

MANAGEMENT OF MELANA WATERSHED USING MULTICRITERIA  
DECISION MAKING APPROACHES

AHMAD AMZARI BIN YACCOB

Laporan projek ini dikemukakan  
sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada syarat  
penganugerahan Sarjana Kejuruteraan (Awam-Hidraul dan Hidrologi)

Fakulti Kejuruteraan Awam  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MEI, 2007

**Specially for my dad, mum, sisters and brother who I love so much  
and grateful thanks are due to the support from all of you.**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr.Supiah Shamsudin for her continuous guidance, support and advice in carrying out this research.

I would also like to thank the staff of environment lab for their assistance and cooperation during sample lab test. Not forgetting also to my friends who help me to complete this project.

My gratefulness goes to my family for their support and understanding. Acknowledgements would no be complete without thanking to Aina and Low and all my friends who directly or indirectly have in many ways gave me inspiration and contributed their ideas towards my project.

## ABSTRACT

Nowadays, watershed management is very important and need to be given attention especially by government agencies because all resources between it are related. This project proposed using Multicriteria Decision Making Approach (MCDM) to identify and rank which subwatershed in Melana need to given priority by government authorities in planning their strategies or alternatives for improvement Melana catchment. Each subwatershed was ranked using Multicriteria Decision Making Approaches specifically applying Fuzzy Composite Programming (FCP) and Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). There were 3 selected subwatershed which were residential, light industry and heavy industry. The objective of this project i) to identify basic indicator for management of Melana watershed, ii) to rank subwatershed in Melana watershed using MCDM approaches, iii) to compare FCP and AHP technique and analyses based on selected basic indicators. The FCP and AHP structures contained 13 first-level indicators, 5 second level indicators, 3 third level indicators and the final indicators. The highest ranking subwatershed was residential with the highest ordered sequence value. The highest ranking subwatershed was also associated with the shortest distance between the fuzzy box and ideal point. The highest ordered sequences value means that subwatershed was the best in economy, water quantity and quality. The critical subwatershed was the lowest ordered sequence value which was heavy industry. In AHP, the highest priority index value was heavy industry. This subwatershed is the critical watershed which need be given attention and conservation. This study showed that FCP has a similar result with AHP.

## ABSTRAK

Sejak kebelakangan ini, pengurusan tadahan menjadi sesuatu yang amat penting dan perlu diberi perhatian terutama oleh badan kerajaan kerana semua sumber di dalam tadahan adalah saling bergantung. Project ini mencadangkan penggunaan *Multicriteria Decision Making Approach (MCDM)* untuk mengenal pasti dan menentukan subtadahan mana yang perlu diberi keutamaan oleh badan kerajaan untuk diambil tindakan dalam mengatur strategi atau menyediakan alternatif untuk memulihkan keadaan tadahan Melana. Setiap subtadahan akan dipangkatkan dengan menggunakan *Multicriteria Decision Making Approaches specifically* iaitu *Fuzzy Composite Programming (FCP)* dan *Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)*. Terdapat tiga subtadahan yang dipilih iaitu industri berat, perumahan dan industri ringan. FCP dan AHP struktur mengandungi tiga belas petunjuk peringkat pertama, lima petunjuk peringkat kedua, tiga petunjuk peringkat ketiga dan akhirnya sistem. Pangkat teratas bagi ketiga-tiga subtadahan ialah perumahan dengan nilai susunan jujukan tertinggi. Pemangkatan subtadahan tertinggi adalah berkaitan dengan jarak terdekat diantara kotak fuzzy dan titik unggul. Nilai susunan jujukan tertinggi menunjukkan bahawa subtadahan tersebut adalah yang terbaik dari aspek ekonomi, kuantiti dan kualiti air. Subtadahan yang kritikal adalah yang mempunyai nilai susunan jujukan yang terendah iaitu industri berat. Dalam AHP, pula, nilai indeks keutamaan tertinggi adalah subtadahan industri berat. Subtadahan ini adalah subtadahan kritikal yang mana perlu diberi perhatian. Kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa FCP mempunyai keputusan yang sama dengan AHP.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	LIST OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	x
	LIST OF FIGURES	xi
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
	LIST OF APPENDIXES	xiv
<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	3
	1.3 Objective of The Study	3
<b>II</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>5</b>
	2.0 Definition of Management Concept	5
	2.1 Definition of Watershed	6

2.2	Regional Patern in Watershed Condition	11
2.3	Defination of Water Quality	12
2.4	Water Quality Management	13
2.5	Assessment for Water Quality	14
2.6	Water Pollutant and Their Source	14
2.7	Water Quality Parameters	15
2.8	Water Quality According to Malaysian's Interim National Water Quality standards	20
2.9	Defination of Multicriterita Decision Making	22
2.10	The Component of The Decision Process	26
2.11	Multictreria Decision Making Tools	27
<b>III</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1	Site Description	32
3.1.1	Heavy Industry	34
3.1.2	Residential	34
3.1.3	Light Industy	34
3.2	Fuzzy Composite Programming	35
3.2.1	Introduction	35
3.2.2	Fuzzy Logic and Fuzziness	36
3.2.3	Fuzzy Sets Fuzzy Number	36
3.2.4	Membership Value	38
3.2.5	Membership Function	38
3.3	Analytic Hierarchy Process	44
3.3.1	Introduction	44
3.3.2	The Principale of Identity and Decomposition	45
3.3.3	Pairwise Comparisons	45
3.3.4	The Need for a Scale of Comparison	48
3.3.5	Consistency	49
3.3.5.1	To Estimate The Cosintency	49

	Ratio	
<b>IV</b>	<b>RESULTS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>51</b>
	1.1 Data Input	51
	4.1.1 Data Input for FCP	52
	4.1.2 Data Input for AHP	57
	4.2 Hierachies Structure	60
	4.3 Result of Fuzzy Composite Programming	62
	4.3.1 Numerical Output	62
	4.3.2 Graphical Output	63
	4.4 Result of Analytic Hierachy Process	65
	4.4.1 Sensivity Analysis	67
	4.5 Discussion	70
<b>V</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>72</b>
	5.1 Conclusion	72
	5.2 Recommendation	73
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>75</b>
	<b>APPENDIX</b>	
	Appendix A Data Input for FCP	77
	Appendix B Data Input for AHP	89
	Appendix C Output for FCP	93
	Appendix D Output for FCP	97



**LIST OF TABLE**

<b>NO. OF TABLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Major pollutant categories and principles sources of pollutants	15
2.2	Interim National Water Quality Standards For Malaysia	20
3.1	Intensity of relative importance	48
4.1	Data input for subwatershed heavy industry	53
4.2	Data input for subwatershed residential	53
4.3	Data input for subwatershed light industry	53
4.4	Weight used in 3 trials	54
4.5	Balancing factors used in 3 trials	55
4.6	Average value for each parameter and subwatershed	57
4.7	System sequence order	62
4.8	Priority index values from AHP	65
4.9	Sensitivity analysis trial on model	67

## LIST OF FIGURES

NO. OF FIGURE	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Illustration for alternative watershed definations	7
2.2	Watershed diagram	8
2.3	The hydrologic process	8
2.4	Typical function of a) utility theory and b) prospect theory	24
3.1	Network of Melana watershed	33
3.2	Membership function for certain fuzzy	37
3.3	A matrix that represnt the comparison of weights	47
4.1	DO (mg/l) bwatershed heavy industry	56
4.2	DO (mg/l) watershed residential	6
4.3	DO (mg/l)bwatershed light industry	7
4.4	Average value for DO (mg/l)	58
4.5	Average value for COD (mg/l)	59
4.6	Average value for BOD (mg/l)	59
4.7	Fuzzy composite programming hierachy structure	60
4.8	Analytic hierarchy process hierachy structure	61.
4.9	Water quality versus economy (trial 1)	63
4.10	Water quantity versus economy (trial 1)	64
4.11	Water quantity versus water quality (trial 1)	64
4.12	Priority index for first analysis	65
4.13	Priority index for second analysis	66
4.14	Priority index for third analysis	66
4.15	Sensivity analysis for synthesis 1 (trial 1)	68

<b>NO. OF FIGURE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
4.16	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 1 (trial 2)	68
4.17	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 1 (trial 3)	69

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BOD	-	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
COD	-	Chemical Oxygen Demand
DO	-	Dissolved Oxygen
TSS	-	Total Suspended Solid
MCDM	-	Multicriteria Decision Making
FCP	-	Fuzzy Composite Programming
AHP	-	Analytic Hierarchy Process
km <sup>3</sup>	-	Kilometre cubic
km <sup>2</sup>	-	Kilometre square
ET	-	Evapotranspiration
%	-	Percentage
F	-	Fahrenheit
EPA	-	Environmental Protection Agency
CaCO <sub>3</sub>	-	Calcium Carbonate
N	-	Nitrogen
DA	-	Decision Analysis
S <sub>ij</sub>	-	The actual value of basic index in second-level group j of basic indicators
L <sub>ij</sub>	-	The composite index for second-level group j of basic indicators
N <sub>j</sub>	-	The number of basic indicators in group j
$\alpha_{ij}$	t	- The weight expressing the relative importance of basic indicators in group j
P <sub>j</sub>	-	The balancing factor among indicators for group j

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A1	BOD (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	78
A2	BOD (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	78
A3	BOD (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	79
A4	COD (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	79
A5	COD (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	80
A6	COD (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	80
A7	TSS (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	81
A8	TSS (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	81
A9	TSS (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	82
A10	Ammonia (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	82
A11	Ammonia (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	83
A12	Ammonia (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	83
A13	Phosphorus (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	84
A14	Phosphorus (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	84
A15	Phosphorus (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	85
A16	Nitrate (mg/l) for subwatershed heavy industry	85
A17	Nitrate (mg/l) for subwatershed residential	86
A18	Nitrate (mg/l) for subwatershed light industry	86
A19	Flowrate (m <sup>3</sup> /s) for subwatershed heavy industry	87
A20	Flowrate (m <sup>3</sup> /s) for subwatershed residential	87
A21	Flowrate (m <sup>3</sup> /s) for subwatershed light industry	88
A22	Rainfall (mm) for all subwatershed	88
B1	Average value for TSS (mg/l)	90

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
B2	Average value for ammonia (mg/l)	90
B3	Average value for phosphorus (mg/l)	91
B4	Average value for nitrate (mg/l)	91
B5	Average value for flowrate (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	92
B6	Average value for rainfall (mm)	92
C1	Water quality versus economy (trial 2)	94
C2	Water quantity versus economy (trial 2)	94
C3	Water quantity versus water quality (trial 2)	95
C4	Water quality versus economy (trial 3)	95
C5	Water quantity versus economy (trial 3)	96
C6	Water quantity versus water quality (trial 3)	96
D1	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 2 (trial 1)	98
D2	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 2 (trial 2)	98
D3	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 2 (trial 3)	99
D4	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 3 (trial 1)	99
D5	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 3 (trial 2)	100
D6	Sensitivity analysis for synthesis 3 (trial 3)	100

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

Malaysia is gifted with an enormous source of good land and fresh water supply. It supported by more than 2500 mm annual rainfall and a dense network of rivers and streams which about 150 major river basins. So that's mean, Malaysia supposedly must enjoy with these natural resources. No doubt Malaysia is called as a country of "water resource-rich" (Ayob Katimon and Supiah Shamsudin, 2005).

In terms of hydrologic water balance, Malaysia has received 990 km<sup>3</sup> annual rainfalls and lost 360 km<sup>3</sup> due to evaporation (36 percent), which has 540 km<sup>3</sup> (54 percent) fresh water surpluses. The total surface runoff (the surface water generated by a combination of rainfall and watershed system) is 566 km<sup>3</sup> and about 64 km<sup>3</sup> contribute to groundwater recharge. Without considering water supply from groundwater system, it is clear that Malaysia has a surplus in fresh water supply. Water is very important for people, food and rural development, economic development and environment.

But unfortunately, many states in Malaysia still have a problem with water supply especially in water supply shortages, low water quality, flash flood in urban

area and economy. So to prevent these problems, we need to manage our watershed from overall aspects. Management of watershed is suggested by using multi criteria decision making approaches.

There are many techniques, adopting complex mathematical models and theories, are developed for decision making. Although all decision makers endeavor to improve final outcomes of decision making, the researcher is more concerned about the decision making process. From scientific point of view, a good final outcome depends upon a good decision making process. Principally, the purpose of MCDM is to provide help and guidance to the decision maker for further discovering his/her true preference in order to catch the most desirable solution of the problem.

A large number of multicriteria decision making (MCDM) methods have been proposed in the past and applied to manage watershed or water resource planning (Keeney and Wood, 1977). In real-world decision-making processes in watershed management, decision making theory has become one of most important fields. It uses the optimisation methodology connected with a single criterion, but also satisfying concepts of multiple criteria. Fuzzy Composite Programming and Analytic Hierarchy Process are one of Multicriteria Decision Making methods. These methods were applied to manage Melana watershed and used to rank sub watershed based on their relative degree of potential to determine a potential that an individual site possesses. These methods also helped to identify sub watershed that need to pay more attention. These approaches are useful for handling watershed system complexity, use more through data and allowing for flexible analysis.



## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Nowadays, we always heard problem about water supply shortage and water quality. That happened because of we have not manage our watershed with proper methods. Management of watershed is very important to guide and coordinate the use of land and other resources in sustainable manner in order to obtain proper product such as water supply without affecting future values and productivity. This can be done through conservation of physical and environmental quality.

A watershed has a strong basis for management because all resources within it are interrelated with each others. All resources include water, soil, forest, minerals, nutrient, habitats and clean air. So if we want all that resources preserve or sustainable for future generation, so we must identify, protect and improve the watershed first by using multi criteria decision making approaches.

## **1.3 Objectives Of The Study**

The objective of this study is to identify and rank manage Melana subwatershed by using multi criteria decision making approaches. Fuzzy Composite Programming and Analytic Hierarchy Process is used in this study as multi criteria decision making methods.

The determination of the best strategy from a number of potential alternatives in watershed management is a complex decision making process. It may include conflicting quantitative and quality criteria and multiple decision-makers. The decision making process will be carried out using the multi-criteria decision making techniques.

The evaluation and ranking of alternatives by MCDM techniques is based on criteria values associated with each of the alternative, and the objectives and preferences by decision makers. Watershed ranking provides watershed scoring technique which would help prioritization of concerns and applicable for the purpose of preservation and mitigation potentials.

Watershed preservation priorities should be defined to give special attention to watersheds in need of restoration and protection the most. There are three objectives for this study:

- 1) to identify basic indicator for management of Melana watershed
- 2) to rank Melana subwatershed using MCDM (FCP and AHP) approaches
- 3) to compare FCP and AHP technique in ranking Melana subwatershed.