



Núcleo de Economia Regional e Urbana da Universidade de São Paulo

Integrating GIS and Input-Output systems for assessing the impacts of floods in São Paulo

International Workshop on Urban Modeling São Paulo, Brazil, July 10, 2012

Eliane Teixeira dos Santos Department of Economics at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil

Outline

✓ The city of São Paulo

Data

Scenarios

Methodology

Some results





Department of Economics, University of Sao Paulo 4





Climate forecasts present changes in frequency and intensity of shortlasting extreme events *

Preliminary climate change studies suggests that between 2070 and 2100 a rise between 2°C to 3°C in São Paulo can double the number of days with intense rain (above 10 mm).

* Vulnerability of Brazilian megacities to climate changes: São Paulo Metropolitan Region (2010) - INPE, UNICAMP, USP, IPT, UNESP

Impact assessment of floods in São Paulo



Impact assessment of floods in São Paulo



Outline

The city of São Paulo

✓ Data

Scenarios

Methodology

Some results

Data: floods

EMC – Emergency Management Center

| 🗶 🛃 🦃 🕶 🖓 = | pontos de alagamento 2000_20 | 011.xls | [Modo | de Cor | mpatibil | lidade] | - Mic | crosoft Excel | uso não (| omerc | ial | | | | | | | | 3 <mark>X</mark> | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|------------|----------|--------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------------|----------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----|
| Arquivo Página Inicial Inserir La | Arquivo Página Inicial Inserir Layout da Página Fórmulas Dados Revisão Exibição 🛆 😮 🗆 🛱 🔀 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arial y | × A A = = ≥ ≫** = Quebrar Texto Autor | naticam | ente | Geral | | | Ŧ | 1 | | | | + | | | ΣΑ | AutoSom | a y 🖌 | | ñ | |
| Colar 🚽 N I S - 🖽 - | ▲ · ▲ · 章 書 書 章 章 章 國 Mesclar e Centralizar | * | | - E | % 000 | €,0 ,00 · | ,00 •,0 | Formataçã Condiciona | o Form I≭ como T | iatar abela ≁ | Estilos de Célula * | Inserii * | r Exclui | ir Formata | ′ <u>⊘</u> ι | .impar * | Cla e F | ssificar iltrar * | Localizar e Selecionar | ÷ |
| Área de Tran 🕞 Fonte | Alinhamento | | - Fai | | Número |) | - Fai | | Estilo |) | | | Célul | las | | | Ediç | ,ão | | |
| A1 • 🤄 f 🖈 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * |
| C | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | K | L M | N | 0 | P | Q | R S | Т | U | V | W | X | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 ALAGAMENTOS COM MAIS OCORRENCIAS EM CADA PERIODO DE VERAO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | DEEEDENCIA | CUD | 00.04 | 04 02 | 02.02 | 02.04 | 6 0 | 4 04 05 6 | PERIOD | O DE C | HUVAS INT | ENSAS | 7 00 4 | | f=== = 0.0 | 00 40 | 6 | 40 44 | | _ |
| | | SUB | 00_01 | 01_02 | 02_03 | 03_04 | trequ | 04_04_05_fre | q05_05_0 | 6 frequ | 16 06_07 Tr | equ/ 0 | /_08 Tre | 20_80 80ps | 1 Treque | 9 09_10 | Treq10 | 10_11 | req11 | |
| 12 ALBUQUERQUE LINS R DR | DEODORO, PC, MAL | SE | | | ^ | | | | | | | | | ^ | | x | 1 | ^ | 5 | |
| 13 ALVARENGA, R. | AFRĂNIO PEIXOTO, AV. | BT | | | х | | | | х | 4 | | | x | 4 X | 4 | X | 4 | Х | 4 | |
| 14 AMÉRICO DE MOURA, PÇ. PROF. | LINEU DE PAULA MACHADO, AV. | BT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | 1 | | | |
| 15 ANHANGABAU, PQ. | SÃO JOÃO, AV. | SE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | 1 | | | |
| 16 ANHANGABAU, TN. | BANDEIRA, PC. DA | SE | | Х | х | | | x | 3 | | х | 3 | | X | 3 | х | 3 | × | | |
| 18 ANTONIO E. DE CARVALITO, AV | NOSSA SENHORA DO Ó AV | FO | | | | | | | x | 4 | x | 4 | x | 4 X | 4 | x | 4 | ^ | | |
| 19 APECATU, PC. | QUEIROZ FILHO, AV. | LA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | 1 | | | |
| 20 ARICANDUVA, AV. | ADUSTINA, R. | IQ | | | | | | | | | X | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 21 ARICANDUVA, AV. | AFONSO DE SAMPAIO E SOUZA, AV. | IQ | | | | | | Х | 1 | | х | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 22 ARICANDUVA, AV. | BAQUIA, R | AF | x | Х | х | | | X | 4 X | 4 | | | x | 4 X | 4 | х | 4 | X | 4 | |
| 23 ARICANDUVA, AV. | GANGES R | AF | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | x | 2 | x | 2 | |
| 25 ARICANDUVA, AV. | ITAQUERA, AV. | AF | | х | | х | 2 | x | 2 | | | | | x | 2 | x | 2 | ~ | - | |
| 26 ARICANDUVA, AV. | JÚLIO COLAÇO, R. | AF | | | | х | 2 | | | | | | | Х | 2 | | | | | |
| 27 ARICANDUVA, AV. | MANUHA R | AF | | | | | _ | | _ | | х | 1 | | | | х | 1 | x | 1 | |
| 28 ARICANDEVA, AV. | | AF | х | Х | х | x | 5 | X | 3 X | 3 | | | | X | 3 | X | 3 | | _ | |
| 30 BANDERA PC DA | CHUCKIZADAN, AV. UK | SE | | | | | | | | - | | | | _ | | Ŷ | 1 | | | |
| 31 BERNARDINO DE CAMPOS, AV. | ALTURA DO N. 144/170 | SE | | | | | | | X | | X | 1 | | - | | ~ | | | | |
| 32 BOSQUE, R. DO | JOAQUIM MANUEL DE MACEDO, R. | LA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | 1 | | | |
| 33 BRASIL, AV. | ALCIDES BARBOSA, R. ENG. | PI | | | | | | | | | | | | | | х | 2 | х | 2 | |
| 34 BRAZ LEME, AV. | ZANZIBAR, R. V/CENTE DODDIQUES, PC | CV | | | v | | | | | | | | x | 1 | | | | | _ | |
| 36 CARVALHO PINTO AV. GOV. | SÃO MIGUEL AV. | PE | | | ^ | | | | • | - | | | | - | 1 | x | 1 | | | |
| 37 CELSO GARCA, AV. | SALIM FARAH MALUF, AV. | MO | | | | | / | | | | | | | | | | - | х | 1 | |
| 38 CHICO POINTES , R. | GUILHERME, AV. | MG | | | | | / | | | | | | | | | | | X | 1 | |
| 39 CHUCB/ZAIDAN, DR. | LOS ANDES, LG. | PI | | | | 1 | / | _ | | _ | X | 1 | | X | 1 | | | | | |
| 40 COSTERA, R. | ADUSTINA, R. CRUZEIRO DO SUL AV | ST | | v | | | | Y | 2 Y | 2 | X | 1 | | v | 2 | | | Y | 2 | |
| 4 EDUCADOR PAULO FREIRE, AV. | ALTURA DO N. 950 | MG | | ~ | | | | ^ | ~ ^ | - | ^ | - | | ^ | 1 4 | х | 1 | ^ | - | - |
| H 4 → H Plan2 (2) | | | | | · / | | | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pronto | | | | | / | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 90% | Θ | | (| +) |
| | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | ~ | | |
| | | | | / | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| streets flooded | | | 1/ | / | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | P | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

frequency of floods

Data: georeferencing floods



Data: georeferenced floods



Data: ARSI (RAIS)

ARSI - Annual Relation of Social Information

Scope: national territory municipal level 97% of formal labor market

Firms: localization total wages



Data: Extented Input-Output Model [2008]

| | | 1 | 2 | SP 3 | 56 | 1 | 1 2 | SPN | /IR 3 | 56 | SPS 1 2 3 56 | | | BR 1 2 3 56 | | | Но | useholds | | |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|---------|----|---|-----------------|-------|----------|----|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------------|---|-----------------|--------|----------|---|-------------------|
| São Paulo | 1 2 3 : 56 | | Z | SP,SP | | | Z | SP,S | 6PMR | | | Z ^s | SP,SPS | | | z | SP,BR | | | C SP |
| Rest of São Paulo Metropolitan Region | 1 2 3 : 56 | | Z ^{SF} | PMR,SP | | | Z ^{SI} | PMR | ,SPM | R | 2 | Z ^{SP} | MR,SP | S | - | Z ^{SF} | PMR,BF | 2 | ſ | C ^{SPMR} |
| Rest of São Paulo state | 1 2 3 : 56 | | Z ^s | SPS,SP | | | Z ^s | SPS,: | SPMR | 2 | | z ^s | PS,SPS | 5 | | Z ^S | PS,BR | | | C ^{SPS} |
| Rest of Brazil | 1 2 3 : 56 | | z' | BR,SP | | | Z | BR,S | SPMR | | | Z ^E | IR,SPS | | | z ' | BR,BR | | | C BR |
| Wages | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Data: Interregional Input-Output Model



Outline

The city of São Paulo Data

✓ Scenarios

Methodology

Some results

Scenarios



Scenarios: an example



The most problematic flood point in 2008

| 100 m | 137 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Zone | Firms | | | | | | | |
| Influence | Affected | | | | | | | |
| Longitude | -46.70449 | | | | | | | |
| Latitude -23.57267 | | | | | | | | |

Outline

The city of São Paulo

Data

Scenarios

✓ Methodology

Some results

Methodology: Interregional I-O System, closed in households



| | | SP 1 2 3 56 | SPMR 1 2 3 56 | SPS 1 2 3 56 | BR 1 2 3 56 | Households |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| São Paulo | 1 2 3 : 56 | Z ^{SP,SP} | Z ^{SP,SPMR} | Z ^{SP,SPS} | Z ^{SP,BR} | C SP |
| Rest of São Paulo Metropolitan Region | 1 2 3 : 56 | Z ^{SPMR,SP} | Z ^{SPMR,SPMR} | Z SPMR,SPS | Z ^{SPMR,BR} | C SPMR |
| Rest of São Paulo state | 1 2 3 : 56 | Z ^{SPS,SP} | Z ^{SPS,SPMR} | Z ^{SPS,SPS} | Z ^{SPS,BR} | C ^{sps} |
| Rest of Brazil | 1 2 3 : 56 | Z ^{BR,SP} | Z BR,SPMR | Z ^{BR,SPS} | Z ^{BR,BR} | C BR |
| Wages | | | | | | |

$$a_{ij}^{rs} = \frac{Z_{ij}^{rs}}{X_j^s}$$

Methodology

| | | | Sections | 38 | 100 | 200 | 3400 |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------|-------------------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | | | 1 | | | 1.422 | 128.563 |
| | | | 2 | 700 | 705 | 708 | 17.958 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Shock Vector - Productivity Coeffici | on | t * Total wa | nosi | n Fl | nnd | Dav | C |
| | | | yesi | | 00u | Duy | 525.879 |
| | - | | | 2.526.756 | 2.525.575 | 1.897.881 | 23.449.628 |
| average sectoral productivi | ty | | 2 | | | | 183.767 |
| с . | 2 | | | | | 171.408 | 1.040.367 |
| | | | | | | 99.217 | 1.362.529 |
| | | | 30 | | | 9.252 | 382,939 |
| | _ | _ | | | 2.872 | 2.872 | 25.245 |
| | - Gʻ | ross Autnut | 14 | | | 225.854 | 1.396.863 |
| Dreaductivity Coofficient - | _ U | loss output | | - 2 | N.252 | 1.108.278 | 5.227.845 |
| Productivity coefficient = | | | | - 2 | - 2 | - 2 | |
| | - Ca | ost of Labor | | - 2 | - 2 | - 2 | 1.110.100 |
| | | , | | - 2 | - 2 | - 2 | 217.441 |
| | | | | | - 2 | 17.047 | 8.115.227 |
| | | | 10 | | | | |
| | | | 20 | | 3.438.294 | 5.477.288 | 5.511.842 |
| | | | 23 | | | 8 | 89.927 |
| | | | 22 | | | 11.798 | 262.185 |
| | | | 25 | 101.486 | 105.252 | 110.964 | 2.208.903 |
| | | | 24 | | | | 16.039 |
| | | | 25 | | | 3.854 | 202.464 |
| | | | 28 | | | 233,964 | 1.147.501 |
| | | | 27 | | 77.256 | 77.336 | 543.995 |
| | | | 28 | | 2.140 | 317.536 | 2,766,702 |
| Linderhying Accumptions. | | | 29 | 31.425 | 68.607 | 94.627 | 2.363.858 |
| Underlying Assumptions: | | | 30 | | | | 227.534 |
| | | | 31 | | | | 1.199.768 |
| | | | 82 | 2.568.775 | 2.509.451 | 2.509.451 | 3.623.619 |
| Continuous production in business days | | | | 340 | 140 | 282.417 | 1.676.683 |
| | | | | | - 3 | | 847.085 |
| | | | | | - 5 | - 5 | |
| ⁻ 1 day of flood impacts 1 day of production | | | | | | | |
| | | | | - 2 | | | 100.000 |
| | | | | | | | 1,100,000 |
| | | | | | | | 2,448,341 |
| | | | - | 100.000 | 107.000 | 1.000.000 | 13,463,367 |
| | | | 47 | 204,042 | 1.675.458 | 3.083.405 | 27.133.757 |
| | | Department of Eco | nomics. | University | of Sao | Paulo 2 | 22 |
| | | | - | 3.334 | 10.846 | 645.963 | 23.442.950 |
| | | | 45 | 22.224 | 474.964 | 5.007.974 | 16.293.667 |

Outline

- The city of São Paulo
- Data
- **Scenarios**
- Methodology
- ✓ Some results

Some results: Potential Product Losses

Direct Damage (in R\$)

| | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 | Scenario 4 |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | 50 m | 100 m | 200 m | 500 m |
| São Paulo | 6.296.382 | 16.888.093 | 47.584.343 | 565.876.814 |
| Rest of São Paulo Metropolitan Region | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rest of São Paulo (state) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rest of Brazil | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 6.296.382 | 16.888.093 | 47.584.343 | 565.876.814 |

Total Damage (in R\$)

| | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 | Scenario 4 |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|
| | 50 M | 100 m | 200 m | 500 m |
| São Paulo | 8.971.487 | 24.679.478 | 72.637.226 | 938.946.439 |
| Rest of São Paulo Metropolitan Region | 1.225.752 | 3.177.525 | 8.667.814 | 113.064.773 |
| Rest of São Paulo (state) | 2.187.005 | 5.083.498 | 11.898.803 | 143.264.062 |
| Rest of Brazil | 3.715.509 | 7.480.972 | 16.074.355 | 185.498.488 |
| | 16.099.752 | 40.421.473 | 109.278.198 | 1.380.773.763 |

Some results: Potential Product Losses

| | Scenario 1 50 m | Scenario 2 100 m | Scenario 3 200 m | Scenario 4 500 m |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| São Paulo | 56 | 61 | 66 | 68 |
| Rest of São Paulo Metropolitan Region | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Rest of São Paulo (state) | 14 | 13 | 11 | 10 |
| Rest of Brazil | 23 | 19 | 15 | 13 |
| | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Damage ratio = Total Damage / Direct Damage

Total Damage (in %)

| | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 | Scenario 4 |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 50 m | 100 m | 200 m | 500 m |
| Damage Ratio | 3,0 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 3,1 |

Thank you!