

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344636955>

# Assessment of ridge-to-reef management actions in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay, Vanuatu

Technical Report · January 2020

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.16548.91525

---

CITATIONS

2

---

READS

824

2 authors:



Jade Delevaux

Stanford University

47 PUBLICATIONS 502 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Kostantinos A Stamoulis

Seascope Solutions

44 PUBLICATIONS 948 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



# Assessment of ridge-to-reef management actions in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay, Vanuatu

Prepared for Ridge-to-reef Programme, GeoScience,  
Energy and Maritime Division,  
SPC

by Seascope Solutions, LLC

January 2020

# **Assessment of ridge-to-reef management actions in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay, Vanuatu**

**Prepared by:  
Seascope Solutions LLC**

January 2020

Published by: SPC, Suva, Fiji

Citation: Delevaux, J.M.S. & Stamoulis, K.A. (2020) Assessment of ridge-to-reef management actions in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay, Vanuatu. Suva, Fiji SPC, 63 pp.

Layout by: SPC

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. METHODS</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 DECISION SUPPORT TOOL OVERVIEW	7
1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION	9
1.3 SCENARIO DESIGN	9
1.3.1 Land-based scenarios	10
1.3.2 Marine protection scenario	10
1.4 SEDIMENT MODEL - INVEST SDR	11
1.4.1 Land-use mapping	12
1.5 WATER QUALITY MODEL	12
1.6 CORAL REEF INDICATORS	12
1.6.1 Field surveys	13
1.7 MARINE DRIVER MODELS	14
1.8 SPATIAL PREDICTIVE CORAL REEF MODELS	14
1.9 RIDGE-TO-REEF ASSESSMENT	16
<b>3. RESULTS</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 PRESENT RIDE-TO-REEF CONDITIONS	17
3.2 CORAL REEF PREDICTIVE MODELS	19
3.3 SPATIAL PREDICTIVE MAPS OF CORAL REEF INDICATORS	21
3.4 TERRESTRIAL DRIVERS IMPACT ASSESSMENT	22
3.5 CORAL REEF BENTHIC INDICATORS IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER LANDUSE CHANGE SCENARIOS	23
3.6 CORAL REEF FISH INDICATORS IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER LAND-USE CHANGE SCENARIOS	24
3.7 CORAL REEF FISHERY IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER COMBINED MARINE & LANDUSE CHANGE SCENARIOS	26
<b>4. DISCUSSION</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 LAND-SEA MODELING & PLANNING	27
4.2 LAND-SEA DECISION SUPPORT TOOL	28
4.3 LAND-SEA SCENARIO PLANNING	29
4.4 AREA-BASED MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS	30
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 - FIGURES</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2 - TABLES</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 – METHODS</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4 – DATA GAPS AND CAVEATS</b>	<b>61</b>

## List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Fig 1	Ridge-to-reef modeling framework.....	8
Fig 2	Study site.....	9
Fig 3	Present ridge to reef drivers.....	18
Fig 4	Coral reef predictive models.....	20
Fig 5	Observed and predicted distribution of coral reef indicators in Mele Bay under present conditions .....	21
Fig 6	Mele Bay land use scenarios: change in land cover, sediment export, and TSS .....	22
Fig 7	Linked land-sea planning under the high deforestation scenario.....	24
Fig 8	Maps of fish indicators change per land-use change scenarios: total biomass, herbivore biomass, and targeted biomass.....	25
Fig 9	Maps of targeted fish indicator change under combined land-use change and marine management scenarios.....	27
Fig S1	Coral reef survey locations identified by strata.....	41
Fig S2	Terrestrial geography & InVEST SDR inputs.....	41
Fig S3	Marine geography variables.....	42
Fig S4	Response curves for coral.....	43
Fig S5	Response curves for macroalgae.....	43
Fig S6	Response curves for turf algae.....	44
Fig S7	Response curves for total biomass.....	44
Fig S8	Response curves for herbivore biomass.....	45
Fig S9	Response curves for targeted biomass.....	46
Fig S10	Coral reef indicators prediction validation.....	47

## List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1	Land use/cover types and cover management (C) factors.....	12
Table 2	Coral benthic reef impact assessment.....	23
Table 3	Coral fish reef impact assessment under land-use change scenarios.....	25
Table 4	Coral fish reef impact assessment.....	26
Table S1	Present land use/cover area (km2 and %). ....	48
Table S2	Fish species recorded during marine surveys.....	48
Table S3	Terrestrial and marine drivers' description and processing methods.....	52
Table S4	Coral reef predictive model performance per indicator.....	53

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Many Pacific Island nations support growing populations, which has led to increased pressure on marine and terrestrial resources. Urbanization, commercial agriculture expansion and other land use activities are threatening coral reefs through increased sediment and nutrient runoff. Given limited resources for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, accessible, easy-to-use conservation planning tools that are appropriate for island contexts are critically needed, especially those that incorporate land-sea linkages and consider human wellbeing.

We adapted and implemented a fine-scale (land: ~30 x 30 m – sea: 30 x 30 m) spatially-explicit decision support framework in Mele Bay on Efate Island in Vanuatu, which covers the Tagabe watershed and the IW R2R project demonstration site in the country. The tool used existing and newly collected datasets to identify where terrestrial conservation initiatives in Tagabe watershed may have the greatest impact on marine conservation in Mele Bay. We tested proposed terrestrial restoration and marine protection scenarios as well as an urbanization scenario in terms of their effects on coral reefs and fisheries. Although coral reefs can flourish in turbid waters, they are restricted to the top 4–10 m depth range and typically support fewer species, slower growth rates, and poorer recruitment.

Our results supported previous studies in showing a negative effect of sediments on coral growth and abundance. We also found that sediments decreased fish biomass. Deforestation resulting from urbanization and commercial agriculture expansion increases sedimentation while forest restoration mitigates sedimentation. Accordingly, our models projected increases in both corals and fishes that scaled with area of forest restored. More trees resulted in more corals and fishes. Marine protection was also shown to support fishery outcomes in terms of increased numbers of targeted fishes.

Conversely, an increase in urbanization (and associated deforestation) caused declines in coral and associated inshore and reef fisheries. A combination of terrestrial forest restoration and marine protection from fishing resulted in the best outcomes for coral reefs and associated reef fisheries in Mele Bay on Efate Island, Vanuatu.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many island societies are highly dependent on terrestrial and marine ecosystems for their livelihoods, cultural identity and wellbeing (Kueffer and Kinney 2017). Today, many Pacific Island nations support growing populations, which has led to increased pressure on fisheries as well as on terrestrial resources (Walker & Bellingham 2011). Across much of the tropics, urbanization, logging and commercial agriculture expansion, in particular, are threatening coral reefs through increased sediment and nutrient runoff (Dauvergne 1998, Mather et al. 1998). Excess nutrients and sediments have been shown to impact coral reefs by promoting benthic algae growth and smothering corals, respectively (Fabricius 2005b, Houk et al. 2014, Smith et al. 2016b). These land-based impacts affect islanders in a number of ways, such as reducing food resources upon which many islanders depend on for wellbeing (Eriksson et al. 2017). In response to those threats, ridge-to-reef management has been widely advocated to foster social-ecological resilience (Delevaux et al. 2019). Implementing ridge-to-reef management requires tools to understand the potential outcomes of management actions on land at sea (Klein et al. 2012, Stamoulis & Delevaux 2015).

In order to address this need, the goal of this consultancy was to develop a local-scale decision support tool that models the effects of proposed land and sea management actions in areas selected as priorities for management. Building on a national-scale (100 x 100 m), spatially-explicit decision support framework, previously developed for quantifying the effect of sediment stream runoff on coral reefs across Vanuatu, this project downscaled (~ 30 m x 30 m), adapted, and applied this tool to inform local scale conservation actions at the sub-watershed scale in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay, on Efate Island, Vanuatu. We calibrated this linked land-sea decision support tool to test whether proposed terrestrial/land-use, and marine conservation/restoration actions can benefit/impact downstream coral reefs and associated ecosystem goods and services (e.g., fisheries). To do so, we determined the impacts of current land-use and proposed/future conservation and restoration efforts from ridge-to-reef on coral reef ecosystems. The framework links the Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs Sediment Delivery Ratio (InVEST SDR) to seascape models through a water quality model, calibrated with existing empirical and remote sensing data available for the region. This approach leveraged existing datasets and recently collected marine ecological surveys in Mele Bay to characterize the effects of planned management actions.

To support the ongoing R2R efforts in Vanuatu and provide management insights for linked watershed and reef systems, we addressed the following three research questions: -

- (i) How does sediment runoff influence coral reef benthic and fish indicators?
- (ii) Where do forest restoration or forest loss from agriculture expansion and urbanization impact coral reefs due to differences in sediment runoff?



- (iii) How do marine ecosystems respond to proposed marine management actions alone and in combination with forest and agriculture land-use restoration and urbanization scenarios?


## 2. METHODS

### *1.1 DECISION SUPPORT TOOL OVERVIEW*

To inform land-use conservation and restoration efforts across the landscape based on coral reefs impacts, we determine the impact of proposed management efforts on coral reefs. In order to do so, we coupled various management scenarios with an adapted linked land-sea modeling framework (Delevaux et al. 2018b) (Fig 1). The framework links InVEST SDR version 3.2 (Hamel et al. 2015a) to coral reef ecosystem state models calibrated with existing empirical and remote sensing data. First, we designed a land-based management scenario that represents the projection of forest restoration set out in the Tagabe watershed management plan, and a scenario showing deforestation due to future urbanization (Eckardt et al. 2008) (Fig 1a). We also included a fishing closure scenario derived from the Ifira marine management plan (Fig 1b).

Second, we calibrated and applied the land-sea framework, which connects sediments and coral reef models. Although nutrients are associated with sediment runoff and agriculture expansion (Fabricius 2005b), we did not explicitly model nutrient runoff here. The linked land-sea decision support tool consists of three key components: (1) InVEST SDR, (2) water quality model, (3) coral reef models. Sediment export ( $\text{t. yr}^{-1}$ ) was modeled at 30 m x 30 m resolution for each watershed using the InVEST SDR, based on current land-use, topography, soil types, and rainfall data (Fig 1c-d). The modeled sediment export was diffused from pourpoints representing stream mouths into the coastal zone using Geospatial Information System-based water quality model to generate the Total Suspended Sediment (TSS) raster data (30 m x 30 m) ( $\text{t.yr}^{-1}$ ) (Fig 1e). The bathymetry map was coupled with GIS-based models, to characterize the marine environment at 30 m x 30 m in terms of habitat structure (Fig 1f-g).

To identify coral reef areas susceptible to the effect of sediment runoff, we modeled coral reef indicators as a function of marine habitat and water quality (represented by TSS). We focused on proxies of ecological resilience, thus the coral reef models were applied to three benthic indicators (coral, macroalgae, and turf algae), known to respond to land-based runoff, and three fish indicators, which represent important subsistence and/or cultural resources (Green and Bellwood 2009, Jupiter and Egli 2011, Smith et al. 2016b). Lastly, we undertook a spatial analysis to assess the potential recovery and/or impact of future scenarios, within Tagabe ridge-to-reef system, on coral reefs to foster coral reef recovery and benefits (Fig 1i).




**Fig 1. Ridge-to-reef modeling framework.**

(a) Land-use change scenarios were coupled with the linked land-sea decision support tool. (b) Marine management scenario. (c) Land cover, topography, rainfall, and soil erodibility data were inputs in (d) the InVEST Sediment Delivery Ratio (SDR) model to quantify sediment export

(t/yr). Sediment export values were assigned to (e) pourpoints at the shoreline and combined with (f) bathymetry and current maps into a coastal discharge model using a GIS distance-based dispersion models to generate sediment plume maps (t/yr). Bathymetry and the habitat map were combined with (g) GIS-based models to derive the marine driver grid data (i.e., habitat topography, geography, exposure, and complexity). (h) The coral reef predictive models were calibrated on coral reef survey data. (i) Outputs were: (1) a linked land-sea decision-support tool, (2) maps of benthic (% cover) and fish ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^2$ ) indicators, and (3) a linked land-sea impact assessment.

## 1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The modeled land area represents four watersheds ranging in size from 628 ha to 6,231 ha with a total area of 12,276 ha (Fig 2). Topographically, the elevation of these watersheds' ranges from 0 to 254 m and averages 182 m (Fig S2a). Yearly rainfall varies between 182.4- 254.8 mm/yr and averages 205.9 mm/yr (Fig S2b). Based on a global database (Batjes 2016), there are three types of soils across the modeled area (Fig S2c). Downstream in Mele Bay, the main currents flow from south to north and east to west (Fig S3a-b). The coral reef habitat area is spread across a total of 715 ha of mostly narrow reef systems, which drop-off quickly into deep water (Fig S3c-d). Tagabe River Catchment is the pilot site for Vanuatu's national R2R project (Fig 2c). It is a site of national significance as it is the only source of potable water for Port Vila's residents, including residential areas, businesses, agriculture and industry. The Tagabe watershed is under several environmental pressures, which include deforestation due to urbanization for new residential areas (Tawney 2006).



**Fig 2. Study site.**

(a-b) Located on Efate island, the local-scale land-sea models were focused on Mele Bay and the watersheds that drain into it. (c) Restoration and urbanization scenarios were implemented for the Tagabe watershed. (d) Marine surveys took place on the coral reefs of Mele Bay.

## 1.3 SCENARIO DESIGN

It is important to note that these scenarios are not meant to predict future land uses in any way, nor do they provide any recommendations for sustainable development, but are rather used to illustrate the potential effect of proposed management actions and reveal how land use change can affect soil erosion and downstream coral reefs.

### 1.3.1 Land-based scenarios

We considered two feasible land-use change scenarios (restoration and urbanization) that represent alternative projected land-use change in Tagabe watershed. The scenarios were designed based on the Tagabe watershed management plan, logging codes, and urbanization trends to inform ridge-to-reef management. The Tagabe River Catchment Management Plan (2017-2030) was officially launched in March 2018 to address pressing environmental issues and improve the management of the catchment in order to protect Port Vila's water supply. The management plan identified and established three Matnakara Water Protection Zones (MWPZ 1, MWPZ2 and MWPZ3) (WRD 2018). These zones have been designated for the protection of the quantity and quality of groundwater and land use practices are regulated in these areas. A recent Rapid Coastal Assessment (RapCA) found that the forest in Tagabe watershed is of high conservation value due to the high endemism and the presence of critically endangered plant species, thus it was recommended that it be declared a Conservation Area so that all commercial activities are prohibited (Sobey 2019). The Forestry Department has earmarked forest conservation and reforestation of the watershed as a high priority. Therefore, we considered a restoration scenario where we assumed conversion of current land uses to native forest in all three Water Protection Zones, as well as in a 30 m vegetation buffer along the Tagabe stream.

At the same time, deforestation is on the rise in Vanuatu and occurs primarily through human settlement and agriculture expansion (Eckardt et al. 2008). Approximately 80% of all deforestation takes place in low elevation terrain (<400 m) (Eckardt et al. 2008). The logging practices code of Vanuatu state that no deforestation should take place on slopes steeper than 30° (McIntosh 2013). Over 90 % of the detected deforestations are located within a perimeter of 3,000 meters around settlements and particularly in proximity to roads (Eckardt et al. 2008). Therefore, we considered an urbanization scenario, where deforestation took place up to 3,000 m around existing human land use and roads, and forest land use was converted to human land use (e.g., cultivated land, low density settlement, and logging). The urbanization scenario modeled human land use expansion (e.g., urban growth, agricultural expansion) in forested land cover on slopes primarily less than 30° and below 400 m elevation in Tagabe watershed. To respect the existing logging practices code of Vanuatu, existing forest habitat along Tagabe river was protected by a 30m buffer, as well as retaining the forest habitat within the declared conservation zones from the Tagabe management plan.

### 1.3.2 Marine protection scenario

The National Adaptation Programme for Action (NAPA) seeks to promote community-based marine resource management to strengthen the adaptive capacities of coastal communities to climate and coastal changes. The marine protection scenario was developed based on the Ifira Marine Protected Area Management plan provided by the Ifira Marine Management (IMM) team (IMMT 2019). The marine managed areas detailed in this document are currently in the registration process to become nationally recognized Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) with the Vanuatu Department of Environment. Therefore, these management actions represent the most likely future scenario of marine protection in the Mele Bay study area. The maps and information in the Ifira MPA Management plan were used to develop a future scenario of fishing effort which was digitized in ArcGIS as a shapefile and then converted to a raster for use in spatial predictive models. While the plan did not specify specific management actions in each CCA, for modelling and planning purposes we assumed cessation of fishing in areas zoned as CCAs.

To map current fishing pressure, we conducted participatory mapping with local community members and project partners. Participants included Rodney Varsino Sope (Ifira Marine Management Field Head Supervisor), Nelson Bakokoto (Tanvasoko Environmental Officer), Ericksen Packett (Ridge-to-reef Project Manager), and Tom Maimai (Compliance Officer). Participants were shown a map of Mele Bay with reef habitat areas delineated and were asked to rank the areas based on fishing pressure on a scale of zero to four with zero representing MPA's and four representing the highest fishing pressure. We used this information along with field observations of fishing activity to create a shapefile representing current relative fishing pressure in Mele Bay that we converted to raster and used as a predictor in the spatial predictive coral reef models.

#### ***1.4 SEDIMENT MODEL - InVEST SDR***

Erosion and overland sediment retention are natural processes that govern the sediment concentration in streams and nearshore regions. Sediment dynamics at the catchment scale are mainly determined by climate (in particular rain intensity), soil properties, topography, and vegetation; and anthropogenic factors such as agricultural activities or dam construction and operation (Sharp et al. 2016). We leveraged the open source InVEST toolbox from the Natural Capital Project for this study. SDR version 3.8 uses soil erosion equations to identify the land areas supplying sediment loads to stream mouths (Hamel et al. 2015b). We applied the InVEST SDR model to quantify the sediment export ( $\text{t.yr}^{-1}$ ) to the coast by watershed due to soil loss on hillslopes from overland erosion (Fig 1) (Hamel et al. 2015b). SDR is spatially explicit and operates at the resolution of the digital elevation model (DEM) input (30.7 m). For each pixel, the model first computes the amount of sediment eroded from that pixel using the Revised Universal Soil Loss equation (RUSLE), then computes the SDR, to estimate the proportion of soil eroded on a given area that will travel to the stream mouth at the shoreline (see Appendix 3 for further details and Hamel et al. 2015 for full details on the model).

### 1.4.1 Land-use mapping

We used satellite imagery available through ArcGIS online in order to create an updated land use map for the Mele Bay study area. A subset of land use classifications from the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) land-use map provided by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Fiji GEM were used to apply supervised classification in ArcGIS by manually digitizing land use polygons at a scale of 1:3000 (Table 1). The Cover Management Factor (C) represents the effect of vegetation on soil erosion rates (Renard et al. 1997). It is the ratio of soil loss of a specific crop to the corresponding soil loss under the condition of continuously fallow and tilled land (Renard et al. 1997).

**Table 1 Land use/cover types and cover management (C) factors used in this study.**

Land use/cover	C-factor	Source
Airport strip	0.3	'Roads' (Rude et al. 2016)
Dirt road	1	'Roads' (Rude et al. 2016)
Forest	0.006	'Second growth forest with shrubs patches' (FAO 2007)
Golf course	0.003	(Falinski 2016)
Grassland	0.014	'Pasto' c-factor, without grazing (FAO 2007, Lianes et al. 2009)
Settlement (H)	0.4	(FAO 2007, Rude et al. 2016)
Settlement (L)	0.1	(FAO 2007, Rude et al. 2016)
Settlement (M)	0.25	(FAO 2007, Rude et al. 2016)
Open land	1	(Roose 1977, El-Swaify et al. 1982, Doheny et al. 2013)
Highway	0.3	'Roads' (Rude et al. 2016)
Secondary roads	0.4	'Roads' (Rude et al. 2016)
Shrubland	0.013	"Potrero" (Lianes et al. 2009)
Tertiary roads	0.6	'Roads' (Rude et al. 2016)
Tree plantation	0.007	(FAO 2007)
Agriculture	0.3	(Evensen et al. 2001, FAO 2007, Rude et al. 2016)

## 1.5 WATER QUALITY MODEL

To model the impact of sediment runoff on coastal water quality, we generated a water quality map (30 x 30 m) representing the total suspended sediment (TSS) from all the watersheds discharging into Mele Bay, for each land-use scenario. The sediment export from each watershed was diffused in coastal waters by adapting a previously developed dispersal plume models in ArcGIS to represent the point source nature of stream discharge in the local coastal waters accounting for depth and currents (Halpern et al. 2008, Delevaux et al. 2018a) (See Appendix 3 for further details).

## 1.6 CORAL REEF INDICATORS

To quantify coral reef resilience and fisheries, we considered the percent cover of three benthic groups (scleractinian corals, turf algae and macroalgae) and the biomass of three fish groupings ( $\text{g.m}^{-2}$ ) based on their ecological roles and importance to local communities (IMMT 2019). The benthic indicators are known to respond to changes in land-based runoff, which in turn influence the distribution of fish taxa (Fabricius 2005b, Brown et al. 2017b), and therefore support aspects of coral reef ecological resilience and fisheries (Green and Bellwood 2009, Smith et al. 2016b). We considered total biomass of all fishes, biomass of targeted fish species, and biomass of herbivorous fishes. We derived percent cover of the benthic indicators and biomass of the fish indicators ( $\text{g.m}^{-2}$ ) from reef survey data collected by Seascope Solutions in November 2019 (see Table S2 for more details).

### 1.6.1 Field surveys

To effectively calibrate the seascope models with respect to sediment impacts, ecological surveys were conducted at a total of 58 sample locations randomly placed on hard bottom habitats stratified by depth, and distance from Tagabe stream using an equal random-stratified sample design (Hirzel and Guisan 2002) (Fig S1). Survey locations were randomly and equally allocated to three depth strata: shallow (1-5 m), moderate (5-12 m), and deep (12-21 m) and three distance strata: near (0-1.5 km), medium (1.5-3 km), and far (3-4.5 km). Pre-selected sample locations were uploaded to a GPS unit used to navigate to each start point in the field. Upon arrival at the survey location, two SCUBA divers immediately entered the water and proceeded to the bottom. The first diver anchored the transect line at the start point and selected a compass heading for the transect which followed the depth contour. Heading were selected in a north/west direction unless the reef structure required laying the transect in the opposite direction. The diver then proceeded to slowly reel out the transect line following the selected heading while identifying, counting, and sizing all fishes observed within 2 m on either side of the transect line to a total of 50 m.

Fishes were identified to the lowest possible taxon and sizes were estimated to the nearest centimeter. The second diver maintained 10 m behind the first diver and took photos of the benthos every two meters along the transect for a total of 25 per transect. The photos were taken with a Canon S110 12-megapixel digital camera in underwater housing and oriented perpendicular to the substrate using a 0.8 m PVC monopod. When both divers completed their surveys, the fish diver proceeded to swim slowly back along the transect counting mobile invertebrates within 2 m on either side of the line while the second diver followed, reeling in the transect line. Length estimates of fishes were converted to weight using the standard weight-length relationship and species-specific fitting parameters. Biomass estimates were summed at the transect level and converted to grams per square meter. Fishes were grouped by trophic group and based on whether they are targeted by fishers. Targeted status was determined by referring to fishery reports for the area (Amos 2007, Sobey 2019) as well as knowledge of targeted species in the South Pacific region (Table S2).

Benthic photos were processed using the Coral Point Count Extension (CPCe 4.1) software (Kohler and Gill 2006). Surface estimates expressed in percent cover were derived from random stratified point count techniques using a nine points/m<sup>2</sup> ratio ensuring reliable habitat profiles with low bias and high precision (Dumas et al. 2009). Nine major habitat categories were considered, related to sediment type and live substratum coverage. These included live coral, coralline algae, macroalgae, turf, coral rubble, non-living substrate (sand, pavement, mud), echinoderms, and other (unknown) live substrate. Percentage cover was then aggregated at the transect level.

### ***1.7 MARINE DRIVER MODELS***

The marine driver grid maps (30 x 30 m) were derived from bathymetry (SPC) maps for the site using GIS-based tools (Fig 2f-g). Based on existing literature habitat characteristics (topography, complexity, and exposure) were identified as important drivers of the modeled coral reef benthic and fish indicators (refer to S3 Table for more details on processing methods). Depth was derived from bathymetry at 5 m resolution (Roelfsema et al. 2013) using passive remote sensing techniques. Three types of habitat drivers, representing direct and indirect effects of seafloor topography on benthic and fish communities were also derived from this bathymetry data (Roelfsema et al. 2013).

- (i) **Habitat topography** metrics, represented by slope computed for two neighborhood sizes (30 and 240 m radii), described the position of the reef relative to the surrounding area.
- (ii) **Habitat complexity** metrics that describe fine-scale topographic structure, were represented by slope of slope, planar curvature, and profile curvature. These were computed using the DEM Surface and Curvature Tools in ArcGIS (ESRI 2011b, Roelfsema et al. 2013).
- (iii) **Habitat exposure** metrics were used to characterize the direct and indirect effects of water flow due seafloor topography and directionality.

These metrics were derived by computing seafloor aspect, the steepest downslope direction of the seafloor measured in degrees, using the Aspect tool in ArcGIS(ESRI 2011b, Roelfsema et al. 2013). We estimated exposure to winds by calculating the circular mean and standard deviation of aspect and converted the circular mean into measures of north and east using the sine and cosine functions, respectively, from the Spatial Analyst toolbox in ArcGIS(ESRI 2011b, Roelfsema et al. 2013).

### ***1.8 SPATIAL PREDICTIVE CORAL REEF MODELS***

We used Boosted Regression Trees (BRT) to generate the coral reef models (Fig 2h) (Franklin 2010). Tree-based models are effective at modeling nonlinearities, discontinuities (threshold effects), and interactions between variables, which is well suited for the analysis of complex ecological data (Breiman 1996, 2001, De'ath and Fabricius 2000). Since the coral reef indicators



were all continuous variables, the response variables were modeled using a Gaussian (normal) distribution, and appropriate data transformations (square root for benthic indicators and fourth root for fish biomass) were applied to improve the normality of the distributions. Highly correlated ( $r > 0.7$ ) environmental drivers were removed from the coral reef models (Stamoulis et al. 2018).

We calibrated the BRT models on locally collected coral reef data to determine the most influential drivers (among the simultaneously tested predictors) and estimate the underlying relationship between the modeled indicators and the key drivers using response curves (Elith et al. 2008, Venables and Ripley 2013). The values of the terrestrial and marine drivers' grid maps were sampled using bilinear interpolation at the location of each reef survey (center of the transect) in ArcGIS. This approach takes a weighted average of the 4 nearest cell values, thereby accounting for the relative position of the reef surveys on the predictor grids and their different native spatial scales.

A BRT model was independently developed for each coral reef indicator using the values of the coral reef indicators and interpolated terrestrial and marine drivers at the reef survey locations. First, we calibrated the benthic indicator models as a function of the terrestrial and marine drivers. Then, we calibrated the fish indicators' models as a function of the terrestrial and marine drivers, as well as the empirical abundance of the three benthic groups. The calibration process used an internal ten-fold cross-validation to maximize the model fit and determine the optimal combinations of four parameters: (1) learning rate (lr), (2) tree complexity (tc), (3) bag fraction (bag), and (4) the maximum number of trees (*see* Elith et al. (2008) for more details).

We used the percent deviance explained (PDE) and internal ten-fold cross validation PDE (CV PDE) as performance measures of the model optimum. The optimal models explained the most variation in the response variables (i.e., greatest CV PDE) and were selected as the best and final models. The model calibration was conducted in R software using the gbm package (Ridgeway 2007, Elith et al. 2008, R Core Team 2014). Spatial autocorrelation of the response variables was tested using Moran's I Index for both the raw values and the ecological model residuals (Miller 2012).

Using the calibrated coral reef models, we predicted and mapped the distribution of each coral reef indicator on a cell-by-cell basis using the values of the terrestrial and marine drivers at each grid cell across the coral reef model domain. Predictive maps were generated for each indicator under present conditions and future scenarios (land-use change, marine management, and combined scenarios) (Lovell et al. 2004, Hoeke et al. 2011). The coral reef predictive maps were generated at 30 x 30 m. The boundaries of the coral reef model domains comprised the marine area of Mele Bay and the offshore boundary corresponded to the maximum surveyed depth (i.e., 21 m) (Fig 2b). First, we spatially predicted each benthic indicator as a function of its key drivers. Then, we spatially predicted the fish indicators as a function of their key drivers, including the predicted distribution of the benthic indicators.

To evaluate the quality of the coral reef model predictions, we compared the measured and predicted values of the coral reef indicators under present conditions. The values of the interpolated predictions and surveyed coral reef indicators at these locations were compared with a linear regression ( $R^2$  and p-value). The predicted values of the benthic and fish grid maps were sampled using bilinear interpolation at the location of each reef survey (center of the transect) in ArcGIS, thereby accounting for the relative position of the reef surveys on the predicted grids. Then, we overlaid the predicted maps with the survey point values for each indicator using the same color ramp scale for the legend to enable visual comparison. The spatial predictions were performed in the R software using the *dismo* and *raster* packages (Hijmans 2014, Hijmans et al. 2014, R Core Team 2014).

### ***1.9 RIDGE-TO-REEF ASSESSMENT***

We applied the framework as a decision-support tool using scenario planning to identify coral reef areas that could be affected by land-use and/or marine management scenarios. To test how selected management actions (i.e., land or marine conservation areas and/or forest restoration areas) can foster coral reef resilience, the scenario impact assessment focused on three dimensions: (1) terrestrial impact (i.e., change in LULC and sediment export), (2) water quality impact (i.e., change in TSS), and (3) marine impact (i.e., change in coral reef indicators).

- (i) First, we assessed and compared the difference between future scenarios and present (baseline) land uses, forest cover and human land uses.
- (ii) Second, we assessed and compared the difference between future scenarios and present (baseline) in terms of sediment export (t/yr).
- (iii) Third, we assessed and compared the change in TSS in terms of areas experiencing either an increase or decrease in TSS.
- (iv) Lastly, we calculated the differences between predictions of coral reef indicators under the land-use change, marine management, and combined scenarios, compared to present conditions.

We computed the significance of the pairwise differences per grid cell for each coral reef indicator relative to the mean and variance of all differences across the coral reef model domain using the *SigDiff* function from the R package *SDMTools* (Januchowski et al. 2010). The grid cells representing significant differences ( $\alpha = 0.10$ ) were reclassified to indicate where predictions were significantly different than present conditions under each scenario. The areas of significant differences for each coral reef indicator were used to quantify the relative changes in benthic habitat and fish biomass within those areas.


Due to lack of data, nutrient runoff was not explicitly modeled in this study, but nutrients are known to bind and travel with sediment, thereby potentially contributing to lack of recovery from bleaching through promoting algae growth (i.e., synergistic effect) (Wooldridge 2009a,

Wooldridge and Done 2009). However, given the limited understanding of these complex processes, we assumed that these effects were additive. Therefore, we applied the precautionary principle and considered these coral reef areas as vulnerable to cumulative impacts (Cooney 2004).

### 3. RESULTS

#### *3.1 PRESENT RIDGE-TO-REEF CONDITIONS*

Currently, the majority of land use/cover across the watersheds discharging in Mele Bay consists of forest (69.1%), grassland (14.8%), shrubland (7.3%), and human settlement and infrastructure (8.2%) (e.g., agriculture, golf course, roads, and plantations) (Table S1 & Fig 3). The sediment export model under existing land-use resulted in a total sediment export of 1,258 t/yr (or 9.7 t/km<sup>2</sup>), with Tagabe watershed discharging approximate 759 t/yr and therefore contributing 50% of the sediment load (Fig 3b). Consequently, the terrestrial human driver (represented by TSS) showed higher values of suspended sediment in the south-eastern side of Mele bay (Fig 3c). The marine human driver (represented by fishing) depicts higher fishing pressure along the Tagabe reef and decreases towards the north and south west of the Mele Bay (Fig 3d). In terms of the marine drivers, the depth of the marine habitats ranged from 0.1 to 21 m, with habitats along the reef slopes of the barrier reefs being topographically more complex, while habitats nearshore being more flat (Fig 3e-f and Fig S3). Reef habitats located to the north of the bay are more exposed to currents and wind (Fig 3g-h).




**Fig 3. Present ridge to reef drivers**

(a) Present land use/cover, (b) InVEST SDR results - sediment export (t/yr) summarized by watershed. The human drivers are represented by (c) modeled TSS plumes (t/yr) and (d) fishing pressure index. The marine drivers include (e) habitat topography (f) complexity, and exposure to wind and currents (g) eastness and (h) northness.

### ***3.2 CORAL REEF PREDICTIVE MODELS***

The PDE of the final coral reef models accounted for 44.6–92.6% and the internal CV PDE accounted for 17.0–47.7% (see Table S2 for more details). Analysis of the residuals from the final coral reef models showed no spatial autocorrelation (Moran's I Index  $p > 0.1$ ). In terms of the terrestrial drivers, the coral reef models indicated that sediment runoff (represented by TSS) was a key driver of coral reef state (Fig. 4). TSS had a negative effect on coral and fish indicators and a positive effect on macroalgae cover. However, TSS was not selected as a key predictor for turf algae. In terms of the marine drivers, the coral reef models identified depth, habitat topography and complexity as key drivers of coral reef state (Fig. 4). The coral reef models also showed that macroalgae was positively associated with the herbivore and targeted fish groups (Fig. 4). Corals and macroalgae were positively associated with depth, while turf algae were negatively associated with depth. Most benthic and all fish indicators were positively associated with steeper, deeper reef slopes and more complex habitat, except for macroalgae, which showed a nonlinear relationship with habitat complexity.




**Fig 4. Coral reef predictive models.**

(a) Benthic and (b) fish predictive models for each site. The benthic and fish indicators are represented along the x-axes. The terrestrial and marine drivers (Fishing and TSS being driven by human actions), and benthic community (for the fish models) are represented on the y-axes. The marine drivers include metrics related to habitat exposure, complexity, topography, and local geography (depth). The bubble size represents the relative percent contribution of each driver and the color indicates whether the relationship between the indicator and the driver is positive (green), concave/convex (yellow), or negative (red).

### 3.3 SPATIAL PREDICTIVE MAPS OF CORAL REEF INDICATORS

The comparison of the predicted coral reef indicator values and empirical survey values showed moderately high  $R^2$  values (ranging from 0.21 – 0.77), and statistically significant relationships for all indicators (see Fig. 5 for more details). The  $R^2$  was higher for coral predictions compared to turf and macroalgae predictions, while the total and targeted fish biomass predictions performed better than the herbivore biomass. The BRT predictions well represented the empirically measured mean % cover (benthic) and biomass (fish) for all indicators across the entire study site (coral: 16.3%, macroalgae: 24.8%, turf algae: 50.1%, total biomass: 46.1 g/m<sup>2</sup>, herbivore biomass: 23.0 g/m<sup>2</sup>, targeted biomass: 28.4 g/m<sup>2</sup>). Under present conditions, the coral reef models predicted a benthic community with lower coral cover ( $\mu=12.3\%$ ; range = 1.8-44.9%), typically found along the reef slopes, compared to higher macroalgae cover ( $\mu=22.1\%$ ; range = 2.9-68.5%), spatially more concentrated on the reef slopes and turf algae cover ( $\mu=51.2\%$ ; range = 22.2-77.2%) higher on the reef flats and nearshore (Fig 5). The coral reef models predicted a fish community with a total biomass averaging 42.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> (range = 20.4-72.6 g/m<sup>2</sup>), which accounted for herbivore biomass ( $\mu=24.1$  g/m<sup>2</sup>, range=4.8-43.0 g/m<sup>2</sup>) and targeted fish biomass ( $\mu=23.0$  g/m<sup>2</sup>, range=3.4-68.5 g/m<sup>2</sup>), found in higher numbers in more complex habitat away from Tagabe river (Fig 5).




**Fig 5. Observed and predicted distribution of coral reef indicators in Mele Bay under present conditions.** Benthic indicators (a-c) are measured in % cover and the fish indicators (d-f) are measured in g.m<sup>-2</sup>. The predicted maps are overlaid with the survey points using the same color ramp for visual comparison, combined with the  $R^2$  and p-values.

### 3.4 TERRESTRIAL DRIVERS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Under the restoration scenario, 1,330 ha of shrubland, grassland, open land, and human settlement was restored to native forest in conservation zone 3 (Fig 6c), the sediment models indicated a decrease of 135 t.yr<sup>-1</sup> of sediment (18% decrease, Fig 6b), compared to current sediment export, resulting in a decrease in TSS around the Tagabe stream mouth (Fig 6c).

Under the urbanization scenario, low density human settlement was expanded by 1,342 ha, resulting in a key loss of 1,330 ha of native forest (Fig 6d), the sediment models indicated an additional 5,188 t.yr<sup>-1</sup> of sediment discharging at the shoreline (683% increase, Fig 6e), resulting in an increase of TSS in the southern and eastern sides of the bay (Fig 6f).



**Fig 6. Mele Bay land use scenarios: change in land cover, sediment export, and TSS.**  
(a-c) restoration and (d-f) urbanization.



### 3.5 CORAL REEF BENTHIC INDICATORS IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER LANDUSE CHANGE SCENARIOS

Under the restoration scenario, the coral reef models predicted a significant change of the benthic habitat over 18 ha (Table 2). This correspond to an average increase of 7% for coral cover over 11 ha and an average decrease of 5% macroalgae cover over 12 ha (Table 2). The potential recovery of coral reef habitat is larger along the Tagabe reef and Ifira Island (eastern side of the bay), as well as Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) (Fig 7).

Under the urbanization scenario, the coral reef models predicted a significant change of the benthic habitat over 50 ha (Table 2). This correspond to an average decrease of 20% for coral cover over 22 ha and an average increase of 17% for macroalgae cover over 29 ha (Table 2).


The potential impact to coral reef habitat is greatest on the southern part of Tagabe reef near the entrance to Vila bay and part of Ifira Island reef (eastern side of the bay), as well as Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) (Fig 7). Turf algae did not change under any scenario because TSS was not selected as a key predictor. The habitat area (ha), average % cover change, and standard deviation from the mean predicted to significantly differ relative to present conditions are reported for the benthic indicators per land-use change scenario.

**Table 2. Coral benthic reef impact assessment.**

Habitat area (ha), average % change (in benthic cover), and standard deviation for areas predicted to significantly differ relative to present conditions are reported for each land-use scenario. The total column shows the total area (ha) showing significant change accounting for spatial overlap amongst indicators.

(Refer to Fig 7 for more details on relative change by benthic indicator spatially).

Benthic indicators	Units	Hard coral	Macroalgae	Turf algae	Total
Restoration	ha	11.3	11.7	-	<b>17.6</b>
	% change	+7.0	-5.1	-	-
	std	± 3.9	± 2.4	-	-
Urbanization	ha	22.4	28.5	-	<b>49.2</b>
	% change	-20.4	+16.9	-	-
	std	± 9.3	± 7.0	-	-



**Fig 7. Maps of benthic indicators change per scenario: hard coral, macroalgae, and turf algae.** Relative change in benthic indicators abundance (% change) is shown under the (a-c) restoration and (d-f) urbanization scenario.

### 3.6 CORAL REEF FISH INDICATORS IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER LAND-USE CHANGE SCENARIOS

Under the restoration scenario, the coral reef models predicted a significant increase for fish biomass over a total of 31 ha (Table 3). This corresponds to increases of 4% for biomass of all fishes combined, 11% for herbivore biomass and 6% for targeted fish biomass (Table 3). The potential recovery of coral reef fishes is greatest along the Tagabe reef and Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) (Fig 8).


Under the urbanization scenario, the coral reef models predicted a significant loss of fish biomass over 76 ha (Table 3). This correspond to losses of 22% for biomass of all fishes combined, 38% for herbivore biomass and 25% for targeted fish biomass (Table 3). The potential impact to coral reef fishes is larger along the Tagabe reef and Ifira Island (eastern side of the bay), as well as Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) (Fig 8).

**Table 3. Coral fish reef impact assessment under land-use change scenarios.**

Habitat area (ha), average % change (in biomass), and standard deviation for areas predicted to significantly differ relative to present conditions are reported for each land-use scenario. The total column shows the total area (ha) showing significant change accounting for spatial overlap amongst indicators.

(Refer to Fig 8 for more details on relative change by fish indicator spatially).

Fish indicators	Units	All Fishes	Herbivores	Targeted	Total
Restoration	ha	24.1	19.6	25.4	<b>30.8</b>
	% change	+4.3	+10.5	+5.6	-
	std	±3.0	±6.4	3.4	-
Urbanization	ha	63.8	64.6	62.2	<b>76.0</b>
	% change	-21.8	-37.6	-25.0	-
	std	±6.6	±11.0	±11.1	-



**Fig 8. Maps of fish indicators change per land-use change scenarios: total biomass, herbivore biomass, and targeted biomass.** Relative change in fish indicator biomass (% change) is shown under the: (a-c) restoration, and (d-f) urbanization scenarios.

### 3.7 CORAL REEF FISHERY IMPACT ASSESSMENT UNDER COMBINED MARINE & LANDUSE CHANGE SCENARIOS


Under the marine management scenario (represented by closure), the coral reef models predicted a significant increase of 13% targeted fish biomass over 96 ha (Table 4). The potential recovery of targeted fishes is greatest along Tagabe reef and around Ifira Island where the proposed management areas are to be located (Fig 9).

Under the combined marine management and restoration scenario, the coral reef models predicted a significant increase of 14% of targeted fish biomass over 90 ha (Table 4). The potential recovery of coral reef fishes is greatest along the Tagabe reef and Ifira Island (eastern side of the bay) where the proposed managed areas are to be located, as well as Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) which is already managed as a no-take area (Fig 9).

Under the combined marine management and urbanization scenario, the coral reef models predicted both a significant increase of 11% of targeted fish biomass over 40 ha and a significant decrease of 20% of targeted fish biomass over 63 ha (Table 4). The potential recovery of the reef fishery due to the marine closure is greatest along the northern portion of Tagabe reef (eastern side of the bay), in Fatumaru bay and around Ifira Island (Fig. 9). The potential impact to the reef fishery occurs on the southern portion of Tagabe reef and around Hideaway Island (northern side of the bay) (Fig 9). Despite the positive effect of the marine closure, the urbanization scenario results in an overall decrease in targeted fish biomass.

**Table 4. Coral reef fishery impact assessment.** Habitat area (ha), average % change (in biomass), and standard deviation for areas predicted to significantly differ relative to present conditions are reported for each land-use scenario. (Refer to Fig 9 for more details on relative change spatially).

Combined scenarios	Units	Targeted Fish Increase	Targeted Fish Decrease
Closure + Present LULC	ha	95.9	-
	% change	+13.1	-
	std	±2.8	-
Closure + Restoration	ha	90.4	-
	% change	+14.1	-
	std	±5.0	-
Closure + Urbanization	ha	39.8	62.5
	% change	+10.8	-20.2
	std	±2.5	±6.9



**Fig 9. Maps of targeted fish indicator change under combined land-use change and marine management scenarios.** Relative change in targeted fish biomass indicator (% change) is shown under: (a) marine management, (b) marine management combined with restoration, and (c) marine management combined with urbanization scenario.

## 4. DISCUSSION

### 4.1 LAND-SEA MODELING & PLANNING

This linked land-sea decision support tool identified reef areas vulnerable to land use/cover change and evaluated proposed management actions in terms of benefits to terrestrial and marine ecosystems. The modeling tool was first informed by data layers representing current conditions and these results represent the effect of current land-use on sediment runoff, once it enters the nearshore environment. Then, land-use change, and marine protection scenarios were applied to quantify the potential impact of TSS on reefs under increasing levels of forest restoration, increased urbanization, and marine closures.

The impacts of proposed terrestrial conservation and restoration actions vary between locations. However, land-use actions can reduce soil erosion and provide benefits downstream and can inform land-sea planning. This requires effective coordination across different agencies. Similarly, it is important to understand how marine conservation actions can help restore the fish communities which is important to local human well-being through food and cultural practices.

In Vanuatu, the Fisheries Department and the Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation have authority over coral reef ecosystems and the Department of Forests is mandated with the management of the forest sector, while local communities are also initiating marine

conservation actions (IMMT 2019). This mismatch of governance and natural boundaries/processes can result in decision-makers having no control over activities outside their jurisdiction that impact the ecology of their systems (Jupiter et al. 2014).

However, these results can facilitate discussions across agencies and inform stakeholders. The outputs are simple maps and spreadsheets, thereby allowing for more transparency in the decision-making process, which can foster community buy-in (Bremer et al. 2015).

#### ***4.2 LAND-SEA DECISION SUPPORT TOOL***

The land-sea tool calibration results established the effect of current land-use, through sediment runoff, on coral reefs in the study area. The coral reef benthic models indicated that coral cover was negatively related to sediment exposure along with all the fish biomass indicators, while macroalgae cover, upon which herbivore and targeted fishes depend, was positively related to sediment exposure (Fig 4).

The adverse direct and indirect impacts of sedimentation and turbidity on benthic habitat at local scales has been well established (Fabricius 2005a). Increases in sediment can indirectly hinder competition for space by reef calcifiers (Smith et al. 2016a). Even if coral reefs in turbid waters can flourish (Anthony 1999), they are restricted to the top 4–10 m depth range (Yentsch et al. 2002, Fabricius et al. 2005), and typically support fewer species, slower growth rates, and poorer recruitment (Rogers 1990). Coral reef fishes can be adversely affected by sedimentation and turbidity through altered foraging (Johansen and Jones 2013). Sedimentation and turbidity also indirectly affect coral reef fishes by altering the benthic community structure and composition (Rogers 1990).

The degree of dependence on different benthic groups may influence the susceptibility of fishes to habitat impacts from sediment runoff (Brown et al. 2017c), which can decrease or alter fish recruitment (DeMartini et al. 2013, Wenger et al. 2014). As a result, our coral reef predictions indicated that reefs closer to Tagabe stream, which discharges the highest amount of sediment in Mele Bay, generally support less coral abundance and fish biomass, in contrast to reefs located to the north west or south east sides of the bay, which support more coral abundance and fish biomass (Fig 5).

The reefs south of Tagabe stream experience higher fishing pressure as indicated by participatory mapping. One reason for this is that the chiefs of the Ifira clan, which holds traditional rights to the land there, have not made it available for development. As a result, there are no waterfront residents that prevent access and discourage fishing as along other parts of Mele Bay (Nelson Bakokoto pers. comm.). The relatively high fishing pressure is another factor which decreases fish biomass and has indirect effects on coral cover due to the removal of herbivores (Rasher and Hay

2010). Thus, the reefs in this area suffer from the cumulative impacts of both high sedimentation and high fishing pressure.

The coral reef fish models' calibration established the effect of habitat and fishing pressure on coral reef fishes in the study area. The models indicated that targeted fish biomass was negatively related to fishing pressure (Fig 4). The adverse direct impact of fishing pressure on targeted reef fishes has been well established (Stamoulis et al. 2018). Fishing pressure alters the composition and trophic structure of marine ecosystems, and the resulting changes to functional groups can have strong effects on overall system resilience (Jackson et al. 2001, Green and Bellwood 2009). For example, removal of keystone herbivores can drive phase shifts to less desirable ecosystem states dominated by algae (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Mumby 2009, Bahr et al. 2015).

Many studies have shown that habitat topography and complexity are primary drivers controlling coral reefs (Friedlander et al. 2003, Pittman et al. 2009, Stamoulis et al. 2018), as shown in Mele Bay where habitat topography and complexity were important predictors of fish biomass. Generally, fish biomass was higher along the reef slopes. Our results show that local-scale habitat characteristics played an important role in shaping these coral reefs.

#### **4.3 LAND-SEA SCENARIO PLANNING**

The scenario analysis results quantified the potential benefits of restoring native forest in Tagabe watershed through reduced TSS risk to downstream coral reefs (Figs 7 & 8). Under the restoration scenarios, we showed that limiting human-derived sources of sediment in areas linked to coral reefs can improve coral reef habitat, while projected increases in urbanization led to an increase in macroalgae and a loss of coral cover and fish biomass (Table 2 & 3). Therefore, conserving and restoring forest in Tagabe conservation zones not only maintains good water quality essential for healthy coral reefs, it is also an important management strategy to mitigate the impacts of climate change on nearshore coral reefs within the range of sediment dispersal from rivers (McCook et al. 2001, Szmant 2002).

Our results indicated that marine conservation can reduce human impacts on coral reefs by increasing fish biomass within the marine closure (Halpern 2003, Delaney et al. 2017). Because targeted fishes are subject to fishing impacts, targeted fish biomass showed an increase under the marine closure scenario. Our results revealed that removal of fishing can enhance fish recovery under forest restoration scenarios or offset impacts of urbanization on the targeted fish community. Although the impacts of urbanization are reduced when coupled with the marine closure, our results indicated that land-based impacts can persist both inside and outside of closure boundaries (Fig. 9).

These spatial trends imply that in the face of land-based impacts, marine closures alone are not always capable of addressing human drivers that impact the benthic community of coral reefs upon which reef fishes depend, reinforcing the need for ridge-to-reef management (Halpern et al. 2013).

#### ***4.4 AREA-BASED MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS***

These spatially explicit models revealed that coral reefs in this area are sensitive to management actions at the local scale. This has important implications for future conservation planning and development in Tagabe watershed and implies that accounting for finer spatial patterns is necessary to reduce impacts on coral reefs. The high resolution of our models allowed us to discover spatial nuances, which revealed the need for both marine and terrestrial management actions. Identifying where coral reefs are more or less vulnerable to local human impacts can inform place-based management actions to minimize risks (Game et al. 2008).

These results highlight that targeted terrestrial management in Tagabe watershed can benefit terrestrial and marine ecosystems, particularly where marine closures may fall short, such as beyond the boundaries of the marine closure. This demonstrates the importance of accounting for the specifics of the place, such as geological history and rainfall (Selvarajah et al. 1994). In Mele Bay, conservation approaches should focus on protecting the reefs which are more vulnerable to sediment runoff and constitute important local fishing grounds for nearby coastal villages.

The results of this analysis correspond very well with the spatial management strategies outlined in the Ifira MPA Management Plan. The plan seeks to place protection from fishing on the reefs south of Tagabe river which are subject to TSS impacts as well as high fishing pressure. Implementing upland management actions will decrease sediment export to these reefs and reducing or eliminating fishing pressure will support recovery. The plan also calls for ecosystem restoration activities such as coral transplantation and crown of thorns starfish removal which will further support coral reef ecosystem recovery in these areas. Furthermore, recent research found that coral reefs managed with high local community engagement and dependence on marine resources have a better chance of withstanding impacts related to climate change (Cinner et al. 2016).

We tested how sensitive our modeling framework was to the linkages between the SDR model and the plume models by running the framework with various c-factor values for the major land-use types. We observed that the magnitude of change and the sizes of the spatial footprints of coral reef impacts as a function of sediment runoff varied depending on the c-factors used. However, the locations of coral reef impact from sediment runoff were consistently detected near the Tagabe watershed, which contributed the largest change in sediment export. Therefore, the potential benefits of forest restoration and/or marine conservation on downstream coral reef only changed in terms of amplitude.



In order to foster the resilience of these reefs, it is essential to consider minimizing land-based impacts, as research increasingly shows that marine closures are less effective when exposed to high land-based source pollution (Halpern et al. 2013, Wenger et al. 2015). Conservation planning should design protected areas that go beyond protecting parts of the ecosystem within their boundaries and instead augment resilience on a scale that transcends land-sea boundaries (Game et al. 2008). In this way, these findings reinforce that area-based ridge-to-reef management can reduce human impacts on coral reefs in the face of climate change.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Integrated land-sea planning requires the ability to trace where land-based pollutants come from and where they are likely to cause an impact once they enter the marine environment. This project adapted, applied and scaled down a linked land-sea decision support tool (Delevaux et al. 2018a), to quantify, track, and map the impact of land-use change and marine conservation on coral reefs at the sub-watershed scale. The soils, rainfall, and current data used in this study are from global datasets, freely available, making this approach useful for regions with limited funding. In addition, this modeling framework relies on two freely available software packages (i.e., InVEST SDR, and R) and the proprietary software ArcGIS (open access QGIS can be used as an alternative) (ESRI 2011a, Team 2014, 2015, Hamel et al. 2015b). By coupling this tool with scenario planning, we were able to test local conservation actions and forecast outcomes in terms of coral reef and fishery health.

We showed that limiting human-derived sources of sediment in areas linked to coral reefs can improve coral reef habitat, while increases in urbanization will lead to an increase in macroalgae and a loss of coral cover and fish biomass. Therefore, conserving and restoring forest in Tagabe conservation zones supports healthy coral reefs and fisheries. Our results also revealed that removal of fishing can enhance fish recovery under forest restoration scenarios or offset impacts of urbanization on the targeted fish community. Although the impacts of urbanization are significantly reduced when coupled with the marine closure, our results indicate that land-based impacts can persist both inside and outside of closure boundaries. Therefore, a combination of terrestrial forest restoration and marine protection from fishing will result in the best outcomes for coral reefs and associated fisheries.

This information can be used to inform land-sea planning and help prioritize local conservation and management actions in Tagabe watershed and Mele Bay. By simultaneously evaluating the effect of land-use change, sediment runoff, fishing pressure, coral reef habitat, and associated fish communities, this research highlighted the potential trade-offs and synergies arising between land and sea under different land-use scenarios. We applied land-use management scenarios based on proposed management actions in the study area in order to evaluate tradeoffs and identify optimal management solutions. By adopting a ridge-to-reef conservation planning process, protected areas can be designed for multiple benefits that include improvements in biodiversity, drinking water,

and reef fisheries. The implementation of this approach in GIS allows managers to visualize and foresee the potential outcomes of management interventions. This type of approach has the potential to engender collaborative stewardship among agencies, communities, and other stakeholders and inform ecosystem-based, land-sea conservation planning in Vanuatu and other Pacific Island nations. The approach also provides basis for ongoing research and modelling work to better identify and understand the impacts and trade-offs of other equally important model potential interactions between land and sea continuum, which are currently poorly understood.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Amos, M. 2007. Vanuatu fishery resource profiles. Apia, Samoa: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.
- Anthony, K. R. 1999. Coral suspension feeding on fine particulate matter. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 232:85–106.
- Anthony, K. R. 2006a. Enhanced energy status of corals on coastal, high-turbidity reefs. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 319:111–116.
- Anthony, K. R., S. R. Connolly, and O. Hoegh-Guldberg. 2007. Bleaching, energetics, and coral mortality risk: Effects of temperature, light, and sediment regime. *Limnology and oceanography* 52:716–726.
- Anthony, K. R. N. 2006b. Enhanced energy status of corals on coastal, high-turbidity reefs. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 319:111–116.
- Bartley, R., Z. T. Bainbridge, S. E. Lewis, F. J. Kroon, S. N. Wilkinson, J. E. Brodie, and D. M. Silburn. 2014. Relating sediment impacts on coral reefs to watershed sources, processes and management: A review. *Science of the Total Environment* 468:1138–1153.
- Batjes, N. H. 2016. Harmonized soil property values for broad-scale modelling (WISE30sec) with estimates of global soil carbon stocks. *Geoderma* 269:61–68.
- Borselli, L., P. Cassi, and D. Torri. 2008. Prolegomena to sediment and flow connectivity in the landscape: a GIS and field numerical assessment. *Catena* 75:268–277.
- Braun, C. D., B. Galuardi, and S. R. Thorrold. 2018. HMMoce: An R package for improved geolocation of archival-tagged fishes using a hidden Markov method. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 9:1212–1220.
- Breiman, L. 1996. Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning* 24:123–140.
- Breiman, L. 2001. Statistical Modeling: The Two Cultures (with comments and a rejoinder by the author). *Statistical Science* 16:199–231.
- Bremer, L. L., J. M. Delevaux, J. J. Leary, L. J. Cox, and K. L. Oleson. 2015. Opportunities and strategies to incorporate ecosystem services knowledge and decision support tools into planning and decision making in Hawai ‘i. *Environmental management* 55:884–899.
- Brown, C. J., S. D. Jupiter, S. Albert, C. J. Klein, S. Mangubhai, J. M. Maina, P. Mumby, J. Olley, B. Stewart-Koster, and V. Tulloch. 2017a. Tracing the influence of land-use change on water quality and coral reefs using a Bayesian model. *Scientific reports* 7:4740.
- Brown, C. J., S. D. Jupiter, H.-Y. Lin, S. Albert, C. Klein, J. M. Maina, V. J. Tulloch, A. S. Wenger, and P. J. Mumby. 2017b. Habitat change mediates the response of coral reef fish populations to terrestrial run-off. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 576:55–68.
- Brown, C. J., S. D. Jupiter, H.-Y. Lin, S. Albert, C. Klein, J. M. Maina, V. J. Tulloch, A. S. Wenger, and P. J. Mumby. 2017c. Habitat change mediates the response of coral reef fish populations to terrestrial run-off. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 576:55–68.
- Cavalli, M., S. Trevisani, F. Comiti, and L. Marchi. 2013. Geomorphometric assessment of spatial sediment connectivity in small Alpine catchments. *Geomorphology* 188:31–41.

- Chicas, S., and K. Omine. 2015. Forest Cover Change and Soil Erosion in Toledo's Rio Grande Watershed. *ISPRS-International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences* 40:353–358.
- Dauvergne, P. 1998. Globalisation and deforestation in the Asia-Pacific. *Environmental Politics* 7:114–135.
- De'ath, G., and K. E. Fabricius. 2000. Classification and Regression Trees: A Powerful yet Simple Technique for Ecological Data Analysis. *Ecology* 81:3178–3192.
- Delevaux, J. M. S., S. D. Jupiter, K. A. Stamoulis, L. L. Bremer, A. S. Wenger, R. Dacks, P. Garrod, K. A. Falinski, and T. Ticktin. 2018a. Scenario planning with linked land-sea models inform where forest conservation actions will promote coral reef resilience. *Scientific Reports* 8:12465.
- Delevaux, J. M. S., R. Whittier, K. A. Stamoulis, L. L. Bremer, S. Jupiter, A. M. Friedlander, M. Poti, G. Guannel, N. Kurashima, K. Winter, Robert, and K. Anders. 2018b. A linked land-sea modeling framework to inform ridge-to-reef management in high oceanic islands. *Plos ONE*.
- Delevaux, J. M., K. A. Stamoulis, R. Whittier, S. D. Jupiter, L. L. Bremer, A. Friedlander, N. Kurashima, J. Giddens, K. B. Winter, and M. Blach-Vaughan. 2019. Place-based management can reduce human impacts on coral reefs in a changing climate. *Ecological Applications* 29: e01891.
- DeMartini, E., P. Jokiel, J. Beets, Y. Stender, C. Storlazzi, D. Minton, and E. Conklin. 2013. Terrigenous sediment impact on coral recruitment and growth affects the use of coral habitat by recruit parrotfishes (F. Scaridae). *Journal of coastal conservation* 17:417–429.
- DeVantier, B. A., and A. D. Feldman. 1993. Review of GIS applications in hydrologic modeling. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 119:246–261.
- Doheny, B., K. Maher, A. Minks, J. Rude, and M. Tyner. 2013. Ridge to Reef: Land Use, Sedimentation, and Marine Resource Vulnerability in Raja Ampat, Indonesia. Page 93. Conservation International and Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, UCSB.
- Duarte, C. M., I. J. Losada, I. E. Hendriks, I. Mazarrasa, and N. Marbà. 2013. The role of coastal plant communities for climate change mitigation and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change* 3:961.
- Dumas, P., A. Bertaud, C. Peignon, M. Leopold, and D. Pelletier. 2009. A “quick and clean” photographic method for the description of coral reef habitats. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 368:161–168.
- Eckardt, R., M. Herold, J. Sambale, and S. Weaver. 2008. Monitoring deforestation patterns and processes in the Pacific island state of Vanuatu. Page 71 *Geospatial crossroads GForum'08: proceedings of the Geoinformatics Forum Salzburg*. Wichmann.
- Elith, J., J. R. Leathwick, and T. Hastie. 2008. A working guide to boosted regression trees. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77:802–813.
- Ellison, J. C. 1999. Impacts of Sediment Burial on Mangroves. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 37:420–426.

- El-Swaify, S. A., E. W. Dangler, and C. L. Armstrong. 1982. Soil erosion by water in the tropics. ESRI. 2011a. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10.4. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, CA.
- ESRI. 2011b. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10. Environmental Systems Research Institute. Redlands, CA.
- Evensen, C. I., S. A. El-Swaify, C. W. Smith, and D. Flanagan, 2001. C-Factor development for sugarcane in Hawaii. Pages 687-690. American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers, Honolulu, HI, USA.
- Fabricius, K., G. De'ath, L. McCook, E. Turak, and D. M. Williams. 2005. Changes in algal, coral and fish assemblages along water quality gradients on the inshore Great Barrier Reef. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 51:384–398.
- Fabricius, K. E. 2005a. Effects of terrestrial runoff on the ecology of corals and coral reefs: review and synthesis. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 50:125–146.
- Fabricius, K. E. 2005b. Effects of terrestrial runoff on the ecology of corals and coral reefs: review and synthesis. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 50:125–146.
- Falinski, K. A. 2016. Predicting sediment export into tropical coastal ecosystems to Support ridge to reef management. University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.
- FAO. 2007. Strategic environmental assessment. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/007/y2413e/y2413e09.htm>.
- Fekete, B. M., C. J. Vörösmarty, and W. Grabs. 2002. High-resolution fields of global runoff combining observed river discharge and simulated water balances. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 16:15–1.
- Fick, S. E., and R. J. Hijmans. 2017. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *International journal of climatology* 37:4302–4315.
- Franklin, J. 2010. Mapping Species Distributions: Spatial Inference and Prediction. Cambridge University Press.
- Friedlander, A. M., E. K. Brown, P. L. Jokiel, W. R. Smith, and K. S. Rodgers. 2003. Effects of habitat, wave exposure, and marine protected area status on coral reef fish assemblages in the Hawaiian archipelago. *Coral Reefs* 22:291–305.
- Game, E. T., M. E. Watts, S. Wooldridge, and H. P. Possingham. 2008. Planning for persistence in marine reserves: a question of catastrophic importance. *Ecological Applications* 18:670–680.
- Gholami, L., S. H. R. Sadeghi, and A. V. K. Darvishan. 2009. Modeling storm-wise sediment delivery ratio model in Chehelgazi watershed by using climatic and hydrologic characteristics. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources* 16:253–260.
- Green, A. L., and D. R. Bellwood. 2009. Monitoring functional groups of herbivorous reef fishes as indicators of coral reef resilience: a practical guide for coral reef managers in the Asia Pacific region. IUCN.
- Guerry, A. D., M. H. Ruckelshaus, K. K. Arkema, J. R. Bernhardt, G. Guannel, C.-K. Kim, M. Marsik, M. Papenfus, J. E. Toft, and G. Verutes. 2012. Modeling benefits from nature:

- using ecosystem services to inform coastal and marine spatial planning. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 8:107–121.
- Halpern, B. S., K. A. Selkoe, C. White, S. Albert, and S. Aswani. 2013. Marine protected areas and resilience to sedimentation in the Solomon Islands. *Coral Reefs* 32:61–69.
- Halpern, B. S., S. Walbridge, K. A. Selkoe, C. V. Kappel, F. Micheli, and C. D’Agrosa. 2008. A Global Map of Human Impact on Marine Ecosystems. *Science* 319:948–952.
- Hamel, P., R. Chaplin-Kramer, S. Sim, and C. Mueller. 2015a. A new approach to modeling the sediment retention service (InVEST 3.0): case study of the Cape Fear catchment, North Carolina, USA. *Science of the Total Environment* 524:166–177.
- Hamel, P., R. Chaplin-Kramer, S. Sim, and C. Mueller. 2015b. A new approach to modeling the sediment retention service (InVEST 3.0): Case study of the Cape Fear catchment. North Carolina, USA. *Sci. Total Environ.*
- Hijmans, R. J. 2014. R package, Raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. Software.
- Hijmans, R. J. 2019. raster: Geographic Data Analysis and Modeling. R package version 2.9-23.
- Hijmans, R. J., S. Phillips, J. Leathwick, and J. Elith. 2014. R package, dismo: Species distribution modeling.
- Hirzel, A., and A. Guisan. 2002. Which is the optimal sampling strategy for habitat suitability modelling. *Ecological modelling* 157:331–341.
- Hoeke, R. K., P. L. Jokiel, R. W. Buddemeier, and R. E. Brainard. 2011. Projected changes to growth and mortality of Hawaiian corals over the next 100 years. *PloS one* 6:e18038.
- Houk, P., D. Benavente, J. Iguel, S. Johnson, and R. Okano. 2014. Coral Reef Disturbance and Recovery Dynamics Differ across Gradients of Localized Stressors in the Mariana Islands. *PLOS ONE* 9:e105731.
- IMMT. 2019. Ifira Marine Protected Area Management Plan. Ifira Marine Management. Port Vila, Vanuatu.
- Januchowski, S. R., R. L. Pressey, J. VanDerWal, and A. Edwards. 2010. Characterizing errors in digital elevation models and estimating the financial costs of accuracy. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 24:1327–1347.
- Johansen, J. L., and G. P. Jones. 2013. Sediment-induced turbidity impairs foraging performance and prey choice of planktivorous coral reef fishes. *Ecological Applications* 23:1504–1517.
- Jokiel, P. L., K. S. Rodgers, C. D. Storlazzi, M. E. Field, C. V. Lager, and D. Lager. 2014. Response of reef corals on a fringing reef flat to elevated suspended-sediment concentrations: Moloka‘i, Hawai‘i. *PeerJ* 2: e699.
- Jupiter, S. D., and D. P. Egli. 2011. Ecosystem-based management in Fiji: successes and challenges after five years of implementation. *Journal of Marine Biology* 2011.
- Jupiter, S. D., A. P. Jenkins, W. J. L. Long, S. L. Maxwell, T. J. Carruthers, K. B. Hodge, H. Govan, J. Tamelander, and J. E. Watson. 2014. Principles for integrated island management in the tropical Pacific. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 20:193–205.
- Klein, C. J., S. D. Jupiter, E. R. Selig, M. E. Watts, B. S. Halpern, M. Kamal, C. Roelfsema, and H. P. Possingham. 2012. Forest conservation delivers highly variable coral reef conservation outcomes. *Ecological Applications* 22:1246–1256.

- Kohler, K. E., and S. M. Gill. 2006. Coral Point Count with Excel extensions (CPCe): A Visual Basic program for the determination of coral and substrate coverage using random point count methodology. *Computers & Geosciences* 32: 1259–1269.
- Lianes, E., M. Marchamalo, and M. Roldán. 2009. Evaluación del factor C de la RUSLE para el manejo de coberturas vegetales en el control de la erosión en la cuenca del río Birrís, Costa Rica. *Agronomía Costarricense* 33:217–235.
- López-Vicente, M., J. Poesen, A. Navas, and L. Gaspar. 2013. Predicting runoff and sediment connectivity and soil erosion by water for different land use scenarios in the Spanish Pre-Pyrenees. *Catena* 102:62–73.
- Lovell, E., H. Sykes, M. Deiye, L. Wantiez, C. Garrigue, S. Virly, J. Samuelu, A. Solofa, T. Poulasi, K. Pakoa, and others. 2004. Status of Coral Reefs in the South West Pacific: Fiji, Nauru, New Caledonia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. *Status of coral reefs of the world* 2:337–362.
- Marois, D. E., and W. J. Mitsch. 2015. Coastal protection from tsunamis and cyclones provided by mangrove wetlands—a review. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 11:71–83.
- Mather, A. S., C. L. Needle, and J. Fairbairn. 1998. The human drivers of global land cover change: the case of forests. *Hydrological processes* 12:1983–1994.
- McIntosh, P. D. 2013. Review of soil and water provisions in the Papua New Guinea Logging Code of Practice and related codes in the tropics, A report under Project GCP. PNG/003/AUL for the PNG Forest Authority, the Food and Agriculture ....
- Melbourne-Thomas, J., C. R. Johnson, T. Fung, R. M. Seymour, L. M. Chérubin, J. E. Arias-González, and E. A. Fulton. 2011. Regional-scale scenario modeling for coral reefs: A decision support tool to inform management of a complex system. *Ecol. Appl.* 1380–1398.
- Miller, J. A. 2012. Species distribution models: Spatial autocorrelation and non-stationarity. *Progress in Physical Geography* 36:681–692.
- Morgan, K. M., C. T. Perry, J. A. Johnson, and S. G. Smithers. 2016. Nearshore Turbid-Zone Corals Exhibit High Bleaching Tolerance on the Great Barrier Reef Following the. Page 224.
- Nagelkerken, I., G. Van der Velde, M. W. Gorissen, G. J. Meijer, T. Van't Hof, and C. Den Hartog. 2000. Importance of mangroves, seagrass beds and the shallow coral reef as a nursery for important coral reef fishes, using a visual census technique. *Estuarine, coastal and shelf science* 51:31–44.
- Neil, D. T., A. R. Orpin, P. V. Ridd, and B. Yu. 2002. Sediment yield and impacts from river catchments to the Great Barrier Reef lagoon: a review. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 53:733–752.
- Olley, J., J. Burton, V. Hermoso, K. Smolders, J. McMahon, B. Thomson, and A. Watkinson. 2015. Remnant riparian vegetation, sediment and nutrient loads, and river rehabilitation in subtropical Australia. *Hydrological Processes* 29:2290–2300.
- Pierce, D. 2019. ncdf4: Interface to Unidata netCDF (Version 4 or Earlier).


- Pittman, S. J., B. M. Costa, and T. A. Battista. 2009. Using Lidar Bathymetry and Boosted Regression Trees to Predict the Diversity and Abundance of Fish and Corals. *J Coast Res*:27–38.
- R Core Team. 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rasher, D. B., and M. E. Hay. 2010. Chemically rich seaweeds poison corals when not controlled by herbivores. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:9683–9688.
- Renard, K. G., G. R. Foster, G. A. Weesies, D. K. McCool, and D. C. Yoder. 1997. Predicting soil erosion by water: a guide to conservation planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). United States Department of Agriculture Washington, DC.
- Ridgeway, G. 2007. Generalized Boosted Models: A guide to the gbm package.
- Roelfsema, C., S. Phinn, S. Jupiter, J. Comley, and S. Albert. 2013. Mapping coral reefs at reef to reef-system scales, 10s–1000s km<sup>2</sup>, using object-based image analysis. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 34:6367–6388.
- Rogers, C. S. 1990. Responses of coral reefs and reef organisms to sedimentation. *Marine ecology progress series*. Oldendorf 62:185–202.
- Roose, E. J. 1977. Use of the universal soil loss equation to predict erosion in West Africa. Pages 60–74 *Soil erosion: prediction and control*. Soil Conservation Society of America Ankeny, IA.
- Rude, J., A. Minks, B. Doheny, M. Tyner, K. Maher, C. Huffard, N. I. Hidayat, and H. Grantham. 2016. Ridge to reef modelling for use within land–sea planning under data-limited conditions. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 26:251–264.
- Saunders, M. I., S. Atkinson, C. J. Klein, T. Weber, and H. P. Possingham. 2017. Increased sediment loads cause non-linear decreases in seagrass suitable habitat extent. *PLOS ONE* 12:e0187284.
- Sharp, R., H. T. Tallis, T. Ricketts, A. D. Guerry, S. A. Wood, R. Chaplin-Kramer, E. Nelson, D. Ennaanay, S. Wolny, and N. Olwero. 2016. InVEST+ VERSION+ User’s Guide. The Natural Capital Project. Stanford University, University of Minnesota, The Nature Conservancy, and ....
- Sheppard, J. K., I. R. Lawler, and H. Marsh. 2007. Seagrass as pasture for seacows: Landscape-level dugong habitat evaluation. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 71:117–132.
- Smith, J. E., R. Brainard, A. Carter, S. Grillo, C. Edwards, J. Harris, L. Lewis, D. Obura, F. Rohwer, E. Sala, and P. S. Vroom. 2016a. Re-evaluating the health of coral reef communities: baselines and evidence for human impacts across the central Pacific. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 283.
- Smith, J. E., R. Brainard, A. Carter, S. Grillo, C. Edwards, J. Harris, L. Lewis, D. Obura, F. Rohwer, E. Sala, P. S. Vroom, and S. Sandin. 2016b. Re-evaluating the health of coral reef communities: baselines and evidence for human impacts across the central Pacific. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 283:20151985.
- Sobey, M. 2019. Rapid Coastal Assessment of Tagabe River Catchment, Port Vila, Vanuatu. Page 34. Port Vila, Vanuatu.




- Stamoulis, K. A., and J. M. S. Delevaux. 2015. Data requirements and tools to operationalize marine spatial planning in the United States. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 116:214–223.
- Stamoulis, K. A., J. M. S. Delevaux, I. D. Williams, M. Poti, B. Costa, M. S. Kendall, S. J. Pittman, M. K. Donovan, L. M. Wedding, and A. M. Friedlander. accepted. Seascape models reveal places to focus coastal fisheries management. *Ecological Applications*.
- Stamoulis, K. A., J. M. S. Delevaux, I. D. Williams, M. Poti, J. Lecky, B. Costa, M. S. Kendall, S. J. Pittman, M. K. Donovan, L. M. Wedding, and A. M. Friedlander. 2018. Seascape models reveal places to focus coastal fisheries management. *Ecological Applications* 28:910–925.
- Tawney, E. J. 2006. Watershed Management and Planning in the Tagabe River Watershed Catchment Area in and around Port Vila, Vanuatu. MSc thesis., Michigan Technological University.
- Team, Q. D. 2015. QGIS geographic information system. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project, Versão 2.
- Team, R. C. 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Terry, J. P., and R. Lal. 2008. An examination of vertical accretion of floodplain sediments in the Labasa river sugarcane belt of Northern Fiji: Rates, influences and contributing processes. *Geographical Research* 46:399–412.
- Toonen, R. J., K. R. Andrews, I. B. Baums, C. E. Bird, G. T. Concepcion, T. S. Daly-Engel, J. A. Eble, A. Faucci, M. R. Gaither, M. Iacchei, J. B. Puritz, J. K. Schultz, D. J. Skillings, M. A. Timmers, and B. W. Bowen. 2011. Defining Boundaries for Ecosystem-Based Management: A Multispecies Case Study of Marine Connectivity across the Hawaiian Archipelago. *Journal of Marine Biology* 2011:13.
- Tulloch, V. J., C. J. Brown, H. P. Possingham, S. D. Jupiter, J. M. Maina, and C. Klein. 2016. Improving conservation outcomes for coral reefs affected by future oil palm development in Papua New Guinea. *Biological Conservation* 203:43–54.
- Venables, W. N., and B. D. Ripley. 2013. *Modern Applied Statistics with S-PLUS*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Walker, L. R., and P. Bellingham. 2011. *Island Environments in a Changing World*. Cambridge University Press.
- Weatherall, P., K. M. Marks, M. Jakobsson, T. Schmitt, S. Tani, J. E. Arndt, M. Rovere, D. Chayes, V. Ferrini, and R. Wigley. 2015. A new digital bathymetric model of the world's oceans. *Earth and Space Science* 2:331–345.
- Wenger, A. S. 2018. Predicting the impact of logging activities on soil erosion and water quality in steep, forested tropical islands. *Environmental Research Letters* 13:044035.
- Wenger, A. S., M. I. McCormick, G. G. Endo, I. M. McLeod, F. J. Kroon, and G. P. Jones. 2014. Suspended sediment prolongs larval development in a coral reef fish. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 217:1122–1128.
- Wenger, A. S., D. H. Williamson, and T. E. Da. 2015. Effects of reduced water quality on coral reefs in and out of no-take marine reserves. *Conservation Biology* 30:142–153.
- Williams, J. R. 1995. The EPIC model. *Computer models of watershed hydrology*:909–1000.

- Wilson, S. K., R. Fisher, M. S. Pratchett, N. a. J. Graham, N. K. Dulvy, R. A. Turner, A. Cakacaka, and N. V. C. Polunin. 2010. Habitat degradation and fishing effects on the size structure of coral reef fish communities. *Ecological Applications* 20:442–451.
- Wischmeier, W. H., and D. D. Smith. 1978. Predicting rainfall erosion losses: a guide to conservation planning. Science and Education Administration, US Department of Agriculture.
- Wooldridge, S. A. 2009a. Water quality and coral bleaching thresholds: Formalising the linkage for the inshore reefs of the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 58:745–751.
- Wooldridge, S. A. 2009b. Water quality and coral bleaching thresholds: Formalising the linkage for the inshore reefs of the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 58:745–751.
- Wooldridge, S. A., and Done. 2009. Improved water quality can ameliorate effects of climate change on corals. *Ecological Applications* 19:1492–1499.
- WRD. 2018. Tagabe River Catchment Management Plan 2017-2030. Page 50. Port Vila, Vanuatu.
- Yentsch, C. S., C. M. Yentsch, J. J. Cullen, B. Lapointe, D. A. Phinney, and S. W. Yentsch. 2002. Sunlight and water transparency: cornerstones in coral research. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 268:171–183.
- Yu, C., J. A. Y. Lee, and M. J. Munro-Stasiuk. 2003. Extensions to least-cost path algorithms for roadway planning. *Int J Geogr Inf* 17:361–376.


## APPENDIX 1 - FIGURES



**Fig S1. Coral reef survey locations identified by distance from Tagabe stream and depth strata.**




**Fig S2. Terrestrial geography & InVEST SDR inputs.** (a) Digital Elevation Model (DEM), (b) Average yearly rainfall (mm/yr), (c) Soil types, (d) Streams and watershed boundaries within the area of interest




**Fig S3. Marine geography variables.** (a) East-west component of HYCOM surface currents, (b) north-south component of HYCOM surface currents, (c) bathymetry, (d) reef habitat.

square.root.COR – page




**Fig S4. Response curves for coral.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.


square.root.MAC – page




**Fig S5. Response curves for macroalgae.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.



**Fig S6. Response curves for turf algae.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.




**Fig S7. Response curves for total biomass.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.




**Fig S8. Response curves for herbivore biomass.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.

fourth.root.TARG – page



**Fig S9. Response curves for targeted biomass.** Curves show the relative relationships with selected terrestrial and marine drivers.





**Fig S10. Coral reef indicators prediction validation**

## APPENDIX 2 - TABLES

**Table S1. Present land use/cover area (km<sup>2</sup> and %).**

Land use/cover	Area (ha)	%
Agriculture	198.6	1.5
Forest	8946.4	69.1
Golf course	52.6	0.4
Grassland	1916.0	14.8
Open land	77.0	0.6
Roads	58.0	0.4
Shrubland	948.8	7.3
Tree plantation	34.2	0.3
Settlement (L)	377.9	2.9
Settlement (M)	254.1	2.0
Settlement (H)	84.2	0.7

**Table S2. Fish species recorded during marine surveys.** Fishes were identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level. Species considered as targeted by fishers are denoted by \*. Herbivores are the ‘Primary’ consumer group.

Scientific name	Family	Consumer group	Max size (cm)
<i>Abudefduf vaigiensis</i>	Damselfish	Planktivore	20
<i>Acanthurus blochii</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	43
<i>Acanthurus dussumieri</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	56
<i>Acanthurus lineatus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	38
<i>Acanthurus leucocheilus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	45
<i>Acanthurus nigrofuscus</i>	Surgeonfish	Primary	23
<i>Acanthurus olivaceus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	40
<i>Acanthurus pyroferus</i>	Surgeonfish	Primary	25
<i>Acanthurus</i> sp	Surgeonfish	Primary	57
<i>Acanthurus triostegus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	27
<i>Amphiprion</i> sp	Damselfish	Planktivore	17
<i>Anampses</i> sp	Wrasse	Secondary	20
<i>Anthias</i> sp	Anthias	Planktivore	14
<i>Anampses twistii</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	18
<i>Apogon</i> sp	Cardinalfish	Planktivore	16
<i>Aprion virescens</i> *	Snapper	Piscivore	112
<i>Arothron nigropunctatus</i>	Pufferfish	Secondary	33
<i>Aulostomus chinensis</i>	Trumpetfish	Piscivore	80
<i>Balistapus undulatus</i>	Triggerfish	Secondary	30
<i>Bodianus axillaris</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	20
<i>Bodianus loxozonus</i> *	Wrasse	Secondary	40

Ostraciidae	Boxfish	Secondary	41
Chaetodontidae	Butterflyfish	Secondary	25
<i>Canthigaster amboinensis</i>	Pufferfish	Primary	14
<i>Canthigaster bennetti</i>	Pufferfish	Primary	10
<i>Calotomus carolinus</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	54
<i>Caranx melampygus</i> *	Jack	Piscivore	117
<i>Cantherhines pardalis</i>	Filefish	Primary	25
<i>Caranx</i> sp*	Jack	Piscivore	165
<i>Caesio teres</i>	Fusilier	Planktivore	40
<i>Canthigaster valentini</i>	Pufferfish	Primary	9
<i>Centropyge bicolor</i>	Angelfish	Primary	15
<i>Centropyge bispinosa</i>	Angelfish	Primary	10
<i>Centropyge flavissima</i>	Angelfish	Primary	14
<i>Cetoscarus ocellatus</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	90
<i>Cephalopholis urodeta</i>	Grouper	Piscivore	28
<i>Chaetodon auriga</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	23
<i>Chaetodon baronessa</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	16
<i>Chlorurus bleekeri</i> *	Parrotfish	Secondary	49
<i>Chaetodon citrinellus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	13
<i>Cheilinus</i> sp	Wrasse	Secondary	45
<i>Chaetodon ephippium</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	23
<i>Cheilinus fasciatus</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	36
<i>Chaetodon kleinii</i>	Butterflyfish	Planktivore	14
<i>Chaetodon lineolatus</i> *	Butterflyfish	Secondary	30
<i>Chaetodon lunulatus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	15
<i>Chaetodon lunula</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	21
<i>Chlorurus microrhinos</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	80
<i>Chaetodon mertensii</i>	Butterflyfish	Primary	13
<i>Chaetodon pelewensis</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	13
<i>Chaetodon speculum</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	18
<i>Chlorurus sordidus</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	40
<i>Chaetodon trifascialis</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	18
<i>Chaetodon ulietensis</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	15
<i>Chaetodon unimaculatus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	20
<i>Chaetodon vagabundus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	23
<i>Chlorurus</i> sp*	Parrotfish	Primary	100
<i>Coris gaimard</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	40
<i>Ctenochaetus binotatus</i>	Surgeonfish	Primary	22
<i>Ctenochaetus</i> sp	Surgeonfish	Primary	30
<i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i>	Surgeonfish	Primary	28
Herbivorous damselfish	Damselfish	Primary	16

Pomacentridae	Damselfish	Secondary	17
Planktivorous damselfish	Damselfish	Planktivore	16
<i>Epibulus insidiator</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	54
<i>Epinephelus merra</i> *	Grouper	Piscivore	33
<i>Forcipiger flavissimus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	22
Caesionidae	Fusilier	Planktivore	31
Mullidae*	Goatfish	Secondary	50
<i>Gomphosus varius</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	32
Serranidae*	Grouper	Piscivore	128
<i>Gymnothorax meleagris</i>	Moray	Piscivore	120
<i>Gymnosarda unicolor</i> *	Tuna	Piscivore	248
<i>Gymnomuraena zebra</i>	Moray	Secondary	150
<i>Halichoeres hortulanus</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	27
<i>Heniochus chrysostomus</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	18
<i>Hemigymnus fasciatus</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	50
<i>Hemigymnus melapterus</i> *	Wrasse	Secondary	60
<i>Heniochus monoceros</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	23
<i>Hemitaenichthys polylepis</i>	Butterflyfish	Planktivore	18
<i>Heniochus singularis</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	30
<i>Heniochus varius</i>	Butterflyfish	Secondary	19
<i>Hipposcarus longiceps</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	60
<i>Kyphosus cinerascens</i> *	Chub	Primary	51
<i>Labroides bicolor</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	14
<i>Labroides dimidiatus</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	12
<i>Lethrinus</i> sp*	Emperor	Secondary	86
Synodontidae	Lizardfishes	Piscivore	22
<i>Lutjanus argentimaculatus</i> *	Snapper	Secondary	104
<i>Lutjanus bohar</i> *	Snapper	Piscivore	90
<i>Lutjanus fulvus</i> *	Snapper	Secondary	40
<i>Lutjanus gibbus</i> *	Snapper	Secondary	53
<i>Lutjanus kasmira</i> *	Snapper	Secondary	40
<i>Lutjanus monostigma</i> *	Snapper	Piscivore	60
<i>Lutjanus semicinctus</i> *	Snapper	Piscivore	35
<i>Macolor macularis</i> *	Snapper	Planktivore	60
<i>Macolor niger</i> *	Snapper	Planktivore	75
<i>Monotaxis grandoculis</i> *	Emperor	Secondary	63
<i>Mulloidichthys flavolineatus</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	40
<i>Mulloidichthys vanicolensis</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	38
<i>Myripristis berndti</i> *	Soldierfish	Planktivore	33
<i>Myripristis kuntee</i> *	Soldierfish	Planktivore	23
Myripristinae*	Soldierfish	Planktivore	35

<i>Myripristis violacea</i> *	Soldierfish	Secondary	30
<i>Naso hexacanthus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Planktivore	75
<i>Naso lituratus</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	46
<i>Naso unicornis</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	70
<i>Naso vlamingii</i> *	Surgeonfish	Planktivore	60
<i>Neoniphon sammara</i>	Soldierfish	Secondary	32
<i>Neoniphon</i> sp	Soldierfish	Secondary	35
<i>Oxycheilinus digramma</i>	Wrasse	Piscivore	30
<i>Oxymonacanthus longirostris</i>	Filefish	Secondary	9
<i>Oxycheilinus</i> sp	Wrasse	Secondary	46
<i>Paracirrhites arcatus</i>	Hawkfish	Secondary	14
<i>Parupeneus barberinus</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	50
<i>Parupeneus crassilabris</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	35
<i>Parupeneus cyclostomus</i> *	Goatfish	Piscivore	50
<i>Paracirrhites forsteri</i>	Hawkfish	Piscivore	23
<i>Parupeneus multifasciatus</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	38
<i>Parupeneus pleurostigma</i> *	Goatfish	Secondary	33
Scaridae*	Parrotfish	Primary	68
<i>Plectorhinchus picus</i> *	Grunts	Secondary	85
<i>Pseudocheilinus octotaenia</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	14
<i>Ptereleotris evides</i>	Dartfish	Planktivore	18
<i>Pterois volitans</i>	Scorpionfish	Piscivore	38
<i>Pygoplites diacanthus</i>	Angelfish	Secondary	25
Siganidae*	Rabbitfish	Primary	38
<i>Rhinecanthus aculeatus</i>	Triggerfish	Secondary	30
<i>Sargocentron caudimaculatum</i> *	Soldierfish	Secondary	25
<i>Saurida gracilis</i>	Lizardfishes	Piscivore	23
<i>Sargocentron</i> sp*	Soldierfish	Secondary	50
<i>Sargocentron spiniferum</i> *	Soldierfish	Secondary	52
<i>Scarus flavipectoralis</i> *	Parrotfish	Secondary	40
<i>Scarus forsteni</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	55
<i>Scarus globiceps</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	31
<i>Scolopsis lineata</i>	Threadfin	Secondary	20
<i>Scarus niger</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	43
<i>Scolopsis</i> sp	Threadfin	Secondary	20
<i>Scarus psittacus</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	33
<i>Scarus rubroviolaceus</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	70
<i>Scarus schlegeli</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	38
<i>Scarus</i> sp*	Parrotfish	Primary	130
<i>Scarus tricolor</i> *	Parrotfish	Primary	55
<i>Seriola dumerili</i> *	Jack	Piscivore	190

<i>Siganus vulpinus</i>	Rabbitfish	Primary	25
<i>Parapercis</i> sp	Sandperch	Secondary	23
Holocentridae	Soldierfish	Secondary	31
<i>Stethojulis bandanensis</i>	Wrasse	Planktivore	16
<i>Sufflamen bursa</i>	Triggerfish	Secondary	28
<i>Sufflamen chrysopterum</i>	Triggerfish	Secondary	22
<i>Taeniura meyeni</i>	Stingray	Secondary	180
<i>Thalassoma hardwicke</i>	Wrasse	Planktivore	20
<i>Thalassoma janssenii</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	20
<i>Thalassoma lunare</i>	Wrasse	Planktivore	25
<i>Thalassoma lutescens</i>	Wrasse	Secondary	25
Labridae	Wrasse	Secondary	93
<i>Zanclus cornutus</i>	Moorish idol	Secondary	20
<i>Zebrasoma rostratum</i>	Surgeonfish	Primary	21
<i>Zebrasoma veliferum</i> *	Surgeonfish	Primary	40

**Table S3. Terrestrial and marine drivers' description and processing methods.**

Type	Code	Metric	Source	Description	Analytical tool
Terrestrial drivers	TSS	Total Suspended Sediment	InVEST SDR model	Proxy for total suspended sediment (t/yr)	Plume model
Marine geography	Depth	Depth	Bathymetry	Average depth (m)	ArcGIS Spatial Analyst tools (ESRI 2011)
Marine Habitat topography	slp	Slope (30m, 240m)	Bathymetry	Maximum rate of change from a cell to its neighbors	ArcGIS Slope tool ArcGIS Focal Statistics tool (ESRI 2011)
Marine Habitat exposure	asp	Surface aspect (mean)	Bathymetry	Slope direction (degrees)	ArcGIS Aspect tool (ESRI 2011)
	asp_sin	Sine aspect (30 m, 240 m)	Bathymetry	Sine of slope direction (derived from transforming the mean aspect into “eastness”) (degrees)	ArcGIS Spatial Analyst tools (sine function) (ESRI 2011b)
	asp_cos	Cosine aspect (30 m, 240 m)	Bathymetry	Cosine of slope direction (derived from transforming the mean aspect into “northness”) (degrees)	ArcGIS Spatial Analyst tools (cosine function) (ESRI 2011)

Marine Habitat complexity	curv_prof	Profile curvature (mean)	Bathymetry	Curvature values can be + (concave), - (convex), or 0 (flat). A proxy for spur and groove effects on water flow.	DEM Surface Tools Curvature tool (Jenness 2013)
	curv_plan	Planar curvature (mean)	Bathymetry	Curvature values can be – (concave) to + (convex), or 0 (flat) (mean). A proxy for spur and groove effects on water flow.	DEM Surface Tools Curvature tool (Jenness 2013)
Benthic community	COR	Coral cover	Coral reef model	Spatially explicit predicted % cover	Coral reef model predictions
	MAC	Macroalgae	Coral reef model	Spatially explicit predicted % cover	Coral reef model predictions
	TUR	Turf algae	Coral reef model	Spatially explicit predicted % cover	Coral reef model predictions

This table provides a description of all the predictor variables modeled in the coral reef models. Each metric is classified by type (terrestrial drivers or marine drivers) and assigned a code for modeling.

**Table S4. Coral reef predictive model performance per indicator.** The percent deviance explained (PDE) by the BRT models for the calibration and cross-validation (CV) processes and the final number of drivers ( $X_i$ ) is shown for Mele Bay.

Indicators	PDE (%)	CV PDE (%)	CV SE (%)	Predictors (#)
Coral	92.6	47.7	7.5	5
Macroalgae	86.6	29.0	13.8	8
Turf algae	77.9	42.1	7.9	6
Total biomass	44.6	22.0	18.7	4
Herbivore biomass	48.4	26.7	19.9	5
Targeted biomass	51.8	17.0	19.8	10

## APPENDIX 3 – METHODS

### *SEDIMENT MODEL - InVEST SDR*

This approach relies on modeling sediment transport throughout the landscape based on local topography, and therefore does not require hydrological modeling to determine the sediment ratio exported to the shoreline. The approach was initially proposed by Borselli et al. 2008) and has received increasing interest in recent years (Cavalli et al. 2013, López-Vicente et al. 2013).

First, we estimated the overland gross erosion per cell using the empirical Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) (*see* equation 1) (Renard et al. 1997):

$$\text{Soil loss} = R \times K \times LS \times C \times P \quad (1)$$

Where R = rainfall erosivity ( $\text{MJ} \cdot \text{mm} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{hr}^{-1}$ ), K = the rate of soil loss per rainfall erosion index unit, known as soil erodibility ( $\text{ton} \cdot \text{ha} \cdot \text{hrs} \cdot \text{MJ}^{-1} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{mm}^{-1}$ ), LS = slope-length and gradient factor (derived from the DEM), C = a vegetation cover (C-factor) and P=management practice effectiveness (P-factor).

The SDR model is based on the concept of hydrological connectivity to estimate sediment retention and export to the shoreline (see Borselli et al. 2008 for more details). First, the SDR computes a connectivity index ( $IC_i$ ) for each pixel  $i$  based on the upslope area and downslope flow path (Borselli et al. 2008). A streamflow accumulation threshold was set to define streams based on the DEM (Hamel et al. 2015b). Given the lack of empirical data for the region, the connectivity of the model was verified by comparing predicted stream outputs to available stream maps. Then, a sediment delivery ratio is derived for each pixel  $i$  based on the connectivity index (Hamel et al. 2015b). The SDR model parameters include an  $IC_0$ , a Borselli k-factor, and a maximum allowable SDR that define the shape of the relationship between the SDR and the connectivity index (Hamel et al. 2015b). The calibration parameters  $IC_0$  and the k-factor were set to 0.5 and 2.0, respectively, and the maximum allowable SDR was set to 0.8 (Hamel et al. 2015b) (*see* Sharp et al. (2016) for more details on effects of parameterization).

The sediment export per present and future scenario are reported at the sub-watershed and watershed scales. This approach was selected since it requires a minimal number of parameters and is spatially explicit. We note that the models have yet to be quantitatively validated against local datasets and were parameterized with values from other regions, which can differ in terms of climate and soil conditions (Gholami et al. 2009).

#### Watershed Delineation

Sub-watersheds were created by processing the DEM raster dataset (~ 30 x 30 m) of Efate, which was provided by the GEM division of SPC, with the ArcHydro toolset in ArcGIS and pour points at the shoreline were edited for accuracy in comparison to satellite imagery and bathymetry data



(DeVantier and Feldman 1993, Falinski 2016, Delevaux et al. 2018a). First the sinks in the DEM were filled using the Fill Sinks tool, so that any areas where water would get trapped had to be elevated to a point where that would no longer occur. Next, the flow path along the terrain was determined using the Flow Direction tool. Then, we calculated the number of grid cells that flow into any given cell in the DEM using the Flow Accumulation tool. At this point there was enough information to define streams within our study area.

A threshold of 1000 cells was chosen for the Stream Definition tool to defines the stream network. Any cells which have a flow accumulation of 1000 or more would then be considered part of the stream network for our study area. The Stream Segmentation tool created a grid of stream segments that have a unique identification. From the output of the Stream Segmentation tool we defined catchments using the Catchment Grid Delineation tool. There is essentially one catchment created for every stream segment. Next, a vector layer for streams was created using the Drainage Line Processing tool. Additionally, a vector layer for catchments was created using the Catchment Polygon Processing tool. Lastly, drainage points for each catchment were created using the Drainage Point Processing tool. These points represent tributaries and where they feed into larger streams and eventually where river mouths let out into the ocean. The outputs were shapefiles representing the watersheds such that each watershed contributes to a discharge point (river mouth) where water quality will be analyzed. The output stream map was compared to hydrographic maps of the Mele Bay study area.

#### Rainfall Erosivity Index (R)

The rainfall-runoff erosivity factor (R) represents the erosion potential caused by rainfall. The rainfall-runoff erosivity factor is represented by a raster dataset with an erosivity index value for each cell. This variable depends on the intensity and duration of rainfall in the area of interest. It is defined as the long-term average of the product of total rainfall energy and the maximum 30-min intensity (I30) of rainstorms (Wischmeier and Smith 1978, Renard et al. 1997). The greater the intensity and duration of the rainstorm, the higher the erosion potential. Determining I30 requires at least 20 years of pluviograph data. Because the erosivity index is widely used, in case of its absence, there are methods and equations to help generate a grid using climatic data. [units: MJ·mm·(ha·h·yr)<sup>-1</sup>]. Mean monthly precipitation data (1950-2000) were obtained from WorldClim's 30 arcsecond resolution Bioclim dataset (Fick and Hijmans 2017). The map of rainfall erosivity was derived from monthly rainfall averages at a 1 km x 1 km (P) and converted to erosivity using the Bols method applied in Indonesia (*see* equation 2):

$$R = \frac{2.5 \times P^2}{100(0.073P + 0.73)} \quad (2)$$

#### Soil Erodibility (K)

Soil erodibility (K) is a measure of the susceptibility of soil particles to detachment and transport by rainfall and runoff. [units:  $\text{tons} \cdot \text{ha} \cdot \text{h} \cdot (\text{ha} \cdot \text{MJ} \cdot \text{mm})^{-1}$ ]. K represents an integrated average annual value of the total soil and soil-profile reaction to many erosion and hydrologic processes. These processes include soil detachment and transport by raindrop impact and surface flow, localized deposition due to topography and tillage-induced roughness, and rainwater infiltration into the soil profile (Renard et al. 1997). K is defined as the rate of soil loss per erosivity index unit as measured on a standard plot 22.1m long with a 9% slope, and continuously in a clean-tilled fallow condition, with tillage performed upslope and downslope (Renard et al. 1997). When profile permeability and structure are not available, soil erodibility can be estimated based on soil texture and organic matter content, based on the work of Wischmeier, Johnson and Cross (reported in (Roose 1977)).

K was derived from the World Inventory of Soil Emission Potentials (WISE) database (Batjes 2016). A special case is the K value for water bodies, for which soil maps may not indicate any soil type. A value of 0 can be used, if no soil loss occurs in water bodies. We clipped the soil map to Efate and joined the table (Table: HW30s\_MapUnit) from the global database to obtain the soil types for the island. The dataset included spatially categorized soil types based on similarities in soil characteristics. Each category contained information on percent organic matter, the product of the primary particle size fraction, and the percent of the top six abundant soil types. For this study, we focused on the topsoil. So, we only needed to join with the topsoil Table PRID (HW30s\_ParEst) from the global database.

K-factor was derived using equation 3 (Williams 1995) and the WISE derived soil properties on a 30 by 30 arc-seconds global grid (Batjes 2016).

$$K = f_{csand} \cdot f_{cl-si} \cdot f_{orgc} \cdot f_{hisand} \quad (3)$$

Where:  $f_{csand}$  = a factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high coarse-sand contents and high values for soils with little sand, expressed in  $(\text{ton}/\text{ha}) \cdot (\text{ha} \cdot \text{hr}/\text{MJ} \cdot \text{mm})$  or  $\text{t} \cdot \text{ha} \cdot \text{hr} \cdot (\text{MJ} \cdot \text{mm} \cdot \text{ha})^{-1}$ ,  $f_{cl-si}$  = a factor that gives low soil erodibility factors for soils with high clay to silt ratios,  $f_{orgc}$  = a factor that reduce soil erodibility for soils with high organic carbon content,  $f_{hisand}$  = a factor that reduces soil erodibility for soils with extremely high sand contents. The soil erodibility values (K) in this table are in US customary units, and require the 0.1317 conversion (FAO 2007). The input factors of Equation 3 are calculated with equations 4-7 below (Williams 1995):

$$f_{csand} = 0.2 + 0.3 \cdot \exp[-0.256 \cdot ms \cdot (1 - m_{silt}/100)] \quad (4)$$

$$f_{cl-si} = m_{silt}/(m_c + m_{silt})^{0.3} \quad (5)$$

$$f_{orgc} = 1 - (0.0256 \cdot \text{orgC} / (\text{orgC} + \exp[3.72 - 2.95 \cdot \text{orgC}])) \quad (6)$$

$$f_{hisand} = 1 - (0.7 \cdot (1 - ms/100)) / ((1 - m_s/100) + \exp(-5.51 + 22.9 \cdot (1 - m_s/100))) \quad (7)$$

Where:  $m_s$  = % sand content,  $m_{silt}$  = % silt content,  $m_c$  = % clay content,  $orgC$  = % organic carbon. Soil erodibility is represented by a raster dataset, with a soil erodibility value for each cell (Fig S1.40-53).

#### Land use cover factors

The amount of protective coverage provided by the flora influences the soil erosion rate. Continuously fallowed and bare soils have a C value equal to 1. C values are lower when more vegetative coverage protects soils against erosion. Well-protected soils have a C value near 0. C-factors assigned to each land cover use/type in Vanuatu were derived from existing literature as estimated based on studies conducted in similar regions containing comparable land uses, from areas with similar geographic and physical processes, and consultation with experts (see Table 1 for more details on parameters) (Roose 1977, Wischmeier and Smith 1978, FAO 2007, Lianes et al. 2009, Doheny et al. 2013, Chicas and Omine 2015).

The Conservation Practice Factor (P) represents the impact of a specific conservation practice on soil erosion rates (Renard et al. 1997). It is the ratio of soil loss of a specific practice to the corresponding soil loss caused by up and down slope culture (Renard et al. 1997). Management practice effectiveness (P factor) was not considered in this model due to lack of data (Hamel et al. 2015b). Therefore, we assume the P value to be 1 throughout the entire region. Assigning C and P values to corresponding land uses was done by editing the attribute table of the land use shapefile in ArcGIS.

### ***WATER QUALITY MODEL***

#### Stream Pourpoints

Pourpoints were created along with sub-watersheds boundaries using the DEM (~ 30.7 x 30.7 m) of Vanuatu, provided by SPC Fiji GEM, with the ArcHydro toolset in ArcGIS. The pourpoint shapefile layer is the link between the terrestrial and marine models. The attribute table contains the watershed unique ID, the SDR results, and the spatial feature point fall on the marine raster layers. The pour points at the shoreline were edited for accuracy in comparison to satellite imagery, available stream map (DeVantier and Feldman 1993, Delevaux et al. 2018a). Then the pourpoint shapefile is split into individual pourpoint shapefiles using the watershed unique ID to model individual Total Suspended Sediment (TSS) plume (t/yr). Finally, the pour points were manually edited to align with the marine raster layers (e.g., bathymetry, currents).

#### Decay Plume Model

We created a cost-path surface ( $c$ ) that quantifies the least accumulative cost-distance (impedance) of moving planimetrically through each cell from each pour point using a composite of three marine drivers known to affect sediment dispersion: depth (m), distance to stream mouth (m), and

current (degree and seconds) (*see* ‘Cost distance raster’ section below for more details) (Yu et al. 2003, Fabricius 2005a, Delevaux et al. 2018a). Then, the spread of sediment into coastal waters from each pour point was modeled using a decay function, which assigned a portion of the remaining quantity from the previous cell in all adjacent cells, based on the cost-path surface until a maximum distance of 3 km from the shoreline was reached (Halpern et al. 2008, Delevaux et al. 2018a) (*see* equation 8). This threshold was based on distance measured in ArcGIS between river mouths.

$$S_i = s_p \times e^{-c^2/D_c} \quad (8)$$

where  $S_i$  = Grid cell value for dispersed sediment (t.yr<sup>-1</sup>) for watershed  $i$ ,  $s_p$  = Sediment (m<sup>3</sup>.yr<sup>-1</sup>) load (t.yr<sup>-1</sup>) at each watershed pour point (obtained from summarizing the total sediment export per watershed),  $c$  = cost-path surface (unitless),  $D_c$  = cost-path surface threshold distance from the shore for each decayed sediment plume per watershed (equivalent to 3 km from the shoreline). Last, we summed all the individual watershed sediment plume gridded maps in ArcGIS to obtain the total suspended sediment (represented by TSS) per land-use scenario for each pixel of coral reef area. This approach to modeling coastal sediment discharge is diffusive, and thus allows for wrap around coastal features, but does not account for nearshore advection that acts to push suspended sediment in specific directions (Halpern et al. 2008). We used these diffusive models to derive conservative estimates of sediment plumes, since the nearshore circulation patterns were unknown for our study site.

### Distance Cost Raster

A distance cost raster, which accounts for the cost of depth and current forcing on each grid cell, was generated for each watershed using the cost allocation tool for each pourpoint and a total cost raster dataset in ArcGIS. The total cost raster layer was generated by summing the current and depth cost layers for each watershed in R. The current and depth cost layers were derived from the current and bathymetry data using the methods described below:

#### *Current Cost Layers*

First, we determine the travel time layer from each pourpoint due to the current data. To determine how surface currents could affect the lateral movement of sediment we used the “Path Distance” tool in ArcGIS (Doheny et al. 2013, Rude et al. 2016). The path distance tool creates an output raster in which each cell is assigned the accumulative cost from the cheapest source cell while accounting for surface distance and horizontal and vertical cost factors. The algorithm utilizes a node/link cell representation. The cost to travel between one node and the next depends on the spatial orientation of the nodes. How the cells are connected impacts the travel cost as well. Every link has a specific impedance associated with it, which is derived from the costs associated with the cells at each end of the link (from the cost raster) as well as the direction of movement. This

tool requires (1) a source (i.e., the individual river mouth pour points shapefiles), (2) cost raster (seconds), (3) input horizontal raster (degree), and (4) a horizontal factor.

The horizontal factor is a user-specified parameter required for the Path Distance tool that defines the relationship between the horizontal cost factor (seconds to cross each cell) and the horizontal relative moving angle. The horizontal factor defines the horizontal difficulty encountered when moving from one cell to the next (ESRI 2011a). The horizontal relative moving angle identifies the angle between the horizontal direction of a cell and the moving direction (ESRI 2011a). For the horizontal factor, we had no additional data other than the HYCOM average monthly surface currents, therefore we had no information to tell us that sediment would go anywhere other than “downstream.” To address this, we chose to use the “forward” pre-set parameter setting which establishes that only forward movement is allowed (i.e., down current). The result of this model was an accumulated cost, in seconds to travel towards or away from each river mouth in our study region while accounting for surface current forcing.

The input cost raster and the horizontal raster were both derived from our Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM) surface current data. To determine mean monthly ocean currents around Vanuatu, we used the HYCOM (HYCOM 2013). HYCOM models are isopycnal (constant potential density) in the open, stratified ocean, which is the only regional data that were available to us for this study. The spatial resolution of the data is  $1/12^\circ$  (~9 km). To acquire the HYCOM data we used the *get.hycom* function from the HMMoce package (Braun et al. 2018), in R to download 10 years of HYCOM surface current data (1993-2002) to overlap with the precipitation data used for the SDR modelling (1950-2000). For the purpose of this study, we used the mean yearly east-west (*u*) and north-south (*v*) velocity components of the surface currents. R package *ncdf4* (Pierce 2019) was used to manipulate the *netcdf* files and store the extracted data in a three-dimensional array. Arrays were converted to raster bricks and current data were averaged by month and then by year using the raster package in R (Hijmans 2019).

Finally, current data was averaged for the entire 10-year period for *u* and *v* variables and output as rasters. The datasets were clipped for Vanuatu coastline and converted to a point shapefile in ArcGIS. The nearshore gaps were filled using the Inverse Distance Weighting interpolation tool in ArcGIS and converted to 100m x 100m resolution rasters. To create the seconds and degree layers, we used Raster Calculator to derive the time in seconds (cost) that it would take to cross an individual cell. To do this we took the width of each pixel (100 m) and divided it by the resulting velocity of the two interpolated annual monthly averaged *u* (E-W) and *v* (N-S) vectors (in m s<sup>-1</sup>) derived from HYCOM data (1993-2002) (Doheny et al. 2013) (see equation 9):

$$\text{Seconds} = \frac{\text{Distance across the cell}}{\sqrt{(u^2) + (v^2)}} \quad (9)$$

For the horizontal raster we needed to determine the direction the resulting vector was going across each cell. We did this by taking our u and v velocities and determining an angle of movement. To determine this angle for each pixel we used the following function in Raster Calculator:

$$Degree = (| \text{ATan2}(u, v) * \frac{180}{\pi} | - 180) \quad (10)$$

Lastly, we determine the travel time cost from each pourpoint due to the current data. The accumulated cost, in seconds to travel towards or away from each river mouth in our study region while accounting for surface current forcing, was reclassified into 20 bins based on quantiles. The output is a current cost layer, which assumes that the diffusion cost increases with distance from the stream mouth (Delevaux et al. 2018a).

### *Bathymetry Cost Layers*

The bathymetry layer used for this study is the General Bathymetric Chart of Oceans (GEBCO) (~500 m x 500 m) and was downloaded from <https://www.gebco.net/> for the area of interest (Weatherall et al. 2015). The dataset was converted to a point shapefile and the nearshore gaps were filled using the Inverse Distance Weighting interpolation tool in ArcGIS. The final bathymetry raster dataset used for this analysis was 100 m x 100m. In R, the bathymetry layer was reclassified into 20 bins based on quantiles. The output is a depth cost layer assumes that diffusion cost is higher in shallower waters (Delevaux et al. 2018a).

## APPENDIX 4 – DATA GAPS AND CAVEATS

This decision support tool was developed and implemented in a data-poor region and therefore under several key data gaps and caveats. First, the resolution of the input foundational layers, including the soils (~900 x 900 m), rainfall (~900 x 900 m), and currents (9 x 9 km), are coarse resolution for the 4 watersheds discharging into the Mele Bay. Because soil and rainfall maps are coarser resolution than the DEM input, at which SDR operates, it may obscure small scale processes and spatial nuances which can occur in small watersheds and narrow reef systems often found in tropical oceanic island environments (Delevaux et al. 2019). In addition to the low resolution, the sediment export loads may be under-estimated due to erosion processes not accounted for in our modeling approach, such as land slip and stream bank erosion which can be major sources of sediment (Olley et al. 2015, Brown et al. 2017a). It is also important to note that the current maps were interpolated nearshore to fill in the gaps along the shoreline, which may create erroneous values. This may have impacted the dispersion of the TSS plume in the study area. In addition, no in situ water quality data was available for the streams and coastal waters modeled, which prevented us from ground-truthing the sediment and coastal plume models.

On the other hand, we manually digitized the land use/land cover map using recent satellite imagery to ensure accuracy and a high-resolution LiDAR bathymetry layer (5m x 5m) was available for the whole study area, which helped refined the plume dispersion model and provide input layers for species distribution modeling. Future work should investigate how these modeled plumes of TSS compare to local knowledge from coastal communities, satellite imagery, and/or in-situ data as those become available. In the meantime, spatial planning requires information to prioritize efforts on that ground and these global datasets are freely available for data poor regions such as Vanuatu.

Our models were calibrated on contemporary conditions using empirical data collected in November 2019. Based on a number of assumptions, they can be used to forecast biological indicator distributions at a different point in time (Franklin 2010). A key assumption with predicting coral reef futures in our modeling approach is that species distributions are in equilibrium with current conditions and the identified relationships will remain constant over time (DeAngelis and Waterhouse 1987, Franklin 2010), which may not always be true (Carpenter 2002). While our sediment models accounted for the connectivity across the landscape (Hamel et al. 2015b), the marine models do not account for species dispersal, migration, and interactions within the seascape, which can influence management scale and outcomes (Guisan 2005, Stamoulis and Delevaux 2015).

Given imperfect knowledge of both the effects of human drivers and how coral reefs respond to these drivers (Coreau et al. 2009), scenario modeling requires simplifications and assumptions, which lead to uncertainty in model projections (Delevaux et al. 2018a). By using present conditions as the baseline for examining projected coral reefs, the comparative benchmark

represents potentially impacted ecosystems (Knowlton and Jackson 2008). Nevertheless, while sources of uncertainty in scenario analysis are inevitable, present conditions still provide an opportunity to identify the trajectory of coral reefs under different human drivers and provide guidance for management (Alagona et al. 2012). We used scenario modeling to illustrate the range of possibilities for the future of coral reefs and test local management actions that can reduce the risk of impacts on coral reefs and associated marine resources (Coreau et al. 2009).

Another key assumption associated with predicting futures with static models is that the effects of time lags and the complex, nonlinear relationships between land-use practices and coral reef benefits are not accounted for, which can influence management scale and outcomes (Toonen et al. 2011). For instance, the restoration and urbanization scenarios assumed restoration and clearing was immediate. In reality, restoration is not an instantaneous process, as it will take many years before a forest has established enough to provide the sediment retention and runoff reduction we considered, therefore sediment export would differ from the total export modeled here. Similarly, clearing proceeds in a patchwork over time and different areas would have different amounts of ground cover or regrowth at different times (Tulloch et al. 2016). From a marine perspective, coral reef response to change in sediment runoff and water will also vary over time based on taxon physiology and due to environmental conditions (Anthony 2006b). Thus, from a management perspective, it is essential to account for the timeframe of anticipated outcomes of conservation actions to factor in social and economic constraints (Saunders et al. 2017).

This research identified where coral reef areas may be subject to sediment exposure, but did not explicitly model potential interactions with nutrients or climate change and cumulative impacts due to a lack of data and the poor understanding of those processes (Anthony 2006a, Wenger et al. 2015, Morgan et al. 2016). It is increasingly recognized that water quality in combination with elevated SST can have a profound influence on management outcomes of nearshore coral reefs under climate change (Anthony et al. 2007). Recent work has shown that sediments can have an antagonistic effect with SST by mitigating bleaching impacts through shading (Anthony 2006a, Anthony et al. 2007), while other research has shown that excess nutrients or fishing pressure can prevent recovery from climate change impacts (Wooldridge 2009b, Wilson et al. 2010).

Finally, this study focused on the impact of sediment runoff due to land cover change on coral reefs. It did not consider seagrass and mangrove habitats, which are vulnerable to sediment runoff and provide important ecosystem goods and services. Seagrass meadows and mangroves serve as nursery habitats for a number of fishery species (Nagelkerken et al. 2000). Seagrass meadows also serve as critical feeding areas for dugongs and sea turtles (Sheppard et al. 2007) and mangroves trap sediments, prevent coastal erosion, and protect coastlines from natural disasters (Marois and Mitsch 2015). Furthermore, seagrass and mangrove systems act as significant carbon sinks, thus mitigating global climate change (Duarte et al. 2013). Previous research has shown that sedimentation can reduce seagrass habitat suitability (Saunders et al. 2017). The relationship between sediment loads and seagrass suitable habitat is non-linear, with large increases in sediment



disproportionately impacting the availability of seagrass suitable habitat. Similarly, it is shown in over 26 cases around the world that excess sediment inputs to mangroves can cause death of trees owing to root smothering, even if mangroves flourish on sedimentary shorelines (Ellison 1999). However, there are insufficient data to establish specific tolerances. Quantifying the links between sediment exports and impacts to coastal habitats is required to calculate the tradeoffs of conservation actions on land in terms of benefits accrued in the ocean. Therefore, spatially explicit decision support tools that capture the impact of land-based source pollution on those ecosystems must be the focus of future research and development, while mangroves and seagrass beds remain to be mapped in Vanuatu.