

Elaboration of Data Layers for Global Earthquake Models: Case Study Pakistan

Dissertation
as a requirement for the degree of

Doktor-Ingenieur

at the Faculty of Civil Engineering
Bauhaus-University Weimar

Submitted by:

Syed Tariq Maqsood, M.Sc.
from Islamabad (Pakistan)

15 August 2011
Weimar

DEDICATION

To my loving parents

BAUHAUS
UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG

ABSTRACT

Earthquakes are amongst the worst natural disasters that could cause vast devastation, lots of casualties and enormous economic loss. Earthquake risk assessment is a technique usually adopted by engineers and decision-makers to mitigate the undesirable results of such disasters. The goal of a seismic risk assessment is the estimation of the consequences of seismic events upon a geographical area (a city, a region, a state or a nation) in a certain period of time. The results provided by an earthquake risk analysis can be regarded as helpful guidelines in respect to all the phases of the risk management: during normal periods, during crisis periods, as well as in the recovery and post-emergency periods.

The aim of this Ph.D. thesis is the elaboration of data layers for earthquake risk assessment. Several field surveys have been conducted to define typical building types in the study area, i.e., Pakistan, and to assess vulnerability of the building stock. Special surveys after the damaging 2005 Kashmir and 2008 Baluchistan earthquakes helped to identify the typical failure mechanisms of different construction types and the factors contributed to their failure. Reconstruction after the 2005 Kashmir earthquake is also observed and key statistics have been collected to compare the risk level before and after the reconstruction. Building and population statistics from the 1998 national census of Pakistan have been used to quantify the social and structural vulnerability and its distribution across the country.

An empirical approach based on European Macroseismic Scale – 1998 and developed at Bauhaus University Weimar, Germany, is used to assess the vulnerability of building stock at different levels of study, i.e., micro (Muzaffarabad City), meso (Northern Pakistan) and macro (whole Pakistan). The empirical method describes the seismic hazard in terms of macroseismic intensities and structural vulnerability in terms of vulnerability classes which is dependent upon building type, quality of materials, workmanship, level of earthquake resistant design etc.

A comprehensive literature review of the published casualty models has been conducted to identify the key contributing parameters and limitations of those published models. An estimation of casualties during the 2005 Kashmir earthquake is carried out using the casualty rates from the published models. Later, a new vulnerability-based casualty model (VBCM) is developed and applied to the 2005 Kashmir earthquake.

Several damage scenarios have been developed in different parts of the study area to estimate the level of damage and loss in the selected scenarios which can be used by the decision makers to begin to draft mitigation policies and programs.

There has been a significant development in the recent years at the global level in this field of research. The two major initiatives are the USGS Prompt Assessment of Global Earthquakes for Response (PAGER) program and Global Earthquake Model (GEM). For the case of Pakistan, PAGER utilizes the published data of the present study to estimate building damage and risk in Pakistan. GEM is still in the initial stages, however, the methodology and goals of both PAGER and GEM are similar in nature to the present study. Therefore, it can be attributed that the work done is in conjunction with the recent demands and developments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTNS

Praise is to God, the most gracious and the most merciful, for His help that enable me to finish this work.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Dr.-Ing. Jochen Schwarz, for his meticulous guidance throughout my period of candidature. I would like to thank him for his continuous help, support and inspiration during this project. His lateral thinking and guidance helped me overcome successfully any obstacles found during the period. Particular thanks are also due to Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Frank Werner for his support and useful suggestions. I am grateful to Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Carsten Könke and Prof. Dr. Polat Gülkan to act as reviewers of this study.

I would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Bauhaus Research School and German Taskforce for Earthquakes to carry out this research.

I would like to thank the support of respective authorities in Pakistan, mainly UN-Habitat, Population Census Organization, and National Engineering Services Pakistan (Pvt.) Ltd. (NESPAK) for providing me the necessary data. Interaction and data sharing with Syed Subtain Hussain and Baber Tanvir being of vital importance is gladly acknowledged.

My gratitude is also extended to the members of the Earthquake Damage Analysis Center (EDAC) at Bauhaus-University for their spontaneous help and cooperation.

My deepest gratitude goes to my father, brothers and sisters for all their prayers and support over the years and for being just a phone call away ready to respond to all my requests and demands.

Furthermore, I wish to express my sincere thanks to my wife, Faiza Yasmeen, for her love, invaluable care and encouragement. Finally, I would like to thank my mother for her love and prayers, which will be with me eternally.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTNS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2. OBJECTIVES.....	2
1.3. METHODOLOGY	4
1.3.1. Earthquake Hazard	4
1.3.2. Building Inventory.....	5
1.3.3. Vulnerability Assessment.....	6
2. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN RISK ASSESSMENT	10
2.1. PROMPT ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL EARTHQUAKES FOR RESPONSE	10
2.1.1. Earthquake Source	10
2.1.2. Shaking Distribution.....	10
2.1.3. Loss Modeling.....	12
2.1.4. Loss Model Summary	15
2.1.5. Earthquake Alerting.....	15
2.1.6. Building Inventory.....	16
2.1.7. PAGER limitations.....	16
2.2. GLOBAL EARTHQUAKE MODEL (GEM).....	17
2.2.1. GEM Ontology and Taxonomy	17
2.2.2. Global Earthquake Consequences Database.....	18
2.2.3. Global Exposure Database.....	18
2.2.4. Global Vulnerability Estimation Methods.....	18
2.3. SUMMARY	19

3.	DATA LAYERS AND ANALYSIS	22
3.1.	EARTHQUAKE HAZARD	22
3.1.1.	Introduction	22
3.1.2.	Past seismicity.....	23
3.1.3.	The largest earthquakes.....	25
3.2.	BUILDING INVENTORY IN PAKISTAN	28
3.2.1.	Statistics.....	28
3.2.2.	Age of the building stock.....	28
3.2.3.	Typical building types.....	30
3.3.	POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	30
3.3.1.	Population density.....	33
3.3.2.	Household size	33
3.4.	SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS.....	34
3.4.1.	Geology.....	35
3.4.2.	Topography	35
3.4.3.	Shear wave velocity	35
3.4.4.	Soil types.....	35
3.5.	DISCUSSION	36
4.	BUILDING CODE AND SEISMIC ZONING MAPS	37
4.1.	BUILDING CODE	37
4.1.1.	Building code for Quetta municipality (1937).....	37
4.1.2.	Building code of Pakistan (1985).....	39
4.1.3.	Building code of Pakistan (2007).....	40
4.2.	SEISMIC ZONING MAPS.....	41
4.2.1.	Development of seismic zoning maps	41
4.2.2.	Comparison of seismic zoning maps.....	44
4.3.	SUMMARY	46
5.	EMPIRICAL VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT	48
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	48
5.2.	VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES.....	48
5.2.1.	Damage probability matrices.....	48
5.2.2.	Vulnerability functions	49
5.3.	EUROPEAN MACROSEISMIC SCALE -1998 (EMS-98)	49
5.3.1.	Factors affecting vulnerability.....	50
5.4.	FIELD SURVEYS IN PAKISTAN	52
5.4.1.	Micro level.....	53
5.4.2.	Macro level.....	56

5.5.	VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT.....	57
5.5.1.	Building type distribution	57
5.5.2.	Vulnerability class distribution.....	60
5.5.3.	Mean Vulnerability Index (MVI)	61
5.6.	RECONSTRUCTION AFTER 2005 KASHMIR EARTHQUAKE.....	62
5.7.	SUMMARY	69

6. VULNERABILITY OF REINFORCED CONCRETE STRUCTURES

	71	
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	71
6.2.	VULNERABILITY FUNCTIONS	72
6.2.1.	Capacity of a building	72
6.2.2.	Earthquake demand.....	72
6.3.	ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	73
6.4.	PUSH OVER ANALYSIS.....	74
6.5.	STRUCTURAL VULNERABILITY OF RC BUILDING IN PAKISTAN.....	75
6.6.	CAPACITY CURVES FROM PUSHOVER ANALYSIS.....	78
6.7.	SUMMARY	78

7. DAMAGE SCENARIOS.....80

7.1.	SELECTION OF SCENARIOS.....	80
7.2.	METHODOLOGY	81
7.2.1.	Identification of building typology	83
7.2.2.	Assessment of Vulnerability Classes.....	83
7.2.3.	Selection of scenario earthquakes	83
7.2.4.	Damage estimation.....	83
7.3.	OBSERVED DAMAGE IN 1935 QUETTA EARTHQUAKE	85
7.4.	OBSERVED DAMAGE IN 2005 KASHMIR EARTHQUAKE.....	86
7.4.1.	Damage to reinforced concrete (RC) frame structures	88
7.4.2.	Damage to masonry structures.....	91
7.5.	OBSERVED DAMAGE IN 2008 BALUCHISTAN EARTHQUAKE	93
7.6.	DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FOR SELECTED SCENARIOS.....	98
7.6.1.	Micro Level - Muzaffarabad	99
7.6.2.	Meso Level - Northern Pakistan.....	100
7.6.3.	Macro Level - South-Western and Northern Pakistan.....	104
7.7.	DISCUSSION	108

8. SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES-FATALITIES AND INJURIES.....	111
8.1. INTRODUCTION	111
8.2. STATE OF THE ART.....	111
8.3. ESTIMATION METHODOLOGIES.....	115
8.4. FACTORS AFFECTING CASUALTY ESTIMATION	118
8.5. CASUALTY ESTIMATION FOR PAKISTAN.....	120
8.5.1. Coburn and Spence Casualty Model (CSCM) – 1992	121
8.5.2. Vulnerability-Based Casualty Model (VBCM).....	123
8.6. DISCUSSION	132
9. LANDSLIDES.....	134
9.1. INTRODUCTION	134
9.2. LANDSLIDE RISK ASSESSMENT	135
9.2.1. Landslide risk.....	135
9.2.2. Risk assessment procedure	136
9.2.3. Related difficulties.....	136
9.3. LANDSLIDE SUCEPTIBILITY ZONATION	138
9.4. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TOWARDS LANDSLIDE HAZARD	138
9.4.1. Topography	138
9.4.2. Geology.....	140
9.4.3. Land use.....	140
9.4.4. Climate.....	141
9.4.5. Human factor	142
9.5. RESULTS.....	144
9.6. REMEDIAL MEASURES.....	145
9.7. SUMMARY.....	146
10. GLOBAL RISK ASSESSMENT: EXTRAPOLATION TO INDIA	147
10.1. INTRODUCTION	147
10.2. SEISMICTIY OF INDIA.....	147
10.2.1. 1988 Bihar earthquake.....	147
10.2.2. 1991 Uttarkashi earthquake	147
10.2.3. 1993 Killari earthquake	148
10.2.4. 1997 Jabalpur earthquake.....	148
10.2.5. 1999 Chamoli earthquake	149
10.2.6. 2001 Bhuj earthquake	149
10.3. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS.....	150
10.4. BUILDING CODE OF INDIA.....	150
10.5. SEISMIC HAZARD MAPS OF INDIA.....	152
10.5.1. Seismic hazard map - 1933 Edition.....	152
10.5.2. Seismic hazard map - 1962 Edition.....	152
10.5.3. Seismic hazard map - 1966 Edition.....	153

10.5.4. Seismic hazard map - 1970 Edition.....	153
10.5.5. Seismic hazard map - 2002 Edition.....	153
10.5.6. Seismic hazard map – GSHAP 1999.....	153
10.6. BUILDING STOCK OF INDIA	155
10.6.1. Mud/adobe structures.....	155
10.6.2. Rubble stone masonry structures.....	155
10.6.3. Brick and Concrete Block Masonry structures	155
10.6.4. Reinforced Concrete Frame structures.....	155
10.6.5. Timber structures.....	156
10.7. Building vulnerability Assessment.....	160
10.8. SUMMARY	161
11. SUMMARY AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS	162
11.1. SUMMARY.....	162
11.1.1. Building code and seismic zoning maps.....	162
11.1.2. Field surveys.....	162
11.1.3. Typical building types.....	163
11.1.4. Empirical Vulnerability Assessment.....	163
11.1.5. Unknown capacity of reinforced concrete structures	163
11.1.6. Damage scenarios.....	163
11.1.7. Reconstruction after 2005 Kashmir earthquake	164
11.1.8. Human causality estimation.....	164
11.1.9. Landslides	164
11.2. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS	165
REFERENCES	166
APPENDIX A: STATISTICAL DATA.....	177
APPENDIX B: EUROPEAN MACROSEISMIC SCALE - 1998	190
APPENDIX C: 2005 KASHMIR EARTHQUAKE – DAMAGES.....	197
APPENDIX D: 2005 EARTHQUAKE -RECONSTRUCTION	204
APPENDIX E: CAPACITY CURVES	211
APPENDIX F: 2008 BALUCHISTAN EARTHQUAKE–DAMAGES	213
DECLARATION.....	216
CURRICULAM VITAE	217

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Earthquake risk assessment methodology	4
Figure 1.2: Overview of methodology adopted by the present study	8
Figure 2.1: Basic PAGER flowchart for operation, calibration and loss estimation	11
Figure 2.2: PAGER report for 2008 Baluchistan earthquake.....	13
Figure 2.3: PAGER report for 2010 Haiti earthquake	14
Figure 2.4: GEM components.....	17
Figure 2.5: Overview of PAGER methodology.....	20
Figure 3.1: Year wise seismicity (above M5.0) in Pakistan from 1960 to 2007	23
Figure 3.2: Spatial distribution of past seismicity in Pakistan.....	24
Figure 3.3: Depth of past seismicity in Pakistan	24
Figure 3.4: Largest earthquakes in and around Pakistan M>7.0	26
Figure 3.5: Age of Building stock in Pakistan	28
Figure 3.6: Building type distribution in Pakistan	29
Figure 3.7: Population distribution by age groups	30
Figure 3.8: Distribution of population and population density in Pakistan	33
Figure 3.9: Population distribution by age groups	33
Figure 3.10: Distribution of population in Pakistan.....	34
Figure 3.11: Geology, topography, shear wave velocity (V_s^{30}) and soil classification in Northern Pakistan.....	36
Figure 4.1: Typical building types as in Building Code for Quetta Municipality.....	39
Figure 4.2: Seismic zoning maps of Pakistan.....	42
Figure 4.3: Comparison of seismic zoning maps and F_a Factor in Pakistan.....	45
Figure 5.1: Selected test areas in Pakistan.....	53
Figure 5.2: Results of field survey in Muzaffarabad city.....	55
Figure 5.3: Vulnerability Class distribution in Muzaffarabad city	56
Figure 5.4: Building type distribution in Pakistan	58
Figure 5.5: Mean Vulnerability Index - MVI	61
Figure 5.6: Calibrated Mean Vulnerability Index (MVI)	61
Figure 5.7: Building distribution in affected areas of 2005 Kashmir earthquake.....	64
Figure 5.8: Building type distribution - reconstruction only.....	65
Figure 5.9: Building type distribution (Before reconstruction).....	66
Figure 5.10: Building type distribution (After reconstruction)	67
Figure 5.11: Mean Vulnerability Index (MVI) distribution.....	68
Figure 6.1: Observed damages to RC structures in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	76
Figure 6.2: Selected frame.....	77
Figure 7.1: Observed damage in Quetta during 1935 Quetta earthquake.....	86
Figure 7.2: Observed damage to RC structures during 2005 Kashmir earthquake	87
Figure 7.3: Damage to Margalla Towers in Islamabad due to 2005 Kashmir earthquake	90
Figure 7.4: Observed damage to masonry structures during 2005 Kashmir earthquake.....	92
Figure 7.5: Damage due to 2005 Kashmir earthquake.....	93

Figure 7.6: Map of location and affected areas in 2005 Kashmir and 2008 Baluchistan earthquake	93
Figure 7.7: Affected population and damaged buildings due to 2008 earthquake.....	94
Figure 7.8: Deaths and injuries due to 2008 Baluchistan earthquake	95
Figure 7.9: Observed damage due to 2008 Baluchistan earthquake	96
Figure 7.10: Observed damage during 2008 Baluchistan earthquake.....	97
Figure 7.11: Undamaged structures after 2008 Baluchistan earthquake.....	98
Figure 7.12: Micro level scenario in Muzaffarabad city	99
Figure 7.13: Location map of meso scale study.....	100
Figure 7.14: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss distribution 2005.....	101
Figure 7.15: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss distribution 2005 After Shock	102
Figure 7.16: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss distribution 1974.....	103
Figure 7.17: Intensity and damage prognosis for historic earthquakes in Pakistan - Mastung and surrounding region	105
Figure 7.18: Intensity and damage prognosis for historic earthquakes in Pakistan – Kashmir and surrounding region	106
Figure 7.19: Intensity and damage prognosis for historic earthquakes in Pakistan – Quetta and surrounding region	107
Figure 8.1: Ratio of disability due to spatial disorder physical confinement.....	112
Figure 8.2: Fatalities and building types: 1999 Chi-Chi Taiwan earthquake	113
Figure 8.3: Earthquake-induced secondary hazards between 1968 and 2008.....	115
Figure 8.4: Factors influencing the number of people killed per building	116
Figure 8.5: Scheme of vulnerability-based human casualty estimation	124
Figure 8.6: Social settings of population and vulnerability of building stock (MVI) in affected districts of NWFP	126
Figure 8.7: Fatality estimation (percentage of the district population) in the affected districts of 2005 Kashmir earthquake	128
Figure 8.8: Fatality estimation in the affected districts of 2005 Kashmir earthquake	129
Figure 8.9: Injury estimation (percentage of the district population) in day scenario in affected districts of 2005 Kashmir earthquake.....	130
Figure 8.10: Injury estimation (percentage of the district population) in night scenario in affected districts of 2005 Kashmir earthquake.....	131
Figure 8.11: Distribution of Pakistani population in age groups.....	133
Figure 9.1: Damage due to landslides	135
Figure 9.2: Schematic representation of landslide risk assessment methodology.....	137
Figure 9.3: Topography of the affected area of 2005 Kashmir earthquake)	139
Figure 9.4: 3D topographical model of the study area of Muzaffarabad District	139
Figure 9.5: Slope, elevation, river, road & landslide locations.....	140
Figure 9.6: Geology of the study area of Muzaffarabad District.....	141
Figure 9.7: Road damages and blockage.....	142
Figure 9.8: Damage to buildings near landslides.....	143
Figure 9.9: 3D model of the study area	145
Figure 10.1: Population characteristics in India with urban and rural division.....	151
Figure 10.2: Seismic hazard maps generation in India	154
Figure 10.3: Building type distribution in India.....	156
Figure 10.4: Building type distribution according to material used in walls.....	157
Figure 10.5: Building type distribution according to material used in roof.....	158
Figure 10.6: Number of rooms in a building.....	159
Figure 10.7: Mean Vulnerability Index (MVI).....	160
Figure A.1: Population distribution by selected age group	178
Figure A.2: Percentage of rural localities by population size	179
Figure A.3: Population distribution by household size.....	180
Figure A.4: Owned housing units by period of construction and number of rooms.....	184

Figure A.5: Owned housing units by period of construction and material	185
Figure A.6: Source of information for households	186
Figure A.7: Distribution of typical building types in urban & rural area	188
Figure A.8: Distribution of population, buildings & vulnerability.....	189
Figure C. 1: Damages to reinforced concrete structures in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	197
Figure C.2: Damages to reinforced concrete structures in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	198
Figure C.3: Damages to masonry structures in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	199
Figure C.4: Damages to roads in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	202
Figure C.5: Damages to bridges in 2005 Kashmir earthquake	203
Figure D.1: Typical building type distribution in affected areas of 2005 Kashmir earthquake.	204
Figure D.2: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss - 1981 earthquake scenario....	205
Figure D.3: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss - 2002 earthquake scenario....	206
Figure D.4: Mean Damage Grade (D_m) and Building Value Loss - Intensity X ($I^*=I_0+1$) earthquake scenario	207
Figure D.5: Fatalities and injuries distribution according to Coburn & Spence 1992	208
Figure D.6: Injuries distribution according to Coburn & Spence 1992	209
Figure F.1: Typical building types in Baluchistan region	213
Figure F.2: Damages to masonry structures in 2008 Baluchistan earthquake	214
Figure F.3: Damages to mud structures in 2008 Baluchistan earthquake	215