Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Programs: Enhancing the Optimal Design Using A Discrete-Continuous Multiobjective Genetic Algorithm

> Mehdi Ahmadi Mazdak Arabi

2013 SWAT Conference

Toulouse, France

Colorado State University





Nonpoint Source Pollution

- Agriculture is among leading contributors to water quality impairments in the U.S. and around the world
- Control of agricultural NPS pollutants can be achieved through implementation of conservation practices, commonly known as best management practices (BMPs)
- Strategies for implementing conservation practices
 - Cost-share programs: a field-scale approach
 - Targeting critical areas within the watershed
 - Critical source areas
 - Scenario analysis
 - Optimization



Implementation of Conser. Practices

- Cost-sharing with land owners and producers
 - Does not guarantee maximum water quality benefits at the watershed scale
- □ Targeting using expert recommendations
- Targeting critical areas using geospatial characteristics of areas within the watershed, e.g., soil-topographic index
 - Important watershed processes and interactions amongst practices are not considered



Targeting Using Scenario Analysis

- Full enumeration and evaluation of all possible scenarios may be infeasible even at HUC 12 or similar scales.
- Employing optimization algorithms can facilitate identification of optimal suites of BMPs that reduce pollutant load at minimum cost.
- Multi-objective approaches can expose tradeoffs between often conflicting environmental, socioeconomic and institutional criteria.



3

Simulation-Optimization Approach

- Binary-variable optimization
- Discrete-variable optimization
- Continuous-variable optimization
- Mixed discrete/continuous-variable optimization



Study Objectives

- To develop a novel heuristic multiobjective optimization method using mixed discrete/continuous decision variables
- To determine improved assessment of environmental and economic tradeoffs using a mixed-variable optimization method compared to a binary optimization approach
- To examine enhanced convergence of the optimization approach by hybridization



Study Area

Eagle Creek Watershed (ECW), Indiana

Drainage area: 41.2 km²



Ô

RA

Calibration and Testing

- □ Simulation model: SWAT
- Special attention was paid to accurate representation of hydrologic and water quality processes

| Gauging | | Calibration (199: | Period (5-1999) | Criteria | Evaluation I (2000 | Period ()-2004) | Criteria |
|---------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------|
| Station | Variable | PBIAS (%) | \mathbb{R}^2 | NSE | PBIAS (%) | R ² | NSE |
| 20 | Monthly Nitrate | 7.9 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 16.9 | 0.85 | 0.67 |
| | Monthly Atrazine | -6 | 0.81 | 0.34 | -14 | 0.7 | 0.41 |
| 22 | Monthly Nitrate | -22.3 | 0.89 | 0.78 | 1.24 | 0.74 | 0.36 |
| | Monthly Atrazine | 42 | 0.69 | 0.44 | -0.1 | 0.5 | 0.28 |
| 27 | Monthly Nitrate | 0.59 | 0.93 | 0.85 | 18.3 | 0.78 | 0.59 |
| | Monthly Atrazine | 13 | 0.66 | 0.35 | -30 | 0.51 | 0.19 |
| 32 | Monthly Nitrate | -7.9 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 8.4 | 0.76 | 0.55 |
| | Monthly Atrazine | 42.3 | 0.75 | 0.52 | 33.1 | 0.51 | 0.14 |
| 35 | Daily Streamflow | -12.2 | 0.78 | 0.61 | 4.3 | 0.78 | 0.56 |



Multiobjective Optimization

- Method: Modified Nondominated Sorted Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II)
- Objective functions

 $\begin{cases} \text{minimize } y = f(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, I, t_d, T) & ; \text{Pollutant load}(s) \\ \text{minimize } C = g(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, I, p, r, t_d, T); \text{Cost}(s) \end{cases}$

Constraint functions {Chance opf adoption {Management considerations



Ø

Economic Component: Cost

$$C = C_0 + r_{OM} \times C_0 \left(\frac{1 - (1 + i)^{-t_d}}{i} \right) + C_{OP}$$

 C_0 : implementation cost

 r_{OM} : maintenance cost as a percentage of C_0

i: interest rate/100

 t_d : design lifetime of the conservation practice (years)

 C_{OP} : opportunity cost (eg. loss of crop production), expressed as

$$C_{OP} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} r_k \beta_k$$

K: number of fields

 r_k : unit price of crop in field k

 β_k : changes in crop production

Ø

Mixed-variable optimization

| | Field 1 | Field 1 | Field 1 | ••• | Field K | Туре |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|-----|---------|------------|
| Practice 1 | 0 1 | 0 1 | 0 1 | | 0 1 | Binary |
| Practice 2 | 0 1 | 0 1 | 0 1 | | 0 1 | Binary |
| Practice 3 | 0 1 2 3 | 0 1 2 3 | 0 1 2 3 | | 0 1 2 3 | Discrete |
| Practice 4 | 0-20 | 0-20 | 0-20 | | 0-20 | Continuous |



ð

Representation of Conservation Practices

| BMP | Parameter | Binary-variable | Mixed-variable |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Fertilizer Management | Application rate reduction (%) | 20 | 0-30 (Continuous) |
| Grassed Waterways | Width (m) | 15 | 10, 15, 25 (Discrete) |
| Grade Stabilization | Height (m) | 1.2 | 1.2 (binary) |
| Tillage/Residue management | Туре | Conservation | Conventional Conservation No-till (Discrete) |



6

Optimization Operation Parameters

- Population size = 100+
 - Parallel runs
- **Crossover probability = 0.5**
- Mutation rate = 0.005
- Termination conditions: 30 consecutive runs with less than 0.01% improvement in objective function values and decision space

Ô

R

Results



- Mixed-variable approach improved load reduction by 20-25%
- Mixed-variable approach identified solutions with up to 40% lower cost for the same level of pollutant load reduction as compared to the binary-variable approach

environmental Risk Assessment & Management System (eRAMS)

Convergence





Ô



Ô

Hybridization

- Hybridization of modified GA with gradient-based local search method
 - **GA-based optimization methods guarantee** "convergence" but not "optimality"
 - **Does not work with discrete-variables problems**

RA

Enhanced Convergence by Hybridization

- The Hybrid method
 terminated in 66
 generations after the
 binary optimization
 solutions were identified
- Nearly 30 times faster
 than the mixed-variable
 NSGA-II



Ô

Comparison of the objective space

 Lebesgue measure (*n*-dimensional volume)

| Algorithm | Lebesgue Measure |
|-----------|----------------------|
| Binary | 4.54×10 ⁸ |
| Mixed | 5.71×10 ⁸ |
| Hybrid | 5.78×10 ⁸ |

Ô



Ø

E

Spatial Distribution of Practices





E

Additional Notes

Priority BMPs

- 1. Grassed waterways
- 2. Fertilizer management
- 3. Residue/tillage management

Tillage/residue management had inverse impact on nitrate load in most of the fields and received the lowest priority



Conclusion

- Tradeoffs between maximizing environmental benefit/load reduction and minimizing Costs are apparent, hence, multi-objectve optimization is an effective tool for prioritization of fields and practices on a HUC 12 or similar scales
- Mixed-variable optimization identified better solutions than binary-variable approach
- Hybrid algorithms can significantly decrease runtime for complex discrete-continuous optimization problems