Coupled urban change and natural hazard consequence model for community resilience planning

Sanderson Dylan R.¹, Cox Daniel T.¹, Amini Mehrshad¹, and Barbosa Andre²

¹Oregon State University ²University of Bristol,Oregon State University

November 16, 2022

Abstract

This paper presents a new coupled urban change and hazard consequence model that considers population growth, a changing built environment, natural hazard mitigation planning, and future acute hazards. Urban change is simulated as an agent-based land market with six agent types and six land use types. Agents compete for parcels with successful bids leading to changes in both urban land use – affecting where agents are located – and structural properties of buildings – affecting the building's ability to resist damage to natural hazards. IN-CORE, an open-source community resilience model, is used to compute damages to the built environment. The coupled model operates under constraints imposed by planning policies defined at the start of a simulation. The model is applied to Seaside, Oregon, a coastal community in the North American Pacific Northwest subject to seismic-tsunami hazards emanating from the Cascadia Subduction Zone. Ten planning scenarios are considered including caps on the number of vacation homes, relocating community, we show: (1) placing a cap on the number of vacation homes results in more visitors in damaged buildings, (2) that mandatory seismic retrofits do not reduce the number of people in damaged buildings when considering population growth, (3) polices diverge beyond year 10 in the model, indicating that many policies take time to realize their implications, and (4) the most effective policies were those that incorporated elements of both urban planning and enforced building codes.

Coupled urban change and natural hazard consequence model for community resilience planning

3 Dylan R. Sanderson¹, Daniel T. Cox², Mehrshad Amini³, and Andre R. Barbosa⁴

¹Ph.D. Student, School of Civil and Construction Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis,
Oregon, United States. <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4443-7074</u>. ²CH2M Hill Professor in Civil
Engineering, School of Civil and Construction Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis,
Oregon, United States. ³Postdoctoral Scholar, School of Civil and Construction Engineering,
Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, United States. <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1854-</u>
<u>0737</u>. ⁴Professor, School of Civil and Construction Engineering, Oregon State University,
Corvallis, Oregon, United States. <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4547-531X</u>

12 Corresponding author: Dylan R. Sanderson (<u>sanderdy@oregonstate.edu</u>)

13 Key Points:

- An urban change model is coupled with a hazard consequence model to consider future hazards, population growth, and planning policies.
- The model is applied to a coastal community in the Pacific Northwest considering Cascadia
 Subduction Zone seismic-tsunami hazards.
- Placing a cap on the number of vacation homes in a community could result in more visitors
 in damaged buildings.

20 Abstract

This paper presents a new coupled urban change and hazard consequence model that considers 21 population growth, a changing built environment, natural hazard mitigation planning, and future 22 acute hazards. Urban change is simulated as an agent-based land market with six agent types and 23 six land use types. Agents compete for parcels with successful bids leading to changes in both 24 25 urban land use - affecting where agents are located - and structural properties of buildings affecting the building's ability to resist damage to natural hazards. IN-CORE, an open-source 26 community resilience model, is used to compute damages to the built environment. The coupled 27 model operates under constraints imposed by planning policies defined at the start of a simulation. 28 The model is applied to Seaside, Oregon, a coastal community in the North American Pacific 29 Northwest subject to seismic-tsunami hazards emanating from the Cascadia Subduction Zone. Ten 30 planning scenarios are considered including caps on the number of vacation homes, relocating 31 community assets, limiting new development, and mandatory seismic retrofits. By applying this 32 coupled model to the testbed community, we show that: (1) placing a cap on the number of vacation 33 homes results in more visitors in damaged buildings, (2) that mandatory seismic retrofits do not 34 reduce the number of people in damaged buildings when considering population growth, (3) 35 polices diverge beyond year 10 in the model, indicating that many policies take time to realize 36 their implications, and (4) the most effective policies were those that incorporated elements of both 37 38 urban planning and enforced building codes.

39

40 Plain Language Summary

Natural hazards negatively impact communities resulting in significant infrastructure damages. 41 Natural hazard mitigation planning attempts to reduce these damages and modeling can be used to 42 measure how effective different mitigation plans can be. A new modeling framework is presented 43 that accounts for population growth, a changing built environment, natural hazard mitigation 44 planning, and future hazards. The model is applied to a testbed community with a large tourist 45 population that is exposed to earthquake and tsunami hazards. Using this model, we consider 46 different combinations of policies such as limiting the number of vacation homes in the 47 community, relocating community assets, limiting new development, and enforcing building 48 codes. Interestingly, we show that while placing a cap on the number of vacation homes does free 49 up housing for full time residents, this also results in more visitors in damaged buildings. It is also 50 shown how even with building codes in place, population growth contributes to an increased 51 number of people in damaged buildings. Lastly, we show how the most effective policies 52 53 incorporate elements of both urban planning and building codes.

54

55 1 Introduction

With disasters occurring at the nexus of the built-natural-social environments (Mileti, 1999; Peek 56 and Guikema, 2021), recent natural hazards have highlighted the need for disaster resilient 57 communities (Koliou et al., 2018). Increasing community resilience has gained traction in recent 58 vears with local stakeholders, national, and global entities alike addressing community resilience 59 and disaster risk reduction (e.g., SPUR, 2009; OSSPAC, 2013; UNDRR, 2015; NIST, 2016). 60 Simultaneously, however, complexities of increasing community resilience in an uncertain future 61 are being identified. These complexities stem from a variety of sources and can include 62 accelerating human activities, increased uncertainty in the built-natural-human environments, and 63 increased complexity of infrastructure systems themselves (Spies et al., 2014; Chester et al., 2021). 64 Population growth, urbanization, and a changing climate are expected to further contribute to 65 increased exposure and societal losses associated with natural hazards in both the immediate and 66 long-term future (Neumann et al., 2015; Hemmati et al., 2020; Bilskie et al., 2022; Cremen et al., 67 2022). As a result, the outcomes of hazard mitigation plans are often difficult to fully envision, 68 with biased policies leading to increased vulnerability of marginalized populations (Peek et al., 69

70 2020).

Given these challenges and complexities, modeling and simulation have been identified as a means

to inform disaster theory and understand emerging phenomena (Mostafavi and Ganapati, 2021).

73 Subsequently, the use of simulation has proven effective to evaluate how natural hazard mitigation

74 plans and policy can help improve community resilience (Talebiyan and Mahsuli, 2018; Wang *et*

al., 2019; Nofal *et al.*, 2021). While many of these simulation efforts provide what-if scenarios for

76 natural hazard mitigation planning, they often consider static, present-day representations of the

77 built-natural-social environments despite their dynamic nature.

There has, however, been a recent shift towards considering disaster resilience under a more 78 dynamic and future-oriented lens (Hemmati et al., 2020; Galasso et al., 2021; Cremen et al., 2022). 79 To this end, there is a need to situate the simulation of disaster resilience within appropriate 80 temporal settings given that both disasters and the adoption of mitigation plans happen over an 81 extended period of time ranging from months to years. The dynamic nature of the built and social 82 environments within disaster resilience simulation can be captured by coupling urban growth and 83 change models with hazard consequence models. Figure 1 shows a conceptual diagram of this 84 coupling. The time scale shown is in decades, and the y-axis shows a "Metric of Interest". Example 85 metrics could include the number of habitable homes, number of residents with electricity, etc. 86 Policies influence how these metrics evolve over time and, while not shown here, these metrics 87 could also decrease. At some point in the future, an extreme event may occur resulting in damages, 88 89 losses, and recovery. The overall goal of the simulation model is to evaluate how policies affect 90 the metric of interest relative to the status quo during non-disaster conditions and how these policies affect the resilience trajectory (initial damage and recovery) following an extreme event. 91



Figure 1: Situating infrastructure resilience within a larger temporal setting by coupling urban
 growth and change modeling with hazard consequence modeling

While it is common to find models to evaluate policies for either non-disaster growth or damagerecovery following a disaster, there are few comprehensive models that evaluate both in a consistent manner. Table 1 provides a review of models and papers divided into three groups: (1) urban growth and change models, (2) hazard consequence models, and (3) coupled urban change and hazard consequence models.



		Urban Change	Earthquake Flood	Hurricane	Tornado	Tsunami		
Model Group	Paper						Model Description/Notes	Model name
Urban growth and change	White and Engelen (1993)	\checkmark					Early cellular automata model of urban change	-
	Berry et al. (1996)	\checkmark					Socioeconomic model influences transition probability matrix, influences land use	LUCAS
	Waddell (2002)	\checkmark					Real estate market modeling choices of households, businesses, real estate, etc.	UrbanSim
	Hunt and Abraham (2003)	\checkmark					Used for simulating spatial economic systems; can be applied to urban land use change	PECAS
	Brown and Robinson (2006)	\checkmark					Residential choice where agents select grid space maximizing utility	SLUCE/SOME
	Bolte et al. (2007)	\checkmark					Land use change model for alternative future evaluation of policies	Envision/EvoLand

Urban Change Earthquake Flood Hurricane Tornado Tsunami

Model Group	Paper					Model Description/Notes	Model name		
	Filatova et al. (2009) √							Residential choice with agent buying/selling mechanisms	ALMA
	Filatova et al. (2011)	\checkmark						Residential choice with agent buying/selling mechanisms for coastal area	ALMA-C
	Magliocca et al. (2011)	\checkmark						Coupled housing and land market	CHALMS
	Chaudhuri and Clarke (2013)	\checkmark						Cellular automata model that started out as wildfire spread model	SLEUTH
	McLaren et al.(2008)		\checkmark					Early regional-level earthquake risk analysis software	MAEVIS
Hazard	van de Lindt et al. (2018)		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	Regional-level natural hazard damage, loss, and recovery	IN-CORE
Consequence	FEMA (2021a)		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	Regional-level natural hazard damage, loss, and recovery; GIS-based	HAZUS
	Deierlein et al.(2021)		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark	Regional-level natural hazard damage, loss, and recovery	SimCenter - R2D
	Jain et al. (2005)	\checkmark			\checkmark			Forecast urban change as proportional to population and consider hurricane risk	
	French (2012)	\checkmark	\checkmark					Forecast urban growth using per capita multipliers and focus on nonstructural damages from earthquakes	
	Filatova (2015)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Empirical land market and consider flood risk as in/out of flood zone	RHEA
	Dubbelboer et al. (2017)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Simulate land market for flood insurance evaluation	
Urban growth	Jenkins et al. (2017)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Agent-based model of land use change for insurance evaluation	
and change + Hazard Consequence	Sleeter et al. (2017)	\checkmark	\checkmark				\checkmark	Apply LUCAS model and consider earthquake/tsunami exposure at regional scale	
	Mills et al. (2018)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Use Envision model to evaluate coastal hazard policies informed by stakeholder engagement	
	Chang et al. (2019)	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark				Urbanization follows simple rules based on policy; consider both earthquake and flood risk	
	Haer et al. (2019)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Agent-based model of land use change for disaster policy evaluation	
	Haer et al. (2020)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Agent-based model of land use change for exploring safe development paradox	

		Urban Change	Earthquake	Flood	Hurricane	Tornado	Tsunami		
Model Group	Paper							Model Description/Notes	Model name
	Sarica et al. (2020)	\checkmark	\checkmark					Apply SLEUTH model and consider buildings exposed to earthquake hazard	
	Calderón et al (2021)	\checkmark	\checkmark					Multi-agent system with agents defining preferences for land use to change; consider earthquake damage	
	Cremen et al. (2021)	\checkmark	\checkmark					Number of residences in future projections match population growth; consider earthquake hazards	
	Hemmati et al. (2021a)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Use cellular automata and consider flood hazards	
	Hemmati et al. (2021b)	\checkmark		\checkmark				Use cellular automata + agent-based model and consider flood hazards	
	Mesta et al. (2022)	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark				Apply SLEUTH model and consider earthquake and flood hazard at regional scale	
	Williams et al. (2022)	\checkmark			\checkmark			Urbanization by using a neural network and consider hurricane hazards	

As shown in Table 1, modeling urban change can take on many forms ranging from cellular automata (White and Engelen, 1993; Chaudhuri and Clarke, 2013) to modeling land markets and buyer-seller transactions (Parker and Filatova, 2008; Parker *et al.*, 2012; Huang *et al.*, 2014). These models are typically used for land use and urban planning to explore alternative futures under various policy scenarios.

107 On the hazard consequence side, there has been extensive research into simulating the impact that 108 natural hazards have on the built- and social-environments. These can include infrastructure 109 damages and losses, recovery and restoration processes, and/or modeling of social impacts. 110 Recently, there have been efforts to transfer this research into deployable models that communities 111 can utilize for resilience planning (*e.g.*, van de Lindt *et al.*, 2018; Deierlein *et al.*, 2021).

The coupling of these two groups of models has increased in recent years as researchers are 112 recognizing that future projections of the built- and social-environments are important to consider 113 for mitigation planning. Limitations to many of the previously coupled models include either 114 considering hazards in a minimal way (i.e., hazard exposure), or considering urban change in a 115 minimal way (i.e., multipliers based on population growth). Only a handful of the modeling 116 approaches in Table 1 focus on the exploration of policies to evaluate hazard risks with both 117 detailed urban change and hazard consequence components (Haer et al., 2019; Hemmati et al., 118 2021a; Hemmati et al., 2021b). These approaches in particular have focused exclusively on flood 119 120 risks.

121 This paper thus presents a new coupled urban change and hazard consequence model that considers

122 population growth, a changing built environment, natural hazard mitigation planning, and future

123 acute hazards. Urban change is modeled via simulation of a land market whereas immediate post-

124 disaster damages are modeled using IN-CORE, an opensource software for community resilience

125 (van de Lindt *et al.*, 2018). The coupled model is applied to Seaside, Oregon, a testbed community

in the North American Pacific Northwest considering seismic-tsunami hazards associated with the

127 Cascadia Subduction Zone.

128 2 Coupled Urban Change and Hazard Consequence Model

129 Figure 2 shows a flowchart of the coupled urban change (grey dash-dot box) and hazard consequence model (blue dash-dot box). IN-CORE is used as the hazard consequence model, and 130 we consider only building damages here. Alternative hazard consequences, including damages to 131 lifelines and social impacts, could be considered using IN-CORE. Each time step in the model 132 represents one year. The overall modeling framework begins with defining an urban change policy 133 or policies that constrain the model simulation (b). These policies could be unrelated to the extreme 134 event, for example to increase tourism, or could be specific to hazard mitigation, for example to 135 incentivize building retrofits. The model is then initiated with a population and housing unit 136 allocation (c), followed by simulating population growth (d). A land market is simulated (e) which 137 updates the community description (f). This process repeats until the hazard event is triggered, at 138 139 which the community description (f) is passed to IN-CORE. IN-CORE maps spatially explicit hazard intensity measures (g) to the built environment using damage models (h). This results in 140 damages to physical infrastructure (i). This process is then repeated for a user-defined number of 141 142 iterations. The remainder of this section provides more detail of the coupled model. Additional model documentation and the source code is provided through the data availability statement. 143



Figure 2: Flowchart of the coupled urban change (grey dash-dot box on left) and hazard
 consequence model (blue dash-dot box on right).

147 2.1 Urban Change Policies

A policy, or combination of policies, is first identified shown as *b* in Figure 2. These could include both policies unrelated to hazard mitigation or those that aim to reduce the damages and losses following natural hazards. Many forms of natural hazard mitigation policies exist. In general, these can be classified as modifying the hazard, modifying the building inventory, modifying building structural properties, or decreasing social and economic losses (S. French, personal communication, February 16, 2022).

Modifying the hazard includes implementing both grey and green engineered solutions to reduce the intensity of natural hazards (Feagin *et al.*, 2015; Saleh and Weinstein, 2016). Modifying the hazard can be costly and requires community buy in. In addition, this may result in the "safedevelopment paradox" in which individuals feel more protected behind engineered structures,

leading to increased exposure if the structural protection were to fail (Haer *et al.*, 2020).

159 Modifying the building inventory includes various urban planning measures such as zoning,

acquisition of damaged buildings for repeating hazards, and managed retreat (Han *et al.*, 2020; Hurlimann *et al.*, 2021). Often a charged topic, managed retreat could disrupt the fabric and

162 cohesive structures of communities (Hino *et al.*, 2017).

Modifying building structural properties includes building codes for new development, and
 structural retrofits or elevation of flood-prone structures for existing development (Haer *et al.*,
 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2021). This can often be difficult to finance and unattainable for low-income
 groups.

167 *Decreasing social and economic consequences* includes hazard insurance mechanisms and 168 recovery financing (Dubbelboer *et al.*, 2017; Costa *et al.*, 2020; Alisjahbana *et al.*, 2021). While 169 these policies could be implemented pre-disaster, actions are often taken as post-disaster 170 responses.

171 Of these policy classes, this paper focuses on *modifying the building inventory* and *modifying*

building structural properties. Note that these policies focus on buildings; however additional

policies could be applied to different aspects of the built environment.

174 2.2 Agent-based modeling of urban land use change

The grey left-most box of Figure 2 is an agent-based model (ABM) of urban change developed in 175 this paper. ABMs have been identified as a "boundary-object" for interdisciplinary disaster 176 research as they can seamlessly integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines (Reilley et al., 177 178 2021). As such, an ABM is adopted here to both simulate urban change and couple the hazard consequence model. The ABM is written in Julia using Agents. jl (Datseris et al., 2022). Each time 179 step in the model represents one year. The urban change model is initiated with a population and 180 housing unit allocation to infer the initial land use, types of agents, and number of people in each 181 parcel (c in Figure 2). Population projections are employed as input to the model and is updated at 182 each annual time step (d in Figure 2). Agents are added to the general model space -i.e., not yet 183 in a parcel – and will be competing in the land market. If at the end of an iteration, the total number 184 of people exceeds the population projection, agents are randomly removed from the model 185 representing out-migration. 186

To drive land use changes in the model, a land market is simulated (e in Figure 2). This is an 187 original model developed herein following the ALMA (Filatova et al., 2009) and ALMA-C 188 (Filatova et al., 2011) models with two notable changes. First, the ALMA and ALMA-C models 189 190 consider two agents (buyers, sellers) and two land uses (vacant, urban). The present work expands on this by considering six agents and six land uses. This is an important addition to account for (1) 191 192 full time resident and visitor populations, and (2) different types of development including single family homes, rental properties, and high occupancy development. Second, the model developed 193 here considers changes to the structural properties of buildings. This is an important feature of the 194 195 model because it allows for coupling to the hazard consequence model.

196 2.2.1 Agent types and relations to land uses

197 The six agents and land uses are shown in Figure 3. Arrows indicate that an agent can occupy a

parcel, whereas the colors indicate an agent owns a parcel. Agents that own parcels can structurally

retrofit the building on their property. The six land uses include (a) Unoccupied, (b) Owned Residential, (c) Rental Residential, (d) Low Occupancy Seasonal Rental, (e) High Occupancy

200 Residential, (c) Rental Residential, (d) Low Occupancy Seasonal Rental, (e) High Occupancy 201 Residential, and (f) High Occupancy Seasonal Rental. The six agent types are as follows.





203

Figure 3: Agents and land uses in the urban growth and change model.

204 Unoccupied Owner agents are associated with unoccupied parcels and act as "sellers" in the model.

As other agents bid on their parcel, they review the bids selecting the maximum if it exceeds their willingness to accept price.

207 Household agents are associated with full-time residents. They either reside in a parcel or are searching for a place to live. They can own an "owned residential" property (*i.e.*, a single-family 208 home), reside in a rental residential (*i.e.*, a rental home) or reside in a high occupancy residential 209 property (*i.e.*, an apartment/condo). The number of people associated with newly added household 210 agents are randomly drawn from a gamma distribution and rounded to the nearest integer. A single 211 age is randomly assigned to represent the head of the household following a gamma distribution 212 213 and increases at each time step. Once the head of the household turns 80 years old, the agent is removed, and their place of residence becomes vacant. A household will randomly gain or lose 214 one person following a Poisson process. 215

Landlord agents own parcels and rent them to household agents as "rental residential" or to visitor agents as "low occupancy seasonal rentals" (*i.e.*, vacation homes) (Vinogradov *et al.*, 2020). At any point in the simulation, landlord agents can choose to switch between these two land uses

based on a net utility gain. Like household agents, landlord agents are removed from the model

220 when they turn 80 and their property becomes vacant.

221 Firm agents purchase properties for development as either "high occupancy residential" (i.e.,

apartments) or "high occupancy seasonal rental" (*i.e.*, hotels). Firm agents cannot switch between

these land uses during the simulation. After a parcel is developed into one of these land uses, it

remains as such for the remainder of the simulation. Firm agents do not age and are not removed

from the model at any point.

226 Visitor agents represent a transient seasonal visitor and temporarily reside in either "low occupancy

seasonal rental" (*i.e.*, vacation homes) or "high occupancy seasonal rental" properties (*i.e.*, hotels).

The number of people associated with a visitor agent is sampled from a gamma distribution. At

- the start of each annual time step, all visitors in the model are removed and new visitor agents are reassigned to vacant low occupancy or high occupancy seasonal rental parcels on a first-come,
- 250 reassigned to vacant low occupancy of high occupancy seasonal rental parcels on a mist-conce

231 first-served basis that maximizes their utility.

The *Real estate* agent sets the market value of every parcel throughout the simulation. This market value is used to inform both the unoccupied owner agents' willingness to accept price and the cost of structural retrofits. The market value of a parcel is based on a user-defined base price of land,

the maximum expected utility that either household or visitor agents will get from the parcel, and

- the overall demand for parcels.
- 237 Gamma distributions are used to sample agent age and number of people in the household because

they are right-skewed and the support is positive. A Poisson distribution, similarly right-skewed,

could alternatively be used to model the number of people in each household (Jarosz, 2021). A

Poisson process is used to model the household change rates as they are commonly used to model the occurrence of events. It is assumed that each high occupancy residential parcel can hold up to

the occurrence of events. It is assumed that each high occupancy residential parcel can hold up to 242 20 household agents, and each high occupancy seasonal rental parcel can hold up to 45 visitor

agents. These values and distributions can be modified based on study area. The owned residential,

- rental residential, and low occupancy seasonal rental properties each have space for 1 occupying
- 245 agent.

246 2.2.2 Agent bidding and changing land uses

Agents compete in the land market attempting to maximize their utility gained from a parcel. The land market is similar to that of the ALMA model; however, different land uses and agents are considered here. All utilities are computed using a Cobb-Douglas utility function, commonly used in urban economics (Huang *et al.*, 2014), and given by:

$$U = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_i^{\alpha_i} \tag{1}$$

where P_i is a normalized value (0-100) representing either proximity to a particular feature or 251 market pressure, α_i weights the importance of this feature to the agent representing a preference, 252 and n are the number of features considered. Spatial features can include the coast, community 253 assets, and the central business district. The preference weights, α_i , for each agent are uncorrelated, 254 sampled from a normal distribution, and rescaled such that they sum to 1. Proximity is computed 255 using a scaled distance decay function, $P_{dist} = 100 \cdot e^{-dk}$, with d being distance to the feature 256 and k being a tunable parameter. Market pressure is based on the number of buyers and sellers, 257 $P_{mkt} = 100 \cdot (0.5 \cdot \epsilon + 0.5)$ where ϵ , as in the ALMA model, is computed as $\epsilon = (NB - 1)^{-1}$ 258 NS)/(NB + NS), with NB number of buyers and NS number of sellers. 259

Agents competing in the land market compute their willingness to pay (WTP) for the parcel that maximizes their utility. Here, the WTP is modified to account for structural retrofits as:

$$WTP = \frac{Y \cdot U^2}{b^2 \cdot U^2} (1 + \epsilon) - \rho \cdot m \tag{2}$$

where *Y* is the agent budget sampled from a normal distribution, *U* is the utility of the parcel, *b* represents costs of other goods. The final two terms of equation (2) were not in the ALMA model and were added to account for the additional costs an agent would incur if retrofits were mandatory. Here, ρ is a constant between 0 and 1 parameterized on the transition between structural-code levels, *e.g.*, $\rho = 0.6$ for a building being retrofit to moderate-seismic code. The market value of the parcel as provided by the real estate agent is represented as *m*.

268 2.3 Damage and loss modeling

The urban change model simulates annual time steps updating the community description until the 269 time of the hazard event. For this paper, the timing of the event is defined as a specified year in 270 the future, rather than treating the occurrence as random. At the time of the hazard, the community 271 272 description (f in Figure 2) – including structural properties and number of people – is passed to IN-CORE. Initial damages to the built environment are computed using the community 273 description, hazard models, and damage models. Hazard models (g in Figure 2) are spatially 274 explicit representations of hazard intensity measures. Damage models (h in Figure 2) map the 275 hazard intensity measures to infrastructural damage. Fragility curves are used here as the damage 276 model to determine the probability that each building exceeds a damage state for a given hazard 277 intensity measure. Figure 4 shows an example of structural seismic fragility curves for light-frame 278 wood buildings and four seismic-code levels (pre-, low-, moderate-, and high-code) (FEMA, 2020; 279 280 FEMA 2021b). The probability of being in a discrete damage state given a hazard intensity is the difference between fragility curves. This is shown in Figure 4 with the text "None/Insignificant", 281 "Moderate", "Heavy", and "Complete". In the case of multiple hazards, cumulative building 282 damage is computed (FEMA, 2020; FEMA 2021b). Using the fragility curves, the expected 283 damage to a building can be determined (*i* in Figure 2). 284

285



286

Figure 4: Example structural fragility curves for W1 structures (wood light frame) and four seismic-code levels (pre-, low-, moderate-, and high-code). Fragility curves are shown for

moderate (blue), heavy (purple), and complete (yellow) damage. The probability of being in a
 discrete damage state given a hazard intensity is the difference between fragility curves.

291 3 Case Study

292 3.1 Seaside, Oregon

293 The city of Seaside, Oregon, is utilized to demonstrate the coupled urban change and hazard consequence model. Seaside - shown in Figure 5 - is a small coastal community in the North 294 American Pacific Northwest, with a population of 7,115 people (US Census Bureau, 2022). 295 Seaside, along with many coastal communities in this region, are under threat of a rupture of the 296 Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ). The CSZ is an approximately 1,000 km long subduction fault 297 that extends between Cape Mendocino, California and Vancouver Island, Canada. Evidence 298 suggests that the last full rupture of the CSZ occurred in 1700 and is estimated to have had a 299 moment magnitude between 8.7 and 9.2. Some studies have estimated a 7% to 11% chance that a 300 full-margin rupture will occur between 2010 and 2060 (Goldfinger et al. 2012). Additionally, an 301 M9 scenario serves as the basis for the Oregon Resilience Plan (OSSPAC, 2013). 302

The economy of Seaside is tourist-oriented with large seasonal fluctuations in visitors (Raskin and 303 Wang, 2017), making this an interesting case study for other coastal towns with large tourist 304 populations. The Seaside building inventory used in this work was developed from a combination 305 of 2012 tax assessor data, Google Street view, and a field survey (Park et al., 2017). Initial parcel 306 population estimates are generated from a housing unit allocation algorithm that uses 2010 US 307 Census data (Rosenheim et al., 2019). Seaside has been used in previous studies to evaluate multi-308 hazard risks (Park et al., 2019; Sanderson et al., 2021b), and infrastructure resilience (Kameshwar 309 et al., 2019; Sanderson et al., 2021a). The Seaside testbed inventory for the built environment and 310 hazard layers is publicly available (Cox et al., 2022). A detailed description of the built 311 environment allows for an analysis at the parcel-scale rather than more aggregate levels. 312





Figure 5: Case study location of Seaside, Oregon showing parcels (black dots), community
 assets, and central business district (shaded central yellow region near the coast)

The population projections for both full time residents (FTR) and visitors (VIS) are shown in 316 Figure 6. The full-time resident population is shown as both historic (Moffatt, 1996) and future 317 projections (Portland State University Population Research Center, 2020). We assume the model 318 starts in 2010 as the building inventory is from 2012 and the housing unit allocation uses 2010 US 319 320 Census data. No historic visitor population data was readily available; however, recent estimates were obtained from a combination of data from the Hatfield Marine Science Center, data from 321 Oregon State Parks, and an Oregon visitor report (Dean Runyan Associates, 2021). It is assumed 322 that the visitor population represents the peak summer nighttime population (i.e., all visitors are 323 located in either hotels or vacation homes). A linear growth in the visitor population to 12,000 by 324 2065 is assumed in alignment with the full-time resident population growth. 325



Figure 6: Historic population data and future population projections for Seaside for full-time
 residents (FTR) and visitors (VIS).

329 3.2 Planning and Building Code Scenarios

Ten scenarios, shown in Table 2, are considered as policy options, and are organized into four scenario clusters: (S0) status quo, (S1) planning, (S2) building codes, and (S3) a combination of planning and building codes. Scenario clusters S1-S3 each have three scenarios labeled a-c.

333

Table 2: Planning and building code scenarios											
Scenario Cluster	Scenario Abbreviation	Cap on LOSR	Relocate Community Assets	No new high occupancy development	Owned Res.	Rental Res.	LOSR				
Status Quo	S0	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Planning	S1a	500	-	-	-	-	-				
	S1b	-	East of Nec.	-	-	-	-				
	S1c	-	-	HOR & HOSR	-	-	-				
Duilding	S2a	-	-	-	Low	Low	Low				
Building	S2b	-	-	-	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate				
Codes	S2c	-	-	-	High	High	High				
Planning	S3a	-	East of Nec.	-	-	-	High				
&	S3b	-	-	HOR & HOSR	-	Moderate	Moderate				
Building Codes	S3c			HOSR			High				

LOSR: Low occupancy seasonal rental; **Nec**: Necanicum River; **HOR**: High occupancy residential; **HOSR**: high occupancy seasonal rental. Note all new high-occupancy development must be up to high-seismic code

334

335 Scenario cluster S1 corresponds to planning decisions. Scenario S1a places a cap on the number 336 of low occupancy seasonal rental properties. While not a hazard mitigation plan, many 337 communities with large visitor populations consider this to provide housing for full-time residents

338 (Vinogradov *et al.*, 2020). Scenario S1b relocates community assets that are west of the Necanicum

River to the east side, further from the ocean and in areas with lower tsunami inundation. Scenario

S1c restricts new high occupancy development for both high occupancy residential and seasonal rental properties.

Scenario cluster S2 corresponds to building code requirements. Scenarios S2a, S2b, and S2c 342 requires any change of hands to be up to low-, moderate-, and high-seismic codes respectively. 343 Seismic retrofit standards for existing buildings allow performance objectives to be less than that 344 of new buildings (ASCE, 2014). Herein we assume that policies involving low and moderate-345 seismic code requirements (scenarios S2a and S2b) translate to these lower performance 346 objectives, whereas the high-code requirement (scenario S2c) translates to the same performance 347 objective as new buildings. All high occupancy buildings must conform to high-seismic code, and 348 this does not differ across scenarios. 349

Scenario cluster S3 corresponds to both planning decisions and building code requirements. 350 Scenarios considered here are intended to be complimentary. Scenario S3a consists of relocating 351 community assets east of the Necanicum River in addition to enforcing any new low occupancy 352 seasonal rental property conform to high-seismic code. S3b consists of no new high occupancy 353 development while simultaneously enforcing that new rental residential and low occupancy 354 seasonal rental properties conform to moderate-seismic code. Lastly, scenario S3c consists of no 355 new high occupancy seasonal rental properties while enforcing that new low occupancy seasonal 356 rental properties conform to high-seismic code. 357

358 *3.3 Urban growth and change results*

359 The model was run for the 10 scenarios in Table 2 with a 500-yr CSZ occurring at year 30. Each scenario was repeated 50 times with uncertainty propagated through the initial housing unit 360 allocation, agent attributes, and ordering of agent scheduling. Figure 7 shows the evolution of the 361 urban landscape for a portion of the city located on the coast and south of the CBD shown in Figure 362 5. The model considered all of Seaside; however, only a portion of the city is shown for clarity. 363 The urban landscape at both the initial time step, assumed to be 2010, and at year 30 are shown in 364 Figure 7 for both rental residential (top row) and low occupancy seasonal rental parcels (bottom 365 row). The results of 3 scenarios from Table 2 are shown: (S0) status quo, (S1a) cap on low 366 occupancy seasonal rental, and (S2a) all change of hands must conform to low seismic code. Rental 367 residential and low occupancy seasonal rental land uses are shown here as they are both owned by 368 landlord agents. The remaining land uses also evolve and are not shown for brevity. Each parcel 369 is shaded according to the probability that the parcel is in the respective land use. The average 370 number of full-time residents (FTR) and visitors (VIS) located in each land use for all of Seaside 371 372 are shown in the bottom left corner of each panel in Figure 7.

Figure 7 shows the impact that policy has on both the urban landscape and number of people. For example, a cap on the number of low occupancy seasonal rental properties (S1a) naturally results in a significantly lower number of visitors in those parcels (2,194 VIS) compared to status quo (3,617 VIS). This also increases the availability of housing for full time residents in rental

residential properties (2,510 FTR) compared to status quo (1,867 FTR).

378 The number of full-time residents in rental residential properties decreases for all scenarios at year

379 30 compared to at year 0. It is more advantageous for landlords to rent their properties as low 380 occupancy seasonal rental units to visitor agents than it is to rent them to full time residents. The

remainder of the visitor residents and full-time residents are in the other land uses.



382

Figure 7: Probability of parcels having different land uses (rows) for the initial time step (first column) and at year 30 for S0 (second column), S1a (third column), and S2a (fourth column).
 The average number of full-time residents (FTR) and visitors (VIS) in the respective land use are shown in the lower left corner of each plot.

Figure 8 shows time series of the number of people in each land use under the same three scenarios 387 (S0, S1a, S2a). Uncertainty in the model is shown via the shaded region as plus/minus one standard 388 deviation. The implications of scenario S1a are clearly shown in Figure 8c by the decrease in 389 number of visitors in low occupancy seasonal rental properties compared to the other scenarios. 390 Interestingly, this policy simultaneously increases the number of visitors in high occupancy 391 seasonal rental properties (Figure 8e) as there is a new unmet demand for visitors. As expected, 392 this scenario frees up housing for full-time residents as the landlord agents transition to renting 393 properties as rental residential (Figure 8b). 394

Scenario S2a results in more full-time residents in high occupancy residential properties compared to the other scenarios (Figure 8d). This is due to the cost of retrofitting, where full time residents are not able to afford as many single-family homes (Figure 8a). The firms then fill in this unmet demand for full time resident housing.



400 Figure 8: Average number of people (plus/minus one standard deviation) in each land use for:
401 (a) owned residential, (b) rental residential, (c) low occupancy seasonal rental, (d) high
402 occupancy residential, and (e) high occupancy seasonal rental.

403 3.4 Damage and loss results

To illustrate the urban change coupling with IN-CORE, Figure 9 spatially shows the damages to 404 the built environment and number of people in each parcel. These results are for a 500-vr CSZ 405 occurring at year 30. The parcels are color coded according to their expected damage state ranging 406 between insignificant and complete. The size of each parcel corresponds to the number of people 407 in that parcel for both visitors (top row) and full-time residents (bottom row). The two columns 408 correspond to scenarios S0 and S1a. It assumed that this population represents the nighttime 409 population in Seaside for summer months when the visitor population is high and when people are 410 located in their places of residence. The larger circles in Figure 9 indicate high occupancy 411 structures in which large concentrations of people are located. An emerging cluster of high 412 occupancy seasonal rental properties can be seen to the north and on the waterfront in Figure 9b 413 that is not present in 9a. As previously discussed, these high occupancy seasonal rental properties 414 fill the unmet demand for visitors if a cap on low occupancy seasonal rentals is put in place. Not 415 only is there a large concentration of visitors in concrete structures, but these are also located near 416 to the coast and in the tsunami inundation zone. This would have implications for a potential 417 increase in life safety risk depending on the type of evacuation actions taken by individuals (Wang 418 et al., 2016, Mostafizi et al., 2019). 419



Figure 9: Single iteration showing expected damage due to 500-yr CSZ and number of people in
each parcel for: (a) scenario S0 and visitor population, (b) scenario S1a and visitor population,
(c) scenario S0 and full-time resident population, and (d) scenario S1a and full-time resident
population. *CBD* is the Central Business District

Figure 10 shows the number of people relative to status quo in parcels with a damage state greater than moderate for all nine planning scenarios (S1a-S3c). This figure especially demonstrates how this modelling approach can be used to explore the emergent behavior of planning policies. Both the number of full-time residents (panel a) and visitors (panel b) are shown in Figure 10. The cap on the number of low occupancy seasonal rentals (S1a) results in significantly more visitors in damaged buildings relative to status quo. While S1a is not a hazard mitigation policy, it could have

- unintentional negative consequences if the CSZ were to occur during summer months when thereare large visitor populations.
- 433 Scenarios S2b and S2c requires all change of hands to retrofit to moderate and high seismic codes
- respectively. These scenarios appear to reduce the number of people in damaged buildings more
- than any other policy. However, while not shown here, these scenarios also result in the largest
- 436 number of unoccupied parcels indicating that the cost of retrofitting is prohibitive for many agents.
- 437 Scenarios in cluster S3 are a combination of planning and building code requirements. Figure 10b
- shows that these scenarios result in a significant decrease in the number of visitors in damaged
- buildings. While not shown, these scenarios also result in less unoccupied parcels than status quo
- 440 conditions. This indicates that effective mitigation planning could consider some combination of
- 441 policies.



Figure 10: Average number of people in parcels with a damage state greater than moderate
 relative to status quo conditions for: (a) full time residents, and (b) visitors. Error bar shows
 plus/minus one standard deviation

To understand the temporal aspects of the CSZ occurring at any time, rather than only year 30 as 446 assumed in the previous analysis, the model was rerun for three scenarios (S0, S1a, S2a) with the 447 CSZ occurring at 5-year intervals, beginning in year 0 and ending at year 30. Figure 11 shows that 448 the policies start to diverge beyond year 10 in the model, highlighting that the effects of many 449 policies may take time to fully realize their implications. Further, as hazard mitigation policies aim 450 to reduce the number of people impacted by disasters, Figure 11 highlights how this objective 451 competes with population growth. While scenario S2a (low seismic code requirements) results in 452 less people being in damaged parcels relative to scenario S0 (status quo), there are still more people 453 in damaged parcels at year 30 than year 0. Uncertainty represented as plus/minus one standard 454 deviation in Figure 11 does not overlap at the later time steps indicating that even with uncertainty 455 there are significant deviations in policy implications. 456



Figure 11: Number of full-time residents and visitors in parcels with a damage state greater than moderate if CSZ with 500-yr recurrence interval were to occur at varying time steps in model

460 **4 Discussion**

Community resilience planning for natural hazards involves many interacting entities as disasters 461 occur at the interface of the built-natural-social environments (Mileti, 1999; Peek and Guikema, 462 2021). Many simulation efforts consider static representations of the built-natural-social 463 environments despite their dynamic and complex nature. The model presented in this paper 464 attempts to capture this dynamic interplay by considering population growth, a changing built 465 environment, and policy choices. This model also situates the simulation of acute hazards within 466 appropriate temporal settings given that these events do not occur immediately, as many simulation 467 efforts assume, but at some point in the future. 468

- 469 The model can be extended and applied to other hazards, infrastructure systems, and communities.
- 470 For example, many coastal communities are exposed to sea-level rise and hurricanes that also
- necessitate a future-oriented lens of the built-natural-human environments. Further, urbanization
- does not apply only to new buildings, but also to other infrastructure systems such as electric
- 473 power, transportation, and water systems.
- In addition to extending this model to other hazards and infrastructure systems, insights from the 474 Seaside testbed can be applied to other communities. Many coastal communities have large tourist 475 populations and this work showed that placing a cap on the number of vacation homes results in 476 477 more visitors in damaged buildings compared to status quo scenarios. This was caused by high occupancy seasonal rental properties (i.e., hotels) filling in a newly created unmet demand for 478 visitors. These high occupancy structures are concrete and typically located in the inundation zone. 479 This combination of factors could have negative implications for increases in life safety risk. In 480 particular, this result highlights that coastal communities considering this policy and subject to 481 rapid onset hazards - such as earthquakes and tsunamis - should have alternative plans in place for 482
- 483 visitors. This could include well marked evacuation routes or vertical evacuation structures.

484 This work also highlighted that the most effective policies were those that considered elements of

both urban planning and enforced building codes on new development. This indicates that there is

486 no one-size-fits all solution to natural hazard mitigation planning, but rather policies should be

tailored for specific communities and population groups. Through iterative processes, this type of modeling can be used to identify nuanced policies that may not be easy to initially imagine but do

489 incorporate many different elements.

Given their complexities and many interacting entities, prediction of urban systems into the future is notoriously difficult. As such, the value of this modeling framework is not to predict the land use of individual parcels, but rather to provide insight into the collective behavior and emerging risks associated with planning policies. Similar efforts considering hazard exposure have involved stakeholder engagement (Mills *et al.*, 2018). This type of modeling with stakeholder engagement can seed rich discussions and be used to inform policy choices.

There are two interesting avenues for future work. First, this model could be coupled with a model 496 497 of earthquake-tsunami life safety. As shown, some policies may put more visitors in damaged buildings that are located in the inundation zone. By coupling a life safety model, we could explore 498 how policy choices impact life safety risk. This work could also include temporal fluctuations in 499 visitor and full-time resident populations including day-night, weekday-weekend, and summer-500 winter. Second, this model uses existing fragility curves at various seismic-code levels. Advances 501 in structural engineering may lead to buildings that are more resistant to hazard damages. 502 Likewise, infrastructure ages and deteriorates over time, which was not accounted for here. Both 503 504 of these could lead to temporal modifications in the fragility curves that are associated with buildings. 505

506 5 Conclusions

507 This paper presented a coupled urban change and hazard consequence model for evaluating 508 community resilience under a future-oriented lens. Urban change was modeled via simulation of 509 a land market whereas immediate post-disaster building damage was simulated using the 510 opensource software IN-CORE. The coupled model was applied to Seaside, Oregon, located in the 511 North American Pacific Northwest considering seismic-tsunami hazards associated with the 512 Cascadia Subduction Zone. By applying the coupled urban change and hazard consequence model, 513 the following conclusions can be made:

 Policies can result in unintended negative outcomes for different population groups: It was shown that by placing a cap on the number of low occupancy seasonal rental properties in a community, more visitors were in damaged buildings compared to status quo conditions (Figure 10). As expected, this policy does free up more housing for full-time residents; however, this also highlights that additional hazard mitigation plans should be put in place if coastal communities pursue this option in areas that are subject to rapid onset disasters.

Mandatory seismic retrofits do not reduce the number of people in damaged buildings
 when considering population growth: Three scenarios were considered in which the CSZ
 was simulated at five-year intervals out to 30-years (status quo, a cap on vacation homes,
 and mandatory seismic retrofits). While the seismic retrofits can reduce the negative
 consequences of the CSZ relative to a status quo conditions, this scenario still resulted in
 an increase of total number of people impacted relative to present day conditions (Figure

526 11). This highlights the challenges of mitigation planning in areas with growing 527 populations and that more transformative adaptation may be necessary.

- 3. Policies take time to be fully realized: By considering the CSZ occurring at 5-year intervals
 from year 0 to year 30, it was shown that the three policies diverge only after year 10 in
 the simulation (Figure 11). This indicates that many policies take time to fully realize their
 implications and highlights the urgency of mitigation planning in areas subject to disasters.
- 4. The most effective policies were those that incorporated elements of both urban planning 532 and mandatory building codes: It was shown that only enforcing building codes may 533 reduce the number of people in damage buildings; however, this also results in a significant 534 number of unoccupied parcels at the end of the model run. This indicates that this is not 535 attainable for many agents and could be cost prohibitive. More effective strategies that 536 reduced the number of people in damaged buildings considered some combination of both 537 enforced building codes and urban planning (Figure 10). Communities should tailor their 538 resilience planning with no one-size-fits-all solution available. 539

540 Many resilience studies consider historic or static representations of the built-natural-social 541 environments despite their dynamic and complex nature. The coupled urban change and hazard 542 consequence model presented in this paper provides an avenue towards planning for hazards in an 543 uncertain future. Given urbanization, population growth, policy choices, and a changing climate, 544 more research should be conducted to account for the complexities that arise at the interface and 545 future of the built-natural-social environments.

546

547 Acknowledgments

548 We acknowledge Peter Ruggiero, John Bolte, Jenna Tilt, and Steven Dundas of the Oregon Coastal

549 Futures research group for their feedback on early model development, and Steven French at the

550 Georgia Institute of Technology for his contributions to the natural hazard mitigation plans and

identification of four classes of hazard planning.

We acknowledge funding in part through Oregon Sea Grant under award no. NA18OAR170072 552 553 (CDFA no. 11.417) from NOAA's National Sea Grant College Program, US Department of Commerce, and by appropriations made by the Oregon State Legislature; the cooperative 554 agreement 70NANB15H044 between the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 555 and Colorado State University through a subaward to Oregon State University; and the National 556 Science Foundation through award NSF-2103713. The content expressed in this paper are the 557 views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions or views of the U.S Department 558 of Commerce, NIST, or NSF. 559

560

561 Data Availability Statement

The model used in this paper was written in Julia and python. The model source code and additional documentation contained in a Jupyter Book are available at Sanderson (2022). The

564 Seaside testbed data inventory is available on DesignSafe.org at Cox et al. (2022).

565 **References**

- Alisjahbana, I., Moura-Cook, A., Costa, R., and Kiremidjian, A. (2021). An agent-based financing model
 for post-earthquake housing recovery: Quantifying recovery inequities across income groups.
 Earthquake Spectra, 38(2),1254-1282. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/87552930211064319</u>
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) (2014). Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings
 ASCE Standard ASCE/SEI 41-13. Reston, VA: American Society of Civil Engineers.
 https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784412855
- 572Berry, M., Hazen, B., MacIntyre, R., and Flamm, R., (1996). LUCAS: A system for modeling land-use573change. IEEE Computational Science and Engineering, 3(1), 24-35.574https://doi.org/10.1109/99.486758
- Bilskie, M., Angel, D., Yoskowitz, D., and Hagen, S. (2022). Future Flood Risk Exacerbated by the
 Dynamic Impacts of Sea Level Rise Along the Northern Gulf of Mexico. *Earth's Future*, 10(4).
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002414
- 578Bolte, J., Hulse, D., Gregory, S., and Smith, C. (2007). Modeling biocomplexity actors, landscapes, and579alternative futures. Environmental Modelling & Software, 22, 570-579.580https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2005.12.033
- Brown, D., and Robinson, D. (2006). Effects of Heterogeneity in Residential Preferences on an Agent Based Model of Urban Sprawl. *Ecology and Society*, 11(1). <u>https://www.jstor.org/stable/26267798</u>
- Calderón, A., and Silva, V. (2021). Exposure forecasting for seismic risk estimation: Application to Costa
 Rica. *Earthquake Spectra*, 37(3), 1806-1826. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/8755293021989333</u>
- Chang, S., Yip, J., and Tse, W. (2019). Effects of urban development on future multi-hazard risk: the case
 of Vancouver, Canada. *Natural Hazards*, 98, 251-265. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3510-x</u>
- Chaudhuri, G., and Clarke, K. (2013). The SLEUTH Land Use Change Model: A Review. *The International Journal of Environmental Resources Research*, 1(1), 88-104. <u>https://doi.org/10.22069/ijerr.2013.1688</u>
- Chester, M., Underwood, S., Allenby, B., Garcia, M., Samaras, C., Markolf, S., Sanders, K., Preston, B.,
 and Miller, T. (2021). Infrastructure resilience to navigate increasingly uncertain and complex
 conditions in the Anthropocene. *npj Urban Sustainability*, 1(4). <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-021-</u>
 <u>00016-y</u>
- Costa, R., Haukaas, T., and Chang, S. (2020). "Agent-based model for post-earthquake housing recovery".
 Earthq Spectra, 37(1), 46-72. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/8755293020944175</u>
- Cox, D., Barbosa, A., Alam, M., Amini, M., Kameshwar, S., Park, H., and Sanderson, D. (2022) [Dataset].
 Seaside Testbed Data Inventory for Infrastructure, Population, and Earthquake-Tsunami Hazard.
 DesignSafe-CI. <u>https://doi.org/10.17603/ds2-sp99-xv89</u>
- Cremen, G., Galasso, C., and McCloskey, J. (2021). A simulation-based framework for Earthquake Risk Informed and People-Centered Decision Making on Future Urban Planning. *Earth's Future*, 10.
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002388

- Cremen, G., Galasso, C., and McCloskey, J. (2022). Modelling and quantifying tomorrow's risks from
 natural hazards. Science of the Total Environment, 817.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152552
- 604Datseris, G., Vahdati, A., and DuBois, T. (2022). Agents.jl: a performant and feature-full agent-based605modelingsoftwareofminimalcodecomplexity.Simulation.606https://doi.org/10.1177/00375497211068820
- 607Dean Runyan Associates (2021). The Economic Impact of Travel in Oregon [PowerPoint Slides]. Travel608Oregon. (Accessed June 20, 2022)609content/uploads/2021/05/OR 2020 Final.pdf
- Deierlein, G., Govindjee, S., and McKenna, F. (2021). Overview of SimCenter Goals and Computational
 Tools. In Deierlein, G., and Zsarnóczay (Ed.), *State of the Art in Computation Simulation for Natural Hazard Engineering (2nd Edition, 1-9), Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4558106*
- Dubbelboer, J., Nikolic, I., Jenkins, K., and Hall, J. (2017). An agent-based model of flood risk and
 insurance. Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, 20(1).
 https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.3135
- Feagin, R., Figlus, J., Zinnert, J., Sigren, J., Martínez, M., Silva, R., Smith, W., Cox, D., Young, D., and
 Carter, G. (2015). Going with the flow or against the grain? The promise of vegetation for protecting
 beaches, dunes, and barrier islands from erosion. *Frontiers Ecological Environment*, 13(4), 203-210.
 https://doi.org/10.1890/140218
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (2020). *Hazus Earthquake Model Technical Manual: Hazus 4.2 Service Pack 3*. Washington, DC, FEMA. (Accessed June 22, 2022).
 <u>https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-10/fema_hazus_earthquake_technical_manual_4-</u>
 2.pdf
- 624 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (2021a). Hazus Inventory Technical Manual: Hazus 4.2 22, 625 Service Pack 3. Washington, DC, FEMA. (Accessed June 2022). https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema hazus-inventory-technical-manual-626 4.2.3.pdf 627
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (2021b). *Hazus Tsunami Model Technical Manual: Hazus 4.2 Service Pack 3*. Washington, DC, FEMA. (Accessed June 22, 2022).
 <u>https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fema_hazus-tsunami-technical-manual-</u>
 <u>4.2.3.pdf</u>
- Filatova, T., Parker, D., and van der Veen, A. (2009). Agent-based urban land markets: Agent's pricing
 behavior, land prices, and urban land use change. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*,
 12(13). <u>http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/12/1/3.html</u>
- Filatova, T., Voinov, A., and van der Veen, A. (2011). Land market mechanisms for preservation of space
 for coastal ecosystems: An agent-based analysis. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 26, 179 <u>190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.08.001</u>
- Filatova, T. (2015). Empirical agent-based land market: Integrating adaptive economic behavior in urban
 land-use models. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems,* 54, 397-413.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2014.06.007

- French, S. (2012). Modeling Nonstructural Damage for Metropolitan Building Stocks. Proceedings of the
 15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Galasso, C., McCloskey, J., Pelling, M., Hope, M., Bean, C., Cremen, G., Guragain, R., Hancilar, U.,
 Menoscal, J., Mwang'a, K., Phillips, J., Rush, D., and Sinclair, H. (2021). Risk-based, pro-poor urban
 design and planning for tomorrow's cities. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 58.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102158
- Goldfinger, C., Nelson, H., Morey, A., Johnson, J., Patton, J., Karabanov, E., Gutiérrez-Pastor, J., Eriksson,
 A., Gràcia, E., Dunhill, G., Enkin, R., Dallimore, A., and Vallier, T. (2012). Turbidite Event History
 Methods and Implications for Holocene Paleoseismicity of the Cascadia Subduction Zone. US *Geological Survey Professional Paper* 1661-F. 170p. https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/pp1661F
- Haer, T., Botzen, W., and Aerts, J. (2019). Advancing disaster policies by integrating dynamic adaptive
 behaviour in risk assessments using an agent-based modeling approach. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab0770
- Haer, T., Husby, T., Botzen, W., and Aerts, J. (2020). The safe development paradox: An agent-based
 model for flood risk under climate change in the European Union. *Global Environmental Change*, 60.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.102009
- Han, Y., Ash, K., Mao, L., and Peng, Z. (2020). An agent-based model for community flood adaptation
 under uncertain sea-level rise. *Climatic Change*, 162, 2257-2276. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02802-6</u>
- Hemmati, M., Ellingwood, B., and Mahmoud, H. (2020). The role of urban growth in resilience of
 communities under flood risk. *Earth's Future*, 8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001382</u>
- Hemmati, M., Mahmoud, H., Ellingwood, B., and Crooks, A. (2021a). Shaping urbanization to achieve
 communities resilient to floods. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16. <u>https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-</u>
 <u>9326/ac1e3c</u>
- Hemmati, M., Mahmoud, H., Ellingwood, B., and Crooks, A. (2021b). Unraveling the complexity of human
 behavior and urbanization on community vulnerability to floods. *Nature Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 1 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-99587-0</u>
- Hino, M., Field, C., and Mach, K. (2017). Managed retreat as a response to natural hazard risk. *Nature Climate Change*, 7, 364-371. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/NCLIMATE3252</u>
- Huang, Q., Parker, D., Filatova, T., and Sun, S. (2014). A review of urban residential choice models using
 agent-based modeling. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 14, 661-689.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1068/b120043p</u>
- Hunt, J., and Abraham, J. (2003). Design and Application of the PECAS Land Use Modelling System. 8th
 International Conference on Computers in Urban Planning.
 <u>http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.197.8490</u>
- Hurlimann, A., Moosavi, S., Browne, G. (2021). Urban planning policy must do more to integrate climate
 change adaptation and mitigation actions. *Land Use Policy*, 101.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105188</u>

- Jain, V., Davidson, R., and Rosowsky, D. (2005). Modeling Changes in Hurricane Risk over Time. *Natural Hazards Review*, 6(2), 88-96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1527-6988(2005)6:2(88)</u>
- Jarosz, B. (2021). Poisson Distribution: A Model for Estimating Households by Household Size.
 Population Research and Policy Review, 40, 149-162. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-020-09575-x</u>
- Jenkins, K., Surminski, S., Hall, J., and Crick, F. (2017). Assessing surface water flood risk and
 management strategies under future climate change: Insights from an Agent-Based Model. *Science of the Total Environment*, 595, 159-168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.03.242
- Kameshwar, S., Cox, D., Barbosa, A., Farokhnia, K., Park, H., Alam, M., and van de Lindt, J. (2019)
 Probabilistic decision-support framework for community resilience: incorporating multi-hazards,
 infrastructure interdependencies, and resilience goals in a Bayesian network. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 191. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2019.106568</u>
- Koliou, M., van de Lindt, J., McAllister, T., Ellingwood, B., Dillard, M., and Cutler, H. (2018). State of the
 research in community resilience: progress and challenges. *Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure*,
 5, 131-151. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/23789689.2017.1418547</u>
- Magliocca, N., Safirova, E., McConnell, V., and Walls, M. (2011). An economic agent-based model of
 coupled housing and land markets (CHALMS). *Computers, Environment, and Urban Systems*, 35,
 183-191. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2011.01.002</u>
- McLaren, T., Myers, J., Lee, J., Tolbert, N., Hampton, S., and Navarro, C. (2008). MAEviz An earthquake
 risk assessment system. *Proceedings of the 16th ACE SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Science*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1145/1463434.1463534</u>
- Mesta, C., Cremen, G., and Galasso, C. (2022). Urban growth modelling and social vulnerability assessment
 for a hazardous Kathmandu Valley. *Nature Scientific Reports*, 12(6152).
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-09347-x
- Mileti, D. (1999). Disasters by Design: A Reassessment of Natural Hazards in the United States. National
 Academies of Sciences, Washington, D.C., Joseph Henry Press. <u>https://doi.org/10.17226/5782</u>
- Mills, A., Bolte, J., Ruggiero, P., Serafin, K., Lipiec, E., Corcoran, P., Stevenson, J., Zanocco, C., and Lach,
 D. (2018). Exploring the impacts of climate and policy change on coastal community resilience:
 Simulating alternative future scenarios. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 109, 80-92.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.07.022
- Moffatt, R. (1996). Population History of Western U.S. Cities & Towns, 1850-1990. Scarecrow Press.
 Lanham, Md.
- Mostafavi, A., and Ganapati, N. (2021). Toward convergence disaster research: Building integrative
 theories using simulation. *Risk Analysis*, 41(7). <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13303</u>
- Mostafizi, A., Wang, H., Cox, D., and Dong, S. (2019). An agent-based vertical evacuation model for a near-field tsunami: Choice behavior, logical shelter locations, and life safety. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 34, 467-470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.12.018

- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). (2016). Community resilience planning guide for
 buildings and infrastructure systems Volume 1. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Standards
 and Technology, <u>https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.1190v1</u>
- Neumann, B., Vafeidis, A., Zimmermann, J., and Nicholls, R. (2015). Future Coastal Population Growth
 and Exposure to Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Flooding A Global Assessment. *PLoS ONE*, 10(3).
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118571</u>
- Nofal, O., van de Lindt, J., Do, T., Yan, G., Hamideh, S., Cox, D., and Dietrich, C. (2021). Methodology
 for Regional Multihazard Hurricane Damage and Risk Assessment. ASCE Journal of Structural
 Engineering, 147(11). https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0003144
- 724Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission (OSSPAC). 2013. "The Oregon Resilience Plan:725Reducing Risk and Improving Recovery for the next Cascadia Subduction Earthquake and Tsunami".726Salem, Oregon. (Accessed June 16, 2022).727https://www.oregon.gov/oem/documents/oregon resilience plan final.pdf
- Park, H., Cox, D., and Barbosa, A. (2017). Comparison of inundation depth and momentum flux based
 fragilities for probabilistic tsunami damage assessment and uncertainty analysis. *Coastal Engineering*,
 122, 10–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2017.01.008
- Park, H., Alam, M., Cox, D., Barbosa, A., and van de Lindt, J. (2019). Probabilistic seismic and tsunami
 damage analysis (PSTDA) of the Cascadia Subduction Zone applied to Seaside, Oregon. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101076
- Parker, D., and Filatova, T. (2008). A conceptual design for a bilateral agent-based land market with
 heterogeneous economic agents. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 32, 454-463.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2008.09.012
- Parker, D., Brown, D., Filatova, T., Riolo, R., Robinson, D., and Sun, S. (2012). Do land markets matter?
 A modeling ontology and experimental design to test the effects of land markets for an agent-based
 model of ex-urban residential land-use change. In *Agent-Based Models of Geographical Systems*,
 Edited by Heppenstall, A., Crooks, A., See, L., and Batty, M., 181-197. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-</u>
 <u>90-481-8927-4_26</u>
- Peek, L., Tobin, J., Adams, R., Wu, H., and Matthews, M. (2020). A Framework for Convergence Research
 in the Hazards and Disaster Field: The Natural Hazards Engineering Research Infrastructure
 CONVERGE Facility. *Frontiers in Built Environment*, 6(110).
 https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2020.00110
- Peek, L., and Guikema, S. (2021). Interdisciplinary Theory, Methods, and Approaches for Hazards and
 Disaster Research: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Risk Analysis*, 41(7), 1047-1058.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13777</u>
- Portland State University Population Research Center (2020). Coordinated Population Forecast for
 Clatsop County, its Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB), and Area Outside of UGBs: 2020-2070.
- 751 <u>https://ondeck.pdx.edu/population-research/sites/g/files/znldhr3261/files/2020-</u>
- 752 <u>07/Clatsop_Report_Final_2020.pdf</u> (retrieved: February 21, 2022)

- Raskin, J., and Wang, Y. (2017). Fifty-year resilience strategies for coastal communities at risk for
 tsunamis. ASCE Natural Hazards Review, 18(1). <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000220</u>
- Reilley, A., Dillon, R., and Guikema, S. (2021). Agent-based models as an integrating boundary object for
 interdisciplinary research. *Risk Analysis*, 41(7). <u>https://doi.org/10.111/risa.13134</u>
- Rosenheim, N., Guidotti, R., Gardoni, P., and Peacock, W. (2019) Integration of detailed household and housing unit characteristic data with critical infrastructure for post-hazard resilience modeling. *Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure* (6). https://doi.org/10.1080/23789689.2019.1681821
- Saleh, F., and Weinstein, M. (2016). The role of nature-based infrastructure (NBI) in coastal resiliency
 planning: A literature review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 183, 1088-1098.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.077</u>
- San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR). (2009). The resilient city: Defining what
 San Francisco needs from its Seismic Mitigation Policies. Retrieved August 20, 2020.
 https://abag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/defining_what_san_francisco_needs_from_its_seismic_mitigati
 on_policies.pdf
- Sanderson, D., Cox, D. and Naraharisetty, G. (2021a). A spatially explicit decision support framework for
 parcel- and community-level risk and resilience assessment using Bayesian networks. *Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/23789689.2021.1966164</u>
- Sanderson, D., Kameshwar, S., Rosenheim, N., and Cox, D. (2021b). Deaggregation of multi- hazard damages, losses, risks, and connectivity: An application to the joint seismic-tsunami hazard at Seaside, Oregon. *Natural Hazards*, 109(2), 1821-1847. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-04900-9
- Sanderson, D. (2022). Coupled Urban Change and Hazard Consequence Model (v0.3) [Software]. Zenodo.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6870341</u>
- Sarica, G., Zhu, T., and Pan, T. (2020). Spatio-temporal dynamics in seismic exposure of Asian megacities:
 past, present and future. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15. <u>https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ababc7</u>
- 779 Sleeter, B., Wood, N., Soulard, C., and Wilson, T. (2017). Projecting community changes in hazard 780 exposure to support long-term risk reduction: A case study of tsunami hazards in the U.S. Pacific 10-22. 781 Northwest. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 22, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.02.015 782
- Spies, T., White, E., Kline, J., Fischer, A., Ager, A., Bailey, J., Bolte, J., Koch, J., Platt, E., Olsen, C.,
 Jacobs, D., Shindler, B., Steen-Adams, M., and Hammer, R. (2014). Examining fire-prone forest
 landscapes as a coupled human and natural systems. *Ecology and Society*, 19(3).
 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06584-190309</u>
- Talebiyan, H., and Mahsuli, M. (2018). Risk-Based Prioritization of a Building Portfolio for Retrofit. *ASCE Journal of Structural Engineering*, 144(1). <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0001927</u>
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). (2015). Sendai framework for disaster risk
 reduction 2015-2030. Retrieved August 20, 2020.
 https://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf

US Census Bureau (2022). "Table DP05: ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. (Accessed May 19, 2022). <u>https://data.census.gov/cedsci/</u>

van de Lindt, J., Ellingwood, B., McAllister, T., Gardoni, P., Cox, D., Peacock, W., Cutler, H., Dillard, M., 794 795 Lee, J., Peek, L., & Mitrani-Reiser, J. (2018). Modeling community resilience: Update on the center 796 for risk-based community resilience planning and the computational environment IN-CORE. 17th 797 United States-Japan-New Zealand Workshop on the Improvement of Structural Engineering and 798 Resilience (ATC-15-16). Oueenstown. New Zealand (Accessed Mav 10. 2022). https://www.nist.gov/publications/modeling-community-resilience-update-center-risk-based-799 community-resilience-planning 800

- Vinogradov, E., Leick, B., and Kivedal, B. (2020). An agent-based modelling approach to housing market
 regulations and Airbnb-induced tourism. *Tourism Management*, 77.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104004
- Waddell, P. (2002). UrbanSim: Modeling Urban Development for Land Use, Transportation, and
 Environmental Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68(3), 297-314.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360208976274
- Wang, H., Mostafizi, A., Cramer, L., Cox, D., and Park, H. (2016). An agent-based model of a multi-modal
 near-field tsunami evacuation: Decision-making and life safety. *Transportation Research Part C*, 64,
 86-100. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2015.11.010</u>
- Wang, D., Davidson, R., Nozick, L., Trainor, J., and Kruse, J. (2019). Computational Framework to Support
 Government Policy-Making for Hurricane Risk Management. *ASCE Natural Hazards Review*, 21(1).
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000348</u>

Wang, W., van de Lindt, J., Rosenheim, N., Cutler, H., Hartman, B., Lee, J., and Calderon, D. (2021). Effect
of Residential Building Retrofits on Social and Economic Community-Level Resilience Metrics. *ASCE Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 27(4). <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000642</u>

- White, R., and Engelen, G. (1993). Cellular automata and fractal urban form: a cellular modelling approach
 to the evolution of urban land-use patterns. *Environment and Planning A*, 25, 1175-1199.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1068/a251175</u>
- Williams, C., Davidson, R., Nozick, L., Trainor, J., Millea, M., and Kruse, J. (2022). Regional county-level
 housing inventory predictions and the effects on hurricane risk. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-021-00350-w

823