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Abstract: This paper presents the application of AHP in environment engineering. In many environment engineering applications the final decision is based on the evaluation of a number of alternatives in terms of a number of criteria. This problem may become a very difficult one when the criteria are expressed in different units or the pertinent data are difficult to be quantified. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is an effective approach in dealing with this kind of decision problems. This may be a difficult task and the Analytic Hierarchy Process seems to provide an effective way for properly quantifying the pertinent data. This paper examines some of the practical and computational issues involved when the AHP method used in environment engineering applications. Various economic, environment and technical data are thorough analysed in this paper to compare sewage treatment plant of Kanpur and Lucknow for gainful research purpose with the help of AHP.
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1. Introduction

The AHP is multi-criteria decision making tool which was introduced by L. Saaty (1977). AHP is important tool in determining the final decision based on mathematics of any multicriteria decision whose units are different. It’s been widely used in the area of industrial management and decision making. This method uses pairwise comparison to determine the final result. Pairwise comparison is done with the help of expertise and study about the subject.

Selection of an appropriate treatment plant is an important issue before designing and implementing any sewage treatment plant. As we know in past decades the alternatives of waste water treatment plant are compared only based on the economic data provided in pre design studies of waste water treatment plant project therefore, the alternative with min capital and operation cost is chosen.

Treatment plant selection involves the detail evaluation of the various factors that must be considered when evolving various processes in treatment plant processes and methods to meet the current and future treatment objectives. So selection of treatment plant is an important issue due to its capital cost and function. Sir Saaty give a technological view and consideration to select best treatment who give best efficiency in removing hazardous component from the sewage so that disposal of waste water are not able to contaminate surface water and underground water.

2. Study Area

The study of two sewage treatment plant is done to compare between them. The first treatment plant is Jajmau sewage treatment plant, Kanpur and second treatment plant is Bharwara sewage treatment plant, Lucknow. Both the treatment plant are chosen because of the feasibility of obtaining data and similar environmental factor.

BHARWARA sewage treatment plant is the Asia largest sewage treatment which has capacity to treat 345mld sewage. In India, first sewage treatment plant is introduced in Kanpur in 1989. Bharwara treatment plant is situated at the bank of Gomti River and receive waste from total Gon Gomti side including Indira nagar, Gomti nagar and Sitapur road areas. JAJMAU sewage treatment plant receives sewage from area bounded by the Ganga river to the north, Armapur state, dada nagar and Kidwai nagar to south. The area is mixed residential and commercial area with industrial area.

3. Methodology

Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP)
The analytic hierarchy process is a mathematical device in multi-criteria decision making which designing the decision factors in a hierarchic problem structure (Saaty, 1990). The main target of the AHP is to decide and help decision makers in making resolutions for the complex problems by structuring the criterion hierarchy of Multi-criteria decision making. The first element in AHP procedures is determining the focus or aim of the problem identified. It is considered as the first level for the AHP hierarchy. Next would be multiple criterion that define alternatives and the last level is the contributing alternatives (causes/factors) for the focus. The standard scale with absolute numbers used as a measurement in order to manage the weight of each alternative.

The scale measurement from 1 to 9 in a fundamental scale of measurement listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Importance</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equal importance</td>
<td>Two activities contribute equally to the objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weak importance of one over another</td>
<td>Experience and judgment slightly favor one activity over another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essential or strong Importance</td>
<td>Experience and judgment strongly favor one activity over another</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Pair-wise comparison scale for AHP preference (Saaty and Windi, 1980; Saaty, 2008)
Reciprocals of above nonzero numbers assigned to it when compared with activity j, then j has the reciprocal value when compared with i.

### Application of AHP to decision making involves four steps:
1. Structuring the decision problem into a hierarchical model.
2. Making pair-wise comparisons of criteria and obtaining the matrix.
4. Aggregation of all priorities

#### Structuring the decision problem into hierarchical model

In this paper waste water treatment plant is divided into 4 criteria which is further divided into sub criteria. The criteria or factor are decided on the basis of study about plant and treatment process.

The criteria used for comparing are as follows:

1. **Economic criteria analysed into next three sub criteria.**
   - Capital cost: includes cost of construction both civil and electro-mechanical works.
   - Land requirement: includes cost of land required for construction of WWTP.
   - Operation and maintenance cost: includes repair cost and energy cost.

2. **Environmental criteria analyzed into next four sub criteria.**
   - BOD removal
   - COD removal
   - TSS removal
   - pH

3. **Technical/administrative criteria**
   - performance
   - reliability

#### Making pair wise comparison and obtaining judgemental matrix

Comparing first level criteria we get the judgemental matrix given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Factor</th>
<th>Economic Factor</th>
<th>Technical Factor</th>
<th>Priority Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-Jan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Factor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Factor</td>
<td>5-Jan</td>
<td>7-Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normalized principal eigen vector is also called priority vector. Since it is normalized, the sum of all elements in priority vector is 1. The priority vector shows relative weights among the factor that we compare.

Aside from the relative weight, we can also check the consistency. For that we have to find principal eigen value. Principal Eigen value is obtained from the summation of products between each element of Eigen vector and the sum of columns of the reciprocal matrix.

\[ \lambda_{\max} = 2(0.2828) + 31(0.6434) + 13(0.0738) = 3.0967 \]

### Consistency

Since judgments may lack a minimum level of consistency, mechanisms to improve consistency are necessary.

\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\max} - n}{n-1} \]

\[ CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \]

Then, he proposed what is called Consistency Ratio, which is a comparison between Consistency Index and Random Consistency Index, or in formula

\[ CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \]

If the value of Consistency Ratio is smaller or equal to 10%, the inconsistency is acceptable. If the Consistency Ratio is greater than 10%, we need to revise the subjective judgment. Here,

Consistency Ratio

\[ CR = 0.0484/0.58 \]

Thus acceptable
Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{max}\cdot n}{(n-1)} \]
\[ = 4.23 - 4 / (4-1) \]
\[ = 0.0766 \]

Consistency Ratio
\[ CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \]
\[ = 0.0766 / 0.9 \]
\[ = 8.5\% < 10\% \)
, hence applicable

Comparing economic factor we get the judgemental matrix given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Cost</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Land Requirement</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Requirement</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{max} = 31 / 21 (0.643) + 21 / 5 (0.284) + 13 (0.073) \]
\[ = 3.0649 \]

Consistency Index
Since judgments may lack a minimum level of consistency, mechanisms to improve consistency are necessary.
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{max}\cdot n}{(n-1)} \]
\[ = 3.0649 - 3 / (3-1) \]
\[ = 0.03245 \]

Consistency Ratio
\[ CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \]
\[ = 0.03245 / 0.58 \]
\[ = 5.6\% < 10\% \)
, hence applicable

Comparing technical factor we get the judgemental matrix given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{max} = 6 (0.167) + 6/5 (0.833) \]
\[ = 2.0016 \]

Consistency Index
Since judgments may lack a minimum level of consistency, mechanisms to improve consistency are necessary.
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{max}\cdot n}{(n-1)} \]
\[ = 2.0016 - 2 / (2-1) \]
\[ = 0.0016 \]

Consistency Ratio
\[ CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \]
\[ = 0.0016 / RI \]

According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated

**Figure:** hierarchy diagram

**Alternative Calculation**
We have two alternatives for the criteria we have decided namely, Kanpur and Lucknow waste water treatment plant. we are going to one by one decide the in of the alternative for each criteria with the help of study and psychology of group study.
Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for COD removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COD Removal</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KANPUR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCKNOW</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{4}{3}(0.75) + 4(0.25) \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for TSS removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSS REMOVAL</th>
<th>KANPUR</th>
<th>LUCKNOW</th>
<th>PRORITY VECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KANPUR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCKNOW</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{3}{2}(0.667) + 3(0.333) \]
= 1.9995

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for pH removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH Removal</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{4(0.25) + 4/3(0.75)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for capital cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{4/3(0.75) + 4(0.25)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for land requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Requirement</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{6(0.167) + 6/5(0.833)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for operating cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{5/4(0.8) + 5(0.2)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{4(0.25) + 4/3(0.75)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.

Matrix for alternative selection for reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
<th>Priority Vector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{4(0.25) + 4/3(0.75)}{2} \]
= 2.00

Consistency Index
\[ CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} \]
According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated.
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According to Saaty for 2x2 matrix the value of RI is 0, hence consistency ratio can’t be evaluated

Aggregation of All Priorities
Final matrix for comparing the alternative. All the calculations and alternative are put together for decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weightage</th>
<th>Kanpur</th>
<th>Lucknow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD REMOVAL</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD REMOVAL</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS REMOVAL</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH REMOVAL</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL COST</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING COST</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIABILITY</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUM</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Result

Final result graph presents the final results of the analysis. The graph shows that Lucknow sewage treatment plant is better evaluated than Kanpur sewage treatment plant. The overall score of Lucknow sewage treatment plant is 0.545 and Kanpur sewage treatment plant is 0.455. Result shows that without the help of AHP it is very hard to compare between the two sewage treatment plant as the difference between the value is very small (0.09) but with the help of AHP we can say that Lucknow sewage treatment plant is better than Kanpur sewage treatment plant.

5. Conclusion

The selection of sewage treatment plant is a complicated multi-criteria decision making process, in which uncertainty, complexity and hierarchy are the most. In this paper, a practical approach is presented for selecting and weighing the waste water treatment plant based on the treatment technique, processes, environmental affects, and capital cost and land requirements. The decision criteria were technical / administrative, economic and environmental criteria as well as their sub-criteria. These criteria were evaluated to determine the best treatment plant for the sewage treatment before deposition to the under-ground or land surfaces. The best treatment plant for treatment of waste water is Bharwara waste water treatment plant, Lucknow among Kanpur and Lucknow sewage treatment plant in AHP method.

From the above study, the following conclusions were made:
1) Application of AHP method in multi-criteria decision making is easy to use and easily understandable by the users as it handles multiple criteria with a certain value of consistency is allowed.
2) The appropriate plant selected from the above study is Bharwara sewage treatment plant which gives guide lines in future construction of treatment plant for sewage.

3) The above observations suggest that MCDM methods should be used as decision support tools and not as the means for deriving the final answer.
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