

# **A New Approach for Dam Safety Assessment Using the Extended Cloud Model**

**Liansheng Sang1 · Jun Wang1 · Jueyi Sui2 · Mauricio Dziedzic2**

Received: 10 November 2021 / Accepted: 18 March 2022 / Published online: 31 March 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2022, corrected publication 2022

## **Abstract**

To address the uncertainty problem in the assessment of the overall safety trend of dams and in the selection of safety trend warning indicators, an Extended Cloud Model (ECM) combined with the Extended Analytic Hierarchy Process (EAHP) method is proposed in this study. In this new approach, diferent factors refecting dam safety monitoring have been considered as a fuzzy system. Considering the characteristics of the forward cloud model and the backward cloud model, the original data have been extended to classify the division interval and determine the respective indicators. The weight distribution for each indicator level has been determined using the EAHP method. The model developed was applied to evaluate the safety trend of the Jilintai concrete panel rockfll dam. Simulation results showed that the proposed model can generate reliable results, in addition to being used to assess the uncertainty problem and the safety warning indicator. The proposed model is also more fexible and easier to use than other methods.

**Keywords** Extended cloud model (ECM) · Extended Analytic Hierarchy Process (EAHP) · Concrete panel rockfill dam · Safety trend assessment

## **1 Introduction**

As the age of the dam increases, certain unsafe factors can arise in the dam, such as the seepage accidents that have occurred in the Northwest Pass Hydropower Station and the Barragrande Hydropower Station. Therefore, using the prototype observation data, based on comprehensive, accurate and reliable safety monitoring data and design information of the corresponding hydraulic buildings, comprehensive analysis of the prediction results of safety monitoring data, for each monitoring index risk factors, the construction of early warning system, in advance or timely warning when abnormalities and alarms are predicted to occur or actually occur, and then form a suitable method for the evaluation of the safety operation of hydraulic buildings, for the early warning of potential safety hazards of dam projects and dam maintenance has a very important signifcance and practical value.

 $\boxtimes$  Jueyi Sui jueyi.sui@unbc.ca Jun C Wang

junwanghfut@126.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Present Address: School of Civil and Water Engineering, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, China

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> School of Engineering, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada

There are many factors that affect the safety of dams, and a comprehensive evaluation of dam safety requires the setting of diferent monitoring indicators. The methods to establish the early warning value of indicators (such as deformation early warning value) are confdence interval method, small probability method and limit state method (Wu and Su [2005;](#page-13-0) Lei et al. [2011](#page-13-1); Wu et al. [2011;](#page-13-2) Su et al. [2012\)](#page-13-3). Some scholars combined with other theories (Gu et al. [2017](#page-12-0)) to establish a risk management-based method for formulating deformation warning indicator values for concrete dams based on the risk theory of concrete dams and the method for formulating deformation indicators for structural calculations, and applied it to a hydropower plant to verify the feasibility of the method. However, all these methods have their limitations and shortcomings: the confdence interval method and the typical small probability method only when the observation data series is long and really encounter more unfavorable load combinations, the predicted monitoring index is close to the extreme value, which is not fexible enough, and the probability of failure is not normative to follow, there is a certain subjective empirical; the limit state method must have complete test data of the physical and mechanical parameters of the dam and dam foundation materials when fnding the monitoring index of the monitoring efect quantity (Su et al. [2017](#page-13-4)). The method of formulating early warning indicators for concrete dam deformation based on risk management theory is not fexible enough, and it is necessary to adjust the dam failure mode and path with the downstream socio-economic development and reformulate the early warning values.

The problem of uncertainty will exist in the evaluation of the overall safety trend of dams, and Li et al. [\(1995](#page-13-5)) proposed a cloud model theory based on probability theory and fuzzy mathematics to realize the mutual transformation of mapping relationships between qualitative concepts and quantitative evaluation, which can well solve the non-existent qualitative and random nature of the problem. Currently, cloud models have been applied and achieved good results in many felds due to their fuzzy and stochastic properties (Li et al. [2017;](#page-13-6) Zhang et al. [2014;](#page-13-7) Yan et al. [2019;](#page-13-8) Liu et al. [2014;](#page-13-9) Yan and Xu [2019;](#page-13-10) Wu et al. [2021;](#page-13-11) Peng and Deng [2020](#page-13-12)). There have been many studies on dam safety assessment (He et al. [2020](#page-13-13); Jafary et al. [2018](#page-13-14); Su et al. [2017;](#page-13-4) Gu et al. [2022](#page-12-1); Yang et al. [2018](#page-13-15)), but cloud models in comprehensive dam safety assessment started later (Li et al. [2014](#page-13-16); He et al. [2016;](#page-12-2) He and Gao [2018;](#page-12-3) Fan et al. [2017\)](#page-12-4), the application of traditional cloud models in dam safety evaluation, although it can well rate the dam safety, the results obtained are relatively single, and the indicators refecting the safe operation of the dam are not clear, and cannot give the results of the proposed early warning values and the weak links afecting the dam safety.

The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) was proposed by Saaty in the 1970s and is commonly used to determine indicator weights (Araujo and Dias [2021](#page-12-5); Ho et al. [2021;](#page-13-17) Radhika et al. [2021;](#page-13-18) Nouha et al. [2021](#page-13-19)). When an assessment matrix for comparing indicators is developed based on pairwise comparisons conducted by experts in the feld, the resulting weighting factors may have a strong subjective uncertainty due to diferent experiences and perceptions of diferent experts. Topology is a discipline that can be used to solve paradoxical problems by creating matter elements and relation elements. The subject, its features and data are considered as three important elements to describe the objective matter. By using intervals instead of discrete values, researchers have combined the traditional AHP with topology to construct an assessment matrix to obtain the weight values of indicators of each level. This method is called the Extended Analytic Hierarchy Process (EAHP), and the indicator weights thus obtained are considered more objective (Dong et al. [2021\)](#page-12-6).

Dam health diagnosis is a complex nonlinear problem with uncertainty, multiple levels, and multiple indicators. The difficulty is firstly to establish a fuzzy system reflecting the combination of overall dam safety monitoring items, and secondly to solve the problem of uncertainty and stochasticity. This study established a new approach for dam safety assessment using the extended cloud model, using prototype observations and the characteristics of the forward cloud model and inverse cloud model to solve the problem of ambiguity and randomness in safety monitoring, and to obtain the grade classifcation based on the original data by extending the The evaluation system of safety trend of Jilintai panel rockfll dam was established based on the risk factors of each monitoring index, and the weight distribution of each index level was determined by combining EAHP to form a suitable evaluation method for the safety operation of hydraulic buildings. The ECM-EAHP method has the advantages of high fexibility, high operability, multiple results, small calculation cost and good visualization. In practice, it can well delete and update indicators as needed, or integrate and subdivide some original indicators to generate some needed derived indicators, which are suitable for dam safety monitoring automation platform and can visually display the dam safety trend, and can provide technical support for the integrated system of dam safety automation monitoring and early warning.

## **2 Assessment System for Safety Trend of Dams**

Developing the assessment system for dam safety trend is a complex task. The accuracy of the assessment system depends mainly on the selection of indicators. These indicators should be representative and concise. In engineering practice, the indicators for dam safety assessment should cover the following fve parts: environmental variables, dam seepage, dam deformation, face deformation, and stress–strain (Yang et al. [2010a](#page-13-20)). Considering these criteria, 35 indicators were selected. For instance, among these 35 indicators, the seepage indicators included seepage both in the left and right bank, as well as through the dam body. The selected indicators are presented in Fig. [1](#page-3-0) and Table [1.](#page-3-1)

## **3 ECM‑EAHP Assessment Method**

#### **3.1 Concepts and Numerical Characteristics of the Cloud Model**

Setting up a quantitative universe *U* which is represented by an exact value *C* is a qualitative concept on *U*. If  $\forall x \in U$  and x is a one-time random event on the qualitative concept *C*, the certainty degree of *x* on *C* is a random number with a stable propensity, and *x* is called a cloud drop (Li et al. [1995](#page-13-5))

$$
\mu = exp\left[-\frac{\left(x - E_x\right)^2}{2\left(E_n\right)^2}\right] \tag{1}
$$

The cloud model has three important characteristics: expectation  $(E_r)$ , entropy  $(E_n)$ , and hyper entropy  $(H_e)$ . Expectation  $(E_x)$  is the symmetrical axis of the cloud model and represents the most likely events, which are the most typical sample events. Entropy  $(E_n)$  is a representation of the uncertainty of the events, which is the range of cloud drop values that the qualitative concept can assume. The hyper entropy  $(H_e)$  represents the uncertainty of the cloud droplets. It is the thickness of the cloud level. The relationship between expectation  $(E_x)$ , entropy  $(E_n)$  and hyper entropy  $(H_e)$  in the cloud model are shown in Fig. [2a](#page-4-0).

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

## **3.2 Introduction to the Extended Cloud Model (ECM)**

The ECM is based on the reciprocal transformation of qualitative concepts and quantitative relationships using both forward and inverse cloud models. In the process of

Reservoir water level $C_{11}$ DC-1-01 $(C_{111})$		Seepage $C_{21}$	WE-1 $(C_{211})$	
Dam foundation seepage	P-1-06 $(C_{221})$	Seepage around the dam	UP-1-13 $(C_{231})$	
$C_{22}$	P-1-26 $(C_{222})$	$C_{23}$	UP-1-24 $(C_{232})$	
	P-1-30 $(C_{223})$		SY-1 $(C_{233})$	
	P-1-31 $(C_{224})$		UP-1-08 $(C_{234})$	
Horizontal displacement $C_{31}$	ID-1-02 $(C_{311})$		UP-1-29 $(C_{235})$	
	ID-1-11 $(C_{312})$	Sedimentation	TC-1-11 $(C_{321})$	
	ID-1-13 $(C_{313})$	$C_{32}$	TC-1-14 $(C_{322})$	
Perimeter joint	JR-1-02-1 $(C_{411})$		TC-1-18 $(C_{323})$	
$C_{41}$	JR-1-07-1 $(C_{412})$	Vertical joint	J-1–12 $(C_{421})$	
	JR-1-09-2 $(C_{413})$	$C_{42}$	J-1-22 $(C_{422})$	
	JR-1-10-2 $(C_{414})$		J-1-27 $(C_{423})$	
	JR-1-02-3 $(C_{415})$	Reinforcement stress	$R-1-06(C_{511})$	
	JR-1-11-3 $(C_{416})$	$C_{5I}$	$R-1-10(C_{512})$	
Face deformation	TM-1-04 $(C_{431})$		$R-1-13(C_{513})$	
$C_{43}$	TM-1-11 $(C_{432})$	Concrete strain	S3-1-02-3 $(C_{521})$	
	TM-1-20 $(C_{433})$	$C_{52}$	S3-1-05-1 $(C_{522})$	
			S3-1-09-2 $(C_{523})$	

<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Table 1** Indicators and corresponding factors



<span id="page-4-0"></span>**Fig. 2** (**a**) Graph of numerical characteristics of CM and (**b**), (**c**) ECM index value selection

transforming the forward cloud model from the qualitative concept to quantitative relationship, the cloud drops of unfavorable events in the cloud map are divided into afliation scope according to the principle of  $3\sigma$ , and the inverse cloud model is reapplied to transform them into qualitative concepts (levels 1 to 4). From the new qualitative concept (levels 1 to 4), the forward cloud model is again used to complete two transformations from the qualitative concept to the quantitative relationship. The index values of each level are obtained from the perspective probability of occurrence, and the index Extended Cloud Diagram is shown in Fig. [2](#page-4-0)b.

Indicator values can be obtained by extracting the cloud drops of neighboring classes with a distance between two cloud drops less than 0.5 and 0.05 in horizontal and vertical coordinates, respectively. The expected value of their horizontal coordinates is taken as the indicator value, as illustrated in Fig. [2](#page-4-0)c for  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$ , and  $G_3$ .

#### **3.3 EAHP**

#### **3.3.1 Extended Analytic Hierarchy Process Steps**

The matrix for pair-wise comparisons was constructed according to the scale (*bij*) proposed by Saaty and Zhang  $(2016)$  $(2016)$  and the judgment principle. By using the  $1 \sim 9$  scale to define intervals instead of discrete values,where 1 means equally important, 9 means the former is far more important than the latter, and the other numbers take values in between, the judgment matrix  $B = [b_{ij}]_{max}$  (*i, j* = *l, 2, …m*) has been constructed, where  $b_{ij} = [b_{ij}^-, b_{ij}^+]$  is an interval. For indicators describing the same attribute, to assess the importance of each indicator by using pair-wise comparison, such as the assessment of *m* indicators inside of the subset  $C = \{C_1, C_2, C_3, \ldots, C_m\}$  by using a range of importance scales to represent judgment results based on experts' experience, and the values are taken at the symmetrical positions of the judgment matrix (Eq. [\(2](#page-4-1))).

<span id="page-4-1"></span>
$$
b_{ji} = 1/b_{ij} = \left[1/b_{ij}^{+}, 1/b_{ij}^{-}\right]
$$
 (2)

Equation ([3\)](#page-5-0) shows the pair-wise comparison matrix.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>
$$
B = \begin{bmatrix} \langle 1, 1 \rangle & \langle b_{12}^-, b_{12}^+ \rangle & \cdots & \langle b_{1m}^-, b_{1m}^+ \rangle \\ \langle \frac{1}{b_{12}^+}, \frac{1}{b_{12}^-} \rangle & \langle 1, 1 \rangle & \langle \cdots \rangle & \langle b_{1m}^-, b_{1m}^+ \rangle \\ \langle \cdots \rangle & \langle \cdots \rangle & \langle \cdots \rangle & \langle \cdots \rangle \\ \langle \frac{1}{b_{1m}^+}, \frac{1}{b_{1m}^-} \rangle & \langle \frac{1}{b_{2m}^+}, \frac{1}{b_{2m}^-} \rangle & \langle \cdots \rangle & \langle 1, 1 \rangle \end{bmatrix}
$$
(3)

#### **3.3.2 Determination of Indicator Weights**

If  $\lambda^-$ ,  $\lambda^+$  are the maximum eigenvalues of matrix *B*, then  $\lambda = [\lambda^-$ ,  $\lambda^+$ ] is the interval eigenvalue of the matrix *B*. By setting  $x = [x^-, x^+]$  to be the maximum eigenvector corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue of *B*.

$$
\tilde{x}^{-} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{1j}^{-}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{-}}, \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{2j}^{-}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{-}}, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{mj}^{-}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{-}}\right)^{T}
$$
(4)

$$
\tilde{x}^{+} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{1j}^{+}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{+}}, \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{1j}^{+}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{+}}, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{b_{1j}^{+}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{ij}^{+}}\right)^{T}
$$
(5)

In order to calculate the indicator weights, further normalization of  $\tilde{x}$ <sup>−</sup>,  $\tilde{x}$ <sup>+</sup> is done as follows. Equations  $(6)$  $(6)$  $(6)$  and  $(7)$  $(7)$  show the minimum and maximum eigenvectors.

<span id="page-5-5"></span><span id="page-5-1"></span>
$$
x^{-} = (x_1^{-}, x_2^{-}, \cdots, x_m^{-})^{T}
$$
\n(6)

<span id="page-5-3"></span><span id="page-5-2"></span>
$$
x^{+} = (x_{1}^{+}, x_{2}^{+}, \cdots, x_{m}^{+})^{T}
$$
\n(7)

Equation [\(8\)](#page-5-3) is used to assess the consistency of a matrix. The permissible range of inconsistency of a matrix will be determined by using the consistency test.

$$
\alpha = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} b^{+}_{ij}}}, \beta = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} b^{-}_{ij}}}
$$
(8)

If  $0 \le \alpha \le 1 \le \beta$ , the matrix meets the consistency condition. If the consistency condition is not satisfed, the original judgment matrix should be reviewed until the condition is satisfed.

#### **3.3.3 Uniformization of Interval Weight**

The weight vector of the interval judgment matrix can be expressed by Eq. ([9\)](#page-5-4).

<span id="page-5-4"></span>
$$
S_{ij} = [S_{ij}^-, S_{ij}^+] = [\alpha x_{ij}^-, \beta x_{ij}^+] = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha x_1^- & \beta x_1^+ \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha x_m^- & \beta x_m^+ \end{pmatrix}
$$
(9)

Then  $V(S_{ijk} > S_{ijl}) \ge 0$  indicates the probability  $(P_{ijk})$  of  $S_{ijk} > S_{ijl}$ . The probability  $(P_{ijk})$  is calculated as follows by using the simple associative series method,

$$
P_{ijl} = 1
$$
  
\n
$$
P_{ijk} = V(S_{ijk} \ge S_{ijl}) = \frac{2(S_{ijk}^+ - S_{ijl}^-)}{(S_{ijk}^+ - S_{ijl}^-) + (S_{ijl}^+ - S_{ijl}^-)}
$$
 (10)

where,  $i, j = 1, 2, ..., m$ ,  $P_{ijk}$  denotes a single ranking of *k* indicators for the *ij* level of indicators. The weights  $\omega_{ijk}$  are obtained after normalization

<span id="page-6-2"></span>
$$
w_{ijk} = \frac{P_{ijk}}{\sum_{k=1}^{m} P_{ijk}}\tag{11}
$$

#### **3.3.4 Index Factor**

Diferent assessment indicators have diferent units. To obtain a reliable assessment, the actual value of each indicator factor  $(X)$  was transformed into a fractional value  $(Q_i)$ according to the indicator value, calculated as defned in Eqs. [\(12\)](#page-6-0) and [\(13\)](#page-6-1).

<span id="page-6-0"></span>
$$
\begin{cases}\nQ_i = 100 & X \leq G_1 \\
Q_i = 100 - \frac{10(X - G_1)}{(G_2 - G_1)} & G_1 < X \leq G_2 \\
Q_i = 90 - \frac{10(X - G_2)}{(G_3 - G_2)} & G_2 < X \leq G_3 \\
Q_i = 80 - \frac{20(X - G_3)}{3(G_3 - G_1)} & G_3 < X\n\end{cases}\n\tag{12}
$$

where,  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  are indicator value 1, indicator value 2 and indicator value 3, respectively.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>
$$
Q = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} Q_{ijk} \times \omega_{ijk}
$$
 (13)

where, *m* is the total number of indicators at the criterion level, *n* is the total number of factors at the indicator level for a subset of the criterion level, and *l* is the total number of factor levels for a subset of the indicator level.

#### **4 Health Diagnosis Method of Jilintai Panel Rockfill Dam**

Jilintai I Hydropower Station is one of the important hydropower projects in the middle reaches of Kashagr River, located in the middle of Jilintai Gorge section of Kashagr River to the east, as shown in Fig. [4.](#page-7-0) The site of Jilintai I hydropower station is located in a "V" shaped valley with a topographic slope of about 45° on both sides and a valley width of 340 m. The normal storage level of the hydropower station is 1420 m, and the top of the right bank is about  $327 \approx 362$  m higher than the left bank. The weathering layer is  $3 \sim 5$  m thick and  $25 \sim 30$  m thick, with stable lithology and high rock strength, and the slope is  $38^{\circ}$   $\sim$  45°. There are low-order north-west, north-east and north-north-east faults in the section. F32, F32-1, F285 and other low-order faults with a greater impact on the dam site are 295°~340°NE∠35~75°, with a fracture zone of 0.5~22 m, with breccia and fractured rock as well as a small amount of faulted mud and mylonite in the fracture zone.

The concrete panel of Jilintai dam which is located in Xinjiang is made of C30W12F300 concrete with water-cement ratio less than 0.45 and slump of  $3 \sim 7$  cm, as showed in Fig. [3](#page-7-1).



<span id="page-7-1"></span>**Fig. 3** Jilintai panel rockfll dam location and dam fll material profle

Emulsifed asphalt is used as a temporary protective layer to ensure the compactness and smooth surface of the bedding material and to reduce the infuence of foundation restraint (Wen and Liao [2004\)](#page-13-22).

During the operation of Jilintai hydropower station, temperature afects the seepage volume and panel deformation. Seepage volume is mainly afected by the reservoir water level and temperature, seepage volume increases with the rise of reservoir water level and decreases with the increase in temperature. It is reported that the impact of the reservoir water level component accounts for about 75% of the annual variation of seepage volume, temperature component accounts for about 5%, and other accounts for about 20%



<span id="page-7-0"></span>**Fig. 4** Indicators for extended cloud model

#### **4.1 Application of the ECM‑EAHP**

the tension joints increases (Yang et al. [2010b](#page-13-24)).

When using the ECM generator, considering the uncertainty and randomness during the calculation process using the cloud model, 30,000 cloud drops were used to generate the cloud map. The process was repeated 50 times, and the average of these calculations was selected as the fnal cloud map. In total, there are 35 indicators, and each indicator has one extended cloud map. The extended cloud maps for four indicators are presented in Figs. [4a](#page-7-0)–d.

The values of the factor indexes are obtained from the extended cloud diagram which show the index values of seepage volume, settlement volume, panel defection deformation, and steel stress. where the Seepage:  $G1 = 117.20L/s$ ,  $G2 = 127.44L/s$ ,  $G3 = 139.20L/s$ ; Settling: G1=583.67 mm, G2=589.37 mm, G3=596.88 mm; Face deformation:  $G1 = 46.53$  mm,  $G2 = 52.99$  mm,  $G3 = 57.58$  mm; reinforcement stress:  $G1 = -43.85$ Mpa,  $G2 = -45.48Mpa$ ,  $G3 = -47.17Mpa$ .

#### **4.2 Calculation Indicator Weights**

Based on the results described above, the judgement matrix was determined, as shown in Table [2](#page-8-0).

Values in Table [2](#page-8-0) were obtained by using Eqs. [\(4](#page-5-5))–[\(7\)](#page-5-2). The corresponding eigenvectors:

$$
x^- = [0.2675 \ 0.2340 \ 0.1982 \ 0.1593 \ 0.1412]
$$
 (14)

$$
x^{+} = [0.2713 \ 0.2288 \ 0.1933 \ 0.1618 \ 0.1449 ] \tag{15}
$$

According to the Eq.  $(8)$  $(8)$ , the summation value is calculated to test the consistency of the Extended interval number judgment matrix, with the results of (Guideline level):  $\alpha = 0.94$ ,  $β=1.05$ . From the results, both α and β satisfy  $0 ≤ α ≤ 1 ≤ β$ , and the consistency test for the judgment matrix is satisfied. The eigenvectors  $x^-, x^+$  for the indicator level are substituted into Eqs. [\(9](#page-5-4))–[\(11\)](#page-6-2) to calculate  $P<sub>p</sub>$  and are then normalized to determine indicator single

Indicator $C_1$ level 1		$C_{2}$	$C_{3}$	$C_{4}$	$C_5$	Weight
$C_I$	<1.0, 1.0>	<1.1.1.2>	<1.3.1.5>	<1.6, 1.9>	< 1.7.2.0 > 0.3211	
C <sub>2</sub>	< 0.83, 0.91	< 1.0.1.0>	<1.18, 1.25>	< 1.3.1.58	< 1.55.1.67 > 0.3036	
$C_3$	< 0.67.0.77 >	< 0.8, 0.85 >	<1.0.1.0>	<1.19, 1.3>	< 1.31, 1.50 > 0.2176	
$C_4$	< 0.53.0.63 >	< 0.63.0.77	< 0.77.0.84	< 1.0.1.0	< 1.06, 1.30 > 0.1035	
$C_5$	< 0.5.0.59	< 0.6, 0.76 >	< 0.67, 0.76 >	< 0.77.0.94	< 1.0.1.0>	0.0542

<span id="page-8-0"></span>**Table 2** Judgement matrix and weights for level 1

level weights. Similarly, other indicator (in Table [1](#page-3-1)) for single level weights are obtained, as shown in Fig. [5.](#page-9-0)

#### **4.3 Calculation of Indicator Level Scores**

Taking the raw indicator data into Eq. ([12](#page-6-0)) allows obtaining the assessment scores of the indicators. Taking these assessment scores into Eq. ([13](#page-6-1)) allows obtaining the assessment scores of the indicator level and the overall assessment scores, shown in Figs. [6a](#page-10-0)–d.

The developed CM-EAHP model has been used for the safety assessment of the Jilintai concrete panel rockfll dam Results showed that due to the decrease in the reservoir water level and the repair projects of the Jilintai dam in recent years, seepage decreased gradually. Results indicated that both the seepage through the dam body and around the dam shoulders is in a safe range, which is consistent with the results obtained from the model calculation.

There was a partial landslide in the back slope of the dam. According to data collected from the automated monitoring system, the horizontal displacement of the dam body has an increasing trend in the past two years. The dam settlement is stable, which may explain the gradual decrease in the local dam deformation score  $(C_3)$  from the model monitoring. Overall, it can be concluded that this concrete face rockfll dam is in good condition, and this assessment agrees with the model results (*C*).

<span id="page-9-0"></span>



<span id="page-10-0"></span>**Fig.** 6 Score chart for dam safety trend in  $2020 - (a) - (d)$  identify the quarters in the year

#### **4.4 Comparison of Results Using Different Models**

#### **4.4.1 The Cloud Model (CM)**

The CM assessment method is usually comprised of the following three steps (Zhang et al. [2014](#page-13-7)): step 1, selection of the original data of the assessment indicators in order to process the cloud transformation; step 2, the establishment of the cloud model of the assessment indicators; and steps 3, comparison of results based on the cloud model of the comprehensive assessment and those of the cloud model of the assessment indicator set. Figure [7a](#page-11-0) illustrates the process.

From the results shown in Figs. [6](#page-10-0) and [7](#page-11-0)b, it can be seen that assessment results of the operation using both the ECM-EAHP method, and the CM method are both level 2, implying that the assessment results are consistent. One can say that the ECM-EAHP method is feasible and efective, and more comprehensive than the traditional dam safety assessment methods which only give one overall result of the assessment level. Additionally, the ECM-EAHP method is more fexible, and can provide more detailed information such as indicator values. Also, the indicator values can be updated as the data is selected and can provide rapid feedback and early warning of the dam's current condition when more adverse conditions are encountered.



<span id="page-11-0"></span>**Fig. 7** Traditional cloud model evaluation process and results

## **4.4.2 Typical Small Probability Method**

The early warning results obtained by using the ECM method were compared to those obtained by using the typical small probability method (Wu and Lu [1989\)](#page-13-25). For the water level indicator, the early warning value obtained using the typical small probability method  $(\alpha=2\%)$  was 1419.93; the early warning value obtained using the ECM was 1420.24. Also, for the horizontal displacement indicator, the early warning value obtained using the typical small probability method ( $\alpha = 2\%$ ) was 94.067; and the early warning value obtained using the ECM was 94.101. These results showed that one can get nearly the same results by using the typical small probability method and the Extended Cloud Model method. However, the Extended Cloud Model is more fexible and less computationally expensive.

# **5 Conclusions**

Dam safety assessment is a complicated process which should consider multi-factors, multi-levels, stochastic and fuzzy aspects. The Cloud Model (CM) can better transform the uncertainty and stochastic qualitative aspects during the dam safety monitoring process into quantitative results. In the present study, the ECM-EAHP method has been developed and applied to assess dam safety trend of the Jilintai concrete panel rockfll dam.

Assessment results by using both the ECM-EAHP method and the CM method showed that the operation level of the Jilintai concrete face rockfll dam is level 2. Results of both methods indicate that the Jilintai concrete face rockfll dam has a good operating condition. The horizontal displacement of the dam body has an increasing trend in the past two years. Results showed that other indicators were in a safe operating condition. The selection of indicator values was consistent with the results of the typical small probability method. The cloud model assessment method is mostly a one-time assessment, and the workload is greater if a secondary assessment process should be conducted. The ECM-EAHP method is a visual assessment method for assessing dam safety trends. The ECM-EAHP method not only provides an overall assessment of the dam's safety level, but also provides a detailed visualization of the dam's operating conditions refected by each factor. The ECM-EAHP method can be combined with an automated dam safety monitoring platform to visualize dam safety trends, providing a methodological

option for an integrated system of automated dam safety monitoring and early warning. The results obtained by applying the proposed method may be useful for the dam maintenance and become more fashionable in other engineering felds. such as the structural feld.

**Acknowledgements** This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 51879065), National Energy Group Science and Technology Innovation Project of China (Grant Nos. GJNY-19-13), National Energy Group Xinjiang Jilintai Hydropower Development Co., The authors are grateful for the fnancial support.

**Author Contributions** All authors contributed to this research work. Here are contributions of each author: Conceptualization: L. Sang, J. Wang, J. Sui, and M. Dziedzic; Methodology: L. Sang, J. Wang, and J. Sui; Validation: L. Sang, J. Wang, and J. Sui; Formal analysis: L.Sang and J.Wang; Investigation: L. Sang, J. Wang, and J. Sui; Resources: L. Sang, J. Wang, and J. Sui; Writing-original draft preparation: L. Sang, J. Wang, and J. Sui; Writing-review and editing: J. Sui, and M. Dziedzic; Supervision: J. Wang, and J. Sui; Funding acquisition: J.Wang. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding** This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 51879065), National Energy Group Science and Technology Innovation Project of China (Grant Nos. GJNY-19–13), National Energy Group Xinjiang Jilintai Hydropower Development Co., The authors are grateful for the fnancial supports.

**Availability of Data and Materials** Availability of data and materials: all data and materials are available upon the requirement.

## **Declarations**

**Human and Animal Rights and Informed Consent** The study does not involve the use of humans or animals.

**Financial Interests** The authors have no relevant fnancial or non-fnancial interests to disclose.

**Competing Interests** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

**Conflict of Interest** All authors certify that they have no afliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any fnancial interest or non-fnancial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.The authors have no fnancial or proprietary interests in any material discussed in this article. This manuscript is an original research work. This manuscript has never been submitted to other journals and conferences for possible publication. There is not any interest that is directly or indirectly related to this research work. There is not any potential confict of interest.

# **References**

- <span id="page-12-5"></span>Araujo JC, Dias FF (2021) Multicriterial method of AHP analysis for the identifcation of coastal vulnerability regarding the rise of sea level: case study in Ilha Grande Bay, Rio de- Janeiro, Brazil. Nat Hazards 107:53–72
- <span id="page-12-6"></span>Dong W, Zhang S, Zhu F (2021) Evaluation of road performance of asphalt mixtures based on topological hierarchical analysis. J Jilin Univ (Eng Ed) 6:2137–2143
- <span id="page-12-4"></span>Fan J, Yang M, Liu BR, Wang JL, Gao JR, Su HZ, Zhao EF (2017) A comprehensive evaluation method study for dam safety. Struct Eng Mech 63(5):639–646
- <span id="page-12-0"></span>Gu YC, Wang SJ, Pang Q, Wang Y, Wu YX (2017) Research on the formulation of early warning indicators for concrete dam deformation based on risk management. J Hydraul Eng 48(04):480–487
- <span id="page-12-1"></span>Gu H, Yang M, Gu Ch, Zheng F, Xiaofei H (2022) A comprehensive evaluation method for concrete dam health state combined with gray-analytic hierarchy-optimization theory. Struct Health Monit 21(2):250–263
- <span id="page-12-2"></span>He J, Gao Q, Shi Y (2016) A multi-level comprehensive evaluation method for dam safety based on cloud model. Syst Eng Theory Pract 36(11):2977–2983
- <span id="page-12-3"></span>He J, Gao Q (2018) An improved cloud merging algorithm adapted to dam health diagnosis. J Wuhan Univ (Inf Sci Ed) 43(07):1022–1029
- <span id="page-13-13"></span>He GJ, Chai JR, Qin Y, Xu ZG, Li SY (2020) Coupled model of variable fuzzy sets and the analytic hierarchy process and its application to the social and environmental impact evaluation of dam breaks. Water Resour Manag 34:2677–2697
- <span id="page-13-17"></span>Ho JY, Ooi J, Wan YK, Andiappan V (2021) Synthesis of wastewater treatment process (WWTP) and supplier selection via fuzzy analytic hierarchy process (FAHP). J Clean Prod
- <span id="page-13-14"></span>Jafary P, Sarab AA, Tehrani NA (2018) Ecosystem health assessment using a fuzzy spatial decision support system in taleghan watershed before and after dam construction. Environ Process 5(4):807–831
- <span id="page-13-5"></span>Li DY, Meng H, Shi X (1995) Membership clouds and membership cloud generators. J Comput Res Dev 32(6):15–20
- <span id="page-13-16"></span>Li J, Wang M, Xu P, Xu P (2014) Classifcation of surrounding rock stability based on cloud mode. J Geotech Eng 36(01):83–87
- <span id="page-13-6"></span>Li X, Zhong D, Ren B, Deng S, Zhu Y (2017) Research on the evaluation of the irrigability of dam foundation rock based on fuzzy RES-cloud model. J Hydraul Eng 48(11):1311–1323
- <span id="page-13-23"></span>Li S, Cheng R, Chen Z, Zeng M, Hao J (2010) Analysis of seepage observation data of Jilintai I hydropower station dam. Water Resour Hydropower Eng 41(06):66–67
- <span id="page-13-1"></span>Lei P, Chang XL, Xiao F, Zhang GJ, Su HZ (2011) Study on early warning index of spatial deformation for high concrete dam. Sci China Ser E 54(6):1607–1614
- <span id="page-13-9"></span>Liu Z, Shao J, Xu W, Xu F (2014) Comprehensive stability evaluation of rock slope using the cloud model-based approach. Rock Mech Rock Eng 47(6):2239–2252
- <span id="page-13-19"></span>Nouha N, Ben AR, Habib A (2021) Water erosion hazard mapping using analytic hierarchy process (AHP) and fuzzy logic modeling: a case study of the Chaffar Watershed (Southeastern Tunisia). Arab J Geosci 14(13):1208
- <span id="page-13-12"></span>Peng T, Deng H (2020) Comprehensive evaluation on water resource carrying capacity in karst areas using cloud model with combination weighting method: a case study of Guiyang, southwest China. Environ Sci Pollut Res 27:37057–37073
- <span id="page-13-18"></span>Radhika EG, Sadasivam GS (2021) Budget optimized dynamic virtual machine provisioning in hybrid cloud using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. Expert Syst Appl 183
- <span id="page-13-21"></span>Saaty TL, Zhang L (2016) The need for adding judgment in bayesian prediction. Int J Inf Technol Decis Mak 15(4):733–761
- <span id="page-13-3"></span>Su HZ, Hu J, Wu ZR (2012) A study of safety evaluation and early-warning method for dam global behavior. Struct Health Monit 11(3):269–279
- <span id="page-13-4"></span>Su H, Yan X, Liu H, Wen Z (2017) Integrated multi-level control value and variation trend early-warning approach for deformation safety of arch dam. Water Resour Manag 31(6):2025–2045
- <span id="page-13-22"></span>Wen YS, Liao J (2004) Formulation and performance of panel concrete for Jilintai I hydropower station. Water Resour Hydropower Eng 6:58–60
- <span id="page-13-11"></span>Wu Y, Chu H, Xu C (2021) Risk assessment of wind-photovoltaic-hydrogen storage projects using an improved fuzzy synthetic evaluation approach based on cloud model: A case study in China. J Energy Storage 38:10258
- <span id="page-13-25"></span>Wu ZR, Lu Y (1989) Safety monitoring indicators of dams using prototype observation feedback. J Hohai Univ 6:29–36
- <span id="page-13-0"></span>Wu ZR, Su HZ (2005) Dam health diagnosis and evaluation. Smart Mater Struct 14(3):S130–S136
- <span id="page-13-2"></span>Wu ZR, Peng Y, Li ZC, Li B, Yu H, Zheng SR (2011) Commentary of research situation and innovation frontier in hydro-structure engineering science. Sci China Ser E 54(4):767–780
- <span id="page-13-8"></span>Yan F, Zhang Q, Ye S, Ren B (2019) A novel hybrid approach for landslide susceptibility mapping integrating analytical hierarchy process and normalized frequency ratio methods with the cloud model. Geomorphology 327:170–187
- <span id="page-13-10"></span>Yan F, Xu K (2019) Methodology and case study of quantitative preliminary hazard analysis based on cloud model. J Loss Prev Process Ind 60:116–124
- <span id="page-13-20"></span>Yang G, Guo X, Gao W, Ma Y (2010a) Safety monitoring design of concrete panel gravel dams in Jilintai Grade I hydropower station. Water Resour Hydropower Technol 41(06):28–30
- <span id="page-13-24"></span>Yang R, Qing SF, Zeng MQ, Hao JS (2010b) Analysis of deformation monitoring data of concrete panel rockfll dam at Jilintai I hydropower station. Water Resour Hydropower Eng 41(06):61–65+75
- <span id="page-13-15"></span>Yang Y, Liu XL, Wang EZ, Fang K, Huang L (2018) Dam safety evaluation based on multiple linear regression and numerical simulation. Rock Mech Rock Eng 51(8):2451–2467
- <span id="page-13-7"></span>Zhang Q, Zhang Y, Zhong M (2014) Multi-level fuzzy integrated evaluation of reservoir-induced earthquake risk based on cloud model. J Hydraul Eng 45(01):87–95

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.