

Assessing the Impact of Landscape Development on Ecosystem Services Value in Tropical Watershed

Y. S. Foo¹, M. Hashim

Institute of Geospatial Science and Technology (INSTeG), Faculty of Geoinformation and Real Estate, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310, Johor Bahru, Malaysia.

Email: yensin88@gmail.com.my

Abstract. As development increases with demand, more forest lands are replaced with cropland, commercial plantation, and infrastructures for being able to accommodate the excessive growth in world's population. Environments were destroyed without considering their values in sustaining life on Earth. This phenomenon is still an ongoing scenario in most of the developing countries in the tropical region including Malaysia. Such unrestricted conversion may cause food or water crisis along with irreparable consequences to local and regional climate as the natural ecosystem is not only the main resources generator but also the climate stabilizer. Contrary to this, a study was conducted in Pahang Watershed, the largest watershed in Peninsular Malaysia with forest as the dominant land cover, to investigate the effect of landscape development on the ecosystem in terms of the erosion and ecosystem service value. Results of soil loss based on USLE indicated a direct relationship between development and total soil loss where total annual soil loss in year 2005 and 2010 showed a significant increase compare to year 2000. Meanwhile, developed and agricultural lands were discovered to be the main contributor whereas forest land produce the least soil loss (<10ton/ha/yr). Apart from this, this study also reports a degrading trend in the overall ecological service value and goods (ESVG). Although oil palm had become the main commercial plantation in current years, the commercial profit brought by oil palm still insufficient to cover losses referring to overall estimated ESGV due to the forest clearance and soil degradation. In addition, for a destroyed ecosystem to be equilibrium again requires years. Therefore, ESGV of the tropical forest are expected to increase continuously in future which mean that the roles of the forest in conserving the environment stabilization and sustainability of life are getting more critical.

1. Introduction

Ecosystem function in providing food and services is the utmost key element to sustain life and motivate the entire operating system of earth itself [1]. Abiotic, consumer, producer and decomposer are the main components forming the ecosystem that linked to each other to maintain the equilibrium state of the whole ecosystem. However, continuous development conducted globally behalf of human civilization had become the biggest threat to nature conservation [2]. Landscape alteration due to development had substantially reduce total of forest land, largest producer and decomposer of the

¹ To whom any correspondence should be addressed.



earth ecosystem globally. Thus, land development which altered the natural surface feature and produce excessive release of greenhouse gases is believed to be the root causing accelerate global warming since the rise of industrial revolution at late 1980's [16].

Applicable to watershed, ecosystem services provisions are highly dependent on the the land use, topography and local climate. Therefore, for country enrich with natural and water resources like Malaysia, proper land use and development management is essential to maximize the function of watershed [3][14]. Unfortunately, prompt development responding to industrial revolution in last few decades had caused land degradation resulting from deforestation and illegal logging even in reserved forest [12][13][17][18]. Evidence on the impact of landscape development such as drastic increase in annual soil loss, landslide and flood hazard in recent year. Though, most of the citizen are still lacking awareness regarding the needs in conserving the natural environment since it is difficult for them also the government policy maker in visualizing the exact value of the ecosystem and how to allocate public spending on conservation, prevention or restoration initiative [19]. In fact, the impacts of soil erosion affects not only food and water security but also local climate due to release of carbonium ions into the air during the erosion process [4]. In present paper, the destruction or degradation caused to the ecosystem due to landscape development was studied through the implementation of ecosystem services values to provide clearer view on the value and importance of ecosystem services to human well-being.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

Pahang watershed with a 440km main stream length is the largest watershed located at N2°48'45" - 3°40'24, E101°16'31" - 103°29'34 Peninsular Malaysia (Fig.1). Over the watershed, 2/3 of the surface are dominated by tropical rainforest. Since 1974, annual mean rainfall intensity received is at 2170mm. Presently, there are two main reservoir which are the Bera and Chini lake reservoir. Due to the large portion of tropical rainforest over the state, tropical timber trading had become the main economic pillar of the state throughout the decades.



Figure 1: Pahang Watershed

2.2. Method

The methods implemented in present study include: (i) Observation on landscape development from 2000 to 2010 ; (ii) analysis on impact of landscape development to total annual soil loss produced

from 2000 to 2010; (iii) Evaluate the impact of landscape development to ecosystem value using ESVG (ecology service value and good) estimation.

2.2.1. Analysis of landscape development to total annual soil loss produced from 2000 to 2010

Land use mapping is performed based on MODIS 16-day 250m data for 2000, 2005 and 2010 using maximum likelihood technique (training sample from Peninsular Malaysia landuse map). To estimate annual soil loss over the watershed, remote sensing data and ancillary data are used as input in Universal Soil Loss Equation, USLE by MORGAN [9][20],

$$A=R.K.LS.C \quad (1)$$

Where A is the annual soil loss (ton/yr), R is the rainfall erosivity factor, K is the soil erodibility factor, LS is the slope-length factor, C is the crop management factor and P is the erosion control factor. Hence, equation 1 is implemented in MODIS NDVI data to map the soil loss pattern in 2000, 2005 and 2010. Meanwhile, ndvi from MODIS product data is transform into C-factor, and LS factor is generated from ASTERDEM using GIS application technique [3][15]. For R factor and K factor applied is provided by Department of Drainage and Irrigation Malaysia [10]. Thus, the soil loss estimated is used as the source in assessing the landscape risk resulted form landscape development.

2.2.2. Evaluate the impact of landscape development to ecosystem value using ESVG (ecology service value and good) estimation from 2000 to 2010

Environment conservation is crucial in slowing down speed of the global warming. But, the uncertainty and invisible commercial market of the ecosystem function and services bring difficulties to policy maker in allocating investment in protecting the environment. So, absolute ecosystem services values are derived as ecological service values and goods for a given area [1][19]. Guideline based on paper by FAO and TEEB on ESVG is used in present study [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 21]. Out of 17 indicators, 11 indicators directly linked to landscape feature are adopted as shown in table 2.

3. Results and Analysis

From 2000 to 2010, various development had been conducted in Pahang Watershed where there is increase in the commercial plantation and built-up area coverage as shows in Table 1. For development purpose, forest is being replace by other plantation that have higher commercial values such as oil palm and rubber. Or else, construction to broaden residential and industrial area which produce more visible economic income to the country. But, in term of gaining profit, the country is actually getting negative profit. It is so since the environment losses due to landscape development is being ignored. Simultaneous to development, occurrence of erosion and the amount of soil loss had been increased excessively through the years from 3mil ton/yr in 2000 to 12mil ton/yr in 2010. Among the land use features, forest produced least amount of soil loss (<10ton/ha/yr) while oil palm and rubber landscape are highly potential in producing large amount of soil loss depending on the state of maturity of the plantation.

Table 1: Land Use Changes from 2000 to 2010

General Land use	2000	2005	changes	2010	changes
	Area(ha)	Area(ha)		Area(ha)	
Forest	2505801	2298612	-207189	2235976	-62636
Secondary Forest	55864	105177	49313	100885	-4292
Oil Palm	230365	392341	161976	425381	33040
Rubber	22776	27199	4423	47386	20187
Built-Up Area	15971	9019	-6952	18128	9109
Wetland	2339	811	-1528	5224	4413

Mix cultivation	35	68	32	302	235
Total (Area)	2833151	2833227		2833281	
Annual soil loss(ton/yr)	2,993,061	2,478,559		14,211,170	

Estimated ESGV for each landscape features is shown in Table 2. Amongst the features, the ESGV for oil palm is the highest that is 1202 USD/ha/yr followed by forest and secondary forest. Sum of the features ESGV for each year show increment in overall ESGV from 2000 to 2010. Conversely, overall ESGV began to show losses for about 26mil USD/yr in 2010 as in Table 3 when environment element, soil loss is included. On this study, ESGV estimated are partially represent the ecosystem services value since only 11 indicator used. Consequently, further implementation of ESGV using full indicators will indicate much higher ESGV assets. Moreover, most of the ecological services values adopted is being generalized to global scale and valuing the ecosystem services at local scale may be more comprehensive for precise ESGV mapping and provide real environmental benefits to policy maker to prioritize environment conservation project.

Table 2: Ecology Service Values and Good in Watershed for 2000, 2005 and 2010

Ecology Service Values And Goods												
Landscape Features	Ecological Services						Ecological Goods					
	# water supply	Erosion Control #	# Waste Treatment	* Carbon Stock	* Carbon Sequestration	Recreation #	Cultural and Artistic info #	Food Production #	Raw Materials #	Medical Resources *	Ornamental Resources *	Total Rate (USD/ha)
tropical primary forest	8	245		8	8	112	2	108.24	330	50	250	1121.4
tropical secondary forest	8	245		6	6	112		32	330		250	989
oilpalms	2								1200			1202
rubber	2								77			79
wetland		96.7						204				300.71
Built-up area												0
Mix cultivation								54				54
soil loss due to erosion(ton / year)												
6												

#ESVG based on Costanza; *ESVG based on FAO, ∞ based on TEEB valuation database [1][11][5]

Table 3: ESGV for Pahang Watershed in 2000, 2005 and 2010

Landscape Features	Total Cost (USD/yr)		
	2000	2005	2010
tropical primary forest	2809603939	2577295662	2507065216
tropical secondary forest	55249480.29	104020282.5	99775067.2
oilpalms	276899247.9	471594115.6	511307642.3
rubber	1799281.565	2148721.563	3743459.295
wetland	703238.8113	243869.3986	1570858.792
Built-up area			
Mix cultivation	1916.04096	3646.13994	16316.83062
soil loss due to erosion(ton / year)			
17,958,366 14,871,354 85,267,020			
Total ecology Services and Goods (USD/yr)	3126,298,738	3140,434,943	3114,951,858

4. Conclusion

Replacement of forest with other land features leaving earth surface less protected thus causing more soil detachment. From 2000 and 2010, reduction in overall forest cover due to landscape development had worsen the erosion occurred where the annual soil loss had achieved 12mil ton/yr in 2010 compare to 3mil ton/yr in 2000. The accelerate increase in soil loss is linked with the landscape development that conducted in the watershed. Among all, forest produced least soil loss which is less than 10ton/ha/yr. Although oil palm has the highest commercial values compare to others in present study, the commercial profit brought by oil palm still insufficient to cover losses referring to overall estimated ESGV due to the forest clearance and soil degradation. However, regional or local ecosystem services valuation should be carry out to provided more precise and accurate values for every 17 parameter used in order to draft and practice a better environment conservation, preservation and restoration policy. Lastly, well-planned landscape development is essential to minimise the destruction towards the natural environment to ensure well-being of human itself and a sustainable living environment in the future.

5. Acknowledgement

Utmost appreciation to Universiti Teknologi Malaysia in providing the author opportunity in doing research as a master candidate with scholarships. Also deeply thank to Ministry of Higher Education for the MyMaster scholarship offered for my master study. Last but no least, the author would like to acknowledge NASA, U.S. Geological Survey, Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and Ecosystem Services Partnership for their kindness in data sharing which help the author in completing this study.

References

- [1] Robert Costanza, Ralph d'Arge, Rudolf de Groot, Stephen Farberk, Monica Grasso, Bruce Hannon, Karin Limburg, Shahid Naem, Robert V. O'Neill, Jose Paruelo, Robert G. Raskin, Paul Suttonk & Marjan van den Belt, 15th May 1997. "The Value of World's Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital," *NATURE*, vol. 387, pp. 253-260,
- [2] Alexander P. E. van Oudenhovn and Rudolf S. de Groot (2013): Trade-offs and Synergies between Biodiversity Conversion, Land Use Changes and Ecosystem Services, *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services and Management*, 9:2, 87-89,
- [3] I. Z. Gitaz, K. Douros, C. Minakou, G. N. Silleos and C. G. Karydas, 2009. "Multi-Temporal Soil Erosion Risk Assessment in N. Chalkidiki using A Modified Usle Raster Model", *EARSeL eProceedings 8, 2009*,
- [4] Van Oost et al., (2007). "The Impact of Agricultural Soil Erosion on the Global Carbon Cycle". p. 626,
- [5] Van der Ploeg, S. and R.S. de Groot (2010) The TEEB Valuation Database – a searchable database of 1310 estimates of monetary values of ecosystem services. Foundation for Sustainable Development, Wageningen, the Netherlands,
- [6] Van der Ploeg, S., R.S. De Groot and Y. Wang (2010) The TEEB Valuation Database: overview of structure, data and results. Foundation for Sustainable Development, Wageningen, the Netherlands,
- [7] De Groot, R.S., P. Kumar, S. van der Ploeg and P. Sukhdev (2010) Estimates of monetary values of ecosystem services. Appendix 3 in: Kumar, P. (editor) (2010). *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Ecological and Economic Foundations*. ISBN 9781849712125, Earthscan, London, UK,
- [8] De Groot, R.S., et al. Integrating the ecological and economic dimensions in biodiversity and

- ecosystem service valuation. In: *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Ecological and Economic Foundations*. Edited by Pushpam Kumar. Earthscan, London and Washington. Pp. 9-40 (2010),
- [9] R.P.C. Morgan, 1994. Estimating regional variations in soil erosion hazards in Peninsular Malaysia, *Malaya Nature Journal* 28, 94-106.
- [10] Ministry Of Natural Resources and Environment Department Of. Irrigation and Drainag Malaysia, 2010. Guideline for Erosion and Sediment Control in Malaysia. (2010),
- [11] M. Hashim, M. Margany, T. Okuda, S. Numata, 2010. "Risk Assessment Mapping of Landscape Development Based on Ecological Service and Goods in Malaysia Lowland Tropical Rainforest," *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering*, ISSN 1934-8932, USA. vol. 4, no.2.,
- [12] Roslan Zainal Abidin and K.H. Tew, (1999). *Compilation of Presented Research Papers on Soil Erosion Issues in Malaysia Second Edition*. Malaysia : VT Soil Erosion Research & Consultancy. 983-40126-0-8,
- [13] Radford, Tim. Soil erosion as big a problem as global warming, say scientists. *The Guardian*. [Online] February 14, 2004. [Cited: December 11, 2011.] <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.,
- [14] Uta schirpke, Georg Leitinger, Erich Tasser, Markus Schermer, Melanie Steinbacher and Ulrike Tappeiner (2013): Multiple ecosystem services of a changing Alpine lanscape landscape: past, present and future, *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services and Management*, 9:2, 123-135,
- [15] K. J. Manoj and C. K. Umesh., 2000."Estimation of soil erosion and sediment yield using GIS" *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, vol. 45:5, 771-786,
- [16] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007. *IPCC Fourth Assessment Report*,
- [17] H.W. Dalzell, A. J. Biddlestone, K. R., Gray, K. Thurairajan, (2007). *Soil Management:Compost Production and Use in Tropical and Subtropical Environtments*. India : Daya Publishing House. 81-7035-504-4.,
- [18] R. Lal, (1994). *Soil Erosion Research Method Second Edition*. USA : St.Lucie Press. 1-84015-09-3,
- [19] *Ecosystem Valuation "The Big Picture"*, www.ecosystemvaluation.org/big_picture, 17/6/2013.
- [20] Y. J. Gobena, (2003). *Soil Erosion Assessment Using Remotely Sensed Data and Ancillary Data in the Desert of Tabernas, Southeast Spain*. ITC. Netherlands.,
- [21] C. Bann, *The economic valuation of tropical land use option: A manual for researchers*, available online at: <http://www.eepsea.org/publications/specialp2/ACF30F.html>, (1998)