



# Refurbishment Project of Expressway Tunnels in South Korea



5. APR. 2017

Nam-Goo Kim Seung-Wan Ryu



### Speaker



Mobile:+82 10 2106 3234 Email: ng1217@ex.co.kr

# Nam-Goo Kim

Tunnel Safety Specialist, Safety Coordinator

PIARC TC D5 (Road Tunnel Operation) member (2008 ~ )

- Working Experience
  - Korea Expressway Corporation (Oct. 1995 ~ ) (Team Leader, Construction Office)

### Educational Background

- B.S. on Building Equipment
- M.S. on Architectural Environment
- M.B.A. , PhD(c) in Business Administration



### 2<sup>nd</sup> Speaker



Mobile:+82 10 7997 7187

E-mail: swryu@ex.co.kr

# Seung-Wan Ryu

**Tunnel Safety Specialist** 

PIARC TC D5 (Road Tunnel Operation) member (2012 ~ )

Working Experience

- Korea Expressway Corporation (Aug. 2006 ~ )
  - VE(Value Engineering)
  - Construction site supervisior(Mechanical Eng)
  - Planning and Design of tunnel
- Educational Background
  - B.S. on Aerospace Engineering
  - M.S. on Control system of Aerospace Engineering



# CONTENTS

- $\boldsymbol{I}$  . Introduction of KEC
- ${\rm I\!I}$  . Background of Refurbishment
- III. Refurbishment Plan
- **W**. Implementation / Results
- **V**. Improvements
- **VI.** Other Refurbishment Projects

# 1. Overview of S. Korea - location



## 1. Overview of S.Korea – Total Road Network

(as of Dec. 2014)

\* Expw (as of 2016)

Name of Route	Authority	Length (km)
Total Length	105,673	
Expressway	KEC(on behalf of MOLIT)	4,453
National Highway	MOLIT	13,950
Special , Metropolitan City Road	Special Metropolitan City Government	4,758
Provincial Road	Provincial Government	18,058
City, County Road	City / County Government	64,768

**X** MOLIT : Ministry of Land, Infrastructure & Transport

# 2. Expressway Network : $7V \ge 9H + 6$ Ring





- 8 -

# - 9 -

# I. Introduction of KEC

# 3. Roles of KEC

- Construction
- Operation & Maintenance of Facilities
- Traffic management
- Research & Development
- International Cooperation & Overseas Project

### \* KEC performs these missions on behalf of the Korean government













# 4. Organization

- 5HQ with 18 division
- 7 Regional HQ, 7 R&D office, 16 Construction Office
- Total Staff : 5,939



- 5. Tunnels & Bridges of Expressway
  - Tunnels : 481 (340km)
    - No. of over 1km : 109 / 1.0-0.5km : 173 / under 0.5km : 199





- No. of over 1km : 62 / under 1km : 8,833



# 6. Financial Status

### Capital

- Authorized Capital : \$31.8bil
- Paid-in Capital : \$26.8bil

### Ø Budget

• Total Capital Revenue : \$9.7bil



### (1USD=1,100KRW)

### Shareholders

- Government : 84.46%
- Export-Import Bank of Korea : 11.12%
- Korea Development Bank : 3.13%
- Industrial Bank of Korea : 0.76%
- Korea Housing Finance Corp. : 0.51%
- Kookmin Bank : 0.02%

### • Total Capital Expenditure : \$9.7bil



### Subway fire in 18.Feb. 2003, Dae-gu city



The arsonist Kim Dae Han took the train no.1079 오전 9시50분 중망대로 at Myeongdeok Station a.m 오전 9시52분 The train was stopped on platform of Jungangno Station, and the No sooner than the arsonist set the fire. 3-4 passengers kept from setting the fire. 오전 9시53분 The arsonist threw a gasoline bottle to car not set fire and ran away, and the passengers escaped 오전 9시55분 Fire report requested at the Fire Headquarters 오전 9시55분35초 Train no.1080 was departed from Daegu 오전 9시56분45초 Train no.1080 was entered in Jungangno Stiat 오전 9시57분 Power supply was shut down The fire spread 오펜 11시50분 지하3층: The arsonist in the hospital was arr 지하철 승강질 2年 1×30분 p.m The fire was suppressed The bodies were founde in the burned train 079전동차 Jungangno Station The passengers were died Bol Siche from suffocation because 플랫폼 위쪽의 스프랑블러 장동 the door wasn't opened (귀일 위에 없음)

Cause of Fire

Loss / Damage

• Issue / Problem

Arson (attempted suicide)

Situation chart of DAEGU SUBWAY ARSON

192 fatalities, 151 wounded, 11mil. USD

Equipment / Procedure / Education / Drill

### Hong-ji-mun tunnel fire in Jun. 2003, Seoul city



Cause of Fire

Loss / Damage

Issue / Problem

Collision of minibus with RV

40 wounded (smoke inhalation)

Rush hour / Operational mistake

### Regulation Changed in Dec. 2004 : Tunnel Grade

Before	After
<ul> <li>Classified by length</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Two ways of classification : Length &amp; Risk Assessment</li> </ul>
≥ 4,000m ≥ 2,000n	1) Classified by length
≥ 1,000m ≥ 800n	• Grade 1 : ≥ 3,000m • Grade 2 : ≥ 1,000m
≥ 500m ≥ 200m	• Grade 3 : ≥ 500m • Grade 4 : < 500m
< 200m	2) R/A : 6 Categories include 14 factors
	<ul> <li>Traffic volume X tunnel length (Veh·km/tube·day)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Altitude gap and slope</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tunnel height and radius of curve</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Restriction to transportation of dangerous goods</li> </ul>
	Frequency of congestion (Service level)
	Uni/Bi Directional Traffic / Road shoulder
	- Total 51 points maximum, over 29point is Grade 1

### Equipment per tunnel

Tunnel Length			В	Before					Af	ter		
(m) Equipment	Over 4,000	Over 2,000	Over 1,000	Over 800	Over 500	Over 200	Under 200	Grade 1 (Over 3,000)	Grade 2 (Over 1,000)	Grade 3 (Over 500)	Grade 4 (Under 500)	Note
Automatic Fire Detector	•	•						•	•			
Emergency Broadcasting	•	•	•					•	•	•		
Radio Broadcasting System	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	
Variable Message Sign	•	•	•	•				•	•			
Emergency Lighting	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	
Exit Signaling	•	•	•					•	•	•		
Smoke Ventilation	•	•	•					•	•	Δ	Δ	by risk assessment
Cross Connection	•	•	•					•	•	•	Δ	spacing 750m -> 250m
UPS	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	

\*\* Extinguisher, Hydrant, Water spray, Fire alarm, Emergency phone, CCTV, VIDS, etc.

\*\*Transition rule : tunnels under design/construction are not mandatory

- 16 -

### Social / Political pressure by imbalance of tunnel safety

Increasing demand from users / the media

Frequent pressure from National Audit





### To satisfy all the equipment to all tunnels...

Equipment	Quantity of tunnels	Budget(Million US\$)
Total	296	478 + α
<b>Cross Connection</b>	85	305 + α
Tunnel Closure System	18	39
Automatic Fire Detector	14	63
Variable Message Sign	13	48
Emergency Broadcasting	36	8
Exit Sign	139	15

+  $\alpha$  changes depending on the condition of making new cross connection.

### Financial / Technical Problem

Budget

Total cost > \$478M, Yearly budget : < \$30M

Environment

Noise, vibration, dust, water pollution

Traffic congestion

Long closure of 1 or 2 lane for construction







### Solutions Used

- Selection by Risk Priority
  - $\rightarrow$  Risk assessment for all old tunnels

Alternative equipment

- $\rightarrow$  Jet-Fans instead of cross connection
- Long-term project
  - $\rightarrow$  Cost division, important equipment first







### Result of Risk Assessment (1)

Name of Tunnel	length(m)	N of lane	Traffic Volume(AADT)	Opened in	Risk point	Priority
Yong-dam	853	3/3	118,086	1996	26.5	1
Gwang-kyo	502	3/2/2	151,234	1991	26	2
Ban-wall	760	3/2/2	134,951	1991	26	2
Suan-san	684	3/3	118,412	1996	26	2
Gwang-am	752	4/2/2	126,807	1991	24.5	5
Mae-hyun2	970	2/2	38,417	2004	21	6
Dae-jun	812	3/3	78,725	1999	20.5	7
Kwanjiwon	526	2/2	61,349	2001	20.5	7
Cho-goyk	870	2/2	38,417	2004	20.5	7
Ka-kuem	845	2/2	38,417	2002	20.5	7
Gwang-myung	812	3/3	80,087	1995	20	11
Kim-hae	690	4/4	89,220	2001	19.5	12
Jung-won	988	3/3	38,417	2002	19.5	12

### Result of Risk Assessment (2)

Name of Tunnel	length(m)	N of lane	Traffic Volume(AADT)	Opened in	Risk Point	Priority
Chang-won2	854	2/2	54,119	2001	19	14
Dal-sung2	993	2/2	37,753	1995	18.5	15
Won-duck	982	2/2	32,612	2005	18	16
Jin-nam	992	2/2	32,011	2004	18	16
Hwam-an1	877	2/2	42,810	2001	17.5	18
Jeung-yack	755	3/3	38,279	1999	17	19
Ho-nam	740	2/2	32,612	2008	17	19
Doo-jung	640	2/2	38,417	2004	16.5	21
Suriti	903	2/2	23,882	2007	16.5	21
Young-dong1	618	3/3	34,630	2003	16	23
Oak-chun1	690	3/3	31,286	2003	16	23
Chu-jum	547	2/2	37,653	2004	16	23
Hwam-an2	520	2/2	59,266	2001	16	23,2

### **Alternative Equipment**

- Function of Cross connection is to separate users from smoke
  - But hard and expensive to make
- → Use ventilation system(Jet-Fan) to help evacuation
  - Relatively simple & short than build cross connection





### Long-term project plan

Year	Target Tunnel	Budget (Million \$)	Equipments	Comment
2009	3 tunnels [Gwang-am, etc]	12.7	1,2,3	
2010	1 tunnel [Suan-san]	5.5	1,2,3	Avg. \$ 4.3 M / tunnel
2011	1 tunnel [Yong-dam]	3.4	1,2,3	
2012	1 tunnel [Mae-hyun2]	1.1	1), (5)	Removed ②, ③
2013	2 tunnels [Dae-jun, etc]	2.4	(4), (5)	Slim-type Jet-Fan
2014	3 tunnels [Cho-gok, etc]	2.9	(4), (5)	
2015	5 tunnels [Ka-kuem, etc]	4.5	(4), (5)	
2016	6 tunnels [Chang-won2, etc]	5.8	(4), (5)	
2017	5 tunnels [Yung-dong1, etc]	4.6	(4), (5)	Less than \$ 1 M / tunnel
2018	5 tunnels [Bang-gok, etc]	4.6	(4), (5)	
2019	3 tunnels [Gu-wan, etc]	2.8	(4), (5)	
2020~	3 tunnels [Mong-tan3, etc]	2.8	(4), (5)	

X 1 Jet-FAN 2 Hydrant 3 Local Control Room 4 Slim-type Jet-FAN 5 IRCS(Integrated Remote Control System)

- 24 -

### Case : Gwang-am Tunnel (752m, 126,807AADT)

- 3 tube (4/2/2 lane) / 2008.08~2009.09 (8 Month) / Total \$5M
- Jet-fans (22ea), Hydrants(63ea), Control system, Power Supply



### Process of Jet-Fan installation





### 3) Beam base



### 6) Install Jet-Fan





4) Assemble beam



### Hydrant Installation



# 2) Chipping & Cutting



### 3) Trimming



### 6) FD connection







### Hydrant Pipe (Utility box)





### 3) Valve & °C Sensor



### 6) Control center



### 5) Pipe route



### 4) Obstacles



### Hydrant Pipe (wall)



# 2) Install Main Pipe

### 3) Branch pipe



### 6) Insulation / Cover



### 5) Heating Cable





### **Other Equipment**

# Wind speed sensor

# Local Control room



### Hydrant pump & Tank



CCTV



RTU



Local panel / sensors



### **Traffic Management**







### Results

Equipment	N of tunnels	<b>'</b> 09~'16	'17	'18	'19	'20	'21~
Cross Connection (Jet-Fan)	85	22	5	5	3	3	47
Tunnel closure system	18	16	2	-	-	-	-
Automatic Fire Detector	14	8	4	2	-	-	-
VMS, LCS	13	10	2	1	-	-	-
Emergency Broadcasting	36	10	-	12	14	-	-
Exit Signaling	139	52	-	9	16	11	51

# V. Improvements

1. Slim type Jet-fan (booster fan)

- Use larger size Jet-fan with same power (reduce Q'ty of JF)
- Enable low construction/operation cost (efficiency improvement)





	Normal Type	Slim Type
Diameter	1,25	0mm
Length	4.9m	3.6m
Weight	2.2ton	1.6ton
Power	37kW	30kW
Efficiency	70~75%	80~85%
F/B ratio	100%	60%

# **V. Improvements**

### 2. Removal of local control building

- Due to reduced electricity capacity, no need for E. personnel
- Monitoring & Control system to the nearest branch office
- Save 0.85 million dollar/Each



# **VI. Other Refurbishment Projects**

### Refurbishment plan of tunnel lightings with LED

Year	Total	~'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	'20	'21~
N. of Tunnels	44	5	2	4	5	3	2	5	18
Cost(Mil. USD)	62.4	6.5	3.9	6.3	10.4	10.7	12.3	12.3	-



# **VI. Other Refurbishment Projects**

Name of Tunnel	length(m)	N of lane	Budget (Million \$)	Opened in	Year of Refurbishment	Priority
Sun-san	684	3/3	2.7	1996	2012	1
Sun-cheon2	861	3/3	3.6	1996	2013~2014	2
Gwang-myung	888	3/3	3.5	1995	2014~2015	3
Chung-kye	450	4/4	2.6	1995	2015	4
Da-bu	1,075	2/2	6.3	1995	2016~2017	5
Jung-bu1	300	2/2	2.4	2002	2016~2017	5
Jung-bu2	236	2/2	1.8	2002	2017	7
Jung-bu3	378	2/2	2.1	2002	2017	7
Yong-dam	766	3/3	2.6	1996	2017~2018	7
Ahn-yang	330	2/2	1.4	1996	2018	10
Su-ri	1,886	4/4	14.7	1999	2018~2019	10
Su-am	1,254	4/4	9.9	1999	2019~2020	12

# **VI. Other Refurbishment Projects**

### KEC established LED lamp standard for roads in 2013

	33V	Efficiency of luminance(Im/W)	Year
	700mA	Over 100	2017
	25W	Over 110	2018

Factor	Performance criteria
Initial luminous flux	Over 95% of normal luminous flux
LLMF(Lamp Lumen Maintenance Factor)	Over 90% of Initial luminous flux (2,000hr)
CRI(Color rendering index)	Over 75
Standard color temperature(K)	Range of Color temperature(K)
5,700	5,665 ± 355
5,000	5,028 ± 283
4,500	4,503 ± 243



# Thank you for your attention Merci pour votre attention