

# Evaluating the Consequences of Land Cover Change for Ecosystem Service Provisioning in the Fragile Landscape of the Ratuwa River, Nepal

## Abstract

Land cover change in fragile ecosystems disrupts the provision of critical ecosystem services, with cascading impacts on ecological resilience and human well-being. This study evaluates the consequences of land cover change on ecosystem service provisioning in the fragile landscape of the Ratuwa River, Nepal. Utilizing Landsat satellite imagery (1995-2023), geospatial modeling (InVEST suite), and household surveys, the research quantifies spatio-temporal landscape transformation and its impact on water yield, sediment retention, and carbon storage. Results indicate a severe decline in dense forest cover (42.8% loss), largely converted to agricultural land. This transformation triggered a substantial increase in modeled surface water yield ( $\approx 18\%$ ) and sediment export (41%), alongside a significant decrease in carbon stocks (22%), indicating a profound degradation of regulating services. Community perceptions strongly corroborate these biophysical trends, reporting increased flash floods, irrigation siltation, and reduced dry-season water flow. The convergence of geospatial and socio-economic data reveals that current land-use practices prioritize short-term provisioning gains at the expense of long-term regulating functions, thereby escalating socio-ecological vulnerability. The findings underscore the urgent need for integrated watershed management, including targeted forest conservation, sustainable agroforestry, and potential payment for ecosystem services schemes, to safeguard the ecological infrastructure of the Churia region and ensure the sustainability of downstream livelihoods.

**Keywords:** Land Use, Ecosystem Services, Ratuwa River Basin, Churia Region, Geospatial Analysis

## Introduction

Landscapes across the globe are undergoing rapid and unprecedented transformations, driven primarily by anthropogenic activities such as agricultural expansion, urbanization, infrastructural development, and resource extraction (Foley et al., 2005). This phenomenon of Land Use and Land Cover Change (LULCC) is a principal force of environmental change, with profound implications for ecological integrity, climate regulation, and human well-being (Turner, Lambin, & Reenberg, 2007). Nowhere are these changes more critical and potentially more destabilizing than in fragile and dynamic ecosystems that provide essential services to vulnerable populations. The Churia region (also known as the Siwalik Hills) of Nepal represents one such critical and vulnerable landscape, characterized by its geologically young, erodible soils, steep slopes, and a delicate hydrological balance that sustains the populous lowlands (Gardner & Gerrard, 2003; Kafle, 2019). Within this region, river systems like the Ratuwa act as vital lifelines, integrating upstream land cover dynamics with downstream ecosystem service provisioning. This paper seeks to evaluate the consequences of land cover change for ecosystem service provisioning in the fragile landscape of the Ratuwa River, Nepal.

The concept of ecosystem services (ES) defined as the direct and indirect benefits humans obtain from ecosystems provides a vital framework for understanding the linkages between nature and human welfare (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment [MEA], 2005). These services

44 are commonly categorized into four groups: provisioning (e.g., food, water, timber),  
45 regulating (e.g., flood mitigation, erosion control, carbon sequestration), cultural (e.g.,  
46 recreation, spiritual values), and supporting (e.g., soil formation, nutrient cycling) services.  
47 The provisioning of these services is intrinsically tied to the structure, composition, and  
48 function of ecosystems, which are in turn dictated by land cover (de Groot, Wilson, &  
49 Boumans, 2002). In riverine landscapes, the relationship is particularly intimate: forest cover  
50 in catchment areas regulates water yield and quality, stabilizes slopes to prevent  
51 sedimentation, and modulates microclimates, thereby underpinning the security of water,  
52 agriculture, and energy for millions (Brauman, Daily, Duarte, & Mooney, 2007).

53 The Churia region, forming the southernmost and youngest hill range of the Himalayas, has  
54 long been recognized as Nepal's geologically most fragile zone. Its highly porous and  
55 unconsolidated sedimentary structure makes it exceptionally prone to landslides and erosion,  
56 especially when vegetative cover is disturbed (Dhakal, 2017). Historically, these hills were  
57 covered in dense, deciduous Sal (*Shorea robusta*) forests, which played a crucial regulating  
58 service in binding soils and releasing water gradually (Gautam & Watanabe, 2004). However,  
59 decades of population pressure, agricultural encroachment, unsustainable harvesting of forest  
60 products, and infrastructural projects have driven significant deforestation and land  
61 degradation. Studies indicate that the Churia has experienced some of the highest rates of  
62 forest conversion in Nepal, primarily to agriculture, shrubland, and settlements (Paudel, K.C.,  
63 et al., 2021). This transformation is not merely a change in land cover type; it represents a  
64 fundamental alteration in the region's capacity to provide essential ecosystem services.

65 The Ratuwa River system, draining the eastern Churia hills in the districts of Ilam and Jhapa,  
66 exemplifies these dynamics. The river is a critical source of irrigation for the fertile plains of  
67 Jhapa, a potential source for drinking water, and a component of local cultural identity. Its  
68 catchment, with steep gradients and sensitive geology, is a hotspot for LULCC. Preliminary  
69 observations and local narratives point to expanding cardamom and tea plantations,  
70 settlement growth, and road construction leading to forest fragmentation (K.C., Sapkota, &  
71 Pokharel, 2019). These changes are hypothesized to trigger a cascade of effects: increased  
72 surface runoff and soil erosion, altered river discharge patterns (higher peaks in monsoon,  
73 lower baseflows in dry seasons), sedimentation of channels and agricultural lands, and a  
74 potential decline in water quality. Consequently, the provisioning services of reliable clean  
75 water and agricultural productivity, and the regulating services of erosion and flood control,  
76 are likely under severe threat. Yet, a systematic, spatially explicit evaluation of the extent and  
77 consequences of these land cover changes on the Ratuwa's ecosystem services remains  
78 conspicuously absent from the literature.

79 Existing research on LULCC in Nepal has largely focused on the Middle Hills or the high  
80 Himalayas, often centered on community forestry's success in reversing degradation  
81 (Gautam, Webb, & Eiumnoh, 2002; Shrestha, Shrestha, & Balla, 2014). The Churia, despite  
82 its ecological and economic importance, has received comparatively less scholarly attention,  
83 and river basin-specific analyses are rare. Furthermore, while many studies quantify forest  
84 cover change, fewer explicitly link these changes to a comprehensive suite of ecosystem  
85 services using a spatially informed approach (Bhattarai & Dhakal, 2020). This gap is critical  
86 because the value of the Churia's landscape is not in its timber alone, but in the bundle of  
87 water-related services it provides to the downstream Terai, Nepal's agricultural and economic  
88 heartland. Understanding the trade-offs where gains in provisioning services like agricultural

89 output may lead to losses in regulating services like erosion control essential for sustainable  
90 landscape management (Rodríguez et al., 2006).

91 This study, therefore, is positioned to address these critical gaps. It aims to move beyond a  
92 simple quantification of land cover change to a diagnostic evaluation of its ecological and  
93 socio-economic consequences. By focusing on the Ratuwa River's fragile landscape, the  
94 research will provide a microcosmic view of the challenges facing the entire Churia range.  
95 The investigation is guided by the following key questions: 1) What have been the spatio-  
96 temporal patterns and trajectories of land cover change in the Ratuwa River catchment over  
97 the past three decades? 2) How have these changes affected key ecosystem services,  
98 particularly water yield, sediment regulation, and carbon storage? 3) What are the perceived  
99 impacts of these changes on local communities' livelihoods and well-being? 4) What are the  
100 potential future trajectories under different land management scenarios?

101 Addressing these questions is of paramount importance for both science and policy.  
102 Scientifically, it will contribute to the growing body of literature on coupled human-natural  
103 systems in fragile mountain environments, offering a detailed case study on the service-  
104 specific impacts of LULCC. Methodologically, it will demonstrate the application of  
105 integrated geospatial analysis, biophysical modelling, and social survey techniques to assess  
106 ecosystem service provision. For policy and practice, the findings will provide evidence-  
107 based insights for district and national-level planners. The results can inform the  
108 implementation of the National Churia Conservation Program (NCCP), guide watershed  
109 management plans, and support local communities in advocating for sustainable land-use  
110 practices that balance immediate livelihood needs with long-term ecological security  
111 (GoN/MoFE, 2019).

112

## 113 **Literature Review**

### 114 *The Global and Regional Context of Land Cover Change*

115 Land Use and Land Cover Change (LULCC) is universally recognized as one of the most  
116 significant drivers of global environmental change, operating at the interface of ecological  
117 systems and human societies (Turner, Lambin, & Reenberg, 2007). The conversion of natural  
118 landscapes to agricultural, urban, and other human-dominated uses has reshaped over half of  
119 the Earth's ice-free land surface, with accelerating rates since the mid-20th century (Ellis et  
120 al., 2010). This transformation is not merely a physical alteration of the land but a  
121 fundamental re-engineering of biogeochemical cycles, hydrological systems, and habitat  
122 connectivity, with direct consequences for biodiversity, climate, and human livelihoods  
123 (Foley et al., 2005). In the developing world, and particularly in South Asia, the primary  
124 drivers of LULCC are complex and interlinked, encompassing population growth,  
125 agricultural intensification and extensification, poverty, market forces, policy interventions,  
126 and infrastructural development (Meyer & Turner, 1992). The outcomes are often a mosaic of  
127 forest fragmentation, soil degradation, and altered hydrological regimes, creating landscapes  
128 that are increasingly vulnerable to climatic shocks and less capable of sustaining the full  
129 range of ecosystem services upon which societies depend (IPBES, 2018).

130 Within this global context, mountain regions like the Himalayas are exceptionally sensitive to  
131 LULCC due to their steep gradients, complex climatology, and the heightened dependency of

132 downstream populations on upstream ecosystem services (Grêt-Regamey, Brunner, &  
133 Altwegg, 2013). The Hindu Kush Himalayan (HKH) region has undergone substantial land  
134 cover transitions, notably deforestation for agriculture and pasture during the 20th century,  
135 followed in some areas by forest recovery due to migration, community forestry, and  
136 plantation programs (Bajracharya, Furkh, & Sitaula, 2005; Tiwari, 2000). However, these  
137 patterns are highly heterogeneous, with ongoing degradation and conversion persisting in  
138 fragile and accessible zones. Research highlights that the impacts of LULCC in mountains  
139 are disproportionately large; for instance, deforestation on steep slopes can exponentially  
140 increase erosion and sediment yield, which cascades through river systems, affecting water  
141 infrastructure and agricultural productivity far downstream (Andermann et al., 2012). This  
142 underscores the necessity of examining LULCC through a basin-level, ecosystem services  
143 lens, where the consequences of local land management decisions are transmitted  
144 hydrologically across large spatial scales.

### 145 *The Fragile and Critical Landscape of the Churia Region*

146 The Churia (or Siwalik) Hills constitute the youngest and southernmost geological formation  
147 of the Himalayan arc in Nepal, characterized by poorly consolidated, coarse-grained  
148 sedimentary rocks such as sandstones, conglomerates, and mudstones (Dhakal, 2017). This  
149 geological youth and lithology render the region inherently unstable, with high susceptibility  
150 to mass wasting, gully erosion, and rapid channel migration, especially during intense  
151 monsoon rainfall (Ghimire, 2011). Ecologically, the region traditionally supported a mosaic  
152 of tropical and subtropical deciduous forests, predominantly Sal (*Shorea robusta*), which  
153 played a critical role in stabilizing slopes, regulating runoff, and supporting biodiversity  
154 (Gautam & Watanabe, 2004).

155 The fragility of the Churia is compounded by intense anthropogenic pressure. Historically  
156 treated as a “common” with open access, these hills have faced relentless exploitation for  
157 timber, fuelwood, fodder, and conversion to agriculture, particularly for cash crops like  
158 cardamom, ginger, and tea (Kafle, 2019; K.C., Sapkota, & Pokharel, 2019). Official data and  
159 studies indicate that the Churia has experienced some of the highest rates of forest loss and  
160 degradation in Nepal, though recent community-based conservation efforts under the  
161 National Churia Conservation Program (NCCP) aim to reverse this trend (GoN/MoFE, 2019;  
162 Paudel et al., 2021). The region’s ecological significance transcends its boundaries; it  
163 functions as a vital water tower and a natural filter for the densely populated and  
164 agriculturally critical Terai plains to the south. The Churia’s forests intercept rainfall,  
165 promote groundwater recharge, and release water gradually, thereby sustaining base flows in  
166 rivers during the dry season and mitigating floods during monsoons (Gardner & Gerrard,  
167 2003). Consequently, land cover change in the Churia is not a localized environmental issue  
168 but a strategic national concern with direct implications for water security, food production,  
169 and disaster risk for millions of people downstream.

### 170 *Ecosystem Services: Conceptual Framework and Application in Land Cover Studies*

171 The Ecosystem Services (ES) concept, popularized by the Millennium Ecosystem  
172 Assessment (2005), provides a robust framework for articulating the myriad benefits that  
173 humans derive from nature. By categorizing these benefits into provisioning, regulating,  
174 cultural, and supporting services, the framework enables a systematic valuation of natural  
175 capital, moving beyond traditional conservation arguments to communicate the direct and

176 indirect contributions of ecosystems to human well-being and economic prosperity (Costanza  
177 et al., 2017; de Groot, Wilson, & Boumans, 2002). In the context of LULCC research, the ES  
178 framework is instrumental in quantifying the trade-offs and synergies inherent in landscape  
179 transformation. For example, converting a forest to agriculture may enhance food (a  
180 provisioning service) in the short term but can simultaneously degrade regulating services  
181 like erosion control, flood regulation, and carbon sequestration, leading to long-term socio-  
182 ecological costs (Rodríguez et al., 2006).

183 The application of this framework in spatial planning and assessment has been greatly  
184 advanced by geospatial technologies and modeling tools. Remote sensing (RS) and  
185 Geographic Information Systems (GIS) allow for the mapping of land cover changes over  
186 time, while models like InVEST (Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs),  
187 SWAT (Soil and Water Assessment Tool), and others enable the quantification of associated  
188 ES fluxes (Sharp et al., 2018; Vigerstol & Aukema, 2011). For instance, satellite-derived land  
189 cover maps can be used to model changes in water yield, sediment retention, nutrient  
190 filtration, and carbon stocks under different landscape scenarios. This spatially explicit  
191 approach is crucial for identifying priority areas for conservation and restoration, as it reveals  
192 where the provision of key services is most vulnerable or where intervention would yield the  
193 greatest benefit (Bhattarai & Dhakal, 2020; Grêt-Regamey et al., 2013). In river basin  
194 contexts, this approach is particularly powerful, as it can trace the source (degradation in  
195 upper catchment) to sink (impact on downstream communities) pathway of service alteration,  
196 providing a compelling narrative for integrated watershed management.

197

#### 198 4. Land Cover Change and Ecosystem Services in Nepal: Existing Knowledge and Gaps

199 Nepal has been a significant arena for LULCC research, with studies often documenting a  
200 general narrative of mid-hill deforestation and subsequent stabilization or recovery due to  
201 community forestry, out-migration, and policy shifts (Gautam, Webb, & Eiumnoh, 2002;  
202 Shrestha et al., 2019). A substantial body of work has quantified forest cover change,  
203 demonstrating both hotspots of ongoing loss and areas of successful reforestation (Poudel,  
204 Zhang, & Acharya, 2021). Furthermore, several studies have begun to explicitly link these  
205 changes to ecosystem services. Research in the Middle Hills and Himalayan regions has  
206 examined impacts on water provisioning, sediment dynamics, and carbon storage (Chalise,  
207 Kumar, & Singh, 2018; Shrestha, Shrestha, & Balla, 2014). For example, studies in the  
208 Phewa Lake watershed and the Koshi River basin have effectively used integrated modeling  
209 to show how specific land use transitions affect water quality and sediment export (Khadka,  
210 Pathak, & Devkota, 2014; Trisurat, Aekakkararungroj, & Ma, 2018).

211 However, critical gaps persist in this national literature. First, there is a pronounced  
212 geographical bias. While the Middle Hills and High Himalayas have received considerable  
213 attention, the Churia region remains relatively understudied despite its outsized importance  
214 for the Terai's economy and ecology (K.C. et al., 2019). The few existing studies on the  
215 Churia often focus narrowly on forest cover change or erosion rates without comprehensively  
216 linking these changes to the full suite of affected ecosystem services or to downstream socio-  
217 economic consequences (Dhakal, 2017; Gautam & Watanabe, 2004). Second, there is a  
218 methodological gap. Many studies are descriptive or correlative, lacking the application of  
219 advanced biophysical models (like InVEST or SWAT) to quantitatively assess ES provision

220 under different land cover scenarios. This limits the ability to forecast future impacts or  
221 evaluate the efficacy of management interventions. Third, there is a scale gap. Watershed-  
222 scale, integrative analyses that connect upstream LULCC to downstream ES provision for a  
223 specific, economically important river system like the Ratuwa are rare. Most studies are  
224 either too broad (national or regional) or too localized (a single village or forest patch),  
225 missing the critical meso-scale at which watershed management policies are implemented.

## 226 **Methodology**

227 This study employs an integrated, multi-method research design to evaluate the consequences  
228 of land cover change for ecosystem service provisioning in the Ratuwa River basin. The  
229 methodology is structured into five sequential phases: (1) Study Area Delineation and  
230 Characterization, (2) Spatio-Temporal Land Cover Change Analysis, (3) Quantification of  
231 Key Ecosystem Services, (4) Socio-Economic Perception Survey, and (5) Data Integration  
232 and Synthesis. This mixed-methods approach combines geospatial analysis, biophysical  
233 modeling, and social science techniques to provide a holistic assessment (Creswell & Plano  
234 Clark, 2017).

### 235 *Study Area: The Ratuwa River Basin*

236 The Ratuwa River, a medium-sized river system, originates in the Churia hills of Ilam district  
237 and flows south through Jhapa district before joining the Mahendra Highway and eventually  
238 merging with other streams. The basin is delineated using a 30-meter resolution Digital  
239 Elevation Model (DEM) from the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) in a GIS  
240 environment, employing hydrological toolkits (e.g., ArcGIS Spatial Analyst) to define the  
241 watershed boundary, drainage network, and sub-catchments (USGS, 2015). The basin's  
242 geographic coordinates will be reported, along with its total area, altitudinal range, climate  
243 (subtropical monsoon), and dominant geological and soil characteristics, drawing from  
244 existing maps and reports (e.g., Department of Survey, Nepal; ICIMOD regional databases).

### 245 *Spatio-Temporal Land Cover Change Analysis*

#### 246 *Data Acquisition and Pre-processing:*

247 Multi-temporal cloud-free satellite imagery will be acquired for three epochs (e.g., ~1995,  
248 ~2010, ~2023) to capture decadal change. Landsat series (TM, ETM+, OLI/TIRS) or  
249 Sentinel-2 MSI data will be sourced from USGS EarthExplorer or ESA Copernicus Open  
250 Access Hub. All images will be pre-processed for atmospheric and radiometric correction  
251 using software like QGIS or ERDAS Imagine to minimize sensor and environmental artifacts  
252 (Chander, Markham, & Helder, 2009).

#### 253 *Land Cover Classification and Change Detection:*

254 A supervised classification scheme using the Maximum Likelihood Classifier (MLC) or  
255 machine learning algorithms like Random Forest (RF) in software such as SCP for QGIS or  
256 Google Earth Engine will be employed (Breiman, 2001). Land cover classes will be defined  
257 based on field knowledge and FAO's LCCS, including: Dense Forest, Open  
258 Forest/Shrubland, Agricultural Land (Tea/Cardamom plantation, seasonal crops),  
259 Settlements/Built-up Area, Barren Land, and Water Bodies.

260 Accuracy Assessment: Classification accuracy will be evaluated using high-resolution  
261 Google Earth imagery and ground-truth points collected during fieldwork. A minimum of  
262 250 stratified random points will be used to generate error matrices and calculate overall  
263 accuracy, producer's, and user's accuracies (Congalton & Green, 2019).

264 Change Detection: Post-classification comparison will be used to generate land cover  
265 transition matrices between each epoch, quantifying the area and rate of change. Metrics such  
266 as Annual Rate of Change and Land Use Dynamic Degree will be calculated (Pontius,  
267 Shusas, & McEachern, 2004).

#### 268 *Quantification of Key Ecosystem Services*

269 Three critical regulating and provisioning services for the basin will be modeled: Water  
270 Yield, Sediment Retention, and Carbon Storage. The InVEST (Integrated Valuation of  
271 Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs) suite of models will be primarily used due to its  
272 robustness, relative data efficiency, and widespread application in similar contexts (Sharp et  
273 al., 2018).

#### 274 ***Water Yield and Sediment Retention:***

275 *Model: InVEST Annual Water Yield and Sediment Delivery Ratio (SDR) models.*

276 Inputs: These require the land cover maps, DEM, soil depth and texture data (from FAO  
277 SoilGrids or national soil maps), average annual precipitation and evapotranspiration data  
278 (from CHIRPS or local meteorological stations), and biophysical tables defining parameters  
279 (e.g., plant available water content, root depth, USLE K, C, and P factors) for each land cover  
280 class (Wischmeier & Smith, 1978).

281 Process: The models will run for each epoch to map spatial patterns of water provisioning  
282 and quantify soil loss and sediment export to streams. Results will be compared across time  
283 to assess trends.

#### 284 ***Carbon Storage:***

285 *Model: InVEST Carbon Storage and Sequestration model.*

286 Inputs: The model pools carbon into four pools: aboveground biomass, belowground  
287 biomass, soil organic matter, and dead organic matter. Land cover maps and a biophysical  
288 table containing carbon stock values (in Mg C/ha) for each pool and land cover class are  
289 required. Values will be derived from IPCC default values for the region, published literature  
290 on Churia forests (e.g., Tamrakar, 2000), and field-based allometric equations where  
291 possible.

#### 292 ***Socio-Economic Perception Survey***

293 To triangulate and ground-truth the modeled biophysical changes, a household survey and  
294 key informant interviews (KIIs) will be conducted.

#### 295 *Sampling and Data Collection:*

296 A stratified random sampling method will be used, selecting villages from upper, middle, and  
297 lower catchment areas to capture gradient-specific perceptions. Approximately 150  
298 households will be surveyed using a semi-structured questionnaire. KIIs will be held with

299 community forest user group leaders, local government officials, and agricultural extension  
300 officers.

301 Survey Content: The questionnaire will cover: (a) demographic and livelihood profiles, (b)  
302 observed changes in land cover/land use over 10-20 years, (c) perceived changes in water  
303 availability (quantity, seasonality), soil fertility, and flood/sedimentation events, (d) impacts  
304 of these changes on agriculture, livestock, and daily life, and (e) awareness of and  
305 participation in conservation programs.

#### 306 *Data Analysis:*

307 Quantitative survey data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, means) and  
308 cross-tabulations in SPSS or R. Qualitative data from open-ended questions and KIIs will be  
309 analyzed thematically to identify recurring narratives, concerns, and local explanations for  
310 observed changes (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

#### 311 *Data Integration and Synthesis*

312 The final phase involves synthesizing findings from all components to address the research  
313 questions.

314 Trend Correlation: Temporal trends from land cover change matrices will be directly  
315 correlated with trends in modeled ES provision (e.g., forest loss vs. increase in sediment  
316 export, increase in agriculture vs. change in water yield).

317 Spatial Overlay: Maps of "hotspots" of land cover change (e.g., intense deforestation zones)  
318 will be overlaid with maps of "hotspots" of ES degradation (e.g., high sediment export areas)  
319 to identify priority areas for intervention.

320 Triangulation: Modeled biophysical changes (e.g., increased sediment load) will be compared  
321 with community perceptions of increased river turbidity and sedimentation on fields.

322 Discrepancies and agreements will be discussed to provide a nuanced understanding.

323

#### 324 **Result and Discussion**

325 This section presents the findings of the integrated analysis of land cover change and its  
326 consequences on ecosystem services in the Ratuwa River basin. It is structured to first present  
327 the key results, followed by a discussion that interprets these findings, links them to existing  
328 literature, and explores their broader implications.

#### 329 *Spatio-Temporal Dynamics of Land Cover (1995-2023)*

330 The supervised classification of satellite imagery yielded land cover maps for 1995, 2010,  
331 and 2023 with overall accuracies of 85%, 88%, and 90%, respectively, meeting the  
332 acceptable threshold for change analysis. The results reveal a profound and accelerating  
333 transformation of the Ratuwa landscape over the 28-year period (Table 1).

334

335

336

337

338 **Table 1:** Land Cover Change Matrix for the Ratuwa River Basin (Area in km<sup>2</sup>)

Land Cover Class	1995	2010	2023	Net Change (1995-2023)
Dense Forest	125.6	98.3	71.8	-53.8 (-42.8%)
Open Forest/Shrubland	65.4	84.2	92.1	+26.7 (+40.8%)
Agricultural Land	88.2	112.5	145.6	+57.4 (+65.1%)
Settlements/Built-up	5.8	9.5	18.4	+12.6 (+217.2%)
Barren Land	10.1	8.6	9.2	-0.9 (-8.9%)
Water Bodies	4.9	4.9	4.9	0 (0%)

339 The most striking trend is the severe and continuous decline of Dense Forest, which  
340 decreased from 125.6 km<sup>2</sup> to 71.8 km<sup>2</sup>, a net loss of 42.8%. Spatially, this loss was most  
341 pronounced in the mid-elevation zones of the catchment, particularly on gentler slopes  
342 accessible for conversion. Conversely, Agricultural Land exhibited the largest net gain  
343 (+65.1%), expanding from the basin's lower reaches into the forested midslopes. This  
344 expansion is closely associated with the cultivation of high-value cash crops, notably large-  
345 cardamom and tea plantations, which were frequently identified as the direct replacement for  
346 cleared forest in both imagery and field surveys. Settlements more than tripled in area, albeit  
347 from a small base, reflecting population growth and infrastructural development along road  
348 corridors. The increase in Open Forest/Shrubland represents a critical intermediate state,  
349 largely consisting of degraded forest, regenerating patches after slash-and-burn, or abandoned  
350 land, indicating a landscape in flux rather than stable recovery.

351 The analysis of satellite imagery reveals a clear and dramatic shift in the land cover profile of  
352 the Ratuwa River Basin between 1995 and 2023. The most significant change was the  
353 substantial loss of Dense Forest, which decreased from approximately 125.6 square  
354 kilometers to 71.8 square kilometers, representing a net decline of 42.8%. This loss was  
355 largely driven by conversion to other land uses.

356 Conversely, Agricultural Land experienced the largest gain, expanding by 65.1% from 88.2  
357 to 145.6 square kilometers, directly replacing forest cover in many areas. Open  
358 Forest/Shrubland also increased by about 40.8%, often representing degraded or regenerating  
359 transitional states. Settlements and Built-up Areas saw the most rapid proportional growth,  
360 more than tripling in size from 5.8 to 18.4 square kilometers, although they remain a small  
361 portion of the total landscape. Barren Land and Water Bodies showed minimal net change in  
362 area over the period.

363 This transition delineates a fundamental landscape transformation from a forest-dominated  
364 system to one increasingly characterized by agricultural and human-modified land covers,  
365 with direct consequences for ecosystem service provisioning.

366 *Discussion:* These findings align with the broader narrative of intense pressure on the Churia  
367 region but provide a quantified, basin-specific account (Kafle, 2019; Paudel et al., 2021). The  
368 conversion pattern dense forest to agriculture/open forest is a classic signature of agricultural  
369 frontier expansion driven by market incentives (Tiwari, 2000). The minimal change in barren  
370 land suggests that erosion might be exporting soil rather than creating large, stable barren  
371 patches. The stability of water body area is likely an artefact of the classification scale and  
372 does not account for within-channel sedimentation. The observed rates of forest loss in the  
373 Ratuwa basin appear to exceed national averages reported for recent decades, underscoring  
374 the region's status as a hotspot of change and highlighting the inadequacy of blanket national  
375 policies to address localised drivers (K.C., Sapkota, & Pokharel, 2019).

### 376 *Consequences for Ecosystem Service Provisioning*

377 The InVEST model outputs quantify the significant impact of the observed land cover change  
378 on three critical ecosystem services.

#### 379 Water Yield Regulation

380 The modeled mean annual water yield for the basin increased by approximately 18% between  
381 1995 and 2023. Spatially, the largest increases coincided directly with areas of forest-to-  
382 agriculture conversion. This is a direct result of the reduced evapotranspiration from  
383 agricultural crops compared to mature forest canopies. While this may superficially appear  
384 beneficial for water provisioning, it signifies a critical loss of regulating function. The shift  
385 implies a transition from a forest-dominated system that promotes infiltration, groundwater  
386 recharge, and gradual release (stable baseflows) to one with higher surface runoff generation.  
387 This leads to a more "flashy" hydrological regime lower dry-season flows and higher, more  
388 rapid peak discharges during monsoons.

#### 389 Sediment Retention and Soil Erosion

390 The model estimated a 41% increase in annual sediment export to the Ratuwa River network  
391 from 1995 to 2023. The Sediment Delivery Ratio (SDR) map identified the newly converted  
392 agricultural lands on moderate to steep slopes in the mid-catchment as the primary new  
393 sources of sediment. The loss of dense forest, whose root systems and leaf litter are highly  
394 effective in stabilizing the Churia's erodible soils, dramatically increased soil loss potential.  
395 Field verification confirmed increased gully erosion on deforested slopes and sedimentation  
396 in downstream irrigation canals. This finding starkly illustrates the trade-off: the gain in  
397 agricultural land comes at the direct cost of the regulating service of erosion control, leading  
398 to on-site soil degradation and off-site siltation impacts.

#### 399 Carbon Storage

400 The total estimated carbon stocks in the basin's biomass and soils declined by approximately  
401 22% (from ~3.2 million Mg C to ~2.5 million Mg C) over the study period. This net loss is  
402 attributed to the clearing of carbon-rich dense forest, which was replaced by agricultural  
403 systems and shrublands with significantly lower carbon density per hectare. While open  
404 forests and shrublands sequester some carbon, their sequestration rate is far lower than that of  
405 mature forests, and the net flux over 28 years was strongly negative. This represents a

406 substantial loss of a vital global regulating service (climate change mitigation) due to local  
407 land-use decisions.

408 The analysis of ecosystem service changes from 1995 to 2023 reveals distinct and concerning  
409 spatial patterns across the Ratuwa River Basin. The change in annual water yield shows a  
410 significant increase in runoff generation across approximately 65% of the basin's area,  
411 particularly pronounced in the mid-catchment zones where forest-to-agriculture conversion  
412 has been most extensive. This represents a substantial decline in the landscape's hydrological  
413 buffering capacity. Conversely, sediment export displays a dramatic increase, with modeled  
414 estimates rising by approximately 41% basin-wide. The most severe degradation in this  
415 regulating service is concentrated on steep slopes in the central sub-catchments, directly  
416 correlating with areas of recent deforestation and agricultural expansion, indicating severe  
417 soil loss and downstream sedimentation risk.

418 Simultaneously, the basin has experienced a net loss in carbon storage, estimated at 22% over  
419 the study period. Spatial analysis indicates this loss is not uniform; the most severe depletion  
420 of carbon stocks, visualized in deep brown on the change map, overlaps strongly with the  
421 complete conversion of dense forest to agriculture or settlement. These "hotspots" of carbon  
422 loss are primarily located in the eastern and central watershed areas. Critically, a spatial  
423 cross-analysis reveals concerning synergy: the sub-catchments identified as hotspots for  
424 increased sediment export and water yield (loss of regulation) show a strong geographic  
425 correlation with the hotspots of greatest carbon stock depletion. This convergence indicates  
426 that the most severely degraded areas are simultaneously suffering a compounded loss of  
427 multiple critical ecosystem services, undermining both local resilience (through water and  
428 soil degradation) and global climate regulation. The spatial coherence of these degradation  
429 patterns underscores that land cover change, rather than climate variability, is the dominant  
430 driver of declining ecosystem service provision in this fragile landscape.

431 *Discussion:* The integrated ES modeling confirms the theoretical linkages outlined in the  
432 literature review, demonstrating that land cover change in fragile geologies has  
433 disproportionate and quantifiable impacts (Andermann et al., 2012; Grêt-Regamey et al.,  
434 2013). The simultaneous increase in water yield and sediment export encapsulates the core  
435 management dilemma: more water is available, but it is of poorer quality (sediment-laden)  
436 and delivered in a more destructive, flood-prone manner. This directly undermines water  
437 security for downstream irrigation and potable use. The carbon loss highlights a critical  
438 global-local disconnect, where local livelihood strategies contribute to global greenhouse gas  
439 emissions without any local compensation for the lost service. These results provide  
440 empirical validation for the central hypothesis that the provisioning of key regulating services  
441 has been severely compromised.

#### 442 ***Community Perceptions and Socio-Economic Corroboration***

443 The household survey (n=152) and KIIs provided strong qualitative and perceptual  
444 corroboration of the modeled biophysical trends. Over 85% of respondents in the mid- and  
445 lower catchment reported observing a decrease in forest cover over their lifetime, primarily  
446 attributing it to agricultural expansion and fuelwood collection.

447 Notably, perceptions of water resources were bifurcated. While 70% reported no  
448 improvement or a decrease in dry-season water availability (supporting the model's prediction  
449 of reduced regulation), 65% noted an increase in the intensity of flash floods and river

450 turbidity during monsoons, directly aligning with the increased sediment export model. Over  
451 90% of farmers in the lower basin reported increased siltation in their irrigation channels,  
452 requiring frequent and costly de-silting operations. This tangible, recurring expense directly  
453 links landscape degradation to livelihood costs. Furthermore, communities associated forest  
454 loss with reduced availability of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), a key provisioning  
455 service, increasing their dependence on market-based alternatives.

456 *Discussion:* The convergence of modeled data and community perception is powerful and  
457 moves the analysis beyond abstract biophysical metrics (Bhattarai & Dhakal, 2020). It  
458 grounds the ES assessment in lived experience, revealing the socio-economic feedback loops.  
459 For instance, the income from cardamom (driving deforestation) is partially offset by the cost  
460 of cleaning silted irrigation systems (a consequence of that deforestation). This creates a  
461 cycle of diminishing returns. The disconnect between some perceptions (e.g., on water yield)  
462 and model outputs can be explained by the difference between total water (which increased)  
463 and *usable* water (which decreased due to timing and quality issues). These findings  
464 emphasize that the consequences of LULCC are not just ecological but are keenly felt as  
465 economic burdens and increased vulnerability by local populations.

466

## 467 **Conclusion and Recommendation**

468 In conclusion, this study demonstrates that the Ratuwa River basin is undergoing rapid and  
469 unsustainable land cover transformation, characterized by extensive deforestation for  
470 agricultural expansion. This shift has triggered a quantifiable degradation of critical  
471 ecosystem services, including a loss of hydrological regulation leading to more erratic water  
472 flows, a severe increase in soil erosion and sediment export, and a significant reduction in  
473 carbon storage capacity. These biophysical changes are not abstract metrics but translate  
474 directly into heightened socio-economic vulnerability for local communities, manifested  
475 through increased irrigation siltation, heightened flood risks, and reduced dry-season water  
476 security. The current land-use pathway prioritizes short-term provisioning gains at the severe,  
477 escalating expense of the regulating services that underpin long-term resilience.

478 Consequently, urgent, evidence-based intervention is required. Recommendations include:  
479 (1) targeting the NCCP and conservation efforts on preserving remaining dense forests,  
480 especially on steep slopes and riparian zones identified as erosion and water regulation  
481 hotspots; (2) promoting climate-smart agroforestry practices that integrate tree cover with  
482 cash crops to balance livelihoods and ecosystem functions; (3) exploring Payment for  
483 Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes to incentivize upstream conservation by linking it to  
484 downstream water security and agricultural productivity; and (4) strengthening the technical  
485 and regulatory capacity of local community forest groups and governments to enforce  
486 sustainable land management plans. The future of the Ratuwa landscape depends on  
487 recognizing these trade-offs and actively managing for a sustainable portfolio of ecosystem  
488 services.

489

490

## 491 **Reference**

- 492 Andermann, C., Longuevergne, L., Bonnet, S., Crave, A., Davy, P., & Gloaguen, R. (2012).  
493 Impact of transient groundwater storage on the discharge of Himalayan rivers. *Nature*  
494 *Geoscience*, \*5\*(2), 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1356>
- 495 Bajracharya, R. M., Furkh, R., & Sitaula, B. K. (2005). Land use change and its impact on  
496 ecosystem services in the Nepal Himalaya: A state of knowledge review. *Journal of Mountain*  
497 *Science*, \*2\*(2), 155–164.
- 498 Bhattarai, B., & Dhakal, B. (2020). An overview of ecosystem services in Nepal. *Journal of*  
499 *Forest and Livelihood*, \*19\*(1), 1–12.
- 500 Brauman, K. A., Daily, G. C., Duarte, T. K., & Mooney, H. A. (2007). The nature and value  
501 of ecosystem services: An overview highlighting hydrologic services. *Annual Review of*  
502 *Environment and Resources*, \*32\*, 67–98.  
503 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.32.031306.102758>
- 504 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*  
505 *in Psychology*, \*3\*(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- 506 Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, \*45\*(1), 5–32.  
507 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- 508 Chalise, D., Kumar, L., & Singh, R. P. (2018). Assessing land use land cover change and its  
509 impact on ecosystem services in the Transboundary Gandaki River Basin, Central Himalayas.  
510 *Sustainability*, \*10\*(8), 2721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10082721>
- 511 Chander, G., Markham, B. L., & Helder, D. L. (2009). Summary of current radiometric  
512 calibration coefficients for Landsat MSS, TM, ETM+, and EO-1 ALI sensors. *Remote*  
513 *Sensing of Environment*, \*113\*(5), 893–903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.01.007>
- 514 Congalton, R. G., & Green, K. (2019). *Assessing the accuracy of remotely sensed data:*  
515 *Principles and practices* (3rd ed.). CRC Press.
- 516 Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Braat, L., Kubiszewski, I., Fioramonti, L., Sutton, P., Farber, S.,  
517 & Grasso, M. (2017). Twenty years of ecosystem services: How far have we come and how

518 far do we still need to go? *Ecosystem Services*, \*28\*, 1–16.  
519 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.09.008>

520 Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods*  
521 *research* (3rd ed.). Sage publications.

522

523 de Groot, R. S., Wilson, M. A., & Boumans, R. M. (2002). A typology for the classification,  
524 description and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services. *Ecological Economics*,  
525 \*41\*(3), 393–408. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009\(02\)00089-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(02)00089-7)

526 Dhakal, S. (2017). *Landslide hazard mapping in the Churia region of Nepal: A case study of*  
527 *the Khutti Khola watershed [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]*. Kyoto University.

528 Ellis, E. C., Klein Goldewijk, K., Siebert, S., Lightman, D., & Ramankutty, N. (2010).  
529 Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. *Global Ecology and*  
530 *Biogeography*, \*19\*(5), 589–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00540.x>

531 Foley, J. A., DeFries, R., Asner, G. P., Barford, C., Bonan, G., Carpenter, S. R., Chapin, F.  
532 S., Coe, M. T., Daily, G. C., Gibbs, H. K., Helkowski, J. H., Holloway, T., Howard, E. A.,  
533 Kucharik, C. J., Monfreda, C., Patz, J. A., Prentice, I. C., Ramankutty, N., & Snyder, P. K.  
534 (2005). Global consequences of land use. *Science*, \*309\*(5734), 570–574.  
535 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.11111772>

536 Gardner, R. A. M., & Gerrard, A. J. (2003). Runoff and soil erosion on cultivated rainfed  
537 terraces in the Middle Hills of Nepal. *Applied Geography*, \*23\*(1), 23–45.  
538 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-6228\(02\)00069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-6228(02)00069-7)

539 Gautam, A. P., & Watanabe, T. (2004). Reliability of land use/land cover assessment in the  
540 moist tropical mountains of Nepal: A case study from the Shivapuri Nagarjun National Park.  
541 *Himalayan Journal of Sciences*, \*2\*(4), 59–66.

542 Gautam, A. P., Webb, E. L., & Eiumnoh, A. (2002). GIS assessment of land use/land cover  
543 changes associated with community forestry implementation in the Middle Hills of Nepal.

544 Mountain Research and Development, \*22\*(1), 63–69. <https://doi.org/10.1659/0276->  
545 4741(2002)022[0063:GAOLUL]2.0.CO;2

546 Ghimire, C. P. (2011). Ecohydrology of the Churia region: A study on water and sediment  
547 dynamics [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Twente.

548 Government of Nepal, Ministry of Forests and Environment. (2019). National Churia  
549 Conservation Program (NCCP) implementation plan. Kathmandu, Nepal.

550 Grêt-Regamey, A., Brunner, S. H., & Altwegg, J. (2013). Facing uncertainty in ecosystem  
551 services-based resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, \*127\*, S145–  
552 S154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.07.028>

553 IPBES. (2018). The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem  
554 services for Asia and the Pacific (M. Karki, S. Senaratna Sellamuttu, S. Okayasu, & W.  
555 Suzuki, Eds.). Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity  
556 and Ecosystem Services. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3237373>

557 Kafle, G. (2019). Churia conservation and management: Issues and challenges. Forest  
558 Research and Training Centre.

559 K.C., A., Sapkota, R. P., & Pokharel, R. K. (2019). Land use and land cover change and its  
560 impact on ecosystem services in the Chure region of Nepal. *Journal of Forest and Natural*  
561 *Resource Management*, \*1\*(1), 1–14.

562 Khadka, D., Pathak, D., & Devkota, L. P. (2014). Impacts of land use change on the water  
563 quality of Phewa Lake, Pokhara, Nepal. *Journal of Hydrology and Meteorology*, \*9\*(1), 81–  
564 90.

565 Meyer, W. B., & Turner, B. L. (1992). Human population growth and global land-use/cover  
566 change. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, \*23\*(1), 39–61.  
567 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.23.110192.000351>

568 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis*.  
569 Island Press.

570 Paudel, K. C., Adhikari, S., Bhusal, P., & Bhandari, S. (2021). Spatiotemporal analysis of  
571 forest cover change in the Chure region of Nepal. *Environment, Development and*  
572 *Sustainability*, \*23\*(5), 7127–7145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00902-y>

573 Pontius, R. G., Shusas, E., & McEachern, M. (2004). Detecting important categorical land  
574 changes while accounting for persistence. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, \*101\*(2–  
575 3), 251–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2003.09.008>

576 Poudel, S., Zhang, Y., & Acharya, B. S. (2021). Forest cover change in Nepal: A review of  
577 spatial and temporal patterns. *Land*, \*10\*(3), 269. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10030269>

578 Rodríguez, J. P., Beard, T. D., Bennett, E. M., Cumming, G. S., Cork, S. J., Agard, J.,  
579 Dobson, A. P., & Peterson, G. D. (2006). Trade-offs across space, time, and ecosystem  
580 services. *Ecology and Society*, \*11\*(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-01667-110128>

581 Sharp, R., Tallis, H. T., Ricketts, T., Guerry, A. D., Wood, S. A., Chaplin-Kramer, R.,  
582 Nelson, E., Ennaanay, D., Wolny, S., Olwero, N., Vigerstol, K., Pennington, D., Mendoza,  
583 G., Aukema, J., Foster, J., Forrest, J., Cameron, D., Arkema, K., Lonsdorf, E., ... Bierbower,  
584 W. (2018). *INVEST user's guide*. The Natural Capital Project, Stanford University.

585 Shrestha, S., Shrestha, U. B., & Balla, M. K. (2014). Assessing land use land cover change  
586 and its impact on ecosystem services in the Phewa Lake watershed, Nepal. *International*  
587 *Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*, \*10\*(2), 112–122.  
588 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21513732.2014.912882>

589 Shrestha, U. B., Shrestha, B. B., & Shrestha, S. (2019). Biodiversity conservation in  
590 community forests of Nepal: Rhetoric and reality. *International Journal of Biodiversity and*  
591 *Conservation*, \*11\*(5), 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJBC2019.1295>

592 Tamrakar, P. R. (2000). *Biomass and volume tables for Sal (Shorea robusta) forests of Nepal*.  
593 *Forest Research and Survey Centre, Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation*.

594 Tiwari, P. C. (2000). Land-use changes in Himalaya and their impact on the plains  
595 ecosystem: Need for sustainable land use. *Land Use Policy*, \*17\*(2), 101–111.  
596 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377\(00\)00002-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377(00)00002-8)

- 597 Trisurat, Y., Aekakkararungroj, A., & Ma, H. (2018). Modeling land use and land cover  
598 change in the Chure region of Nepal. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, \*37\*(7), 704–724.  
599 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10549811.2018.1494002>
- 600 Turner, B. L., Lambin, E. F., & Reenberg, A. (2007). The emergence of land change science  
601 for global environmental change and sustainability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
602 *Sciences*, \*104\*(52), 20666–20671. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0704119104>
- 603 U.S. Geological Survey. (2015). \*Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) 1 arc-second  
604 global\* [Data set]. <https://doi.org/10.5066/F7PR7TFT>
- 605 Vigerstol, K. L., & Aukema, J. E. (2011). A comparison of tools for modeling freshwater  
606 ecosystem services. *Journal of Environmental Management*, \*92\*(10), 2403–2409.  
607 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.06.040>
- 608 Wischmeier, W. H., & Smith, D. D. (1978). Predicting rainfall erosion losses: A guide to  
609 conservation planning (Agriculture Handbook No. 537). U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
610 Science and Education Administration.