AHP Comparison Framework

"What is the worth of a specific bridge construction technique in terms of a customer service criterion?"

Although information about questions like the previous one are vital in making the correct decision, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to quantify them correctly. Therefore, many decision-making methods attempt to determine the relative importance, or weight, of the alternatives for each criterion involved in a given decision-making problem.

Pairwise comparisons are used to determine the relative importance of each alternative for each criterion. In this approach the decision-maker has to express his opinion about the value of one single pairwise comparison at a time.

Each choice is a linguistic phrase. Some examples of such linguistic phrases are: "A is more important than B", or "A is of the same importance as B", or "A is a little more important than B", and so on.

For instance, when system A is compared to system B then the decision-maker has determined that system A is between to be classified as "essentially more important" and "demonstrated more important" than system B (see also Table1 and Table2). Thus, the corresponding comparison assumes the value of 6.

Table1 and Table2 are both representing the AHP comparison scales. The difference between these tables are in the way that scales are qualified (represented by words). Decision makers can consider both tables in the pairwise comparison process, to choose and assign the scores more rigorously.

Intensity of Importance	Definition	Explanation
1	Equal importance	Two activities contribute equally to the objective
3	Weak importance of one over another	Experience and judgment slightly favor one activity over another
5	Essential or strong importance	Experience and judgment strongly favor one activity over another
7	Demonstrated importance	An activity is strongly favored and its dominance demonstrated in practice
9	Absolute importance	The evidence favoring one activity over another is of the highest possible order of affirmation
2,4,6,8	Intermediate values between the two adjacent judgments	When compromise is needed
Reciprocals of above nonzero	If activity i has one of the above nonzero numbers assigned to it when compared with activity j, then j has the reciprocal value when compared with i.	

Table 1: Scale of Relative Importances (according to Saaty, 1980)

I able 2.	Ta	ble	2.
-----------	----	-----	----

The Fundamental Scale for Pairwise Comparisons			
Intensity of Importance	Definition	Explanation	
1	Equal importance	Two elements contribute equally to the objective	
3	Moderate importance	Experience and judgment slightly favor one element over another	
5	Strong importance	Experience and judgment strongly favor one element over another	
7	Very strong importance	One element is favored very strongly over another; its dominance is demonstrated in practice	
9	Extreme importance	The evidence favoring one element over another is of the highest possible order of affirmation	
Intensities of 2, 4, 6, and 8 can be used to express intermediate values. Intensities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc. can be used for elements that are very close in importance.			

Please indicate the level of preference by choosing the most descriptive score (both value and direction) in the rubrics below.



Construction	Design and Construct Detours
Construction	Right of Way
Construction	Project Design and Development
Construction	Maintenance of Essential Services
Construction	Construction Engineering
Construction	Inspection, Maintenance and Preservation
Construction	Toll Revenue
МОТ	Design and Construct Detours
МОТ	Right of Way
МОТ	Project Design and Development
МОТ	Maintenance of Essential Services
МОТ	Construction Engineering
МОТ	Inspection, Maintenance and Preservation

MOT	Toll Revenue
Design and Construct	Right of Way
Design and Construct Detours	Project Design and Development
Design and Construct	Maintenance of Essential Services
Design and Construct	Construction Engineering
Design and Construct	Inspection, Maintenance and Preservation
Design and Construct	Toll Revenue
Right of Way	Project Design and Development
Right of Way	Maintenance of Essential Services
Right of Way	Construction Engineering
Right of Way	Inspection, Maintenance and Preservation
Right of Way	Toll Revenue
Project Design and Development	Maintenance of Essential Services



Indirect Costs:



User Delay	Livability During Construction
User Delay	Road Users Exposures
User Delay	Construction Personnel Exposure
Freight Mobility	Revenue Loss
Freight Mobility	Livability During Construction
Freight Mobility	Road Users Exposures
Freight Mobility	Construction Personnel Exposure
Revenue Loss	Livability During Construction
Revenue Loss	Road Users Exposures
Revenue Loss	Construction Personnel Exposure
Livability During Construction	Road Users Exposures
Livability During Construction	Construction Personnel Exposure



Schedule Constraints:



Site Constraints:



Horizontal/Vertical Obstructions	Archaeological Constraints
Environmental	Historical
Environmental	Archaeological Constraints
Historical	Archaeological Constraints

Customer Service:

Public Perceptions Public Relations



Maintenance of Esse	ential Services:	
ABC		Conventional
Construction Engine	ering:	
ABC		Conventional
Inspection, Maintena	ance and Preservation:	
ABC		Conventional
Toll Revenue:		
ABC		Conventional
User Delay:		
ABC		Conventional
Freight Mobility:		
ABC		Conventional
Revenue Loss:		
ABC		Conventional
Livability During Co	onstruction:	

ABC ABC Conventional Road Users Exposure: ABC Conventional Conventional Conventional Conventional

ABC

Calendar or Utility or	RxR or Navigational:	
ABC		Conventional
Marine and Wildlife:		
ABC		Conventional
Resource Availability	<i>y</i> :	
ABC		Conventional

Bridge Span Con	figurations:	
ABC		Conventional
Horizontal/Vertic	cal Obstructions:	
ABC		Conventional
Environmental:		
		Commentional

ABC		Conventional
Historical:		

ABC		Conventional	
Archaeological Constraints:			
ABC		Conventional	

Public Perception:	
ABC	Conventional

Public Relations: ABC