Prioritizing Stormwater Project Alternatives Using Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis

12th ANNUAL OHIO STORMWATER CONFERENCE Sharonville Convention Center May 10, 2019

Gina Beim, P.E., M. ASCE Gina.Beim@MCDAconsulting.com

Learning Objectives

- Recognize common pitfalls in complex decision making and prioritization problems.
- Assign weights to decision making objectives in a manner that accurately reflects the decision maker's preferences and is theoretically valid.
- Create a hierarchy of goals, objectives and measures relevant for selecting watershed restoration, green infrastructure and BMP projects.
- Cite examples of projects in which multi criteria decision making approaches were used for selecting watershed restoration, green infrastructure and BMP projects.

Outline

- Motivation
- Background on MCDA / Modeling the decision choice
- Simple example
- Case Studies
- Summary
- Questions

Motivation

Choosing among several alternatives for

Watershed Restoration

Green Infrastructure Projects

Best Management Practices

Multiple, conflicting objectives

Cost

Effectiveness

Operational Complexity

Socio-economic Impact

Public Perception

Decision making is complex.

Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) makes the decision process manageable and transparent.

Motivation

USA, CANADA, CHINA, AUSTRALIA, IRAN, SAUDI ARABIA

8 Case studies 6 countries Average of 7 measures as many as 26 Average of 17 alternatives as many as 70



Background on MCDA / Modeling the decision Choice

What is MCDA

A field of Operations Research

A collection of mathematical methods that help evaluate alternatives and prioritize/select them based on the Decision Maker's values and preferences.

A framework for addressing complex decision making problems involving multiple, conflicting criteria/goals/objectives

Why not select using B/C analysis?

Some things cannot be monetized

The distribution of benefits among different stakeholders is not captured by a single net benefits measure

Trade-offs are not explicit

Why not just make a spreadsheet?

Different measurement scale for each criterion

Difficult to correctly assign weights for each criterion

Complexity of preferences is not captured

Green Infrastructure Project Choice

	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3
Cost			
Public acceptance			
Effectiveness			

MCDA Background

Between WWII and 1970: Operations research, optimization, single objective function

1970s: first multi criteria decision aid methods

Ralph Keeney and Howard Raiffa wrote "Decisions with Multiple Objectives" in 1975

Multi Criteria Decision Analysis

Helps stakeholders

- Consider all relevant alternatives
- Articulate what is important
- Define criteria (goals) that are comprehensive but not overlapping
- Make trade-offs fairly explicit
- Account for uncertainty
- Examine results (sensitivity analysis)
- Document the decision process

Multi Criteria Decision Analysis

Does not

Decide for the decision maker Analyze everything in terms of \$\$ Pre judge/ pre select an alternative

MCDA approaches

Outranking (alternatives ranked on each criterion) AHP (pairwise comparisons of alternatives) Multi Attribute Utility/Value Theory

- Captures preferences in detail with Utility/Value Functions
- Alternatives ranked based on overall utility

Simple example: Choose college

MCDA Consulting LLC

3 Alternatives



Columbia

MIT

Stanford

© MCDA Consulting LLC

4 Criteria, Measures comprehensive, non redundant

Cost (dollars)

Distance from home (Miles? Travel time?)

Future professional success (qualitative, probabilistic? Stats?)



Hierarchy of Goals, Sub-goals, measures

Value Functions: Satisfaction as a function of each measure

Ask the Decision Maker questions to help build the functions



Value Functions: Satisfaction as a function of each measure



Distance from Home

Value Functions: Satisfaction as a function of each measure

Professional Success, Greek Life



Non continuous function, histogram

Weights

Should truly represent trade-offs that decision maker is willing to make

Depend on scale / range (e.g. cost)

Hard to assign directly (cognitive biases)

Mathematically valid

Graphic tools and trade off questions are one way to assess (there are others)

Assessing weights through trade-off questions

2 hypothetical colleges **A** and **B**

A is as good as possible on Greek Life and as bad as possible on Distance.B is as good as possible on Distance and as bad as possible on Greek Life.

They are equal on the other measures.

Would you prefer **A** or **B**? (Suppose you say **B**)

How much would A need to improve on the measure "Distance" for you to be indifferent between these 2 hypothetical colleges?

MCDA process

Units of measurements for cost, distance, Greek life and professional success

Scores of Columbia, MIT and Stanford on cost, distance, Greek life and professional success (**s**_{ii})

Family's value functions for cost, distance, Greek life and Professional success (**u (s)**)

Weights of cost, distance, Greek life and professional success (**w**_i)

The collection of weights and value functions is called a "preference set".

The total score of each college is a weighted sum



College choice: sensitivity analysis

Based on what you told us, Stanford is looking the best. Does it make sense?

What if you placed less emphasis on distance, for example – would results change? What if you got the assessment for Greek Life at Columbia wrong – would results change?

In other words, is the result robust?

How many preference sets? Parent 1, Parent 2, child? Parents, child? The family? Are results consistent throughout preference sets?

Case Studies

Small Urban Watershed, Montreal

- Best BMP combination for residential watershed in the suburbs of Greater Montreal
- 4 higher level criteria: water quantity control (sub criteria: peak flow and runoff volume reduction; delay to reach outfall peak flow); water quality control (sub criteria: Total Suspended Solids; Total Phosphorous; Total Nitrogen); cost and social performance (sub criteria: aesthetic and landscape benefits, acceptability, perceived quality of life improvement and contributions to sustainable development).
- 12 alternative combinations of green roofs, rain gardens, rain barrels and pervious pavement.
- 3 groups of stakeholders/preference sets: land developers and planners, engineers, citizens.
- Rain gardens and combination of rain gardens with pervious pavement ranked at the top for all preference sets.

Carvallo Aceves, M. and Fuamba, M.: *Methodology for Selecting Best Management Practices Integrating Multiple Stakeholders and Criteria*. Part 2: Case Study. Water (2016), 8, 56. MDPI.

College Campus, China

- Select BMPs for a college campus in Foshan City, China
- 3 higher level criteria, 12 sub-criteria, 26 measures
- 12 BMP alternatives: Infiltration trench; Infiltration basin; Dry detention pond; Wet detention pond; Vegetated filter strip; Grassed swale; Constructed wetlands; Sand filter; Green roof; Rain barrel; Porous pavement; Bioretention cells
- Top rated BMPs: bioretention cell, wet pond and green roofs.
- Lowest rated BMPs: porous pavements, infiltration trenches, and rain barrels.
- A plan for installation throughout campus was designed.

• Jia, H. et al: Development of a multi-criteria index ranking system for urban runoff best management practices (BMPs) selection. Environ Monit Assess (2013) 185:7915–7933, Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht.



Rural Watershed, Michigan

- Select best combination of BMPs for Honeyoey Creek-Pine Creek watershed, a USEPA Area of Concern.
- 3 criteria: stream health scores, farmers' social preferences and BMP installation costs.
- 8 combinations of BMPs: no management, no-tillage, native grass, cover crop, residue management and forest.
- MCDA to select approach for each of 185 sub basins.
- MCDA to select optimal combination of sub basin approaches.
- Multiple stakeholders / various preferences sets.
- Group process to select final plan.

Sabbaghian, R. J. et al: Application of risk-based multiple criteria decision analysis for selection of the best agricultural scenario for effective watershed management. Journal of Environmental Management 168 (2016) pp. 260 – 272, Elsevier.

28

Industrial Site, Australia

- Identify optimum strategies to improve the quality of runoff from the Brooklyn Industrial Precinct in Melbourne, Australia.
- 3 higher level criteria: Environmental, Economic and Social (TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE)
- 11 lower level criteria: Total Runoff, Volume Reduction, Sediment Removal, Nutrient Removal, Heavy Metal Removal, Peak Flow Reduction, Habitat Creation, Potable Water Savings, Equivalent Annual Cost, Capital Cost, Operation And Maintenance Cost, Improvement of Livability.
- 10 potential combinations of sedimentation basin areas and bioretention areas
- Optimum solution: combination of 5300 ft² vegetated swale and 38000 ft² bioretention area.
- Sensitivity analysis on weights, recognizing their subjectivity. Solution robust.

Jayasooriya, V. M. et al. Multi Criteria Decision Making in Selecting Stormwater Management Green Infrastructure for Industrial areas Part 1: Stakeholder Preference Elicitation Water Resources Management (2019) 33:627–639. Part 2: A Case Study with TOPSIS. Water Resources Management (2018) 32:4297–4312. Springer.



Summary

5/6/2019 © MCDA Consulting LLC 30

MCDA Methods have been used around the world to select stormwater projects.

We reviewed some of these case studies.

The professionals who chose this approaches recognized that it was superior to B/C analysis or a simple spreadsheet, because they

did not monetize all criteria; made trade-offs clear; incorporated stakeholders/decision maker's values; documented decision process.

In a simple example, we have

identified goals and scales to measure each goal; organized the decision problem in a hierarchy; modeled preferences with Value Functions; revealed decision maker's preferences through trade-off questions.

Questions

5/6/2019 © MCDA Consulting LLC 32