

# 結合客觀量測與主觀意見以進行道路施工環境影響評估審查之風險預測與管理 = Integrating objective measurement and ...

陳嘉伸、劉豐瑞

E-mail: 9708085@mail.dyu.edu.tw

## 摘要

中文摘要 我國環境影響評估法規定各種開發行為，在規劃階段應同時考量環境因素，若對環境有不良影響者，應提出環境影響評估說明書或報告書。在準備環境影響評估說明書或報告書時，編撰人員最關心的事：審查結論風險的預測與審查結論的風險管理。先前研究提出利用案例式推理(Case-Based Reasoning, CBR)結合模糊推理(Fuzzy Reasoning)推測審查結論的機率，並以重要-績效分析法(Important Performance Analysis, IPA)進行環境因子審查結論風險分析。然而，在先前研究中是以客觀的量測值直接當作為環境影響的顯著性(Significance)，並以此當作案例式推理(CBR)的特徵值，作為預測系統的輸入。雖然其驗證通過率雖高達96.7%，但仍有小部分風險預測不夠精確。事實上，環境影響評估說明書或報告書的審查是以委員會的形式來進行，更明確而論，一個開發案之環境影響是否具有顯著性，是一個依據客觀資訊的主觀意見(Subjective judgment)。因此，單以客觀量測值來進行審查風險預測，可能是造成預測系統不夠精確的原因。因此，本研究提出：(1)找出影響各個因子顯著性的準則(主觀意見)；(2)以模糊推理方式來將客觀量測與主觀意見融合以評估顯著性；(3)以資料採礦(Data mining, DM)中的分類樹(Classification tree)的技術來進行風險預測與管理。最後，與先前研究之成效進行比較。在本研究進行客觀量測與主觀意見之結合後，依據其顯著性程度而成功分類出有條件通過、進入第二階段審查與不通過之案例，使得其先前研究96.7%之驗證通過率，提高至100%。關鍵詞：環境影響評估、模糊推理、主觀意見、顯著性、分類樹

關鍵詞：環境影響評估；模糊推理；主觀意見；顯著性；分類樹

## 目錄

目錄封面內頁 簽名頁 授權書 .....	iii
..... iv 英文摘要 .....	iv
vi 誌謝 .....	vii
..... viii 圖目錄 .....	viii
..... xi 表目錄 .....	xi
xii 第一章 緒論 1.1 研究背景 .....	1
..... 1.2 研究目的 .....	1
..... 1.3 研究限制 .....	6
..... 1.4 研究流程 .....	11
..... 第二章 文獻回顧 2.1 評估環境衝擊顯著性之文獻 .....	14
..... 2.2 模糊推理應用環境工程相關領域之文獻 .....	18
..... 第三章 研究方法 3.1 各個因子顯著性的準則(主觀意見) .....	23
..... 3.1.1 各個因子顯著性準則(主觀意見)之統計說明 .....	47
..... 3.2 模糊推理 .....	48
..... 3.2.1 模糊集合 .....	49
..... 3.2.2 模糊數 .....	50
..... 3.2.3 語意變數 .....	51
..... 3.2.4 解模糊化 .....	52
..... 3.2.5 推理模式 .....	53
..... 3.2.6 以模糊推理結合客觀量測與主觀意見去評估環境顯著值 .....	56
..... 3.3 資料探勘之決策樹簡介 .....	66
..... 3.3.1 決策樹分析 .....	66
..... 3.4 道路工程之環境影響評估審查風險結論預測分類樹 .....	72
..... 第四章 道路工程環境影響評估審查結論預測架構之驗證 4.1 空氣污染與加上主觀意見後之差異 .....	78
..... 4.2 測試案例之結論預測驗證 .....	83
..... 4.2.1 空氣污染 .....	84
..... 4.2.2 水污染 .....	86
..... 4.2.3 土壤汙染 .....	88
..... 4.2.4 固體廢棄物 .....	90
..... 4.2.5 噪音與振動 .....	91
..... 4.2.6 陸域生態 .....	93
..... 4.2.7 水域生態 .....	95
..... 4.2.8 經濟環境 .....	97
..... 4.2.9 社會環境 .....	99
..... 4.2.10 文化環境 .....	100
..... 4.2.11 討論 .....	102
..... 4.2.12 案例庫組成 .....	106
..... 第五章 實例 5.1 實例介紹 .....	111
..... 5.2 預測結果 .....	111
..... 5.3 風險管理 .....	116
..... 第六章 結論 .....	119
..... 參考文獻 .....	121
..... 附錄A 各因子一階顯著結果 .....	121

125 附錄B 各因子分類樹結果	148 圖目錄圖1.1 道路工程環境影響因子架構
3 圖1.2 先前研究之架構	4 圖1.3 本研究之初步架構
7 圖1.4 研究流程與架構	13 圖3.1 PSI 的模糊等級
50 圖3.2 三角模糊數的歸屬函數圖	51 圖3.3 重心法示意圖
52 圖3.4 以(a)t-norm 運算子“min”與模糊輸入、(b)t-norm 運算子“min”與精確輸入、(c) t-norm 運算子“product”與精確輸入進行模糊推理	55 圖3.5 以模糊推理評估環境衝擊顯著性
57 圖3.6 空氣污染衝擊評估因子之隸屬度函數(a)一氧化碳CO ; (b) 二氧化硫SO <sub>2</sub> ; (c) 二氧化氮NO <sub>2</sub> ; (d)總懸浮為例TSP ; (e) 空氣污染衝擊	61 圖3.7 零階顯著性評估因子之隸屬度函數(a)環境現況 ; (b)施工 預測 ; (c)防治措施 ; (d)零階顯著值
62 圖3.8 空氣污染一階顯著性評估因子之隸屬度函數(a)污染零階顯著值 ; (b)環境敏感度 ; (c)空間分佈 ; (d)資訊可靠度 ; (e) 資訊充實度 ; (f)空氣污染一階顯著值	65 圖4.1 空氣污染因子顯著值的分布 : (a)零階顯著值 ; (b)一階顯著值
82 圖5.1 0 案例之工程位置圖	112 表目錄表1.1 臺中生活圈2 號線東段4 號線北段及大里聯絡道工程環境影響說明書固體廢棄物之預測結論
5 表2.1 評估衝擊顯著性文獻彙整	16 表2.2 模糊推理應用環境工程相關領域文獻彙整
21 表3.1 空氣污染主觀意見之準則	23 表3.2 空氣污染防治區整理表格
25 表3.3 水污染主觀意見之準則	27 表3.4 水污染敏感區位表
29 表3.5 水污染敏感區位評分表	29 表3.6 土壤污染主觀意見之準則
31 表3.7 固體廢棄物主觀意見之準則	33 表3.8 噪音與振動主觀意見之準則
35 表3.9 陸域生態主觀意見之準則	37 表3.10 水域生態主觀意見之準則
40 表3.11 經濟環境主觀意見之準則	42 表3.12 社會環境主觀意見之準則
44 表3.13 文化環境主觀意見之準則	45 表3.14 主觀因子之統計說明
47 表3.15 空氣污染衝擊法則(FR 1-01)	59 表3.16 空氣污染零階顯著性評估法則表(FR 2-01)
63 表3.17 條件 X 屬性分類 C 的對應表	71 表3.18 空氣污染因子一階分類樹
73 表3.19 水污染因子一階分類樹	73 表3.20 土壤污染因子一階分類樹
74 表3.21 固體廢棄物因子一階分類樹	74 表3.22 噪音與振動因子一階分類樹
75 表3.23 陸域生態因子一階分類樹	75 表3.24 水域生態因子一階分類樹
76 表3.25 經濟環境因子一階分類樹	76 表3.26 社會環境因子一階分類樹
77 表3.27 文化環境因子一階分類樹	77 表4.1 空氣污染因子有條件通過之零階顯著值與一階顯著值 ...
79 表4.2 進入第二階段空氣污染零階顯著值與一階顯著值的差異 ..	81 表4.3 不通過 ( 假設 ) 空氣污染零階顯著值與一階顯著值的差異 ..
81 表4.4 空氣零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表	85 表4.5 空氣因子測試案例
86 表4.6 空氣零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表	86 表4.7 水零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表
87 表4.8 水因子測試案例	87 表4.9 水零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表
88 表4.10 土壤零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表	89 表4.11 土壤因子測試案例
89 表4.12 土壤零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表	89 表4.13 廢棄物零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表
90 表4.14 廢棄物因子測試案例	91 表4.15 廢棄物零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表
91 表4.16 噪音與振動零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表	92 表4.17 噪音與振動測試案例
93 表4.18 噪音與振動零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表	93 表4.19 陸域零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表
94 表4.20 陸域因子測試案例	94 表4.21 陸域零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表
95 表4.22 水域零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表	96 表4.23 水域因子測試案例
96 表4.24 水域零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表	97 表4.25 經濟零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表
98 表4.26 經濟環境因子測試案例	98 表4.27 經濟零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表
98 表4.28 零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表	99 表4.29 社會環境因子測試案例
100 表4.30 社會零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表	100 表4.31 文化零階與一階的案例學習分類結果比較表
101 表4.32 文化環境因子測試案例	102 表4.33 文化零階與一階的測試案例分類結果比較表
102 表4.34 六個測試案例分類結果與先前研究比較表	104 表4.35 所有案例與其各因子之審查結論
107 表5.1 案例之客觀量測值整理表	113 表5.2 案例之客觀因子
114 表5.3 案例之主、客觀因子與衝擊顯著性之預測	115

## 參考文獻

- 參考文獻 1. Aamodt, A., Plaza, E., (1994). Case-based reasoning: foundational issues, methodological variations, and system approach, *AI Communications* 7(1), 39-59. 2. Antunes P, Santos R, Jordao L. The application of Geographical Information Systems to determine environmental impact significance. *Environ Impact Asses Rev* 2001;21:511 – 35. 3. Altunkaynak, A., Ozger, M., Cakmakc?, M., (2005). Fuzzy logic modeling of the dissolved oxygen fluctuations in Golden Horn. *Ecological Modelling* 189(3/4), 436-446. 4. Andriantiatsaholiniaina, L.A., Kouikoglou, V.S. and Phillis, A.P., (2004). Evaluating strategies for sustainable development: fuzzy logic reasoning and sensitivity analysis, *Ecological Economics* 48(2), 149-172. 5. Astel, A., (2007). Chemometrics based on fuzzy logic principles in environmental studies. *Talanta* 72(1), 1-12. 6. Beattie RB., (1995). Everything you already know about EIA (but don ' t often admit). *EIA Review* ;15(2):109 – 14. 7. Barreto-Neto, A., de Souza Filho, C.R., (2008). Application of fuzzy logic to the evaluation of runoff in a tropical watershed 23(2), 244-253. 8. Borri, D., Concilio, G. and Conte, E., (1998). A fuzzy approach for modeling knowledge in environmental systems evaluation, *Computer Environment and Urban Systems* 22(3), 299-313. 9. Bojorquez-Tapia LA, Ezcurra E, Garcia O. Appraisal of environmental impacts and mitigation measures through mathematical matrices. *J Environ Manag* 1998;53:91 – 9. 10. Chan, F.T.S., (2005). Application of a hybrid case-based reasoning approach in electroplating industry. *Expert Systems with Applications* 29(1), 121-130. 11. Cheng, C. B., (2003). A fuzzy inference system for similarity assessment in case-based reasoning systems--An application to product design, *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 38, 385-394. 12. Dai, J., Lorenzato, S. and Rocke, D.M., (2004). A knowledge-based model of watershed assessment for sediment, *Environmental Modelling & Software* 19(4), 423 – 433. 13. de Siqueira Campos Boclin, A., de Mello, R., (2006). A decision support method for environmental impact assessment using a fuzzy logic approach. *Ecological Economics* 58(1), 170-181. 14. Dixon, B., (2005). Groundwater vulnerability mapping: A GIS and fuzzy rule based integrated tool. *Applied Geography* 25(4), 327-347. 15. Dzung, R.J., Lee, H.Y., (2004). Critiquing contractors' scheduling by integrating rule-based and case-based reasoning, *Automation in Construction* 13(5), 665 – 678. 16. Duinker Peter N, Beanlands Gordon E. (1986). The significance of environmental impacts: an exploration of the concept. *Environ Manage*;10(1):1-11. 17. Dubois, D., Prade, H., (1980). *Fuzzy Sets and Systems: Theory and Applications*, New York, USA: Academic Press. 18. Fleming, G., van der Merwea, M., McFerren, G., (2007). Fuzzy expert systems and GIS for cholera health risk prediction in southern Africa. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 22(4), 442-448. 19. Gonzalez, B., Adenso-Diaz, B. and Gonzalez-Torre, P.L., (2002). A fuzzy logic approach for the impact assessment in Ica, Resources, Conservation and Recycling 37(1), 61-79. 20. Graham Wood, (2008) Thresholds and criteria for evaluating and communicating impact significance in environmental statements: ' See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil ' ? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 28(1) 22 – 38 21. Hatzikos, E.V., Bassiliades, N., Asmanis, L., Vlahavas, I., (2007). Monitoring water quality through a telematic sensor network and a fuzzy expert system. *Expert Systems* 24(3), 143-161. 22. Humphreys, P., Mclvor, R., Chan, F., (2003). Using case-based reasoning to evaluate supplier environmental management performance, *Expert Systems with Applications* 25(2), 141-153. 23. Jacobo, V.H., Ortiz, A., Cerrud, Schouwenaars, R., (2007). Hybrid expert system for the failure analysis of mechanical elements. *Engineering Failure Analysis* 14(8), 1435 – 1443. 24. Kontic B. (2000). Why are some experts more credible than others? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*;20(4):427 – 34. 25. Kalapanidas, E., Avouris, N., (2001). Short-term air quality prediction using a case-based classifier, *Environmental Modelling & Software* 16(3), 263-272. 26. Kaster, D.S., Medeiros, C.B., Rocha, H.V., (2005). Supporting modeling and problem solving from precedent experiences: the role of workflows and case-based reasoning, *Environmental Modelling & Software* 20(6), 689-704. 27. King, J.M.P., Banares-Alcantara, R., Manan, Z.A., (1999). Minimising environmental impact using CBR: an azeotropic distillation case study. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 14(5), 359 – 366. 28. Kolodner, J., (1993). *Case-based reasoning*, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, San Mateo. 29. Kowalski, Z., Meler-Kapcia, M., Zieli?ski, S., Drewka, M., (2005). CBR methodology application in an expert system for aided design ship's engine room automation. *Expert Systems with Applications* 29(2), 256-263. 30. Lee, B.H., Scholz, M., Horn, A., Furber, A.M., (2006). Constructed Wetlands: Prediction of Performance with Case-based Reasoning (Part B), *Environmental Engineering Science* 23(2), 332-340. 31. Lee, H. K., Oh, K.D., Park, D.H., Jung, J.H. and Yoon, S.J., (1997). Fuzzy expert system to determine stream water quality classification form ecological information, *Water Science Technology* 36(12), 199-206. 32. Liu, K.F.R., (2007b). Evaluating environmental sustainability: An integration of multiple-criteria decision-making and fuzzy logic. *Environmental Management* 39(5), 721-736. 33. Liu, K.F.R., (2007a). A high-level fuzzy Petri nets model for integrating quantitative and qualitative decision-making. *Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness & Knowledge-Based Systems* 15(3), 253-284. 34. Marsili-Libelli, S., (2004). Fuzzy prediction of the algal blooms in the Orbetello lagoon. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 19(9), 799-808. 35. Metternicht, G., Gonzalez, S., (2005). FUERO: foundations of a fuzzy exploratory model for soil erosion hazard prediction. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 20(6), 715-728. 36. Marling C.R., Petot G.J., Sterling, L.S., (1999). Integrating case-based and rule-based reasoning to meet multiple design constraints, *Computational Intelligence* 15(3), 308-332. 37. Martilla, J.A. and James, J.C., (1977). Importance-performance analysis, *Journal of Marketing* 41(1), 77-79. 38. Mouton, A.M., Schneider, M., Depestele, J., Goethals, P.L.M.; De Pauw, N., (2007). Fish habitat modelling as a tool for river management. *Ecological Engineering* 29(3), 305-315. 39. Miyashita, K., Sycara, K., (1995). CABINS: A framework of knowledge acquisition and iterative revision for schedule improvement and reactive repair, *Artificial Intelligence Journal* 76(1-2), 377-426. 40. Mizoguchi, R., Miyashita, K., Sycara, K., (1996). Modeling ill-structured optimization tasks through cases, *Decision Support Systems* 17(4), 345-64. 41. Nunez, H., Sanchez-Marre, M., Cortes, U., Comas, J., Martinez, M., Rodriguez-Roda, I., Poch, M., (2004). A comparative study on the use of similarity measures in casebased reasoning to improve the classification of environmental system situations, *Environmental Modelling & Software* 19(9), 809-819. 42. Ocampo-Duque, W., Ferre-Huguet, N., Domingo, J.L.,

Schuhmacher, M., (2006). Assessing water quality in rivers with fuzzy inference systems: A case study. *Environment International* 32(6), 733-742.

43. Pal, K., (1999). An approach to legal reasoning based on a hybrid decision-support system. *Expert Systems with Applications* 17(1), 1 – 12.

44. Phillis, Y.A., Andriantiatsaholainaina, L.A., (2001). Sustainability: an ill-defined concept and its assessment using fuzzy logic, *Ecological Economics* 37(3), 435-456.

45. Prato, T., (2007). Assessing ecosystem sustainability and management using fuzzy logic. *Ecological Economics* 61(1), 171-177.

46. Prato, T., (2005). A fuzzy logic approach for evaluating ecosystem sustainability. *Ecological Modelling* 187 (2/3), 361-368.

47. Prentzas, J., Hatzilygeroudis, I., (2007). Categorizing approaches combining rule-based and case-based reasoning. *Expert Systems* 24(2), 97-122.

48. Remm, K., (2004). Case-based predictions for species and habitat mapping, *Ecological Modelling* 177(3/4), 259-281.

49. Reynold, K.M., Jensen, M., Andreasen, J. and Goodman, I., (2000). Knowledge-based assessment of watershed condition, *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 27(1), 315-333.

50. Riesbeck, C.K., Schank, R.C., (1989). *Inside Case-based reasoning*, Erlbaum, Northvale, NJ.

51. Riordan, D., Hansen, B.K., (2002). A fuzzy case-based system for weather prediction, *Engineering Intelligent Systems* 10(3), 139-146.

52. Rodriguez-Roda, I., Sanchez-Marre, M., Comas, J., Baeza, J., Colprim, J., Lafuente, J., Cortes, U., Poch, M., (2002). A hybrid supervisory system to support WWTP operation: implementation and validation, *Water Science and Technology* 45(4-5), 289-297.

53. Rossille, D., Laurent, J.F., Burgun, A., (2005). Modelling a decision-support system for oncology using rule-based and case-based reasoning methodologies, *International Journal of Medical Informatics* 74(2-4), 299-306.

54. Roussel, O., Cavelier, A., Werf, H.M.G., (2000). Adaptation and use of a fuzzy expert system to assess the environmental effect of pesticides applied to field crops, *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 80(1), 143 – 158.

55. Sadiq, R., Al-Zahrani, M.A., Sheikh, A.K., Husain, T., Farooq, S., (2004). Performance evaluation of slow sand filters using fuzzy rule-based modelling. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 19(5), 507-515.

56. Schank, R.C., Abelson, R.P., (1977). *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding: an Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*, L. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.

57. Verdenius, F., Broeze, J., (1999). Generalised and instance-specific modelling for biological systems, *Environmental Modelling & Software* 14(5), 339-348.

58. Vicente-Agustin Cloquell-Ballester, Rafael Monterde-Diaz, Victor-Andres Cloquell-Ballester, Maria-Cristina Santamarina-Siurana, (2007) Systematic comparative and sensitivity analyses of additive and outranking techniques for supporting impact significance assessments, *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 27(1) 62 – 83

59. Wilkins H. (2003) The need for subjectivity in EIA: discourse as a tool for sustainable development. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 23(4):401 – 414.

60. Wang, W., Cheung, C.F., Lee, W.B., Kwok, S.K., (2007). Knowledge-based treatment planning for adolescent early intervention of mental healthcare: a hybrid case-based reasoning approach. *Expert Systems* 24(4), 232-251.

61. Werf, H.M.G. and Zimmer, C., (1998). An indicator of pesticide environmental impact based on a fuzzy expert system, *Chemosphere* 36(10), 2225-2249.

62. Wieland, R., Mirschel, W., (2008). Adaptive fuzzy modeling versus artificial neural networks 23(2), 215-224.

63. Yong, M., Yong-zhen, P., Xiao-lian, W., Shu-ying, W., (2006). Intelligent control aeration and external carbon addition for improving nitrogen removal. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 21(6), 821-828.

64. Yanger, R., (1980). On a general class of fuzzy connectives, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 4(3), 235-242.

65. Zaheeruddin, Jain, V.K., (2006). A fuzzy expert system for noise-induced sleep disturbance. *Expert Systems with Applications* 30(4), 761-771.

66. Zadeh, L.A. (1965) *Fuzzy Sets. Information and Control* 8, 338-353.

67. 劉建華, (2003), 「案例式推理應用於河川生態工法成本估算之研究」, 中華大學營建管理研究所碩士論文。

68. 劉豐瑞, 賴嘉宏, (2007/a), 結合模糊分析網路程序法與模糊邏輯 於營建工程環境影響評估(I):理論研究, 科學與工程技術期刊 3(2): 55-67.

69. 劉豐瑞, 賴嘉宏, (2007/b), 結合模糊分析網路程序法與模糊邏輯 於營建工程環境影響評估(II):案例研究, 科學與工程技術期刊 3(2): 69-84, 70.

余志偉, (2007), 結合案例式推理與模糊推理於道路工程環境 影響評估審查結論預測, 大葉大學環境工程研究所碩士論文。