

# **Decision Support Framework for Post- earthquake Restoration of Sewerage Pipelines and Systems**

---

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering

by

Miao (Melanie) Liu

Department of Civil and Natural Resources Engineering

University of Canterbury

2016

---

# Table of contents

---

<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYM</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation .....	1
1.2 Aims and objectives .....	3
1.3 Expected significance .....	4
1.4 Scope .....	5
1.5 Outline of the thesis.....	6
<b>CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>8</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2 Classification and taxonomy of municipal sewerage systems .....	8
2.3 Seismic hazard characterisation for underground pipelines.....	14
2.3.1 Seismic performance of sewerage systems in past earthquakes .....	14
2.3.2 Seismic hazard analysis .....	15
2.3.3 Seismic hazard parameters .....	17
2.4 Physical damage assessment .....	21
2.4.1 Earthquake-induced damage mechanism and damage measurements.....	21
2.4.2 Simplified fragility assessment approach: Fragility matrix.....	24
2.4.3 Advanced fragility assessment approach: Fragility functions .....	25
2.5 Functional impact evaluation.....	28
2.5.1 Functional failure classification of sewer components .....	28
2.5.2 Performance evaluation of sewerage systems at the business-as-usual time.....	30
2.5.3 Post-earthquake performance evaluation of infrastructure systems.....	32
2.6 Restoration time estimation .....	34
2.6.1 Restoration models for infrastructure systems .....	34
2.7 Decision support frameworks and systems .....	42

2.7.1	Decision support frameworks for post-disaster recovery .....	42
2.7.2	Post-earthquake decision support systems for infrastructure systems .....	43
2.8	Chapter summary .....	48

### **CHAPTER 3. POST-EARTHQUAKE DECISION MAKING ON SEWER**

	<b>RECOVERY IN CHRISTCHURCH .....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	49
3.2	The Christchurch sewerage system.....	50
3.2.1	The sewer reticulation.....	51
3.2.2	Pump stations/lift stations.....	54
3.2.3	Manholes .....	57
3.3	The CES in 2010-2011 .....	58
3.4	Seismic performance of the CSS following the CES .....	60
3.4.1	Physical damage to the Christchurch sewerage components .....	60
3.4.2	Functional impact of the CSS.....	65
3.5	Organisations involved in the Canterbury recovery after the CES.....	66
3.6	SCIRT’s Strategies in the rebuilding programme .....	68
3.7	Decision making process of SCIRT’s sewerage pipelines rebuilding programme .....	70
3.8	Chapter summary .....	79

### **CHAPTER 4. IDENTIFYING THE REQUIREMENTS FOR DECISION MAKING ON POST-EARTHQUAKE INFRASTRUCTURE**

	<b>RECOVERY .....</b>	<b>80</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	80
4.2	What are critical success factors? .....	81
4.3	Research method .....	82
4.4	Identification of CSFs for post-earthquake infrastructure recovery.....	87
	CSF 1: Establishment of a recovery vehicle .....	88
	CSF 2: Formulation of a flexible funding plan .....	90
	CSF 3: Selection of a rebuild driver .....	91
	CSF 4: Determination of rebuild project prioritisation methodology .....	93
	CSF 5: Standardisation of data management mechanism.....	96
	CSF 6: Community engagement.....	97

4.5	Lessons learnt from the Canterbury post-disaster infrastructure recovery.....	99
4.6	Chapter summary .....	101

**CHAPTER 5. PROPOSAL FOR DECISION SUPPORT FRAMEWORK FOR  
POST-EARTHQUAKE RESTORATION OF SEWERAGE  
PIPELINES AND SYSTEMS..... 103**

5.1	Introduction .....	103
5.2	Informational needs for decisions in relation to post-earthquake restoration of sewerage systems .....	104
5.3	Overview of decision support framework for post-earthquake restoration of sewerage pipelines and systems .....	106
5.3.1	Physical damage module .....	108
5.3.2	Functional impact module .....	108
5.3.3	Pipeline restoration module.....	109
5.4	Databases and seismic hazard parameters implemented in the development of the decision support framework .....	109
5.4.1	Database description.....	109
5.4.2	Seismic hazard parameters used in the research.....	112
5.5	Chapter summary .....	116

**CHAPTER 6. PHYSICAL DAMAGE MODULE: FRAGILITY MATRICES  
AND FUNCTIONS OF SEWERAGE PIPELINES..... 117**

6.1	Introduction .....	117
6.2	Comparative study of the databases on the CSS .....	118
6.2.1	Analysis of the CCTV inspection database .....	118
6.2.2	Analysis of the combined completed repair and renewal databases.....	121
6.2.3	Analysis of the overlap of pipes in the CCTV inspection and completed repair databases.....	125
6.3	A fragility matrix of sewerage pipelines .....	129
6.3.1	Observed seismic vulnerability from field investigation.....	129
6.3.2	Proposal for a fragility matrix of sewerage pipelines .....	133
6.4	Fragility functions for sewerage pipelines.....	135
6.4.1	Fragility function formulation .....	135
6.4.2	Fragility functions of sewer gravity pipelines .....	136

6.4.3	Fragility functions of sewer pressure pipelines .....	144
6.5	Comparing fragility functions of SPP and of water supply pipelines .....	146
6.6	Chapter summary .....	148

## **CHAPTER 7. FUNCTIONAL IMPACT MODULE: POST-EARTHQUAKE**

### **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OF SEWERAGE SYSTEMS 149**

7.1	Introduction .....	149
7.2	The post-earthquake recovery phases .....	150
7.3	Development of post-earthquake PIs for sewerage systems .....	152
7.3.1	Structural domain PIs of sewerage systems.....	153
7.3.2	Hydraulic domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	155
7.3.3	Environmental domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	157
7.3.4	Social domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	158
7.3.5	Economic domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	159
7.4	Chapter summary .....	161

## **CHAPTER 8. PIPELINE RESTORATION MODULE: RESTORATION**

### **MODELS OF SEWERAGE PIPES ..... 162**

8.1	Introduction .....	162
8.2	Data and statistic models adopted .....	163
8.2.1	Database description and processing .....	163
8.2.2	Variable definition.....	165
8.2.3	Model types and prediction measures .....	168
8.3	A statistical approach for estimating sewer restoration time .....	172
8.3.1	Model selection and comparison .....	172
8.3.2	Random sampling prediction results .....	175
8.3.3	Out-of-sample prediction results .....	179
8.4	Variable importance and interpretation .....	182
8.5	Limitations .....	185
8.5	Chapter summary .....	187

## **CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK..... 188**

9.1	Introduction .....	188
9.2	Contribution summary.....	188

9.2	Identifying future research .....	195
9.3.1	Fragility analysis.....	195
9.3.2	Functionality evaluation .....	196
9.3.3	Restoration time prediction .....	196
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....		197
<b>APPENDIX A</b> R code for developing restoration models of sewerage pipelines ...		210

## List of figures

---

Figure 2.1	Schematic representation of a sewerage system.....	9
Figure 2.2	Main components and responsibilities of a) pressurised and b) vacuum sewerage systems .....	11
Figure 3.1	The Christchurch wastewater network according to pipe type (i.e., gravity, pressure) .....	51
Figure 3.2	Length proportions (km) of gravity and pressure pipes in diameter (mm) categories .....	52
Figure 3.3	Number of pump stations by year installed .....	56
Figure 3.4	Locations of the CES causative fault planes .....	58
Figure 3.5	Earthquake-induced damage to the sewerage system in Christchurch: a) damaged sewer pipes; b) physical damage to AC sewer pipes .....	60
Figure 3.6	DR (number of faults/km) on sewer pipelines classified by pipe material and pipe diameter .....	61
Figure 3.7	Earthquake-induced damages to PSs in Christchurch: a) PS differential movement; b) uplifted PS .....	63
Figure 3.8	Organisational chart of the agencies and companies involved in the Canterbury Earthquake recovery .....	66
Figure 3.9	Examples of alternative techniques adopted by SCIRT: a) installation of PVC rising main; b) directional drilling machines .....	68
Figure 3.10	Diagram of decision-making process of post-earthquake reinstatement of the Christchurch sewerage system pipelines as of 21 January 2015...	71
Figure 4.1	Flowchart of rebuild project prioritisation methodology .....	92
Figure 4.2	An example of a ranking map generated after the catchment prioritisation process.....	94
Figure 5.1	Inputs, tools and outputs of the decision support framework for post-earthquake restoration of sewerage systems .....	106

Figure 5.2	The CSN and the PGV values of the February earthquake, reproduced from data published by the USGS .....	112
Figure 5.3	Liquefaction Resistance Index (LRI Zoning) for Christchurch City: a) observed LRI zones; b) LRI Zones and associated ground deformation .....	113
Figure 6.1	Average faults on the damaged pipes (bars) and total length of pipes in that range of lengths in the network (line) according to pipe length.....	117
Figure 6.2	Average repairs on the repaired pipes (bars) and total length of pipes in that range of lengths in the network (line) according to pipe length ...	120
Figure 6.3	Average repairs on the repaired pipes (bars) and total length of pipes in that range of diameter in the network (line) according to pipe diameter .....	121
Figure 6.4	Ratios of fault to repair of pipes: (a) diameters less than 300 mm; (b) diameters of 300 mm and greater vs. pipe length and the ratio of one (horizontal line) .....	124
Figure 6.5	Correlation of average fault/repair ratios at each PGV value for the 1540 pipes that have been both repaired and had faults found through CCTV .....	126
Figure 6.6	Physical defects on sewer pipes: a) longitudinal split on an AC pipe; b) pipe joint pull-out .....	129
Figure 6.7	Fragility curves and observed damage data for six types of gravity pipes (namely: AC, CI, CONC, EW, RCRR, PVC & PE) as a function of PGV and liquefaction zones .....	137
Figure 6.8	Fragility curves and repairs undertaken for the SPP in Christchurch as a function of PGV and of liquefaction zones .....	142
Figure 6.9	Comparison of the proposed fragility functions of sewerage AC pressure pipelines and existing fragility algorithms of AC water-supply pipelines .....	144
Figure 8.1	Overlap of the soil map and the Christchurch wastewater pipelines ...	164
Figure 8.2	The partitioning of training and validation datasets by use of: a) random sampling approach; and b) out-of-sample approach .....	167



Figure 8.3	Comparison of the CCR for MLR, AFT, CPH, and RSF models, using random sampling validation dataset .....	173
Figure 8.4	Restoration curves for actual restoration time, MLR, AFT, CPH models, and the method of RSF (blue), using random sampling validation dataset .....	174
Figure 8.5	Comparison of the CCR values for MLR, AFT, and RSF models, using out-of-sample validation dataset .....	176
Figure 8.6	Restoration curves for actual restoration time, MLR, AFT, CPH models, and the method of RSF, using out-of-sample validation dataset .....	177
Figure 8.7	Variable importance gained by use of the RSF model .....	178

## List of tables

---

Table 2.1	The taxonomy of sewerage systems in literature .....	13
Table 2.2	Damage mechanism and measures adopted in literature.....	23
Table 2.3	Breakdown of function failures, failure impacts, and resultant impacts according to the functions of sewerage system assets .....	29
Table 2.4	Platforms for seismic risk assessment in literature .....	45
Table 3.1	Taxonomy for the Christchurch sewerage system .....	50
Table 3.2	Breakdown of pipe distribution of the Christchurch sewerage network..	54
Table 3.3	Defect categories for gravity sewer pipes and recommended recovery action classification .....	73
Table 4.1	Sample of survey reports conducted in November 2013 .....	97
Table 5.1	Databases used in this thesis .....	109
Table 6.1	Breakdown of the overlap of pipes between repair, renewal and CCTV inspection databases .....	122
Table 6.2	Observed seismic fragility for wastewater pipes by pipe material, joint type and pipe diameter .....	130
Table 6.3	A fragility matrix for sewerage pipes according to liquefaction zones ..	132
Table 6.4	Parameters of fragility functions of AC sewer gravity pipes .....	134
Table 6.5	Parameters of fragility functions of CI sewer gravity pipes .....	135
Table 6.6	Parameters of fragility functions of CONC sewer gravity pipes .....	135
Table 6.7	Parameters of fragility functions of EW sewer gravity pipes .....	135
Table 6.8	Parameters of fragility functions of RCRR sewer gravity pipes .....	136
Table 6.9	Parameters of fragility functions of PVC & PE sewer gravity pipes ....	136
Table 6.10	Parameters of fragility functions of SPP .....	141
Table 7.1	Community expectations and recovery objectives in the defined post-earthquake recovery phases .....	148

Table 7.2	Structural domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	150
Table 7.3	Hydraulic domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	153
Table 7.4	Environmental domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	155
Table 7.5	Social domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	156
Table 7.6	Economic domain PIs of sewerage systems .....	157
Table 8.1	Definition, mean and standard deviation (S.D.) of the candidate variables considered in this analysis .....	162
Table 8.2	Comparison of the regression results for AFT models .....	168
Table 8.3	Regression results for CPH and MLR models .....	169
Table 8.4	Comparison of the interactions captured in the fitted models .....	170
Table 8.5	Comparison of prediction results for four candidate methods .....	171
Table 8.6	Comparison of the RMSE and MAE for four candidate models .....	175