Life cycle assessment of a typical European single-family residence and its flood related repairs

Hennequin, Thomas; Dong, Yan; Arnbjerg-Nielsen, Karsten; Sørup, Hjalte Jomo Danielsen

Published in:
Journal of Cleaner Production

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.125](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.125)

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Hennequin, T., Dong, Y., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., & Sørup, H. J. D. (2019). Life cycle assessment of a typical European single-family residence and its flood related repairs. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 228, 1334-1344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.04.125>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 Life cycle assessment of a typical European single- 2 family residence and its flood related repairs

3 Thomas Hennequin^a (corresponding author), Yan Dong^{b,c}, Karsten Arnbjerg-Nielsen^{a,b}, Hjalte Jomo
4 Danielsen Sørup^{a,b}

5 a: Urban Water Systems, Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark,
6 Bygningstorvet, Building 115, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark (thhen@env.dtu.dk, karn@env.dtu.dk,
7 hlds@env.dtu.dk)

8 b: Global Decision Support Initiative, Technical University of Denmark

9 c: Quantitative Sustainability Assessment, Department of Management Engineering, Technical University of
10 Denmark (yado@dtu.dk)

11 **Abstract:** Floods are a constant threat to ecosystems, humans, infrastructure and assets. The combination
12 of increased urbanization and rising sea levels makes it a concern of increasing societal importance. This
13 study offers a new perspective on environmental impact assessment of flood related repairs related to a
14 single-family residence using life cycle assessment. A typical European house built in the 2010's is modelled
15 in the life cycle assessment framework with focus on items damaged by a flood. Flood damage is assessed
16 on the detail level of the house's different components using flood depth as the indicator of damage level. A
17 life cycle inventory is built individually for each considered item group affected by flooding. The influence of
18 flood depths and house ages are studied. The results show that the main impacts of flood related repairs
19 come from the replacement of the wooden flooring, the water heater and furniture. Overall, flood related
20 repairs add between 3.5 and 17.8% of environmental impacts to the life cycle of the house depending on
21 house age and flood depth; deeper water and bad timing in relation to maintenance cycles causing more
22 impacts. Moreover, a very high positive correlation between environmental and economic impact is found in
23 most impact categories.

24 **Keywords:** LCA; Life cycle assessment; Flood; Flood repairs; Residential.

25

1. Introduction

The residential sector is one of the anthropologic activities with the highest impact on the environment, amounting to 40% of global energy use and 38% of global greenhouse gases emissions (UNEP, 2012). To assess this environmental burden, Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is often used. Numerous LCAs have assessed the impact of residences or of the built environment (Goldstein et al., 2018; Khasreen et al., 2009; Lasvaux et al., 2017; Roux et al., 2016; Vilches et al., 2016). However, amongst the various life cycle phases of a house, the regular maintenance and the repairs needed after a natural disaster are seldom within the scope. Few examples choose to include earthquake, hurricane or flood related repairs (Matthews et al., 2016; Sarkisian, 2014; Sudret et al., 2014).

Accounting for half of the occurrences and mortality of natural disasters and resulting in the largest insured losses of all natural catastrophes, flooding is a constant threat to ecosystems, humans, and infrastructure (Guha-Sapir, 2016; Munich Re, 2017). The interplay with other stakeholders and social implications makes flood risk management particularly difficult (Aerts et al., 2018). Moreover, this risk increases dramatically over time because of sea level rise (Arnbjerg-Nielsen et al., 2015; Hirabayashi et al., 2013) and urbanization (UN, 2014). It is a societal concern that cannot and should not be ignored, especially in the context of climate adaptation. Natural disasters and their consequences have been studied in literature, mainly within the field of risk assessment, where risk is defined as a combination of probability of occurrence and potential economic damage calculated from depth-damage curves (Aerts et al., 2018; Morita, 2008). While this is efficient in terms of economic optimization, it may be less optimal in terms of resource consumption, which may in turn lead to unnecessarily high environmental consequences. Hence more integrated assessments, such as LCA, may offer a more comprehensive and consistent view of flood damage versus flood protection.

The LCA framework has indeed recently been used to assess flood prevention, namely, infrastructure construction such as concrete walls and ripraps, while integrating avoided damage (Petit-Boix et al., 2016). It was also used to assess flood damage in the context of stormwater best management practices (Petit-Boix et al., 2017). Finally, the choice of materials and configuration of a flood resilient single family residence were optimized by combining LCA and a Monte Carlo analysis which included sea level rise (Matthews et al., 2016).

While researchers are increasingly aware of a flood's environmental consequences, it is argued that further improvement of its assessments is needed. Even when LCA is used, the impact categories are constrained to carbon footprint, water depletion and embodied energy (Matthews et al., 2016). By conducting

55 a full LCA, this study intends to avoid burden shifting by producing a thorough assessment. It also attempts to
56 bring together the fields of resource optimization and risk assessments, notably by using the same type of
57 depth-damage relationship. Moreover, the environmental impact of flood related repairs is compared to a
58 baseline house with no flooding using a comparative LCA. This is believed to further extend the reach of this
59 study by appealing to decision makers with communicative and versatile results.

60 The objective of this study is to develop and exemplify a methodology enabling the inclusion of flood
61 related repairs in the LCA of a house. By analysing the results, two major questions will be answered: the
62 amount of additional impact a house has on the environment when it is flooded once, and whether there is a
63 correlation between economic and environmental flood damage. Moreover, the main contributor of flood
64 related repairs' environmental impact will be identified and the importance of the house age when the flood
65 occurs is scrutinized.

66 **2. Method**

67 The LCA methodology is extensively standardized through ISO 14040 and 14044 (ISO, 2006a, 2006b).
68 It is used worldwide by decision makers in a variety of fields. The method used in this study to conduct a
69 comparative LCA is presented in this section and consists of four main steps.

70 First, the aims and scope of the study are defined through the functional unit and system boundaries. All
71 the phases of the house's lifecycle that would happen irrespective of the flood occurrence are excluded. As a
72 result, the focus is drawn to flood related repairs and an inventory for these repairs is constructed in two stages.
73 The first stage is the flood damage assessment based on the work of the United States Army Corps of
74 Engineers (USACE), which allows to identify the items damaged by a flood, using maximum water depth as
75 an indicator. Then, based on the items identified, a house is modelled in the LCA framework with characteristics
76 chosen to represent a typical European single-family residence. Life Cycle Inventories (LCIs) are built for each
77 of the items constituting the house, mainly using Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs). The next step
78 is to determine the amount of each item needed for each flooding scenario, including a baseline with no flood.
79 Finally, a sensitivity analysis is conducted to assess the robustness of the model.

80 **2.1. Functional unit and system boundaries**

81 The functional unit is building and maintaining a typical European single-family residence built in the
82 2010's over its 120 years expected lifetime. The resource consumption in relation to human use of the house

are omitted. This way we focus on the resource consumption related to the physical house itself. The aim is to conduct a comparative LCA study that includes numerous scenarios through which two situations are compared, one with and one without flooding. The former consists in one scenario, the baseline, while the latter is a range of flood scenarios exploring two dimensions of the issue, namely, flood depth and the house age. The baseline scenario consists in a basic LCA of a house and is used mainly as an element of comparison whereas the flooding scenarios focus largely on flood related repairs.

The system boundaries chosen for both cases are listed in Table 1. The exclusions of the use phase, the demolition and the recycling lie in the comparative nature of the LCA as they would have to occur irrespective of whether a flood occurs or not. The construction phase is modelled as the addition of all the items making up the house, omitting construction site activities, such as excavation for the foundations or the use of scaffolding, as their impact is negligible (Lasvaux et al., 2017). It is hypothesized that the maintenance cycles will be affected by flooding, making the inclusion of the maintenance phase a necessity. Both the maintenance phase and the flood related repairs consists in complete or partial replacements of items. In the former, items that reached the end of their lifetime are replaced and, in the latter, items damaged by the flood are replaced (see section 2.2.1). Finally, given that the lifetime of the house was modelled on a decadal scale, the house's content such as cloths or consumers electronics were excluded as their short lifetimes leads their replacement to be independent of flooding.

It is argued that these scenarios and system boundaries allow to focus on flood related repairs while contextualizing them in the life cycle of the house. Given the intent to target flood related repairs, the next step is to map all processes and items involved in that phase, for different flood scenarios, and organize them in an inventory.

Table 1 - LCA system boundaries for the two cases, where X stands for excluded and ✓ for included.

Life cycle phase	Baseline	Flood
Construction	✓	✓
Maintenance (replacement, reparations)	✓	✓
Use (heating, electricity, water, etc.)	X	X
Flood related repairs	X	✓
Demolition	X	X
Recycling of construction materials	X	X

2.2. Inventory of flood related repairs

2.2.1. Flood damage assessment

Before modelling the house in the LCA framework, flood damage is assessed in order to map items in the house that are expected to be damaged and make them a priority. To do so, the flood maximum depth, denoted FD , was chosen as the indicator of damage. Traditionally, in the field of risk assessment, this would be done using stage-damage curves built with historical data. However, this type of curve yields values on the scale of different land uses, meaning a single damage value for roads or for commercial buildings. A single damage value for the whole residential sector is far too general for the calculations of items flows required here (cf. section 2.3). Indeed, it would mean that the house considered would be uniformly damaged, with the same proportion of repairs needed for items as different as electrical plugs and ceiling insulation. Instead, damage on single items in the house was linked to flood depth using the data from an expert opinion based report commandeered by the USACE (USACE, 2006). This economic assessment was adjusted to yield damage functions, $Di(FD)$, for each item i considered. The adjustment step consisted in converting economic values into relative values, using whichever was highest between the price of replacement or reparation reported by the USACE as the full damage upper limit. The output for a one-story on slab single-family residence flooded during one day with mixed fresh and salt water is reported in Table 2.

Using this data, one can map flood damage precisely: for a given flood depth, a relative damage value is attributed to each item. For example, for a flood depth of 20cm, almost a third of the wall insulation is damaged and replaced. This example shows that realistic repairs are considered in the USACE's report, in that case by taking into account the absorption property of the insulation as well as the fact that the gypsum plasterboard needs to be replaced in similar proportions.

It should be noted that basement flooding is considered in the USACE's report, which is why a flood with 0m of water is considered damaging. Moreover, flood depths up to 4.6m can be found in the USACE report. However, values higher than 2.1m are not used in this study as it could result in structural lifting (Middelmann-Fernandes, 2010). Instead, the water levels of Table 2 between 0 and 2.1m will all be considered, apart from the 0.6m level, resulting in nine flooding scenarios. These nine water depths will be assessed for all house ages, in increments of 10 years. This allows the investigation of the first dimension of the flood scenario while describing the associated uncertainty.

Table 2 - Damage depth relationship adapted from USACE (USACE, 2006), for a one-story on slab single-family residence flooded during one day with mixed fresh and salt water. The damage values are expressed in percentage of total replacement and greyed when maximum damage is reached.

Item's category	Flood level (m) relative to ground floor									
	0	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.1
Heat and cool units/ducts	28.7	38.7	53	53	53	55.5	66.9	66.9	66.9	66.9
Bottom cabinets	11.4	68.2	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Plumbing fixtures	5.6	12.7	15.3	18.8	21.6	23.4	36.7	36.7	36.7	36.7
Flooring/carpet/tile	34.2	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Paint/wallpaper (interior)	13.9	63.8	91.7	91.7	91.7	91.7	100	100	100	100
Doors/trim	13.6	55.3	67.6	74.5	87.7	87.7	100	100	100	100
Sheetrock/(walls)	6.7	33.2	44.3	44.3	53.2	53.2	80.2	93.9	100	100
Wall insulation	6.5	32.3	42.4	42.4	52.2	61.3	87.1	100	100	100
Baseboard	14.6	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Built-in appliances	13.1	33.9	67.8	78.7	86	100	100	100	100	100
Electrical and lighting/panel	1.1	3.7	3.7	15.3	30.5	31.6	50.8	65.6	75	81.9
Counter tops	13	26	26	26	26	61.3	100	100	100	100
Wall cabinets	21.8	33.4	33.4	33.4	33.4	33.4	56.7	100	100	100
Windows/trim	0	0	0	3.4	7.6	23.9	49.3	70.1	70.1	70.1
Ceiling insulation & ductwork	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roof	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exterior wall/siding	0	3	3	3	8	8	12.4	15.4	19	19
Slab/foundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Structural frame	0.7	2.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Facia/soffit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2.2.2. House modelled

The single-family residence was modelled using two main sources: 1) the mapping presented in Table 2, in order to focus on elements damaged by the flood, and 2) literature references dealing with LCA of houses (Peuportier, 2001; Rasmussen and Birgisdottir, 2015) as well as flooding (Matthews et al., 2016). While diverse types of house designs exist, it was chosen to model a typical European single-family residence built in the 2010s. By modelling a recent, average house, it is argued that representative results are obtained. The resulting design is a 130m² house built on a concrete slab, with a brick structural frame, a 20cm thick mineral insulation and a 120 years lifetime. Figure 1 illustrates the house modelled with a floorplan, which was also used to dimension several items constituting the house. This figure includes some additional figurative elements such as beds and chairs (cf. Table 3 for list of items included in the flood damage assessment).

149

150 *Figure 1 - Floorplan of the single-family residence modelled, with some additional figurative elements such as beds and*
151 *chairs (cf. Table 3 for list of items included in the flood damage assessment).*

152 Concretely, the house was modelled in the LCA framework as 32 separate items listed in Table 3. Most
153 of the items selected are affixed to the house except for the wardrobes and living room furniture. An LCA and
154 subsequent Life Cycle Inventory (LCI) were built for each of the 32 items constituting the house. To do so,
155 Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs) of the specific products chosen were used, as it is the most
156 representative data available.

157 An EPD is a collection of technical data for a given product, issued either by the manufacturer or by
158 governmental agencies as an averaged reference. The data is mainly comprised of an LCA, but also reaches
159 further in certain cases, with health or acoustic assessments. The results of the EPDs' LCAs were not used
160 directly as this would have led to a limited number of impact categories and inconsistencies in LCA
161 methodologies. Instead, the EPDs' LCIs were extracted, and the LCAs were rebuilt in SimaPro (Pré
162 Consultants BV, 2018). High fidelity was achieved thanks to the level of detail of the EPDs' LCIs, often
163 referencing precisely which items of different databases were used for a given material or process.

164 The EPDs were found on a French open database that references products declared either by the
165 manufacturer or by the French Ministries of Housing and of Ecology (FMHE) (INIES, 2017). All the EPDs used
166 in this study follow the traditional LCA regulation ISO 14044, and are further regulated by the French NF EN
167 15804 which deals with EPDs as an entity (INIES, 2017). In some cases, EPDs were replaced by literature
168 studies, when the LCIs reported there were transparent enough. Finally, when specific data was not available,
169 generic data from the Ecoinvent v3.2 database was used. The specific sources for each of the item modelled
170 can be found in Table 3. Detailed LCIs for each item can be found in the [supplementary material]. All of the
171 items were eventually modelled in SimaPro, using the *ReCiPe Midpoint (E) V1.13/Europe* (Goedkoop et al.,
172 2013).

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191 Table 3 - List of the house's items that were modelled grouped by category, alongside their sources. When no source is
192 mentioned, the name of the Ecoinvent process used is written in *italic* where GLO and RER stand for global and Europe.

Category	Items modelled	Source
Heat and Cool Units/Ducts	1 kW electric radiator	(Thermor, 2015)
	Flexible ventilation duct, 12.5cm ND	(FMHE, 2014a)
	Mechanical ventilation, simple flux, 60m ³ /h	(Groupe Atlantic, 2015)
Bottom/wall cabinets and counter tops	Kitchen cabinet	(González-García et al., 2011)
	Living room furniture	(González-García et al., 2011)
	Wardrobe	(Iritani et al., 2015)
Plumbing Fixtures	Ceramic WC	(Ideal standard France, 2016)
	10 kW gas Water heater	(FMHE, 2016a)
	PVC pipe	(GIRPI, 2015)
	Ceramic kitchen sink	(AFISB, 2014)
	Ceramic bathroom sink	(Ideal standard France, 2015)
Flooring	Ceramic tile	<i>Ceramic tile, GLO</i>
	Wooden flooring with decorative paper	(FMHE, 2014b)
Paint (interior)	White alkyd paint	<i>Alkyd paint, white, RER</i>
Doors/Trim	Wooden entrance door	(Bel'M, 2012)
	Wooden inner door	<i>Door, inner, wood (GLO)</i>
Sheetrock/(Walls)	Gypsum plasterboard	<i>Gypsum plasterboard (GLO)</i>
Wall and ceiling Insulation	Stone wool	<i>Stone wool (GLO)</i>
Base Molding	Wooden baseboard	(FMHE, 2014c)
	Ceramic baseboard	(FMHE, 2014d)
Electrical and Lighting/Panel	Domestic cable	(FMHE, 2017)
	Domestic socket	(Legrand, 2016)
	Domestic switch	(FMHE, 2016b)
	54 W lighting	(FMHE, 2016c)
	74 W suspended lighting	(FMHE, 2016d)
	Miniature Circuit Breaker	(Schneider Electric, 2014)
Windows/Trim	Double glazed PVC framed window	<i>Window, PVC (GLO)</i>
Roof	Clay roof tile	<i>Roof tile, clay (GLO)</i>
Exterior Wall/Siding	Wooden painted siding	(FCBA, 2015)
Slab/Foundation	Foundation	(Rasmussen and Birgisdottir, 2015)
	Slab	(Rasmussen and Birgisdottir, 2015)
Structural Frame	Structural frame	(Rasmussen and Birgisdottir, 2015)

193

2.3. Items flows

The Item Flows (*IFs*) described in this section refer to the number of each of the 32 items needed for different scenarios. For example, the number of radiators needed when first building the house, or when a flood with a given water level occurs on a house with a given age. It is not to be confused with the reference flow of the overarching comparative LCA, which is one house for all scenarios. It is not to be confused either with the reference flows of the 32 LCAs conducted for each item. The reference flows for the items, as well as their LCIs, can be found in the [supplementary material].

The *IFs* for the baseline scenario are the addition of the two phases included, namely, construction and maintenance. The simplified construction phase consists in the addition of the initial quantities, denoted IQ_i , for each item i . The initial quantities were determined using the references of Table 3, as well as the floor plan of Figure 1, which was used as a canvas to dimension several items (e.g. lengths of ventilation ducts and water pipes or area of flooring, etc.). Additional sources and expert opinions were also used for several items which was reported in the [supplementary materials]. To add the maintenance phase, the initial quantities were multiplied by the ratio of the house lifetime, L_H , and the item's lifetime, L_i , leading to:

$$IF_{i,baseline} = IQ_i \cdot \frac{L_H}{L_i} \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

The outputs of this equation can be found in Table 4 alongside lifetimes, for all items. It should be noted that the technical lifetimes found in the literature references were often unrealistic and were therefore corrected, using a single unified source (ATD, 2016).

However, while being convenient, Equation 1 only yields correct results when the lifetime of the house is a multiple of the lifetime of the item considered, yielding an underestimation otherwise. Fortunately, the 120 years lifetime of the house is a multiple of most of the items' lifetimes, and the few exceptions with a lifetime of 50 years had their *IFs* corrected, which is noted in Table 4. To find the correct *IFs* for items with a 50 years lifetime, the life cycle of the house was divided in decades. For each decade, items that saw their lifetime run out were replaced. While not as straightforward as a single equation, this method allows a realistic accounting of all items, which is extensively discussed in section 4.1.

For the flooding scenario, the initial quantities and therefore the construction phase are the same. However, the maintenance cycles change due to the introduction of a flood. Utilizing the damage functions introduced in section 2.2, the additional materials needed for flood related repairs are incorporated:

223

$$IF_{i,flood} = IQ_i \cdot \left(D_i(FD) + \frac{L_H}{L_i} \right) \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

224

Once again, items with a lifetime of 50 years stood out as incorrect. Moreover, further complexity is introduced as IF calculation is impacted by how old the house is when the flood occurs. Both phenomena were accounted for by using the same methodology that allowed to correct Equation 1. Floods during eleven decades of the house's lifetime were considered, from decade 1 to 11. This allowed to fully explore the second dimension of the flood scenarios, namely, the house age. The outputs are presented in section 3.1 and discussed in section 4.1.

231 **2.4. Assessing sensitivity**

A two-step sensitivity analysis is used to assess the model's robustness. The first step is a perturbation analysis where selected key parameters are varied in realistic ranges while the effect of the change on the results is expressed using sensitivity ratios, denoted SR and calculated via Equation 3. For example, a ratio of 0.3 means that the relative change in results is 30% of the relative change in parameter. A linear influence of a parameter will therefore be reflected by a ratio of 1.

237

$$SR = \frac{\frac{\Delta Results}{Initial\ result}}{\frac{\Delta Parameter}{Initial\ parameter}} \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

238

The second step of the sensitivity analysis is an assumption check where two selected hypotheses are challenged. The first is the choice of insulation, which impact is assessed by investigating the impact of a change in insulation thickness. This was chosen because of the rapidly changing and non-uniform insulation policies across Europe. The second assumption checked is the structural frame's main component, namely,

243 the cement facing bricks. The impact on the results of replacing them by either clay or shale bricks is
244 investigated.

245 3. Results

246 As mentioned in section 2.2.2, the results presented in this section were obtained using the *ReCiPe*
247 *Midpoint (E) V1.13/Europe* (Goedkoop et al., 2013) computed through the SimaPro software. This method
248 does not have a normalization factor for water depletion, explaining the absence of this impact category when
249 normalized results are presented. Moreover, when all impact categories could not be presented on a figure,
250 climate change was used. It is believed that this impact category is communicative and is often representative
251 of general behaviours. To mitigate the bias introduced by this truncated view, all the characterized results are
252 included in the [*supplementary material*].

253 3.1. Inventory

254 The results of the method presented in section 2.3 are gathered in Table 4. Only two house ages are
255 displayed in this table and throughout this study because they represent all the possibilities. Indeed, floods
256 occurring during decades 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11 yield equal *IFs* and are represented by a flood during decade 5.
257 The same applies for floods occurring during decades 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9, which are represented by a flood
258 during decade 2. These equalities explain why only two decades are represented in Table 4. These equalities
259 are a result of a shifting of timing of investment, which will be illustrated by Figure 3. This means that nine
260 water depths are considered for two house ages, effectively amounting to a total of eighteen flood scenarios.
261 The results of Table 4 are further discussed in section 4.1. More detailed results, spread over the decades of
262 the lifetime of the house, can be found in the [*supplementary material*].

263

264

265

266 Table 4 – Initial quantities (IQ_i), lifetimes (L_i), and item flows of the baseline and two flood scenarios for all items,
267 calculated using Equation 1 and Equation 2. The corrected values for items with a lifetime of 50years are notified in italic.
268 A flood depth of 0.5m was used for both floods.

	IQ_i	Unit	L_i (y)	Baseline ($IF_{i,baseline}$)	Flood during decade 5 ($IF_{i,flood}$)	Flood during decade 2 ($IF_{i,flood}$)
Paint	87.7	kg	10	1053	1133	1133
Ventilation duct	21.4	m	20	129	140	140
Mechanical ventilation	1	p	20	6	6	6
Socket	30	p	20	180	185	185
Switch	16	p	20	96	99	99
MCB	1	p	20	6	7	7
Water heater	1	p	30	4	5	5
Wall light	6	p	30	24	25	25
Suspended light	9.0	p	30	36	36	36
Window	13	m ²	30	52	53	53
Radiator	16	p	40	48	57	57
Kitchen cabinet	4	p	50	12	16	12
Living room furniture	1	p	50	3	4	3
Wardrobe	2.0	p	50	6	8	6
WC, ceramic	2	p	50	6	7	6
PVC pipe	36.5	m	50	110	117	110
Kitchen sink	1.0	p	50	3	4	3
Bathroom sink	2.0	p	50	6	7	6
Ceramic tile	65.5	m ²	60	131	197	197
Wooden flooring	67.1	m ²	60	135	202	202
Door, entrance	1.0	p	60	2	3	3
Door, inner	8	p	60	16	22	22
Baseboard, MDF	60.3	m	60	121	181	181
Baseboard, ceramic	64.3	m	60	129	193	193
Sheetrock	369.4	m ²	120	370	534	534
Stone wool, wall	1115	kg	120	1115	1589	1589
Stone wool, ceiling	1400	kg	120	1400	1400	1400
Cable	172	m	120	172	199	199
Roof tile	6162.6	kg	120	6163	6163	6163
Siding	104.6	m ²	120	105	108	108
Foundation	132	m ²	120	132	132	132
Slab	132	m ²	120	132	132	132
Structural frame	132	m ²	120	132	137	137

269

3.2. Impacts over the life cycle

Looking at the impacts occurring through time allows for investigation of the contribution of each stage but also helps illustrate the way maintenance cycles shift when a flood occurs. Figure 2 shows relative climate change results for the baseline scenario plotted against time. The largest impact, by far, is the initial construction. This is due to the group of items lasting for the whole life of the house, namely, the structural frame, foundation, slab, gypsum plasterboard and insulation. The initial construction amounts to 67 % of the house's impact on climate change, and 55% on average in all impact categories.

The other large impacts occur during decades 3, 6 and 9 which is mostly due to the replacement of the items with lifetimes of 20, 30, and 60 years. One may also notice the significant impact occurring during decade 5 and 10 that accounts for 5 % of the total impact each. This highlights the fact that the model chooses to replace items with a lifetime of 50 also during decade 10, a choice that probably would not be made in a realistic setting. If this group of items were not replaced, the total climate change impact of the baseline scenario would go down by 3.9%. Given that the used-up group of items would still have to be maintained by replacement with items of shorter lifetimes, which would come with its own environmental impact, the overestimation is believed to be negligible.

Figure 2 - Climate change results for the baseline scenario, expressed as a percentage of the total baseline impact, spread over the twelve decades of the house's life cycle. Each decade shows the list of items replaced.

Figure 3 shows the relative difference between the baseline and two floods scenarios, expressed against time and calculated from normalized climate change results. The two floods considered have water levels of 0.5m and occur during decades 2 and 5.

Before the flood occurs, there is no difference between the baseline and flood scenarios. The impact of flood related repairs is denoted by a red outline, which represents the direct component of the flood's impact. This direct impact is equal for both flood scenarios, amounting to 9.6% relative additional impact. This was expected as the *IFs* for flood related repairs and calculated identically in both cases, using the first part of Equation 2. After the flood, the maintenance cycles of several items are shifted through time because the natural disaster forces early replacements, which in turn moves impacts. This constitutes the indirect component of the flood's impact. For a flood occurring during decade 5, these shifts cancel out, and the entirety of the flood's direct impact is carried out in overall difference. On the contrary, a flood occurring during decade 2 ends up having a lower overall impact because the direct impact of the flood is mitigated by its indirect component. This will be further discussed in section 4.1, on the level of *IFs*.

Figure 3 – Change introduced by floods of 0.5m during decade 2 and 5 relative to the baseline scenario, visualized through time and calculated from climate change normalized results.

3.3. Summed normalized results

Figure 4 provides an overview of the results summed for all items and phases. The normalized impacts of the baseline scenario for all categories are expressed in Person Equivalent (PE) with data labels while the additional impact caused by two 0.5m floods occurring during decades 2 and 5 is expressed relative to the baseline impact (%). The first observation is that, disregarding the impact category considered, the scenario with a flood during decade 5 has the highest impact, followed by the flood during decade 2. This is in line with the climate change impacts results of the previous section. On average across categories, floods during decades 2 and 5 add 7.7 and 11.8 % to the baseline scenario, respectively.

Furthermore, large disparities between categories can be observed when looking at the absolute normalized impact of the baseline in the data labels of Figure 4. Impacts range from a few tenth of PE for ozone depletion to hundreds of PE for marine ecotoxicity. Moreover, considering that this single-family residence can provide housing for an average of 3.5 individuals during 120 years, it amounts to 420PE for housing. Moreover, when looking at climate change, only 2% of the house's inhabitants' equivalent impact is

317 spent on housing. It is lower than the 38% mentioned in the introduction because the use phase is not
 318 considered here, which is by far the most impactful (Rasmussen and Birgisdottir, 2015).

319 Baseline (data labels in PE) ■ Flood in decade 2 ■ Flood in decade 5

320 *Figure 4 -Additional impact (%) of two 0.5m flood occurring during decades 2 and 5, relative to the baseline normalized*
 321 *results in absolute value displayed in data labels (Personal equivalent, PE), summed for all items of the house, for all*
 322 *impact categories. Phases as described in Table 1 are included.*

323 3.4. Impact of flood related repairs related to flood depth

324 Figure 5 shows the additional damage resulting from a single flood plotted against the water level, relative
 325 to a baseline house and from four standpoints:

- 326 1) the additional environmental impact (%) caused by a flood with worst possible timing (during decade
 327 5), calculated from the results of this study, on average for all impact categories
- 328 2) the same additional environmental impact (%) calculated identically, but for a flood with best possible
 329 timing (during decade 2)
- 330 3) the evolution of flood damage with depth (% , right axis), as calculated by the USACE (USACE, 2006)
 331 in the North-American context, relative to the maximum flood damage.

4) the evolution of flood damage with depth (% , right axis), as calculated in the work commandeered by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) (Huizinga, 2007) in the European context, relative to the maximum flood damage.

Curves 1) and 2) represent the same notion that was introduced when comparing scenarios on Figure 4.

Overall, the additional environmental impact resulting from a single flood ranges from 3.5% to 17.8% from floods of 0m occurring during decade 2 to floods of 2.1m during decade 5, respectively. It is argued that realistic additional damage would fall in the area in between the two curves (denoted in blue on the figure), with the two curves representing the worse and best cases. Actual damage would depend on the precise age of the house when the flood occurs and hence on exactly how good or poor the flood timing was.

Comparing the area of realistic additional damage with curve 3) allows to conclude that the environmental impact of a flood is correlated to its economic impact, especially for low flood depths. The fact that the work of the USACE was used to model the environmental impacts in the first place is partly responsible for this result. However, if the environmental weight of the items had been distributed differently, this correlation would have been refuted. This is a major result as this correlation is often an assumption in literature and has not been verified explicitly before. The correlation can be verified for all impact categories individually, except for agricultural land occupation and ionising radiation as documented in the [supplementary material].

The flood damage assessment of this study is based on the work of USACE which is contextualized in the US, whereas this study intends to yield results representative for Europe. This calls for the comparison made in between curves 3) and 4). The damage function calculated by the USACE was compared to the work commandeered by the European JRC (Huizinga, 2007). It is a far-reaching attempt to catalogue traditional economic damage curves on the level of land uses, for water levels of 0 to 6m, and for the 27 countries that were in the EU in 2007. The data chosen for Figure 5 is their average findings for the residential buildings, across all the countries considered. It shows that the evolution of the two curves is similar enough to yield representative results in the range of water levels considered.

Figure 5 - Additional environmental impact caused by floods with best and worst timings relative to the baseline house (primary axis), as well as the economic damage functions from USACE and JRC for European and North-American contexts (secondary axis), plotted against flood depth (m).

4. Discussion

4.1. Limitations

It is argued that the way item flows are calculated, meaning how flood related repairs are integrated in the life cycle of the house, is a significant choice. Indeed, the method chosen determines whether the house age will have an impact on the results. By laying down *IFs* throughout the decades, amounts close to reality were obtained which account for the influence of the house age. The fact that decadal cycles of maintenance is a simplification that lead to a division of the results in a worst and a best scenario is argued to be an acceptable trade-off.

The method chosen therefore allows to account for the fact that maintenance cycles shift when a flood forces early replacement. To illustrate that, one may notice that three categories of items arise when looking at the *IFs* results (cf. Table 4 and [supplementary material]).

373 First, for items with a lifetime of 20 years or lower, the introduction of a flood does not impact the IF.
374 Simply said, this group of items would have been replaced with or without flood. This result notably justifies
375 the exclusion of the content of the house (i.e. consumers electronics or cloths), as they have even shorter
376 lifetimes. A second group of items, with lifetimes that are higher or equal to 30 and also are a multiple of 120
377 years, see their IF go up with a flood, but are not impacted by the house age. Their maintenance cycle is
378 affected by the natural disaster but can shift freely through time disregarding of when it occurs (see
379 [supplementary material]). A final group of items, with a lifetime of 50years, also see their IF go up with the
380 introduction of a flood but in different amounts depending on the age of the house age.

381 Representing flood damage using solely the indicator of maximum flood depth is criticized by some
382 because it does not consider flood velocity and duration or failures occurring when structures are lifted
383 (Huizinga, 2007; Middelman-Fernandes, 2010; USACE, 2006). In this study, the duration of the flood is
384 specified, and no flood depths higher than 2.1m are considered specifically to avoid the uncertainty linked to
385 high velocity waters. Adding the fact that flood damage is assessed on the item level as opposed to land uses,
386 it is argued that the approach chosen mitigates the limitations of stage-damage curves while fitting in the LCA
387 framework.

388 Other factors are limiting, albeit to a lesser extent. The eclectic nature of the sources used for the LCIs of
389 the 32 individual LCAs conducted on the items of the house leads to varying degrees of precision. For example,
390 while packaging is included in most LCIs, some include specific values while other just work with assumptions
391 based on the overall weight of the product. This means that the overall representativeness of the LCA is difficult
392 to discuss. The difficulty of comparing these results to other study in a direct way is another limiting factor. To
393 the authors' knowledge, the closest approach in literature is the work of Matthews conducted in 2016
394 (Matthews et al., 2016). However, even in that case, they dealt with the issue statistically using a Monte-Carlo
395 analysis that accounts for sea level rise, and they studied a comparison with a flood resilient house design in
396 the North-American context. These differences set it too far apart from our method for any worthwhile direct
397 comparison of results. Further work was however based on this model of a single-family residence which may
398 make for easier comparisons (Hennequin et al., 2018).

399 **4.2. Sensitivity analysis**

400 **4.2.1. Perturbation analysis**

401 The methodology presented in section 2.4 is used to assess the robustness of the model. The influence
402 of 16 key parameters on the results was assessed by calculating their sensitivity ratios with Equation 3, which
403 were averaged for all impact categories and reported on Figure 6. These were calculated using characterized
404 results of the scenario with a flood of 0.5m occurring during decade 5. Both the parameters range of variation
405 and the complete collection of sensitivity ratios can be found in the [supplementary material].

406 The first observation is that no parameters is overpowering the results. The maximum ratio is 0.36 for the
407 paint usage in the natural land occupation category, and the average of all the ratios is 0.063 with a standard
408 deviation of 0.064. The generally low ratios observed here are mostly due to the substantial number of items
409 modelled, which all participate in the results in similar proportions. None of the parameters can be said to have
410 an overwhelming influence on the results, which makes for a robust model.

411 Moreover, it can be observed that the results are most sensitive to the initial quantities of the structural
412 frame, the lifetime and initial quantity of the furniture and windows as well as the paint usage. Finally, the
413 results show that none of the impact categories are significantly more sensitive to the changes in parameters
414 than another. Averaging the ratios per category yields ratios ranging from 0.046 for human toxicity to 0.076 for
415 water depletion.

416

417 *Figure 6 - Average and min/max range of sensitivity ratios for selected parameters across impact categories, calculated*
418 *using Equation 3.*

419 **4.2.2. Assumption check**

420 The result of the four assumption checks presented in section 2.4 are presented in Figure 7. The influences
421 of the changes made to the model are compared to the scenario with a 0.5m flood during decade 50, taken as
422 a reference. Characterized impact on climate change have been chosen to build the figure for the sake of
423 clarity, However, whenever climate change is not representative of the behaviour of the rest of the categories,
424 it is discussed.

425 A 10cm thicker insulation brings the reference flow of wall and ceiling insulation for reference scenario
426 from 2989 to 4483kg. Using thicker stone wool insulation logically makes the impact of the reference scenario
427 go up, by 2% in average across all impact categories. However, if the use phase of the house was included,
428 the savings on heating might counterbalance that negative effect, making for a worthy trade-off.

429 The brick reference flow for clay and shale was respectively adjusted to 25410 (Littlehampton, 2017) and
430 24717kg (Slmetric, 2016). For both types of bricks, the impact of the reference scenario goes down, by 15%
431 and 17% for the clay and shale when looking at climate change and 8 and 5% in average across all impact
432 categories. The large effect of these changes is due to the fact that the structural frame is a major hotspot of
433 the baseline scenario and SimaPro results showed that the fibre cement bricks were responsible for most of
434 that impact.

Figure 7 - Assumption check with results as characterized impact on climate change (ton CO2 eq.) and a flood of 0.5m as a reference scenario

5. Conclusion

This study has presented a holistic method to assess the environmental impact of a house's flood related repairs. It was chosen to focus on the residential portion of the built environment as it is the part most heavily affected by flood. The method was exemplified by studying a European single-family residence built in the 2010's.

The main conclusions of the study can be summarized as:

- With or without flooding, the main impact of the life cycle of a house is its construction, when omitting the use phase. The initial construction amounts to 55% of total impact when no flooding is occurring and to 50% when the house is flooded once. This is because several impactful elements are built only once at the beginning, namely, the structural frame, the foundation, the slab, the insulation and the gypsum plasterboard.
- A correlation between the economic impact of a flooding event and its environmental impact is demonstrated. It is valid for most impact categories, except for agricultural land occupation and ionizing radiation, and between water levels of 0 and 2.1m.

- 452 • The main element of the single-family residence impacting the environment is the structural frame which
453 makes up one fifth of the total impact. 80% of the frame's impact is due to its cement facing bricks. This
454 could be mitigated using shale or clay bricks instead.
- 455 • The main elements of the flood related repairs impacting the environment are the wooden flooring, the
456 water heater, and the furniture. Together, they account for half of the impact of the renovation needed after
457 a flood.
- 458 • When a house is flooded with a water level of 0.5m, the additional environmental impact will range from 8
459 to 12%. The extent of the increase depends on when the flood occurs. This range will evolve from 3.5-
460 6.4% to 13-17.5% when the water level increases from 0 to 2.1m.

461 This study has the ambition to be part of the foundation for further studies dealing with the environmental
462 impact of flooding. Larger questions can be answered using this method as groundwork, notably dealing with
463 climate change adaptation and risk assessment. For example, by building upon this LCA study one could
464 inform decision makers on strategic options of flood risk management.

465

466 **Acknowledgement**

467 Part of the work was carried out as part of the Innovation network Water in Urban Areas, supported
468 financially by the Ministry for Higher Education and Science under contract 1363-00039B.

469

470 **6. References**

- 471 Aerts, J.C.J.H., Botzen, W.J., Clarke, K.C., Cutter, S.L., Hall, J.W., Merz, B., Michel-Kerjan, E., Mysiak, J.,
472 Surminski, S., Kunreuther, H., 2018. Integrating human behaviour dynamics into flood disaster risk
473 assessment. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0085-1>
- 474 AFISB, 2014. Évier en grès émaillé [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/INIES_CÉVI20140415_144207/Évier_en_grès_émaillé_1_3.pdf)
475 [inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/INIES_CÉVI20140415_144207/Évier_en_grès_émaillé_1_3.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/INIES_CÉVI20140415_144207/Évier_en_grès_émaillé_1_3.pdf) (accessed
476 2.23.17).

477 Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Leonardsen, L., Madsen, H., 2015. Evaluating adaptation options for urban flooding
 478 based on new high-end emission scenario regional climate model simulations. *Clim. Res.* 64, 73–84.
 479 <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr01299>

480 ATD, 2016. Average Life Span of Homes, Appliances, and Mechanicals [WWW Document]. URL
 481 <http://www.atdhomeinspection.com/advice/average-product-life/> (accessed 7.16.17).

482 Bel'M, 2012. Déclaration Environnementale - Porte d'entrée bois reconstitué non vitrée [WWW Document].
 483 URL [http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/1400_fdes portes bel'm_gamme bois](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/1400_fdes portes bel'm_gamme bois 58mm_modeles non vitres_20 12 2012.pdf)
 484 [58mm_modeles non vitres_20 12 2012.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/1400_fdes portes bel'm_gamme bois 58mm_modeles non vitres_20 12 2012.pdf) (accessed 2.24.17).

485 FCBA, 2015. Déclaration environnementale - Bardage peint en bois [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_CBAR20150925_104219/DE_Bardages_peints_sept.2015.pdf)
 486 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_CBAR20150925_104219/DE_Bardages_peints_sept.2015.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_CBAR20150925_104219/DE_Bardages_peints_sept.2015.pdf)
 487 (accessed 2.24.17).

488 FMHE, 2017. Câble basse tension, 2.5mm² (16/20A), 0.5/1kV [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Cable_basse_tension.pdf)
 489 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Cable_basse_tension.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Cable_basse_tension.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

490 FMHE, 2016a. Données Génériques - Chauffe eau gaz 10kW [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Chauffe-eau_gaz_10kW.pdf)
 491 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Chauffe-eau_gaz_10kW.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Chauffe-eau_gaz_10kW.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

492 FMHE, 2016b. Interrupteurs/sectionneurs domestiques [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Interrupteurs-sectionneurs.pdf)
 493 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Interrupteurs-sectionneurs.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Interrupteurs-sectionneurs.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

494 FMHE, 2016c. Luminaires intérieurs étanches [P=54W et diam.=70mm] [WWW Document]. URL
 495 [http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Luminaires_interieurs_etanches_P_54W_et_diam._70mm.pdf)
 496 [Luminaires_interieurs_etanches_P_54W_et_diam._70mm.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Luminaires_interieurs_etanches_P_54W_et_diam._70mm.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

497 FMHE, 2016d. Plafonniers, Suspensions intérieurs linéaires pour éclairage tertiaire ou industriel [P=74W]

498 [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation->
499 [Plafonniers_Suspensions_interieurs_lineaires.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Plafonniers_Suspensions_interieurs_lineaires.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

500 FMHE, 2014a. Données Génériques - Conduits flexibles DN125mm [WWW Document]. URL
501 http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Conduits_flexibles_DN125mm.pdf
502 (accessed 7.19.18).

503 FMHE, 2014b. Parquet de bois stratifié, 10mm [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.base->
504 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/2093_evea_pour_sipev_-_fdes_peintures_mates_en_pa_-_080611.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/2093_evea_pour_sipev_-_fdes_peintures_mates_en_pa_-_080611.pdf) (accessed
505 7.19.18).

506 FMHE, 2014c. Données Génériques - Plinthe en bois reconstitué [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.base->
507 [inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Plinthe_en_bois_reconstitue_MDF_haut._7cm_et_ep.1cm.pdf)
508 [Plinthe_en_bois_reconstitue_MDF_haut._7cm_et_ep.1cm.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Plinthe_en_bois_reconstitue_MDF_haut._7cm_et_ep.1cm.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

509 FMHE, 2014d. Données Génériques - Plinthe en céramique [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.base->
510 [inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Plinthe_en_ceramique_haut._7cm_et_ep.1.4cm.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/Documentation-Plinthe_en_ceramique_haut._7cm_et_ep.1.4cm.pdf)
511 (accessed 7.19.18).

512 GIRPI, 2015. Canalisation eau potable PVC [WWW Document]. URL <http://www.base->
513 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_ISYS20160314_165940/GIRPI_EPD_SYSTEM_O_format_FR_EN_158](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_ISYS20160314_165940/GIRPI_EPD_SYSTEM_O_format_FR_EN_158)
514 [04_CN.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/INIES_ISYS20160314_165940/GIRPI_EPD_SYSTEM_O_format_FR_EN_15804_CN.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

515 Goedkoop, M., Heijungs, R., De Schryver, A., Struijs, J., van Zelm, R., 2013. ReCiPe 2008, A life cycle impact
516 assessment method which comprises harmonised category indicators at the midpoint and the endpoint
517 level.

518 Goldstein, B., Rasmussen, F.N., Goldstein, B., Rasmussen, F.N., 2018. LCA of Buildings and the Built
519 Environment, in: Life Cycle Assessment. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56475-3_28

520 González-García, S., Gasol, C.M., Lozano, R.G., Moreira, M.T., Gabarrell, X., Rieradevall i Pons, J., Feijoo, G.,
521 2011. Assessing the global warming potential of wooden products from the furniture sector to improve
522 their ecodesign, *Science of the Total Environment*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.09.059>

523 Groupe Atlantic, 2015. Profil Environnemental Produit Caisson de ventilation individuel simple flux VMC
524 simple flux hygro [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00020-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_01.pdf)
525 [inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00020-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_01.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/iniesV4/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00020-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_01.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

526 Guha-Sapir, D., 2016. 2016 preliminary data1: Human impact of natural disasters.

527 Hennequin, T., Sørup, H.J.D.H.J.D., Dong, Y., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., 2018. A framework for performing
528 comparative LCA between repairing flooded houses and construction of dikes in non-stationary
529 climate with changing risk of flooding. *Sci. Total Environ.* 642, 473–484.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.05.404>

531 Hirabayashi, Y., Mahendran, R., Koirala, S., Konoshima, L., Yamazaki, D., Watanabe, S., Kim, H., Kanae, S.,
532 2013. Global flood risk under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 3, 816–821.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1911>

534 Huizinga, H., 2007. Flood damage functions for EU member states.

535 Ideal standard France, 2016. Pack WC (cuvette et réservoir) en porcelaine [WWW Document]. URL
536 <http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/Consultation.aspx> (accessed 2.23.17).

537 Ideal standard France, 2015. Lavabo porcelaine [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/Consultation.aspx)
538 [inies.fr/inies/Consultation.aspx](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/Consultation.aspx) (accessed 2.23.17).

539 INIES, 2017. Inventaires de cycle de vie [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.inies.fr/inventaires-de-cycle-](http://www.inies.fr/inventaires-de-cycle-de-vie/)
540 [de-vie/](http://www.inies.fr/inventaires-de-cycle-de-vie/) (accessed 3.10.17).

541 Iritani, D.R., Silva, D.A.L., Saavedra, Y.M.B., Grael, P.F.F., Ometto, A.R., 2015. Sustainable strategies analysis
542 through Life Cycle Assessment: A case study in a furniture industry, *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
543 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.05.029>

544 ISO, 2006a. EN ISO 14040:2006 - Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Principles and
545 framework. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7550.1107>

546 ISO, 2006b. EN ISO 14044:2006 -Environmental management - Life cycle assessment - Requirements and
547 guidelines. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-011-0297-3>

548 Khasreen, M.M., Banfill, P.F.G., Menzies, G.F., 2009. Life-cycle assessment and the environmental impact of
549 buildings: A review. *Sustainability* 1, 674–701. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su1030674>

550 Lasvaux, S., Lebert, A., Achim, F., Grannec, F., Hoxha, E., Nibel, S., Schiopu, N., Chevalier, J., 2017. Towards
551 guidance values for the environmental performance of buildings: application to the statistical analysis
552 of 40 low-energy single family houses' LCA in France. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 22, 657–674.
553 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-016-1253-z>

554 Legrand, 2016. Prise 2 P+T - 16 A - Bornes auto - Pur [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/LGRP-00036-V01.01-FR_pdfpep.pdf)
555 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/LGRP-00036-V01.01-FR_pdfpep.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/LGRP-00036-V01.01-FR_pdfpep.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

556 Littlehampton, 2017. Brick information - height, weigh, dimensions [WWW Document]. URL
557 <http://littlehamptonbrick.com.au/clay-bricks/brick-specifications/> (accessed 7.29.17).

558 Matthews, E., Friedland, C.J., Orooji, F., 2016. Integrated environmental sustainability and resilience
559 assessment model for coastal flood hazards. *J. Build. Eng.* 8, 141–151.
560 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2016.08.002>

561 Middelmann-Fernandes, M.H., 2010. Flood damage estimation beyond stage-damage functions: An

562 Australian example. *J. Flood Risk Manag.* 3, 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-318X.2009.01058.x>
 563 Morita, M., 2008. Flood risk analysis for determining optimal flood protection levels in urban river
 564 management. *J. Flood Risk Manag.* 1, 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-318X.2008.00016.x>
 565 Munich Re, 2017. Natural catastrophe losses at their highest for four years [WWW Document]. Munich RE.
 566 URL [https://www.munichre.com/en/media-relations/publications/press-releases/2017/2017-01-04-press-](https://www.munichre.com/en/media-relations/publications/press-releases/2017/2017-01-04-press-release/index.html)
 567 [release/index.html](https://www.munichre.com/en/media-relations/publications/press-releases/2017/2017-01-04-press-release/index.html) (accessed 1.31.19).
 568 Petit-Boix, A., Arahuetes, A., Josa, A., Rieradevall, J., Gabarrell, X., 2016. Are we preventing flood damage
 569 eco-efficiently? An integrated method applied to post-disaster emergency actions. *Sci. Total Environ.*
 570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.034>
 571 Petit-Boix, A., Seigné-Itoiz, E., Rojas-Gutierrez, L.A., Barbassa, A.P., Josa, A., Rieradevall, J., Gabarrell, X.,
 572 2017. Floods and consequential life cycle assessment: Integrating flood damage into the environmental
 573 assessment of stormwater Best Management Practices. *J. Clean. Prod.* 162, 601–608.
 574 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.047>
 575 Peuportier, B.L.P., 2001. Life cycle assessment applied to the comparative evaluation of single family houses
 576 in the French context. *Energy Build.* 33, 443–450. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788\(00\)00101-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(00)00101-8)
 577 Pré Consultants BV, 2018. SimaPro [WWW Document]. URL <https://simapro.com/> (accessed 3.29.18).
 578 Rasmussen, F.N., Birgisdottir, H., 2015. Bygningens Livscyklus: Identifikation af væsentlige bygningsdele,
 579 materialegrupper og faser i en miljømæssig vurdering. København SBI Forl. 2015:09.
 580 Roux, C., Schalbart, P., Peuportier, B., 2016. Analyse de cycle de vie conséquentielle appliquée à l'étude
 581 d'une maison individuelle. Conférence IBPSA Fr. 1–8.
 582 Sarkisian, M.P., 2014. Design of environmentally responsible structures in regions of high seismic risk.

583 Struct. Infrastruct. Eng. 10, 849–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15732479.2012.761249>

584 Schneider Electric, 2014. Product environmental profile- Harmony 9001KQ [WWW Document]. URL

585 http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/HAGE-2014-030-V1-EN_pdfpep.pdf

586 (accessed 2.23.17).

587 SImetric, 2016. Density of materials [WWW Document]. URL https://www.simetric.co.uk/si_materials.htm

588 (accessed 7.29.17).

589 Sudret, B., Mai, C., Konakli, K., 2014. Assessment of the lognormality assumption of seismic fragility curves

590 using non-parametric representations 1451–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe>

591 Thermor, 2015. Radiateur electrique mural 1kW [WWW Document]. URL [http://www.base-](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00007-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_02.pdf)

592 [inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00007-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_02.pdf](http://www.base-inies.fr/inies/UploadedFiles/PEPUploads/SCGA-00007-V01.01-FR_pdfpep_02.pdf) (accessed 7.19.18).

593 UN, 2014. World Urbanization Prospects, UNDESA. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2005.12.9>

594 UNEP, 2012. Building Design and Construction : Forging Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Development,

595 United Nations Environment Programme.

596 USACE, 2006. Depth-Damage Relationships for Structures, Contents, and Vehicles and Content-to-Structure

597 Value Ratios (CSVVR) in Support of the Lower Atchafalaya Reevaluation and Morganza to the Gulf.

598 Vilches, A., Garcia-Martinez, A., Sanchez-Montañes, B., 2016. Life cycle assessment (LCA) of building

599 refurbishment: A literature review. Energy Build. 135, 286–301.

600 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.11.042>

601