

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Certificate	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
List of Abbreviations	vi
Table of contents	viii
List of figures.....	xi
List of tables.....	xiii

Chapter 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION (1 - 29)

1.1 Introduction	2
1.1.1 Affected of flood in International region.....	2
1.1.2 National region	5
1.1.3 Flood affected in Assam and BTAD	7
1.2 Literature Survey	14
1.2.1 Conceptualization of flood risk and vulnerability.....	14
1.2.2 Flood risk expressions	15
1.2.3 Methods to assess flood vulnerability.....	18
1.2.4 Vulnerability indicators.....	20
1.3 Fuzzy logic approach in hydrology.....	21
1.4 Significance of the study	28
1.5 Objectives of the study	28
1.6 Methodology	29
1.7 Organization of the Thesis	29

Chapter-2: PRELIMINARIES (30 – 52)

2.1 Basic of Fuzzy set	31
2.2 Fuzzy number	36
2.2.1 Triangular fuzzy number	38
2.2.2 Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number.....	39

2.3	Linguistic Variable	39
2.4	Overview Decision- Making and its support	41
2.4.1	Fuzzy Multi criteria decision Making	41
2.4.2	Decision making in a fuzzy environment	42
2.4.3	Classification of MCDM	42
2.5	Methods.....	44
2.5.1	Fuzzy A H P.....	45
2.5.2	Fuzzy VIKOR	47
2.5.3	Fuzzy TOPSIS.....	50

Chapter 3: STUDY AREA AND DATA COLLECTION (53 – 65)

3.1	Introduction	54
3.2	Geography of study Area	54
3.2.1	Population	55
3.2.2	Climate	56
3.3	River basin of BTAD	60
3.4	Data Collection	65

Chapter 4: IDENTIFICATION OF THE FLOOD VULNERABILITY REGION (66 – 87)

4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	The OWA operator	69
4.3	The Proposed VIKOR Method	71
4.4	The case Study of proposed method.....	74
4.5	Result and discussion.....	85
4.6	Conclusion	86

Chapter 5: STRUCTURAL FLOOD CONTROL MODELLING (88-103)

5.1	Introduction	89
5.2	Flood Control Project Alternatives.....	91
5.3	Applications of Proposed Framework	93

5.4 Conclusion.....103

**Chapter 6: SELECTION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT AND
COMPARISON OF MCDM (104-132)**

6.1 Introduction105
6.2 Fuzzy PROMETHEE106
6.3 Application of the Model to case illustration114
6.4 Comparisons among MCDM methods125
6.5 Sensitivity Analysis130
6.6 Conclusion132

Chapter 7: RESEARCH SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION (133– 137)

7.1 Research Summary.....134
7.2 Conclusion137
7.3 Recommendation137

REFERENCES..... (138-155)

APPENDIX

PUBLICATIONS

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Annual occurrence and economic damages: 1990-2017	3
Figure 1.2 (a) No. of people deaths (Cred Crunch March 2018).....	4
Figure 1.2 (b) No. of people affected (million) (Cred Crunch March 2018).....	4
Figure 1.2 (b) No. of people affected (million) (Cred Crunch March 2018).....	5
Figure 1.3 Conceptual linkages between vulnerability, resilience, and adaptive capacity (Redrawn from Cutter et al., 2008).....	18
Figure 2.1 illustrates the regions in the universe of core, support., alpha cut 1.....	35
Figure: 2.2 (a) Convex, (b) Non convex	36
Figure 2.3 Real Number and Fuzzy Number	37
Figure 2.4 Triangular Fuzzy Number	38
Figure 2.5 A Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number.....	39
Figure 2.6 Linguistic Variable Example	40
Figure 2.7 the intersection between M_1 and M_2	46
Figure 3.1 Year round rainfall of BTAD, 2014.....	57
Figure 3.2 Year round rainfall of BTAD, 2015	58
Figure 3.3 Year round rainfall of BTAD, 2016	59
Figure 3.4: Average yearly max and min temp of BTAD for the year 2014 to 2016	60
Figure 3.5 study area map	61
Figure. 4.1 Flowchart of the best alternative selection process	70
Figure 4.2 Study area map	76
Figure 4.3 Hierarchical structure of the problem	77
Figure 4.4. Linguistic variables for rating of alternatives (Yucenur 2012).....	78
Figure 4. 5. Linguistic variables for rating the criteria (Yucenur , 2012)	78
Figure 4.6 Ranking of Alternatives by S R and Q	85
Figure 4.7 Ranking of Criterion weights	86
Figure 5.1 Satellite map of Chirang District	93
Figure 5.2 Ranking by Q at different value of v	102
Figure 6.1 Linguistic scale relative importance (G. Tuzkaya et al. 2010)	108
Figure 6.2 Linguistic scale of evaluation (G. Tuzkaya et al. 2010)	109

Figure 6.3 General preference function of PROMETHEE	113
Figure 6.4 River system under BTAD	116
Figure 6.5 Decision main criteria and sub criteria.....	118
Figure 6.6 Hierarchical structure of rating of alternatives	119
Figure 6.7 Fuzzy PROMETHEE I-II partial and complete ranking	126

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Statement Showing Damage due to Flood during 1953 – 2011 in India....	6
Table 1.2 Statistics on affect of Damages caused by floods in Assam.....	10
Table 1.3 Statistics on affect of Damages caused by floods in District of Assam...	11
Table 1.4 Statistics on affect of damages caused by flood in BTAD 2015 and 2017.....	12
Table 3.1 Administrative structure of BTAD	55
Table 3.2 Demographic structure in BTAD region.....	56
Table 3.3 District wise Rainfall BTAD 2014.....	57
Table 3.4 District wise Rainfall BTAD 2015.....	58
Table 3.5 District wise Rainfall BTAD 2016	59
Table 3.6 River system under BTAD.....	61-62
Table 4.1 Linguistic variable scales for rating of alternatives (Shemshadi, 2011).....	78
Table 4.2 Linguistic variable scales for rating the criteria weights (Shemshadi, 2011).....	78
Table 4.3 Linguistic assessment of alternatives given by six experts	79
Table 4.4 Linguistic assessment of criteria weights	79
Table 4.5 Aggregated fuzzy rating of alternatives and aggregated fuzzy weights of criteria.....	80
Table 4.6 The fuzzy best and fuzzy worst values of all criteria ratings	81
Table 4.7 Normalized fuzzy distance for the five alternatives	82
Table 4.8 The value of S, R, and Q for all alternatives	83
Table 4.9 The ranking of alternatives ordered by S, R, and Q in increasing order	83
Table 4.10 Criteria wise ranking of five alternatives.	84
Table 4.11 Ranking of criteria weights. Ordering (High to low)	85
Table 5.1 The structural alternatives of flood damages measure.....	91
Table 5.2 Four main criteria and 12 sub- criteria are developed (Zamri et al. 2013).....	92

Table 5.3 Linguistic variables for Fuzzy Pairwise Scale.....	95
Table 5.4 Pairwise comparison of Main criteria via Linguistic variables.....	95
Table 5.5 Fuzzy geometric mean of pairwise comparison (Main Criteria).....	96
Table 5.6 Final priority weights of Main criteria and Sub criteria.....	96
Table 5.7 Linguistic variables for the rating of Alternatives.....	97
Table 5.8 Linguistic assessment of alternatives given by three experts.....	97
Table 5.9 Aggregated fuzzy ratings of alternatives and aggregated fuzzy weights of criteria.	98
Table 5.10 The fuzzy best and fuzzy worst values of all criteria ratings	99
Table 5.11 Normalized fuzzy distances for the four alternatives and Criterion Weight.....	100
Table 5.12 The values of S, R and Q for all alternatives	100
Table 5.13 The rankings of the four alternatives by S, R and Q in increasing order.....	101
Table 5.14 The Q for different values of v.....	102
Table 5.15 Ranking of alternatives by Q for different values of v.....	102
Table 6.1 Linguistic scale for importance (Kahraman et al., 2006).....	108
Table 6.2 Linguistic terms for Alternatives Ratings	109
Table 6.3 Pair wise comparison criterion Rating	120
Table 6.4 Fuzzy geometric mean of pair wise comparison of Criteria	121
Table 6.5 Final priority weights of Main criteria and Sub criteria	121
Table 6.6 Importance of the alternatives with respect to criteria assessed by Experts (linguistic variable)	122
Table 6.7 Triangular fuzzy value of alternatives' linguistic evaluation	123
Table 6.8 Aggregated Triangular fuzzy values of alternatives of each criteria.....	122
Table 6.9 Weighted normalized fuzzy decision matrix	123
Table 6.10 Defuzzyfied fuzzy decision matrix	124
Table 6.11 Pair wise preference function of the alternatives	124
Table 6.12 Weighted aggregated preference function , outgoing, incoming, net flow and Ranking	125
Table 6.13 Distances between $A_i(i=1,2,3,4)$ and F^* with respect to criterion	127
Table 6.14 Distances between $A_i(i=1,2,3,4)$ and F^- with respect to criterion....	127

Table 6.15 Closeness coefficient (CC_i) of alternatives and their final ranking.....	128
Table 6.16 Fuzzy Best Value and Fuzzy Worst Value	129
Table 6.17 Normalized fuzzy distances for the four alternatives	130
Table 6.18 The values of S, R and Q for all alternatives	131
Table 6.19 The rankings of the four alternative by S, R and Q	131
Table 6.20 Ranking of alternatives based on Fuzzy PROMETHEE, fuzzy TOPSIS and fuzzy VIKOR	131
Table 6.21 Comparative Ranking	132