

Manuscript IJPD

by I Wayan Koko Suryawan

Submission date: 14-Feb-2022 10:35AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1761719067

File name: Manuscript_IJPD_TURNITIN.doc (413.5K)

Word count: 3651

Character count: 19731

Decision Analysis of Alternative River Debris to Landfill Transportation Systems in Jakarta

Mega Mutiara Sari^{1,*}, Takanobu Inoue², Regil Kentaurus Harryes³, Kuriko Yokota², Shigeru Kato², Suprihanto Notodarmojo⁶, Kevin Foggy Delu¹, I Wayan Koko Suryawan¹

¹Department of Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Infrastructure Planning, Universitas Pertamina, Komplek Universitas Pertamina, DKI Jakarta, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia

²Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Toyohashi University of Technology, Japan

³Faculty of Vocational Studies, Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

⁴Study Program of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jalan Ir Sutami 36A Surakarta, Jawa Tengah 57126, Indonesia

⁵Department of Environmental Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Jend. Urip Sumoharjo No. 179, Surakarta 57 128, Central Java, Indonesia

⁶Department of Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Jl. Ganesha no. 10, Bandung 40132, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: mega.tiarasari1986@gmail.com; mega.ms@universitaspertamina.ac.id

Abstract

River debris in Jakarta is generated in several locations by conventional transportation. Waste transportation with traditional models is usually not time-efficient, primarily when river debris is generated every time. Transport systems that can be used for river debris include compactor systems, pre-compactor systems, and baller systems. This research uses literature study and secondary data in determining alternatives. Meanwhile, the alternative selection was carried out using the Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) method. This study uses four criteria for selecting alternatives: initial capital, type of transport container, operation and maintenance, and processing capability. The utility value of waste transportation with compaction and pre-compacting systems does not significantly have utility values of 0.722 and 0.833, respectively. At the same time, the baller system has a utility value of 0.222. This shows that the compacted system is more suitable to be applied to SPA river debris in Jakarta. The presence of a pre-compactor can also reduce the water content in-river debris

Keywords: decision analysis, river debris, compactor system, pre-compactor system, baller system

1. Introduction

River debris is a persistent solid material (sturdy) produced by a human (Rech et al., 2014). In addition, river debris can be interpreted as a material that is difficult to decompose in the form of processed or manufactured solids that is disposed of or left intentionally or not by humans in the waters (Sheavly & Register, 2007). However, if you look back, river debris does not only consist of inorganic types. There are also organic types that can be decomposed. Thus, it can be concluded that river debris is solid material or material left over from human activities that are disposed of intentionally or unintentionally into the waters (Pawar et al., 2016).

Intermediate Transition Station (SPA) is a means of transferring from small transportation equipment to larger means of transportation, where in general SPA is required for districts/cities that have locations more than 25 km away which can be equipped with waste processing facilities (Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia, 2013). The types of waste handled by the regional-scale SPA are household waste and non-hazardous and toxic. Waste that enters and is managed at the SPA is allowed in a mixed condition and/or processed residue (Mojtahedi et al., 2021).

SPA is a place or facility for transferring the waste from a small collection vehicle to a larger transfer vehicle (Yadav & Karmakar, 2020). However, SPA can also be interpreted as a means of transferring the waste from small vehicles to large vehicles, which is needed if the distance between each waste management facility is more than 25 km (Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia, 2013). This facility is needed because of the technical limitations of small garbage collection vehicles and cost savings in using large vehicles to move garbage.

With the SPA, of course, the transportation pattern will change slightly. Transport vehicles with small container sizes, i.e., between 6 to 10 m³, will take the trash to the TPS, then throw it in the SPA. Vehicles with larger container sizes, between 40 to 90 m³ will carry waste at the SPA to be taken to the TPA or TPST. The operation of this pattern is namely the trailer moves to the SPA, the trailer receives the cargo from the SPA, the trailer carries the load to the TPA or TPST for unloading, and the trailer returns to

the SPA, and so on until the transportation process finished. This study aims to analyze the most appropriate alternative for waste transportation for river debris in Jakarta.

2. Methods ¹

Following the Minister of Public Works Regulation No.03/PRT/M/2013 concerning the Implementation of Waste Infrastructure and Facilities in the Handling of Household Waste and Types of Household Waste (Kementerian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia, 2013). SPAs are required to have the technology to reduce the volume of waste by using the method of sorting and compacting. At this stage, three alternative management technologies will be produced, which will then be determined, or one of the three alternatives will be selected. The alternative selection will use the Utility Theory and Compromise Program methods. The chosen alternative is the best and fulfills the criteria contained in the Minister of Public Works Regulation No.03/PRT/M/2013 concerning the Implementation of Waste Infrastructure and Facilities in the Handling of Household Waste and Types of Household Waste. In addition, the choice of design alternatives will use a decision-making method called Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM).

MADM is a branch of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM), where MCDM collects several decision-making methods. MCDM is divided into MADM and Multi-Objective Decision Making (MODM). MADM is used to choose the best alternative from several existing alternatives, and MODM is used to select the best solution design (Alinezhad and Khalili, 2019). The two alternative selection methods in this design have a similar way of working, namely by comparing the relative value of each alternative for each component being considered, then generalizing the points or values of each alternative to obtain a relative value. Then the relative value is calculated using the formula for each method, then sort the calculation results obtained. Finally, the alternative with the highest value will be selected as the best alternative from other alternatives (Ballesterero and Hero, 1991).

The following are the steps to determine the best alternative using the utility theory method (Alinezhad and Khalili, 2019):

1. Determine the components to evaluate existing alternatives.
2. Interpret the value of the components to get the objective value of each alternative (zij).
3. Changing or transforming alternative objective values (zij) into relative values (nij). Relative value is a value that has no dimensions only uses a scale of 0-1. The following is the formula used to calculate relative values:
$$n_{ij} = \frac{z_{ij} - \min(z_{ij})}{\max(z_{ij}) - \min(z_{ij})}; i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$
4. Determine the amount of weight based on the importance of the goals to be achieved. The larger the value, the more important the component is. Next, divide the weight per component by the total weight to obtain a standardized weight (ai) for each component.
5. Calculate the utility value using the following equation 2:
$$N_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} n_{ij}; i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$
6. Sort the utility value of each alternative from the highest value (closer to 1) to the lowest value. The higher the utility value (closer to 1), then the alternative is the best alternative

The Compromise Programming method was used to determine Jakarta's river debris transportation system. The Compromise Programming method is applied based on predetermined criteria and several alternative solutions (Khedrigharibvand et al., 2019). The steps to select the best alternative use the compromise program method (Yu, 1973):

1. Determine the components to evaluate existing alternatives.
2. Interpret the value of the components to get the objective value of each alternative (zij).
3. Changing or transforming alternative objective values (zij) into relative values (nij). Relative value is a value that has no dimensions, only uses a scale of 0-1. The following is the formula used to calculate relative values:
$$n_{ij} = \frac{z_{ij} - \min(z_{ij})}{\max(z_{ij}) - \min(z_{ij})}; i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (3)$$
4. Determine the amount of weight based on the importance of the goals to be achieved. The larger the value, the more critical the component is. Next, divide the weight per component by the total weight to obtain a standardized weight (ai) for each component.
5. Calculate the relative distance using the following formula:
$$d_{ci} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \times (1 - n_{ij})^p; i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (4)$$
6. Calculate the indicator value using the following formula:
$$I_{ij} = 1 - d_{ci}; i = 1, \dots, m \quad (5)$$
7. Sort the indicator values of each alternative from the highest value (closer to 1) to the lowest value. The higher the indicator value (closer to 1), the alternative is the best alternative

The location of the SPA design is near the main route of waste transportation to the Bantar Gebang TPST, namely the Jakarta Outer Ring Roads (JORR) Toll Road. So that vehicle transporting waste originating from the TPS for marine waste to the SPA and vehicles transporting waste with a volume larger than the SPA to the TPST Bantar Gebang can have direct access to the main transportation route. In addition, this design location is also on the left side of the main transportation route to make it easier for vehicles to transport marine waste originating from marine waste TPS to get to the SPA. This is because Indonesia

uses a left-lane traffic system. On the other hand, suppose the design location is on the right side of the transportation route. In that case, it will certainly cause more obstacles given the large volume of vehicles, such as cutting the road in the opposite direction or turning through the flyover to get to the location. Therefore, the drag on transportation can be minimized with the design located on the left side of the main transport route. This research was carried out in the following areas:

1. TPS Pesing, this TPS is located on Jalan Pangeran Tubagus Angke, RT.4/RW.8, Wijaya Kusuma Village, Grogol Petamburan District, West Jakarta City, Special Capital Region of Jakarta 11460.
2. Pluit TPS, this TPS is located on Jl. Pluit Selatan Raya, RT.16/RW.17, Penjaringan, Kec. Penjaringan, City, North Jkt, Special Capital Region of Jakarta 14431.
3. TPS Perintis, this TPS is located at Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan, RT.1/RW.17, Klp. Gading Tim., Kec. Klp., Gading, North Jkt City, Special Capital Region of Jakarta 14240.

3. Results and Discussions

According to the Minister of Public Works Regulation No.03/PRT/M/2013 concerning the Implementation of Waste Infrastructure and Facilities in Handling Household Waste and Types of Household Waste, SPA has one function to reduce the volume of waste. Reduction of the volume of waste is made by using the method of sorting and also compaction. The SPA design will have three alternatives that have fulfilled the requirements of the Minister of Public Works No.03/PRT/M/2013 concerning the Implementation of Waste Infrastructure and Facilities in the Handling of Household Waste and Waste Similar to Household Waste. The alternatives in this design focus on technologies that can be applied to the SPA. The selection of this alternative only focuses on the technology for compaction. This is because to reduce costs, sorting will be done manually. Sorting will be carried out in the waste unloading area which is integrated with the sorting site before the waste is compacted. The following are three selected alternatives that have met the technological requirements in the SPA in the concerning the implementation of waste infrastructure and facilities in handling household waste and waste similar to household waste (Figure 1).




Figure. 1 Three Alternatives given in transporting River Debris at SPA to Landfill in Jakarta (Source: Modification from (US-EPA, 2002))

The need for alternative selection in design is one of the stages in the design process (Ahmad et al., 2018). This is done to find the best results from several alternatives that exist to be applied. For example, SPA has six alternative designs in applying its technology (US-EPA, 2002). For this reason, it is necessary to choose an alternative regarding the requirements with alternative selection will use a method called utility theory and compromise program.

The selection of this alternative only focuses on the technology for compaction. This is because to reduce costs, sorting will be done manually. Sorting will be carried out in the waste unloading area which is integrated with the sorting area before the waste is compacted. For the first alternative (compactor system), the incoming river debris will be unloaded in the unloading area or sorting area. Sorting is carried out to separate waste that is still worth recycling and waste that cannot be recycled. Furthermore, the waste that cannot be recycled with the help of a wheel loader will be pushed into the hydraulic cylinder (Hao et al., 2018). This system uses hydraulic rams located lower than the unloading or sorting area. The hydraulic ram will move horizontally and push while compacting the garbage in the garbage transport vehicle container (Zakaria et al., 2021). Since this technology directly inserts the push or compactor area into the container, the container must be designed to withstand the thrust of the compactor hydraulics (Figure 1).

For the second alternative (pre-compactor system), in the unloading area or sorting area for sorting. Sorting is carried out to separate waste that is still worth recycling and waste that cannot be recycled (Nemat et al., 2022). Furthermore, the waste that cannot be recycled with the help of a wheel loader will be pushed into a hole. The hole is directly connected to the compactor or compactor. This system uses hydraulic rams located in long beam-shaped chambers to compact the waste and produce output such as wooden "blocks" or logs, which are made of waste. The garbage blocks will be put into a container with a conveyor belt connected to a compactor or with the help of a forklift (Figure 1).

For the last alternative (baller system), the incoming river debris will be unloaded in the unloading area or sorting area for sorting. Sorting is carried out to separate waste that is still worth recycling and waste that cannot be recycled. Furthermore, the waste that cannot be recycled with the help of a wheel loader will be pushed into a hole. The hole is directly connected to the compactor. The compactor in this system is also known as a baler. This tool compresses garbage into cubes with ropes that tie the cubes together for easy transport. These cubes are then loaded into a container with the help of a forklift (Figure 1).

Alternative systems that have been described in the previous chapter will be selected to find the best system. Determination is a stage in choosing the best alternative from several existing alternatives (Hwang and Masud, 1979). Selection of alternative technology will use Utility Theory and Compromise Program. Both methods are methods found in Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM). In MADM, Utility Theory is also known as Multi-Objective Optimization Ratio Analysis (MOORA) (Alinezhad & Khalili, 2019). Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT), while Compromise Program is also known as Multi-Objective Mathematical Programming (MOMP) (Zopounidis et al., 1998). These methods identify the existing alternatives as points or values based on the components considered, then generalize the points or scores of each alternative to obtain a relative value. Then the relative value is calculated using the formula for each method, and then the results are sorted. The alternative with the highest value will be selected as the best alternative from other alternatives (Ballesterro & Romero, 1991). The component of alternative selection considerations refers to things that need to be considered in determining technology when designing.

Table 1. Alternative Weighting to be Used in Decision Analysis

Weighting	1	2	3	Source
Initial Economic Capital	The initial capital required to implement technology ≤ US\$200.000	The initial capital required to implement technology US\$ 200.000- US\$ 400.000	The initial capital required to implement technology > US\$ 400.000	(Kuehn, 1981; US-EPA, 2002)
Carrier Container Type Components	Can use light-weight containers when transporting waste to the following processing site	It is recommended to use a medium-weight container when transporting waste to the following processing site	Must use heavy-weight containers when transporting waste to the following processing site	(US-EPA, 2002)
Operation and maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It does not require special equipment or accommodation to handle river debris No special operator is required Easy to repair Repair does not require special personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended to use special equipment or accommodation in handling waste. It is recommended to use a special operator in the operation Repair is a little time consuming Repairs are recommended to use special personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires special equipment or accommodation to handle waste Requires special operator in the operation Repair takes time Repair requires special personnel 	(US-EPA, 2002)
Processing capability	Able to process ≤33,33% waste classification entering the SPA	Able to process 33,33%-66,66% waste classification entering the SPA	Able to process > 66,66% waste classification entering the SPA	(US-EPA, 2002)

Initial capital is the cost required or incurred to purchase and implement alternative technologies. In this component, consideration is carried out by looking at the direct costs of each alternative. This component also considers the 2020 DKI Jakarta Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) for the Regional Apparatus Work Unit (SKPD) of UPK Water bodies in the procurement of waste processing equipment amounting to IDR 3,499,954,968. The type of transport container is carried by trailers or waste transport vehicles when waste is transported from the SPA to the management site. The technology and equipment in the SPA to put waste into containers determine the type of container. In this component, consideration is carried out by looking at the container requirements of each alternative.

Operation and maintenance ease operating or running and maintaining the applied technology. In addition, it is also seen whether special equipment is needed to apply the technology. In this component, considerations are made by looking at each alternative's ease of operation and maintenance. Finally, processing capability is the ability or proficiency of technology in processing waste. This is because each

technology has limitations in waste processing. In this component, consideration is carried out by looking at the technology's ability to process waste in each alternative.

After determining the components or things that need to be considered along with the value of the provisions of the features or things that need to be considered. The selection of alternatives using the Utility Theory and Compromise Program can be made by following the steps in method. The first step is to assign a value to the alternative alternatives for each component or thing that needs to be considered. This value refers to the value of the provisions that have been set in Table 1. Table 2 below is a table of the initial assessment of the selection of alternative technologies determined.

8
Table 2. Worst Value and Best Value

No.	Criteria	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Worst Value	Best Value
1	Initial economic capital	1	2	3	3	1
2	Transport container type	3	1	1	3	1
3	Operation and maintenance	2	1	3	3	1
4	Processing capability	3	3	1	1	3

After assigning a value to each alternative to a component or thing to consider, the worst and best values are selected. Then the selection of technological alternatives is continued by giving a relative value for each component or thing considered in the alternative. Alternative values can be calculated using formula 1. At the same stage, the weights of the components or items considered are also given. Then the weighting of each component standardized the weight. This standardization is done by dividing the weight of the components or things considered by the total weight of the overall components or things considered. Table 3 below is a table for the relative assessment of the selection of alternative technologies.

Table 3. Weight Standard

No.	Criteria	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Weigh	Weight Standard
1	Initial economic capital	1	0.5	0	3	0.333
2	Transport container type	0	1	1	2	0.222
3	Operation and maintenance	0.5	1	0	1	0.111
4	Processing capability	1	1	0	3	0.333

With the completion of standardization of weights, the next step is to calculate utility value on utility theory and calculate the distance and indicator value on the compromise program. There will be a compromising factor (p) in calculating the distance, with a value range of 2-4. Utility value, distance, and indicator value can be calculated using equation 2-4. Table 4 below is a table of Utility Theory and Compromise Program after the calculations.

Table 4. Number of receptors in each container

No.	Description	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
1	Utility Theory			
	Utility Value	0.722	0.833	0.222
	Rating	2	1	3
2	Compromise Program			
	Relative Distance	0.5	0.289	0.882
	Indicator Value	0.5	0.711	0.118

Table 4 show the two alternative selection methods show that the first ranking falls on the second alternative, namely the application of compaction technology with a pre-compactor system. In addition, this alternative will be equipped with manual sorting of waste in the loading and unloading area or sorting area before the waste is pushed into the compactor. Therefore, in the design of this SPA, a manual sorting

method will be applied to the loading and unloading area or the sorting area and using a pre-compactor system as a compactor technology.

5. Conclusion

There are three alternative technologies in SPA design. After selecting an alternative using utility theory and a compromise program, it was found that the alternative with pre-compactor technology had the highest value or became the best alternative to be implemented.

Acknowledgement

This research was implemented and fully supported by the Japan Society for The Promotion Science and Indonesia Directorate General of Research, Technology and Higher Education (JSPS/DG-RSTHE), through a Bilateral Joint Research Projects 2019-2022 between Universitas Pertamina, Indonesia, and Toyohashi University of Technology, Japan. Special thanks also extended to UPK Badan Air of Indonesia, who has been permitted to take samples in their working area.

References

Manuscript IJPD

ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%

SIMILARITY INDEX

7%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- | | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Sumardjo, A Firmansyah, L Dharmawan, A Kriswatriyono, YP Wulandari. "Environmental Management System Toward Sustainable Development Goals Achievement Base on Community Empowerment in Peri-Urban", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2022
Publication | 3% |
| 2 | www.ecoeet.com
Internet Source | 1% |
| 3 | www.smujo.id
Internet Source | 1% |
| 4 | stu.aminef.or.id
Internet Source | 1% |
| 5 | P Damayanti, S S Moersidik, J T Haryanto. "Waste to Energy in Sunter, Jakarta, Indonesia: Plans and Challenges", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2021
Publication | <1% |
-

6

Nirwana Nirwana. "The effect of human capital on regional financial conditions through cultural capital of employees", *International Journal of Law and Management*, 2018

Publication

<1 %

7

icgere.fttm.itb.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

8

Davide Chicco, Matthijs J. Warrens, Giuseppe Jurman. "The coefficient of determination R-squared is more informative than SMAPE, MAE, MAPE, MSE and RMSE in regression analysis evaluation", *PeerJ Computer Science*, 2021

Publication

<1 %

9

fibo.id

Internet Source

<1 %

10

Vita Ratri Cahyani, Jun Murase, Akihiro Ikeda, Katsutoshi Taki, Susumu Asakawa, Makoto Kimura. "Bacterial communities in iron mottles in the plow pan layer in a Japanese rice field: Estimation using PCR-DGGE and sequencing analyses", *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, 2008

Publication

<1 %

11

accelconf.web.cern.ch

Internet Source

<1 %

12

www.coursehero.com

Internet Source

<1 %

13

Sinha. "Evaluation of Transportation Projects and Programs Using Multiple Criteria",
Transportation Decision Making, 05/05/2007

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Manuscript IJPD

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6
