

---

SPRINGER SERIES ON  
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

---

BRUCE N. ANDERSON  
ROBERT W. HOWARTH  
LAWRENCE R. WALKER  
Series Editors

## Springer Series on Environmental Management

---

**The Professional Practice of Environmental Management** (1989)  
R.S. Dorney and L. Dorney (eds.)

**Chemicals in the Aquatic Environment: Advanced Hazard Assessment** (1989)  
L. Landner (ed.)

**Inorganic Contaminants of Surface Water: Research and Monitoring Priorities** (1991) J.W. Moore

**Chernobyl: A Policy Response Study** (1991) B. Segerst ahl (ed.)

**Long-Term Consequences of Disasters: The Reconstruction of Friuli, Italy, in its International Context, 1976-1988** (1991)  
R. Geipel

**Food Web Management: A Case Study of Lake Mendota** (1992) J.F. Kitchell (ed.)

**Restoration and Recovery of an Industrial Region: Progress in Restoring the Smelter-Damaged Landscape near Sudbury, Canada** (1995) J.M. Gunn (ed.)

**Limnological and Engineering Analysis of a Polluted Urban Lake: Prelude to Environmental Management of Onondaga Lake, New York** (1996)  
S.W. Effler (ed.)

**Assessment and Management of Plant Invasions** (1997) J.O. Luken and J.W. Thieret (eds.)

**Marine Debris: Sources, Impacts, and Solutions** (1997) J.M. Coe and D.B. Rogers (eds.)

**Environmental Problem Solving: Psychosocial Barriers to Adaptive Change** (1999) A. Miller

**Rural Planning from an Environmental Systems Perspective** (1999) F.B. Golley and J. Bellot (eds.)

**Wildlife Study Design** (2001)  
M.L. Morrison, W.M. Block, M.D. Strickland, and W.L. Kendall

**Selenium Assessment in Aquatic Ecosystems: A Guide for Hazard Evaluation and Water Quality Criteria** (2002) A.D. Lemly

**Quantifying Environmental Impact Assessments Using Fuzzy Logic** (2005) R.B. Shepard

Richard B. Shepard

# Quantifying Environmental Impact Assessments Using Fuzzy Logic

With 42 Illustrations

 Springer

Richard B. Shepard  
Applied Ecosystem Services, Inc.  
Troutdale, OR 97060  
USA  
rshepard@appl-ecosys.com

*Series Editors:*

Dr. Bruce N. Anderson  
Planreal Australasia  
Keilor, Victoria 3036  
Australia  
bnanderson@compuserve.com

Dr. Robert W. Howarth  
Program in Biogeochemistry  
and Environmental Change  
Cornell University  
Corson Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
rwh2@cornell.edu

Dr. Lawrence R. Walker  
Department of Biological  
Sciences  
University of Nevada  
Las Vegas  
Las Vegas, NV 89154  
walker@unlv.nevada.edu

*Cover illustration:* Fig. 9.18, page 94. Intersection, conjunction, T-norm, minimum.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Quantifying environmental impact assessments using fuzzy logic / Richard B. Shepard.

p. cm. — (Springer series on environmental management)

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 0-387-24398-4

1. Environmental impact analysis. 2. Fuzzy logic. I. Shepard, Richard B. II. Series.

TD194.6.Q36 2005

333.71'4—dc22

2005040214

ISBN-10: 0-387-24398-4

Printed on acid-free paper.

© 2005 Springer Science+Business Media, Inc.

All rights reserved. This work may not be translated or copied in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher (Springer Science+Business Media, Inc., 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, USA), except for brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis. Use in connection with any form of information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed is forbidden.

The use in this publication of trade names, trademarks, service marks, and similar terms, even if they are not identified as such, is not to be taken as an expression of opinion as to whether or not they are subject to proprietary rights.

Printed in the United States of America. (SBA)

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

SPIN 10979020

springeronline.com

---

## Preface

Formal requirements for the assessment of environmental impacts of development activities may have begun in the United States with the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969, but they now are found in more than 200 countries worldwide. The details vary, but the underlying goals of minimizing environmental degradation and improving environmental conditions are the same. In many countries, these national requirements are supplemented by additional requirements by states, provinces, counties, cities and other political divisions that are collectively called sub-national statutes and regulations.

I am most familiar with the requirements at the national level in the United States as well as at the state and county levels in the western half of the country. However, books, other published reports, and communications with peers amply document that problems caused by the subjective nature of environmental impact assessments are international in scope. This subjectivity can be quantified and treated with mathematical rigor by the application of advanced computational intelligence techniques. This approach will work equally well regardless of geographic location or political jurisdiction because it is responsive to variations in societal values, legal frameworks, and regulatory agency practices. Trans-national organizations such as the European Union, World Bank, and United Nations Environmental Program also set project environmental standards that must be met in addition to the standards set by local governments.

It is important to make this disclaimer emphatically: in no way is this book to be taken as criticism of environmental impact assessment (EIA) laws, regulations, practitioners, or theorists. Such criticism would be neither warranted nor justified. Identifying subjective aspects is not criticism. Such identification forms the basis for understanding this book and benefitting from its content.

This book has three objectives:

1. The first objective is to document how environmental impact assessments have been conducted and to explain when and why contention develops. The book stresses that environmental assessments (whether of impacts or of existing conditions) are subjective expressions of societal, group, and individual values and opinions. As such, they are not objective or measurable. Science, particularly ecology and environmental science, has difficulties dealing with feelings, beliefs, and values, which are “nonscientific” concepts.

The specifics of the EIA process vary with the controlling jurisdiction; there is no attempt to describe all the variations and subtle differences, because this is not a book to teach the theory and detailed practice of environmental impact assessments as implemented worldwide. However, specific points will be based on my experiences as well as what others have experienced and described in published literature.

The first objective establishes two important points: EIAs are subjective and existing assessment methods do not effectively handle subjectivity. We speak and write using terms that cannot be measured. Concepts such as *significant*, *distant*, *acceptable* and others are understood by everyone – but we each may have a different definition of these terms. Almost all environmental regulatory processes depend on such imprecise, vague, inherently uncertain terms. Commercial development may be prohibited on *steep* slopes, but how is *steep* defined? It is almost always an arbitrary, crisp value; for example, 20 percent. This does not mean that a slope of 19.5 percent is not *steep*, but it means that there is no sharp threshold that separates *steep* from *not steep*. Fortunately, fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic, and approximate reasoning (among other computational intelligence methods) handle subjectivity effectively by

quantifying it and manipulating it with mathematical rigor.

2. The second objective is to justify the use of fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic and approximate reasoning to provide decision-makers with the ability to make well-informed decisions: ones that are technically sound and legally defensible. I do this by describing core issues of an environmental impact assessment in terms of fuzzy modeling and other computational intelligence techniques.

The concept of fuzzy sets was developed explicitly to address the inherent imprecision of everyday language which we all use to express ideas that cannot be measured. Fuzzy logic is the mathematics that permits rigorous operations on fuzzy sets to arrive at a outcome that is meaningful and can be explained. Approximate reasoning is the computer modeling of how humans make decisions (IF this THEN do that) when all the input data are subjective and not directly measurable. Other advanced techniques of artificial intelligence (AI) (including expert systems, decision support systems, and data mining using neural networks and evolutionary algorithms) also can be effectively and productively applied to addressing the underlying purposes of environmental impact assessments.

3. The third objective is to illustrate the use of computational intelligence techniques presented in objective 2 for environmental impact assessment. This example creates an approximate reasoning model applied to a project completed the traditional way under Washington state laws and regulations. While the example is based on a real industrial development proposal, the original environmental impact assessment was not developed with computational intelligence techniques. Therefore, the example has been adapted to demonstrate the application of these tools by adding missing information and deleting some components to make the example a reasonable size.

Mathematical symbols used in fuzzy logic (from [9]).

Symbol	Meaning
$\neg$	set NOT (also complement or inversion)
$\cap$	set AND (also intersection operator)
$\cup$	set OR (also union operator)
$\Re$	higher-dimensional fuzzy space
$[x,x,x]$	fuzzy membership value
$\in$	member of a set; within
$\text{poss}(x)$	the possibility of event $x$
$\text{prob}(x)$	the probability of event $x$
$\{x\}$	crisp, or Boolean, membership function
$\bullet$	dyadic operator
$\xi(x)$	expected value of a fuzzy region
$\mu$	fuzzy membership function
$\propto$	proportionality
$\mu(x)$	membership, or truth, function in fuzzy set
$\Re$	element from domain of fuzzy set
$\otimes$	Cartesian product or space
$\emptyset$	empty, or null, set
$\supset$	implication
$\wedge$	logical AND
$\vee$	logical OR
$\Sigma$	summation

## Acknowledgments

Among all the people whose efforts have brought me to the level of understanding and experience that allows me to write knowledgeably about environmental impact assessments and fuzzy system models a handful stand out of the crowd. Earl Cox introduced me to fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic with the first edition of his *The Fuzzy System Handbook* a decade ago. Since then his comments and suggestions have been helpful to my understanding of this subject and the subtleties of writing software that function to compute fuzzy system models with parallel rule-firing and the ability to solve otherwise intractable problems. Dr. William Siler created a parallel-firing fuzzy inference engine that



is at the core of the solutions presented here. Three other friends and professional colleagues deserve public thanks for the highly productive conversations we have had over the years on environmental issues and running natural resource industries. These friends, Jonathan Brown, Paul Scheidig, and Ivan Urnovitz, manfully read drafts of the book and let me know at what sections their eyes started to glaze over. Paul Scheidig bravely read the first two parts and gave me his usual invaluable feedback. The suggestions from all the above for elucidation and clarity make this book a much better work. My fiancée, Pamela Sue Alexander, cheerfully accepted my long hours at the computer with patience and understanding; this made the process both easier and more pleasant. My editor at Springer, Janet Slobodien, has been a great guide into the world of book publishing, a world much different from that of peer-reviewed scientific or trade journal publishing. Despite the best efforts of all these outstanding people, any errors or mistakes that remain are mine alone.

Richard B. Shepard  
February 2005  
Troutdale, Oregon

---

# Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	v
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	xvii
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	xxi
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 Making Decisions .....	4
1.1.1 Decision Support Systems .....	4
1.1.1.1 Multi-Objective .....	5
1.1.1.2 Multi-Criteria .....	5
1.1.2 Expert Systems .....	6
1.1.3 Decision-Making in the EIA Process .....	7

---

## Part I The Traditional Approach

---

<b>2 General Principles</b> .....	11
2.1 Definition of EIA .....	11
2.2 Objectives of EIA .....	12
2.3 EIA Principles .....	12
2.3.1 Basic Principles .....	13
2.3.2 Operating Principles .....	14
2.4 Other Guidelines .....	15
2.5 Problem Areas .....	16

- 2.6 EIA Process Overview ..... 18
- 3 Scoping** ..... 23
- 4 Baseline Conditions** ..... 27
  - 4.1 What To Include ..... 28
  - 4.2 Collecting Data ..... 29
    - 4.2.1 Literature Reports ..... 30
    - 4.2.2 Field Studies ..... 30
  - 4.3 Baseline Condition Use ..... 31
  - 4.4 Missing or Insufficient Data ..... 32
- 5 Alternatives** ..... 35
- 6 Impact Assessment** ..... 39
  - 6.1 Impact Identification ..... 40
  - 6.2 Impact Prediction ..... 43
  - 6.3 Impact Evaluation ..... 45
    - 6.3.1 Individual Impacts ..... 46
    - 6.3.2 Alternatives Evaluation ..... 47
    - 6.3.3 Cumulative Effects Assessment ..... 49
- 7 Writing the Impact Statement** ..... 53

---

**Part II The Modern Approach**

---

- 8 Moving to the New Paradigm** ..... 57
  - 8.1 Tools for the New Paradigm ..... 57
  - 8.2 Progress Toward Adoption ..... 58
    - 8.2.1 Mercury Bioaccumulation Risks ..... 58
    - 8.2.2 Checklist Enhancement ..... 59
    - 8.2.3 Fuzzy Logic GIS ..... 60
    - 8.2.4 Fuzzy Decision Analysis ..... 60
    - 8.2.5 Fuzzy EIA ..... 61
- 9 Introduction to Fuzzy Sets and Logic** ..... 63
  - 9.1 Measurement and Language ..... 63
  - 9.2 From Subjectivity to Objectivity ..... 64
  - 9.3 Linguistic Variables ..... 65

9.4	Ranking of Preferences .....	66
9.5	Fuzzy Sets (Type-1) .....	68
9.5.1	Crisp Sets .....	68
9.5.2	Fuzzy Sets .....	71
9.5.3	Fuzzy Numbers .....	76
9.5.4	Membership Function Shape .....	77
9.5.5	Alpha Cuts .....	82
9.5.6	Fuzzy Hedges .....	83
9.6	Fuzzy Sets (Type-2) .....	85
9.7	Fuzzy Set Operators .....	92
9.8	IF-THEN Rules .....	95
9.9	Defuzzification .....	98
9.10	Fuzzy Implication .....	99
9.10.1	Min-Max Implication Rules .....	101
9.10.2	Additive Implication Rules .....	102
9.10.3	Weighted Geometric Mean .....	104
9.10.4	Symmetric Summation .....	104
9.10.5	Ordered Weighted Aggregators .....	106
9.11	Compatibility Index .....	108
9.11.1	Unit Compatibility Index .....	109
9.11.2	Statistical Compatibility Index .....	112
9.11.3	Compatibility Height Selection .....	112
<b>10</b>	<b>Environmental Conditions .....</b>	<b>115</b>
10.1	Inadequate Data .....	115
10.2	Fuzzy Set Design .....	117
10.3	Characterization .....	121
<b>11</b>	<b>Impact Inference and Assessment .....</b>	<b>129</b>
11.1	Societal Values and Beliefs .....	129
11.2	Fuzzy Expert System Models .....	133
11.2.1	Designing the Model .....	134
11.2.1.1	Universe of Discourse .....	135
11.2.1.2	Name Convention .....	135
11.2.1.3	Hedge .....	136
11.2.1.4	Membership Function Shape, Overlap, and Location .....	136
11.2.1.5	Defuzzification and Output Processing ..	136
11.2.2	Rule Creation .....	137

- 11.2.2.1 Sources ..... 137
- 11.2.2.2 Rule Organization ..... 139
- 11.2.2.3 Logic Operators ..... 143
- 11.2.2.4 Implication Operators ..... 144
- 11.2.2.5 Aggregation Operator ..... 145
- 11.2.2.6 Defuzzification Method ..... 147
- 11.2.2.7 Importance Weights ..... 148
- 11.3 Significance, Acceptability, Sustainability ..... 149
  - 11.3.1 Significance ..... 150
    - 11.3.1.1 Likelihood of Occurrence ..... 151
    - 11.3.1.2 Direction and Magnitude ..... 153
    - 11.3.1.3 Areal Extent ..... 155
    - 11.3.1.4 Duration ..... 155
    - 11.3.1.5 Reversibility ..... 156
    - 11.3.1.6 Mitigation Degree ..... 157
    - 11.3.1.7 Occurrence Timing ..... 158
    - 11.3.1.8 Geographic Scale ..... 158
  - 11.3.2 Acceptability ..... 159
  - 11.3.3 Sustainability ..... 164
- 12 Multi-Objective, Multi-Criteria Decision-Making ..... 167**

---

**Part III Application**

---

- 13 Introduction ..... 181**
  - 13.1 What This Part Includes ..... 181
  - 13.2 Description of the Project ..... 182
  - 13.3 Purpose ..... 182
  - 13.4 Need ..... 184
- 14 Scoping ..... 187**
  - 14.1 Determining Components ..... 188
  - 14.2 Public Participation Process ..... 190
  - 14.3 Conflicting Values ..... 191

**15 Baseline Environment** . . . . . 195

15.1 Vegetation and Wildlife . . . . . 195

15.1.1 Vegetation Cover Types . . . . . 196

15.1.2 Sensitive, Threatened, and Endangered Plant Species . . . . . 199

15.1.3 Wildlife . . . . . 199

15.1.4 Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species . . . . . 202

15.2 Wetlands, Hydrology, and Water Quality . . . . . 204

15.2.1 Wetlands . . . . . 204

15.2.2 Hydrology . . . . . 204

15.2.3 Water Quality . . . . . 206

15.3 Aesthetics . . . . . 208

15.4 Transportation . . . . . 209

15.4.1 Introduction . . . . . 209

15.4.2 Existing Traffic Volumes and Operations . . . . . 210

15.4.3 Nonautomobile Transportation Facilities . . . . . 211

15.4.3.1 Public Bus Transportation . . . . . 211

15.4.3.2 Airports . . . . . 212

15.4.3.3 Bicycle Facilities . . . . . 212

15.4.3.4 Pedestrian Facilities . . . . . 212

15.5 Fuzzifying Initial Conditions . . . . . 213

15.6 Environmental Condition Index . . . . . 216

**16 Project Alternatives** . . . . . 219

16.1 The Affected Environment . . . . . 222

16.1.1 Vegetation and Wildlife . . . . . 222

16.1.1.1 Alternative 1 . . . . . 223

16.1.1.2 Alternative 2 . . . . . 223

16.1.1.3 Alternatives 3 and 4 . . . . . 223

16.1.1.4 Alternative 5 . . . . . 224

16.1.2 Threatened and Endangered Species . . . . . 224

16.1.2.1 Bald Eagle . . . . . 224

16.1.2.2 Sandhill Crane . . . . . 224

16.1.3 Wetlands, Hydrology, and Water Quality . . . . . 225

16.1.3.1 Wetlands . . . . . 225

16.1.3.2 Hydrology . . . . . 228

16.1.3.3 Water Quality . . . . . 230

16.1.4 Aesthetics . . . . . 233

16.1.4.1 Alternative 1 . . . . . 233

16.1.4.2	Alternative 2	234
16.1.4.3	Alternative 3	234
16.1.4.4	Alternative 4	235
16.1.4.5	Alternative 5	235
16.1.5	Transportation	236
16.1.5.1	Alternative 1	237
16.1.5.2	Alternative 2	237
16.1.5.3	Alternative 3	237
16.1.5.4	Alternative 4	238
16.1.5.5	Alternative 5	239
16.1.6	Cumulative Effects	239
<b>17</b>	<b>Results and Conclusions</b>	<b>245</b>
17.1	Running the Model	245
17.2	Environmental Condition Indices	249
17.3	Making and Supporting Policy Decisions	251
17.4	Caveats	251
17.5	What the Future Holds	253
	<b>References</b>	<b>255</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>259</b>

---

## List of Figures

6.1	An example of a Leopold matrix. Each cell is scored for impact magnitude and importance. ....	41
6.2	An example of an impact network used on a dredging project.....	43
9.1	The crisp set of steep slopes. The threshold is at 20 percent. All grades greater than 20 percent are members of the set; all grades less than 20 percent are not members. Exactly 20 percent is an ambiguous discontinuity.....	70
9.2	A generic fuzzy set showing all the parts discussed in the text. ....	71
9.3	The fuzzy set of steep slopes. Each measured grade > 2 percent is a member of this set to some degree. ....	73
9.4	The fuzzy set, <i>significant</i> , demonstrating that the grade of membership varies until there is consensus that all higher values are completely within the set.....	74
9.5	A fuzzy term set for slope steepness. ....	75
9.6	An example of a singleton fuzzy set for the number 2.25..	76
9.7	One way of expressing the concept of “about 20.” The shape and width of the membership function will vary with the meaning in different situations. ....	77
9.8	A triangular fuzzy term set. ....	79
9.9	A trapezoidal fuzzy term set .....	80
9.10	A bell (sigmoid, S)-shape fuzzy term set.....	81



9.11	Alpha-cut threshold for fuzzy set <i>Significant</i> . . . . .	82
9.12	Fuzzy hedges modifying the fuzzy set of <i>Normal</i> traffic volume . . . . .	83
9.13	(a) Graphical representation of a Type-2 fuzzy set for <i>Significance</i> . The domain of the grade of membership associated with $x = 4$ is shown by the vertical line. (b) The Gaussian secondary membership function at $x = 4$ . . .	88
9.14	A triangular fuzzy set for the concept of <i>Acceptable</i> . The base points of the member function (marked $l$ and $r$ ) span a range of values. . . . .	89
9.15	A Type-2 fuzzy set as a Gaussian curve with uncertain mean. . . . .	91
9.16	Gaussian primary membership function with uncertain standard deviation. The FOU disappears to certainty when $\mu_T(x) = 1.0$ . . . . .	92
9.17	Fuzzy set operators <i>min</i> , <i>max</i> , and <i>complement</i> . . . . .	93
9.18	Fuzzy <i>AND</i> . . . . .	94
9.19	The union of two sets, $A$ and $B$ , and the T-conorm, or S-norm. . . . .	94
9.20	Antecedent conditions combined with <i>AND</i> using the fuzzy operator $\max(A,B)$ . . . . .	97
9.21	Two methods of defuzzifying a consequent fuzzy set. . . . .	98
9.22	Applying the rules using the min-max inference method. . . . .	103
9.23	Regions of decreased compatibility in a solution fuzzy set. . . . .	109
9.24	Defuzzified output of erosion risk significance when $\mu[0.42]$ . . . . .	110
9.25	Defuzzified output of erosion risk significance when $\mu[0.72]$ . . . . .	111
10.1	Acceptable values of dissolved oxygen for salmonids, expressed as a fuzzy set. . . . .	123
10.2	The Type-2 fuzzy set for <i>a moderate amount</i> . This is the middle set of five in the term set for the linguistic variable, <i>Aesthetics</i> . . . . .	128
11.1	The major components of an approximate reasoning expert system model and the flow of processing through the components. . . . .	134

11.2	Voting frequency by wildlife biologists on whether specified population sizes are significant. . . . .	140
11.3	Correlation product of erosion risk. . . . .	147
11.4	The overall structure of the significance policy. . . . .	152
11.5	Fuzzy sets for determining impact significance: a) likelihood of occurrence; b) direction and magnitude; c) aerial extent; d) duration. . . . .	153
11.6	Fuzzy sets for determining impact significance: a) reversibility; b) mitigation; c) occurrence period; d) geographic scale . . . . .	154
11.7	All labels with interval and uncertainty. From [20, page 74]. . . . .	162
11.8	The final set of labels for <i>Acceptability</i> . Each will be represented as a Type-2 fuzzy term. . . . .	162
11.9	Converting the label <i>A moderate amount</i> into the Type-2 fuzzy set <i>Moderate_amount</i> . Also shown are the degrees of membership for two specific values. . . . .	163
12.1	Example of an AHP for seaport development. Four objectives and three criteria (constraints) are shown as levels in the decision-making hierarchy. . . . .	168
13.1	Location of the Columbia Gateway area of the Port of Vancouver. The Columbia River is the border between the states of Oregon and Washington. This is a portion of one map included in the written EIS. (From [2]). . . . .	183
15.1	The amount of vegetation of value to wildlife under existing conditions. . . . .	213
15.2	The fuzzy term sets <i>Unacceptable</i> and <i>Acceptable</i> in the linguistic variable "Water_quality." . . . .	214
15.3	The fuzzy sets for <i>Good</i> and <i>Not_Good</i> used to quantify environmental conditions at the Columbia Gateway site. . . . .	218
16.1	The four parcels (numbered 2–5) that compose the Columbia Gateway area at the Port of Vancouver (USA). Parcel 1 is the developed area, part of which is seen at the bottom center of the map. (From [2]). . . . .	220

---

# List of Tables

9.1	Linguistic hedges and their meaning when applied to fuzzy sets. Adapted from [9, page 218]. . . . .	84
9.2	Boolean truth tables for <i>AND</i> , <i>OR</i> , and <i>NOT</i> . . . . .	92
10.1	Word variable labels and parameters for Type-2 fuzzy sets. . . . .	127
11.1	Importance values to be used in pairwise comparisons of environmental components. . . . .	130
12.1	Planners preferences on dam evaluation criteria (objectives). . . . .	170
12.2	The weights of the function evaluation criteria. . . . .	170
12.3	The relative importances of each dam function on cultural alterations. . . . .	171
12.4	The relative effects of each dam function on potential cultural alteration of the local population. . . . .	171
12.5	The relative importances of each dam function on the economy. . . . .	172
12.6	The relative effects of each dam function on the economy. . . . .	172
12.7	The relative environmental impacts of each dam function. . . . .	172
12.8	The relative environmental impacts of each dam function. . . . .	173

12.9	The relative transportation distance importance of each dam function. ....	173
12.10	The relative importances of transportation distance on each dam function. ....	174
12.11	Relative criteria scores for each dam function. ....	174
14.1	Results of pairwise comparisons of some components considered in the Columbia Gateway environmental impact assessment. ....	192
14.2	Importance of components to be included in the example environmental impact assessment. ....	193
15.1	Areal extent (in acres) of each vegetation cover type identified on the Columbia ....	196
15.2	Wetland types and areal extent prior to development, in acres. ....	204
15.3	Functions and values (0 = lowest, 10 = highest) for wetlands on each of the four parcels at Columbia Gateway. ....	205
15.4	Level of service categories for intersections with and without traffic control signal lights. For intersections with signals the numbers are the average seconds each vehicle is stopped. For unsignaled intersections the numbers are the average seconds of total delay for each vehicle. ....	211
15.5	Existing traffic conditions at certain signaled and unsignaled intersections in the vicinity of the Columbia Gateway area (data from afternoon peak hour surveys in 2000; delay time in seconds). ....	212
15.6	Importance weights of each environmental component included in the example assessment. ....	217
16.1	Direct wetland impacts for each alternative (in acres) (The natural processes that would change wetlands were not estimated in the written EIS). ....	225
16.2	Representative water quality of stormwater runoff from industrial lands in urban environments. Treatment efficiency based on removal within detention ponds. ....	231

16.3	Estimated annual discharge of pollutants post-development (in pounds). . . . .	232
16.4	Level of service (LOS) and volume:capacity (v/c) ratios or intersections in the Columbia Gateway vicinity as projected for peak afternoon hour in 2020. Delay time in seconds. . . . .	238
16.5	Potential trip generation for each alternative. . . . .	239
17.1	Environmental Condition Indices (ECI) for the existing conditions and proposed alternatives at the Columbia Gateway site, Port of Vancouver, USA. . . . .	250