

Risk and Vulnerability Assessment of Energy-Transportation Infrastructure Systems to Extreme Weather

Jiawei Wang, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Qinglai Guo, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Hongbin Sun, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The interaction between extreme weather events and interdependent critical infrastructure systems involves complex spatiotemporal dynamics. Multi-type emergency decisions within energy-transportation infrastructures significantly influence system performance throughout the extreme weather process. A comprehensive assessment of these factors faces challenges in model complexity and heterogeneity between energy and transportation systems. This paper proposes an assessment framework that accommodates multiple types of emergency decisions. It integrates the heterogeneous energy and transportation infrastructures in the form of a network flow model to simulate and quantify the impact of extreme weather events on the energy-transportation infrastructure system. Based on this framework, a targeted method for identifying system vulnerabilities is further introduced, utilizing a neural network surrogate that achieves privacy protection and evaluation acceleration while maintaining consideration of system interdependencies. Numerical experiments demonstrate that the proposed framework and method can reveal the risk levels faced by urban infrastructure systems, identify weak points that should be prioritized for reinforcement, and strike a balance between accuracy and evaluation speed.

Index Terms—Extreme weather, emergency decision-making, energy-transportation coupling, risk assessment, vulnerability identification.

I. INTRODUCTION

The systems composed of critical infrastructures such as electricity, heating, and transportation are the foundation of the normal functioning of human society and play a vital role in social development [1], [2]. At the same time, the growing interconnection, coupling, and interdependence among these systems have significantly impacted their sensitivity to failures [3], posing severe challenges to ensuring their safe, stable, and efficient operation.

In recent years, climate change has led to more frequent and widespread occurrences of extreme weather events such as hurricanes and snowstorms [4]. The destructive impact of extreme weather is neither static nor isolated but follows a certain spatiotemporal evolution trajectory, affecting multiple systems simultaneously. The interactions between extreme weather and systems, as well as among the systems themselves, add layers of complexity to assessing the risks faced by coupled infrastructure systems under such conditions.

Regarding the resilience of energy systems under extreme weather, substantial research has focused on emergency

decision-making, considering aspects like microgrid formation, distributed energy resources, electric vehicles (or mobile energy storage), repair crews, preventive reinforcement, and fuel transportation. These studies analyze the risks faced by urban infrastructure systems during extreme weather and propose valuable action strategies. For example, [5] mitigates the risks of extreme storms to the Texas power grid by reinforcing critical lines under spatiotemporal random line failures. [6] introduces a model for coordinating electric vehicles and renewable energy in distribution network restoration scheduling to provide grid services. [7] proposes a multi-stage optimization model for coordinating line reinforcement, mobile power sources, mobile de-icing equipment, and repair scheduling during ice storms. [8] develops a joint scheduling model involving topology reconfiguration, mobile energy storage, mobile generators, and fuel transportation to restore disrupted distribution networks. These works have made significant contributions by exploring various combinations of emergency decisions, yet they focus solely on power systems, overlooking how interactions among different infrastructure systems under extreme weather conditions could influence assessments.

Some studies have considered integrated energy systems that include energy forms beyond electricity. For instance, [9] investigates the resilience of electricity and heating in power-heat integrated energy systems during snowstorms, taking into account liquefied natural gas fuel distribution. [10] investigates electricity-gas-heat integrated energy systems, considering multi-energy coupling, topology reconfiguration, and data center waste heat utilization. [11] studies post-disaster fault recovery of power-heat integrated energy systems, simultaneously conducting topology reconfiguration for power and heating networks. While these works extend the focus from power grids to integrated energy systems, their perspective remains primarily on the energy side, neglecting the critical role of transportation systems as infrastructure systems and failing to address the heterogeneous difference between energy and transportation systems.

Urban infrastructure systems may be coupled at various levels, such as physical, geographical, informational, and logical. The spatiotemporal dynamic development of extreme weather is a concept situated at the geographical level. Moreover, emergency decisions related to electric vehicles, mobile energy storage, mobile generators, repair scheduling, and fuel transportation occur within the transportation system at the geographical level. Therefore, incorporating the transportation system as an infrastructure system of equal standing to the

J. Wang, Q. Guo, and H. Sun are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China. (*Corresponding Author: Qinglai Guo*).

energy system and studying the behaviors and performance of the transportation system alongside the energy system under extreme weather conditions is a natural requirement for establishing a more comprehensive evaluation framework [12]. On the one hand, this requires a more detailed consideration of risk compounding effects. For example, although hurricanes may not directly destroy transportation systems, power outages at charging stations caused by distribution line failures could degrade the performance of the transportation system. While rainfall and flooding may have little impact on the power network, they could delay repair work in the transportation network, thereby affecting the repair time for distribution lines and, in turn, impacting power loads. On the other hand, this also allows for a more thorough exploration of the additional resilience potential in transportation networks, facilitating coordinated decision-making for emergency repairs, emergency power supply, and emergency transportation.

While considering the spatiotemporal dynamics of extreme weather and fully accommodating the behaviors of different systems is of great importance, every additional factor introduces the need to integrate a new model component into the existing framework, increasing the overall complexity of the model [6], [13]. This leads to the common issue in existing work where, in focusing on a subset of emergency decision combinations as the breakthrough research focus, other subsets may be overlooked. Integrating too many types of energy-transportation emergency decisions into the model can lead to excessive computational scale or undesirable properties. Additionally, models that consider the interdependence of systems will involve multiple entities in energy and transportation, and a model that centralizes all components may face privacy concerns [14], as, for instance, the power system may not be willing or able to access specific information about the heating network or transportation network.

Furthermore, the significant heterogeneous difference between energy and transportation systems poses challenges for establishing a comprehensive energy-transportation model [12]. For example, within the energy system, the same type of energy flow does not exhibit diverse types, only varying in numerical values. However, the state of the transportation system involves a diverse range of vehicle behaviors that are spatially and temporally coupled. Even when vehicles exhibit identical movement characteristics, their behavior types may still vary (e.g., charging/discharging, transporting passengers, delivering supplies, repairs, or empty vehicle movement). The specific behavior type determines the state of the transportation system itself and, due to the interdependence between systems, also affects other systems.

The aim of this paper is to establish an extreme weather risk assessment framework for energy-transportation-coupled infrastructure systems, integrating multiple types of emergency decisions in order to quantify risk levels, identify vulnerabilities, and provide guidance for responding to extreme weather events. In the proposed framework, efforts are made to address the challenges of model scalability, privacy protection, and the heterogeneous difference between energy and transportation systems. To the best of the author's knowledge, an extreme weather risk assessment framework that effectively handles

these challenges while fully accommodating various types of energy-transportation emergency decisions has not been sufficiently developed or discussed.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- 1) Considering the spatiotemporal evolution of extreme weather events, a framework is established using Monte Carlo simulation based on Latin hypercube sampling to simulate and quantify the impacts of extreme weather events on energy-transportation coupled infrastructure systems.
- 2) The energy and transportation sides, which exhibit heterogeneous differences, are integrated in the form of network flows, and an integrated electricity-heat-transportation emergency model is developed to fully accommodate multiple types of emergency decisions, including both energy-side and transportation-side emergency decisions.
- 3) A method for identifying system vulnerabilities is proposed, and based on neural network surrogates, privacy protection and assessment acceleration are achieved while maintaining the consideration of interdependence between the coupled infrastructure systems.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II establishes the extreme weather risk assessment framework using Monte Carlo simulation. Section III presents each model component needed to construct the integrated electricity-heat-transportation emergency model, describing the interactions between infrastructure systems and extreme weather events. Section IV proposes a method for identifying system vulnerabilities and achieving fast assessments based on neural network surrogates. Section V provides numerical experiments. Section VI summarizes the paper.

II. RISK ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

This paper takes the power-heat-transportation coupled infrastructure system as a representative research object. It includes both the interdependencies within the energy system (e.g., power-heat coupling) and the interdependencies between the energy system and the transportation system. Compared to studies that focus only on power systems, integrating systems with different time scales and heterogeneous differences is more challenging. For example, heating pipelines experience transmission delays from the pipeline inlet to the outlet [15], while in the transportation network, vehicles departing from a node will also experience a significant delay before reaching the end of the road [16].

A considerable body of research on integrated energy systems has been dedicated to addressing the differences between power and heat systems [17], [18]. Under moderate assumptions, mature methods exist that model both the power and heat systems within the same set of mathematical equations. However, organizing the actions of a fleet of vehicles, capable of making multiple types of decisions, within the transportation system in a way that facilitates coupling with the energy system still presents challenges. In many existing studies, traffic flow models primarily focus on the individual rationality of dispersed private car users and road congestion effects

[19] and cannot describe the action patterns of task-oriented traffic flows such as repair work, emergency power supply, and fuel transportation. In extreme weather scenarios, multi-type emergency decisions on the transportation side are crucial to characterizing the interdependencies of systems. This interdependency extends beyond the typical scope of electric vehicle and charging station studies in power-transportation coupling research [20]. Therefore, this paper emphasizes the integration of heterogeneous differences on both the energy side and the transportation side.

This paper uses a spatiotemporal network extension approach [21] and applies it to extreme weather scenarios, extending it to the energy-transportation system as the basis for the risk assessment framework. The core idea is to extend the network along the time dimension, treating the same network at different times as distinct networks. Time delay effects are represented as network flows from a node in the network at time t_m to another node in the network at time t_n ($m < n$). For the state of charge (SOC) of electric vehicles or mobile energy storage, SOC can be extended based on the transportation network within the spatiotemporal framework so that edges between nodes represent both time progression, location movement, and changes in SOC. Therefore, any transportation decision for vehicles can be fully described by the edges in the extended network. For example, for a vehicle's movement behavior, it will inevitably involve a change in location, passage of time, and a decrease in SOC; for a charging behavior, it will involve time progression, an increase in SOC, and no change in location.

Different tasks of vehicles in the transportation network will manifest as network flows with different characteristics, and they will flow separately in the extended transportation network. Special behaviors such as charging/discharging, repair work, and fuel scheduling are not fundamentally different from other traffic flows because the transportation network only focuses on their movement characteristics and states. However, these task-oriented traffic flows will create cross-system coupling effects at their spatiotemporal destination when they reach their end points. For example, network flows representing charging/discharging will affect the power loads associated with the destination node; network flows representing repair work will affect the operational status of components at the destination location. The specific mathematical formulations are provided in Section III.

As shown in Figure 1, after the network extension, both energy and traffic flows move within the overall spatiotemporal energy-transportation coupled network, where networks with different time scales and characteristics can be integrated together. The interdependence between networks and the various types of emergency decisions can all be expressed in this integrated model in the form of unified network flows.

Extreme weather events attack the interdependent urban infrastructure systems along specific spatiotemporal paths. These events are mapped into spatiotemporal distributions of damage probabilities through the vulnerability curves of system components, and they apply damage to the system through certain random variables in the integrated model mentioned above. The framework proposed in this paper can




Fig. 1. A framework for risk assessment under extreme weather based on the power-heat-transportation system model in the form of network flow.

accommodate discrete or continuous random variables, following various probability distributions, such as those related to system component damage, traffic road travel time, repair time of damaged components, and renewable energy output. The treatment of these random variables depends on the application scenario. Since the goal of this paper is risk assessment and weak link identification, Monte Carlo simulation is chosen as the computational method. The Monte Carlo simulation method is a mainstream approach for handling uncertainty and balancing probabilities with consequences [22], [23]. Monte Carlo simulation quantifies system performance and risk by sampling random variables, running the unified emergency model in various scenarios, and calculating the average in each scenario.

If optimization scheduling or control is required for a specific emergency decision combination, scenario-based optimization methods, similar to Monte Carlo simulation (such as Sample Average Approximation, SAA), can be conveniently applied to the framework described above. Attempting to express chance constraints, stochastic programming, or robust optimization in an analytical form depends on the nature of the probability distributions or uncertainty sets, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

III. SYSTEM MODEL COMPONENTS

A. Power network

The mathematical modeling approach represented by the resilience trapezoid [22] has been widely recognized in numerous studies. Its core idea is that infrastructure systems should maintain the service as much as possible (or minimize the loss of service), which is the primary guiding principle for constructing objective functions in existing related work [6], [10]. From a practical perspective, loads differ in importance, which determines the priority of meeting demand in emergency scenarios. Therefore, based on load, this paper uses load value as a performance indicator for measuring power network services [9]. This reflects the relative differences in load and facilitates the integration of objectives from both the energy and transportation sides.

The objective function (1) represents the load value in the power network.

$$F^{\text{PN}} = \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^{\text{power}} P_{i,t}^{(l^*)} \Delta t \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathcal{T} is the set of simulation time periods, and \mathcal{N} is the set of power system nodes. Δt is the length of each simulation period. σ_i^{power} represents the importance value of power node i . $P_{i,t}^{(l*)}$ denotes the pure active power load at power node i .

Depending on the nature of the evaluated power network, different levels of mathematical models can be applied to describe the energy flow within the power network, such as the DC optimal power flow model or the LinDistFlow model for radial networks [24]. The network topology is described by a series of binary variables, which serve both as topology re-configuration decisions and are influenced by extreme weather events. These models have good mathematical properties, and aside from the discrete topology variables, there are no factors that impede computation.

The formulas for the power grid model are omitted here. A detailed model description can be found in the document in [25].

B. Heat network

Heat loads, similar to power loads, also have varying levels of importance, with critical heat loads being prioritized for supply [26]. The objective function (2) represents the load value in the heat network:

$$F^{\text{HN}} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{load}}} \sigma_i^{\text{heat}} H_{i,t}^{(l)} \Delta t \quad (2)$$

$\mathcal{H}^{\text{load}}$ is the set of heat load nodes in the heat system. σ_i^{heat} is the importance value of the heat node i . $H_{i,t}^{(l)}$ is the heat load power at heat node i during time period t .

The focus of the risk assessment framework proposed in this paper is to capture the distribution of energy flows and traffic flows. A detailed depiction of the hydraulic and thermal dynamics within the heat network is not the focus of this paper and is not necessary for extreme weather scenarios. Therefore, this paper uses an energy flow model for the heat network, specifically using the heat in the pipes (the product of temperature and mass flow rate) as decision variables and approximating heat loss [18]. This energy flow model is simple and applicable, maintaining the capture of the heat network's operational trends while significantly reducing the computational burden.

The formulas for the heat network model are omitted here. A detailed model description can be found in the document in [25].

C. Transportation network

The transportation network model based on network flow is constructed within a time-space-energy augmented network, the concept of which has been elaborated in Section II. In this augmented network, \mathcal{E} represents the set of nodes. Each node has fundamental attributes such as loc (spatial location), time (temporal point), or soc (state of charge), denoted by n_{\sim} . The attributes $i_{\text{ori},\sim}$ and $i_{\text{des},\sim}$ correspond to the origin and destination properties of edge i within the augmented network. Additionally, i_{dist} signifies the spatial distance associated with edge i in the augmented network. i_{delay} is the identifier for the

time delay on edge i , indicating that traveling along edge i to reach the destination takes an additional i_{delay} units of Δt compared to the ideal scenario.

It is crucial to emphasize that in extreme weather scenarios, the transportation system is not only an accessory or a callable resource of the energy system; it inherently faces attacks from extreme weather, leading to service degradation. Consequently, the objective function (3) quantifies the value of traffic demand within the traffic network, minus the costs caused by time delays.

$$F^{\text{TN}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{ser}}} x_i^{\text{ser}} \left(r_i^{\text{in},(0)} + r_i^{\text{in},(1)} i_{\text{dist}} - r_i^{\text{time}} i_{\text{delay}} \Delta t \right) \quad (3)$$

$r_i^{\text{in},(0)}$ represents the fixed value of traffic demand i , and $r_i^{\text{in},(1)}$ denotes the value per unit distance of traffic demand i . r_i^{time} indicates the cost per unit time delay for traffic demand i .

The basic details of the network flow model in the time-space-energy augmented network can be referred to in the authors' previous work focused on transportation topics [21]. It describes the general constraints that the network flow must follow. The following notations are defined: \mathcal{G} is the set of locations in the traffic network. \mathcal{F} is the set of charging stations. \mathcal{S}' is the set of nodes requiring fuel delivery. s_n and e_n represent the external inflow and outflow of the extended node n , respectively.

$o_{\text{ori},\text{des},t}$ is the number of traffic demands requesting to move from ori to des during time period t , and $x_{\text{ori},\text{des},t}^{\text{drop}}$ represents the number of these traffic demands that are not satisfied. $P_{f,t}^{\text{cha}}$ and $P_{f,t}^{\text{dis}}$ denote the charging and discharging power at charging node f during time period t . $\xi_{s,t}^{\text{sup}}$ represents the amount of fuel supplied to fuel demand node s during time period t . $\theta_{g,t}$ indicates the amount of resources (such as materials, personnel, etc.) actively engaged in emergency repairs at location g during time period t .

$$\forall x_i^{\text{re}}, x_i^{\text{cha}}, x_i^{\text{dis}}, x_i^{\text{ser}}, x_i^{\text{stop}}, x_{\text{ori},\text{des},t}^{\text{drop}}, x_i^{\text{GR}}, x_i^{\text{IR}}, x_i^{\text{FT}}, e_n \geq 0 \quad (4a)$$

$$\sum_{\text{type} \in \{\text{ser}, \text{re}, \text{cha}, \text{dis}, \text{stop}, \text{GR}, \text{IR}, \text{FT}\}} \left(\sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{type}} \\ i_{\text{ori}} = n}} x_i^{\text{type}} - \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{type}} \\ i_{\text{des}} = n}} x_i^{\text{type}} \right) = s_n - e_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{E} \quad (4b)$$

$$e_n = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ if } n_{\text{time}} < t^{\text{max}} \text{ or } n_{\text{soc}} < c^0 \quad (4c)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{E}} e_n = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{E}} s_n \quad (4d)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{ser}} \\ i_{\text{ori},\text{loc}} = \text{ori} \\ i_{\text{des},\text{loc}} = \text{des} \\ i_{\text{ori},\text{time}} = t}} x_i^{\text{ser}} = o_{\text{ori},\text{des},t} - x_{\text{ori},\text{des},t}^{\text{drop}}, \quad \forall \text{ori}, \text{des} \in \mathcal{G}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (4e)$$

$$C_f^{\text{max}} \geq P_{f,t}^{\text{cha}} = P^{\text{cha}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cha}} \\ i_{\text{ori},\text{loc}} = f \\ i_{\text{ori},\text{time}} = t}} x_i^{\text{cha}}, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (4f)$$

$$C_f^{\max} \geq P_{f,t}^{\text{dis}} = P^{\text{dis}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{dis}} \\ i_{\text{ori,loc}} = f \\ i_{\text{ori,time}} = t}} x_i^{\text{dis}}, \forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (4g)$$

$$\xi_{s,t}^{\text{sup}} = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{FT}} \\ i_{\text{des,loc}} = s \\ i_{\text{des,time}} = t}} x_i^{\text{FT}}, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}', \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (4h)$$

$$\theta_{g,t} = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{IR}} \\ i_{\text{ori,loc}} = g \\ i_{\text{ori,time}} = t}} x_i^{\text{IR}}, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (4i)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{IR}} \\ i_{\text{ori}} = n}} x_i^{\text{IR}} \leq \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{GR}} \\ i_{\text{des}} = n}} x_i^{\text{GR}} + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{IR}} \\ i_{\text{des}} = n}} x_i^{\text{IR}}, \forall n \in \mathcal{E} \quad (4j)$$

To comprehensively describe the diverse types of behaviors in the traffic network, different types of edges and traffic flows are defined. $\mathcal{I}^{\text{type}}$ and x_i^{type} represent the set of edges of a specific type “type” and the traffic flow on edge i of that type, respectively. In this paper, “type” includes the following eight categories: ser (satisfying traffic demand), re (empty vehicle movement), cha (charging), dis (discharging), stop (remaining stationary), GR (emergency repair movement), IR (in the process of emergency repair), and FT (fuel transportation). The decision types in the traffic network can be further adjusted according to practical needs, such as removing the SOC dimension in the augmented network to adapt to non-electric vehicles.

Constraints (4a)-(4d) define the basic behavior of the network flow. Constraint (4a) is the non-negativity constraint. Constraint (4b) is the network flow conservation at the nodes. Constraints (4c) and (4d) combined require that all flows must exit the network from a node with SOC of at least c^0 at the final time period t^{\max} , while also ensuring that the total number of vehicles remains constant. This means that, at the end of the time period, all vehicles should have an SOC no less than c^0 .

On this basis, additional descriptions are added to reflect the impact of each type of vehicle activity. Constraint (4e) describes the behavior that satisfies traffic demand. Constraints (4f) and (4g) aggregate charging and discharging vehicles into charging and discharging power. Constraint (4h) aggregates fuel supply vehicles into the fuel supply amount. Constraint (4i) aggregates repair vehicles into the number of resources committed to the repair work. Constraint (4j) describes the continuity of the repair process. These variables are a concentrated representation of the coupling between the transportation system and other systems.

D. System coupling

The coupling between energy and transportation systems can be categorized into energy, logistics, and repair operations. Detailed formulations are provided in [25]. The following focuses on the coupling between repair traffic flow and the energy system.

Let $\delta_{i,j,t}$ indicate whether the repair resources for the power line (i,j) at time period t exceed the required threshold $R^{\text{need}}_{i,j}$ [20]. $t_{i,j}^{\text{break}}$ denotes the time period when the power

line (i,j) is first destroyed by a disaster, which is generated by the disaster attack model. $t_{i,j}^{\text{repair}}$ is the required repair time for the line (i,j) , and it may be a random variable [27].

$$\theta_{j,t} \geq R_{i,j}^{\text{need}} \delta_{i,j,t}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{B}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (5a)$$

$$s_{i,j,t-1} \leq s_{i,j,t} \leq s_{i,j,t-1} + \prod_{\tau=t-t_{i,j}^{\text{repair}}}^{t-1} \delta_{i,j,\tau}, \quad (5b)$$

$$\forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{B}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, t - t_{i,j}^{\text{repair}} \geq t_{i,j}^{\text{break}} \\ s_{i,j,t} = 0, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{B}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, t_{i,j}^{\text{break}} \leq t < t_{i,j}^{\text{break}} + t_{i,j}^{\text{repair}} \quad (5c)$$

Constraint (5a) requires that if $\delta_{i,j,t} = 1$, the repair resources invested in line (i,j) must exceed the threshold. Constraints (5b) and (5c) require that for a line that has been destroyed, if it is to be re-closed, there must have been a continuous repair process with sufficient resources for $t_{i,j}^{\text{repair}}$ periods before the closure (or it must have been repaired and closed earlier).

E. Hazard attack

Different extreme weather events will impose various forms or combinations of damage on urban infrastructure systems. This study takes a rainstorm as a representative extreme weather event, highlighting the interdependence between energy and transportation systems, with the modeling of wind fields, precipitation, and related references detailed in [25].

The random variables describing the effects of rainstorms are as follows: $u_{i,j,t}$ represents the state of the power line or transportation road (i,j) under attack by the disaster at time period t , where 0 means it is attacked, and 1 means it is not attacked. For traffic roads with reduced performance but no interruption, $v_{a,b,t}$ indicates the performance level of road (a,b) at time period t . These variables can be sampled using the Monte Carlo method, combining rainstorm disaster modeling and vulnerability probability curves. Thus, if reliable vulnerability curves can be obtained, the modeling approach presented in this paper can also be extended to other types of extreme weather, as effects like snowstorms or icing ultimately influence system performance through random variables in the model.

Additionally, the following symbols are defined: \mathcal{B} denotes the set of branches in the power network. $s_{i,j,t}$ indicates whether the branch (i,j) is closed, where 0 means open and 1 means closed. $t_{i,a}$ represents the time period at which the flow on edge i in the time-space-energy network reaches location a , considering the impact of road performance. $T_{a,b}$ is the required travel time for road (a,b) under normal conditions. $\text{path}(i)$ represents the set of roads in the time-space-energy network corresponding to the path chosen for edge i .

$$|s_{i,j,t} - u_{i,j,t} s_{i,j,t-1}| \leq 1 - u_{i,j,t}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{B}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (6a)$$

$$x_i^{\text{type}} = 0, \text{ if } \prod_{(a,b) \in \text{path}(i)} u_{a,b,t_{i,a}} = 0, \\ \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{type}}, \text{ type} \in \{\text{ser, re, GR, FT}\} \quad (6b)$$

$$x_i^{\text{type}} = 0, \text{ if } i_{\text{delay}} \neq \left[\frac{1}{\Delta t} \sum_{(a,b) \in \text{path}(i)} \frac{1 - v_{a,b,t_i,a}}{v_{a,b,t_i,a}} T_{a,b} \right],$$

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{type}}, \text{ type} \in \{\text{ser, re, GR, FT}\} \quad (6c)$$

$$x_i^{\text{GR}} = 0, \text{ if } \prod_{(j, i_{\text{des}}) \in \mathcal{B}} u_{j, i_{\text{des}}, i_{\text{ori}}, \text{time}} = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{GR}} \quad (6d)$$

Constraint (6a) represents the relationship between disaster damage and line closure status, which is also influenced by the repair constraints described in Section III-D. Constraint (6b) ensures that all movement behaviors (satisfying transportation demand, empty vehicle movement, repair movement, and fuel transportation) require that the roads along the path are not interrupted. Constraint (6c) chooses out the time delay associated with the path corresponding to a specific movement behavior. Constraint (6d) prohibits the pre-allocation of repair resources unless a line interruption has occurred.

IV. IDENTIFICATION OF VULNERABLE COMPONENTS AND SURROGATE-BASED METHODS

A. Direct Method for Quantifying Vulnerable Components

The risk assessment framework not only aims to reveal the potential risk levels of extreme weather events but also provides targeted strategic recommendations for responding to such events. Identifying system vulnerabilities is a key function of the framework. By simulating a specific extreme weather event, the results should help improve understanding of the system's structure and accurately identify which components' failures are primarily responsible for service disruptions. When preventive conditions are met, the framework can guide the allocation of time and resources to reinforce weak system components [5].

This paper argues that the vulnerability of a component under extreme weather events should encompass at least the following aspects: (1) Its failure probability is high. (2) The failure time is long, especially if it is in a hard-to-repair location. (3) Its failure causes significant system losses, particularly cross-system impacts.

Focusing on only one aspect of vulnerability is clearly inadequate. For example, even if a line has a high failure probability, if it is in an unimportant location in the network and its failure doesn't cause significant load loss, it cannot be considered vulnerable. Considering the characteristics of only one system is also incomplete. For instance, a power line's failure may not cause significant electric load loss but could lead to large heat load losses due to cascading effects like electric heating.

Urban infrastructure systems form a coupled whole, and this coupling mechanism is complex. Existing vulnerability indicators based on graph theory and physical properties for power networks are difficult to transfer easily and reasonably to multi-network energy-transportation systems, and heuristic indicator construction inherently involves some subjectivity. To fully capture the aspects of vulnerability, this paper adopts a direct method to evaluate the vulnerability of a system component. Specifically, the paper evaluates the vulnerability

of a component b by performing Monte Carlo simulations in Section II for both its "before reinforcement" and "after reinforcement" states. The expected values of the objective function for the two simulations are Obj_b and Obj_0 . As defined in equation (7), their difference (absolute or relative) directly represents the system performance improvement achieved by reinforcing component b , referred to as the reinforcement utility, denoted U_b^{Abs} or U_b^{Rel} .

$$U_b^{\text{Abs}} = \text{Obj}_b - \text{Obj}_0; \quad U_b^{\text{Rel}} = \frac{\text{Obj}_b - \text{Obj}_0}{\text{Obj}_0} \quad (7)$$

This definition of the indicator is simple, intuitive, and free from any additional heuristic subjectivity. Furthermore, since the ultimate application of vulnerability assessment is to prioritize preventive reinforcement, directly simulating the reinforced system provides a practical evaluation method. Because the Monte Carlo-based risk assessment framework already accounts for factors such as trade-offs between probability and consequences and energy-transportation interdependence, the vulnerability indicator (7) naturally encompasses a comprehensive meaning.

B. Neural Network Surrogate-Based Method

The main challenge in using the direct method to identify system vulnerabilities lies in the efficiency issues caused by repeatedly running Monte Carlo simulations. In order to rank the vulnerability of all system components and highlight the most critical ones, full-scale Monte Carlo simulations are required for both the "before reinforcement" and "after reinforcement" states of each component. The computational burden involved in this process can be very large.

On the other hand, the system components typically of interest are power lines, which are independently reinforced and repaired by the power grid company. While the power lines are assets of the power grid company, the company cannot consider the interdependencies between systems using only its own models. It needs to obtain detailed information from the heat and transportation networks, which may raise privacy concerns. Establishing and maintaining models of the heat and transportation networks would also impose an additional burden on the power grid company.

To accelerate computation and protect privacy, this paper proposes a vulnerability assessment method based on neural network surrogates, building on the direct method. The core idea is to train neural networks that can fit the mapping of boundary variables to the objective function, replacing the roles of the heat and transportation networks. As shown in Fig. 2, the proposed method involves two phases: training and embedding.

- 1) **Training phase.** The heat and transportation networks generate samples independently and train surrogate models for themselves. The input to the surrogate model is the boundary variables of the network, and the output is the objective function of the network. When generating samples, the boundary variables should cover a broad range to enable the surrogate model to learn different patterns, such as good and bad scenarios.




Fig. 2. Surrogate-based approach for system vulnerability identification and quantification.

- 2) **Embedding phase.** The power network receives the trained surrogate models and attempts to independently assess the vulnerability of power lines using the direct method. In the original model, all internal variables and constraints of the heat and transportation networks are replaced by the surrogates, leaving only the boundary variables interacting with the outside world. The surrogate model provides the objective function corresponding to specific boundary variables of the sub-network. Therefore, when solving the surrogate model, the power network can perceive the interactions between itself and other networks.

It should be noted that models with surrogate constraints are more complex than models of a general nature. A learning constraint requires several auxiliary variables and constraints to reconstruct it into a set of mixed-integer constraints to embed the original optimization problem [28]. For example, this paper uses a neural network with ReLU activation functions and linear hidden layers. For a given neuron, let x_1, \dots, x_n represent the outputs of the n neurons from the previous layer, β_1, \dots, β_n be the weights of the edges connecting the previous layer neurons to this neuron, and β_0 be the bias. Then, the output y of the current neuron after the activation function is:

$$y = \text{ReLU}(w) = \max(0, w) = \max\left(0, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i x_i + \beta_0\right) \quad (8)$$

The ReLU activation function is essentially a max operator, so $y = \text{ReLU}(w)$ can be linearized using Big-M, where M is a sufficiently large positive number and u is an auxiliary binary variable:

$$\begin{cases} y \geq w, \\ y \geq 0, \\ y \leq (1-u)M, \\ y \leq w + uM, \\ u \in \{0, 1\} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Compared to the original model, the model with neural network surrogates remains a mixed-integer linear programming problem. Although embedding the neural network introduces

TABLE I
CASE SETUP FOR NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS.

	Repair Crew	Preventive Reinforce	Topology Reconfig	Power Supply	Fuel Transport
Case#1	✗	✗	✗	✗	—
Case#2	Ideal Repair	✗	✗	✗	—
Case#3	✓	✗	✗	✗	—
Case#4	✓	✓	✗	✗	—
Case#5	✓	✗	✓	✗	—
Case#6	✓	✗	✗	✓	—
Case#7(*)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Case#8(*)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓

(*): Insufficient initial fuel reserves.

auxiliary variables and constraints, the number of variables and constraints in the model is still significantly reduced compared to the original model, leading to a substantial acceleration in solution speed.

Additionally, the surrogate neural networks are trained by the heat network and transportation network independently, generating their own samples and training their models. This step only involves the sub-networks themselves and is much smaller in scale than the comprehensive model, making it possible for the sub-networks to complete this step in advance. During the embedding phase, the heat and transportation networks only provide the power network with the neural network structure and parameters, without needing to provide any internal information. Therefore, the surrogate approach ensures privacy protection, allowing the power network to independently assess the vulnerability of power lines, considering interdependencies between systems without requiring detailed information about other networks.

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

This paper conducts numerical experiments using an integrated energy system comprising a 33-node power network, a 27-node heat network, and a 33-node transportation network. A typhoon of approximately level 15, accompanied by a rainstorm, is set to make landfall at the system at 12:00 on Day 1. Detailed configurations of the system and hurricane disaster scenarios are available in [25].

A. Extreme weather risk assessment and multi-type emergency decision-making

All cases employ Monte Carlo simulations to compute 200 scenarios. The performance metrics of the networks are calculated by dividing the objective function values obtained from simulations by the baseline values under disaster-free conditions, resulting in a numerical range between 0 and 1.

As shown in Table I, this paper sets up eight cases to demonstrate the scalability of the proposed framework, covering various emergency factors in an extreme weather event. Among these, preventive reinforcement is non-targeted, with five power lines and ten transportation roads randomly selected for reinforcement. Meanwhile, “Ideal Repair” denotes repair operations that disregard the impact of rainstorms on the transportation network and resource constraints.




Fig. 3. System indicator curves of all cases.

Figure 3 illustrates that under different combinations of emergency decision factors, the power, heat, and transportation networks exhibit distinct performance curves. Thanks to the consideration of multiple emergency decisions, various insights can be provided through combination and comparison.

Due to the destruction of power lines by the hurricane and the obstruction of traffic by the rainstorm, both the power and transportation systems suffer inevitable performance losses. Generally, the heat network is least affected as it is not directly attacked by the hurricane and rainstorm, but it still experiences performance degradation due to interdependencies. Without any emergency decisions (Case#1), the power system cannot recover to its normal state after being hit by the disaster. The heat network can maintain normal performance during off-peak hours, and the transportation network's performance can gradually recover as road-accumulated water subsides.

Each added emergency decision enhances the ability of the energy-transportation coupled system to maintain performance during extreme weather events. Power system repairs (Case#3) allow for gradual restoration of power supply and performance. Compared to ideal repairs (Case#2), actual repairs are constrained by the transportation network's performance and resource availability, with delays caused by rain-induced waterlogging postponing the repair of damaged lines, thus slowing the recovery speed. Preventive reinforcement (Case#4) directly improves each system's performance during the disaster. Topology reconfiguration (Case#5) significantly enhances the service performance of the power and heat networks by avoiding interruptions to certain critical power and heat loads. EV power supply (Case#6), through discharging, temporarily assists in supplying certain critical power loads and indirectly helps protect heat loads.

If the initial fuel reserve is insufficient (Case#7), its impact will ripple through all systems. Power and heat sources will be constrained by fuel shortages, forcing reduced output and load shedding. The transportation system will suffer performance losses due to charging limitations. However, as shown in Fig. 4, even with insufficient fuel reserves, vehicle dispatch for fuel transport (Case#8) can alleviate fuel shortages, promoting power and heat generation and pulling the system's performance curve back to that of fuel-sufficient conditions, closely overlapping with Case#3.




Fig. 4. Vehicle behaviors in transportation system (Case#8) - scenario average




Fig. 5. Contribution of different emergency decisions in reducing extreme weather losses.

By comparing with the baseline, the utility of each emergency decision can be quantified. As shown in Fig. 5, among single emergency decisions, topology reconfiguration can reduce 84.45% of the value loss caused by extreme weather, making it the most effective emergency decision in this context.

The above combinations and comparisons powerfully demonstrate the risk superposition and mutual support brought by energy-transportation coupling while also highlighting the necessity of comprehensively considering interdependencies among systems and multi-type emergency decisions.

B. Rapid identification of system vulnerabilities

To identify vulnerable power lines under extreme weather, five methods were set up for comparison to highlight the advantages of the proposed framework combining models and surrogates.

- **Direct Method (DM):** Each power line is reinforced, and the system with the reinforcement is simulated to evaluate the utility of reinforcing that line. This is the most comprehensive simulation and serves as the benchmark.
- **Assessment using only power network model (Only Power, OP):** This method evaluates line vulnerability by considering only the power network, ignoring interdependencies with other systems.
- **Assessment using only surrogate model (Only Surrogate, OS):** Using data from Monte Carlo simulations, a neural network surrogate for the coupled energy-transportation system is trained. The input consists of extreme weather scenarios, and the output is the system performance indicator. This method directly evaluates line vulnerability via the surrogate.
- **Heuristic loss allocation (Heuristic Allocation, HA):** This method heuristically attributes losses from $t - 1$ to




Fig. 6. Accuracy of different methods in identifying vulnerable lines.

t to the power line that was in a failed state during this period. The losses are distributed across the lines proportionally, and the lines with the highest cumulative loss responsibility are deemed most critical for reinforcement.

- **Assessment using proposed method (Surrogates with Power model, SP):** The heat and transportation networks are represented by neural network surrogates, combined with the power network, which uses a physical model.

All methods were evaluated using the same set of Monte Carlo scenarios, with the results of DM as the benchmark. Additional details can be found in [25]. Six repeat experiments with different random seeds were conducted. Figure 6 shows the accuracy of each method in identifying the top 5 or 10 weakest lines.

The proposed SP method outperforms other baseline methods, achieving accuracy close to that of DM while reducing computation time by approximately 27 times. This result aligns with theoretical expectations.

When evaluating with only the power network model (OP), the identified vulnerabilities are limited to within the power system itself, missing interdependencies across systems. For instance, as shown in Fig. 7, line (#7 – #8) is the most critical in the coupled system due to electric heating at bus #8. Failure of line (#7 – #8) not only disrupts electric loads but also significantly affects heat loads, causing substantial losses. The OP method cannot capture this relationship and thus fails to identify this critical line.

The main issue with heuristic methods like HA is the difficulty in quantifying causal relationships between system losses and component failures. Even if losses and failures occur simultaneously, their causal relationship depends on the system structure and operational mechanisms. Additionally, the intensity of causation varies among components, making it challenging to define a fair loss allocation rule.

The surrogate-only method (OS) also has limitations. Complex interdependencies are difficult for standard neural networks to capture fully, often requiring more sophisticated architectures. Furthermore, a lack of high-quality training samples constrains data-driven methods. Surrogate models need to be trained on a wide range of scenarios to differentiate between “good” and “bad” cases, capturing the impact of line reinforcement. However, a single Monte Carlo simulation rarely covers all possible scenarios, and generating such samples requires repeated coupled simulations, which would




Fig. 7. Vulnerability indicator of power lines. (a) DM. (b) OP.

TABLE II
PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT METHODS IN REPEATED RANDOM EXPERIMENTS.

	Computation Time (s)	Top-5	Top-10
		Loss Reduction (\$)	Loss Reduction (\$)
DM	69952 ± 3177	902335 ± 223786	1294606 ± 335152
OP	717 ± 2.74	486066 ± 175044	815438 ± 233432
OS	1.43 ± 0.16	330149 ± 57771	627966 ± 199822
HA	47.77 ± 1.69	424717 ± 177894	844558 ± 310988
SP	2623 ± 31.27	855665 ± 211725	1290301 ± 319964

almost revert to the original DM and undermine the purpose of using surrogates.

The proposed SP method strikes a balance among the approaches mentioned above. Compared to DM, it significantly reduces the problem size and accelerates evaluation while preserving interdependencies and privacy. Compared to OP, it partially incorporates interdependencies and captures essential coupling trends. Compared to HA, it adopts a direct method framework, retaining the physical system’s operational details. Compared to OS, it employs a hybrid approach, using models and surrogates. Additionally, the heating and transportation network surrogates are trained independently by the heating and transportation networks themselves, allowing them to autonomously generate a large number of boundary variable inputs covering both “good” and “bad” scenarios as training samples in advance, without needing to interact with other systems.

Reinforcing the lines identified as weak by each method significantly reduces system losses under the same extreme weather scenarios, with results shown in Table II. Data from repeated experiments are presented as “mean ± standard deviation.”

The results demonstrate that although SP cannot perfectly identify the weakest lines, reinforcing the top 5 or 10 lines predicted by SP yields results close to those of DM. Other baseline methods with lower prediction accuracy lead to less effective risk mitigation after reinforcement. This indicates that the proposed method captures essential system trends

and achieves a balance between accuracy and computational efficiency.

VI. CONCLUSION

Under the threat of extreme weather events, urban infrastructure systems, particularly energy and transportation, face challenges of cross-system failure propagation and risk amplification. There are interdependencies and mutual support between systems, accompanied by multi-type energy-transportation emergency decisions. This paper proposes a risk assessment framework that accommodates multiple types of emergency decisions, integrating the heterogeneous energy and transportation sides to simulate and quantify the impacts of extreme weather events on energy-transportation coupled systems. Based on this framework, a method for identifying system vulnerabilities is further developed, with neural network surrogates used to accelerate evaluation and ensure privacy protection.

The scenario-based approach employed in this framework can improve sampling efficiency and accelerate simulation through unsupervised learning and other methods. Additionally, integrating causal inference mechanisms into vulnerability assessment will enhance interpretability, providing guidance for targeted resilience improvements. These topics will be the focus of future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Hafeznia and B. Stojadinović, "ResQ-IOS: An iterative optimization-based simulation framework for quantifying the resilience of interdependent critical infrastructure systems to natural hazards," *Applied Energy*, vol. 349, p. 121558, Nov. 2023.
- [2] S. A. Markolf, C. Hoehne, A. Fraser, M. V. Chester, and B. S. Underwood, "Transportation resilience to climate change and extreme weather events – beyond risk and robustness," *Transport Policy*, vol. 74, pp. 174–186, Feb. 2019.
- [3] S. V. Buldyrev, R. Parshani, G. Paul, H. E. Stanley, and S. Havlin, "Catastrophic cascade of failures in interdependent networks," *Nature*, vol. 464, pp. 1025–1028, Apr. 2010.
- [4] F. H. Jufri, V. Widiuputra, and J. Jung, "State-of-the-art review on power grid resilience to extreme weather events: Definitions, frameworks, quantitative assessment methodologies, and enhancement strategies," *Applied Energy*, vol. 239, pp. 1049–1065, Apr. 2019.
- [5] J. Stürmer, A. Plietzsch, T. Vogt, F. Hellmann, J. Kurths, C. Otto, K. Frieler, and M. Anvari, "Increasing the resilience of the Texas power grid against extreme storms by hardening critical lines," *Nature Energy*, vol. 9, pp. 526–535, May 2024.
- [6] L. Wang, B. Chen, Y. Ye, P. Chongfuangprinya, B. Yang, D. Zhao, and T. Hong, "Enhancing distribution system restoration with coordination of repair crew, electric vehicle, and renewable energy," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 15, pp. 3694–3705, Jul. 2024.
- [7] R. Tao, D. Zhao, H. Wang, and X. Xia, "Multi-stage defender-attacker-defender model for distribution system resilience enhancement in ice storms with line hardening, mobile device and repair crew dispatching," *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, vol. 9, pp. 1103–1118, May 2023.
- [8] W. Wang, X. Xiong, Y. He, J. Hu, and H. Chen, "Scheduling of separable mobile energy storage systems with mobile generators and fuel tankers to boost distribution system resilience," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, pp. 443–457, Jan. 2022.
- [9] B. Li, Y. Chen, W. Wei, Y. Hou, and S. Mei, "Enhancing resilience of emergency heat and power supply via deployment of lng tube trailers: A mean-risk optimization approach," *Applied Energy*, vol. 318, p. 119204, Jul. 2022.
- [10] R. Tao, D. Zhao, C. Xu, H. Wang, and X. Xia, "Resilience enhancement of integrated electricity-gas-heat urban energy system with data centres considering waste heat reuse," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 14, pp. 183–198, Jan. 2023.
- [11] K. Wang, Y. Xue, Q. Guo, M. Shahidehpour, Q. Zhou, B. Wang, and H. Sun, "A coordinated reconfiguration strategy for multi-stage resilience enhancement in integrated power distribution and heating networks," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 14, pp. 2709–2722, Jul. 2023.
- [12] J. Wang, Q. Guo, B. Wang, and H. Sun, "Risk assessment of energy-transportation coupled system with unified integration of multi-type emergency decisions under extreme weather," in *2024 IEEE 7th Student Conference on Electric Machines and Systems (SCEMS)*, pp. 1–6, Nov. 2024.
- [13] Y. Fan, N. Chen, Y. Zhao, X. Ding, R. Zhang, and X.-P. Zhang, "Review of methodology and best practice of power system restoration plan," *Energy Internet*, vol. 1, pp. 123–140, Dec. 2024.
- [14] D. Qiu, Y. Wang, T. Zhang, M. Sun, and G. Strbac, "Hierarchical multi-agent reinforcement learning for repair crews dispatch control towards multi-energy microgrid resilience," *Applied Energy*, vol. 336, p. 120826, Apr. 2023.
- [15] J. Duquette, A. Rowe, and P. Wild, "Thermal performance of a steady state physical pipe model for simulating district heating grids with variable flow," *Applied Energy*, vol. 178, pp. 383–393, Sept. 2016.
- [16] T. Zhao, H. Yan, X. Liu, and Z. Ding, "Congestion-aware dynamic optimal traffic power flow in coupled transportation power systems," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 19, pp. 1833–1843, Feb. 2023.
- [17] L. Yang, X. Sun, X. Cao, M. Chen, and X. Guan, "Joint chance-constrained coordinated scheduling for electricity-heat coupled systems considering hydrogen storage," *Energy Internet*, vol. 1, pp. 99–111, Aug. 2024.
- [18] Y. Xue, M. Shahidehpour, Z. Pan, B. Wang, Q. Zhou, Q. Guo, and H. Sun, "Reconfiguration of district heating network for operational flexibility enhancement in power system unit commitment," *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, vol. 12, pp. 1161–1173, Apr. 2021.
- [19] W. Wei, D. WU, Q. WU, M. Shafie-Khah, and J. P. Catalão, "Interdependence between transportation system and power distribution system: a comprehensive review on models and applications," *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, vol. 7, pp. 433–448, May 2019.
- [20] Y. Ge, L. Du, and H. Ye, "Co-optimization approach to post-storm recovery for interdependent power and transportation systems," *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, vol. 7, pp. 688–695, Jul. 2019.
- [21] J. Wang, Y. Sheng, H. Ge, X. Bai, J. Su, Q. Guo, and H. Sun, "Charging pricing for autonomous mobility-on-demand fleets based on game theory," *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, vol. 12, pp. 2006–2018, Nov. 2024.
- [22] M. Panteli, D. N. Trakas, P. Mancarella, and N. D. Hatziargyriou, "Power systems resilience assessment: Hardening and smart operational enhancement strategies," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 105, pp. 1202–1213, Jul. 2017.
- [23] L. Xu, N. Lin, D. Xi, K. Feng, and H. V. Poor, "Hazard resistance-based spatiotemporal risk analysis for distribution network outages during hurricanes," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, pp. 1–10, Sept. 2024.
- [24] B. Li, Y. Chen, W. Wei, S. Mei, Y. Hou, and S. Shi, "Preallocation of electric buses for resilient restoration of distribution network: A data-driven robust stochastic optimization method," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 16, pp. 2753–2764, Jun. 2022.
- [25] J. Wang, "Supplementary materials for risk and vulnerability assessment of energy-transportation infrastructure systems to extreme weather." <https://github.com/DEPOT-JW/Extreme-Weather-Risk-Assessment-and-Vulnerability-Identification>, Jan. 2025.
- [26] Y. Zhou, X. Li, H. Han, Z. Wei, H. Zang, G. Sun, and S. Chen, "Resilience-oriented planning of integrated electricity and heat systems: A stochastic distributionally robust optimization approach," *Applied Energy*, vol. 353, p. 122053, Jan. 2024.
- [27] H. Zhang, Z. Bie, G. Li, and Y. Lin, "Assessment method and metrics of power system resilience after disasters," *The Journal of Engineering*, vol. 2019, pp. 880–883, Jan. 2019.
- [28] D. Maragno, H. Wiberg, D. Bertsimas, Ş. İ. Birbil, D. den Hertog, and A. O. Fajemisin, "Mixed-integer optimization with constraint learning," *Operations Research*, Dec. 2023.