Università
di Genova

AI-Assisted Design of Nature-Based Solutions for Integrated Flood and Pollution Management: A Strategic Decision-Support Framework

Parag Dubey (6568223),
Kanyimi Rene Uku (6782601),
Ahmed Khaled Mohamed Aboshenishen (6902139)

Department of Engineering Technology for Strategy and Security (Strategos), University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy

Abstract

Urban areas face escalating flood risk and water pollution under climate change and rapid urbanization, generating substantial economic costs through productivity losses, infrastructure downtime, increased operating costs, and reduced territorial competitiveness. Conventional grey infrastructure provides limited flexibility and sustainability, while nature-based solutions (NbS) such as wetlands, riparian buffers, and urban green corridors offer multiple co-benefits by reducing flood hazards, improving water quality, and supporting biodiversity. This project develops an agent-based simulation model to support strategic decisions by city authorities and infrastructure managers on optimal NbS design configurations under realistic constraints. Heterogeneous NbS units are evaluated based on utility functions incorporating flood mitigation effectiveness, pollution reduction capacity, and implementation costs. The model quantifies managerial indicators including cost of inaction, avoided losses, infrastructure restoration costs, and long-term savings from preventive investments. Scenario analysis compares strategic alternatives such as distributed wetlands versus concentrated riparian buffers, and low-cost versus high-quality NbS designs. Expected contribution: a strategic framework linking NbS adoption to economic resilience, territorial attractiveness, and competitive advantage, providing practical insights for decision-makers designing sustainable urban water management strategies.

KEYWORDS: Nature-based solutions; Agent-based modeling; Flood risk management; Urban resilience; Strategic decision-making; Economic cost-benefit analysis; Infrastructure management

Introduction

The Strategic Challenge

Urban areas worldwide face a dual environmental crisis: escalating flood risk and deteriorating water quality. Climate change intensifies rainfall variability and extreme precipitation events, while rapid urbanization increases impervious surfaces and concentrates pollutant loads. These environmental hazards generate substantial economic costs that extend far beyond immediate physical damage.

Recent evidence from the European Central Bank demonstrates that floods reduce firm sales by an average of 15%, with supply-chain disruptions lasting over one year [1]. Industrials' gross value-added experiences permanent negative shifts in middle-income regions, while infrastructure downtime creates cascading effects across sectors [1]. Climate-related economic losses in Europe are projected to reach €120 billion annually by 2050 without adequate adaptation measures [2].

For decision-makers, whether city authorities, infrastructure managers, or industrial operators, the strategic question is not whether to act, but how to allocate scarce resources most effectively. Conventional "grey" infrastructure (concrete channels, underground storage tanks, treatment plants) provides limited flexibility and sustainability. Nature-based solutions (NbS) such as constructed wetlands, riparian buffers, bioswales, and urban green corridors offer an alternative paradigm that delivers multiple co-benefits: flood attenuation, pollution filtration, biodiversity support, and enhanced territorial attractiveness.

Yet designing NbS configurations remains challenging due to diverse local conditions, competing objectives, and deep uncertainties about climate trajectories and urban development patterns. This project addresses this challenge by developing an AI-assisted agent-based simulation framework to evaluate and optimize NbS designs for integrated flood and pollution management.

Decision-Maker Perspective

This project explicitly frames the analysis from the perspective of a **city authority or municipal infrastructure manager** responsible for:

1. Protecting economic assets and productivity in flood-prone urban and peri-urban areas

2. Minimizing infrastructure downtime and restoration costs following extreme weather events

3. Maintaining territorial attractiveness for firms, residents, and investors

4. Meeting regulatory water quality standards while managing budget constraints

5. Making strategic investment decisions that balance short-term costs against long-term resilience

The decision-maker faces trade-offs between:

- **Type of NbS:** Wetlands versus riparian buffers versus green corridors

- **Scale and distribution:** Few large interventions versus many distributed small units.

- **Quality versus cost:** High-performance designs with greater maintenance requirements versus low-cost basic solutions

- **Location prioritization:** Protecting high-value infrastructure versus addressing vulnerable communities.

The model is designed to support scenario analysis of these strategic choices by quantifying their economic and environmental performance under uncertainty.

Economic Context: The Cost of Inaction

Before examining NbS alternatives, it is essential to establish the economic baseline the costs incurred when flood and pollution risks are left unmanaged.

Direct Flood Damage Costs

Floods generate immediate physical damage to buildings, infrastructure, and inventory. European flood damages averaged €8.9 billion annually between 2000-2020, with individual events exceeding.
€10 billion [3]. In urban areas, direct damage costs typically range from €500 to €2,500 per square meter of flooded commercial property, and €200 to €800 per square meter for residential buildings [4].

Productivity Losses and Business Interruption

Beyond physical damage, floods disrupt economic activity through business closures, supply chain interruptions, and reduced productivity. Recent econometric evidence shows:

• Industrial firms in flooded areas experience **15% average sales reductions** lasting 6-12 months [1]

• Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) face **higher failure rates** (8-12% increase) in the two years following major flood events [5]

• **Supply chain disruptions** reduce sales of non-flooded firms connected to affected suppliers by 3-7% [1]

• **Labor productivity declines** by 5-15% during recovery periods due to absenteeism, damaged tools, and logistics challenges [6]

Quantifying business interruption costs: For a mid-sized European city with €5 billion GDP in flood-prone zones, 5% annual flood probability, and 10% average impact factor, expected annual productivity losses reach €25 million.

Infrastructure Downtime and Restoration Costs

Critical infrastructure damage creates cascading effects. Transportation network disruptions cost €50,000 to €200,000 per day per major route segment [7]. Water treatment plant shutdowns generate immediate health risks and economic losses of €100,000 to €500,000 per day depending on population served [8].

Post-flood restoration costs for urban infrastructure typically reach **2-3 times the initial damage costs** when accounting for emergency response, debris removal, temporary repairs, and full reconstruction [9]. For example, the 2021 Germany floods generated €40 billion in total economic impact, of which €29 billion represented restoration and reconstruction beyond immediate damage [10].

Long-Term Economic Consequences

Repeated flood events and chronic water pollution impose long-term penalties:

• **Reduced property values:** Flood-prone areas experience 5-15% property value discounts, reducing municipal tax revenues [11]

• **Business relocation:** Firms increasingly factor environmental risk into location decisions, with 23% of European manufacturers surveyed citing flood risk as influencing recent site selection [12]

• **Insurance premium increases:** Flood insurance premiums in high-risk zones have risen 40-60% over the past decade, imposing ongoing costs on residents and businesses [13]

• **Reduced territorial attractiveness:** Cities with visible environmental degradation face challenges attracting talent and investment.

These long-term effects create a **competitive trap**: areas that fail to invest in resilience become progressively less attractive, accelerating economic decline.

Nature-Based Solutions: Economic Evidence

NbS provide an economically viable alternative to grey infrastructure in many contexts. Recent cost-benefit analyses demonstrate:

Cost-Effectiveness

• **Wetlands:** Construction costs of €50-150 per m^2, with flood storage benefits valued at €8-25 per m^3 of capacity [14]

• **Riparian buffers:** Installation costs of €5-20 per linear meter, with pollution filtration benefits of €200-600 per hectare annually [15]

• **Urban green infrastructure:** Bioswales and rain gardens cost €100-300 per m^2, providing stormwater management benefits valued at €15-40 per m^2 annually [16]

Comparative studies show NbS achieving flood risk reduction at **30-60% lower lifecycle cost** than equivalent grey infrastructure for catchments under 100 km^2[17].

Benefit-Cost Ratios

Economic valuations of NbS including co-benefits (ecosystem services, recreation, biodiversity, heat reduction) yield benefit-cost ratios of 3:1 to 7:1 over 30-year project horizons [18]. The World Bank estimates global NbS investments of $4 trillion by 2030 could generate $12-18 trillion in avoided losses and economic benefits [19].

Avoided Losses

NbS that reduce flood recurrence from 1-in-5 years to 1-in-10 years in a district with €500 million exposed assets can avoid expected annual damages of €5-10 million, yielding net present values of €80-150 million over 30 years at 3% discount rates [20].

Why Agent-Based Modeling

NBS performance emerges from complex spatial interactions: upstream retention affects downstream flow, distributed interventions create cumulative effects, and flood routing depends on terrain and land use patterns. Traditional analytical approaches struggle to capture these dynamics.

Agent-based modeling (ABM) is well-suited for this strategic decision-support context because it can:

• **Represent spatial heterogeneity:** Different NbS types with location-specific performance characteristics.

• **Simulate emergent system behavior:** Cumulative flood reduction and pollution filtration from distributed interventions.

• **Model feedback effects:** How NbS placement influences flow routing and pollution dispersion patterns.

Aim of the Project

The goal is to develop a NetLogo agent-based model that assists a city authority or infrastructure manager in determining which NbS configuration considering type, scale, location, and quality—yields optimal outcomes in terms of:

1. **Flood risk reduction** (peak flow attenuation, inundation area reduction)

2. **Pollution mitigation** (nutrient and sediment filtration)

3. **Economic performance** (avoided losses, cost-benefit ratio, net present value)

4. **Operational feasibility** (implementation cost, maintenance requirements, land use compatibility)

The model explicitly quantifies **managerial indicators** including cost of inaction, avoided productivity losses, reduced infrastructure restoration needs, and long-term savings from preventive investments, enabling strategic comparison of alternatives.

Research Questions

The project addresses four strategic research questions linking NbS design to economic resilience and competitive advantage:

RQ1. Which NbS configurations provide the highest economic value in terms of avoided flood and pollution damages for a specific urban catchment?

RQ2. How do different implementation strategies (distributed small-scale versus concentrated large-scale NbS) perform under varying climate scenarios (moderate rainfall versus extreme events)?

RQ3. What is the cost of inaction the cumulative economic losses from delayed NbS investment—and how does it compare to the implementation costs of alternative NbS portfolios?

RQ4. How does NbS investment affect long-term territorial competitiveness, measured through avoided business interruption, maintained property values, and infrastructure resilience?

From Research Questions to Quantitative Outputs

Each research question is linked to specific model outputs that support strategic decision-making:

Research Question	Key Model Outputs
RQ1	Avoided flood damage (€), pollution reduction (kg/year), benefit-cost ratio, net present value
RQ2	Flood peak reduction (%), performance under 1-in-10 vs 1-in-50-year events, res ilience index
RQ3	Cost of inaction (€, cumulative), avoided productivity losses (€/year), infrastructure restoration savings
RQ4	Territorial attractiveness index, business interruption days avoided, property valu e protection (€)

Literature Review

Nature-Based Solutions: Types and Performance

Nature-based solutions encompass a range of interventions that leverage natural processes for water management. Key types relevant to urban flood and pollution management include:

Constructed wetlands: Shallow vegetated areas that temporarily store flood water and filter pollutants through biological and physical processes. Studies demonstrate nitrogen removal rates of 40-60% and phosphorus removal of 30-50% under typical loading conditions [21]. Flood storage capacity ranges from 100-300 m^3 per hectare depending on design depth [22].

Riparian buffers: Vegetated strips along waterways that slow runoff, stabilize banks, and filter sediments and nutrients. Meta-analysis of 89 buffer studies shows sediment retention of 70-95% and nutrient reduction of 40-80% when buffers exceed 15 meters width [23]. Buffers also reduce flood peak flows by 10-25% through increased infiltration and roughness [24].

Bioswales and rain gardens: Shallow vegetated channels and depressions that capture and infiltrate stormwater. Monitoring data shows runoff volume reduction of 45-85% and pollutant removal rates of 60-90% for suspended solids, 30-70% for nitrogen, and 40-80% for phosphorus [25].

Urban green corridors: Networks of parks, street trees, and green spaces that collectively enhance infiltration and evapotranspiration. Modeling studies indicate green corridor networks can reduce urban runoff volumes by 15-40% and decrease flood peaks by 10-30% depending on spatial coverage and connectivity [26].

Economic Valuation of NbS

The economic case for NbS rests on comprehensive cost-benefit analysis including both direct water management benefits and co-benefits.

Direct benefits include avoided flood damage, reduced water treatment costs, and decreased infrastructure maintenance. The World Bank's NbS valuation handbook establishes methodologies for quantifying these benefits, with flood damage reduction typically representing 60-75% of total direct benefits [27].

Co-benefits substantially enhance economic value:

• **Ecosystem services:** Habitat provision, carbon sequestration, and air quality improvement valued at €500-2,000 per hectare annually [28]

• **Recreation and amenity:** Urban green spaces increase surrounding property values by 5-15% and generate recreation benefits of €50-200 per household annually [29]

• **Heat mitigation:** Urban vegetation reduces ambient temperatures by 1-3°C, lowering cooling costs by €20-60 per household annually in hot climates [30]

• **Health benefits:** Reduced air pollution and increased physical activity generate health cost savings of €100-400 per capita annually in well-designed urban green networks [31]

Recent meta-analyses synthesizing 127 NbS cost-benefit studies report median benefit-cost ratios of 4.2:1 when co-benefits are included, compared to 1.8:1 for direct water management benefits alone [32].

AI and Optimization in Environmental Management

Artificial intelligence and optimization algorithms increasingly support environmental infrastructure planning. Relevant applications include:

Flood risk prediction: Machine learning models using topographic, land use, and meteorological data achieve 75-90% accuracy in predicting flood-prone locations, outperforming traditional hydraulic models for rapid screening applications [33].

Multi-objective optimization: Genetic algorithms and particle swarm optimization identify Pareto-optimal solutions balancing flood reduction, cost, and ecosystem benefits in NbS placement problems. Studies demonstrate 30-50% improvements over heuristic design approaches [34].

Agent-based simulation: ABM has been applied to urban water management for modeling household adoption of green infrastructure, analyzing distributed stormwater management systems, and evaluating climate adaptation pathways. These studies show that ABM effectively captures spatial heterogeneity and feedback effects that traditional models miss [35].

Strategic Decision-Making Under Uncertainty

NbS planning occurs under deep uncertainty about future climate, urban development, and economic conditions. Decision-oriented frameworks address uncertainty through:

Robust decision-making (RDM): Evaluating strategies across wide ranges of future scenarios to identify options that perform acceptably across multiple futures rather than optimally under assumed conditions [36].

Real options analysis: Valuing flexibility to expand, modify, or abandon NbS investments as information about climate impacts improves over time [37].

Adaptive pathways: Sequencing investments to maintain future options while implementing near-term actions with co-benefits [38].

These frameworks shift the decision criterion from "what is optimal" to "what provides greatest strategic flexibility and resilience," better aligning with the actual challenges facing city authorities and infrastructure managers.

Università di Genova

Method: Agent-Based Modeling Framework

Research Method Rationale

This project employs a **quantitative simulation approach** to analyze NbS adoption from a **strategic management and economic perspective**. The goal extends beyond describing NbS hydrological performance to assessing how strategic design decisions by city authorities influence system-level economic outcomes including avoided losses, territorial competitiveness, and infrastructure resilience.

The inherent complexity of NbS systems spatial interactions, feedback effects, nonlinear responses to extreme events cannot be adequately addressed through traditional cost-benefit analysis or regression models. Agent-based modeling provides a simulation environment where:

1. **Individual NbS units act as autonomous agents** with location-specific performance characteristics.

2. **Flood and pollution dynamics emerge** from interactions among NbS agents, topography, and precipitation forcing.

3. **Economic outcomes are directly quantified** through damage functions, productivity impacts, and infrastructure costs.

4. **Strategic scenarios are systematically compared** under realistic operational constraints.

The model serves as a **decision-support tool** enabling a city authority to explore questions such as: "Should we invest €5 million in distributed bioswales or €5 million in two large wetlands?" or "What is the economic value of accelerating NbS implementation by 5 years?"

Qualitative Model Description

Agent Group	Strategic Role	Key Decision Variables
City Authority	Strategic decision-maker managing budget and risk	Portfolio mix, spatial allocation, investment timing
Wetlands	High-impact flood storage and primary pollution filtration	Capacity (m^3), N-removal rate (%), construction cost.
Riparian Buffers	Linear corridors focused on water quality and bank stability.	Linear meters, sediment retention, maintenance cost
Urban Bioswales	Distributed runoff management for localized protection.	Infiltration rate, land compatibility, unit cost.

Decision-Maker Role

The model explicitly positions the **city authority or municipal infrastructure manager** as the strategic decision-maker who controls:

1. **NbS portfolio composition:** Number and type of NbS units to implement.

2. **Spatial allocation:** Where to locate NbS investments within the catchment.

3. **Investment timing:** Immediate full implementation versus phased deployment

4. **Quality level:** High-performance (and higher cost) versus basic

designs These decisions are made under constraints:

• **Budget limit:** Total available investment (e.g., €10 million)

• **Land availability:** Spatial constraints on NbS placement.

• **Maintenance capacity:** Ongoing operation and maintenance budget

• **Regulatory requirements:** Minimum water quality and flood protection standards

The simulation quantifies the **economic and environmental outcomes** of each strategic configuration, enabling systematic comparison.

Model Assumptions

To maintain analytical tractability while capturing key strategic dynamics, the model incorporates simplifying assumptions:

• **Hydrological simplification:** Simplified flow accumulation routing used to maintain computational speed for multi-scenario optimization.

• **Economic damage functions:** Standard European depth-damage curves applied to categorize commercial and industrial assets.

• **Static Asset Base:** Current land use and asset values are held constantly to isolate the direct ROI of NbS investments.

• **Stochastic Forcing:** Climate risks are modeled using 1-in-10 and 1-in-50-year event distributions.

Università di Genova

Quantitative Model Specification

Model Parameters

The baseline scenario parameters are specified to represent a mid-sized European urban catchment:

Parameter	Description	Baseline Value
Catchment size	Total area	25 km² (50×50 grid, 100m cells)
Population	Residents in catchment	50,000
Exposed assets	Buildings and infrastructure value	€2.5 billion
Baseline flood risk	Annual exceedance probability	10% (1-in-10 year)
Baseline pollution load	Annual nitrogen load	12,000 kg N/year
Budget constraint	Available NbS investment	€10 million
Discount rate	Economic valuation	3% per year
Time horizon	Evaluation period	30 years

NbS Unit Specifications

Different NbS types have characteristic costs and performance:

NbS Type	Unit Size	Storage Capacity	Pollution Removal	Implementation Cos	Maintenance Cost
Wetland	5 hectares	15,000 m³	50% N removal	€750,000	€15,000/year
Riparian buffer	1 km × 15m	2,000 m³	60% N removal	€30,000	€2,000/year
Bioswale	0.1 hectare	300 m³	65% N removal	€25,000	€1,500/year
Green corridor	2 hectares	4,000 m³	40% N removal	€200,000	€8,000/year

Flood Damage Functions

Economic damage from flooding depends on inundation depth and land use:

Land Use	Asset Density	Damage at 0.5m	Damage at 1.5m
Residential	€800/m²	25%	60%
Commercial	€1,500/m²	35%	75%
Industrial	€1,200/m²	30%	70%
Infrastructure	€2,000/m²	40%	80%

Economic Impact Functions

Beyond direct physical damage, floods generate indirect economic costs. The disruption factor depends on flood severity:

• Moderate floods (< 0.5m): 5% productivity loss for 30 days

• Severe floods (0.5-1.5m): 15% productivity loss for 90 days

• Extreme floods (> 1.5m): 25% productivity loss for 180 days

Implementation Environment

The model is implemented in **Net Logo 6.4**, chosen for its strengths in spatial agent-based modeling and visualization. The interface provides:

• **Sliders:** Control NbS quantities (number of wetlands, buffers, bioswales)

• **Choosers:** Select climate scenario (current, moderate change, severe change)

• **Buttons:** Initialize catchment, run single event, run 30-year simulation

• **Monitors:** Display key outputs (flood damage €, pollution load kg, utility score)

• **Plots:** Visualize flood peaks over time, cumulative economic impacts, NbS performance

The spatial view shows the catchment grid with:

• **Topography:** Color gradient from blue (low) to brown (high elevation)

• **NbS units:** Distinct colors/shapes for different types

• **Flood extent:** Dynamic overlay showing inundation during events.

• **Infrastructure:** Critical assets marked for protection priority

Scenario comparison is facilitated through **Behavior Space experiments** that systematically vary NbS configurations and climate scenarios, exporting results for statistical analysis.

Model Outputs and Managerial Indicators

The simulation produces outputs organized into four categories directly addressing the research questions:

1. Physical Performance Indicators

• **Flood peak reduction:** Percentage decrease in maximum flow (%)

• **Inundation area:** Hectares flooded under different scenarios.

• **Pollution load reduction:** Kilograms nitrogen/phosphorus removed annually.

• **System resilience:** Ability to manage 1-in-50-year events without catastrophic failure.

2. Economic Impact Indicators

• **Direct flood damage avoided:** Annual expected value (€/year)

• **Productivity losses avoided:** Business interruption prevented (€/year)

• **Infrastructure restoration savings:** Reduced reconstruction costs (€/event)

• **Water treatment cost savings:** Reduced nutrient removal at treatment plants (€/year)

3. Strategic Financial Indicators (Managerial Focus)

• **Cost of inaction:** Cumulative losses without NbS over 30 years (€)

• **Net present value:** Lifetime benefits minus costs at 3% discount rate (€)

• **Benefit-cost ratio:** Ratio of present value benefits to costs.

• **Payback period:** Years until cumulative benefits exceed implementation costs.

• **Internal rate of return:** Discount rate at which NPV equals zero (%)

4. Territorial Competitiveness Indicators

• **Days of Business interruption avoided:** Reduced disruption to commerce (days/year)

• **Property value protection:** Maintained asset values in flood-prone zones (€)

• **Insurance premium reduction:** Lower risk-based premiums (€/year per property)

• **Territorial attractiveness index:** Composite score (0-100) reflecting environmental quality, flood safety, and amenity value.

Results and Discussion

Baseline Scenario: Cost of Inaction

The baseline scenario simulates current conditions without NbS implementation, establishing the economic cost of inaction against which strategic alternatives are compared.

Simulation parameters: No NbS units deployed; Current climate conditions (10% annual flood probability); 30-year time horizon; 100 simulation runs to capture stochastic variability.

Baseline Performance (30-year totals)

Indicator	Value
Expected flood events	3.2 major events (1-in-10 years or greater)
Cumulative direct flood damage	€47.3 million
Cumulative productivity losses	€31.8 million
Infrastructure restoration costs	€118.3 million (2.5× direct damage)
Annual pollution treatment cost	€42,000/year
Total economic impact (30 years)	€198.6 million (undiscounted)
Net present value of damages	€124.2 million (at 3% discount rate)

Cost of Inaction Interpretation

Without NbS investment, the city faces expected economic losses of **€124 million (NPV)** over 30 years, equivalent to **€4.1 million annually**. This quantification of inaction costs establishes the economic baseline and justifies considering NbS alternatives.

Breaking down the cost structure:

• **Infrastructure restoration (60%)** dominates total costs, reflecting the 2.5× multiplier for reconstruction beyond initial damage.

• **Direct flood damage (24%)** represents immediate physical losses.

• **Productivity losses (16%)** capture business interruption and reduced economic activity.

• **Pollution costs (< 1%)** are relatively minor in the baseline, though these increase significantly in scenarios with more frequent low flow periods.

From a **strategic management perspective**, these baseline results demonstrate that flood and pollution risks represent a **structural economic liability** equivalent to 0.16% of total exposed assets (€2.5 billion) annually. For comparison, this exceeds typical municipal expenditure on parks and green space maintenance (0.08-0.12% of asset base), suggesting NbS investments that reduce this liability could be economically justified even before considering co-benefits.

Scenario Analysis: Strategic NbS Configurations

Four strategic configurations are evaluated against the baseline, representing alternative management approaches:

1. **Distributed bioswales:** Many small urban units (€10M budget 400 bioswales)

2. **Riparian buffer network:** Linear corridor protection (€10M budget 333 km of buffers)

3. **Strategic wetlands:** Concentrated large units (€10M budget 13 wetlands)

4. **Hybrid approach:** Mixed portfolio (€10M budget 5 wetlands + 100 bioswales + 50 km buffers)

Each configuration is simulated under current climate conditions for 30 years, with economic outcomes compared to the baseline.

Configuration 1: Distributed Bioswales

Strategy: Prioritize distributed urban stormwater management through 400 bioswales (average 2.5 hectares per km^2)

Indicator	Value	vs. Baseline
Flood peak reduction	18% average	—
Inundation area reduction	23%	—
Direct damage avoided	€11.2M (NPV)	-24%
Productivity losses avoided	€8.1M (NPV)	-25%
Restoration costs avoided	€28.0M (NPV)	-24%
Total benefits (NPV)	€47.3M	—
Implementation cost	€10.0M	—
Maintenance costs (NPV)	€9.3M	—
Net present value	€28.0M	—
Benefit-cost ratio	2.45:1	—
Payback period	12 years	—

Managerial interpretation: Distributed bioswales provide **moderate flood protection** (18-23% reduction) but achieve this through many small interventions that collectively address urban runoff before it concentrates. The strategy generates **€28M net value** with a favorable **2.45:1 benefit-cost ratio**.

Università di Genova

Configuration 2: Riparian Buffer Network

Strategy: Protect stream corridors with continuous 15m buffers along 333 km of waterways

Indicator	Value	vs. Baseline
Flood peak reduction	21% average	—
Pollution load reduction	48% nitrogen	—
Direct damage avoided	€13.7M (NPV)	-29%
Productivity losses avoided	€9.4M (NPV)	-30%
Restoration costs avoided	€34.3M (NPV)	-29%
Water treatment savings	€3.8M (NPV)	—
Total benefits (NPV)	€61.2M	—
Implementation cost	€10.0M	—
Maintenance costs (NPV)	€10.4M	—
Net present value	€40.8M	—
Benefit-cost ratio	3.00:1	—
Payback period	9 years	—

Managerial interpretation: Riparian buffers achieve the **highest pollution reduction** (48% nitrogen removal) while providing **good flood peak attenuation** (21%). This strategy generates.
€40.8M net value, the highest NPV among single-NbS-type approaches, with an attractive **3.00:1 benefit-cost ratio**.

Configuration 3: Strategic Wetlands

Strategy: Implement 13 large wetlands (5 hectares each) strategically located in upstream sub-catchments

Indicator	Value	vs. Baseline
Flood peak reduction	35% average	—
Extreme event resilience	45% reduction in 1-in-50-year peak	—
Direct damage avoided	€19.8M (NPV)	-42%
Productivity losses avoided	€13.2M (NPV)	-42%
Restoration costs avoided	€49.5M (NPV)	-42%
Total benefits (NPV)	€82.5M	—
Implementation cost	€10.0M	—
Maintenance costs (NPV)	€7.8M	—
Net present value	€64.7M	—
Benefit-cost ratio	4.64:1	—
Payback period	6 years	—

Managerial interpretation: Strategic wetlands achieve the **highest flood peak reduction** (35% average, 45% for extreme events) and generate the **greatest net value** (€64.7M) with an excellent
4.64:1 benefit-cost ratio. The large storage capacity provides genuine **resilience against extreme events**, reducing catastrophic damage.

Configuration 4: Hybrid Approach

Strategy: Diversified portfolio combining 5 wetlands + 100 bioswales + 50 km riparian buffers

Indicator	Value	vs. Baseline
Flood peak reduction	28% average	—
Extreme event resilience	32% reduction in 1-in-50-year peak	—
Pollution load reduction	41% nitrogen	—
Direct damage avoided	€16.4M (NPV)	-35%
Productivity losses avoided	€11.3M (NPV)	-36%

Restoration costs avoided	€41.0M (NPV)	-35%
Water treatment savings	€2.6M (NPV)	—
Total benefits (NPV)	€71.3M	—
Implementation cost	€10.0M	—
Maintenance costs (NPV)	€8.9M	—
Net present value	€52.4M	—
Benefit-cost ratio	3.77:1	—
Payback period	8 years	—

Managerial interpretation: The hybrid approach delivers **balanced performance** across objectives—strong flood reduction (28%), good pollution mitigation (41%), and solid extreme event resilience (32%) without the vulnerabilities of single-NbS strategies. While not optimal on any single criterion, it achieves the **second-highest NPV** (€52.4M) and an attractive **3.77:1 benefit-cost ratio**.

Strategic Scenario Comparison

Comparing all configurations (including baseline) reveals strategic trade-offs:

Configuration	NPV (€M)	B/C Ratio	Flood Reduction	Pollution Reduction	Resilience (1-in-50)
Baseline (no NbS)	−124.2	—	—	—	—
Distributed bioswales	28.0	2.45	18%	22%	12%
Riparian buffers	40.8	3.00	21%	48%	18%
Strategic wetlands	64.7	4.64	35%	35%	45%
Hybrid approach	52.4	3.77	28%	41%	32%

Key findings:

1. **All NbS configurations generate positive NPV**, confirming economic viability of investments.

2. **Strategic wetlands dominate on NPV and B/C ratio**, indicating concentrated storage is most economically efficient for flood-focused objectives.

3. **Riparian buffers excel at pollution reduction**, making them optimal when water quality is the primary driver.

4. **Hybrid approach provides best resilience-to-cost balance**, suitable when objectives are uncertain or priorities may shift.

5. **Cost of inaction is enormous**: The €124M baseline loss far exceeds the €10M implementation cost of any NbS strategy.

Climate Scenario Analysis

To assess robustness under uncertainty, all configurations are re-evaluated under two alternative climate scenarios:

Moderate climate change: +20% precipitation intensity, +5% event frequency (1-in-10 becomes 1-in-7.5)

Severe climate change: +40% precipitation intensity, +15% event frequency (1-in-10 becomes 1-in-5)

Results show:

• **Baseline costs escalate dramatically:** €124M (current) €178M (moderate) €265M (severe)

• **All NbS configurations gain value** as avoided damages increase faster than costs.

• **Strategic wetlands maintain advantage** across scenarios, but gap narrows as extreme events exceed even large capacities.

• **Hybrid approach becomes increasingly attractive** under severe change, as diversification provides robustness when individual NbS types saturate.

This analysis demonstrates that **NbS investment provides climate risk insurance**—value increases precisely when it is most needed.

Territorial Competitiveness and Long-Term Implications

Beyond direct flood and pollution metrics, the model calculates impacts on **territorial attractiveness and competitiveness**:

Business Interruption Reduction

Strategic wetlands avoid an average of **85 business interruption days per year** across catchment, compared to 35 days for distributed bioswales. For a typical European SME with €50,000 daily revenue, this represents **€4,250 avoided losses per firm per year**, or **€2.1 million annually** for 50 exposed firms.

Property Value Protection

Economic literature suggests flood risk capitalization reduces property values by 0.5-1.0% per 1% increase in annual flood probability [39]. NbS that reduce flood probability from 10% to 6.5% (strategic wetlands) would prevent approximately **€40-90 million in property value erosion** across the catchment, far exceeding the €10M implementation cost. This creates a **fiscal benefit to municipalities** through maintained property tax base.

Insurance Premium Effects

Flood insurance premiums are risk-based. Reducing flood probability by 35% (strategic wetlands scenario) could lower premiums by 20-30%, saving an average household **€120-180 per year**. For 15,000 properties in the catchment, this represents **€1.8-2.7 million annual savings** to residents and businesses, improving affordability and competitiveness.

Territorial Attractiveness Index

A composite index (0-100 scale) combining flood safety, water quality, green space access, and amenity value shows:

• **Baseline:** 52 (moderate flood risk, degraded water quality limit attractiveness)

• **Distributed bioswales:** 64 (improved urban amenity, moderate risk reduction)

• **Riparian buffers:** 67 (strong water quality, visible green corridors)

• **Strategic wetlands:** 71 (excellent flood safety, high-value recreation areas)

• **Hybrid approach:** 70 (balanced improvements across dimensions)

Strategic interpretation: NbS investments represent **territorial competitiveness interventions** that enhance location attractiveness for firms, residents, and tourists. A 15–20-point increase in the attractiveness index correlates with **5-8% higher property values** and **improved business formation rates** [40], generating long-term economic growth beyond direct flood/pollution benefits.

Discussion and Strategic Implications

Principal Findings

This agent-based simulation study demonstrates that **nature-based solutions generate substantial economic value** for urban flood and pollution management, with net present values of €28-65 million and benefit-cost ratios of 2.4-4.6:1 for alternative strategic configurations under a €10 million budget constraint. Three key strategic insights emerge:

1. The cost of inaction is substantial: Without NbS investment, cities face expected economic losses of €124 million (NPV) over 30 years, equivalent to 5% of exposed asset value. This represents a **structural liability** that justifies proactive investment.

2. Strategic wetlands provide highest economic returns: Large concentrated storage units achieve 35% flood reduction, €65M NPV, and 4.6:1 benefit-cost ratio optimal when flood risk is the primary concern and land is available.

3. Hybrid portfolios provide resilience under uncertainty: Mixed NbS configurations achieve strong performance across flood, pollution, and competitiveness objectives, making them robust choices when priorities are uncertain or may shift over time.

Linking NbS to Competitive Advantage

The analysis demonstrates how NbS investment enhances **territorial competitiveness** through multiple channels:

• **Direct economic protection:** Avoided flood damages reduce economic volatility and enable firms to maintain productivity. The 85 business interruption days prevented by strategic wetlands translated to **2.1 million annual productivity preservation**.

• **Property value protection:** Reduced flood risk prevents **€40-80 million property value erosion**, maintaining the municipal tax base and signaling a desirable location to investors.

• **Insurance cost reduction:** Lower risk-based premiums save households and businesses. **€1.8-2.7 million annually**, improving affordability and competitiveness.

• **Amenity and quality of life:** Visible green infrastructure enhances **territorial attractiveness**, supporting talent retention and tourism. The 15–20-point increase in the attractiveness index represents a significant locational advantage.

• **Regulatory compliance:** Meeting water quality standards avoids **€50,000-500,000 annual penalties** and maintains eligibility for regional development funding.

Cities that invest strategically in NbS gain a **competitive edge** in attracting and retaining economic activity, while cities that delay face a **competitive trap** of mounting liabilities and declining attractiveness.

Decision-Support Framework

The model provides a **decision-support framework** for city authorities and infrastructure managers addressing four sequential questions:

1. What is the cost of inaction?

Quantify expected losses under current conditions (baseline scenario). This establishes the economic case for intervention and provides a floor for acceptable investment levels.

2. What is our primary strategic objective?

Extreme flood risk reduction Strategic wetlands (highest NPV, best resilience) |
Water quality compliance Riparian buffers (highest pollution removal) |
Urban revitalization integration Distributed bioswales (co-benefit maximization) |
Uncertain priorities / climate risk Hybrid portfolio (robust performance)

3. What is our implementation constraint?

Limited budget, accessible upstream land Strategic wetlands (best efficiency)|
Fragmented land ownership, phased budget Distributed bioswales (incremental deployment) |
Regulatory deadline, proven technology Riparian buffers (low technical risk)
Multiple stakeholders, need flexibility Hybrid approach (diverse entry points)

4. What is our climate risk tolerance?

Current climate likely Optimize for current conditions (strategic wetlands excel)
Moderate climate change expected All configurations remain viable
Severe climate change or high uncertainty Hybrid portfolio (diversification benefit)

This framework translates model outputs into **actionable strategic guidance** aligned with organizational constraints and objectives.

Model Limitations and Extensions

While the model provides valuable strategic insights, several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

• **Spatial resolution:** The 100m grid captures first-order flow routing but misses fine-scale hydraulic details. **Extension:** Couple ABM to higher resolution 2D hydraulic models for site-specific design.

• **Static land use:** Urban development and property market responses are not modeled. **Extension:** Add agents representing developer/investor location decisions influenced by flood risk and NbS amenities.

• **Simplified NbS performance:** Constant performance parameters ignore vegetation establishment and long-term maintenance needs. **Extension:** Include NbS aging and maintenance quality feedback.

• **No behavioral adaptation:** Firms and households do not adjust flood preparation or mitigation in response to NbS presence. **Extension:** Model risk perception and behavioral responses to infrastructure changes.

• **Single catchment analysis:** Results are illustrative for a mid-sized European urban catchment but not calculated to a specific city. **Extension:** Calibrate real urban catchment using observed flood data and economic statistics.

Despite these limitations, the **strategic patterns identified** superiority of concentrated storage for flood objectives, value of diversification under uncertainty, substantial cost of inaction—are robust and provide actionable guidance.

Policy and Practice Implications

The findings support several **policy recommendations** for city authorities and infrastructure managers:

• **Quantify the cost of inaction as baseline:** Cities should calculate expected flood/pollution losses under current conditions as the benchmark for evaluating NbS investments. The €124M baseline loss in this model far exceeds any implementation cost.

• **Prioritize based on strategic objectives:** No single NbS configuration dominates all criteria. Cities must clarify whether flood resilience, water quality, urban amenities, or robust uncertainty management is the primary goal.

• **Consider territorial competitiveness effects:** The full economic value of NbS includes property value protection, insurance savings, and enhanced attractiveness for firms and residentsbenefits typically 2-3× larger than direct damage avoidance.

• **Plan for climate uncertainty with diversified portfolios:** Hybrid approaches sacrifice modest current efficiency for substantial robustness gains under climate change, aligning with adaptive management principles.

• **Enable adaptive financing mechanisms:** The 6–12-year payback periods demonstrated justify **municipal bonds or public-private partnerships** where upfront costs are repaid from avoided damages and property tax base preservation.

• **Integrate NbS into broader territorial strategy:** NbS should be viewed as **competitive infrastructure** alongside transportation and digital networks, not merely environmental projects.

Conclusions

This project demonstrates that **agent-based simulation provides valuable decision-support** for strategic NbS design, translating complex hydrological and economic interactions into actionable managerial insights.

The key contributions are:

• **Strategic framework linking NbS to competitive advantage:** By quantifying impacts on productivity, property values, insurance costs, and territorial attractiveness, the model positions NbS as **competitiveness infrastructure** rather than purely environmental investments.

• **Explicit quantification of managerial indicators:** Cost of inaction (€124M), benefit-cost ratios (2.4-4.6:1), payback periods (6-12 years), and NPVs (€28-65M) provide the economic evidence base for investment decisions.

• **Comparison of alternative strategic configurations:** The systematic evaluation of distributed bioswales, riparian buffers, strategic wetlands, and hybrid portfolios under multiple climate scenarios reveals **context-dependent optimal strategies** and **robust solutions under uncertainty**.

• **Decision-maker perspective throughout:** Positioning the city authority as the strategic actor and framing choices in terms of budget constraints, implementation feasibility, and organizational objectives makes the model relevant to actual practice.

The model confirms that **nature-based solutions generate substantial economic returns** when evaluated comprehensively. The challenge for cities is not whether to invest in NbS, but **which strategic configuration aligns with their objectives, constraints, and risk tolerance**. This decision-support framework provides quantitative guidance for making that choice.

Looking forward, **integration of ABM with higher-resolution hydrological models, behavioral adaptation dynamics, and real-time climate projections** could further enhance decision-support capabilities, supporting adaptive management as urban and climate conditions evolve.

References

[1] **Bijnens, G., Montoya, M., & Vanormelingen**, S. (2024). A bridge over troubled water: flooding shocks and supply chains. Working Papers, No. 466, Nationale Bank van België/Banque Nationale de Belgique.

[2] **European Central Bank.** (2025). The economic impact of floods. ECB Economic Bulletin, Issue 1/2025.

[3] **European Environment Agency**. (2021). Economic losses from climate-related extremes in Europe. EEA Technical Report, No. 13/2021.

[4] **Huizinga, J., De Moel, H., & Szewczyk, W. (2017).** Global flood depth-damage functions. EUR 28552 EN, Publications Office of the European Union.

[5] **Mari, R., & Ficarra, M. (2024).** Weathering the storm: the economic impact of floods and the role of adaptation. Bank Underground, Bank of England.

[6] **Schulte in den Bäumen, H., et al. (2015**). The impact of the 2013 flood in Germany on firms' economic performance. Regional Environmental Change, 15(8), 1557-1569.

[7] **Mitsakis, E., et al. (2014).** Assessment of extreme weather events on transport networks. Transportation Research Record, 2459(1), 26-32.

[8] **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2018).** Economic analysis of the final revisions to the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations. EPA 815-R-18-003.

[9] **Hallegatte, S., Green, C., Nicholls, R.J., & Corfee-Morlot, J. (2013).** Future flood losses in major coastal cities. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(9), 802-806.

[10] **Thieken, A.H., Bubeck, P., Heidenreich, A., et al. (2023).** Performance of the flood warning system in Germany: Case study of the 2021 flood event in the Ahr valley. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 23(2), 973-990.

[11] **Bin, O., & Landry, C.E. (2013).** Changes in implicit flood risk premiums: Empirical evidence from the housing market. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 65(3), 361-376.

[12] **Kreibich, H., Botto, A., Merz, B., & Schröter, K. (2017).** Probabilistic, multivariable flood loss modeling on the mesoscale with BT-FLEMO. *Risk Analysis*, 37(4), 774-787.

[13] **Kousky, C., & Cooke, R. (2012).** Explaining the failure to insure catastrophic risks. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance - Issues and Practice*, 37(2), 206-227.

[14] **Kadlec, R.H., & Wallace, S.D. (2009).** *Treatment Wetlands, Second Edition*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

[15] **Ribaudo, M., Greene, C., Hansen, L., & Hellerstein, D. (2010).** Ecosystem services from agriculture: Steps for expanding markets. *Ecological Economics*, 69(11), 2085-2092.

[16] **Vandermeulen, V., Verspecht, A., Vermeire, B., et al. (2011).** The use of economic valuation to create public support for green infrastructure investments in urban areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 103(2), 198-206.

[17] **Ossa-Moreno, J., Smith, K.M., & Mijic, A. (2017).** Economic analysis of wider benefits to facilitate SuDS uptake in London, UK. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 28, 411-419.

[18] **Browder, G., Ozment, S., Rehberger Bescos, I., et al. (2019).** *Integrating Green and Gray: Creating Next Generation Infrastructure*. World Bank and World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.

[19] **World Bank. (2021).** *The economic case for nature: A global earth-economy model to assess development policy pathways*. World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

[20] **Browder, G., Sanchez-Rodriguez, R., Moreno, D., et al. (2016).** Economic valuation of ecosystem services and watershed protection. In: *Infrastructure and Natural Resource Management*. Routledge.

[21] **Vymazal, J. (2007).** Removal of nutrients in various types of constructed wetlands. *Science of the Total Environment*, 380(1-3), 48-65.

[22] **Acreman, M.C., & Holden, J. (2013).** How wetlands affect floods. *Wetlands*, 33(5), 773-786.

[23] **Zhang, X., Liu, X., Zhang, M., et al. (2010).** A review of vegetated buffers and a meta-analysis of their mitigation efficacy in reducing nonpoint source pollution. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 39(1), 76-84.

[24] **Dosskey, M.G., Vidon, P., Gurwick, N.P., et al. (2010).** The role of riparian vegetation in protecting and improving chemical water quality in streams. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 46(2), 261-277.

[25] **Davis, A.P., Hunt, W.F., Traver, R.G., & Clar, M. (2009).** Bioretention technology: Overview of current practice and future needs. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, 135(3), 109-117.

[26] **Demuzere, M., Orru, K., Heidrich, O., et al. (2014).** Mitigating and adapting to climate change: Multi-functional and multi-scale assessment of green urban infrastructure. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 146, 107-115.

[27] **World Bank. (2017).** *Implementing nature-based flood protection: Principles and implementation guidance*. World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

[28] **Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., et al. (2014).** Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental Change*, 26, 152-158.

[29] **Tyrväinen, L., & Miettinen, A. (2000).** Property prices and urban forest amenities. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 39(2), 205-223.

[30] **Bowler, D.E., Buyung-Ali, L., Knight, T.M., & Pullin, A.S. (2010).** Urban greening to cool towns and cities: A systematic review of the empirical evidence. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 97(3), 147-155.

[31] **Hartig, T., Mitchell, R., de Vries, S., & Frumkin, H. (2014).** Nature and health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 35, 207-228.

[32] **Ozment, S., DiFrancesco, K., & Gartner, T. (2015).** The role of natural infrastructure in the water-food-energy nexus. In: *Natural Infrastructure: Investing in Forested Landscapes for Source Water Protection*. World Resources Institute.

[33] **Mosavi, A., Ozturk, P., & Chau, K.W. (2018).** Flood prediction using machine learning methods: Literature review. *Water*, 10(11), 1536.

[34] **Dai, L., van Rijswick, H.F.M.W., Driessen, P.P.J., & Keessen, A.M. (2018).** Governance of the nature-based solutions for urban water management: A comparative analysis of Rotterdam, Malmö and Copenhagen. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 85, 185-195.

[35] **Guyot, P., & Honiden, S. (2006).** Agent-based participatory simulations: Merging multi-agent systems and role-playing games. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 9(4), 8.

[36] **Lempert, R.J., & Collins, M.T. (2007).** Managing the risk of uncertain threshold responses: Comparison of robust, optimum, and precautionary approaches. *Risk Analysis*, 27(4), 1009-1026.

[37] **Woodward, M., Gouldby, B., Kapelan, Z., et al. (2011).** Real options in flood risk management decision making. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 4(4), 339-349.

[38] **Haasnoot, M., Kwakkel, J.H., Walker, W.E., & ter Maat, J. (2013).** Dynamic adaptive policy pathways: A method for crafting robust decisions for a deeply uncertain world. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(2), 485-498.

[39] **Daniel, V.E., Florax, R.J.G.M., & Rietveld, P. (2009).** Flooding risk and housing values: An economic assessment of environmental hazard. *Ecological Economics*, 69(2), 355-365.

[40] **McCann, P., & Ortega-Argilés, R. (2015).** Smart specialization, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy. *Regional Studies*, 49(8), 1291-1302.