scenario. The same trend can be noticed for each of the safe areas. It is worthy to notice that safe area 3 is more affected than the others by the critical *DV* levels noticed in the upstream part of the urban scenario, as shown, for instance, by $F_{e,0.50}$ in the levee-failure scenario.

Finally, during the evacuation process, several evacuees change their initial evacuation target, which is the nearest safe area. They can change their target because of [17]: (a) group motion criteria; (b) surrounding critical *DV* levels retrieved along the path initially selected. The percentage of evacuees changing their initial target in respect of the total number of arrived evacuees is equal to 34% for the river-overflow and 39% for the levee-failure scenario (see the supplementary material: S1). In both cases, evacuees' target selection for safe area 1 is essentially affected by the spatial proximity of safe area 0 and safe area 3. No significant differences are noticed for the other safe areas.

- 475
- 476 477

 Table 3. Simulation results for levee-failure and river-overflow scenarios, in the original scenario, according to Section 2.2.1

 KPIs. Safe areas positions are shown in Figure 2.

Scenario	Reference	P_e (st. dev.)	<i>Pe,%</i> (st. dev.)	Te,0.05	Те,0.50	<i>Те,0.95</i>	Fe,0.50	Fe,0.95
(max sim. time [s])	safe areas	[persons]	[%]	[s]	[s]	[s]	[persons/s]	[persons/s]
levee-failure (600s)	all	152 (4)	51 (3)	10	46	377	1.71	0.39
	safe area 0	18 (3)	6 (19)	10	22	113	0.45	0.17
	safe area 1	49 (2)	16 (5)	24	56	86	0.44	0.59
	safe area 2	33 (3)	11 (8)	28	58	479	0.29	0.07
	safe area 3	51 (3)	17 (6)	9	42	301	0.60	0.17
river-overflow	all	137 (2)	46 (2)	85	159	265	0.50	0.44
(300s)	safe area 0	20 (1)	15 (1)	73	158	279	0.06	0.07
	safe area 1	36 (2)	26 (2)	111	151	230	0.13	0.15
	safe area 2	35 (2)	26 (1)	108	208	251	0.08	0.13
	safe area 3	46 (2)	33 (1)	45	126	237	0.16	0.18



479

480 Figure 6. Evacuation curves for the original scenario in case of: a) levee-failure; b) river-overflow. Evacuation curves are offered for



483 **Table 4.** Out-of-time evacuees *P*₀ (and their characterization) in the levee-failure and river-overflow simulations, for the original

484 scenario, according to the KPIs in Section 2.2.1. Percentage values are calculated for the main or secondary related conditions.

Main condition	Secondary conditions	Po (st. dev.)[per-		<i>Po,%</i> (st. dev.) [%]		Po,la - Po,sp - Po,ca	
		sons]				[%]	
		Levee-	River-	Levee-	River-	Levee-	River-
		failure	overflow	failure	overflow	failure	overflow
		(600s)	(300s)	(600s)	(300s)	(600s)	(300s)
all		148 (4)	163 (2)	49 (3)	54 (1)	55-45-0	22-36-42
evacuees who stop		2 (1)	53 (1)	2 (1)	32 (1)	100-0-0	0-0-100
upstream (streets E							

and M) because of							
floodwater conditions							
(e.g. stability loss)							
total number of evac-		146 (3)	110 (2)	98 (1)	68 (1)	54-46-0	33-54-13
uees located down-							
stream							
	evacuees who stop in the	5 (3)	18 (3)	3 (2)	11 (2)	0-100-0	0-18-82
	main street (streets K, L,						
	A0)						
	evacuees who stop near	0 (0)	10 (5)	0 (0)	6 (3)	0-0-0	100-0-0
	safe area 3						
	evacuees who stop near a	4 (2)	12 (2)	2 (1)	8 (1)	100-0-0	100-0-0
	downstream safe area						
	evacuees who stop in the	8 (1)	14(1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0-0-0	38-62-0
	square (square P-p1-p2)						

486





490 $R_{area,scen}$ in Table 5 and $R_{street,scen}$ in Figure 7 confirm that the river-overflow leads to a worse outcome. In this scenario, 491 the higher impact is due to the floodwater conditions (see $R_{DV,area,scen}$ in Table 5), which increase the number of *out-of-*492 *time evacuees* (see $R_{O,area,scen}$ in Table 5) and *casualties* (see $R_{street,scen}$ in Figure 7). On the contrary, crowding conditions 493 (see $R_{cr,street,scen}$ in Table 5) are higher for the levee-failure scenario since the lower DV levels reduce the number of *casu-*494 *alties* and allow evacuees to effectively move in the outdoor built environment.

495 Figure 8 summarizes the risk of each outdoor space in the scenario by comparing the river-overflow and the levee-496 failure scenario. Raw data are reported in the tables of supplementary material: S2. In both cases, higher risk levels are 497 reached at the upstream streets (E, J, M, N in Figure 2), mainly because of large DV values and of a high number of out-498 of-time evacuees (essentially, casualties). Streets F, G and N have medium-high Rstreet.scen values for the other streets 499 orthogonal to the floodwater direction. This effect is due to their related number of latecomers and of spontaneously 500 gathering evacuees thanking the limited DV levels (compare to Figure 7). This phenomenon is more important in the 501 river-overflow scenario. Finally, some parts of the outdoor built environment placed downstream (e.g. A0, A2, H, I, p2, 502 R) are mainly affected by higher crowding levels and so their risk is comparable to the ones of streets F and G, especially 503 in the river-overflow scenario.

504

505 **Table 5** Risk index for the whole area (*R*_{area,scen}) and the related influencing factors, by comparing river-overflow and levee-fail-

~	\mathbf{n}	^
~	11	6
•	.,	
		• •

	•
1120	cooportoc
uic	SUCHALIOS.

Scenario	Ro,area,scen	R _{DV} ,area,scen	R cr,area,scen	R area,scen
Levee-failure	0.27	0.21	1.00	0.30
River-overflow	0.87	1.00	0.81	0.91





509 Figure 8. Rstreet,scen for: a) levee-failure; b) river-overflow. Buildings (light grey blocks) and safe area codes are supplied. The KPI scale 510 is shown by the color map (0.2 ranges discretization). Raw data are shown by supplementary material: S2.

511 3.3

Risk reduction strategies proposal

512 In the original scenario, the percentage of evacuees reaching a safe area is almost the same for both river-overflow 513 and levee-failure. Nevertheless, the results of Section 3.2 underline how the riskiest scenario is represented by the river-

514 overflow one because of the critical conditions due to DV levels leading to a higher number of out-of-time evacuees and

515 casualties. Thus, this flood scenario is considered in the following to propose risk reduction strategies.

516 Figure 9 summarizes R_{street} in the river-overflow scenario (raw data are offered by supplementary material: S3) and

517 highlights riskier areas, this suggesting practical solutions to support evacuees during hazardous phases.

518 The riskiest streets are located upstream, essentially because of the number of out-of-time evacuees (i.e. streets E, J,

519 M). In such outdoor spaces, most of the evacuees stop moving because they can lose their stability because of floodwaters

- 520 conditions. Direct support against the critical DV levels should be provided to the individuals located along streets E and
- 521 M, to lead them moving towards streets S, J and B or staying here in safe conditions. Evacuees moving along street J
- 522 should be similarly supported. In addition, the upstream streets that are orthogonal to the floodwater direction (i.e. streets

- F and G) are riskier than the others because of the number of *latecomers* and *spontaneously gathering evacuees* here thanks to the limited *DV* levels. The evacuees who stop moving here should maintain a safe position while waiting for the rescuers' arrival.
- 526 Finally, despite the higher crowding level, streets placed downstream are characterized by a negligible risk level in
- 527 respect to *R*_{*O*,street} and *R*_{*DV*,street} (that are essentially null and void).
- 528 In view of the above, two different risk reduction solutions can be provided:
- the implementation of handrails can essentially support evacuees while moving or facing severe *DV* levels
 conditions (see Section 3.3.1);
- the implementation of handrails plus raised platforms/sidewalks can "separate" the evacuees from the critical
 floodwater levels, and let them waiting for the rescuers' arrival in safe conditions (see Section 3.3.2).

533 Thus, two related *risk reduction scenarios* are defined and described as follows, while their implementation layout is

- offered in Figure 10. In addition to the aforementioned solutions, signs could be installed in the riskiest areas to inform
- people about the possible threads (e.g. in terms of possible flood depth) during the normal use of the outdoor built envi-
- 536 ronment [27].
- 537



- 538
- 539 Figure 9. R_{street} representation by considering the river-overflow conditions in the original scenario. Light grey blocks are the buildings,
- 540 while safe area codes are supplied. The KPI scale is shown by the colour map involving a 0.2 ranges discretization.
- 541



Figure 10. Proposed risk reduction strategies and their positioning in the related scenarios: a) handrails implementation (dashed lines);
b) handrails+raised platforms (rectangles, to qualitatively represent their areas; identification codes defined as in Table 6). Safe areas are pointed out.

546 3.3.1 Strategies proposal: handrails implementation

Handrails are placed along the sidewalks. They help evacuees maintaining stability while moving towards a safe area
[17,21,37]. In most cases, this solution maintains a low impact on the existing built environment because the handrails
could be implemented on the existing fences or building walls.

550 In the related simulations, we assumed that evacuees supported by handrails could not lose their stability but they could 551 not also increase their speed (conservative approach in respect to the total evacuation time) [21,35,37,44,45]. This as-552 sumption was contemplated in some modelling approaches concerning flooded environments [17,46,47] and it can be 553 considered valid within the floodwater conditions provided by the simulations (D(x,y,t) < 1.2m/s and V(x,y,t) < 3.2m/s) [38]. 554 Handrails are hence placed at the street boundaries (building walls, fences), where floodwater speeds are reduced due 555 to the no-slip condition at the wall. Safe areas positions and identification codes are the same as in the original scenario. 556 Figure 10-A shows that handrails are mainly placed along upstream streets (i.e. streets B, E, J, M, S) because of their critical DV levels. Meanwhile, evacuees moving along the other downstream street (e.g. N and F) could be limitedly 557 558 supported by handrails because no stability loss phenomena are detected in the river-overflow scenario. Anyway, hand-559 rails could be implemented in a widespread manner into the outdoor built environment to support evacuees in other 560 floodwater conditions with higher DV levels.

561 3.3.2 Strategies proposal: handrails+raised platform implementation

562 Raised platforms or sidewalks should be easily reached by the evacuees so as to wait for rescuers in safe conditions, 563 thus being considered safe areas. Thus, in this scenario, we assumed that the position of these elements was associated 564 with additional safe areas in the outdoor layout. Each platform should be also marked by clear and visible (in terms of 565 legibility and aesthetics) identification signs, which could inform the community about the use of the areas also in non-566 disaster conditions (to be seen by both residents and visitors) [27].

567 These platforms are placed along upstream streets (i.e. streets E, J, M) and in the main layout areas where spontane-568 ously gathering evacuees are noticed (i.e. streets F and N), according to the simulation results of the original scenario (see 569 Figure 7). Thus, nine safe areas are proposed by: (a) maintaining safe areas 1, 2 and 3 and removing safe area 0 (which is 570 the less used); (b) introducing six safe areas on raised platforms. Their position is shown in Figure 10-B. Anyway, hand-571 rails are still implemented along the streets B, E, M and S to avoid individuals losing their stability because of critical 572 floodwater levels, and so to allow them to reach the raised platform. Table 6 quantitatively describes the raised platforms 573 and their implementation according to the identification codes (as safe areas) in Figure 10-B. Table 6 also provides details 574 concerning: (a) the location; (b) the average number of evacuees to be hosted according to the original scenario results 575 (compare to, e.g., Figure 7); (c) the related minimum wait area; (d) the possible width (orthogonal to the street) and length 576 (parallel to the street) of the area; (e) the height of the platform from the ground; (f) additional notes on the possible 577 implementation in the considered scenario.

578 In particular, each platform dimension (area [m²]) should be great enough to host the average number of gathering 579 individuals (estimated according to P_0 values in original scenario simulation) in proper density conditions (3pp/m², to 580 allow them to wait without contact phenomena [82,83]). Their height from the ground should avoid the possibility that 581 floodwaters interfere with evacuees while they are waiting (railings should be always provided). Moreover, their imple-582 mentation in the outdoor layout should guarantee:

- 583
- adequate access points to ensure the individuals reach the top of the platform (stairs or ramps). In our proposal, • 584 the stairs have a tread and a rise of 21cm, while ramps have a slope of 8% to guarantee access by wheelchairs;

their overall dimension compatible with the surrounding outdoor layout without consistent modifications to

585

٠

586 it (i.e. to the exiting sidewalks and car lanes);

587 • possible use of the space under the platforms in ordinary conditions.

In the following simulations, the two designed raised sidewalks placed along the street F are considered as a single 588

589 safe area because of their proximity in a space with low DV levels. Figure 11 shows a couple of possible schematic examples of the raised platform implementation in the case study. In Figure 11-A a street-level parking lot along the street might be removed to introduce the platform on one street side (view of scheme for street J – saJ1). The access is guaranteed by stairs while the underlying spaces can be normally used as bus shelters or waste disposal facilities. In Figure 11-B, a raised sidewalk might be created by removing a couple of streetlevel parking lots, accessible by a ramp to guarantee the normal use as a sidewalk (view of scheme for street F - saF). Similarly, continuously raised sidewalks can be implemented.

- 596
- 597 598

Table 6 Data on the raised platforms implementation. Platforms with "*" are split into two equal parts (on each street side), and the shown dimensions refer to each of the raised sidewalks (thus hosting half of the evacuees' number).

Street	Safe	Evacuees	Minimum	Possible	Possible	Height	Notes
	area	to be	area [m ²]	width	length	from the	
	code	hosted		[m]	[m]	ground	
						[m]	
E	saE	20	8	1.8	4.5	2.4	removing a street-level parking
J	saJ1	10	4	1.8	2.3	2.4	lot along the street to introduce
J	saJ2	10	4	1.8	2.3	2.4	the platform on one street side; the space under the platform can be normally used as a bus shelter or waste disposal facilities
F	saF*	53	10*	1.8*	5.6*	0.6*	raised sidewalks with removing o a couple of street-level parking lots, accessible by a ramp to guar- antee the normal use as a side- walk
М	saM	19	8	3.2	2.4	2.4	raised area within the public square spaces (e.g. garden area)

Р	saP	17	6	2.0	3.0	1.0	not currently used vehicle access
							point; the space under the plat-
							form can be normally used as bus
							shelter or waste disposal facilities

t



600

Figure 11. Examples of the possible implementation of raised platforms in the case-study, according to the positions identified by
Table 6: a) removing a street-level parking lot along the street to introduce the platform on one street side, with access by stairs (e.g.
saJ); b) raised sidewalks with access by ramp (e.g. saF).

604

605 3.4 Effectiveness of the risk reduction strategies

Table 7 offers the simulation results for the river-overflow scenario by considering the *original scenario* versus the ones concerning the implementation of handrails and handrails+raised platforms. The number of arrived evacuees, the related evacuation times and the evacuation flows are provided. Figure 12 compares the evacuation curves of these scenarios.

From a general point of view, according to Figure 12, the overall evacuation curves concerning the risk reduction strategies always demonstrate an improvement in respect to the *original scenario* (also considering maximum and minimum curves). Data and KPIs are outlined for the overall simulation area and for each considered safe area. Table 8 shows data on *out-of-time evacuees*, by including the characterization of the areas and the causes that prevent them from reaching a safe area within the simulation time.

Results of the handrail implementation scenario are quite similar to the ones of the original scenario, both for the overall evacuation process and for each safe area. The main similarities concern P_e and $F_{e,0.50}$ (see Table 7), the general evacuation trend (see Figure 12) and the choice of the safe areas (see supplementary material: S4). The effects of handrails 618 are beneficial, especially if considering the possibility to avoid casualties because of body stability loss, as shown by $P_{O,ca}$ 619 [%] in Table 8. Nevertheless, the critical floodwater conditions in the upstream streets still slow down the evacuees located 620 in streets B, E, M and S. In fact, some of these individuals can reach a safe area (as shown by increasing P_e in Table 7), 621 but they represent the last arrived evacuees. $T_{e,0.95}$ and $F_{e,0.95}$ slightly increase because of such phenomena. Similarly to 622 the original scenario, 31% of the evacuees change their target because of group motion criteria and surrounding critical 623 DV levels retrieved along the path initially selected. They were too limitedly supported by the handrails while moving. 624 Thus, evacuees still try to spontaneously gather along the street F because of the local beneficial floodwater conditions, 625 as for the original scenario (compare, e.g., with Figure 13).

626 On the contrary, the handrails+raised platform implementation significantly decreases the risk conditions for the evac-627 uees. Firstly, P_e , $F_{e,0.50}$ and $F_{e,0.95}$ increase, as displayed by Table 7. It is worth noticing that the evacuation flows are 3 628 times the ones in the original scenario (see also the slope of the evacuation curves in Figure 12). The combination of 629 handrails in the upstream streets and raised platforms avoids the presence of casualties as well as limits the number of 630 latecomers and spontaneously gathering evacuees (see also Figure 13). In fact, the evacuees located upstream can use 631 the handrails to reach the nearest safe areas on the raised platform (i.e. saE, saM, saJ1 and saJ2). According to experi-632 mental analysis on evacuation behaviours [37], evacuees who cannot reach one of these safe areas prefer to wait near the 633 buildings and spontaneously gather while being supported by the handrails. The time needed to reach the platforms is 634 essentially affected by the floodwater levels and by the distances of the arriving evacuees from the raised platform (see 635 $T_{e,0.95}$ in Table 7).

636 The introduction of raised platforms along the street F and the square P-p1-p2 reduces the number of evacuees arriving 637 at the safe areas placed downstream, and in particular to the safe area 3. In this sense, please also see the supplementary 638 material: S4, i.e. "Difference in arriving evacuees ("initially choosing" minus "reaching")" data. In fact, evacuees try to 639 minimize their distance from a safe area by using saF and saP. Finally, let comparing the number of evacuees used to 640 evaluate the dimension of the safe areas (according to the original scenario simulations, see Table 6) and the number of 641 evacuees who arrived at the raised platforms according to the simulation results (see Table 7). The most significant differences are retrieved for saF (+86%) and saP (+347%). Anyway, a possible increase of saF and saP surface is still possible 642 643 in the outdoor built environment. Both sidewalks of street F can be turned into raised elements, while the platform saP 644 can be enlarged since it is placed in a square with gardens.

646 Table 7 Simulation results for river-overflow scenario, in the original scenario and in the ones with risk reduction strategies im-

Scenario	Reference	P_e (st. dev.)	<i>Pe</i> ,% (st. dev.)	Te,0.05	Te,0.50	<i>T</i> _e ,0.95	Fe,0.50	Fe,0.95
(max sim. time	safe areas	[persons]	[%]	[s]	[s]	[s]	[persons/s]	[persons/s]
[s])								
Original scenario	all	137 (2)	46 (2)	85	159	265	0.50	0.44
	safe area 0	20 (1)	15 (1)	73	158	279	0.06	0.07
	safe area 1	36 (2)	26 (2)	111	151	230	0.13	0.15
	safe area 2	35 (2)	26 (1)	108	208	251	0.08	0.13
	safe area 3	46 (2)	33 (1)	45	126	237	0.16	0.18
Handrails imple-	all	143 (6)	48 (4)	69	153	270	0.50	0.53
mentation	safe area 0	22 (5)	7 (3)	60	133	259	0.08	0.07
	safe area 1	36 (6)	25 (4)	89	163	253	0.11	0.13
	safe area 2	41 (3)	28 (2)	90	160	246	0.13	0.16
	safe area 3	44 (5)	30 (3)	60	129	258	0.16	0.16
Handrails+raised	all	289 (3)	96 (1)	13	91	217	1.60	1.27
platform imple-	safe area 1	33 (3)	12 (1)	62	143	229	0.31	0.34
mentation	safe area 2	17 (1)	6 (<1)	21	113	194	0.07	0.08
	safe area 3	3 (1)	1 (<1)	33	35	37	0.05	0.06
	saE	20 (1)	7 (<1)	6	40	86	0.25	0.22
	saM	18 (1)	6 (<1)	42	72	138	0.12	0.12
	saJ1	9(1)	2 (<1)	4	36	90	0.14	0.10
	saJ2	12 (1)	4 (<1)	19	38	67	0.16	0.16
	saF	99 (1)	34 (<1)	10	78	235	0.65	0.40
	saP	76 (2)	27 (1)	50	107	173	0.36	0.42

647 plemented (handrails; handrails+raised platform), according to Section 2.2.1 KPIs. Safe areas positions are shown in Figure 10.



Figure 12. Evacuation curves for the whole process and for each safe area in the river-overflow scenario considering: a) handrails implementation; b) handrails+raised platform implementation. The whole process evacuation curve for the original scenario is shown (line-two dots evacuation curve, in red, by including: minimum curve, as a dotted line; average curve, as line-two dots line; maximum curve, as a dashed line).

- 655 **Table 8** Out-of-time evacuees *Po* (and their characterization) in case of the implementation of handrails (H) and handrails+raised
- 656 platform (H+P), according to the KPIs in Section 2.2.1. Percentage values are calculated with respect to the main or secondary re-
- 657

lated conditions.

Main condition	Secondary conditions	ns Po (st. dev.)[per-		<i>P0,%</i> (st. 0	lev.) [%]	P 0,1a - P 0,sp - P 0,ca	
		sons]				[%]	
		Н	H+P	Н	H+P	Н	H+P
all		157 (3)	11 (3)	52 (1)	4(1)	69-31-0	67-33-0
evacuees who stop		16(1)	1 (1)	10 (1)	9 (9)	100-0-0	100-0-0
upstream (streets E							
and M) because of							
floodwater conditions							
(e.g. stability loss)							
total number of evac-		141 (2)	10 (2)	90 (1)	91 (18)	65-35-0	64-36-0
uees located down-							
stream							
	evacuees who stop in the	25 (1)	6 (1)	18 (1)	60 (10)	32-68-0	17-83-0
	main street (streets K, L,						
	A0)						
	evacuees who stop near	8 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	0-0-0	0-0-0
	safe area 3						
	evacuees who stop near a	9(1)	7 (1)	6 (1)	70 (10)	100-0-0	100-0-0
	downstream safe area						
	evacuees who stop in the	15 (0)	5 (0)	11 (0)	50 (0)	0-0-0	0-0-0
	square (square P-p1-p2)						



Figure 13. Position of out-of-time evacuees at the end of the river-overflow simulations in case of: a) handrails implementation; b)
handrails+raised platform implementation. Latecomers (red circles), spontaneously gathering evacuees (green circles), casualties (black
circles) are shown on the DV map (scale on the right coloured bar).

659

664 *Rarea,scen* and *Rstreet,scen* proposed in Table 9 and Figure 14 are evaluated for the *original* and *risk reduction scenarios*.

665 The floodwater conditions are the same in the three scenarios (see $R_{DV,area,scen}$ in Table 9). The handrails+raised platform

666 implementation scenario is the best solution since it:

667 1. is the less affected by data on *out-of-time evacuees* (see the lowest $R_{O,area,scen}$);

- 668 2. shows an increase in the crowding-related factor because the majority of evacuees can reach a safe area (see 669 the highest $R_{cr,street,scen}$);
- 670 3. is characterized by a $R_{area,scen, red-pre}$ reduction up to -54%.
- 671
- Table 9 Risk index for the whole area (*Rarea,scen*) and the related influencing factors, by comparing river-overflow conditions in the
 original scenario with the handrails implementation and handrails+raised platform scenarios.

Scenario	R _{0,area,scen}	R _{DV} ,area,scen	R cr,area,scen	R area,scen
Original scenario	0.85	1.00	0.64	0.89
Handrails implementation	0.26	1.00	0.69	0.53
Handrails+Raised platform implementation	0.02	1.00	1.00	0.41

Figure 14 graphically summarizes the risk of each street in the reference scenarios. $R_{DV,street,scen}$ values are always equal because of the same flood scenario (compare to supplementary material: S5 data). The results confirm the same conclusions offered for $R_{area,scen}$. Some downstream outdoor spaces (e.g. square p2) are affected by the presence of *out-of-time*

⁶⁷⁴

678 evacuees also in the risk reduction scenarios (see Figure 13). As a result, the overall risk of such spaces increases, but



679 casualties are not noticed here.

682 Figure 14. Rstreet,scen representation by considering the river-overflow conditions in: a) the original scenario; b) handrails implementa-683 tion; c) handrails+raised platform implementation. Buildings (light grey blocks) and safe area codes are supplied. The KPI scale is 684 shown by the colour map (0.2 ranges discretization). Raw data are shown by supplementary material: S5.

685

Discussion 4 686

687 The methodology application and the analysis of simulation results underline the general capabilities of the behavioural 688 design-based methodology and some rules to design risk reduction strategies for the outdoor built environment against 689 flood risk. For each of these key findings, specific case study outcomes are also provided.

690 The following capabilities of the simulation-based methodology could be highlighted:

691 Providing simulations on the current probable scenarios by including evacuation representation is useful to un-692 derstand the dynamics of the emergency conditions over space and time from a holistic perspective. According to 693 the proposed KPIs, the different flood scenarios are useful to individuate the best risk-reduction strategy to be 694 implemented. In fact, the proposed KPIs account for most of the effects of evacuation behaviours. Meanwhile, 695 they focus on the outdoor built environment and its composing parts, which are pivotal elements for the evacuees' 696 safety during urban floods. Such approach could be integrated into models based on Life Safety and Hazard or 697 AHP-based risk rating metrics (e.g. [10,11,22,34,54,62]) to include aspects such as (a) the evacuation curve/flows, 698 (b) the use of open spaces, and (c) the presence of spontaneous gathering areas. Thus, the assessment of each part 699 of the built environment could be performed. Concerning the specificities of the case study, the simulation results 700 show that the river-overflow scenario is riskier for the evacuees in the outdoor built environment if compared to

the considered levee-failure scenario. The main causes are due to the combination of the initial critical conditions
in floodwaters levels and their related quick-spreading in the urban layout, which brings evacuees to stop moving
(i.e. provoking casualties);

704 Effects of evacuees' attraction and gathering towards the nearest "safe" area is useful to identify where the res-705 cuers' action should be focused to support the exposed evacuees. In a regular urban environment, evacuees should 706 tend to move towards the outdoor areas that are orthogonally placed in respect to the main floodwater flows, 707 because of the local safer conditions in terms of floodwater levels. Thus, solutions aimed at collecting them in 708 such areas are recommended. Handrails can increase the safety of evacuees while moving towards these areas. 709 Anyway, handrails cannot completely improve the number of evacuees arriving at the safe areas themselves. Con-710 cerning the case study, the majority of evacuees gathers in the upstream orthogonal streets instead of in the down-711 stream ones because of the specific domain conditions.

712 Furthermore, from a modelling perspective, the adopted approach takes advantage of micro-scale and behavioural 713 design-based modelling criteria to firstly consider both pedestrian traffic and fatalities estimations [22,62]. It also seems 714 to overcome current limitations on experimental-based behaviours shown by many existing models (e.g. 715 [10,11,18,22,34,54,62]). In particular, the proposed evacuation model includes rules for: (a) spontaneous path selection 716 (moving towards areas with lower floodwater levels) and gathering behaviours; (b) coming-and-going behaviours; (c) 717 attraction towards immobile objects such as buildings, fences, handrails. Furthermore, the effects of such behaviours are 718 innovatively investigated at the micro-scale, that is considering each individual and each street or square in the built 719 environment. The related overall impact at the macro-scale can be hence assessed.

720 Nevertheless, some limitations concerning individual features exist because the model relies on average adults' evac-721 uation simulation to demonstrate the methodology capabilities. Future works should model evacuation speeds and human 722 body stability issues inducing fatalities according to the specific individual characteristics, such as mass, height, age, 723 gender, and other motion abilities, also thanking specific experimental works [21,22,38,49]. This work adopts insights of 724 handrails use in evacuation conditions, by homogeneously considering that evacuees cannot lose stability while using 725 them [21,35,37,44,45]. Future works to estimate the effective support of handrails for evacuees moving on foot in flood-726 waters will hence enrich the simulation of individual speeds while using handrails. Considering body stability issues, a 727 generic form of water depth versus velocity curve in the Life Safety Model could be adopted to represent the related 728 additional uncertainties, by pursuing, for instance, a probabilistic approach [22,25,54]. Further evaluations concerning 729 different human body stability loss phenomena (buoyancy; body failure), also in the view of the other stability-affecting 730 factors (e.g. age, gender, weight, height) [22,35,50,51], should be provided. Based on local census databases or in-situ

surveys [24,42], probabilistic distributions of the exposed people will be used in future works, thus including all uncertainties which concern individuals' features and positions within the built environment over the time.

733 About the application context, this work is mainly centred on a limited built environment (a square and the nearby 734 streets), although the proposed framework could be applied to wider urban areas, both in existing and new urban contexts. 735 Nevertheless, splitting the domain into sub-areas could be preferred to analyse homogeneous areas in terms of built envi-736 ronment or hazard or exposure conditions, also depending on the position of the reference gathering areas. At the same 737 time, other built environments, such as underground ones, can take advantage of this behavioural design-based method-738 ology. In this case, the composing elements of the underground spaces (e.g. corridors, staircases, platforms in case of 739 underground stations) can be assessed in terms of floodwater characterization and evacuation process through the same 740 simulation rules and KPIs proposed by this work.

Considering risk reduction solutions, for the first time at the authors' knowledge, this work focuses on the effectiveness analysis of architectural interventions in the outdoor built environment to support exposed individuals during the flood emergency [35,37,45]. In this sense, the work provides insights on a solution that is less investigated than traditional ones, such as those relating to the positioning of gathering areas, implementation of early warning systems, and modifications to the emergency path configurations [22,54]. Simulation results highlight the following rules for risk reduction strategies considering their design by technicians of Local Authorities and Civil Defence bodies:

handrails implementation in the scenario can effectively reduce the overall risk of the whole area as a consequence
 of no casualties in the number of evacuees (human body stability effects are avoided since evacuees can be supported by handrails). Concerning the specificities of the case study, this reduction is equal to about -40% if assuming that evacuees supported by handrails cannot lose their stability under any floodwater conditions;

raised platforms can be distributed in the urban fabric to create safe areas where evacuees can gather and wait for the rescuers' arrival. Their position can be defined according to the simulation results in the *original scenario.* Anyway, some general rules can relate to concentrating them in upstream streets and in orthogonal streets where
 evacuees tend to spontaneously gather. More data on the effective dimension of raised platforms can be provided
 according to the related scenario simulations. Concerning the specificities of the case study, the reduction of the
 overall area risk is up to about -54% while combining the raised platform with the implementation of handrails
 along the upstream streets.

Handrails and raised platforms can be architecturally integrated to provide new spaces and activities in the outdoor built environment. In this work, the case study application would like to depict the general capabilities of such architectural micro-scale interventions, giving some preliminary and not-exhaustive examples. Although the possible efforts for their implementation in the outdoor built environment, the integration of handrails and raised platform into the emergency

- 762 plan could reduce the residual risk due to possible lacks in warning systems implementation and functioning [84–86],
- real such as those due to lacks in the system organization or in the data operation or possible failures of the systems. They
- rould support also evacuees who could perform unsafe behaviours also if they are warned about the flood arrival (e.g.
- time-wasting activities, selection of the wrong evacuation paths) [37].

Finally, the demonstration of the methodology capabilities underlines how stakeholders and planners can take ad-

vantage of behavioural design-based outcomes. They can analyse different event scenarios and test the effectiveness of

- 768 other kinds of risk reduction strategies, such as:
- *macro-scale interventions*, e.g.: (a) early warning systems to alert the population and speed up the evacuation
 before the critical conditions are reached; (b) drainage systems to limit the floodwater impacts on the evacu ation process;
- micro-scale solutions, e.g.: (a) re-shaping of urban spaces to include architectural elements to support the
 individuals; (b) evacuation guidance systems to point out the correct evacuation direction to the safer areas in
 the urban fabric; (c) intervention on spaces that can host mass-gathering events; (d) urban spaces requalification using architectural elements that could improve safety but could be also used in normal fruition conditions²;
- *emergency management strategies*, i.e.: (a) evacuation plan communication to people to improve their pre paredness and awareness; (b) gathering areas location according to micro-scale solutions.
- The model could be modified to represent specific aspects and behavioural issues altering the decision model, the pedestrian traffic model or the fatalities model depending on the considered solution.
- 781

782 **5** Conclusions

Increasing the resilience of our communities against flood risk in the built environment should take advantage of the evaluation of evacuees' behaviours and choices, especially if considering the initial phases of a flood emergency, i.e. evacuation. In this sense, analyses on the outdoor built environment are key elements for evacuees' safety, considering that evacuees can move in flood-affected scenarios. Simulation-based tools and methods can effectively evaluate the risk for the exposed evacuees and the built environment from a holistic perspective. On this basis, successful risk reduction strategies can be proposed to increase the resistance and resilience of the existing built environments as long as they can: (a) effectively support evacuees to be safe during the emergency; (b) avoid additional threats; (c) lead evacuees to "correctly" behave in these critical emergency phases; (d) be easy-to-implement; (e) be integrated with the normal fruition of
 the built environment also in non-disaster conditions.

Starting from this standpoint, this work proposes a micro-scale and behavioural design-based methodology to assess the risk in outdoor built environments. The methodology is used to propose effective risk reduction solutions and then to evaluate their effectiveness. It is holistic since it: (a) is based on the joint representation of floodwater hydrodynamics and evacuation process; (b) combines critical descriptors of these two aspects into merged KPIs for risk assessment.

An existing experimental-based flood evacuation simulator is used to represent the emergency conditions and then to provide data for the KPIs. The application to a case-study demonstrates the method capabilities in: (a) identifying risks for evacuees due to the individual-floodwater-built environment interactions starting from the micro-scale behavioural phenomena; (b) assessing the risk at the micro (i.e. street, square) and macro (i.e. whole outdoor built environment)scales; (c) comparing different flood scenarios, both including hydrodynamic and evacuation.-related standpoints; (d) proposing and evaluating risk reduction actions, by mainly focusing the attention on architecturally-integrated elements (e.g.: platforms, handrails) in high-risk outdoor spaces.

Risk evaluations and safety levels comparisons are possible through the proposed KPIs. Finally, simulation results also trace some general remarks by focusing on the methodology (and KPIs) application, and on general criteria for implementing the proposed architecturally integrated elements in the outdoor layout.

806 The methods and tools proposed by this work focus on evacuees' behaviour and on the floodwater dynamic represen-807 tation, but it does not consider the damages induced on the built environment itself. Thus, future activities should involve 808 the inclusion of the "built environment damage"-related factors (i.e. buildings, infrastructural elements, roads, and so on, 809 by also including drainage systems and sewers) as a function of floodwater spreading over the simulation time and space. 810 Moreover, the method should be applied to different typological scenarios to derive the related "typical" risk assessment 811 configuration, depending, for instance, on: the layout features; the possible flood events; the characterization of exposed 812 people in terms of emergency behaviours and risk awareness levels. Such application results will also encourage the 813 definition of best practices for increasing communities' safety in the related outdoor built environment scenarios.

814 6 Acknowledgement

815 This work was supported by the "Building Resilience to flood Impact Deriving from Global warming in Europe –
816 BRIDGE" project, developed at Università Politecnica delle Marche.

817 **7 References**

- A.K. Mollah, S. Sadhukhan, P. Das, M.Z. Anis, A cost optimization model and solutions for shelter allocation
 and relief distribution in flood scenario, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 31 (2018) 1187–1198.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.11.018.
- K. Oubennaceur, K. Chokmani, M. Nastev, R. Lhissou, A. El Alem, Flood risk mapping for direct damage to
 residential buildings in Quebec, Canada, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 33 (2019) 44–54.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.09.007.
- 824 [3] D. Serre, C. Heinzlef, Assessing and mapping urban resilience to floods with respect to cascading effects through 825 infrastructure Disaster critical networks, Int. J. Risk Reduct. 30 (2018)235-243. 826 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.02.018.
- P. Marana, C. Eden, H. Eriksson, C. Grimes, J. Hernantes, S. Howick, L. Labaka, V. Latinos, R. Lindner, T.A.
 Majchrzak, I. Pyrko, J. Radianti, A. Rankin, M. Sakurai, J.M. Sarriegi, N. Serrano, Towards a resilience
 management guideline Cities as a starting point for societal resilience, Sustain. Cities Soc. 48 (2019) 101531.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101531.
- [5] G. Cerè, Y. Rezgui, W. Zhao, Critical review of existing built environment resilience frameworks: Directions for
 future research, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 25 (2017) 173–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.09.018.
- B. Molinari, F. Ballio, J. Handmer, S. Menoni, On the modeling of significance for flood damage assessment,
 Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 10 (2014) 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.10.009.
- J. Wu, M. Ye, X. Wang, E. Koks, Building Asset Value Mapping in Support of Flood Risk Assessments: A Case
 Study of Shanghai, China, Sustainability. 11 (2019) 971. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11040971.
- 837 [8] C.E. Kontokosta, A. Malik, The Resilience to Emergencies and Disasters Index: Applying big data to benchmark 838 and validate neighborhood resilience capacity, Sustain. Cities Soc. 36 (2018)272-285. 839 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.10.025.
- 840 [9] M.A.R. Shah, A. Rahman, S.H. Chowdhury, Sustainability assessment of flood mitigation projects: An innovative 841 decision support framework, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 23 (2017)53-61. 842 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.04.006.
- 843 [10] H.-M. Lyu, W.-H. Zhou, S.-L. Shen, A.-N. Zhou, Inundation risk assessment of metro system using AHP and

- 844 TFN-AHP in Shenzhen, Sustain. Cities Soc. 56 (2020) 102103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102103.
- H.-M. Lyu, S.-L. Shen, A. Zhou, J. Yang, Perspectives for flood risk assessment and management for mega-city
 metro system, Tunn. Undergr. Sp. Technol. 84 (2019) 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tust.2018.10.019.
- 847 [12] E.L. French, S.J. Birchall, K. Landman, R.D. Brown, Designing public open space to support seismic resilience:
- 848 A systematic review, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 34 (2019) 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.11.001.
- 849 [13] K. Rus, V. Kilar, D. Koren, Resilience assessment of complex urban systems to natural disasters: A new literature
- 850 review, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 31 (2018) 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.05.015.
- 851 [14] UNISDR, Guidelines for Reducing Flood Losses, United Nations Headquarters (UN), 2002.
- P.J.G. Ribeiro, L.A. Pena Jardim Gonçalves, Urban resilience: A conceptual framework, Sustain. Cities Soc. 50
 (2019) 101625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101625.
- 854 K. Park, J. Won, Analysis on distribution characteristics of building use with risk zone classification based on [16] 855 urban flood risk assessment, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 38 (2019)101192. 856 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101192.
- G. Bernardini, M. Postacchini, E. Quagliarini, M. Brocchini, C. Cianca, M. D'Orazio, A preliminary combined
 simulation tool for the risk assessment of pedestrians' flood-induced evacuation, Environ. Model. Softw. 96
 (2017) 14–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.06.007.
- K. Matsuo, L. Natainia, F. Yamada, Flood and Evacuation Simulations for Urban Flooding, 5th Int. Conf. Flood
 Manag. (2011) 391–398.
- K. Kim, P. Pant, E. Yamashita, Integrating travel demand modeling and flood hazard risk analysis for evacuation
 and sheltering, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 31 (2018) 1177–1186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.10.025.
- J.G. Leskens, M. Brugnach, A.Y. Hoekstra, W. Schuurmans, Why are decisions in flood disaster management so
 poorly supported by information from flood models?, Environ. Model. Softw. 53 (2014) 53–61.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.11.003.
- 867 [21] H.-K. Lee, W.-H. Hong, Y.-H. Lee, Experimental study on the influence of water depth on the evacuation speed
 868 of elderly people in flood conditions, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 39 (2019) 101198.
 869 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101198.
- 870 [22] D. Lumbroso, M. Davison, Use of an agent-based model and Monte Carlo analysis to estimate the effectiveness

- of emergency management interventions to reduce loss of life during extreme floods, J. Flood Risk Manag. 11
 (2018) S419–S433. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfr3.12230.
- [23] M. Di Mauro, D. Lumbroso, Hydrodynamic and loss of life modelling for the 1953 Canvey Island flood, in: Flood
 Risk Manag. Res. Pract., CRC Press, 2008: pp. 1117–1126. https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203883020.ch131.
- 875 [24] D. Lumbroso, W. Johnstone, K. De Bruijn, M. Di Mauro, B. Lence, A. Tagg, Modelling mass evacuations to
- 876 improve the emergency planning for floods in the UK, the Netherlands and North America, in: Int. Conf. Emerg.
- 877 Prep. (InterCEPt), Challenges Mass Evacuation, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, 2010.
- M.J.P. Mens, M. van der Vat, D. Lumbroso, A comparison of evacuation models for flood event management
 application on the Schelde and Thames Estuaries, in: P. Samuels, S. Huntington, W. Allsop, J. Harrop (Eds.),
 Flood Risk Manag. Res. Pract., CRC Press/Balkema, Leiden, The Netherlands, 2008: pp. 1109–1115.
- [26] G. Bernardini, R. Lovreglio, E. Quagliarini, Proposing behavior-oriented strategies for earthquake emergency
 evacuation: A behavioral data analysis from New Zealand, Italy and Japan, Saf. Sci. 116 (2019) 295–309.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.03.023.
- 884 [27] S. Yamashita, R. Watanabe, Y. Shimatani, Smart adaptation activities and measures against urban flood disasters,
 885 Sustain. Cities Soc. 27 (2016) 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.06.027.
- D. Lumbroso, F. Vinet, Tools to Improve the Production of Emergency Plans for Floods: Are They Being Used
 by the People that Need Them?, J. Contingencies Cris. Manag. 20 (2012) 149–165.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2012.00665.x.
- [29] S. Soares-Frazão, J. Lhomme, V. Guinot, Y. Zech, Two-dimensional shallow-water model with porosity for urban
 flood modelling, J. Hydraul. Res. 46 (2008) 45–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221686.2008.9521842.
- [30] A. Paquier, E. Mignot, P.-H. Bazin, From Hydraulic Modelling to Urban Flood Risk, Procedia Eng. 115 (2015)
 37–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2015.07.352.
- [31] H. Chanson, R. Brown, New criterion for the stability of a human body in floodwaters, J. Hydraul. Res. 53 (2015)
 540–541. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221686.2015.1054321.
- 895 [32] S. Opper, P. Cinque, B. Davies, Timeline modelling of flood evacuation operations, Procedia Eng. 3 (2010) 175–
 896 187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2010.07.017.
- 897 [33] N. Mishima, N. Miyamoto, Y. Taguchi, K. Kitagawa, Analysis of current two-way evacuation routes based on

- residents' perceptions in a historic preservation area, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 8 (2014) 10–19.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.12.003.
- 900 [34] H.-M. Lyu, W.-J. Sun, S.-L. Shen, A. Arulrajah, Flood risk assessment in metro systems of mega-cities using a
 901 GIS-based modeling approach, Sci. Total Environ. 626 (2018) 1012–1025.
 902 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.138.
- 903 [35] H. Chanson, R. Brown, D. McIntosh, Human body stability in floodwaters: the 2011 flood in Brisbane CBD, in:
 904 Hydraul. Struct. Soc. Eng. Challenges Extrem., The University of Queensland, 2014: pp. 1–9.
 905 https://doi.org/10.14264/uql.2014.48.
- 906 [36] P. Hu, Q. Zhang, P. Shi, B. Chen, J. Fang, Flood-induced mortality across the globe: Spatiotemporal pattern and
 907 influencing factors, Sci. Total Environ. 643 (2018) 171–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.06.197.
- 908 [37] G. Bernardini, S. Camilli, E. Quagliarini, M. D'Orazio, Flooding risk in existing urban environment: from human
 909 behavioral patterns to a microscopic simulation model, Energy Procedia. 134 (2017) 131–140.
 910 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.09.549.
- [38] R.J. Cox, M.J. Shand, T.D.Blacka, Australian Rainfall & Runoff revision project 10: Appropriate safety criteria
 for people, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1038/103447b0.
- 913 [39] S.Y. Schreider, D.I. Smith, A.J. Jakeman, Climate Change Impacts on Urban Flooding, Clim. Change. 47 (2000)
 914 91–115. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1005621523177.
- [40] X. Jia, G. Morel, H. Martell-Flore, F. Hissel, J.-L. Batoz, Fuzzy logic based decision support for mass evacuations
 of cities prone to coastal or river floods, Environ. Model. Softw. 85 (2016) 1–10.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.07.018.
- 918 [41] H. Qi, M.S. Altinakar, A GIS-based decision support system for integrated flood management under uncertainty
 919 with two dimensional numerical simulations, Environ. Model. Softw. 26 (2011) 817–821.
 920 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.11.006.
- [42] A. Nara, X. Yang, S. Ghanipoor Machiani, M.-H. Tsou, An integrated evacuation decision support system
 framework with social perception analysis and dynamic population estimation, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 25
 (2017) 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.09.020.
- 924 [43] R. Zhu, J. Lin, B. Becerik-Gerber, N. Li, Human-building-emergency interactions and their impact on emergency

- 925 response performance: A review of the state of the art, Saf. Sci. 127 (2020) 104691.
 926 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104691.
- [44] K. Kotani, T. Ishigaki, S. Suzuki, T. Asao, Y. Baba, K. Toda, Evaluation for emergency escape during stair
 climbing in a simulated flood evacuation, in: 2012 Southeast Asian Netw. Ergon. Soc. Conf., IEEE, 2012: pp. 1–
 5. https://doi.org/10.1109/SEANES.2012.6299592.
- Y. Baba, T. Ishigaki, K. Toda, Experimental Studies on Safety Evacuation From Underground Spaces Under
 Inundated Situations, J. JSCE. 5 (2017) 269–278. https://doi.org/10.2208/journalofjsce.5.1_269.
- M. Balakhontceva, V. Karbovskii, A. Boukhanovsky, S. Sutulo, Multi-agent Simulation of Passenger Evacuation
 from a Damaged Ship Under Storm Conditions, Procedia Comput. Sci. 80 (2016) 2455–2464.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.05.547.
- Y. Zheng, X.-G. Li, B. Jia, R. Jiang, Simulation of pedestrians' evacuation dynamics with underground flood
 spreading based on cellular automaton, Simul. Model. Pract. Theory. 94 (2019) 149–161.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simpat.2019.03.001.
- [48] T. Ishigaki, Y. Onishi, Y. Asai, K. Toda, H. Shimada, Evacuation criteria during urban flooding in underground
 space, 11th Int. Conf. Urban Drain. (2008) 7.
- G. Bernardini, E. Quagliarini, M. D'Orazio, M. Brocchini, Towards the simulation of flood evacuation in urban
 scenarios: Experiments to estimate human motion speed in floodwaters, Saf. Sci. 123 (2020) 104563.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104563.
- L. Milanesi, M. Pilotti, R. Ranzi, A conceptual model of people's vulnerability to floods, Water Resour. Res., 51,
 182–197, Doi10.1002/2014WR016172. (2015) 5375–5377. https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR014979.Reply.
- 945 [51] H.U. Bae, K.M. Yun, J.Y. Yoon, N.H. Lim, Human stability with respect to overtopping flow on the breakwater,
 946 Int. J. Appl. Eng. Res. 11 (2016) 111–119.
- 947 [52] M. Postacchini, G. Bernardini, M. D'Orazio, E. Quagliarini, Human stability during floods: Experimental tests 948 105153. on а physical model simulating human body, Saf. Sci. 137 (2021)949 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.105153.
- A. Schadschneider, W. Klingsch, H. Klüpfel, T. Kretz, C. Rogsch, A. Seyfried, Evacuation Dynamics: Empirical
 Results, Modeling and Applications, Encycl. Complex. Syst. Sci. (2009) 3142-3176 LA-English.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30440-3 187.

- M. Shirvani, G. Kesserwani, P. Richmond, Agent-based modelling of pedestrian responses during flood
 emergency: mobility behavioural rules and implications for flood risk analysis, J. Hydroinformatics. 22 (2020)
 1078–1092. https://doi.org/10.2166/hydro.2020.031.
- A. Veeraswamy, E.R. Galea, L. Filippidis, P.J. Lawrence, S. Haasanen, R.J. Gazzard, T.E.L. Smith, The
 simulation of urban-scale evacuation scenarios with application to the Swinley forest fire, Saf. Sci. 102 (2018)
 178–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2017.07.015.
- [56] H. Chu, J. Yu, J. Wen, M. Yi, Y. Chen, Emergency Evacuation Simulation and Management Optimization in
 Urban Residential Communities, Sustainability. 11 (2019) 795. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030795.
- 961 [57] A. Zlateski, M. Lucesoli, G. Bernardini, T.M. Ferreira, Integrating human behaviour and building vulnerability 962 for the assessment and mitigation of seismic risk in historic centres: Proposal of a holistic human-centred 963 simulation-based approach, J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 43 (2020)101392. Int. 964 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101392.
- 965 N. Wood, J. Jones, J. Peters, K. Richards, Pedestrian evacuation modeling to reduce vehicle use for distant [58] 966 tsunami evacuations in Hawai'i, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 28 (2018)271-283. 967 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.03.009.
- 968 [59] G. Lämmel, D. Grether, K. Nagel, The representation and implementation of time-dependent inundation in large969 scale microscopic evacuation simulations, Transp. Res. Part C Emerg. Technol. 18 (2010) 84–98.
 970 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2009.04.020.
- 971 [60] S. Scheuer, D. Haase, V. Meyer, Towards a flood risk assessment ontology - Knowledge integration into a multi-972 Comput. Environ. Urban (2013)82-94. criteria risk assessment approach, Syst. 37 973 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2012.07.007.
- 974 [61] F. Dottori, R. Figueiredo, M.L. V. Martina, D. Molinari, A.R. Scorzini, INSYDE: a synthetic, probabilistic flood
 975 damage model based on explicit cost analysis, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. 16 (2016) 2577–2591.
 976 https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-16-2577-2016.
- [62] L. Zhuo, D. Han, Agent-based modelling and flood risk management: A compendious literature review, J. Hydrol.
 591 (2020) 125600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125600.

- 979 [63] S.P. Simonovic, S. Ahmad, Computer-based Model for Flood Evacuation Emergency Planning, Nat. Hazards. 34
 980 (2005) 25–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-004-0785-x.
- 981 [64] L. Melito, M. Postacchini, G. Darvini, M. Brocchini, Waves and currents at a river mouth: The role of 982 macrovortices. sub-grid turbulence and seabed friction. Water (Switzerland). 10 (2018).983 https://doi.org/10.3390/w10050550.
- 984 [65] D. Helbing, A.F. Johansson, Pedestrian, Crowd and Evacuation Dynamics, Encycl. Complex. Syst. Sci. 16 (2010)
 985 6476–6495.
- [66] T. Ishigaki, R. Kawanaka, Y. Onishi, H. Shimada, K. Toda, Y. Baba, Assessment of Safety on Evacuating Route
 During Underground Flooding BT Advances in Water Resources and Hydraulic Engineering, in: C. Zhang, H.
 Tang (Eds.), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009: pp. 141–146.
- [67] E. Ronchi, E.D. Kuligowski, P.A. Reneke, R.D. Peacock, D. Nilsson, The Process of Verification and Validation
 of Building Fire Evacuation Models, NIST Tech. Note. 1822 (2013).
- M. Hashemi, A.A. Alesheikh, A GIS-based earthquake damage assessment and settlement methodology, Soil
 Dyn. Earthq. Eng. 31 (2011) 1607–1617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2011.07.003.
- 993 [69] N. Emori, T. Izumi, Y. Nakatani, A Support System for Developing Tourist Evacuation Guidance, in: H.K. Kim,
 994 M.A. Amouzegar, S. Ao (Eds.), Trans. Eng. Technol., Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2016: pp. 15–28.
 995 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0551-0 2.
- 996 [70] M. Haghani, M. Sarvi, Crowd behaviour and motion: Empirical methods, Transp. Res. Part B Methodol. 107
 997 (2018) 253–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TRB.2017.06.017.
- 998 [71] M. D'Orazio, S. Longhi, P. Olivetti, G. Bernardini, Design and experimental evaluation of an interactive system 999 reduction for pre-movement time in case of fire, Autom. Constr. 52 (2015)16 - 28. 1000 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2015.02.015.
- 1001 [72] T. Korhonen, S. Hostikka, Fire Dynamics Simulator with Evacuation: FDS + Evac Technical Reference and
 1002 User's Guide, 2010.
- 1003 [73] L. Taneja, N.B. Bolia, Network redesign for efficient crowd flow and evacuation, Appl. Math. Model. (2017).
 1004 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2017.08.030.
- 1005 [74] V. Pillac, P. Van Hentenryck, C. Even, A conflict-based path-generation heuristic for evacuation planning,

- 1006 Transp. Res. Part B Methodol. 83 (2016) 136–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2015.09.008.
- 1007 [75] M. Sasabe, K. Fujii, S. Kasahara, Road network risk analysis considering people flow under ordinary and
 1008 evacuation situations, Environ. Plan. B Urban Anal. City Sci. (2018) 239980831880294.
 1009 https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808318802940.
- 1010 [76] D. Kazantzidou-Firtinidou, C. Gountromichou, N.C. Kyriakides, P. Liassides, K. Hadjigeorgiou, SEISMIC RISK
- 1011 ASSESSMENT AS A BASIC TOOL FOR EMERGENCY PLANNING: "PACES" EU PROJECT, WIT Trans.
- 1012 Built Environ. 173 (2017) 43–54. https://doi.org/10.2495/DMAN170051.
- 1013 [77] T.L. Saaty, The Analytic Hierarchy Process, New York, NY, USA, 1980. https://doi.org/0070543712.
- 1014 [78] A. Shayannejad, B. Abedini Angerabi, Earthquake Vulnerability Assessment in urban areas using MCDM, Int.
 1015 Rev. Spat. Plan. Sustain. Dev. 2 (2014) 39–51. https://doi.org/10.14246/irspsd.2.2_39.
- E. Quagliarini, G. Bernardini, S. Santarelli, M. Lucesoli, Evacuation paths in historic city centres: A holistic
 methodology for assessing their seismic risk, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 31 (2018) 698–710.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.07.010.
- [80] M. Brocchini, J. Calantoni, M. Postacchini, A. Sheremet, T. Staples, J. Smith, A.H. Reed, E.F. Braithwaite, C.
 Lorenzoni, A. Russo, S. Corvaro, A. Mancinelli, L. Soldini, Comparison between the wintertime and summertime
- 1021 dynamics of the Misa River estuary, Mar. Geol. 385 (2017) 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2016.12.005.
- [81] Ministry of Interior (Italy), DM 03/08/2015: Fire safety criteria (Approvazione di norme tecniche di prevenzione
 incendi, ai sensi dell'articolo 15 del decreto legislativo 8 marzo 2006, n. 139.), 2015.
- 1024 [82] T. Klüpfel, H. Meyer-König, PedGo Guardian: an assistant for evacuation decision making, in: U. Weidmann, U.
 1025 Kirsch, M. Schreckenberg (Eds.), Pedestr. Evacuation Dyn. 2012, Springer International Publishing, 2014: pp.
 1026 445–454.
- 1027 [83] A. Johansson, D. Helbing, H.Z. Al-Abideen, S. Al-Bosta, From Crowd Dynamics to Crowd Safety: A Video1028 Based Analysis, Adv. Complex Syst. 11 (2008) 497–527.
- 1029 [84] S.H.M. Fakhruddin, A. Kawasaki, M.S. Babel, Community responses to flood early warning system: Case study
- 1030
 in Kaijuri Union, Bangladesh, Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct. 14 (2015) 323–331.

 1031
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2015.08.004.
- 1032 [85] Q. Fan, Z. Tian, W. Wang, Study on Risk Assessment and Early Warning of Flood-Affected Areas when a Dam

1033 Break Occurs in a Mountain River, Water. 10 (2018) 1369. https://doi.org/10.3390/w10101369.

- I034 [86] J. Cools, D. Innocenti, S. O'Brien, Lessons from flood early warning systems, Environ. Sci. Policy. 58 (2016)
 1035 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.01.006.
- 1036 [87] R. Briganti, A. Torres-Freyermuth, T.E. Baldock, M. Brocchini, N. Dodd, T.-J. Hsu, Z. Jiang, Y. Kim, J.C.
- 1037 Pintado-Patiño, M. Postacchini, Advances in numerical modelling of swash zone dynamics, Coast. Eng. 115

1038 (2016) 26–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2016.05.001.

1039

1040 Appendix A: FlooPEDS model description

1041 The Flooding Pedestrians' Evacuation Dynamics Simulator (FlooPEDS) was adopted in this work for joint hydrody-

namic and evacuation simulation purposes [17]. All the notations of the model are reported and described in Table A.1.

The hydrodynamic model is based on the solution of the Nonlinear Shallow Water Equations [87]. The NSWE solver has been validated during the last decades over very different shallow-water contexts (e.g. [64,87]). Its verification in an urban environment during a historical event (in combination with the evacuation/behavioural model) is reported in the original work about FlooPEDS [17]. NSWEs consist of a continuity equation and two momentum-conservation equations along *x* and *y*, as shown in Equations 1, 2 and 3:

1048
$$D_{,t} + (uD)_{,x} + (vD)_{,y} = 0$$
 (2)

1049
$$u_{,t} + uu_{,x} + vu_{,y} + gD_{,x} = gh_{,x} - B_x$$
 (3)

1050
$$v_{,t} + uv_{,x} + vv_{,y} + gD_{,y} = gh_{,y} - B_{y}$$
 (4)

1051

These are used for the description of depth-averaged flows, where: commas represent partial differentiation, (x,y,z) are the orthogonal Cartesian coordinates; (u, v) is the depth-averaged velocity vector, with modulus V [m/s]; the total water depth D is made of the bed level h and the instantaneous water surface level $\eta = D - h$; the Chezy-type bottom friction is represented by B_x and B_y [64]. The simulated scenarios are represented using a 3D mesh with a given constant spatial resolution. For the case study of Section 2.3, the mesh covers an area of 350m by 265m as shown in Figure 2, in which each rectangular cell is characterized by a spatial resolution of $(\Delta x, \Delta y)=(0.8, 0.5)m$. Each building block is represented as a discrete rectangular-shaped obstacle. For each cell not covering the building blocks, the hydrodynamic simulator provides the time evolution of water depth D(x,y,t) and depth-averaged flow speed V(x,y,t). These both provide the specific force per unit width M(x,y,t) [m³/m] and the human body stability conditions DV(x,y,t) [m²/s] as discussed in Section 2.1 [18,35,48].

1062 The micro-scale evacuation model combines: (a) an Agent-Based Model (ABM) to describe intentional issues of the 1063 evacuees in terms of behavioural patterns [37]; and (b) a Social Force Model (SFM) [65] to describe the motion process 1064 as the combination of attractive and repulsive forces connected to the behavioural patterns of the ABM. Each simulated 1065 pedestrian moves in the designed 2D continuous space and tries to reach a safe area. His/her motion is influenced by the 1066 surrounding D(x,y,t), V(x,y,t) and M(x,y,t) values, that are calculated by the hydrodynamic simulator. The evacuation 1067 motion is solved within a maximum evacuation time, which is fixed according to the hydrodynamic simulation conditions. 1068 It was assumed that all the individuals know the position of the safe area. Thus, each simulated agent selects its evac-1069 uation path to minimize the distance towards the safe area and the risk due to floodwater conditions (i.e., in terms of M). 1070 Paths selection decision can be performed at the initial position point and at the crossroads or in other decisional points 1071 (e.g. plano-altimetric variations of the urban layout). To this end, in such positions, he/she evaluates the local conditions 1072 of the possible paths to be selected (in terms of M and distance to the safe area). If the shortest path is the one with the 1073 lower M value, he/she moves toward this path. Otherwise, he/she moves towards another path. As a result, a difference 1074 can exist between the safe area selected at the start of the evacuation, and the safe area gained at the end of the process. 1075 The path selection influences the evacuation direction since it steers the individual's SFM-based drive-to-target force

1076 $\overrightarrow{O_g}$ [N]. Then, his/her preferred evacuation speed $v_{pref,i}(x, y, t)$ varies over time and space depending on M(x, y, t), as 1077 shown by Equation 5 which is based on previous experimental results [37].

1078

1079
$$v_{pref,i}(x,y,t) = 0.52 M(x,y,t)^{-0.11}$$
 (5)

1080

1081 $\overrightarrow{O_g}$ is the result of attractive and repulsive forces that modify his/her final local evacuation direction. Attractive forces 1082 are activated towards [17]: unmovable obstacles (i.e. buildings, fences and other street furniture, handrails) that can sup-1083 port the individual's motion in floodwaters (see $\overrightarrow{F_{attr,w}}$ [N] in Equation 6); other surrounding individuals, because of 1084 social identification and group phenomena [65]. Repulsive forces $\overrightarrow{F_{rep,w}}$ [N] are aimed at avoiding individual-individual 1085 and built elements-individual overlapping [65].

1087
$$\overrightarrow{F_{attr,w}(t)} = F_w \frac{d_w - R_i}{d_{w,max}} \overrightarrow{\iota_w}$$
 if $d_w < d_{w,max}$, $F_w \overrightarrow{\iota_w}$ elsewhere (6)

- Finally, Equation 7 summarizes the SFM-based equation to solve the motion of each evacuee, step by step during the simulation time. Some random variations in the behaviours could be described by the term $\vec{\epsilon(t)}$ [N] [65].
- 1091

1092
$$m_{i}\frac{\overline{dv_{l}(t)}}{dt} = \overline{O_{g}(t)} + \sum \overline{F_{rep,l}(t)} + \sum \overline{F_{re}}_{,w}(t) + \sum \overline{F_{attr,l}(t)} + \sum \overline{F_{attr,w}(t)} + \overline{\varepsilon(t)}$$
(7)

1093

1094 The evacuation ends if the individual:

- reaches a safe area (*arrived evacuees*) or at the end of the simulation time, if the individual is still moving and
 he/she is not able to reach a safe area within the maximum simulation time because of his/her evacuation path
 or speed. Such *latecomers* can be affected, for instance, by the interactions with other pedestrians and/or with
 speed-decreasing floodwaters conditions;
- moves along the same path more than 1 time, since *M* values of surrounding paths are worse than the ones of the 1100 selected path. According to this experimental-based behaviour, he/she can spontaneously gather with surround-1101 ing individuals because of $\overrightarrow{F_{attr.l}}$ (spontaneously gathering evacuees);
- stops moving because of critical surrounding conditions, i.e. in case of body stability loss (DV>1.20 m²/s) [31,38]. Such conditions could eventually provoke life threats by considering adult pedestrians (*casualties*). In addition, D(x,y,t)<1.2m/s and V(x,y,t)<3.2m/s are considered as limiting values for adults in good conditions having a height (h_i) and mass (m_i) product $h_im_i>50$ [38].
- Equation 6 is solved for dt=0.1s, by using the Euler's method in a separate way for x and y axes, to update each simulated individual's position. According to Equation 6 and Equation 7, the following main variables setup was used for the evacuation simulator [17]: $m_i=80$ kg (however, $h_im_i>50$) and $R_i=0.35$ m (to represent an average adult evacuee); $F_w=300$ N and $d_{w,max}=9$ m; $\varepsilon(t)=0$ N.
- 1110
- 1111

Table A.1 Modeling notations.

Symbol	Measure	Description
B_x , B_y	ms ⁻²	Bottom friction terms
D	m	Total water depth
d_w	m	Actual distance between pedestrian i and obstacle w

$d_{w max}$ m		Maximum distance of activation for attractive forces between the pedestrian		
w, max		and the unmovable obstacle		
$\overrightarrow{F_{attr,l}}$, $\overrightarrow{F_{attr,w}}$	(modulus) N	Attractive forces for group interactions and for fixed obstacles influence		
$\overrightarrow{F_{rep,l}}$, $\overrightarrow{F_{rep,w}}$	(modulus) N	Repulsive force from other pedestrians and from obstacles		
F	N	Constant parameter for maximum attraction force between a pedestrian and the		
1 w	1	unmovable obstacle		
g	9.81 m/s ²	gravity acceleration		
h	m	Bottom vertical position		
i i w		Subscripts for: the pedestrian subject of valuation; other pedestrians; an		
<i>t</i> , <i>j</i> , <i>w</i>		obstacle		
		Versor between the current pedestrian <i>i</i> position and the unmovable obstacle		
ι_W	-	which attract the pedestrian		
		specific force per unit width, which varies over space (x and y coordinates) and		
M(x,y,l)	m²/m	time (t)		
m_i	kg	Pedestrian mass		
$\vec{O}_{g}(t)$	(modulus) N	Drive-to-target force		
		Radius of pedestrian <i>i</i> , that is the distance between his/her barycentre and		
R_i	m	his/her shoulder, thus considering an ideal circle circumscribing the individual		
		on a plan view		
t dt	s	Time in motion simulation evaluation, gap between two different motion		
<i>i, ui</i>	5	simulation evaluation		
u	m/s	Depth-averaged streamwise (x-directed) velocity		
V	m/s	Depth-averaged crossflow (y-directed) velocity		
V	m/s	Modulus of the Depth-averaged velocity vector		
$\eta = \alpha(x + y + t)$	m/s	Preferred individuals' speed for isolated pedestrian <i>i</i> in floodwaters (in "those"		
· prej ,i (^, y , v)		conditions and without considering other pedestrians)		
$\vec{v}(t)$	(modulus) m/s	Actual velocity of the pedestrian		
$\vec{\varepsilon}(t)$	(modulus) N	Gaussian error due to possibility of different evacuees' behaviours and features		
	I	I		

η	m	Instantaneous water surface level
$\vec{\eta}_{iw}$	-	Unit vector pointing from <i>i</i> to <i>w</i> used for repulsive forces calculus

1112 Appendix B: KPIs notations

difference in arriving evacuees[%]percentage difference between the number of evacuees reaching the safe area a the simulation end and the one of evacuees "initially choosing" the safe area $F_e: F_{e,0.05}, F_{e,0.50},$ $F_{e,0.95}$ [persons/s]effective average flow of evacuees arrived in a safe area: flows for P_e =5%, P_e =50% and P_e =95%number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time			
arriving evacuees $[^{70}]$ the simulation end and the one of evacuees "initially choosing" the safe area $F_e: F_{e,0.05}, F_{e,0.50},$ [persons/s]effective average flow of evacuees arrived in a safe area: flows for $P_e=5\%$, $F_{e,0.95}$ $P_e=50\%$ and $P_e=95\%$ number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time	difference in	Г0/ 1	percentage difference between the number of evacuees reaching the safe area at
$F_e: F_{e,0.05}, F_{e,0.50},$ $F_{e,0.95}$ [persons/s]effective average flow of evacuees arrived in a safe area: flows for $P_e=5\%$, $P_e=50\%$ and $P_e=95\%$ number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time	arriving evacuees		the simulation end and the one of evacuees "initially choosing" the safe area
$F_{e,0.95}$ $P_e=50\%$ and $P_e=95\%$ number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time	F_e : $F_{e,0.05}$, $F_{e,0.50}$,	[norsons/s]	effective average flow of evacuees arrived in a safe area: flows for $P_e=5\%$,
number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time	F _{e,0.95}		$P_e=50\%$ and $P_e=95\%$
	D. D.	[manana]	number of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties); number of out-of-time
evacuees (including casualties) for a certain street	Г (), Г (),street	[persons]	evacuees (including casualties) for a certain street
percentage of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties) in respect to number			percentage of out-of-time evacuees (including casualties) in respect to number
$P_{O,\%}$, $P_{O,street,\%}$ [%] of exposed people in the outdoor built environment; value referred to a certain	$P_{O,\%}$, $P_{O,street,\%}$	[%]	of exposed people in the outdoor built environment; value referred to a certain
street			street
$P_{O,la}$, $P_{O,la,street}$ [%]percentages of latecomers in respect to P_O ; value for a certain street	$P_{O,la}$, $P_{O,la,street}$	[%]	percentages of latecomers in respect to P_O ; value for a certain street
P P percentages of spontaneously gathering evacuees in respect to P_0 ; value for a	D. D.	F0/1	percentages of spontaneously gathering evacuees in respect to P_0 ; value for a
<i>I</i> _{<i>O,sp</i>} , <i>I</i> _{<i>O,sp,street</i> [⁷⁰] certain street}	I O,sp , I O,sp,street		certain street
$P_{O,ca}, P_{O,ca,street}$ [%] percentages of casualties in respect to P_O ; value for a certain street	P _{O,ca} , P _{O,ca,street}	[%]	percentages of casualties in respect to P_O ; value for a certain street
P_e [persons] number of evacuees arrived in a safe area within the simulation time	Pe	[persons]	number of evacuees arrived in a safe area within the simulation time
<i>P</i> [9/1] percentage of evacuees arrived in a safe area within the simulation time in	D	F0/_1	percentage of evacuees arrived in a safe area within the simulation time in
respect to the number of exposed people in the outdoor built environment respect to the number of exposed people in the outdoor built environment $e^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	1 e,%		respect to the number of exposed people in the outdoor built environment
street crowding (how many evacuees go through a given street in the urban			street crowding (how many evacuees go through a given street in the urban
$P_{cr,street}$, $P_{cr,street,\%}$ [persons] layout while evacuating); percentage value calculated in respect of the	$P_{cr,street}$, $P_{cr,street,\%}$	[persons]	layout while evacuating); percentage value calculated in respect of the
maximum $P_{cr,street}$ value within the simulated area			maximum $P_{cr,street}$ value within the simulated area
$R_{area,scen}$ - the risk of the whole <i>area</i> in a given scenario <i>scen</i>	R _{area,scen}	-	the risk of the whole area in a given scenario scen
$R_{street,scen}$ - the risk of a single <i>street</i> (or square) in a given <i>scen</i>	<i>R</i> _{street,scen}	-	the risk of a single <i>street</i> (or square) in a given <i>scen</i>
the risk of a single <i>street</i> (or square) in comparison to other streets (squares) in	P		the risk of a single <i>street</i> (or square) in comparison to other streets (squares) in
a given scenario	I \street	-	a given scenario

R _{O,area,scen}		risk for out-of-time evacuees: for the whole area in the given scenario, for the
, $R_{O,street,scen}$, $R_{O,street}$	-	given in the considered scenario, on the given street
R _{DV,area,scen} , R _{DV,street,scen} ,	-	risk due to the floodwater level: for the whole area in the given scenario, for the
R _{DV,street}		street in the given scenario, on the given street
$R_{cr,area,scen}$,	_	crowding risk index on the area: for the whole area in the considered scenario,
$R_{cr,street,scen}$, $R_{cr,street}$		for the street in the considered scenario, on the considered street
$T_e: T_{e,0.05}$, $T_{e,0.50}$,	[s]	evacuation time: evacuation time for $P=5\%$ $P=50\%$ and $P=95\%$
<i>T_{e,0.95}</i>	[5]	
	3.4	
Weights in AHP	Measure	weights Description
Weights in AHP	Measure	out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to
Weights in AHP	-	weights Description out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$)
Weights in AHP	Measure	weights Description out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$) DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$,
Weights in AHP wo wo	Measure -	weights Description out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$) DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$, $R_{DV,street,scen}$ and $R_{DV,street}$)
Weights in AHP wo wo		weights Description out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$) DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$, $R_{DV,street,scen}$ and $R_{DV,street}$) crowding-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{cr,area,scen}$,
Weights in AHP WO WDV Wcr		weights Description out-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$) DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$, $R_{DV,street,scen}$ and $R_{DV,street}$) crowding-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{cr,area,scen}$, $R_{cr,street,scen}$ and $R_{cr,street}$)
Weights in AHP WO WDV Wcr		Weights Descriptionout-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$)DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$, $R_{DV,street,scen}$ and $R_{DV,street}$)crowding-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{cr,area,scen}$, $R_{cr,street,scen}$ and $R_{cr,street}$)weights related to spontaneously gathering evacuees, latecomers, casualties to
Weights in AHP wo wDV wcr wsp , Wla , Wca	Measure	Weights Descriptionout-of-time evacuees-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{O,area,scen}$, $R_{O,street,scen}$ and $R_{O,street}$)DV-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{DV,area,scen}$, $R_{DV,street,scen}$ and $R_{DV,street}$)crowding-related weight in the level 1 AHP application (related to $R_{cr,area,scen}$, $R_{cr,street,scen}$ and $R_{cr,street}$)weights related to spontaneously gathering evacuees, latecomers, casualties to be applied in the level 2 AHP application for the components of $R_{O,area,scen}$,

1113 Appendix C: Risk indices relating to the built environment

1114 The following paragraphs describe the definition of the area risk-related KPIs, which represent the overall risk condi-

1115 tions for the whole simulation area or for a part of it:

1116	•	the risk of the whole area $R_{area,scen}$ [-] considers different scenarios to compare the risks of the whole area in
1117		each of them (section C.1);

- the risk of a single street (or square) $R_{street,scen}$ [-] considers different scenarios to compare the risks of the street 1119 in each of them (section C.2);
- the risk of a single street (or square) in comparison to other streets (squares) *R_{street}* considers the conditions
 within the same given scenario [-] (section C.3).

All these KPIs were based on a two-level Decision Hierarchy, as shown by Table C1. The weight estimation was performed through the open-source tool AHP Online System⁵. The first level is composed of factors (in order of importance):

(a) related to the *out-of-time evacuees* ("how many evacuees cannot reach a safe area?"). The associate weight is w_O [-]. This factor was associated with 3 second-level variables, depending on the reasons inducing the evacuees to stop out of a safe area (compare to Section 2.2.1). In order of importance, they are: *casualties* (w_{ca}), because they represent evacuees who cannot be saved at the end of the emergency; *latecomers* (w_{la}), since they can still move at the end of the simulation; *spontaneously gathering evacuees* (w_{sp}), since they are located in areas where *DV* conditions are not critical at all;

(b) related to the floodwater risk levels ("how much the flood is critical?"), in terms of DV, since it affects the human body stability. This factor has no second-level variable. The associate weight is w_{DV} [-];

- 1133 (c) related to the use of the urban layout and of the paths ("where evacuees move?"), or rather on the overall crowding 1134 conditions along the streets. This factor has no second-level variable. It is the least relevant because it just outlines 1135 the possibility of individual-individual interactions along the paths and the probable exposure to particular DV1136 levels during the whole evacuation process⁶. The associate weight is w_{cr} [-].
- 1137
- 1138
 Table C1 Decision hierarchy overview for the risk indices, by including principal eigenvalue and Ratio of Consistency evaluated

 1139
 through the AHP application, for each level.

	Level 1	Level 2
Relative Risk Index	out-of-time evacuees-related: <i>w</i> ₀ =0.604	spontaneously gathering evacuees: $w_{sp}=0.073$
		latecomers: w _{la} =0.200
		casualties: w_{ca} =0.727
	DV -related: w_{DV} =0.326	-
	crowding-related: <i>w_{cr}</i> =0.07	-
Principal eigen value	3.006	3.009
RC	0.60%	1.00%

⁵ https://bpmsg.com/ahp/ahp-hierarchy.php (last access: 19/09/2019)

⁶ e.g. DV-related factors being equal in two parts of the same scenario, the less riskiest is the one with the lowest crowding level since evacuees can more freely move.

1141 C.1 Rarea,scen

1142 Let consider different comparable scenarios to measure the risks of the whole area in each of them. For each scenario,

1143 *R*_{area,scen} was calculated according to Table C1 decision hierarchy, as shown by Equation C.1:

1144
$$R_{area,scen} = R_{0,area,scen} \cdot w_0 + R_{DV,area,scen} \cdot w_{DV} + R_{cr,area,scen} \cdot w_{cr} = \left(\frac{P_{0,ca}}{P_{0,ca,max,scen}} \cdot w_{ca} + \frac{P_{0,la}}{P_{0,la,max,scen}} \cdot w_{la} + \frac{P_{0,la$$

1145
$$\frac{P_{O,sp}}{P_{O,sp,max,scen}} \cdot w_{sp} \cdot w_0 + \frac{DV_{area,max}}{DV_{area,max,scen}} \cdot w_{DV} + \frac{P_{cr,area,max}}{P_{cr,area,max,scen}} \cdot w_{cr}$$
(C.1)

1146 where *max* refers to the maximum value in the area in the given scenario, and *max,scen* refers to the maximum value 1147 in all the comparable scenarios.

1148 C.2 Rstreet,scen

1149 Let consider different comparable scenarios to measure the risks of a given street in each of them. For each scenario,

1150
$$R_{street,scen}$$
 was calculated according to Table C1 decision hierarchy, as shown by Equation C.2:

1151
$$R_{street,scen} = R_{0,street,scen} \cdot w_0 + R_{DV,street,scen} \cdot w_{DV} + R_{cr,street,scen} \cdot w_{cr} = \left(\frac{P_{0,ca,street}}{P_{0,ca,street,max,scen}} \cdot w_{ca} + \frac{P_{0,ca,street,scen}}{P_{0,ca,street,max,scen}} \cdot w_{ca} + \frac{P_{0,ca,street,scen}}{P_{0,ca,street,scen}} \cdot w_{ca} + \frac{P_{0,ca,street,scen}}{P_{0,ca,street,scen}}$$

1152
$$\frac{P_{O,la,street}}{P_{O,la,street,max,scen}} \cdot w_{la} + \frac{P_{O,sp,street}}{P_{O,sp,street,max,scen}} \cdot w_{sp} \cdot w_{O} + \frac{DV_{street,max}}{DV_{area,max,scen}} \cdot w_{DV} + \frac{P_{cr,street}}{P_{cr,street,max,scen}} \cdot w_{cr}$$
(C.2)

1153 where, where max refers to the maximum value for the considered street in the given scenario, and max, scen refers to

1154 the maximum value in all the comparable scenarios.

1155 C.3 Rstreet

1156 Let consider a certain scenario to compare the risks of the open spaces in the built environment (i.e. streets, squares).

1157 For each open space (i.e. street) in the simulation area, R_{street} was calculated according to Table C1 decision hierarchy, as

1159
$$R_{street} = R_{0,street} \cdot w_b + R_{DV,street} \cdot w_{DV} + R_{cr,street} \cdot w_{cr} = \left(\frac{P_{0,ca,street}}{P_{0,ca,street,max}} \cdot w_{ca} + \frac{P_{0,la,street}}{P_{0,la,street,max}} \cdot w_{la} + \frac{P_{0,la,street,max}}{P_{0,sp,street,max}} \cdot w_{sp}\right) \cdot w_0 + \frac{DV_{street,max}}{DV_{area,max}} \cdot w_{DV} + \frac{P_{cr,street}}{P_{cr,street,max}} \cdot w_{cr}$$
(C.3)

1161 where *max* refers to the maximum value in the given scenario.