

MODELLING THE IMPACTS OF LAND-USE AND CLIMATE CHANGE IN  
SKUDAI RIVER WATERSHED

AL-AMIN DANLADI BELLO

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MARCH 2018

I dedicated this work to

Late Dr. Noor Baharim bin Hashim

and

Late Danladi Bello Guga

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and special thanks to my supervisors Dr. Mohd Ridza Mohd Haniffah for his support, guidance, encouragement and patience throughout this research period. Without his untiring guidance, support, and valuable advice during the research and writing, this thesis would have not been completed. Special thanks to Dr. Ilya Khairanis Othman for her valuable suggestion as a cosupervisor, I appreciate your assistance.

My appreciation goes to the Ass. Prof. Dr. Shamsuddin Shahid for attending to my various questioning and many advices from him during my research. I am very grateful to my research colleagues, especially Maznah binti Ismail, Khairul Mohd annuar and many others. Same goes to my friends and brothers which need not to be mentioned.

Many thanks to the following agencies; Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID), Department of Environment (DOE), Malaysia Meteorological Department (MMD), and Indah Water Konsotium (IWK) for providing the data that makes this study become feasible.

Finally, my special thanks to my beloved parents, brothers and sisters for their unending love, sacrifice, encouragement and support. The same goes to my wife Hauwau Idris Salis for her unreserved support, love, and patience towards the success of this thesis.

## ABSTRACT

Predicting the impact of land-use, climate change and Best Management Practices (BMPs) on a watershed is imperative for effective management of aquatic ecosystems, floods, pollutant control and maintenance of water quality standard in a tropical climate. Based on the prediction, unique information can be derived that is critical to the watershed management under dynamic environmental conditions. The study seeks to evaluate how land-use and climate change influences the hydrology, sediments, and water quality of an urbanized tropical watershed in which the land-use is controlled by urban development as observed from historical and projected land covers. Therefore, the response of a tropical watershed and its river system under climate and land-use changes were evaluated using Skudai River watershed as a case study. Seven land-use scenarios from the year 1989 to 2039 were developed using remote sensing techniques, and nine projected climate change scenarios were derived using dynamically downscaled model from the based projection under representative concentration pathways (RCPs) scenarios. These scenarios were integrated into the Hydrological Simulation Program FORTRAN (HSPF) model to determine the impact of land-use, climate change, and pollutants control via best management practices in a tropical watershed system. The model was calibrated and validated from 2002 to 2014, and the performance coefficients showed a good correlation between simulated and observed streamflow, water temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ), nitrate nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ), and orthophosphate ( $\text{PO}_4$ ) concentrations. The output of the validated model under land-use changes showed that the hydrological water balance of the watershed changes with total runoff as the primary source of water loss. For streamflows and in-stream concentrations ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ , and  $\text{PO}_4$ ), as the streamflow increases,  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  and  $\text{PO}_4$  concentrations increase while  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  concentration showed low response as compared to the other two concentrations. As urban development increased from 18.2% to 49.2%, nutrient influx such as total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) loads increased from 3080 to 4560 kg/yr and from 130 to 270 kg/yr, respectively. Furthermore, TN to TP ratio changed from 8.3:1 to 7:1, an indication that the rivers are receiving excess nutrients flows which might result in eutrophication at the downstream of the watershed. The amount of sediment load produced in the watershed decreased by approximately 17.8% as a result of the changes in land-use derived from urban development. Further analysis of the results showed that climate change with high rainfall and increase in air temperature do not affect DO concentration and water temperature in comparison to climate change with low rainfall. Implementation of multiple detention pond BMPs in identified Critical Source Areas (CSAs) reduced pollutant loads by 14% to 27% as compared to watershed without any BMPs, independent of climate and land-use changes. Analysis of BMPs using existing and future land-use is very important to ensure their effectiveness to control and maintain water quality. This study provides a basis to develop water resource management in an urban watershed and be resilient to land-use and climate changes.

## ABSTRAK

Ramalan impak guna tanah, perubahan iklim dan Amalan Pengurusan Terbaik (BMPs) di kawasan tadahan air adalah penting untuk pengurusan ekosistem akuatik, kawalan pencemaran dan penyenggaraan kualiti air dalam iklim tropika. Berdasarkan ramalan tersebut, maklumat unik boleh diperolehi untuk pengurusan tadahan air di bawah keadaan persekitaran dinamik. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menilai bagaimana penggunaan tanah dan perubahan iklim mempengaruhi hidrologi, sedimen, dan kualiti air di kawasan tadahan air tropika bandar di mana penggunaan tanah dikawal oleh pembangunan bandar seperti yang diperhatikan dari sejarah guna tanah dan guna tanah terunjur. Oleh itu, tindak balas dari kawasan tadahan tropika dan sistem sungai di bawah perubahan iklim serta penggunaan tanah dinilai menggunakan kawasan tadahan air Sungai Skudai sebagai kajian kes. Tujuh senario guna tanah dari tahun 1989 hingga 2039 telah dibangunkan dengan menggunakan teknik penginderaan jarak jauh, dan sembilan senario perubahan iklim terunjur diperolehi menggunakan model skala turun dinamik daripada unjuran asas senario di bawah *representative concentration pathways* (RCPs). Senario ini telah diintegrasikan ke dalam model Program Simulasi Hidrologi FORTRAN (HSPF) untuk menentukan kesan guna tanah, perubahan iklim, dan kawalan pencemaran melalui amalan pengurusan terbaik dalam sistem tadahan air tropika. Model ini telah ditentukan dan disahkan dari tahun 2002 hingga 2014, dan pekali prestasi menunjukkan korelasi yang baik antara keputusan simulasi dengan data cerapan untuk kadar alir sungai, oksigen terlarut (DO), kehendak oksigen biokimia (BOD), ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ), nitrat nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ), dan kepekatan *orthophosphate* ( $\text{PO}_4$ ). Hasil analisis daripada model yang telah disahkan di bawah perubahan penggunaan tanah menunjukkan bahawa perubahanimbangan air hidrologi dengan sumber utama kehilangan air adalah daripada air larian. Untuk aliran sungai dan kepekatan kadar alir ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ,  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  dan  $\text{PO}_4$ ), kepekatan  $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$  dan  $\text{PO}_4$  meningkat manakala kepekatan  $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$  menunjukkan tindak balas yang rendah berbanding dua kepekatan yang lain. Oleh kerana pembangunan bandar meningkat daripada 18.2% kepada 49.2%, jumlah nutrien seperti jumlah nitrogen (TN) dan jumlah fosforus (TP) meningkat daripada 3080 kepada 4560 kg setahun dan daripada 130 kepada 270 kg setahun. Tambahan pula, nisbah TN ke TP berubah dari 8.3:1 hingga 7:1, menunjukkan bahawa sungai-sungai menerima aliran nutrien yang berlebihan yang boleh mengakibatkan proses eutrofikasi di kawasan hilir tadahan air. Jumlah beban enapan yang dihasilkan di kawasan tadahan air menurun sebanyak 17.8% akibat perubahan penggunaan tanah yang diperolehi daripada pembangunan bandar. Analisis lanjutan menunjukkan perubahan iklim yang meningkatkan keamatan hujan dan suhu udara tidak memberi kesan kepada kepekatan DO dan suhu air apabila dibandingkan dengan perubahan iklim dengan hujan yang berkeamatan rendah. Implementasi kolam penahan air untuk tujuan BMPs di kawasan sumber kritikal (CSAs) telah mengurangkan beban bahan cemar daripada 14% kepada 27% berbanding kawasan tadahan air tanpa BMPs, tanpa perubahan iklim dan perubahan guna tanah. Analisis BMPs menggunakan guna tanah sedia ada dan guna tanah masa depan adalah sangat penting untuk memastikan keberkesannya untuk mengawal dan memelihara kualiti air. Kajian ini menyediakan suatu dasar untuk membangunkan pengurusan sumber air di kawasan tadahan air bandar dan berdaya tahan terhadap perubahan guna tanah dan perubahan iklim.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xv
	LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxvii
	NOTATION OF MODEL PARAMETERS	xxix
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxxii
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Background of the Study	2
1.3	Problem Statements	5
1.4	Objectives	7
1.5	Scope of Study	7
1.6	Significance of the Study and Contribution	8
1.7	Thesis Structure and Organization	10

<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Introduction	11
2.2	Fundamental of Hydrology and Hydrologic Cycle	11
2.3	Water Demand and Sustainability	14
2.4	Water Resources and its Management in Malaysia	15
2.5	Water Pollution	18
2.6	Origin of the Water Quality Models	21
2.6.1	Water Temperature Models	21
2.6.2	Dissolved Oxygen Saturation (DO) Models	23
2.6.3	Nutrients Models	25
2.7	Concept of Watershed	27
2.7.1	Development and Background of Watershed Modeling	28
2.7.2	Review of Some Available Watershed Models	30
2.7.3	Summary of Watershed Modeling Application	32
2.8	Overview of BASIN/HSPF Model	33
2.8.1	Better Assessment Science Integrating Point and Nonpoint Sources (BASINS)	35
2.8.2	Weather Data Management Utility	36
2.8.3	The HSPEXP+ Program	37
2.8.4	Climate Assessment Tool (CAT)	39
2.8.5	Hydrological Simulation Process in HSPF Model	40
2.8.5.1	Pervious Segment	41
2.8.5.2	Impervious Segment	42
2.8.5.3	Reaches Segment	42
2.8.6	Simulation of Water Quality Constituents in HSPF	43

2.8.7	Simulation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in HSPF Model	44
2.8.8	Model Performance Evaluation	46
2.8.9	Sensitivity Analysis	47
2.9	Best Management Practices (BMPs)	49
2.10	Geostatistical Estimation for Spatial Rainfall Distribution	50
2.11	Climate Changes	52
2.11.1	Projection of Climate Change in Southeast Asia	54
2.11.2	Application of Climate Change in Watershed Modeling	54
2.12	Land-use/ Land cover	55
2.12.1	Remote Sensing	56
2.12.2	LU/LC Classification and Accuracy	57
2.12.3	Change Detection	59
2.12.4	Land Change Model (LCM)	61
<b>3</b>	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>63</b>
3.1	Overview	63
3.2	Study Area	65
3.2.1	Weather of Skudai River watershed	67
3.2.2	Soil characteristics of the Skudai River watershed	67
3.2.3	Land-use/Land-cover (LU/LC) of the Skudai River watershed	68
3.3	HSPF model	70
3.3.1	Model Input and Calibration Data	70
3.3.1.1	Weather Data	72
3.3.1.2	Hydrological Data	72
3.3.1.3	Water Quality Data	73
3.3.1.4	Point Sources Data	74



	3.3.1.5 Atmospheric Deposition	75
	3.3.2 Development of Model Input Database	76
3.4	Development of Spatial Rainfall Distribution of Skudai River Watershed	76
3.5	HSPF Model Set-up	78
	3.5.1 Model Calibration Process and Performance Evaluation	79
	3.5.2 Sensitivity Analysis	81
3.6	Climate Change Assessment in the Skudai River Watershed	86
3.7	Land-use/Land cover (LU/LC) Dataset	89
	3.7.1 Image Classification, Accuracy Assessment and Change Detection	89
	3.7.2 Prediction of Future LU/LC Changes	91
	3.7.3 Developed LU/LC Scenarios of Skudai River Watershed	93
	3.7.4 LU/LC Scenarios for Small Rivers in the Skudai River Watershed	94
3.8	Assessment of Scenarios	96
	3.8.1 Evaluation of LU/LC Scenarios	96
	3.8.2 Evaluation of Climate Change Scenarios	98
	3.8.3 Statistical Methods	100
	3.8.3.1 Non perimetric test: Jonckheere Terpstra Test	100
	3.8.3.2 Perimetric test: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	101
	3.8.4 Independent Comparison (Post Hoc test statistics)	104
3.9	Best Management Practices (BMPs)	105
	3.9.1 Selection and Characterization of the BMPs Removal Efficiency	105

3.9.2	Identification of Critical Nonpoint Sources (CSAs)	106
3.9.3	Assessment of the BMP Effectiveness in a Combined LU/LC and Climate Change Scenarios in a CSAs	108
<b>4</b>	<b>LAND-USE, WATERSHED MODEL DEVELOPMENT, AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS</b>	<b>109</b>
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	Development of Historical LU/LC of Skudai River Watershed	110
4.2.1	Image Classification and Accuracy Assessment	110
4.2.2	Prediction of LU/LC Changes	113
4.3	Spatial Rainfall Distribution in Skudai River Watershed	122
4.3.1	Application of Spatial Rainfall Distribution of Skudai River Watershed in HSPF Model	125
4.4	HSPF Model Calibration and Validation	126
4.4.1	Hydrology	126
4.4.1.1	Hydrological Assessment of the Skudai River Watershed	129
4.4.1.2	Sensitivity of Hydrologic Calibration Parameters	130
4.4.2	Sediment	132
4.4.2.1	Sensitivity Analysis of Sediment Calibration Parameters	134
4.4.3	Water Temperature	136
4.4.3.1	Sensitivity Analysis of Water Temperature Calibration Parameters	138
4.4.3.2	Water Temperature Variability Among the River Systems	139
4.4.4	Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	140

4.4.4.1	Sensitivity Analysis of DO Calibration Parameters	142
4.4.4.2	DO Variability	144
4.4.5	Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	144
4.4.5.1	Sensitivity Analysis of BOD Calibration Parameters	147
4.4.6	Ammonia Nitrogen (NH <sub>3</sub> -N)	149
4.4.6.1	Sensitivity Analysis of Ammonia Nitrogen Calibration Parameters	151
4.4.7	Nitrate Nitrogen (NO <sub>3</sub> -N)	153
4.4.7.1	Sensitivity Analysis of Nitrate Nitrogen Calibration Parameters	156
4.4.8	Orthophosphate (PO <sub>4</sub> )	158
4.4.8.1	Sensitivity Analysis of Orthophosphate Calibration Parameters	160
4.5	Summary of the Results	162
<b>5</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACTS OF LAND-USE AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b>	<b>165</b>
5.1	Introduction	165
5.2	Influence of LU/LC Changes on the Skudai River Watershed	166
5.2.1	Impact of LU/LC on the Hydrology of Skudai River Watershed	166
5.2.1.1	Effects of Changes in LU/LC on the Average Streamflow of Skudai River	171
5.2.1.2	Sensitivity of Hydrological Constituents to LU/LC Changes	172
5.2.2	Influence of LU/LC on Sediment Yield of Skudai River Watershed	173

5.2.2.1	Sensitivity of Sediment to LU/LC Change	178
5.2.2.2	The Combined Effect of Rainfall and LU/LC on Sediment Yield	179
5.2.3	Effects of LU/LC Changes on Nutrients Loads	180
5.2.3.1	Total Nitrogen (TN)	181
5.2.3.2	Total Phosphorus (TP)	183
5.2.3.3	Relationship Between Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus under LU/LC Changes	187
5.2.3.4	Sensitivity of LU/LC Category to Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus Loads	188
5.2.4	The Assessment of Pollutant Concentrations in the Skudai River under LU/LC Changes	189
5.2.5	Impact of Urbanization on the River System of a Watershed	191
5.2.6	Estimating Pollutant Concentrations in a Stream from Changes in Nutrients Loads under Urban Development	193
5.3	Climate Change Assessment in the Skudai River Watershed	195
5.3.1	Variation of Water Temperature under Climate Change Scenarios	195
5.3.2	Variation of Dissolved Oxygen (DO) Concentration under Climate Change Scenarios	198
5.3.3	DO Concentration and Water Temperature Relationship under Different Climate Change Scenarios	201

5.3.4	Relationship between Streamflow, Water Temperature, and DO Concentration under Climate Change Scenarios	203
5.3.5	Influence of Land-Use on Water Temperature and DO Concentration under Climate Change Scenarios	205
5.3.6	Impact Climate Change on Aquatic Ecosystem	207
5.4	Targeted Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Skudai River Watershed	208
5.4.1	Critical Sources Areas (CSAs) for BMP Implementation	209
5.4.2	Importance of Considering Multiple LU/LC in Identification of Critical Sources Areas for Best Management Practices (BMPs) Implementation in a Watershed	216
5.4.3	Effectiveness of Targeted Best Management Practices (BMPs) under Climate and LU/LC Changes in Critical Sources Areas (CSAs)	217
5.5	Summary of the Results	220
<b>6</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>224</b>
6.1	Introduction	224
6.2	Conclusions	224
6.3	Recommendations for Future Work	226
	REFERENCES	228
	Appendix A-G	269- 313

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Summary of watershed models with main characteristics and features [146]	31
2.2	Summary of digital change detection techniques [328]	60
3.1	Characteristics of some rivers in the Skudai River watershed	65
3.2	Type of Input data required for calibration of some constituents in HSPF model	71
3.3	Meteorological data summary	72
3.4	In-stream water quality summary for the four selected stations	73
3.5	Indah Water Konsotium (IWK) point sources distribution in the study area	74
3.6	Monthly average atmospheric deposition at Skudai River watershed	75
3.7	Modeling sections with their calibration parameters	80
3.8	Statistical Performance evaluation criteria for monthly calibration [343]	81
3.9	Pervious land segment (PERLND) selected parameters for sensitivity analysis	82
3.10	Impervious land segment (IMPLND) selected parameters for sensitivity analysis	83
3.11	Reaches segment (REACHES) selected parameters for sensitivity analysis	83

3.12	Developed air temperature and precipitation scenarios from the projected RCPs scenarios with their monthly means	88
3.13	Remote sensed satellite images used in LU/LC classification	89
3.14	LU/LC classification system of Skudai Watershed	90
3.15	Summary of Skudai River watershed LU/LC scenarios	93
3.16	Rivers and Surrounding LU/LC scenarios	95
3.17	Average Pollutant Removal rate of stormwater Ponds (percent)	106
3.18	Best management practices (BMPs) scenarios for skudai watershed	108
4.1	Classification Accuracy assessment using confusion matrix for each LU/LC datasets (Sen.-Sensitivity; Prec.-Precision)	113
4.2	Probability transition matrix for simulation of LU/LC of year 2015	118
4.3	Result of validation analysis of 2015 projected LU/LC	119
4.4	Model Parameters for the predicted and observed rainfall depths in OCK and OK algorithm	124
4.5	Average Annual water balance of Skudai River watershed (simulation period Jan 2000 to Jul 2015) using 2013 LU/LC	129
5.1	Average annual hydrological budget of Skudai watershed as LU/LC changes (simulation period Jan, 2000 to Jul, 2015)	168
5.2	Simulated average streamflow under different LU/LC scenarios	171
5.3	Temporal LU/LC composition and average slope for each ranged of Sediment yield computed at sub-watershed scale	176
5.4	Result of Jonckheere-Terpstra Test <sup>a</sup> for ordered median of simulated values of streamflow and in-stream concentrations under six the LU/LC scenarios	189
5.5	Trophic classification of Sengkang, Senai, Melana and Skudai Rivers	192

5.6	Changes in total nitrogen to total phosphorus ratio under LU/LC scenarios	193
5.7	Multiple linear regression for estimation of TN <sup>a</sup> and TP <sup>b</sup> concentrations (mg/L)	194
5.8	Results of one-way ANOVA of simulated water temperature under climate change scenarios	196
5.9	The results of one-way ANOVA of simulated dissolved oxygen (DO) under climate change scenarios	199
5.10	Identified sub-watersheds that contribute 50% NPS pollutants in the watershed for the two LU/LC scenarios	209



## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	World water distribution [60]	12
2.2	The hydrological cycle and estimates of the main water reservoirs, given in $10^3\text{km}^3$ for storage, and the flow of moisture through the system, given in $10^3\text{km}^3/\text{yr}$ for exchange [67]	13
2.3	Mean annual rainfall and runoff [78]	16
2.4	Nutrient cycle in an aquatic ecosystem [59].	26
2.5	HSPF model development structure [186]	34
2.6	BASINS 4.1 interface	36
2.7	Watershed management data utility (WDMUtil) interface	37
2.8	HSPEXP+ program application interface	38
2.9	Climate data tool (CAT) wizard	40
2.10	HSPF representation of conceptual hydrologic model [200]	41
2.11	The RCHRES module structure responsible for river water quality simulation [144].	44
2.12	Best Management Practice Evaluation chart [144]	45
3.1	Flow chart showing a brief methodology used in this study	64
3.2	Skudai River watershed; Johor Bahru, Malaysia.	66
3.3	Soil characteristics of Skudai River watershed (DOA)	68

3.4	Present Land-use of Skudai River watershed (source: Remote Sensing data)	69
3.5	Summarized process in inputting data into WDMUtil program	76
3.6	HSPF model interface showing 33 Hydrological Response Units (HRUs) of Skudai River watershed	79
3.7	Skudai River watershed air temperature anomaly as projected using the two representative concentration pathways emission scenarios (RCP 4.5 and 8.5)	87
3.8	Skudai River watershed precipitation anomaly as projected using the two representative concentration pathways emission scenarios (RCP 4.5 and 8.5)	87
3.9	Flowchart for prediction of LU/LC changes using land change model (LCM)	92
3.10	Methodology chart for LU/LC scenarios assessment of the Skudai River watershed	94
4.1	LU/LC classification results (a) 1989; (b) 1999; (c) 2009; (d) 2013; (e) 2015	111
4.2	Historical LU/LC variability among land cover classes from 1989 to 2013	112
4.3	Percent changes in LU/LC categories between 1989 and 2009	114
4.4	Constraints and factors utilized to developed suitability maps for each land-use (LU/LC) category: (a) elevation constrain; (b) road distance constrain; (c) building factor; (d) conserved areas for future development	115
4.5	LU/LC classes suitability maps for: (a)Urban; (b) Forest; (c)Agriculture; (d) Wetland; (e) Barren	116
4.6	LCM produced transition potential between LU/LC category (a) agriculture to build-up (b) agriculture to forest; (c) forest	

	to build-up; (d) forest to agriculture; (e) wetland to build-up;	
	(f) wetland to agriculture	117
4.7	(a) Observed LU/LC of 2015 (b) Simulated LU/LC 2015	119
4.8	Predicted LU/LC of: (a)2019; (b)2029; (c) 2039 of Skudai River watershed (d) Statistical distribution of LU/LC classes	121
4.9	Ordinary co-kriging plots: (a) Adjusted semivariogram for Ordinary Co-Kriging (OCK); (b)1:1 line of the predicted and observed rainfall values ( $R^2=0.89$ )	122
4.10	Ordinary kriging plots: (a) Adjusted semivariogram for Ordinary Kriging (OK); (b) 1:1 scatter plot of the predicted and observed rainfall values in OK ( $R^2=0.91$ )	123
4.11	Spatial rainfall distribution of Skudai River watershed	125
4.12	Calibrated observed and simulated streamflows for Skudai River watershed: (a) monthly streamflow and precipitation time series; (b) scatter plot with $R^2$ value of 0.89	127
4.13	Validated Observed and Simulated Streamflows for Skudai River Watershed: (a) Monthly Streamflow and Precipitation time series; (b) Scatter Plot with $R^2$ value of 0.83	128
4.14	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of streamflow to calibration parameters and input variables; the Right Hand Side (RHS) represent PREC, ATEMP, UZSN, INFILT, LZSN, and DEEPFR; the Left Hand Side (LHS) represent AGWETP, INTFW, IRC, BASETP, and LZETP.	131
4.15	Calibrated observed and simulated sediment flow for Skudai River watershed: (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	133
4.16	Validated observed and simulated sediment flow for Skudai River watershed: (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	134

4.17	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of Sediment Flow to Calibration Parameters and Input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, KSAND, KGER, EXPSND and TAUCS; LHS represent JSER, KSER, TAUCD, M, KEIM, REMSCP, and ACCDSP.	136
4.18	Calibrated observed and simulated instream water temperature at: (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	137
4.19	Validated observed and simulated instream water temperature at (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	138
4.20	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of instream water temperature to Calibration Parameters and Input variables; RHS represent PREC and ATEMP; LHS represent KATRAD, KCOND, KEVAP, and CFSAEX.	139
4.21	Calibration of the observed and simulated dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration at (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	141
4.22	Validation of the observed and simulated dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration at (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	142
4.23	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of DO concentration to Calibration Parameters and Input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, TCBOD, BRBOD2, and KODSET; LHS represent SUPSAT, REAK, EXPREV, BRBOD1, and KBOD20.	143
4.24	Calibration of the observed and simulated biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) concentration at (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	146

4.25	Validation of the observed and simulated biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) concentration at (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	147
4.26	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of BOD concentration to calibration parameters and input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, TCBOD, KODSET, WSQOP_I, BRBOD(2) and KBOD20; LHS represent SUPSAT, BENOD, TCBEN, BRBOD(1), and WSQOP_P.	148
4.27	Calibration of the observed and simulated ammoniacal nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ) concentration at (a) 3S110 station (b) 3S117 station (c) 3S107 station (d) 3S116 station	150
4.28	Validation of the observed and simulated ammoniacal nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ ) concentration at (a) 3S110 station (b) 3S117 station (c) 3S107 station (d) 3S116 station	151
4.29	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ concentration to calibration parameters and input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, WSQOP_I, WSQOP_P, KTAM20, and BRNIT(2); LHS represent BRNIT(1), KNO220, KNO320, SQOLIM_I_ $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ , and SQOLIM_P_ $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ .	153
4.30	Calibration of the observed and simulated nitrate nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ) concentration at (a) 3S110 station (b) 3S117 station (c) 3S107 station (d) 3S116 station	155
4.31	Validation of the observed and simulated nitrate nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ) concentration at (a) 3S110 station (b) 3S117 station (c) 3S107 station (d) 3S116 station	156
4.32	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentration to calibration parameters and input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, WSQOP_I_ $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ , KTAM20, and KNO320; LHS represent BRNIT(1), BRNIT(2), KNO220, SQOLIM_I_ $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ , WSQOP_P_ $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ , and SQOLIM_P_ $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ .	158

4.33	Calibration of the observed and simulated orthophosphate (PO <sub>4</sub> ) concentration at: (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	159
4.34	Validation of the observed and simulated orthophosphate (PO <sub>4</sub> ) concentration at: (a) 3S110 station; (b) 3S117 station; (c) 3S107 station; (d) 3S116 station	160
4.35	Average Sensitivity Index ( $S_i$ ) of PO <sub>4</sub> concentration to calibration parameters and input variables; RHS represent PREC, ATEMP, and WSQOP_I_PO <sub>4</sub> ; LHS represent KTAM20, SQOLIM_I_PO <sub>4</sub> , SQOLIM_P_PO <sub>4</sub> , WSQOP_P_PO <sub>4</sub> , BRPO <sub>4</sub> (1), and BRPO <sub>4</sub> (2).	162
5.1	Change in volume due to LU/LC variability	169
5.2	Distribution of Water Yield (mm.ha <sup>-1</sup> .yr <sup>-1</sup> ) at sub-watershed scale (a) L2 scenario (1989 LU/LC) (b) L3 scenario (1999 LU/LC)(c) L4 scenario (2009 LU/LC) (d) L5 scenario (2019 LU/LC) (e) L6 scenario (2029 LU/LC) (f) L7 scenario (2039 LU/LC)	170
5.3	Relative Sensitivity of (a) Hydrological element to LU/LC scenarios(b) Runoff component to LU/LC scenarios	172
5.4	Sediment yield distribution map at sub-watershed scale from the baseline condition (2013 land-use)	174
5.5	Distribution of sediment yield (t.ha <sup>-1</sup> .yr <sup>-1</sup> ) at sub-watershed scale (a) L2 scenario (1989 LU/LC) (b) L3 scenario (1999 LU/LC)(c) L4 scenario (2009 LU/LC) (d) L5 scenario (2019 LU/LC) (e) L6 scenario (2029 LU/LC) (f) L7 scenario (2039 LU/LC)	175
5.6	Sensitivity of LU/LC class to sediment yields under different LU/LC scenarios (L2-L7)	178
5.7	(a) Relationship between changes in sediment yield with varying rainfall events as LU/LC changes (b) Sensitivity of	

	sediment yields to change in LU/LC at high and low rainfall scenarios in the watershed	180
5.8	Spatial distribution of total nitrogen (TN) loads ( $\text{kg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) at sub-watershed scale (a) L2 scenario (1989 LU/LC) (b) L3 scenario (1999 LU/LC)(c) L4 scenario (2009 LU/LC) (d) L5 scenario (2019 LU/LC) (e) L6 scenario (2029 LU/LC) (f) L7 scenario (2039 LU/LC)	183
5.9	Spatial distribution of total phosphorus (TP) loads ( $\text{kg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) at sub-watershed scale (a) L2 scenario (1989 LU/LC) (b) L3 scenario (1999 LU/LC)(c) L4 scenario (2009 LU/LC) (d) L5 scenario (2019 LU/LC) (e) L6 scenario (2029 LU/LC) (f) L7 scenario (2039 LU/LC)	185
5.10	Relationship between increase urban development and (a) TN loads (b) TP loads	187
5.11	Sensitivity of land-use classes to (a) TN loads and (b) TP loads - under different scenarios	188
5.12	Post-hoc result of the independent-samples Jonckheere-Terpstra test for ordered alternative of land use scenarios:(a) Orthophosphate ( $\text{mg/L}$ ) (b) Nitrate nitrogen ( $\text{mg/L}$ ) (d) Ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{mg/L}$ ) (c) Streamflow ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ )	190
5.13	River network and their characteristic land-use of 2013	191
5.14	Post-hoc result of the mean water temperature ( $T_w$ ) under climate change scenarios, a homogenous subset of scenarios denoting the columns labeled from 1 to 6: (a) upstream (b) mid-section (c) downstream.	197
5.15	Post-hoc result of the mean dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations under climate change scenarios, a homogenous subset of scenarios denoting the columns labeled from 1 to 6: (a) upstream (b) mid-section (c) downstream.	200

5.16	Regression plot between simulated $T_w$ and DO concentration under different climate change scenarios (red lines represent polynomial regression and blue lines represent exponential regression): (a) scenario S1 (b) scenario S2 (c) scenario S3 (d) scenario S4 (e) scenario S5 (f) scenario S6 (g) scenario S7 (h) scenario S8 (i) scenario S9	202
5.17	Regression plot for streamflow againsts $T_w$ (blue lines) and DO concentration (red lines) for all climate change scenarios: (a) scenario S1 (b) scenario S2 (c) scenario S3 (d) scenario S4 (e) scenario S5 (f) scenario S6 (g) scenario S7 (h) scenario S8 (i) scenario S9.	204
5.18	Relationship between LU/LC and climate change on three selected tropical rivers and their influence on water temperature and DO concentration: (a) Sengkang River; (b) Senai River; and (c) Melana River.	206
5.19	Sediment distribution at sub-watershed scale (a) L1 scenario (b) L7 scenario	210
5.20	Total phosphorus (TP) distribution at sub-watershed scale (a) L1 scenario (b) L7 scenario.	211
5.21	Total nitrogen (TN) distribution at sub-watershed scale (a) L1 scenario (b) L7 scenario	212
5.22	Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) distribution at sub-watershed scale (a) L1 scenario (b) L7 scenario	213
5.23	Water quality index for the identified critical nonpoint sources areas (a) L1 scenario (b) L7 scenario	214
5.24	Combined water quality index for the Skudai River watershed	215
5.25	Percent reduction of pollutant loads under climate change and LU/LC scenarios (a) TN (b) TP (c) Sediment (d) BOD	218
5.26	Percent load reduction by sub-watersheds with Best Management Practices (BMPs) (a) TN for L1 scenario (b) TN	



for L7 scenario (c) TP for L1 scenario (d) TP for L7 scenario  
(e) Sediment for L1 scenario (f) Sediment for L7 scenario (g)  
BOD for L1 scenario (h) BOD for L7 scenario.

219

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DO	-	Dissolved oxygen
BOD	-	Biochemical oxygen demand
PO <sub>4</sub>	-	Ortho-phosphate
NH <sub>4</sub> -N	-	Ammonia nitrogen
NO <sub>3</sub> -N	-	Nitrate nitrogen
TN	-	Total nitrogen
TP	-	Total phosphorus
SED	-	Sediment
L <sub>n</sub>	-	Land-use scenarios
S <sub>n</sub>	-	Climate change scenarios
LU/LC	-	Land-use/land cover
T <sub>w</sub>	-	Water temperature
HSPF	-	Hydrological simulation program FORTRAN
CAT	-	Climate assessment tools
BASINS	-	Better assessment science of integrated point and nonpoint sources
NPS	-	Nonpoint sources
R <sup>2</sup>	-	Coefficient of determinant
UCI	-	User control input
WDMUtil	-	Weather data management utility
PBIAS	-	Percent bias
KRMSE	-	Kriging root mean square error
GIS	-	Geographic information system
LCM	-	Land change model

MCE	-	Multi criteria evaluation
SEN	-	Sensitivity
NSE	-	Nash-Sutcliffe coefficient of efficiency
HRU	-	Hydraulic response unit
BMPs	-	Best management practices
CSAs	-	Critical source areas

## NOTATION OF MODEL PARAMETERS

ACQOP	-	Accumulation rate of quality constituent
AGWETP	-	Fraction of remaining evapotranspiration from active groundwater
AGWRC	-	Base groundwater recession
ANAER	-	Concentration of dissolved oxygen below which anaerobic condition exist
BASETP	-	Fraction of remaining evapotranspiration from baseflow
BENOD	-	Benthal oxygen demand at 20°C
BRBOD1	-	Benthal release of BOD at high oxygen concentration
BRBOD2	-	Incremental to benthal release of BOD under anaerobic conditions
BRNIT1	-	Benthal release rate of inorganic nitrogen under aerobic conditions
BRNIT2	-	Benthal release rate of inorganic nitrogen under anaerobic conditions
BRPO41	-	Benthal release rate of ortho-phosphate under aerobic conditions
BRPO42	-	Benthal release rate of ortho-phosphate under anaerobic conditions
CEPSC	-	Interception storage capacity
CFSAEX	-	Correction factor for solar radiation
DEEPFR	-	Fraction of groundwater inflow to deep groundwater
DENOXT	-	Dissolved oxygen concentration threshold above which denitrification ceases
ELEV	-	Mean reach elevation
EXPOD	-	Exponential factor in the dissolved oxygen term of the benthal oxygen demand equation
EXPRED	-	Exponent to depth used in the calculation of the reaeration coefficient
EXPREL	-	Exponential factor in the dissolved oxygen term of the benthal BOD release equation
EXPREV	-	Exponent to velocity used in the calculation of the reaeration coefficient

EXPSND	-	Exponent of sandload input power function formula
INFEXP	-	Exponent in infiltration equation
INFILD	-	Ratio between maximum and mean infiltration capacities
INFILT	-	Index to infiltration capacity of the soil
INTFW	-	Interflow inflow parameter
IRC	-	Interflow recession parameter
KATRAD	-	Longwave radiation coefficient
KBOD20	-	BOD decay rate at 20°C
KCOND	-	Conduction-convection heat transport coefficient
KEVAP	-	Evaporation coefficient
KGRND	-	Heat conductance coefficient between the ground and the mud layer
KMUD	-	Heat conductance coefficient between water and the ground
KNO220	-	Unit oxidation rate of nitrite at 20°C
KNO320	-	Unit denitrification rate of nitrate at 20°C
KODSET	-	Rate of BOD settling
KSAND	-	Coefficient of sandload input power function formula
KTAM20	-	Unit oxidation rate of total ammonia at 20°C
KVARY	-	Variable groundwater recession
LSUR	-	Length of overland flow plane
LZETP	-	Lower zone evapotranspiration parameter
LZSN	-	Lower zone soil nominal storage
M	-	Erodibility coefficient of the sediment
MALGR	-	Maximal unit algal growth rate for phytoplankton
MUDDEP	-	Depth of mud layer
NSUR	-	Manning's n (roughness) for overland flow plane
PETMAX	-	Temperature below which evapotranspiration is reduced
PETMIN	-	Temperature below which evapotranspiration is zero
REAK	-	Empirical constant for equation used to calculate the reaeration coefficient
SLSUR	-	Slope of overland flow plane
SQOLIM	-	Limiting storage of quality constituent
SUPSAT	-	Allowable dissolved oxygen supersaturation
TAUCD	-	Critical bed shear stress for deposition
TAUCS	-	Critical bed shear stress for scour
TCBEN	-	Temperature correction coefficient for benthic oxygen
TCBOD	-	Temperature correction coefficient for BOD decay
TCDEN	-	Temperature correction coefficient for the denitrification rate
TCGINV	-	Temperature correction coefficient for surface gas invasion
TCNIT	-	Temperature correction coefficient for the nitrogen oxidation rates

TGRND	-	Ground temperature
UZSN	-	Upper zone nominal soil moisture storage
WSQOP	-	Rate of surface runoff which will remove 90% of stored quality constituent

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Publications	269
B	Model equations	270
C	Land-use/land cover	281
D	Geostatistical estimation computed factors	290
E	Model parameter estimation and sensitivity analysis	292
F	Impact of land-use on watershed system	311
G	Best management practices (BMPs)	313

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Overview**

Watersheds are changing systems which are in a constant state of transformation due to human activities or natural occurrences [1]. What we do in a watershed can improve the amount and quality of water that is available [2]. Advance in technology provides insightful information about watershed systems under various multiple stressors. Understanding the significance of each stressor in a watershed is essential for adequate water resources management. Prior researches in rivers have revealed that stressors frequently interrelate, resulting in complex, unclear result that cannot be projected based on the impact of the specific stressors involved [3]. The introduction of technologically based approach provides some improvement in this regard by integrating spatial and temporal properties of a watershed (i.e. topography, climates, land-use, etc.) to predict the likely responses at different watershed conversion stage using measured data.

Climate change and land-use/land-cover (LU/LC) are two significant stressors for small rivers or streams and have common effects on stream ecosystem, and these are best presented on a watershed scale. This two stressors have the potential to significantly alter



the hydrologic cycles and consequently increases transport of diffuse pollutants to the receiving streams and rivers. They are directly related to the amount of diffuse pollutants discharge into the rivers and water quality conditions within a watershed [4]. Climate and LU/LC changes are predetermined conditions that must be incorporated in the planning and management of water resources at watershed-scale. In the future, watershed management will depend on the ability of the existing best management practices (BMPs) to reduce nonpoint sources pollutants generated from land areas under different climatic and LU/LC variations.

This research focused on the application of a hydrological and water quality model (Hydrological Simulation Program – FORTRAN, HSPF) for hydrological, water quality and best management practices in a watershed scale under the influences of climate and LU/LC changes. It is used to simulate watershed hydrology and water quality on the land surface and in the river. The model contains hydrological and water quality tools to simulate the impact of climate change and LU/LC variation on the watershed system. This study presents the application of HSPF model to Skudai River watershed (Johor, Malaysia), and it was used to evaluate present and projected LU/LC and climate change effects on hydrology, sediments, and water quality. It also evaluates the effectiveness of targeted best management practices under climate and LU/LC changes.

## **1.2 Background of the Study**

Malaysia falls in a region characterized by high constant temperatures, abundant rainfall, and humidity [5]. This characteristics weather conditions usually result to environmental problems of which solid understanding of the natural conditions is critical. Like many other government initiatives, Malaysian government introduces policies and regulations to protect and improve surface water conditions that is shouldered under different departments and agencies at both local and federal level [6]. Since the inception

of these policies, a little improvement was observed, particularly at the watershed level. It was due to the rapid development taking place in the watershed land areas coupled with the changing weather conditions.

The existing and future urban development are certain human activities, but its negative impacts on the stream ecosystem need to be evaluated for environmental and human safety. Examining the effects can inform decisions, planning, and policies affecting freshwater resources by studying the interactions between watersheds and stream conditions [7]. The amount of nutrients and pollutants produced from urban areas are among the leading causes of stream impairment in most urbanized watersheds [8-10]. For example, as urban development grows, vegetation and wetland areas are converted to impervious surfaces (buildings, roads, etc.), which changes hydrologic regimes, ecosystem distribution, and nutrient dynamics [11, 12]. These changes adversely affect water quantity and quality, aquatic habitat, functions of stream ecosystems [13] and socioeconomic concerns [14]. The estimation of watershed potential LU/LC has become an important driver in urban planning and watershed management and it is strongly related to future development stressors, because it can be identified and controlled [15-18]. Detecting the impact of LU/LC are important to stream regulation and management since top decisions and guidelines are relatively built on finding environmental consequences resulting from watershed disturbance [7]. A wide range of studies on water quality and quantity at watershed scale examine the effects of past variation in LU/LC on the hydrology and water quality conditions [19-23], but integrating them into future perspective is relatively low.

On the other hand, climate change due to increased variability in weather conditions, with extreme events such as floods, have been predicted to have significant impacts on water quantity and quality [24-30]. The impact of climate change on human health and aquatic ecosystems can be viewed through water quality impairment resulted by higher water temperatures, increased/decreased precipitation, moderate and extreme flow conditions [31]. The relationship of climate change affecting water resources have

been identified [32, 33]. Water quality impairments due to extreme weather events have demonstrated how climate change is generating a significant threat to both the quantity and quality of freshwater resources [34, 35], and could result in societal and economic costs [36]. Some studies have shown the capability of climate change to alter the characteristics of the surface water, and influence land surface processes that controls the generation, discharge, and transport of toxic materials and anthropogenic contaminants to both ground and surface waters [37-41].

However, there is an apparent lack of understanding of accurate LU/LC change (both historical and future) in analyzing the potential water quality impacts in tropical watersheds. The reactions of water quality to climate changes in a tropical climate remain unclear. Furthermore, the prediction of future LU/LC from the historical LU/LC characterizations are either unutilized or often ignored, or are not directly connected to the present LU/LC category when doing the projection. Consequently, the effects of projected urban LU/LC forms and trends, under different climate emission scenarios, on surface water quantity and quality at the watershed scale and sub-watershed levels are currently uncertain in tropical regions like Malaysia.

Adequate water resources use and protection under dynamic physical settings require the application of watershed models that can simulate different flow systems. The implementation of watershed management actions required details understanding of the watershed hydrological and water quality behaviour under different anthropogenic conditions. Doing this is possible by application of watershed models, because watershed models are suitable technical tools used in the management of watersheds. They are computer-based models that relate the origins and transport of multiple pollutants from both point and non-point sources in the whole catchment drained by a river [42]. Identifying the complexity of the entire hydrologic system; pollutants transport using these models, input data such as soil types, topography, LU/LC category, type of watershed management practices, meteorology, atmospheric depositions and point

sources are needed. Also, an additional task is usually brought in when these models are used to forecast the impacts of various stressors [43].

### **1.3 Problem Statements**

Prior research have indicates that tropical river system were the most diverse freshwater ecosystems on earth [44] and the most expected to be impacted by climate change and other human activities [45]. Due to their geographical location, rivers in the tropics regions are exposed to solar radiation more frequently coupled with low inter-annual and inter-seasonal climatic variation [46]. The anthropogenic impacts are more serious in tropical countries [45], increasing the likelihood of both water quality and ecosystem malfunction. Due to all these factors acting simultaneously and affecting the aquatic ecosystem, and watershed physical setting, it is likely that relationship between natural and chemical variables with biological communities in tropical streams will result in responses differently to that observed in temperate rivers. As the predicted high temperatures that is expected to manifest earlier than any other climatic groups [40], these will directly affect tropical watersheds in terms of water availability and climatic complexity such as frequent storms events, and water quality degradation (such as eutrophication). Consequently, these will result in changes in the aquatic system and its composition, distribution, and habitats [47]. A lot of studies on climate change and LU/LC have acknowledged its impact on many scales, but its influence under regular high temperatures area in a LU/LC and climate changes scenarios is limited [40]. There is need for awareness on the significances of these physical variables which might result to an unproductive aquatic ecosystem inducing the risks for freshwater aquacultural practices and economic crisis [48]. Hence, the adequate knowledge on the relatives interaction between LU/LC and climate changes in tropical watersheds is required.

Furthermore, the location of a watershed and linked of its land boundary with the sea creates an extreme pressure gradient that caused a lot of rainfall. The combination of this effect and extremes temperature in equatorial regions in the course of maritime exposure produces extreme weather conditions and frequent occurrence of floods and this will increased water pollution [49]. Studies by Salarpour *et al.* [50] shows that 12% of the Skudai River watershed was likely to flood for 100 years recurrence interval and 8% for 2 years recurrence interval and this will be more critical given the planned development under Iskandar Malaysia development plan with a projection of about 80% urban dominated areas [51] whereby Iskandar Malaysia controls the whole of the Skudai River watershed. A detail hydrological and water quality study of the watershed is critical, as it will guide decision making and improvement of the existing management practices. Recent research shows that about 50% of the sub-watersheds in the Skudai River watershed have a negative watershed sustainability index based on measured potential flood damages (PFD) and potential water quality deterioration [52]. Muhammad [53], shows that rivers in Skudai watershed are prone to water quality degradation due to rapid development, industrialization and increase population.

Malaysia environmental quality report shows that some of the rivers in Johor watersheds have persistently maintained their poor water quality status compared with the previous reports of 2008 and 2013 [54]. Melana River (in Skudai River watershed) was among the rivers identify in the report, and studies have shown that in the future the conditions might be deteriorated [52]. The degradation of water quality is a product of multiple LU/LC activities and climate conditions, including both at point sources (with a single waste load allocation) and non-point sources areas from a diffused pollution loads. Harnessing these sources using modelling approach will provide an information that is critical for sustainable water resources management in a tropical watershed system.

## **1.4 Objectives**

This study involves the development of water quantity and quality model of a tropical watershed based on its background conditions. The developed model is aim to assess the influences of land-use and climate change on a watershed system using Skudai River watershed as a case study. A proposed mitigation action via best management practices are presented alongside the impacts of land-use and climate changes. The objectives of this study were outlined as follows.

- i To develop the hydrological and water quality model of a tropical watershed using Skudai River watershed as a case study;
- ii. To assess the impact of land-use changes on the hydrology, sediment, total nitrogen and phosphorus pollutants in the watershed;
- iii. To evaluate the impact of the projected temperature variations and its effects on water temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations in the watershed;
- iii. To estimate the effectiveness of the targeted best management practices under land-use and climate change scenarios on the identified critical sources areas in the tropical watershed system.

## **1.5 Scope of Study**

In order to achieve the study objectives, several specific tasks were performed. The following are the specific tasks and assumption which were used in this study:

- i. The case study was limited to Skudai River watershed;
- ii. The historical and future land-use of the study area were produced using remote sensing techniques and were used as land-use scenarios;
- iii. Application of hypothetical land-use scenarios that are different to the remote sensed developed land-use scenarios to evaluate the interaction between catchment

- land-use variation and climate change on small tropical rivers within the watershed;
- iv. Application of geostatistical estimation method to capture the spatial rainfall distribution of the study area and integrates it into the model to mimic the spatial variability of rainfall in the watershed;
  - v. Determination of the sensitivity of the model calibration parameters to reduce uncertainty on the modelling results;
  - vi. The impact of land-use considered in this study are based on water balance variability, sediment loads and changes on the non-point sources pollutants;
  - vii. Two land-use scenarios were used in the identification of critical source areas for targeted best management practices in the study area.

## **1.6 Significance of the Study and Contribution**

Water resource managers need to utilize cutting edge tools to fulfill their management interests with high efficiency, as water resource management practices will be affected due to lack of this tools. Inputs for critical decision making requires data monitoring that is limited by human resources and short-term sampling studies and sporadic monitoring programs that are commonly observed. The flexibility in managing enormous quantities of dynamic data input, transferring data from similar gauged environment or by extrapolating the available data to ungauged environments reduce these problems for water resources expert and simplify alternatives for decision making, hence the application of modeling approach. Watershed modeling estimates the hydrology and pollutant dynamics derived from a point and non-point sources to water bodies utilizing different algorithms that depend on measured data [55]. Skudai River watershed required such approach due to its influence and significant for water quality control and management of the Johor Strait. This approach aimed at identifying the watershed hydrological and hydro-chemical components that controls the watershed hydro-

environmental properties which will be utilized for effective management of the watershed or similar watershed.

In the other hand, the application of semi-distributed models is still relatively new in Malaysia, even though they have been used widely in other countries [56]. There is no detailed study that considered the impact of climate and temporal land-use/land cover (LU/LC) changes on the hydrology, soil erosion (sediment), water temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), nutrients. Furthermore, evaluating the effectiveness of best management practices under this conditions (climate and land-use) at watershed scale is also relatively low in tropical regions. The effects of multiple stressors on the tropical rivers are poorly understood, and this study present the impact of two important stressors; LU/LC and climate change. Effects of urbanization on the river system and the shift of the river trophic class were illustrated, as prior studies do not demonstrated the trends and changes in the trophic class of tropical river systems under an increased urban development. The efficiency of the targeted best management practices (BMPs) in the reduction of water pollutions under the influence of climate and LU/LC changes were predicted, as previous studies in Malaysia focused on specific BMPs type and its performance, which is centered on flood attenuation with few on water quality control in a localized condition. While there are a lot of studies addressing the effectiveness of BMPs at a local stage (either confine residential areas or isolated complex in Malaysia), no available information shows an attempt to determine the effectiveness of BMPs in the reduction of water pollution using identified critical sources areas (CSAs) at a sub-watersheds or watershed-scale. In fact, the concept of identified CSAs for targeted BMPs implementation using watershed modelling is relatively new, and its application in an urban dominated watershed and in a tropical climate are yet to be elucidated. The urban stormwater manual of Malaysia (MSMA) does not include it in the conditions required for stormwater management system implementation and siting [57]. Furthermore, it is imperative to evaluate the impact of BMPs to interrupt nonpoint source pollution at sources and treat the pollutant considering future LU/LC and climate scenarios. This approach will guide relevant policies to manage small tropical rivers and watersheds under climate and LU/LC change which are absent or poorly informed.



## **1.7 Thesis Structure and Organization**

This study is designed to model the impact of climate change, LU/LC and the effectiveness of targeted best management practices under climate and LU/LC scenarios in a watershed system. Skudai watershed was chosen as a case study due to its location, planned future development, and mixed LU/LC. A measured data with different resolution, measurement and scale were used for the development and application of the watershed model. This thesis was structured and designed in six chapters to present the study designed, analysis, results, discussion and recommendation. Chapter 1, represent the study objectives, statement of problems, scope, and contribution to knowledge. Chapter 2, provides the general backgrounds and reviews of literature relevant to the research methodology and materials used. In Chapter 3, the materials and methods used to achieve the study objectives were presented. The model parameter estimation, calibration, and validation of the model with the development of LU/LC scenarios are presented in Chapter 4. The result and analysis of the model output under climate changes, LU/LC and BMPs effectiveness are presented in Chapter 5. Also, the discussion of the results analysis and comparing the results with other findings of other researchers were included in the same chapter. Finally, in Chapter 6, the conclusion of the findings of the study and recommendation for future works were presented

## REFERENCES

1. McCuen, R. Hydrologic modeling in 2050: Knowledge requirements in a multi-nonstationary environment. *Toward a sustainable water future*. 2012: 226-233.
2. Montgomery, D. R., Grant, G. E. and Sullivan, K. Watershed analysis as a framework for implementing ecosystem management. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 1995. 31(3): 369-386.
3. Folt, C., Chen, C., Moore, M. and Burnaford, J. Synergism and antagonism among multiple stressors. *Limnology and oceanography*. 1999. 44 (3part2): 864-877.
4. Shi, P., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Li, P. and Xu, G. Influence of land use and land cover patterns on seasonal water quality at multi-spatial scales. *Catena*. 2017. 151: 182-190.
5. Shahid, S., Shahid, S., Pour, S. H., Pour, S. H., Wang, X., Wang, X., Shourav, S. A., Shourav, S. A., Minhans, A. and Minhans, A. Impacts and adaptation to climate change in Malaysian real estate. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*. 2017. 9(1): 87-103.
6. Zakaria, S. and Selamat, Z. Water resources management in Malaysia. *National Institute for Land and Infrastructure Management. Japan. [Website] www. nilim. go. jp. Accessed*. 2010. 21.
7. Smucker, N. J., Kuhn, A., Charpentier, M. A., Cruz-Quinones, C. J., Elonen, C. M., Whorley, S. B., Jicha, T. M., Serbst, J. R., Hill, B. H. and Wehr, J. D. Quantifying urban watershed stressor gradients and evaluating how different land cover datasets affect stream management. *Environmental management*. 2016. 57(3): 683-695.
8. Duan, S., Kaushal, S. S., Groffman, P. M., Band, L. E. and Belt, K. T. Phosphorus export across an urban to rural gradient in the Chesapeake bay watershed. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*. 2012. 117(G1).
9. Edwards, C. A. Environmental quality: Factors influencing environmental degradation and pollution in India. *Food Security and Environmental Quality in the Developing World*. 2016: 193.

10. Li, F., Liu, X., Zhang, X., Zhao, D., Liu, H., Zhou, C. and Wang, R. Urban ecological infrastructure: An integrated network for ecosystem services and sustainable urban systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2016. 30: 1-7.
11. Hogan, D. M., Jarnagin, S. T., Loperfido, J. V. and Ness, K. Mitigating the effects of landscape development on streams in urbanizing watersheds. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2014. 50(1): 163-178.
12. Bhaskar, A., Beesley, L., Burns, M. J., Fletcher, T., Hamel, P., Oldham, C. and Roy, A. Will it rise or will it fall? Managing the complex effects of urbanization on base flow. *Freshwater Science*. 2016. 35(1): 293-310.
13. Miltner, R. J., White, D. and Yoder, C. The biotic integrity of streams in urban and suburbanizing landscapes. *Landscape and urban planning*. 2004. 69(1): 87-100.
14. Pickett, S. T., Buckley, G. L., Kaushal, S. S. and Williams, Y. Social-ecological science in the humane metropolis. *Urban ecosystems*. 2011. 14(3): 319-339.
15. Schueler, T. R., Fraley-McNeal, L. and Capiella, K. Is impervious cover still important? Review of recent research. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2009. 14(4): 309-315.
16. Wickham, J., Neale, A., Mehaffey, M., Jarnagin, T. and Norton, D. Temporal trends in the spatial distribution of impervious cover relative to stream location. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2016. 52(2): 409-419.
17. Weitzell, R. E., Kaushal, S. S., Lynch, L. M., Guinn, S. M. and Elmore, A. J. Extent of stream burial and relationships to watershed area, topography, and impervious surface area. *Water*. 2016. 8(11): 538.
18. Utz, R. M., Hopkins, K. G., Beesley, L., Booth, D. B., Hawley, R. J., Baker, M. E., Freeman, M. C. and L. Jones, K. Ecological resistance in urban streams: The role of natural and legacy attributes. *Freshwater Science*. 2016. 35(1): 380-397.
19. Bhaduri, B., Harbor, J., Engel, B. and Grove, M. Assessing watershed-scale, long-term hydrologic impacts of land-use change using a GIS-NPS model. *Environmental management*. 2000. 26(6): 643-658.
20. Tong, S. T. and Chen, W. Modeling the relationship between land use and surface water quality. *Journal of environmental management*. 2002. 66(4): 377-393.
21. Tang, Z., Engel, B., Pijanowski, B. and Lim, K. Forecasting land use change and its environmental impact at a watershed scale. *Journal of environmental management*. 2005. 76(1): 35-45.

22. Wu, L., Long, T.-y., Liu, X. and Guo, J.-s. Impacts of climate and land-use changes on the migration of non-point source nitrogen and phosphorus during rainfall-runoff in the Jialing river watershed, China. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2012. 475: 26-41.
23. Wang, Z., Yang, S., Zhao, C., Bai, J., Lou, H., Chen, K., Wu, L., Dong, G. and Zhou, Q. Assessment of non-point source total phosphorus pollution from different land use and soil types in a mid-high latitude region of China. *Water*. 2016. 8(11): 505.
24. Murdoch, P. S., Baron, J. S. and Miller, T. L. Potential effects of climate change on surface-water quality in North America. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2000. 36(2): 347-366.
25. Komatsu, E., Fukushima, T. and Harasawa, H. A modeling approach to forecast the effect of long-term climate change on lake water quality. *Ecological Modelling*. 2007. 209(2): 351-366.
26. Wilson, C. O. and Weng, Q. Simulating the impacts of future land use and climate changes on surface water quality in the Des Plaines river watershed, Chicago metropolitan statistical area, Illinois. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2011. 409(20): 4387-4405.
27. Crossman, J., Futter, M., Oni, S., Whitehead, P., Jin, L., Butterfield, D., Baulch, H. and Dillon, P. Impacts of climate change on hydrology and water quality: Future proofing management strategies in the Lake Simcoe watershed, Canada. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*. 2013. 39(1): 19-32.
28. Fan, M. and Shibata, H. Simulation of watershed hydrology and stream water quality under land use and climate change scenarios in Teshio river watershed, Northern Japan. *Ecological Indicators*. 2015. 50: 79-89.
29. Alamdari, N., Sample, D. J., Steinberg, P., Ross, A. C. and Easton, Z. M. Assessing the effects of climate change on water quantity and quality in an urban watershed using a calibrated stormwater model. *Water*. 2017. 9(7): 464.
30. Fant, C., Srinivasan, R., Boehlert, B., Rennels, L., Chapra, S. C., Strzepek, K. M., Corona, J., Allen, A. and Martinich, J. Climate change impacts on us water quality using two models: Hawqs and US basins. *Water*. 2017. 9(2): 118.
31. Molina-Navarro, E., Trolle, D., Martínez-Pérez, S., Sastre-Merlín, A. and Jeppesen, E. Hydrological and water quality impact assessment of a Mediterranean limno-reservoir under climate change and land use management scenarios. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2014. 509: 354-366.

32. Hagemann, S., Chen, C., Clark, D., Folwell, S., Gosling, S. N., Haddeland, I., Hannasaki, N., Heinke, J., Ludwig, F. and Voss, F. Climate change impact on available water resources obtained using multiple global climate and hydrology models. *Earth System Dynamics*. 2013. 4: 129-144.
33. Haddeland, I., Heinke, J., Biemans, H., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Hanasaki, N., Konzmann, M., Ludwig, F., Masaki, Y. and Schewe, J. Global water resources affected by human interventions and climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2014. 111(9): 3251-3256.
34. Davis, J., O'Grady, A. P., Dale, A., Arthington, A. H., Gell, P. A., Driver, P. D., Bond, N., Casanova, M., Finlayson, M. and Watts, R. J. When trends intersect: The challenge of protecting freshwater ecosystems under multiple land use and hydrological intensification scenarios. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2015. 534: 65-78.
35. Honkonen, T. Water security and climate change: The need for adaptive governance. *PER: Potchefstroomse Elektroniese Regsblad*. 2017. 20(1): 1-26.
36. Park, J.-H., Duan, L., Kim, B., Mitchell, M. J. and Shibata, H. Potential effects of climate change and variability on watershed biogeochemical processes and water quality in Northeast Asia. *Environment International*. 2010. 36(2): 212-225.
37. Campbell, J. B. and Wynne, R. H. *Introduction to remote sensing*: Guilford Press:United Kingdom. 2011.
38. Hartman, M. D. *Ecosystem modeling to understand global change effects to terrestrial and fresh water systems*. Colorado State University; USA. 2013.
39. Reinmann, A. B. *Effects of winter climate change on carbon and nitrogen losses from temperate forest ecosystems*. Boston University, USA, 2014.
40. Pachauri, R. K., Allen, M. R., Barros, V. R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J. A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q. and Dasgupta, P. *Climate change 2014: Synthesis report. Contribution of working groups i, ii and iii to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*: IPCC. 2014.
41. Paroissien, J.-B., Darboux, F., Couturier, A., Devillers, B., Mouillot, F., Raclot, D. and Le Bissonnais, Y. A method for modeling the effects of climate and land use changes on erosion and sustainability of soil in a Mediterranean watershed (Languedoc, France). *Journal of environmental management*. 2015. 150: 57-68.
42. Korfmacher, K. S. The politics of participation in watershed modeling. *Environmental management*. 2001. 27(2): 161-176.

43. Yen, H., Wang, X., Fontane, D. G., Harmel, R. D. and Arabi, M. A framework for propagation of uncertainty contributed by parameterization, input data, model structure, and calibration/validation data in watershed modeling. *Environmental Modelling & Software*. 2014. 54: 211-221.
44. Dudgeon, D. *Tropical stream ecology*: Academic Press: Cambridge, 2011.
45. Smith, P., Gregory, P. J., Van Vuuren, D., Obersteiner, M., Havlík, P., Rounsevell, M., Woods, J., Stehfest, E. and Bellarby, J. Competition for land. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*. 2010. 365(1554): 2941-2957.
46. Taniwaki, R. H., Piggott, J. J., Ferraz, S. F. and Matthaei, C. D. Climate change and multiple stressors in small tropical streams. *Hydrobiologia*. 2017. 793(1): 41-53.
47. Hamdan, O., Aziz, H. K. and Hasmadi, I. M. L-band alos palsar for biomass estimation of Matang mangroves, Malaysia. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 2014. 155: 69-78.
48. Pour, A. B. and Hashim, M. Identification of high potential bays for habs occurrence in Peninsular Malaysia using palsar remote sensing data. *International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing & Spatial Information Sciences*. 2016. 42.
49. Bilotta, G. and Brazier, R. Understanding the influence of suspended solids on water quality and aquatic biota. *Water research*. 2008. 42(12): 2849-2861.
50. Salarpour, M., Rahman, N. A. and Yusop, Z. Simulation of flood extent mapping by infoworks RS-case study for tropical catchment. *J. Software Eng*. 2011. 5: 127-135.
51. IRDAa. Integrated land use blue print for Iskandar Malaysia. Johor Bahru, Malaysia.<http://iskandarmalaysia.com.my/downloads/land-blueprint.pdf> (Accessed 12 August 2016) 2011.
52. Naubi, I., Zardari, N. H., Shirazi, S. M., Roslan, N. A., Yusop, Z. and Haniffah, M. R. B. M. Ranking of Skudai river sub-watersheds from sustainability indices–application of promethee method. *International Journal*. 2017. 12(29): 124-131.
53. Muhammad I. Water quality assessment of sg skudai. Final year project report, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 2011
54. Environment, D.O.E Malaysia environmental quality report. Environment, D.O.E., Ed. Enviro Knowledge Center: (Accessed 10/04/2017) 2016.

55. Alarcon, V. J., McAnally, W., Diaz-Ramirez, J., Martin, J. and Cartwright, J. A hydrological model of the mobile river watershed, Southeastern USA. *Proceedings of the AIP Conference Proceedings: AIP*. 641-645.
56. Khalid, K., Ali, M. F., Rahman, N. F. A., Mispan, M. R., Haron, S. H., Rasid, M. Z. A., Hamim, N. M. and Kamaruddin, H. Application of the SWAT hydrologic model in Malaysia: Recent research. 2016.
57. MSMA Malaysia urban storm water management manual, department of irrigation and drainage Malaysia. <http://www.Water.Gov.My/home/56/1201-msma-manual?Lang=en>. (access 9/12/2016). 2016.
58. Dingman, S. L. *Physical hydrology*: Waveland press, Illinois, USA. 2015.
59. Fonseca, A., Botelho, C., Boaventura, R. A. and Vilar, V. J. Integrated hydrological and water quality model for river management: A case study on Lena river. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2014. 485: 474-489.
60. Gleick, P. H. Water in crisis: A guide to the worlds fresh water resources. [https://www.2000litergesellschaft.ch/.../user.../GLEICK\\_1993\\_Water\\_in\\_Crisis.pdf](https://www.2000litergesellschaft.ch/.../user.../GLEICK_1993_Water_in_Crisis.pdf) (Accessed 10/07/2016). 1993.
61. Carle, M. V., Halpin, P. N. and Stow, C. A. Patterns of watershed urbanization and impacts on water quality. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2005. 41(3): 693-708.
62. Ouyang, T., Zhu, Z. and Kuang, Y. Assessing impact of urbanization on river water quality in the Pearl river delta economic zone, China. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 2006. 120(1): 313-325.
63. Srinivasan, V., Seto, K. C., Emerson, R. and Gorelick, S. M. The impact of urbanization on water vulnerability: A coupled human–environment system approach for Chennai, India. *Global Environmental Change*. 2013. 23(1): 229-239.
64. Ren, L., Cui, E. and Sun, H. Temporal and spatial variations in the relationship between urbanization and water quality. *Environmental science and pollution Research*. 2014. 21(23): 13646-13655.
65. Zhao, J., Lin, L., Yang, K., Liu, Q. and Qian, G. Influences of land use on water quality in a reticular river network area: A case study in Shanghai, China. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 2015. 137: 20-29.
66. Pregun, C. Z. Ecohydrological and morphological relationships of a regulated lowland river; based on field studies and hydrological modeling. *Ecological Engineering*. 2016. 94: 608-616.

67. Trenberth, K. E., Smith, L., Qian, T., Dai, A. and Fasullo, J. Estimates of the global water budget and its annual cycle using observational and model data. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*. 2007. 8(4): 758-769.
68. Döll, P. and Bunn, S. E. The impact of climate change on freshwater ecosystems due to altered river flow regimes. *Climate change*. 2014: 143-146.
69. Copetti, D., Carniato, L., Crise, A., Guyennon, N., Palmeri, L., Pisacane, G., Struglia, M. V. and Tartari, G. Impacts of climate change on water quality. *Regional assessment of climate change in the mediterranean*: Springer. 307-332; 2013.
70. Wada, Y. and Bierkens, M. F. Sustainability of global water use: Past reconstruction and future projections. *Environmental Research Letters*. 2014. 9(10): 104003.
71. MacDonald, G. M. Water, climate change, and sustainability in the Southwest. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2010. 107(50): 21256-21262.
72. Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., Dankers, R., Eisner, S., Fekete, B. M. and Colón-González, F. J. Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2014. 111(9): 3245-3250.
73. Thomas, B. F. and Famiglietti, J. S. Sustainable groundwater management in the arid southwestern us: Coachella valley, California. *Water resources management*. 2015. 29(12): 4411-4426.
74. Savenije, H. H. Why water is not an ordinary economic good, or why the girl is special. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*. 2002. 27(11): 741-744.
75. Jacobs, K., Lebel, L., Buizer, J., Addams, L., Matson, P., McCullough, E., Garden, P., Saliba, G. and Finan, T. Linking knowledge with action in the pursuit of sustainable water-resources management. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2016. 113(17): 4591-4596.
76. Sivapalan, M., Konar, M., Srinivasan, V., Chhatre, A., Wutich, A., Scott, C., Wescoat, J. and Rodríguez-Iturbe, I. Socio-hydrology: Use-inspired water sustainability science for the anthropocene. *Earth's Future*. 2014. 2(4): 225-230.
77. Azhar, G. Managing Malaysian water resources development. *Malaysian Journal of Community Health*. 2000. 6: 40-58.
78. Lim, C. H. State of water resources in malaysia. Presentation on dialogue on “water environment partnership in asia (WEPA)” department of irrigation and drainage Malaysia. <http://www.Wepa-db.Net/pdf/0810malaysia/e.Pdf> . (accessed 17/06/2015). 2008.



79. Forum Air Malaysia, F. A. M. Is the target of 25% non-revenue water by 2020 achievable? [www.forumair.org.my/.../is%20the%20target%20of%2025%20percent%20nrw%20b](http://www.forumair.org.my/.../is%20the%20target%20of%2025%20percent%20nrw%20b) (Accessed 21/06/2015).2016.
80. Chan, N. W. Managing urban rivers and water quality in Malaysia for sustainable water resources. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*. 2012. 28(2): 343-354.
81. Tan, K. and Mokhtar, M. An appropriate institutional framework towards integrated water resources management in Pahang River basin, Malaysia. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 2009. 27(4): 536-547.
82. Al-Mamun, A. and Zainudin, Z. Sustainable river water quality management in Malaysia. *IJUM Engineering Journal*. 2013. 14(1).
83. Hochmuth, J. D., Asselman, J. and De Schampelaere, K. A. Are interactive effects of harmful algal blooms and copper pollution a concern for water quality management? *Water research*. 2014. 60: 41-53.
84. Devane, M. L., Moriarty, E. M., Wood, D., Webster-Brown, J. and Gilpin, B. J. The impact of major earthquakes and subsequent sewage discharges on the microbial quality of water and sediments in an urban river. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2014. 485: 666-680.
85. Potter, S., Becker, J., Johnston, D. and Rossiter, K. An overview of the impacts of the 2010-2011 canterbury earthquakes. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 2015. 14: 6-14.
86. Ranjbaran, M. and Sotohian, F. Environmental impact and sedimentary structures of mud volcanoes in southeast of the Caspian sea basin, Golestan province, Iran. *Caspian J. Env. Sci*. 2015. 13(4): 391-405.
87. Jennerjahn, T. C., Jänen, I., Propp, C., Adi, S. and Nugroho, S. P. Environmental impact of mud volcano inputs on the anthropogenically altered Porong river and Madura strait coastal waters, Java, Indonesia. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*. 2013. 130: 152-160.
88. Chapra, S. C. *Surface water-quality modeling*: Waveland press, Illonois, USA. 2008.
89. Zobrist, J. and Reichert, P. Bayesian estimation of export coefficients from diffuse and point sources in Swiss watersheds. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2006. 329(1): 207-223.
90. Carpenter, S. R., Caraco, N. F., Correll, D. L., Howarth, R. W., Sharpley, A. N. and Smith, V. H. Nonpoint pollution of surface waters with phosphorus and nitrogen. *Ecological applications*. 1998. 8(3): 559-568.

91. Duda, A. M. Addressing nonpoint sources of water pollution must become an international priority. *Water Science and Technology*. 1993. 28(3-5): 1-11.
92. Jaksch, J. A. and Peskin, H. M. Nonpoint-source water pollution. *Resources;(United States)*. 1984. 75.
93. Tim, U. S. and Jolly, R. Evaluating agricultural nonpoint-source pollution using integrated geographic information systems and hydrologic/water quality model. *Journal of environmental quality*. 1994. 23(1): 25-35.
94. Berankova, D. and Ungerman, J. Nonpoint sources of pollution in the Morava River basin. *Water Science and Technology*. 1996. 33(4-5): 127-135.
95. Howarth, R. W., Sharpley, A. and Walker, D. Sources of nutrient pollution to coastal waters in the United States: Implications for achieving coastal water quality goals. *Estuaries*. 2002. 25(4): 656-676.
96. Zhang, W., Wu, S., Ji, H. and Kolbe, H. Estimation of agricultural non-point source pollution in china and the alleviating strategies i. Estimation of agricultural non-point source pollution in China in early 21 century. *Scientia agricultura sinica*. 2004. 37(7): 1008-1017.
97. Makarewicz, J. C., Lewis, T. W., Snyder, B., Winslow, M. J., Pettenski, D., Rea, E., Dressel, L. and Smith, W. B. Genesee river watershed project. Volume 1. Water quality analysis of the genesee river watershed: Nutrient concentration and loading, identification of point and nonpoint sources of pollution, total maximum daily load, and an assessment of management practices using the soil water assessment tool (SWAT) model. A report to the USDA. 2013.
98. Shen, Z., Qiu, J., Hong, Q. and Chen, L. Simulation of spatial and temporal distributions of non-point source pollution load in the three Gorges reservoir region. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2014. 493: 138-146.
99. Hoag, D. L., Arabi, M., Osmond, D., Ribaud, M., Motallebi, M. and Tasdighi, A. Policy Utopias for nutrient credit trading programs with nonpoint sources. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2017.
100. Lamba, J., Karthikeyan, K. and Thompson, A. Apportionment of suspended sediment sources in an agricultural watershed using sediment fingerprinting. *Geoderma*. 2015. 239: 25-33.
101. Megahan, W. F. and King, P. N. Identification of critical areas on forest lands for control of nonpoint sources of pollution. *Environmental Management*. 1985. 9(1): 7-17.
102. Pionke, H. B., Gburek, W. J. and Sharpley, A. N. Critical source area controls on water quality in an agricultural watershed located in the Chesapeake basin. *Ecological Engineering*. 2000. 14(4): 325-335.

103. Niraula, R., Kalin, L., Srivastava, P. and Anderson, C. J. Identifying critical source areas of nonpoint source pollution with SWAT and GWLF. *Ecological Modelling*. 2013. 268: 123-133.
104. Huang, J. J., Lin, X., Wang, J. and Wang, H. The precipitation driven correlation based mapping method (pcm) for identifying the critical source areas of non-point source pollution. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2015. 524: 100-110.
105. Giri, S., Qiu, Z., Prato, T. and Luo, B. An integrated approach for targeting critical source areas to control nonpoint source pollution in watersheds. *Water Resources Management*. 2016. 30(14): 5087-5100.
106. Poudel, D., Lee, T., Srinivasan, R., Abbaspour, K. and Jeong, C. Assessment of seasonal and spatial variation of surface water quality, identification of factors associated with water quality variability, and the modeling of critical nonpoint source pollution areas in an Agricultural watershed. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. 2013. 68(3): 155-171.
107. Ghebremichael, L. T., Veith, T. L. and Hamlett, J. M. Integrated watershed-and farm-scale modeling framework for targeting critical source areas while maintaining farm economic viability. *Journal of environmental management*. 2013. 114: 381-394.
108. Chen, L., Zhong, Y., Wei, G., Cai, Y. and Shen, Z. Development of an integrated modeling approach for identifying multilevel non-point-source priority management areas at the watershed scale. *Water Resources Research*. 2014. 50(5): 4095-4109.
109. Shen, Z., Hou, X., Li, W., Aini, G., Chen, L. and Gong, Y. Impact of landscape pattern at multiple spatial scales on water quality: A case study in a typical urbanised watershed in China. *Ecological Indicators*. 2015. 48: 417-427.
110. Wei, P., Ouyang, W., Gao, X., Hao, F., Hao, Z. and Liu, H. Modified control strategies for critical source area of nitrogen (csan) in a typical Freeze-thaw watershed. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2017. 551: 518-531.
111. Bouraoui, F. and Grizzetti, B. An integrated modelling framework to estimate the fate of nutrients: Application to the Loire (France). *Ecological Modelling*. 2008. 212(3): 450-459.
112. Bouraoui, F. and Grizzetti, B. Modelling mitigation options to reduce diffuse nitrogen water pollution from agriculture. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2014. 468: 1267-1277.
113. Meyer, J. L., Sale, M. J., Mulholland, P. J. and Poff, N. L. Impacts of climate change on aquatic ecosystem functioning and health. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 1999. 35(6): 1373-1386.

114. Webb, B., Clack, P. and Walling, D. Water–air temperature relationships in a Devon River system and the role of flow. *Hydrological processes*. 2003. 17(15): 3069-3084.
115. Idso, S., Aase, J. and Jackson, R. Net radiation—soil heat flux relations as influenced by soil water content variations. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*. 1975. 9(1): 113-122.
116. Sweers, H. A nomogram to estimate the heat-exchange coefficient at the air-water interface as a function of wind speed and temperature; a critical survey of some literature. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1976. 30(4): 375-401.
117. Bowie, G. L., Mills, W. B., Porcella, D. B., Campbell, C. L., Pagenkopf, J. R., Rupp, G. L., Johnson, K. M., Chan, P., Gherini, S. A. and Chamberlin, C. E. Rates, constants, and kinetics formulations in surface water quality modeling. *EPA*. 1985. 600: 3-85.
118. Gay, L. W. The regression of net radiation upon solar radiation. *Archiv für Meteorologie, Geophysik und Bioklimatologie, Serie B*. 1971. 19(1): 1-14.
119. Paltridge, G. Direct measurement of water vapor absorption of solar radiation in the free atmosphere. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*. 1973. 30(1): 156-160.
120. Keijman, J. The estimation of the energy balance of a lake from simple weather data. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*. 1974. 7(3): 399-407.
121. Livingstone, D. M. and Imboden, D. M. Annual heat balance and equilibrium temperature of Lake Aegeri, Switzerland. *Aquatic Sciences-Research Across Boundaries*. 1989. 51(4): 351-369.
122. Svendsen, M. B. S., Bushnell, P., Christensen, E. A. F. and Steffensen, J. F. Sources of variation in oxygen consumption of aquatic animals demonstrated by simulated constant oxygen consumption and respirometers of different sizes. *Journal of fish biology*. 2016. 88(1): 51-64.
123. Khani, S. and Rajaei, T. Modeling of dissolved oxygen concentration and its hysteresis behavior in rivers using wavelet transform-based hybrid models. *CLEAN–Soil, Air, Water*. 2017. 45(2).
124. Smith, K. Oxygen demands of San Diego trough sediments: An in situ study. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 1974. 19(6): 939-944.
125. Seiki, T., Izawa, H., Date, E. and Sunahara, H. Sediment oxygen demand in Hiroshima bay. *Water Research*. 1994. 28(2): 385-393.
126. Cummins, K. W. and Klug, M. J. Feeding ecology of stream invertebrates. *Annual review of ecology and systematics*. 1979. 10(1): 147-172.

127. Redman, C. L., Grove, J. M. and Kuby, L. H. Integrating social science into the long-term ecological research (Iter) network: Social dimensions of ecological change and ecological dimensions of social change. *Ecosystems*. 2004. 7(2): 161-171.
128. Bunch, M., Morrison, K., Parkes, M. and Venema, H. Promoting health and well-being by managing for social–ecological resilience: The potential of integrating ecohealth and water resources management approaches. *Ecology and society*. 2011. 16(1).
129. Cohen, A. and Davidson, S. The watershed approach: Challenges, antecedents, and the transition from technical tool to governance unit. *Water alternatives*. 2011. 4(1): 1.
130. Bodin, Ö. and Tengö, M. Disentangling intangible social–ecological systems. *Global Environmental Change*. 2012. 22(2): 430-439.
131. Fischer, J., Gardner, T. A., Bennett, E. M., Balvanera, P., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S., Daw, T., Folke, C., Hill, R. and Hughes, T. P. Advancing sustainability through mainstreaming a social–ecological systems perspective. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. 2015. 14: 144-149.
132. McGinnis, M. and Ostrom, E. Social-ecological system framework: Initial changes and continuing challenges. *Ecology and Society*. 2014. 19(2).
133. Adler, R. W. and Straube, M. Watersheds and the integration of us water law and policy: Bridging the great divides. 2000.
134. Davies, J.-M. and Mazumder, A. Health and environmental policy issues in canada: The role of watershed management in sustaining clean drinking water quality at surface sources. *Journal of environmental management*. 2003. 68(3): 273-286.
135. Chaves, H. M. and Alipaz, S. An integrated indicator based on basin hydrology, environment, life, and policy: The watershed sustainability index. *Water Resources Management*. 2007. 21(5): 883-895.
136. da Fonseca, A. R. River water quality modelling for river basin and water resourcesmanagement.[https://sigarra.up.pt/ffup/pt/pub\\_geral.show\\_file?pi\\_gdoc\\_id=380913](https://sigarra.up.pt/ffup/pt/pub_geral.show_file?pi_gdoc_id=380913) (Accessed 23 April 2017); 2015.
137. Tung, Y.-K. Evaluating the probability of violating dissolved oxygen standard. *Ecological Modelling*. 1990. 51(3-4): 193-204.
138. Orlob, G. T. *Mathematical modeling of water quality: Streams, lakes and reservoirs*, Vol. 12: John Wiley & Sons. 1983.

139. Crawford, N. H. and Linsley, R. K. Digital simulation in hydrology's stanford watershed model 4. 1966.
140. Hydrocomp Hydrocomp simulation programming: Operations manual. [https://www.amazon.co.uk/Hydrocomp-simulation-programming-operations-manual/.../...](https://www.amazon.co.uk/Hydrocomp-simulation-programming-operations-manual/.../) (Accessed 03/02/2016).1976.
141. Donigian, A. S. and Crawford, N. H. *Modeling nonpoint pollution from the land surface*: US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Research Laboratory. 1976.
142. Donigian, A. S. *Agricultural runoff management (arm) model version ii: Refinement and testing*: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Research Laboratory. 1977.
143. Brown, L. C. and Barnwell, T. O. *The enhanced stream water quality models qual2e and qual2e-uncas: Documentation and user manual*: US Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Research and Development. Environmental Research Laboratory. 1987.
144. Bicknell, B. R., Imhoff, J. C., Kittle Jr, J. L., Jobes, T. H., Donigian Jr, A. S. and Johanson, R. Hydrological simulation program—fortran: HSPF, version 12.2 user's manual. *AQUA TERRA Consultants, Mountain View, California*. 2005.
145. Arnold, J. G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R. S. and Williams, J. R. Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment part I: Model development. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 1998. 34(1): 73-89.
146. Daniel, E. B., Camp, J. V., LeBoeuf, E. J., Penrod, J. R., Dobbins, J. P. and Abkowitz, M. D. Watershed modeling and its applications: A state-of-the-art review. *The Open Hydrology Journal*. 2011. 5(1).
147. Borah, D. K. and Bera, M. Watershed-scale hydrologic and nonpoint-source pollution models: Review of applications. *Transactions of the ASAE*. 2004. 47(3): 789.
148. Kim, S. M., Benham, B. L., Brannan, K. M., Zeckoski, R. W. and Doherty, J. Comparison of hydrologic calibration of HSPF using automatic and manual methods. *Water resources research*. 2007. 43(1).
149. Malone, R. W., Yagow, G., Baffaut, C., Gitau, M. W., Qi, Z., Amatya, D. M., Parajuli, P. B., Bonta, J. V. and Green, T. R. Parameterization guidelines and considerations for hydrologic models. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2015. 58(6): 1681-1703.

150. Guzman, C. D., Tilahun, S. A., Dagnew, D. C., Zegeye, A. D., Tebebu, T. Y., Yitaferu, B. and Steenhuis, T. S. Modeling sediment concentration and discharge variations in a small Ethiopian watershed with contributions from an unpaved road. *Journal of Hydrology and Hydromechanics*. 2017. 65(1): 1-17.
151. Pak, J. H., Fleming, M., Scharffenberg, W., Gibson, S. and Brauer, T. Modeling surface soil erosion and sediment transport processes in the upper north Bosque River watershed, Texas. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2015. 20(12): 04015034.
152. Zeinivand, H. and Smedt, F. D. Spatially distributed modeling of soil erosion and sediment transport at watershed scale. Proceedings of the *World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2009: Great Rivers*. 1-10.
153. Kumar, S., Mishra, A. and Raghuwanshi, N. S. Identification of critical erosion watersheds for control management in data scarce condition using the SWAT model. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2014. 20(6): C4014008.
154. De Vente, J., Poesen, J., Verstraeten, G., Govers, G., Vanmaercke, M., Van Rompaey, A., Arabkhedri, M. and Boix-Fayos, C. Predicting soil erosion and sediment yield at regional scales: Where do we stand? *Earth-Science Reviews*. 2013. 127: 16-29.
155. Santhi, C., Arnold, J. G., Williams, J. R., Dugas, W. A., Srinivasan, R. and Hauck, L. M. Validation of the SWAT model on a large river basin with point and nonpoint sources. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2001. 37(5): 1169-1188.
156. Alexander, R. B., Johnes, P. J., Boyer, E. W. and Smith, R. A. A comparison of models for estimating the riverine export of nitrogen from large watersheds. *The nitrogen cycle at regional to global scales*: Springer. 295-339; 2002.
157. Grizzetti, B., Bouraoui, F., Granlund, K., Rekolainen, S. and Bidoglio, G. Modelling diffuse emission and retention of nutrients in the Vantaanjoki watershed (Finland) using the SWAT model. *Ecological Modelling*. 2003. 169(1): 25-38.
158. Singh, J., Knapp, H. V., Arnold, J. and Demissie, M. Hydrological modeling of the Iroquois River watershed using HSPF and SWAT. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2005. 41(2): 343-360.
159. Abbaspour, K. C., Yang, J., Maximov, I., Siber, R., Bogner, K., Mieleitner, J., Zobrist, J. and Srinivasan, R. Modelling hydrology and water quality in the pre-Alpine/Alpine Thur watershed using SWAT. *Journal of hydrology*. 2007. 333(2): 413-430.

160. Bouwman, A., Bierkens, M., Griffioen, J., Hefting, M., Middelburg, J., Middelkoop, H. and Slomp, C. Nutrient dynamics, transfer and retention along the aquatic continuum from land to ocean: Towards integration of ecological and biogeochemical models. *Biogeosciences*. 2013. 10(1): 1-22.
161. Gebremariam, S. Y., Martin, J. F., DeMarchi, C., Bosch, N. S., Confesor, R. and Ludsin, S. A. A comprehensive approach to evaluating watershed models for predicting river flow regimes critical to downstream ecosystem services. *Environmental modelling & software*. 2014. 61: 121-134.
162. Berndt, M. E., Rutelonis, W. and Regan, C. P. A comparison of results from a hydrologic transport model (HSPF) with distributions of sulfate and mercury in a mine-impacted watershed in Northeastern Minnesota. *Journal of environmental management*. 2016. 181: 74-79.
163. Sharifi, A., Yen, H., Boomer, K. M., Kalin, L., Li, X. and Weller, D. E. Using multiple watershed models to assess the water quality impacts of alternate land development scenarios for a small community. *Catena*. 2017. 150: 87-99.
164. Mekonnen, B. A., Mazurek, K. A. and Putz, G. Modeling of nutrient export and effects of management practices in a cold-climate Prairie watershed: Assiniboine River watershed, Canada. *Agricultural Water Management*. 2017. 180: 235-251.
165. Zawiah, W. Z. W., Jemain, A. A., Ibrahim, K., Suhaila, J. and Sayang, M. D. A comparative study of extreme rainfall in Peninsular Malaysia: With reference to partial duration and annual extreme series. *Sains Malaysiana*. 2009. 38(5): 751-760.
166. Nor, N. I., Harun, S. and Kassim, A. H. Radial basis function modeling of hourly streamflow hydrograph. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2007. 12(1): 113-123.
167. Sulaiman, M., El-Shafie, A., Karim, O. and Basri, H. Improved water level forecasting performance by using optimal steepness coefficients in an artificial neural network. *Water resources management*. 2011. 25(10): 2525-2541.
168. Yusop, Z., Chan, C. and Katimon, A. Runoff characteristics and application of hec-hms for modelling stormflow hydrograph in an oil palm catchment. *Water Science and Technology*. 2007. 56(8): 41-48.
169. Razi, M., Ariffin, J., Tahir, W. and Arish, N. Flood estimation studies using hydrologic modeling system (HEC-HMS) for Johor river, Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Sciences*. 2010. 10(11): 930-939.
170. Amini, A., Ali, T. M., Ghazali, A. H. B., Aziz, A. A. and Akib, S. M. Impacts of land-use change on streamflows in the Damansara watershed, Malaysia. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*. 2011. 36(5): 713.



171. Halwatura, D. and Najim, M. Application of the HEC-HMS model for runoff simulation in a tropical catchment. *Environmental modelling & software*. 2013. 46: 155-162.
172. Mah, Y. D. S., Frederik, J. P. and Salim, S. Use of infoworks river simulation (rs) in Sungai Sarawak Kanan modeling. [www.innovyze.com/files/2008/sungai\\_sarawak\\_kanan.pdf](http://www.innovyze.com/files/2008/sungai_sarawak_kanan.pdf) (Accessed 06/08/ 2016). 2007.
173. Toriman, M. E., Hassan, A. J., Gazim, M. B., Mokhtar, M., SA, S. M., Jaafar, O., Karim, O. and Aziz, N. A. A. Integration of 1-d hydrodynamic model and GIS approach in flood management study in Malaysia. *Research Journal of Earth Sciences*. 2009. 1(1): 22-27.
174. Izham, M. Y., Uznir, U., Alias, A. and Ayob, K. Georeference, rainfall-runoff modeling and 3d dynamic simulation: Physical influence, integration and approaches. Proceedings of the *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference and Exhibition on Computing for Geospatial Research & Application*: ACM. 21.
175. Memarian, H., Balasundram, S. K., Talib, J. B., Sung, C. T. B., Sood, A. M. and Abbaspour, K. Validation of ca-markov for simulation of land use and cover change in the Langat basin, Malaysia. *Journal of Geographic Information System*. 2012. 4(6): 542-554.
176. Abdullah, J. *Distributed runoff simulation of extreme monsoon rainstorms in Malaysia using trex*. Colorado State University. Libraries; 2013.
177. Ghani, A. A., Zakaria, N. and Falconer, R. River modelling and flood mitigation; malaysian perspectives. Proceedings of the *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Water Management*: Thomas Telford Ltd. 1-2.
178. Ayub, K. R., Hin, L. S. and Aziz, H. A. Swat application for hydrologic and water quality modeling for suspended sediments: A case study of Sungai Langat's catchment in Selangor. 2009.
179. Lai, S. H. and Arniza, F. Application of swat hydrological model to upper Bernam River basin (UBRB), Malaysia. *IUP Journal of Environmental Sciences*. 2011. 5(2).
180. Ali, M. F., Rahman, N. F. A. and Khalid, K. Discharge assessment by using integrated hydrologic model for environmental technology development. Proceedings of the *Advanced Materials Research*: Trans Tech Publ. 378-382.
181. Khalid, K., Ali, M. and Rahman, N. A. The development and application of malaysian soil taxonomy in SWAT watershed model. *Isfram 2014*: Springer. 77-88; 2015.

182. Mohd, M., Mispan, M., Juneng, L., Tangang, F., Rahman, N., Khalid, K., Rasid, M. and Haron, S. Assessment of impacts of climate change on streamflow trend in upper Kuantan watershed. *ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*. 2015. 10(15): 6634-6642.
183. Tan, M. L., Ibrahim, A. L., Yusop, Z., Duan, Z. and Ling, L. Impacts of land-use and climate variability on hydrological components in the Johor River basin, Malaysia. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*. 2015. 60(5): 873-889.
184. Khalid, K., Ali, M., Rahman, N. A. and Mispan, M. Application on one-at-a-time sensitivity analysis of semi-distributed hydrological model in tropical watershed. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*. 2016. 8(2): 132.
185. Donigian, A. S. and Huber, W. C. *Modeling of nonpoint source water quality in urban and non-urban areas*: Environmental Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, US Environmental Protection Agency. 1991.
186. Shenk, G. W., Wu, J. and Linker, L. C. Enhanced hspf model structure for Chesapeake bay watershed simulation. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 2012. 138(9): 949-957.
187. Duda, P., Hummel, P., Donigian Jr, A. and Imhoff, J. Basins/hspf: Model use, calibration, and validation. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2012. 55(4): 1523-1547.
188. WinHSPF. An independent, fully integrated component of a comprehensive modelling system. [www.aquaterra.com/resources/hspfsupport/winhsfpf.php](http://www.aquaterra.com/resources/hspfsupport/winhsfpf.php) 2008. (Accessed 26/01/2016)
189. Kinerson, R. S., Kittle, J. L. and Duda, P. B. Basins: Better assessment science integrating point and nonpoint sources. *Decision support systems for risk-based management of contaminated sites*: Springer. 1-24; 2009.
190. Luzio, M., Srinivasan, R. and Arnold, J. G. Integration of watershed tools and SWAT model into basins. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2002. 38(4): 1127-1141.
191. Mishra, A., Bicknell, B. R., Duda, P., Donigian, T. and Gray, M. H. Hspexp+: An enhanced expert system for hspf model calibration—a case study of the Snake river watershed in Minnesota. *Journal of Water Management Modeling*. 2017. <https://www.chijournal.org/Content/Files/C422.pdf> (Accessed 19 March 2017).
192. Lumb, A. M., McCammon, R. B. and Kittle, J. L. *Users manual for an expert system (hspexp) for calibration of the hydrological simulation program--fortran*: US Geological Survey Reston, VA. 1994.
193. USEPA Basins 4.0 climate assessment tool (cat): Supporting documentation and user's manual (final report). U.S. Environmental protection agency, Washington, dc, epa/600/r-08/088f. 2009.

194. Imhoff, J., Kittle, J., Gray, M. and Johnson, T. Using the climate assessment tool (cat) in us epa basins integrated modeling system to assess watershed vulnerability to climate change. *Water Science and Technology*. 2007. 56(8): 49-56.
195. Coffey, R., Benham, B., Kline, K., Wolfe, M. L. and Cummins, E. Modeling the impacts of climate change and future land use variation on microbial transport. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*. 2015. 6(3): 449-471.
196. Johnson, T. E. and Weaver, C. P. A framework for assessing climate change impacts on water and watershed systems. *Environmental Management*. 2009. 43(1): 118-134.
197. Taner, M. Ü., Carleton, J. N. and Wellman, M. Integrated model projections of climate change impacts on a North American Lake. *Ecological Modelling*. 2011. 222(18): 3380-3393.
198. Johnson, T., Butcher, J., Parker, A. and Weaver, C. Investigating the sensitivity of us streamflow and water quality to climate change: US EPA global change research program's 20 watersheds project. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*. 2011. 138(5): 453-464.
199. Dudula, J. and Randhir, T. O. Modeling the influence of climate change on watershed systems: Adaptation through targeted practices. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2016. 541: 703-713.
200. Johnson, M. S., Coon, W. F., Mehta, V. K., Steenhuis, T. S., Brooks, E. S. and Boll, J. Application of two hydrologic models with different runoff mechanisms to a hillslope dominated watershed in the Northeastern US: A comparison of HSPF and SMR. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2003. 284(1): 57-76.
201. Moyer, D. and Hyer, K. Use of the hydrological simulation program-fortran and bacterial source tracking for development of the fecal coliform total maximum daily load (TMDL) for blacks run, Rockingham county, Virginia. 2003.
202. Johanson, R. C. and Davis, H. H. *Users manual for hydrological simulation program-fortran (hspf)*, Vol. 80: Environmental Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, US Environmental Protection Agency. 1980.
203. Horn, A. L., Rueda, F. J., Hörmann, G. and Fohrer, N. Implementing river water quality modelling issues in mesoscale watershed models for water policy demands—an overview on current concepts, deficits, and future tasks. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*. 2004. 29(11): 725-737.
204. Alukwe, I. A. *Evaluating the effects of watershed land use distribution and bmp data on hspf water quality predictions*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; USA. 2013.

205. Moriasi, D. N., Arnold, J. G., Van Liew, M. W., Bingner, R. L., Harmel, R. D. and Veith, T. L. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2007. 50(3): 885-900.
206. Donigian, A. Watershed model calibration and validation: The hspf experience. *Proceedings of the Water Environment Federation*. 2002. 2002(8): 44-73.
207. Hinnell, A., Ferré, T., Vrugt, J., Huisman, J., Moysey, S., Rings, J. and Kowalsky, M. Improved extraction of hydrologic information from geophysical data through coupled hydrogeophysical inversion. *Water resources research*. 2010. 46(4).
208. Yang, G., Bowling, L. C., Cherkauer, K. A., Pijanowski, B. C. and Niyogi, D. Hydroclimatic response of watersheds to urban intensity: An observational and modeling-based analysis for the White River basin, Indiana. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*. 2010. 11(1): 122-138.
209. Diaz-Ramirez, J. N., McAnally, W. H. and Martin, J. L. Sensitivity of simulating hydrologic processes to gauge and radar rainfall data in subtropical coastal catchments. *Water resources management*. 2012. 26(12): 3515-3538.
210. Gardner, R., O'Neill, R., Mankin, J. and Carney, J. A comparison of sensitivity analysis and error analysis based on a stream ecosystem model. *Ecological Modelling*. 1981. 12(3): 173-190.
211. Saltelli, A. Making best use of model evaluations to compute sensitivity indices. *Computer Physics Communications*. 2002. 145(2): 280-297.
212. Van Griensven, A., Meixner, T., Grunwald, S., Bishop, T., Diluzio, M. and Srinivasan, R. A global sensitivity analysis tool for the parameters of multi-variable catchment models. *Journal of hydrology*. 2006. 324(1): 10-23.
213. Li, Z., Shao, Q., Xu, Z. and Cai, X. Analysis of parameter uncertainty in semi-distributed hydrological models using bootstrap method: A case study of SWAT model applied to Yingluoxia watershed in Northwest China. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2010. 385(1): 76-83.
214. Moreau, P., Viaud, V., Parnaudeau, V., Salmon-Monviola, J. and Durand, P. An approach for global sensitivity analysis of a complex environmental model to spatial inputs and parameters: A case study of an agro-hydrological model. *Environmental modelling & software*. 2013. 47: 74-87.
215. Dimov, I., Georgieva, R., Ostromsky, T. and Zlatev, Z. Advanced algorithms for multidimensional sensitivity studies of large-scale air pollution models based on sobol sequences. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*. 2013. 65(3): 338-351.

216. Baroni, G. and Tarantola, S. A general probabilistic framework for uncertainty and global sensitivity analysis of deterministic models: A hydrological case study. *Environmental Modelling & Software*. 2014. 51: 26-34.
217. McCuen, R. H. The role of sensitivity analysis in hydrologic modeling. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1973. 18(1): 37-53.
218. White, K. L. and Chaubey, I. Sensitivity analysis, calibration, and validations for a multisite and multivariable SWAT model. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2005. 41(5): 1077-1089.
219. Liu, Y., Godrej, A. N., Grizzard, T. J. and Dillaha, T. . Application and sensitivity analysis of a watershed model application using hspf with the nutrient algorithm agchem in Upper Broad Run watershed, Virginia. *Effective Modeling of Nutrient Losses and Nutrient Management Practices in an Agricultural and Urbanizing Watershed*. 2011: 56.
220. Zheng, Y. and Keller, A. A. Understanding parameter sensitivity and its management implications in watershed-scale water quality modeling. *Water Resources Research*. 2006. 42(5).
221. Lenhart, T., Eckhardt, K., Fohrer, N. and Frede, H.-G. Comparison of two different approaches of sensitivity analysis. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*. 2002. 27(9): 645-654.
222. Mostaghimi, S., Park, S., Cooke, R. and Wang, S. Assessment of management alternatives on a small agricultural watershed. *Water Research*. 1997. 31(8): 1867-1878.
223. Cho, J.-P. A comprehensive modeling approach for bmp impact assessment considering surface and ground water interaction. <http://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu>. (Accessed 24/07/2015), 2007.
224. Ackerman, D. and Stein, E. D. Evaluating the effectiveness of best management practices using dynamic modeling. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 2008. 134(8): 628-639.
225. Boucher, A., Tremwel, T. K. and Campbell, K. L. Best management practices for water quality improvement in the Lake Okeechobee watershed. *Ecological Engineering*. 1995. 5(2): 341-356.
226. Gitau, M. W., Veith, T. L., Gburek, W. J. and Jarrett, A. R. Watershed level best management practice selection and placement in the Town Brook watershed, New York1. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2006. 42(6): 1565-1581.

227. Kaini, P., Artita, K. and Nicklow, J. W. Optimizing structural best management practices using SWAT and genetic algorithm to improve water quality goals. *Water resources management*. 2012. 26(7): 1827-1845.
228. O'Donnell, T. K., Baffaut, C. and Galat, D. L. Predicting effects of best management practices on sediment loads to improve watershed management in the Midwest, USA. *International Journal of River Basin Management*. 2008. 6(3): 243-256.
229. Ritter, W. F. and Sood, A. Modeling bmps in Delaware's inland bays watershed. Proceedings of the *World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2012: Crossing Boundaries*. 424-434.
230. Qiu, Z. Comparative assessment of stormwater and nonpoint source pollution best management practices in suburban watershed management. *Water*. 2013. 5(1): 280-291.
231. Rousseau, A. N., Savary, S., Hallema, D. W., Gumiere, S. J. and Foulon, É. Modeling the effects of agricultural BMPS on sediments, nutrients, and water quality of the Beaurivage river watershed (Quebec, Canada). *Canadian Water Resources Journal*. 2013. 38(2): 99-120.
232. Alvarez, S., Asci, S. and Vorotnikova, E. Valuing the potential benefits of water quality improvements in watersheds affected by non-point source pollution. *Water*. 2016. 8(4): 112.
233. Aulenbach, B. T., Landers, M. N., Musser, J. W. and Painter, J. A. Effects of impervious area and bmp implementation and design on storm runoff and water quality in Eight small watersheds. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2017. 53(2): 382-399.
234. Zakaria, N. A., Ghani, A. A., Abdullah, R., Sidek, L. M., Kassim, A. and Ainan, A. Msma—a new urban stormwater management manual for Malaysia. Proceedings of the *International Conference "ICHE"*.
235. Sidek, L. M., Takara, K., Zakaria, N., Ghani, A. and Abdullah, R. An assessment of stormwater management practices using MSMA manual in Malaysia. Proceedings of the *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Managing Rivers in the 21st Century: Issues and Challenges (RIVERS04)*. Penang, Malaysia. 329-343.
236. Sultana, N., Akib, S., Aqeel Ashraf, M. and Roseli Zainal Abidin, M. Quality assessment of harvested rainwater from green roofs under tropical climate. *Desalination and Water Treatment*. 2016. 57(1): 75-82.
237. Liew, Y., Selamat, Z., Ab. Ghani, A. and Zakaria, N. Performance of a dry detention pond: Case study of Kota Damansara, Selangor, Malaysia. *Urban Water Journal*. 2012. 9(2): 129-136.

238. San L, Y., Teo, F. Y. and Ghani, A. A. Assessment of the climate change impact on a dry detention pond at Kota Damansara, Malaysia. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Urban Drainage, Sarawak, Malaysia*.
239. Vasukey, P., Ahmad, R. and Abidin, M. Z. Evaluation of bioretention system under tropical climate: A case study at humid tropics centre Kuala Lumpur Malaysia (HTCKL). 2010.
240. Muha, N. E. and Sidek, L. M. Bio-retention system as storm water quality improvement mechanism. *Sci Res J*. 2015. 3(2): 39-46.
241. Muha, N. E., Sidek, L. M., Basri, H., Beecham, S. and Abidin, M. R. Z. A field evaluation of bioretention system flow and pollutant treatment in tropical climate.
242. Muha, N. E., Sidek, L. M. and Jajarmizadeh, M. Water quality improvement through reductions of pollutant loads on small scale of bioretention system. *Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*: IOP Publishing. 012010.
243. Noor, N. A. M., Sidek, L. M., Desa, M. N. B. M. and Abidin, M. R. Z. Performance evaluation on constructed wetland as water quality improvement for tropical condition. *redac.eng.usm.my/html/publish/2011\_47.pdf (Accessed 19/09/2015)*.
244. Johari, N. E., Abdul-Talib, S., Wahid, M. A. and Ghani, A. A. Trend of total phosphorus on total suspended solid reduction in constructed wetland under tropical climate. *Isfram 2015*: Springer. 273-280; 2016.
245. Sidek, L. M., Muha, N. E., Noor, N. A. M. and Basri, H. Constructed rain garden systems for stormwater quality control under tropical climates. *Proceedings of the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*: IOP Publishing. 012020.
246. Kok, K. H., Mohd Sidek, L., Chow, M. F., Zainal Abidin, M. R., Basri, H. and Hayder, G. Evaluation of green roof performances for urban stormwater quantity and quality controls. *International Journal of River Basin Management*. 2016. 14(1): 1-7.
247. Benisi Ghadim, H., Sai Hin, L., Hooi Bu, C. and Jie Chin, R. Effectiveness of bioecods for peak flow attenuation: An appraisal using Infoworks SD. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*. 2017. 62(3): 421-430.
248. Diaz-Ramirez, J., McAnally, W. and Martin, J. Analysis of hydrological processes applying the hspf model in selected watersheds in Alabama, Mississippi, and Puerto Rico. *Applied engineering in agriculture*. 2011. 27(6): 937-954.

249. Dingman, S. L., Seely-Reynolds, D. M. and Reynolds, R. C. Application of kriging to estimating mean annual precipitation in a region of orographic influence. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 1988. 24(2): 329-339.
250. Todini, E. and Pellegrini, F. A maximum likelihood estimator for semi-variogram parameters in kriging. *Geoenv ii—geostatistics for environmental applications*: Springer. 187-198; 1999.
251. Dassou, E. F., Ombolo, A., Chouto, S., Mboudou, G. E., Essi, J. M. A. and Bineli, E. Trends and geostatistical interpolation of spatio-temporal variability of precipitation in Northern Cameroon. *American Journal of Climate Change*. 2016. 5(02): 229.
252. Shah, S., O'connell, P. and Hosking, J. Modelling the effects of spatial variability in rainfall on catchment response. 2. Experiments with distributed and lumped models. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1996. 175(1-4): 89-111.
253. Faurès, J.-M., Goodrich, D., Woolhiser, D. A. and Sorooshian, S. Impact of small-scale spatial rainfall variability on runoff modeling. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1995. 173(1-4): 309-326.
254. Koren, V., Finnerty, B., Schaake, J., Smith, M., Seo, D.-J. and Duan, Q.-Y. Scale dependencies of hydrologic models to spatial variability of precipitation. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1999. 217(3): 285-302.
255. Ryu, J. H. Application of HSPF to the distributed model intercomparison project: Case study. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2009. 14(8): 847-857.
256. Goovaerts, P. *Geostatistics for natural resources evaluation*: Oxford University Press on Demand. UK, 1997.
257. Watts, J. and Maidment, D. Geo-spatial hspf model creation: Toward a digital watershed. Proceedings of the *World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2007: Restoring Our Natural Habitat*. 1-5.
258. Sarangi, A., Cox, C. and Madramootoo, C. Geostatistical methods for prediction of spatial variability of rainfall in a Mountainous region. *Transactions of the ASAE*. 2005. 48(3): 943-954.
259. Drogue, G., Humbert, J., Deraisme, J., Mahr, N. and Freslon, N. A statistical-topographic model using an omnidirectional parameterization of the relief for mapping orographic rainfall. *International Journal of Climatology*. 2002. 22(5): 599-613.
260. Goovaerts, P. Geostatistical approaches for incorporating elevation into the spatial interpolation of rainfall. *Journal of hydrology*. 2000. 228(1): 113-129.



261. Borga, M. and Vizzaccaro, A. On the interpolation of hydrologic variables: Formal equivalence of multiquadratic surface fitting and kriging. *Journal of Hydrology*. 1997. 195(1-4): 160-171.
262. Hevesi, J. A., Flint, A. L. and Istok, J. D. Precipitation estimation in Mountainous terrain using multivariate geostatistics. Part II: Isohyetal maps. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*. 1992. 31(7): 677-688.
263. Clark, I. Practical geostatistics. [www.sacnasp.org.za/files/9/Uploads/49/geostats-201426Mar.pdf](http://www.sacnasp.org.za/files/9/Uploads/49/geostats-201426Mar.pdf) (Accessed 17/09/2015), 1979. 3: 129.
264. Eddy, J. A. Climate and the changing sun. *Climatic Change*. 1977. 1(2): 173-190.
265. Newell, R. E. Climate and the ocean: Measurements of changes in sea-surface temperature should permit us to forecast certain climatic changes several months ahead. *American Scientist*. 1979. 67(4): 405-416.
266. Landsberg, H. E. Man-made climatic changes. *Science*. 1970. 170(3964): 1265-1274.
267. Leith, C. Climate response and fluctuation dissipation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*. 1975. 32(10): 2022-2026.
268. Cess, R. D. Climate change: An appraisal of atmospheric feedback mechanisms employing zonal climatology. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*. 1976. 33(10): 1831-1843.
269. Agrawala, S. Context and early origins of the intergovernmental panel on climate change. *Climatic Change*. 1998. 39(4): 605-620.
270. Agrawala, S. Explaining the evolution of the ipcc structure and process. <https://www.belfercenter.org/.../explaining-evolution-ipcc-structure-and-process> (Accessed 27/01/2016), 1997.
271. Hulme, M. and Mahony, M. Climate change: What do we know about the IPCC? *Progress in Physical Geography*. 2010. 34(5): 705-718.
272. Vasileiadou, E., Heimeriks, G. and Petersen, A. C. Exploring the impact of the ipcc assessment reports on science. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2011. 14(8): 1052-1061.
273. Mastrandrea, M. D., Field, C. B., Stocker, T. F., Edenhofer, O., Ebi, K. L., Frame, D. J., Held, H., Kriegler, E., Mach, K. J. and Matschoss, P. R. Guidance note for lead authors of the IPCC fifth assessment report on consistent treatment of uncertainties. 2010.
274. Grotch, S. L. and MacCracken, M. C. The use of general circulation models to predict regional climatic change. *Journal of Climate*. 1991. 4(3): 286-303.

275. Jones, P. G., Thornton, P. K. and Heinke, J. Generating characteristic daily weather data using downscaled climate model data from the IPCC'S fourth assessment. *ccafs.climate.org/.../Generating\_Characteristic\_Daily\_Weather\_Data\_using\_Downscal...* (Accessed 29/07/2015). 2009.
276. Weaver, A. J. and Sarachik, E. Evidence for decadal variability in an ocean general circulation model: An advective mechanism 1. *Atmosphere-Ocean*. 1991. 29(2): 197-231.
277. Cruz, F., Narisma, G., Dado, J., Singhruck, P., Tangang, F., Linarka, U., Wati, T., Juneng, L., Phan-Van, T. and Ngo-Duc, T. Sensitivity of temperature to physical parameterization schemes of regcm4 over the CORDEX-Southeast asia region. *International Journal of Climatology*. 2017.
278. Chung, J. X., Ngai, S. T., Tay, T. W., Liew, J. N. and Tangang, F. Simulation of surface temperature in southeast asia during the Southeast Asian southwest monsoon using REGCM4. *Proceedings of the AIP Conference Proceedings: AIP Publishing*. 020011.
279. Juneng, L., Tangang, F., Chung, J. X., Ngai, S. T., Tay, T. W., Narisma, G., Cruz, F., Phan-Van, T., Ngo-Duc, T. and Santisirisomboon, J. Sensitivity of Southeast Asia rainfall simulations to cumulus and air-sea flux parameterizations in REGCM4. *Climate Research*. 2016. 69(1): 59-77.
280. Ngo-Duc, T., Tangang, F. T., Santisirisomboon, J., Cruz, F., Trinh-Tuan, L., Nguyen-Xuan, T., Phan-Van, T., Juneng, L., Narisma, G. and Singhruck, P. Performance evaluation of regcm4 in simulating extreme rainfall and temperature indices over the CORDEX-Southeast Asia region. *International Journal of Climatology*. 2017. 37(3): 1634-1647.
281. Merritt, W. S., Alila, Y., Barton, M., Taylor, B., Cohen, S. and Neilsen, D. Hydrologic response to scenarios of climate change in sub watersheds of the Okanagan basin, British Columbia. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2006. 326(1): 79-108.
282. Wood, A. W., Leung, L. R., Sridhar, V. and Lettenmaier, D. Hydrologic implications of dynamical and statistical approaches to downscaling climate model outputs. *Climatic change*. 2004. 62(1): 189-216.
283. Fowler, H. J., Blenkinsop, S. and Tebaldi, C. Linking climate change modelling to impacts studies: Recent advances in downscaling techniques for hydrological modelling. *International journal of climatology*. 2007. 27(12): 1547-1578.
284. Ahmadi, M., Records, R. and Arabi, M. Impact of climate change on diffuse pollutant fluxes at the watershed scale. *Hydrological Processes*. 2014. 28(4): 1962-1972.

285. Narsimlu, B., Gosain, A. K. and Chahar, B. R. Assessment of future climate change impacts on water resources of upper sind river basin, India using SWAT model. *Water resources management*. 2013. 27(10): 3647-3662.
286. Verma, S., Bhattarai, R., Bosch, N. S., Cooke, R. C., Kalita, P. K. and Markus, M. Climate change impacts on flow, sediment and nutrient export in a Great lakes watershed using SWAT. *CLEAN-Soil, Air, Water*. 2015. 43(11): 1464-1474.
287. Zhou, Z., Ouyang, Y., Li, Y., Qiu, Z. and Moran, M. Estimating impact of rainfall change on hydrological processes in Jianfengling Rainforest watershed, China using BASINS-HSPF-CAT modeling system. *Ecological Engineering*. 2017. 105: 87-94.
288. Dale, V. H. The relationship between land-use change and climate change. *Ecological applications*. 1997. 7(3): 753-769.
289. Tomer, M. D. and Schilling, K. E. A simple approach to distinguish land-use and climate-change effects on watershed hydrology. *Journal of hydrology*. 2009. 376(1): 24-33.
290. Hunsaker, C. T., Garten, C. T. and Mulholland, P. J. Modeling nitrogen cycling in forested watersheds of Chesapeake bay. Oak Ridge National Lab., TN (United States). 1995.
291. Xiao, H. and Ji, W. Relating landscape characteristics to non-point source pollution in mine waste-located watersheds using geospatial techniques. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2007. 82(1): 111-119.
292. Uuema, E., Roosaare, J. and Mander, Ü. Scale dependence of landscape metrics and their indicative value for nutrient and organic matter losses from catchments. *Ecological Indicators*. 2005. 5(4): 350-369.
293. Lee, S.-W., Hwang, S.-J., Lee, S.-B., Hwang, H.-S. and Sung, H.-C. Landscape ecological approach to the relationships of land use patterns in watersheds to water quality characteristics. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 2009. 92(2): 80-89.
294. Amiri, B. J. and Nakane, K. Modeling the linkage between river water quality and landscape metrics in the Chugoku district of Japan. *Water resources management*. 2009. 23(5): 931-956.
295. Jiang, T., Huo, S., Xi, B., Su, J., Hou, H., Yu, H. and Li, X. The influences of land-use changes on the absorbed nitrogen and phosphorus loadings in the drainage basin of Lake Chaohu, China. *Environmental Earth Sciences*. 2014. 71(9): 4165-4176.
296. Patil, A. and Deng, Z.-Q. Input data measurement-induced uncertainty in watershed modelling. *Hydrological sciences journal*. 2012. 57(1): 118-133.

297. Diaz-Ramirez, J. N., Alarcon, V. J., Duan, Z., Tagert, M. L., McAnally, W., Martin, J. L. and O'Hara, C. G. Impacts of land use characterization in modeling hydrology and sediments for the Luxapallila Creek watershed, Alabama and Mississippi. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2008. 51(1): 139-151.
298. Chen, X.-L., Zhao, H.-M., Li, P.-X. and Yin, Z.-Y. Remote sensing image-based analysis of the relationship between urban heat island and land use/cover changes. *Remote sensing of environment*. 2006. 104(2): 133-146.
299. Xiao, J., Shen, Y., Ge, J., Tateishi, R., Tang, C., Liang, Y. and Huang, Z. Evaluating urban expansion and land use change in Shijiazhuang, China, by using GIS and remote sensing. *Landscape and urban planning*. 2006. 75(1): 69-80.
300. Chandra, S. and Sharma, K. Application of remote sensing to hydrology. Proceedings of the *Proceedings of symposium on hydrology of rivers with small and medium catchments, Univ of Roorkee, India*. 1-13.
301. Schmugge, T. J., Kustas, W. P., Ritchie, J. C., Jackson, T. J. and Rango, A. Remote sensing in hydrology. *Advances in water resources*. 2002. 25(8): 1367-1385.
302. Wagner, W., Blöschl, G., Pampaloni, P., Calvet, J.-C., Bizzarri, B., Wigneron, J.-P. and Kerr, Y. Operational readiness of microwave remote sensing of soil moisture for hydrologic applications. *Hydrology Research*. 2007. 38(1): 1-20.
303. Kerr, J. T. and Ostrovsky, M. From space to species: Ecological applications for remote sensing. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 2003. 18(6): 299-305.
304. Hunsaker, C. T., Goodchild, M. F., Friedl, M. A. and Case, T. J. *Spatial uncertainty in ecology: Implications for remote sensing and gis applications*: Springer Science & Business Media. 2013.
305. Bastiaanssen, W. G., Molden, D. J. and Makin, I. W. Remote sensing for irrigated agriculture: Examples from research and possible applications. *Agricultural water management*. 2000. 46(2): 137-155.
306. Atzberger, C. Advances in remote sensing of agriculture: Context description, existing operational monitoring systems and major information needs. *Remote Sensing*. 2013. 5(2): 949-981.
307. Mattikalli, N. M. and Richards, K. S. Estimation of surface water quality changes in response to land use change: Application of the export coefficient model using remote sensing and geographical information system. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 1996. 48(3): 263-282.
308. Olmanson, L. G., Brezonik, P. L. and Bauer, M. E. Airborne hyperspectral remote sensing to assess spatial distribution of water quality characteristics in large rivers: The Mississippi river and its tributaries in Minnesota. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 2013. 130: 254-265.

309. Weng, Q. Land use change analysis in the Zhujiang delta of China using satellite remote sensing, GIS and stochastic modelling. *Journal of environmental management*. 2002. 64(3): 273-284.
310. Jaiswal, R. K., Saxena, R. and Mukherjee, S. Application of remote sensing technology for land use/land cover change analysis. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing*. 1999. 27(2): 123-128.
311. Shalaby, A. and Tateishi, R. Remote sensing and gis for mapping and monitoring land cover and land-use changes in the Northwestern coastal zone of egypt. *Applied Geography*. 2007. 27(1): 28-41.
312. Dewan, A. M. and Yamaguchi, Y. Land use and land cover change in Greater Dhaka, Bangladesh: Using remote sensing to promote sustainable urbanization. *Applied Geography*. 2009. 29(3): 390-401.
313. Rawat, J. and Kumar, M. Monitoring land use/cover change using remote sensing and GIS techniques: A case study of Hawalbagh block, district Almora, Uttarakhand, India. *The Egyptian Journal of Remote Sensing and Space Science*. 2015. 18(1): 77-84.
314. Liu, X., He, J., Yao, Y., Zhang, J., Liang, H., Wang, H. and Hong, Y. Classifying urban land use by integrating remote sensing and social media data. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*. 2017: 1-22.
315. Gilbert, A. Third world cities: The changing national settlement system. *Urban studies*. 1993. 30(4-5): 721-740.
316. Aguilar, A. G., Ward, P. M. and Smith Sr, C. Globalization, regional development, and mega-city expansion in Latin America: Analyzing Mexico city's Peri-urban hinterland. *cities*. 2003. 20(1): 3-21.
317. meyfroidt, p., lambin, e. f., erb, k.-h. and Hertel, T. W. Globalization of land use: Distant drivers of land change and geographic displacement of land use. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. 2013. 5(5): 438-444.
318. Cohen, W. B. and Goward, S. N. Landsat's role in ecological applications of remote sensing. *AIBS Bulletin*. 2004. 54(6): 535-545.
319. USGS United state geological survey, Landsat missions and history. <https://landsat.usgs.gov/landsat-8-history> (Accessed 24/11/2016).
320. Turner, B. L., Lambin, E. F. and Reenberg, A. The emergence of land change science for global environmental change and sustainability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2007. 104(52): 20666-20671.
321. Walter, V. Object-based classification of remote sensing data for change detection. *ISPRS Journal of photogrammetry and remote sensing*. 2004. 58(3): 225-238.

322. Foody, G. M. Assessing the accuracy of land cover change with imperfect ground reference data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*. 2010. 114(10): 2271-2285.
323. Congalton, R. G. A review of assessing the accuracy of classifications of remotely sensed data. *Remote sensing of environment*. 1991. 37(1): 35-46.
324. Verbyla, D. and Hammond, T. Conservative bias in classification accuracy assessment due to pixel-by-pixel comparison of classified images with reference grids. *Remote Sensing*. 1995. 16(3): 581-587.
325. Manandhar, R., Odeh, I. O. and Ancev, T. Improving the accuracy of land use and land cover classification of Landsat data using post-classification enhancement. *Remote Sensing*. 2009. 1(3): 330-344.
326. Liu, C., Frazier, P. and Kumar, L. Comparative assessment of the measures of thematic classification accuracy. *Remote sensing of environment*. 2007. 107(4): 606-616.
327. Song, C., Woodcock, C. E., Seto, K. C., Lenney, M. P. and Macomber, S. A. Classification and change detection using Landsat TM data: When and how to correct atmospheric effects? *Remote sensing of Environment*. 2001. 75(2): 230-244.
328. Singh, A. Review article digital change detection techniques using remotely-sensed data. *International journal of remote sensing*. 1989. 10(6): 989-1003.
329. Mas, J.-F. Monitoring land-cover changes: A comparison of change detection techniques. *International journal of remote sensing*. 1999. 20(1): 139-152.
330. Afify, H. A. Evaluation of change detection techniques for monitoring land-cover changes: A case study in new Burg el-Arab area. *Alexandria engineering journal*. 2011. 50(2): 187-195.
331. Hyandye, C. and Martz, L. W. A markovian and cellular automata land-use change predictive model of the Usangu catchment. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*. 2017. 38(1): 64-81.
332. Guan, D., Li, H., Inohae, T., Su, W., Nagaie, T. and Hokao, K. Modeling urban land use change by the integration of Cellular automaton and Markov model. *Ecological Modelling*. 2011. 222(20): 3761-3772.
333. Eastman, J. R. Idrisi selva tutorial. *Idrisi Production, Clark Labs-Clark University*. 2012. 45: 51-63.
334. Suhaila, J. and Jemain, A. A. Spatial analysis of daily rainfall intensity and concentration index in Peninsular Malaysia. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*. 2012. 108(1-2): 235-245.

335. Paramanathan, S. *Soils of Malaysia: Their characteristics and identification*, Vol. 1: Academy of Sciences Malaysia. 2000.
336. Paramanathan, S. and Zauyah, S. Soil landscapes in Peninsular Malaysia. *Their characteristics and identification*. Academy of Sciences Malaysia: 2000. 1986.
337. Department of Irrigation and Drainage. Flood mitigation master plan study for Wilayah Pembangunan Iskandar (wpi). Unpublished report. 2009.
338. Phogat, V., Yadav, A., Malik, R., Kumar, S. and Cox, J. Simulation of salt and water movement and estimation of water productivity of rice crop irrigated with saline water. *Paddy and Water Environment*. 2010. 8(4): 333-346.
339. Chen, F.-W. and Liu, C.-W. Estimation of the spatial rainfall distribution using inverse distance weighting (IDW) in the middle of Taiwan. *Paddy and Water Environment*. 2012. 10(3): 209-222.
340. Gong-Saholiariliva, N., Neppel, L., Chevallier, P., Delclaux, F. and Savéan, M. Geostatistical estimation of daily monsoon precipitation at fine spatial scale: Koshi River basin. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2016. 21(9): 05016017.
341. Kumar, A., Maroju, S. and Bhat, A. Application of arcgis geostatistical analyst for interpolating environmental data from observations. *Environmental Progress & Sustainable Energy*. 2007. 26(3): 220-225.
342. Mishra, A., Kar, S. and Raghuwanshi, N. Modeling nonpoint source pollutant losses from a small watershed using HSPF model. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 2009. 135(2): 92-100.
343. Moriasi, D., Wilson, B., Douglas-Mankin, K., Arnold, J. and Gowda, P. Hydrologic and water quality models: Use, calibration, and validation. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2012. 55(4): 1241-1247.
344. Mishra, A., Kar, S. and Singh, V. Determination of runoff and sediment yield from a small watershed in sub-humid subtropics using the HSPF model. *Hydrological Processes*. 2007. 21(22): 3035-3045.
345. Fontaine, T. A. and Jacomino, V. M. Sensitivity analysis of simulated contaminated sediment transport. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 1997. 33(2): 313-326.
346. Bracmort, K. S., Arabi, M., Frankenberger, J., Engel, B. A. and Arnold, J. G. Modeling long-term water quality impact of structural BMPs. *Transactions of the ASABE*. 2006. 49(2): 367-374.
347. Zheng, B., Campbell, J. B. and de Beurs, K. M. Remote sensing of crop residue cover using multi-temporal Landsat imagery. *Remote sensing of Environment*. 2012. 117: 177-183.

348. Sudhira, H., Ramachandra, T. and Jagadish, K. Urban sprawl: Metrics, dynamics and modelling using GIS. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*. 2004. 5(1): 29-39.
349. Ioannis, M. and Meliadis, M. Multi-temporal landsat image classification and change analysis of land cover/use in the prefecture of Thessaloiniki, Greece. *Proceedings of the International Academy of Ecology and Environmental Sciences*. 2011. 1(1): 15.
350. Zhao, Y., Zhang, K., Fu, Y. and Zhang, H. Examining land-use/land-cover change in the Lake Dianchi watershed of the Yunnan-Guizhou plateau of southwest China with remote sensing and GIS techniques: 1974–2008. *International Journal of environmental research and public health*. 2012. 9(11): 3843-3865.
351. Sun, H., Forsythe, W. and Waters, N. Modeling urban land use change and urban sprawl: Calgary, Alberta, Canada. *Networks and spatial economics*. 2007. 7(4): 353-376.
352. Getachew, H. E. and Melesse, A. M. The impact of land use change on the hydrology of the Angereb watershed, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Water Sciences*. 2012. 1.
353. Mishra, V. N., Rai, P. K. and Mohan, K. Prediction of land use changes based on land change modeler (LCM) using remote sensing: A case study of Muzaffarpur (Bihar), India. *Journal of the Geographical Institute " Jovan Cvijic "*. 2014. 64(1): 17.
354. Teegavarapu, R. S., Meskele, T. and Pathak, C. S. Geo-spatial grid-based transformations of precipitation estimates using spatial interpolation methods. *Computers & Geosciences*. 2012. 40: 28-39.
355. Anderson, M. J. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral ecology*. 2001. 26(1): 32-46.
356. Lunneborg, C. E. Jonckheere–terpstra test. *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference* 2005. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118445112.stat06337/full> (Accessed 21/09/2016).
357. Vock, M. and Balakrishnan, N. A jonckheere–terpstra-type test for perfect ranking in balanced ranked set sampling. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*. 2011. 141(2): 624-630.
358. Bewick, V., Cheek, L. and Ball, J. Statistics review 10: Further nonparametric methods. *Critical care*. 2004. 8(3): 196.
359. USEPA Basin technical note 7: Matching storet parameters with HSPF output. 2005. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/201508/documents/2005\\_12\\_20\\_basins\\_tecnote7.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/201508/documents/2005_12_20_basins_tecnote7.pdf) (Accessed 12/01/2016).



360. Dodds, W. K., Jones, J. R. and Welch, E. B. Suggested classification of stream trophic state: Distributions of temperate stream types by chlorophyll, total nitrogen, and phosphorus. *Water Research*. 1998. 32(5): 1455-1462.
361. Cleveland, C. C. and Liptzin, D. C: N: P stoichiometry in soil: Is there a “Redfield ratio” for the microbial biomass? *Biogeochemistry*. 2007. 85(3): 235-252.
362. Hillebrand, H. and Sommer, U. The nutrient stoichiometry of benthic microalgal growth: Redfield proportions are optimal. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 1999. 44(2): 440-446.
363. Havens, K. E., James, R. T., East, T. L. and Smith, V. H. N: P ratios, light limitation, and cyanobacterial dominance in a subtropical lake impacted by non-point source nutrient pollution. *Environmental Pollution*. 2003. 122(3): 379-390.
364. Zhang, S., Li, Y., Fan, W. and Yi, Y. Impacts of rainfall, soil type, and land-use change on soil erosion in the Liusha River watershed. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*. 2016. 22(4): 04016062.
365. Romano, S. P., Baer, S. G., Zaczek, J. J. and Williard, K. W. Site modelling methods for detecting hydrologic alteration of flood frequency and flood duration in the floodplain below the Carlyle dam, Lower Kaskaskia River, Illinois, USA. *River research and applications*. 2009. 25(8): 975-984.
366. D'Agostino, R. B. *Goodness-of-fit-techniques*, Vol. 68: CRC press, Florida, United State. 1986.
367. Jonckheere, A. R. A distribution-free k-sample test against ordered alternatives. *Biometrika*. 1954. 41(1/2): 133-145.
368. Robert, C. P. *Monte carlo methods*: Wiley Online Library, New Jersey, United State. 2004.
369. George, D. *Spss for windows step by step: A simple study guide and reference, 17.0 update, 10/e*: Pearson Education India. 2011.
370. Cohen, Y. and Cohen, J. Y. Analysis of variance. *Statistics and Data with R: an applied approach through examples*. 1988: 463-509.
371. Pallant, J. *Spss survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows (versions 10 and 11): SPSS student version 11.0 for windows*: Open University Press. 2001.
372. Pallant, J. *SPSS survival manual*: McGraw-Hill Education, New York, US. 2013.

373. Montgomery, D. Experiments with a single factor: The analysis of variance. *Design and analysis of experiments*. 1991. 7: 87-89.
374. CWP Center for watershed protection, national pollutant removal performance database for stormwater treatment practices. <https://owl.cwp.org/mdocs.../winerr-national-pollutant-removal-database-2nd-edition> (Accessed 12/10/2016). 2007.
375. Kantrowitz, I. H. and Woodham, W. *Efficiency of a stormwater detention pond in reducing loads of chemical and physical constituents in urban streamflow, Pinellas county, Florida*: US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey. 1995.
376. Liu, R., Xu, F., Zhang, P., Yu, W. and Men, C. Identifying non-point source critical source areas based on multi-factors at a basin scale with SWAT. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2016. 533: 379-388.
377. Bradt, S. Introduction to ArcGIS. Esri Press, United State. 2013.
378. Xie, H. and Lian, Y. Uncertainty-based evaluation and comparison of swat and hspf applications to the Illinois River basin. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2013. 481: 119-131.
379. Bu, H., Meng, W., Zhang, Y. and Wan, J. Relationships between land use patterns and water quality in the Taizi River basin, china. *Ecological Indicators*. 2014. 41: 187-197.
380. Koomen, E. and Stillwell, J. Modelling land-use change. *Modelling land-use change*. 2007: 1-22.
381. IRDAb. Road layout design blueprint for Iskandar Malaysia, [skandarmalaysia.com.my/downloads/Road-Layout-Design-Blueprint.pdf](http://skandarmalaysia.com.my/downloads/Road-Layout-Design-Blueprint.pdf) (Accessed 19/07/2016). 2011.
382. MPC 22nd productivity report 2014/2015. *Malaysia Productivity Corporation*. [www.mpc.gov.my/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Productivity-Report-201415.pdf](http://www.mpc.gov.my/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Productivity-Report-201415.pdf) (Accessed 12/10/2016). 2015.
383. Viera, A. J. and Garrett, J. M. Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Fam Med*. 2005. 37(5): 360-363.
384. Ziv, B., Saaroni, H., Pargament, R., Harpaz, T. and Alpert, P. Trends in rainfall regime over Israel, 1975–2010, and their relationship to large-scale variability. *Regional environmental change*. 2014. 14(5): 1751-1764.
385. Diskin, M. Factors affecting variations of mean annual rainfall in Israel. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*. 1970. 15(4): 41-49.

386. Sapriza-Azuri, G., Jódar, J., Navarro, V., Slooten, L. J., Carrera, J. and Gupta, H. V. Impacts of rainfall spatial variability on hydrogeological response. *Water Resources Research*. 2015. 51(2): 1300-1314.
387. USEPA. basins technical note 8: Sediment parameter and calibration guidance for hspf. [www.epa.gov/waterscience/basins/docs/tecnote8.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/basins/docs/tecnote8.pdf). (Accessed 23/11/2015). 2006.
388. Hayashi, S., Murakami, S., Watanabe, M. and Bao-Hua, X. HSPF simulation of runoff and sediment loads in the upper Changjiang River basin, China. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 2004. 130(7): 801-815.
389. Leach, J., Olson, D., Anderson, P. and Eskelson, B. Spatial and seasonal variability of forested headwater stream temperatures in Western Oregon, USA. *Aquatic Sciences*. 2017. 79(2): 291-307.
390. Detenbeck, N. E., Morrison, A. C., Abele, R. W. and Kopp, D. A. Spatial statistical network models for stream and river temperature in New England, USA. *Water Resources Research*. 2016. 52(8): 6018-6040.
391. Ometo, J. P. H., Martinelli, L. A., Ballester, M. V., Gessner, A., Krusche, A. V., Victoria, R. L. and Williams, M. Effects of land use on water chemistry and macroinvertebrates in two streams of the Piracicaba River basin, South-east Brazil. *Freshwater Biology*. 2000. 44(2): 327-337.
392. Mulholland, P. J., Helton, A. M., Poole, G. C., Hall, R. O., Hamilton, S. K., Peterson, B. J., Tank, J. L., Ashkenas, L. R., Cooper, L. W. and Dahm, C. N. Stream denitrification across biomes and its response to anthropogenic nitrate loading. *Nature*. 2008. 452(7184): 202.
393. Harvey, R., Lye, L., Khan, A. and Paterson, R. The influence of air temperature on water temperature and the concentration of dissolved oxygen in Newfoundland rivers. *Canadian Water Resources Journal*. 2011. 36(2): 171-192.
394. Sun, N., Yearsley, J., Voisin, N. and Lettenmaier, D. P. A spatially distributed model for the assessment of land use impacts on stream temperature in small urban watersheds. *Hydrological processes*. 2015. 29(10): 2331-2345.
395. Orr, H. G., Simpson, G. L., Clers, S., Watts, G., Hughes, M., Hannaford, J., Dunbar, M. J., Laizé, C. L., Wilby, R. L. and Battarbee, R. W. Detecting changing river temperatures in England and Wales. *Hydrological Processes*. 2015. 29(5): 752-766.
396. Singh, K. P., Basant, A., Malik, A. and Jain, G. Artificial neural network modeling of the river water quality—a case study. *Ecological Modelling*. 2009. 220(6): 888-895.

397. Yu, S., Xu, Z., Wu, W. and Zuo, D. Effect of land use types on stream water quality under seasonal variation and topographic characteristics in the Wei River basin, China. *Ecological Indicators*. 2016. 60: 202-212.
398. Wurts, W. A. Daily ph cycle and ammonia toxicity. *World Aquaculture*. 2003. 34(2): 20-21.
399. Price, K. Effects of watershed topography, soils, land-use, and climate on baseflow hydrology in humid regions: A review. *Progress in Physical Geography*. 2011. 35(4): 465-492.
400. Brun, S. E. and Band, L. E. Simulating runoff behavior in an urbanizing watershed. *computers, environment and urbanizing watershed*. 2000. 24(1): 5-22.
401. Castillo, V. M., Gomez-Plaza, A. and Martinez-Mena, M. The role of antecedent soil water content in the runoff response of Semiarid catchment: A simulation approach. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2003. 284(1): 114-130.
402. Gurtz, J., Baltensweiler, A. and Lang, H. Spatially distributed hydrotope-based modeling of evapotranspiration and runoff in Mountainous basins. *Hydrological processes*. 1999. 13(17): 2751-2768.
403. Tang, G., Carroll, R. W., Lutz, A. and Sun, L. Regulation of precipitation-associated vegetation dynamics on catchment water balance in a Semiarid and arid Mountainous watershed. *Ecohydrology*. 2016. 9(7): 1248-1262.
404. Schilling, K. E., Jha, M. K., Zhang, Y. K., Gassman, P. W. and Wolter, C. F. Impact of land use and land cover change on the water balance of a large agricultural watershed: Historical effects and future directions. . *Water Resources Research*. 2008. 44(7).
405. Valentin, C., Agus, F., Alamban, R., Boosaner, A., Bricquet, J. P., Chaplot, V. and Phachomphonh, K. Runoff and sediment losses from 27 upland catchments in Southeast Asia: Impact of rapid land use changes and conservation practices. . *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*. 2008. 128(4): 225-238.
406. Vivoni, E. R., Ivanov, V. Y., Bras, R. L. and Entekhabi, D. On the effects of triangulated terrain resolution on distributed hydrologic model response. *Hydrological Processes*. 2005. 19(11): 2101-2122.
407. Zhao, G., Kondolf, G. M., Mu, X., Han, M., He, Z., Rubin, Z., Wang, F., Gao, P. and Sun, W. Sediment yield reduction associated with land use changes and check dams in a catchment of the Loess Plateau, China. *Catena*. 2017. 148: 126-137.
408. Yan, B., Fang, N., Zhang, P. and Shi, Z. Impacts of land use change on watershed streamflow and sediment yield: An assessment using hydrologic modelling and partial least squares regression. *Journal of Hydrology*. 2013. 484: 26-37.

409. Azim, F., Shakir, A. S. and Kanwal, A. Impact of climate change on sediment yield for Naran watershed, Pakistan. *International Journal of Sediment Research*. 2016. 31(3): 212-219.
410. El Kateb, H., Zhang, H., Zhang, P. and Mosandl, R. Soil erosion and surface runoff on different vegetation covers and slope gradients: A field experiment in southern Shaanxi province, China. *Catena*. 2013. 105: 1-10.
411. Diyabalanage, S., Samarakoon, K., Adikari, S. and Hewawasam, T. Impact of soil and water conservation measures on soil erosion rate and sediment yields in a tropical watershed in the central highlands of Sri Lanka. *Applied Geography*. 2017. 79: 103-114.
412. Bisantino, T., Bingner, R., Chouaib, W., Gentile, F. and Trisorio Liuzzi, G. Estimation of runoff, peak discharge and sediment load at the event scale in a medium-size Mediterranean watershed using the ANNAGNPS model. *Land degradation & development*. 2015. 26(4): 340-355.
413. Pan, C., Shangguan, Z. and Lei, T. Influences of grass and moss on runoff and sediment yield on sloped Loess surfaces under simulated rainfall. *Hydrological Processes*. 2006. 20(18): 3815-3824.
414. Berghout, A. and Meddi, M. Sediment transport modelling in Wadi Chemora during flood flow events. *Journal of Water and Land Development*. 2016. 31(1): 23-31.
415. Xiao, L., Yang, X. and Cai, H. Responses of sediment yield to vegetation cover changes in the Poyang lake drainage area, China. *Water*. 2016. 8(4): 114.
416. Notebaert, B., Verstraeten, G., Ward, P., Renssen, H. and Van Rompaey, A. Modeling the sensitivity of sediment and water runoff dynamics to holocene climate and land use changes at the catchment scale. *Geomorphology*. 2011. 126(1): 18-31.
417. Zalina, M. D., Desa, M. N. M., Nguyen, V. and Kassim, A. H. M. Selecting a probability distribution for extreme rainfall series in Malaysia. *Water science and technology*. 2002. 45(2): 63-68.
418. Old, G. H., Leeks, G. J., Packman, J. C., Smith, B. P., Lewis, S., Hewitt, E. J., Holmes, M. and Young, A. The impact of a convectional summer rainfall event on river flow and fine sediment transport in a highly urbanised catchment: Bradford, West Yorkshire. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2003. 314: 495-512.
419. López-Tarazón, J. A., Batalla, R. J., Vericat, D. and Balasch, J. Rainfall, runoff and sediment transport relations in a mesoscale Mountainous catchment: The river isábena (ebro basin). *Catena*. 2010. 82(1): 23-34.

420. Douglas, I. The impact of land-use changes, especially logging, shifting cultivation, mining and urbanization on sediment yields in humid tropical Southeast Asia: A review with special reference to Borneo. *IAHS Publications-Series of Proceedings and Reports-Intern Assoc Hydrological Sciences*. 1996. 236: 463-472.
421. El-Khoury, A., Seidou, O., Lapen, D., Que, Z., Mohammadian, M., Sunohara, M. and Bahram, D. Combined impacts of future climate and land use changes on discharge, nitrogen and phosphorus loads for a Canadian River basin. *Journal of environmental management*. 2015. 151: 76-86.
422. Wang, Y., Zhang, X. and Huang, C. Spatial variability of soil total nitrogen and soil total phosphorus under different land uses in a small watershed on the Loess Plateau, China. *Geoderma*. 2009. 150(1): 141-149.
423. Liu, Y., Godrej, A. N. and Grizzard, T. J. . Sensitivity analysis, calibration and validation of a watershed model application using hspf with the nutrient algorithm pqual in upper Broad Run watershed, Virginia. *Effective Modeling of Nutrient Losses and Nutrient Management Practices in an Agricultural and Urbanizing Watershed*. 2011: 26.
424. Shrestha, M. K., Recknagel, F., Frizenschaf, J. and Meyer, W. Future climate and land uses effects on flow and nutrient loads of a Mediterranean catchment in South Australia. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2017. 590: 186-193.
425. Sala, O. E. Global biodiversity scenarios for the year 2100. *Science*. 2000. 287: 1770-1774.
426. Tromboni, F. and Dodds, W. Relationships between land use and stream nutrient concentrations in a highly urbanized tropical region of Brazil: Thresholds and riparian zones. *Environmental Management*. 2017: 1-11.
427. Wilson, H. F., Satchithanatham, S., Moulin, A. P. and Glenn, A. J. Soil phosphorus spatial variability due to landform, tillage, and input management: A case study of small watersheds in Southwestern Manitoba. *Geoderma*. 2016. 280: 14-21.
428. Steegen, A., Govers, G., Takken, I., Nachtergaele, J., Poesen, J. and Merckx, R. Factors controlling sediment and phosphorus export from two Belgian agricultural catchments. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 2001. 30(4): 1249-1258.
429. Søndergaard, M., Jensen, J. P. and Jeppesen, E. Role of sediment and internal loading of phosphorus in shallow lakes. *Hydrobiologia*. 2003. 506(1): 135-145.
430. Villa, A., Djodjic, F. and Bergström, L. Soil dispersion tests combined with topographical information can describe field-scale sediment and phosphorus losses. *Soil use and management*. 2014. 30(3): 342-350.

431. Perks, M., Owen, G., Benskin, C. M. H., Jonczyk, J., Deasy, C., Burke, S., Reaney, S. and Haygarth, P. M. Dominant mechanisms for the delivery of fine sediment and phosphorus to fluvial networks draining grassland dominated headwater catchments. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2015. 523: 178-190.
432. Lamba, J., Thompson, A. M., Karthikeyan, K., Panuska, J. C. and Good, L. W. Effect of best management practice implementation on sediment and phosphorus load reductions at subwatershed and watershed scale using SWAT model. *International Journal of Sediment Research*. 2016. 31(4): 386-394.
433. Marshall, E. and Randhir, T. Effect of climate change on watershed system: A regional analysis. *Climatic Change*. 2008. 89(3-4): 263-280.
434. Ngoye, E. and Machiwa, J. F. The influence of land-use patterns in the Ruvu River watershed on water quality in the river system. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*. 2004. 29(15): 1161-1166.
435. Soranno, P., Hubler, S., Carpenter, S. and Lathrop, R. Phosphorus loads to surface waters: A simple model to account for spatial pattern of land use. *Ecological Applications*. 1996. 6(3): 865-878.
436. Wu, J., Ren, Y., Wang, X., Wang, X., Chen, L. and Liu, G. Nitrogen and phosphorus associating with different size suspended solids in roof and road runoff in Beijing, China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. 2015. 22(20): 15788-15795.
437. Bratt, A. R., Finlay, J. C., Hobbie, S. E., Janke, B. D., Worm, A. C. and Kemmitt, K. L. Contribution of leaf litter to nutrient export during winter months in an urban residential watershed. *Environmental Science & Technology*. 2017. 51(6): 3138-3147.
438. Baginska, B., Pritchard, T. and Krogh, M. Roles of land use resolution and unit-area load rates in assessment of diffuse nutrient emissions. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2003. 69(1): 39-46.
439. Kimmins, J. Evaluation of the consequences for future tree productivity of the loss of nutrients in whole-tree harvesting. *Forest ecology and management*. 1976. 1: 169-183.
440. Zabaleta, I. and Rodic, L. Recovery of essential nutrients from municipal solid waste—impact of waste management infrastructure and governance aspects. *Waste Management*. 2015. 44: 178-187.
441. Carey, R. O., Hochmuth, G. J., Martinez, C. J., Boyer, T. H., Dukes, M. D., Toor, G. S. and Cisar, J. L. Evaluating nutrient impacts in urban watersheds: Challenges and research opportunities. *Environmental Pollution*. 2013. 173: 138-149.

442. Bayram, A. and Önsoy, H. Sand and gravel mining impact on the surface water quality: A case study from the city of Tirebolu (Giresun province, ne Turkey). *Environmental earth sciences*. 2015. 73(5): 1997-2011.
443. Dodds, W. K., Clements, W. H., Gido, K., Hilderbrand, R. H. and King, R. S. Thresholds, breakpoints, and nonlinearity in freshwaters as related to management. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*. 2010. 29(3): 988-997.
444. Panagopoulos, Y., Makropoulos, C. and Mimikou, M. Reducing surface water pollution through the assessment of the cost-effectiveness of BMPS at different spatial scales. *Journal of environmental management*. 2011. 92(10): 2823-2835.
445. Brezonik, P. L. and Stadelmann, T. H. Analysis and predictive models of stormwater runoff volumes, loads, and pollutant concentrations from watersheds in the Twin cities Metropolitan area, Minnesota, USA. *Water Research*. 2002. 36(7): 1743-1757.
446. Nelson, K. C. and Palmer, M. A. Stream temperature surges under urbanization and climate change: Data, models, and responses. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2007. 43(2): 440-452.
447. Fang, X. and Stefan, H. G. Simulations of climate effects on water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and ice and snow covers in lakes of the contiguous us under past and future climate scenarios. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 2009. 54(6part2): 2359-2370.
448. Lenderink, G. and Van Meijgaard, E. Increase in hourly precipitation extremes beyond expectations from temperature changes. *Nature Geoscience*. 2008. 1(8): 511.
449. Tang, C., Li, Y., Jiang, P., Yu, Z. and Acharya, K. A coupled modeling approach to predict water quality in lake Taihu, China: Linkage to climate change projections. *Journal of freshwater ecology*. 2015. 30(1): 59-73.
450. Isaak, D., Wollrab, S., Horan, D. and Chandler, G. Climate change effects on stream and river temperatures across the Northwest US from 1980–2009 and implications for Salmonid fishes. *Climatic Change*. 2012. 113(2): 499-524.
451. Flint, L. E. and Flint, A. L. A basin-scale approach to estimating stream temperatures of tributaries to the Lower Klamath river, california. *Journal of environmental quality*. 2008. 37(1): 57-68.
452. Caissie, D. The thermal regime of rivers: A review. *Freshwater biology*. 2006. 51(8): 1389-1406.



453. Meier, W., Bonjour, C., Wüest, A. and Reichert, P. Modeling the effect of water diversion on the temperature of mountain streams. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*. 2003. 129(8): 755-764.
454. Gaffield, S. J., Potter, K. W. and Wang, L. Predicting the summer temperature of small streams in Southwestern Wisconsin. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2005. 41(1): 25-36.
455. Woltemade, C. J. Stream temperature spatial variability reflects geomorphology, hydrology, and microclimate: Navarro river watershed, California. *The Professional Geographer*. 2017. 69(2): 177-190.
456. Kalny, G., Laaha, G., Melcher, A., Trimmel, H., Weihs, P. and Rauch, H. P. The influence of riparian vegetation shading on water temperature during low flow conditions in a medium sized river. *Knowledge & Management of Aquatic Ecosystems*. 2017(418): 5.
457. Piggott, J. J., Townsend, C. R. and Matthaei, C. D. Climate warming and agricultural stressors interact to determine stream macroinvertebrate community dynamics. *Global change biology*. 2015. 21(5): 1887-1906.
458. Remen, M., Imsland, A. K., Stefansson, S. O., Jonassen, T. M. and Foss, A. Interactive effects of ammonia and oxygen on growth and physiological status of juvenile atlantic COD (*Gadus Morhua*). *Aquaculture*. 2008. 274(2-4): 292-299.
459. Leuven, R., Hendriks, A., Huijbregts, M., Lenders, H., Matthews, J. and Velde, G. V. D. Differences in sensitivity of native and exotic fish species to changes in river temperature. *Current Zoology*. 2011. 57(6): 852-862.
460. Kaushal, S. S., Likens, G. E., Jaworski, N. A., Pace, M. L., Sides, A. M., Seekell, D., Belt, K. T., Secor, D. H. and Wingate, R. L. Rising stream and river temperatures in the United States. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*. 2010. 8(9): 461-466.
461. Hansen, G. J., Read, J. S., Hansen, J. F. and Winslow, L. A. Projected shifts in fish species dominance in Wisconsin lakes under climate change. *Global change biology*. 2017. 23(4): 1463-1476.
462. Heller, N. E. and Zavaleta, E. S. Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: A review of 22 years of recommendations. *Biological conservation*. 2009. 142(1): 14-32.
463. Bosch, N. S., Evans, M. A., Scavia, D. and Allan, J. D. Interacting effects of climate change and agricultural BMPs on nutrient runoff entering Lake Erie. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*. 2014. 40(3): 581-589.

464. Randhir, T. O., Wright, E. and Ahern, J. Modeling suburban phosphorus runoff and BMPS: Downscaling from watershed systems to site-specific scales. *Journal of Sustainable Water in the Built Environment*. 2017. 3(4): 04017011.
465. Liu, Y., Bralts, V. F. and Engel, B. A. Evaluating the effectiveness of management practices on hydrology and water quality at watershed scale with a rainfall-runoff model. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2015. 511: 298-308.
466. Sim, C. H., Yusoff, M. K., Shutes, B., Ho, S. C. and Mansor, M. Nutrient removal in a pilot and full scale constructed wetland, Putrajaya city, Malaysia. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2008. 88(2): 307-317.
467. Hartigan, J. P. Basis for design of wet detention basin BMP'S. Proceedings of the *Design of urban runoff quality controls*: ASCE. 122-143.
468. Kenner, S. J. and Oswald, J. K. Decision support tool utilizing an HSPF watershed model application for the Central Big Sioux river in eastern south Dakota. Proceedings of the *World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2014*. 2306-2315.