1 # Influence of climate change, land use land cover, population and industries
2 # on the pollution of Ganga River

3 SnehaSanty[1], Pradeep Mujumdar[1,2] and Govindasamy Bala[1,3]

4 [1]Interdisciplinary Centre for Water Research, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

5 [2]Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

6 [3]Centre for Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

7 **Correspondence:**

8 Sneha Santy, Interdisciplinary Centre for Water Research, Indian Institute of Science,
9 Bangalore 560 012, India. E-mail: snehasanty@iisc.ac.in

10 **Abstract**

11 Climate change, land use land cover (LULC), population, industries, and sewage treatment are
12 factors that can strongly influence river water quality. This paper uses a coupled hydrological-
13 water quality simulation model to assess the influence of each of these drivers on the most
14 polluted river stretch of the Ganga River. The water quality model QUAL2K is driven by these
15 five factors to assess their influence on nine water quality parameters, namely dissolved oxygen
16 (DO), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), faecal coliform, ammonia, nitrate, total nitrogen,
17 organic-, inorganic-, and total phosphorous. Climate change projections are taken from CMIP5
18 RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios. Five socio-environmental scenarios which consider sewer
19 network, sewage treatment capacity, level of treatment at sewage treatment plants (STPs), and
20 the type of sewage (domestic or mixed) are also considered. The water quality is simulated
21 using a coupled HEC-HMS-QUAL2K framework. The non-point source pollution is quantified
22 using the export coefficient method, where the export of pollutants from all land use classes
23 are considered. The climate change effect is found to have a larger effect on Kanpur water
24 quality than other drivers, with a percentage contribution of above 70% because of the large
25 sensitivity of water quality parameters to the amount of streamflow. Climate change projections
26 combined with socio-environmental scenarios imply that the large increase in pollution due to
27 climate change, LULC, industry, and population growth cannot be controlled by the current
28 treatment proposals for 2050. However, providing adequate STPs to meet the population of
29 2050, and allowing only domestic sewage to reach STPs can help to achieve the objective of
30 the Ganga Action Plan in the mid-21st century.

31 **Keywords:** Climate change, land use, industry, population, Ganga pollution, water quality

1. Introduction

Water pollution of rivers is one of the crucial environmental issues, especially for developing countries like India. However, proper management can save our rivers from future pollution (Shukla et al.,2018). For this to happen, it is important to understand the sensitivity of water quality parameters to major drivers that cause pollution. This knowledge can help water system designers and policy makers take appropriate measures while designing a treatment unit or changing policies for industrial dischargers. The major drivers that can affect the river water quality in the future are climate change, land use land cover changes, population and industrial growth, and the amount of treatment given to wastewater (Hunter, 2003).

In India, the Ganga River has high religious importance, and it serves a large population in many ways, such as, irrigation, industrial and domestic use and hydropower generation. Ganga Action Plan (GAP) was launched in 1986 to achieve 'bathing class' standard by 2000 (Environment & Forests Division and Water Resources Division Planning Commission Government of India, 2009). Though there has been a significant improvement in Ganga water quality since 2006 (Central Pollution Control Board, 2013), the goal of GAP is not fulfilled, particularly at the pollution hotspot of Kanpur (Central Pollution Control Board, 2013). A study conducted by seven Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) in 2011suggested that there should be an Urban River Management Plan that focuses on how sewage should be treated and conveyed (Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010a). It also proposed to construct sewage treatment plants (STP) for the present load and later increase the capacity to meet the demand from population increase. Further, it suggested to enhance the level of treatment at STPs to tertiary level as the present treatment is not effective in treating microbial load, and to increase sewer connectivity to STPs (Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010b; Indian Institutes of Technology, 2011; Indian Institutes of Technology, 2012). In this context, it is also important to isolate the effects of major drivers on water quality.

Climate change is an important driver which can aggravate water pollution. Even if municipal or industrial discharges remain the same in the future, climate change can alter flow characteristics and temperature, affecting the dilution factor, reaction kinetics, and water pollution (Rehana and Mujumdar, 2012). Climate change impact studies on the Ganga River show a reduction in water availability, water quality, and ecological degradation if no actions are taken in the future (Bons, 2018; Santy et al., 2020; Santy et al., 2022). In recent studies on the Ganga River basin using a process-based Integrated Catchment (INCA) model (Jin, 2015;

65 Whitehead et al., 2015; Whitehead et al., 2018; Whitehead, 2018), ammonia, nitrate, and

66 phosphorous concentration are projected to decrease in the SRES A1B scenarios.

67 Land use land cover also play an important role in water quality, with high nutrient

68 concentration associated with agricultural land; high BOD, COD, and suspended solid

69 associated with urban land; and improved water quality associated with forestland (Santy et

70 al., 2020; Permatasari et al., 2017; Davids et al., 2018; Jacobs et al., 2018; Namugizea et al.,

71 2018; Gyawali et al., 2013). A growing population could result in increased water demand and

72 municipal sewage generation, which will aggravate the pollution of rivers (Khattiyavong and

73 Lee, 2019). Further, socio-economic factors, such as agricultural, industrial, and domestic

74 demands, sewage treatment capacity, and effluent characteristics, also influence the Ganga

75 basin water quality (Bons, 2018; Whitehead et al., 2015).

76 Wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) are meant to reduce river pollution by reducing the

77 pollutant concentration of sewage. However, the effluents of WWTP should be well within

78 limits, otherwise the effluents can cause pollution (Pascual-Benito et al., 2020). Past studies on

79 the effluent discharge of pharmaceutical industries to the rivers show the importance of WWTP

80 as it can help to improve the quality of water downstream. Partial removal of pollutants can

81 lead to having residues in the drinking water (Al-Ahmad et al., 1999; Hernando et al., 2006;

82 Choi et al., 2008). The inflow rate is identified as the most crucial operational factor of a

83 wastewater treatment plant in a study in the UK (Astaraie-Imani et al., 2012). Climate change

84 can impact the inflow rate and the treatment processes due to hydrologic variation, increase in

85 water temperature, increase in organic load, and variation in chemical and pathogenic load

86 (Hurst et al., 2004; Rosario-Ortiz et al., 2007).

87 The isolated and combined impact of climate change and land use on Ganga river water quality

88 is analysed in Santy et al., (2020) using hypothetical scenarios and a standalone water quality

89 simulation model. That work dealt with sensitivity of water quality parameters to climatic and

90 land use forcings, using hypothetical scenarios; however, more realistic climate and land use

91 projections are to be considered for an accurate quantification of isolated effects. In the

92 subsequent study (Santy et al., 2022), the isolated risk of low water quality, eutrophication and

93 fish kill with climate change is quantified for the 2040-60 and 2080-2100 periods. Santy et al.,

94 (2022) use climate projections of CMIP5 RCP 4.5 & RCP 8.5 scenarios and a coupled

95 hydrological-water quality simulation model for the analysis. However, the effects of major

96 factors such as land use projections, population and industrial growth are not considered in that

97   study. The work presented in this paper advances the earlier work by explicitly accounting for

98   anthropogenic forcings such as land use, population and industrial growth along with climate

99   change and their isolated effects on water quality The percentage contribution of these factors

100   to water pollution is quantified, and the predominant factor is identified. Planners and designers

101   consider only population growth for the future while designing a treatment unit, which can

102   underestimate future pollution levels as factors such as climate change, land use land cover and

103   industrial growth would affect water quality. Hence, it is essential to study whether the

104   proposed treatment can cater to the additional load due to these anthropogenic factors. The

105   objectives of this paper are to (i) isolate the effects of climate change, land use land cover

106   change, population and industrial growth on water quality, and (ii) to assess whether the

107   proposed treatment for Kanpur in the mid-21st century is sufficient to achieve the objective of

108   GAP.

109   The CMIP5 climate change projections for 20 GCMs along with land use projections, industry

110   and population growth are used to drive a coupled hydrological-water quality simulation model

111   to simulate nine water quality parameters: dissolved oxygen (DO), biochemical oxygen

112   demand (BOD), faecal coliform (FC), ammonia, nitrate, total nitrogen (TN), organic-,

113   inorganic- and total phosphorous (TP). The comparison of CMIP5 and CMIP6 climate outputs

114   shows that the multi model ensemble means of both give similar values, and CMIP6 is not

115   found to outperform the CMIP5 dataset (Bourdeau-Goulet and Hassanzadeh, 2021; Li et al.,

116   2021). The export coefficient method is used to estimate the non-point source pollution from

117   each land use class. Water quality is also analyzed for five socio-environmental scenarios

118   where proposed sewage treatment capacities, level of treatment at STP: secondary and tertiary,

119   and type of sewage reaching STP: domestic and mixed is considered. The novelty of the study

120   lies in isolating the effects of the major drivers: climate change, land use land cover, population

121   and industrial growth on water quality in terms of nine water quality parameters and identifying

122   the most crucial driver for the most polluted Kanpur stretch of the Ganga River. This will help

123   decision-makers decide in the design of treatment units to ensure water quality.

124   **2. Methodology**

125   **2.1 Study Area**

126   Ganga river supports one of the highest density of population in the world (Central Water

127   Commission & National Remote Sensing Centre, 2014), stretching across northern India and

128   Bangladesh. The river has a catchment area of 8,61,404 sq. km and a length of 2525km in India.

129   Ganga River, the largest river basin in India, lies between 73°2'E to 89°5'E longitudes and

130   21°6'N to 31°21'N latitudes. The types of industries discharging to the Ganga River are

131   Tannery, sugar & distillery, pulp and paper mills with high pollution load of BOD, Chemical

132   oxygen demand (COD), solids, TN, chromium, sulphate, sulphide and chloride.

133

134   Figure 1: (a) Ganga basin with study area Ankinghat to Shahzadpur river stretch and Ankinghat

135   catchment highlighted in two boxes; (b) Schematic diagram of the river stretch with point and

136   non-point loads joining.

137   A 238 km long stretch of Ganga River from Ankinghat to Shahzadpur is considered in the

138   present study. Figure 1 shows the study area with point loads and diffuse loads. The prominent

139   locations where the drains carrying domestic and industrial sewage join are Kanpur, Jajmau,

140   Unnao, and Fatehpur. The effluent characteristics of each drain (Supplementary Table S1)

141   consist mainly of BOD, ammonia, nitrate, faecal coliform and phosphorous loading. The major

142   industries contributing to Kanpur, Unnao and Jajmau drains are Tannery and slaughterhouse

143   (Supplementary Table S2).

144   The Ranighat drain (KD1), Sisamau Nala (KD2), Bhagwatdas Nala (KD3), Golaghat Nala

145   (KD4), Satti chaura (KD5), Permiya drain (KD6) and Muir mill drain (KD7) join Ganga river

146   at Kanpur with high ammonia and faecal coliform loading and low nitrate loading. The Loni

147   drain (UD1) and City Jail drain (UD2) join Unnao with high BOD and faecal coliform loading.

148   The Shetla Bazar (JD1), Wazidpur drain (JD2), and Bhurighat drain (JD3) join at Jajmau with

149   high BOD, ammonia, nitrate, phosphorous and faecal coliform loading. The Panki Thermal

150   Power Plant drain (PD1), ICI drain (PD2), Ganda Nalla (PD3), COD nalla (PD4) and Halwa

151   Khanda Nalla (PD5) join Pandu river with high BOD, ammonia and faecal coliform loading

152   and moderate nitrate loading. The data used for the study is given in Supplementary Table S3.

153   **2.2 Methodology**

154   A schematic diagram of an overview of the work is given in Figure 2. To obtain the individual

155   effect of climate change, land use, land cover, population and industry, coupled hydrological

156   and water quality simulations are performed by changing only one driver at a time in a

157   simulation, keeping other drivers unchanged in the future. An ensemble of statistically

158   downscaled air temperature and precipitation projections from 20 GCMs (Supplementary

159   Table S4) for the mid-21st century for two climate change scenarios, RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5, is

160   considered for climate change projections. The projected LULC for 2040 (Both cropland and

161   built-up land are allowed to change) with a good kappa index of agreement from Chawla and

162   Mujumdar, 2018 for the Upper Ganga basin is used for the present study. The population

163   projections of the drain catchment area are calculated from the projected population of India

164   (United Nations, 2019) for the mid-century using the Ratio and Correlation method of

165   Population forecast (Martin & Serow, 1978) where the population growth rate of the city is

166   assumed to be the same as the population growth rate of entire India. The industrial load is

167   increased by 10%, 20% and 30% to analyze the effect of industries on water quality. Assuming

168   a fixed increase in the number of industrial areas per 100,000 population for Kanpur (Indian

169   Institute of Technology,2013), the percentage increase for 2040 projections is approximately

170   10%.. Additional information on these drivers is given in Supplementary Text S1. The stream

171   flow and water quality are simulated using HEC-HMS model (Supplementary Text S2) and

172   QUAL2K model (Supplementary Text S3), respectively.

173

174   Figure 2: Overview of work

175

2.2.1 Hydrological Model

176

177 The Hydrologic Engineering Center, Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS 4.3) (U. S

178 Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center, 2000) is used to simulate the

179 streamflow at Ankinghat, the headwater for the water quality simulation. Simple Canopy,

180 Simple Surface, SCS curve number method, SCS Unit Hydrograph, Constant Monthly

181 Baseflow, and Muskingum are the methods used for modelling the canopy, surface, loss,

182 transform, baseflow, and routing, respectively. The model is calibrated for the period 1977-

183 2002 and validated for 2003-2012 on a monthly timescale with an R^2 of 0.6 (Supplementary

184 Text S2). The model is found to perform well for low flows. The climatic inputs such as

185 precipitation, average temperature and temperature range are changed with RCP 4.5 and 8.5,

186 and the curve number is changed with land use land cover projections. The monthly streamflow

187 is simulated by the model and the 30Q10 value is calculated (Supplementary Text S4) and

188 given as input to the water quality model, QUAL2K. For analyzing the individual contribution

189 of each driver, only corresponding inputs are changed while keeping other factors unchanged.

2.2.2 Water quality simulation model

190

191 The nine water quality parameters assessed are dissolved oxygen, biochemical oxygen demand,

192 ammonia, nitrate, total nitrogen, organic-, inorganic- and total phosphorous and faecal

193 coliform. These parameters are simulated using the water quality simulation model QUAL2K

194 (Chapra and Pelletier, 2003) (Supplementary Text S3). The inputs to the model are stream flow,

195 stream temperature, water quality at the headwater, hydro geometric characteristics of the river

196 reach such as width, depth, channel slope, side slope, manning's n, meteorological data such as

197 air temperature, dew point temperature, wind speed, evaporation, cloud cover; point loads and

198 diffuse loads. The diffuse load is calculated using an export coefficient method where export

199 from all land-use types is considered (Supplementary Text S5).

200 The point loads include industrial and domestic sewage discharge. The point load projections

201 consider the population and industrial growth. The sewage projections are calculated from the

202 population projections of each drain's catchment area and are taken as 80% of the water supply,

203 135 litres per capita per day. The non-point load changes with land use land cover changes are

204 simulated from export coefficients developed for the study area (Santy et al., 2020). The water

205 temperature is simulated using the Air-water temperature regression model for Ankinghat

206 (Santy et al., 2020), and the 30Q10 value of streamflow from the 2040 through 2060 period is

207 given as input to the QUAL2K model. The calibrated rate kinetics is changed with changes in

208   stream temperature (Supplementary Table S5). The water quality is analyzed at five

209   checkpoints: Kanpur downstream, Jajmau downstream (1), Jajamau downstream (2), Fatehpur

210   downstream, and Shahzadpur. The Jajamu downstream (1) and (2) correspond to immediate

211   downstream and 8km downstream of Jajmau, which is identified as the critical location in the

212   DO sag curve. The individual effect of each driver is analyzed using percentage change from

213   baseline and change ratio. Change ratio is calculated as the ratio of change in a water quality

214   parameter for a single driver to cumulative change expressed in percentage.

215   $$CR_{i,j} = \frac{\Delta C_{i,j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{4} \Delta C_{i,j}} \qquad\qquad (1)$$

216   Where $CR_{i,j}$ is the change ratio of ith water quality parameter for j[th] driver and $\Delta C_{i,j}$ is the

217   change in i[th] water quality parameter for j[th] driver from baseline.

2.3 Socio-environmental scenarios

219   Five socio-environmental scenarios (Table 1) are considered based on the proposals made for

220   a cleaner Ganga basin (Indian Institute of Technology, 2010 a, b, c, d; Indian Institute of

221   Technology, 2011; Indian Institute of Technology, 2012). The first scenario is the baseline

222   future scenario, considering climate change, LULC change, and population and industrial

223   growth for the mid-21st century with STPs at present-day levels. From second scenario

224   onwards, we assume that all households would have access to toilets, sewer line connectivity

225   is fully established, and STPs receive total capacity sewage. The proposed and tendered STP

226   works for the future are considered for second scenario (Supplementary Text S6), along with

227   future climate change, LULC, and growth of industries and population. We also assume that

228   the faecal coliform concentration at headwater is within the bathing class limit (500 MPN

229   (100mL)[-1]), and the diffuse load contribution of the faecal load is a minimum as open

230   defecation will be entirely removed from the system.

231   The third scenario is a planning scenario proposed by the Urban River management plan

232   (Indian Institute of Technology, 2010a, 2010b) for Ganga. Kanpur is the first city to prepare

233   such a plan in 2021, and the major highlights include increasing the STP capacity to meet the

234   present population (2020), and the plan would last for 15 to 25-year duration. Also, the

235   wastewater flowing in the drains is tapped and redirected to STPs, where mixed sewage,

236   including industrial and domestic sewage, reaches the STP. Even if the industries are

237   discharging at effluent standards, it mixes with untreated wastewater before reaching STPs.

238   This leads to a larger increase in the flow of the drains than the population demand, resulting

239 in overflowing or bypassing of untreated sewage reaching the Ganga River. Hence, it is crucial
240 to study the difference if only domestic sewage reaches STP for treatment. Therefore, one
241 additional sub-scenario is considered for 3, 4 and 5 with separate industrial and domestic
242 sewage treatment. Scenario 4 assumes STP capacity for the 2050 population load is in place.
243 Scenario 5 is the same as scenario 3 but tertiary level treatment is given at the STPs for proper
244 microbial removal as proposed by IIT Consortium reports. Scenarios 4 and 5 show how
245 treatment capacity and level affect water quality, which is more critical to reducing microbial
246 pollution.

247 Table 2 shows a detailed description and nomenclature of the scenarios. In the scenario name,
248 'C' refers to climate change, and the number after C describes climate change scenarios, '45' for
249 RCP 4.5, and '85' for RCP 8.5. This is followed by 'LP' for land use, industry and population
250 projection. For example, C45LP and C85LP represent the socio-environmental scenario 1 for
251 climate change scenarios RCP 4.5 and 8.5. The following letter 'S' represents STP, and the
252 following number denotes the year for which STPs are built to meet the demand: 'S20' and
253 'S50' indicate that the STP capacity is built to meet the population of 2020 and 2050,
254 respectively. This is followed by 'S' or 'T', representing the level of treatment given at STPs: S
255 for secondary and T for tertiary. The letter 'M' or 'D' represents the sewage type received at
256 STPs: M for mixed sewage and D for domestic sewage.

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268   Table 1: Description of the five socio-environmental scenarios

Scenario no	Description	Details
1	Baseline future scenario with STP capacity at present day conditions.	Future Climate, LULC, population, industry for 2050; Point loads of 2018 drain data modified for 2050; present STP working condition
2	Includes proposed STPs (Real-time scenario)	Future Climate, LULC, population, industry for 2050; Point loads of 2018 drain data modified for 2050; complete sewer lines laid; STP working on total capacity; proposed & tendered STPs also considered; all industries comply with effluent standards; STPs work with secondary level treatment
3	Increased STP capacity (Planning Scenario)	Same as scenario 2, with an increase in STP capacity to meet the population of 2020 as proposed by the Urban River Management Plan for Ganga
4	Tertiary treatment at STP	Same as scenario 3, but with tertiary treatment at STPs
5	Ideal scenario	Same as scenario 2, but with an increase in STP capacity to meet the population of 2050

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278   Table2: Socio-environmental scenarios. 'C' refers to climate change; '45' and '85' for RCP 4.5

279   & 8.5; 'LP' for land use, industry and population projection; 'S' represents STP, followed by

280   number denoting the year (20 for 2020 and 50 for 2050) for which STPs are built to meet the

281   demand, followed by 'S' or 'T', representing the level of treatment given at STPs (S for

282   secondary and T for tertiary), and followed by 'M' or 'D' representing the sewage type received

283   at STPs: M for mixed sewage and D for domestic sewage.

Sl no	Scenario name	Climate scenario	LULC	Population	Industry	Sewer lines	STP capacity	STP treatment level	Sewage type
1	C45LP	RCP 4.5	LULC projection for 2040 from Chawla & Mujumdar, 2018	Population Projections for 2050	Industrial growth for 2050	Present	Present	Secondary	M
2	C45LPSPSM					Fully laid	Proposed STPs	Secondary	M
3a	C45LPS20SM						STPs to meet 2020 population	Secondary	M
3b	C45LPS20SD								D
4	C45LPS20TM						STPs to meet 2020 population	Tertiary	M
4b	C45LPS20TD								D
5	C45LPS50SM						STPs to meet 2050 population	Secondary	M
5b	C45LPS50SD								D
6	C85LP	RCP 8.5				Present	Present	Secondary	M
7	C85LPSPSM					Fully laid	Proposed STPs	Secondary	M
8a	C85LPS20SM						STPs to meet 2020 population	Secondary	M
8b	C85LPS20SD								D
9a	C85LPS20TM						STPs to meet 2020 population	Tertiary	M
9b	C85LPS20TD								D
10a	C85LPS50SM						STPs to meet 2050 population	Secondary	M
10b	C85LPS50SD								D

284

285

286

287

none
none

3. Results & Discussion

3.1 Future projections of drivers

3.1.1 Climate change projections

The air temperature anomalies for RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 show an increase in air temperature within a range of 1.5 to 2.5 °C for mid of 21st century, with a higher temperature rise in the RCP 8.5 scenario (Figure 3(a)). The annual precipitation anomaly from the historical period shows an increase in median annual precipitation for the Ankinghat catchment (Figure 3(b)). The model-wise air temperature and precipitation projections for climate change show large variability (Supplementary Figure S1); hence, an ensemble of GCMs is considered for the analysis. The monthly precipitation increases during the summer monsoon season and decreases during the pre-monsoon season (Supplementary Figure S1). The increase in air temperature and the resulting stream temperature (Supplementary Figure S2) and reduction in summer precipitation (Supplementary Figure S1) can have a negative impact on streamflow, with more low flow events which can reduce the dilution volume for the pollutant loads.

Figure 3: Climate change and land-use projections (a) Air temperature anomaly and (b) Percentage precipitation anomaly for Ankinghat catchment; (c) Land use land cover percentage

305   composition for Ankinghat catchment for 2015 and 2040; (d) 30-day low flow with a return

306   period of 10 years for climate change and land use land cover projections

3.1.2 Land use land cover projections

308   The land use land cover projections for the Ankinghat catchment show an increase in

309   agricultural land and built-up land and a reduction in forestland (Figure 3(c)). The percentage

310   composition of the land for the study area in 2015 and 2040 simulated is shown in Fig 4. The

311   projected LULC shows an increase in agricultural land and built-up land and a reduction in

312   wasteland and forestland for both the stretches. Agricultural land is the predominant land cover

313   type for the study area; hence, non-point source pollution can have a major effect on water

314   quality. An increase in non-point pollution load of up to 10% is simulated for the future LULC

315   which can affect mainly the nutrient pollution. Also, increase in agricultural land can affect the

316   evapotranspiration and hence affect the streamflow which in turn affects water quality by

317   altering the dilution factor (Zou et al., 2017).

3.1.3 Population and Industrial projections

319   The projected population of the mid-century catchment area of the drains along with the present

320   population is shown in Fig 5(a), and the sewage generated by the present and future population

321   calculated is shown in Fig 5(b). The population projected for mid-century matches with the

322   projections made by Kanpur and Unnao city for Planning, which uses the mean of population

323   obtained from Arithmetic increase, geometric increase and incremental increase method

324   (Ministry of Urban Development et al., 2016, Unnao Nagar Palika Parishad, 2016). A

325   population increase is expected in the Kanpur area, where there is much scope for urban

326   expansion due to available fertile land for cultivation, and job opportunities due to industrial

327   growth for the future. The rise in population can lead to rise in sewage generated and hence

328   increase the point loads coming to the drains, especially the faecal coliform. Industrial growth

329   is expected in the Kanpur industrial belt, due to availability of raw materials and current efforts

330   towards industrialization in Uttar Pradesh to increase economic growth (The Economic Times,

331   2021). The industrial growth can lead to high pollution in river if the effluents are not treated

332   properly before disposal.

333   The comparison of point loads from drains with population and industry projections are shown

334   in Figure 5 (c)-(g). The BOD loads are greatly affected by population and industrial growth,

335   with a higher loading corresponding to population growth at all drains. The effect of industrial

336   and population growth has significantly affected Unnao and Jajmau BOD loadings. Unnao

drains did not contribute to ammonia and nitrate loading. The effect of population dominates

the effect of industry on ammonia and nitrate loading, except for Jajmau, where both the effects

are found comparable. The most significant increase in ammonia and nitrate loading from

baseline is observed for Jajmau drains. The only drain which carries P load is the Jammu drain,

which is found to increase further with industry growth, whereas population growth did not

impact its loading. Faecal coliform loading increases with population growth at all checkpoints

and is not affected by industrial growth.

344

Figure 4: Land use land cover projections. Percentage composition of land use for Ankinghat
to Kanpur in (a) 2015 and (b) 2040, for Kanpur to Shahzadpur in (c) 2015 and (d) 2040. Non-
point source pollution load for (e) Ankinghat to Kanpur and (f) Kanpur to Shahzadpur.

348

Figure 5: (a) Population projections for the catchment area of drains; (b) Sewage generated comparison for 2020 and 2050; Point load comparison of population and industry projections with the baseline for (c) BOD, (d) Ammonia, (e) Nitrate, (f) Phosphorous and (g) Faecal Coliform.

353

3.2 Streamflow changes under changing climate and land use land cover

The 30Q10 flow comparison for the climate change and land use land cover projections simulated from the HEC-HMS model in Figure 3(d) shows a reduction of low flows for the future. The annual minima streamflow at Ankinghat also shows a considerable decrease in the magnitude of low flows in the future, with more reduction corresponding to the RCP 8.5 (Supplementary Figure S3). The month with the lowest flow is March (Supplementary Figure S4). Even though the Ganga River is snow-fed, the barrages constructed upstream nullify the impact of snowmelt on streamflow at Ankinghat, thus having low flows during summer (Santy et al., 2020). The significant reduction in the summer month flows poses a severe threat to the quantity and quality of water. The low flows are predicted to reduce with high warming in Europe (Marx et al., 2018).

The land use land cover is not found to affect low flow significantly, whereas climate change significantly reduces the low flow. The increase in agricultural land simulated can lead to an increased evapotranspiration and can affect low flows. However, significant changes in low flows are not identified and can be due to the large catchment area for Ankinghat and the resulting complex physical processes resulting in a slight change in streamflow at Ankinghat with land-use changes (Fohrer et al., 2001). The curve numbers of each sub-catchment had significant changes with LULC projections (Supplementary Figure S5); however, it was insufficient to make significant changes in streamflow. The effect of land-use changes on streamflow is found to be more pronounced at the subbasin than at the basin level (Zhou et al., 2013).

3.3 Individual effects of climate change, land use land cover, population and industrial growth on water quality

The individual effects of major drivers of pollution- climate change, land use land cover, population and industries on water quality simulated using the coupled HEC-HMS and QUAL2K model is compared in terms of percentage changes of nine water quality parameters for each driver from baseline period (Figure 6).

3.3.1 Influence of climate change on water quality

Climate change affects water quality mainly by low flow and stream temperature changes. Climate change is found to affect all water quality parameters significantly (Figure 6), with a higher percentage change corresponding to higher warming scenario RCP 8.5. The effect of

385   climate change dominates the effect of other drivers for DO concentration (Figure 6(a) & 7(a))
386   with a maximum percentage reduction of 60% for Kanpur downstream corresponding to RCP
387   8.5. Climate change has a more significant effect on DO, which can be attributed to a reduction
388   in saturation DO with a rise in stream temperature and a reduction in dilution volume followed
389   by a decrease in low flows. The percentage increase is BOD is more than 100% for future
390   climate at Kanpur and Jajmau downstream points. The percentage increase in ammonia with
391   RCP 4.5 and 8.5 is also more than 100% for Kanpur and Jajmau downstream. The percentage
392   change in P components with climate change is above 50% for Kanpur and Jajmau
393   downstream. The percentage change in nitrate is found to be less than 18% with changes in
394   driver. The percentage change in nitrate concentration is small compared to other water quality
395   parameters (Figure 6(d)) because of the higher denitrification rate for this river stretch. Increase
396   in pollutant concentration with climate change is due to reduced dilution volume following a
397   decreased low flow. It can be noted that the nutrient concentration is high during the low flow
398   period, and climate change is the important driver aggravating pollution; hence, climate change
399   alone can lead to eutrophication during the low flow period for the Ganga river stretch
400   considered here. The climate change leads to increased pollution of FC in Kanpur and Fatehpur
401   downstream with an increase in more than 50% of the concentration, while the concentration
402   is found to reduce for Jajmau downstream and Shahzadpur (20 to 85%) (Figure 6(i)). This
403   reduction at Jajmau is due to FC's higher sensitivity to temperature (Santy et al., 2020).

404   **3.3.2 Influence of land use land cover on water quality**

405   The land use land cover change leads to changes in non-point source pollutant load and hence
406   an increase in pollution. The effect of land use land cover on water quality parameters are found
407   to be minimal except for nutrients with a percentage change less than 5%. The percentage
408   change in ammonia with LULC for all checkpoints is found to be less than 4%. The effect of
409   LULC on nitrate is more in Jajmau than in other checkpoints (Figure 7(d)), however, the
410   percentage change in nitrate is less than 1. The land use land cover alone doesn't lead to higher
411   pollution; however together with climate change it can aggravate pollution due to reduction in
412   dilution volume for the increased NPS load.

413   **3.3.3 Influence of population on water quality**

414   The population growth is found to affect all water quality parameters except for P, due to the
415   absence of P in domestic sewage. The percentage change in BOD with population is found to
416   be 30%. The effect of population growth is more pronounced at the Jajmau downstream due to

additional point loads projected with population. However, the extra loading at Pandu river drains due to population growth is offset by the excess flow from Pandu river drains. The effect of population on DO is slightly higher than that of industrial growth at Kanpur downstream. However, industrial growth is dominant for other checkpoints because Kanpur downstream is the immediate downstream point of the industrial loading, and hence it will take some distance downstream to reach the impact. The effect of population on nitrate varies from 2 to 4% except for Kanpur downstream, where the percentage increase is less than 1. The percentage change in ammonia and TN with population growth ranges from 13-24% and 6-17% respectively. The effect of population on FC concentration is dominant with a percentage change ranging from 20-30% for all check points. The increase in concentration with population growth is due to the increased point loads, resulting in high pollution downstream of the drain confluence.

3.3.4 Influence of industry on water quality

Industrial growth is found to affect DO, BOD and ammonia. Industrial growth with 30% rise in industry (INDS+30) is found to have more impact than population growth on BOD with an increase of about 40% from baseline at all checkpoints. Ammonia concentration is found to be more affected by industrial growth in the Jajmau downstream (Figure 6(c) & 7(c)) with a percentage change varying from 20 to 30%. The P components are not found to change with industrial growth, as the primary source of P load in this river stretch is fertilizers used in agricultural fields (Supplementary Table1). The only point load of P is from an industry effluent from Jajmau and is well within limits. The industrial growth does not affect FC concentration due to absence of FC in the industry effluent. A considerable percentage reduction of 10% in DO concentration is simulated at Jajmau d/s with a 30% rise in industry. The industrial growth resulted in higher pollution due to an increased point load.

3.3.5 Percentage contribution of each driver to water quality change

The percentage contribution of each driver for future water quality change calculated from the change ratio for Kanpur and Shahzadpur is shown in Figures 7 and 8. The major drivers of pollutants such as population, industries, land use land cover and climate change have a large effect on all water quality parameters (Figure 6). It can be noted that the contribution of climate change dominates the effect contribution of other drivers (Figure 7 & 8). This can be due to the dominating effect of streamflow over the changes in point and non-point loads due to population, industrial and land use land cover growth. The effect of climate change decreases

448 downstream of the stretch due to high flow from Pandu river drains joining the river

449 (Supplementary Figure S6, S7)

450 The effect of each driver is found to change with checkpoints (Figure 7 & Supplementary

451 Figure S6) and can be attributed to the varied state of loads at each checkpoint. Downstream

452 of Kanpur can be considered a representative of critical locations or drain confluence points,

453 whereas Shahzadpur can be considered a representative of a location away from point loads.

454 The pollution hotspot points are more vulnerable to climate change (Figure 7 & Supplementary

455 Figure S8) and its influence is very high and, hence, neglecting climate change in future designs

456 can have severe implications.

457 Climate change's contribution is larger compared with other drivers, especially at Kanpur

458 downstream. The contribution of climate change to DO, BOD, ammonia, nitrate, TN, organic

459 P, inorganic P and TP is 85%, 70%, 85%, 90%, 85%, 95% , 95% and 95% respectively (Figure

460 7). This high contribution of climate change is due to the reduced dilution volume. The

461 contribution of population, industry and land use together is only around 20 to 30%. The

462 contribution of population to DO, BOD, ammonia, nitrate, and TN is 6%, 12%, 5%, 2%, and

463 7% respectively (Figure 7). The contribution of industry growth is comparable to the

464 contribution of population growth. The major contribution of FC is from climate change and

465 population growth, with an individual contribution of 65 and 35% (Figure 7). Land use land

466 cover has a considerable effect on nitrate and P concentrations in comparison with other water

467 quality parameters, however the contribution is only 5%. The effect of population, industry and

468 land use tend to increase downstream due to the addition of more flows from Pandu river drains

469 resulting in an increased flow and hence an increased dilution volume.

470   The individual contribution of climate change is reduced from Kanpur to Shahzadpur. The

471 contribution of climate change to DO, BOD, ammonia, nitrate, TN, organic P, inorganic P and

472 TP is 35%, 30%, 25%, 60%, 40%, 60%, 75% and 75% (Figure 8). The contribution of

473 population to DO, BOD, ammonia, nitrate, and TN, is 35%, 30%, 40%, 20%, and 30%,

474 respectively (Figure 8). Climate change, population and industry are found to contribute

475 equally to DO and BOD concentration. The contribution of population to FC has risen from

476 Kanpur to Shahzadpur; however, climate change contribution is slightly higher than

477 population. The contribution of climate change to ammonia increase reduced for Shahzadpur,

478 with population and industrial contribution overwhelming the effect of climate change.

479 However, climate change contribution is dominant for nitrate and TN. The higher contribution

of ammonia for population and industrial growth is due to large ammonia concentration in sewage and industrial effluent. The contribution of land use land cover on P components is large with 20 to 40% contribution. However, climate change is found to dominant for P concentration due to low dilution volume followed by a reduced low flow.

Figure 6: Percentage change in water quality parameters for climate change (RCP 4.5 & RCP 8.5), land use land cover (LULC), population (POPL), and Industry (INDS) growth. (+10,+20 and +30 correspond to the percentage increase in industry in the future) for (a) DO, (b) BOD,

488   (c) ammonia, (d) nitrate, (e) organic phosphorous, (f) inorganic phosphorous, (g) total nitrogen,

489   (h) total phosphorous, and (i) faecal coliform.

490

491   Figure 7: Individual effects of climate change (RCP 4.5), land use land cover (LULC), industry

492   (INDS) and population (POPL) on (a) DO, (b) BOD, (c) Faecal coliform, (d) Ammonia, (e)

493   Nitrate, (f) total nitrogen, (g) organic- ,(h) inorganic- and (i) total phosphorous for Kanpur

Figure 8: Individual effects of climate change (RCP 4.5), land use land cover (LULC), industry (INDS) and population (POPL) on (a) DO, (b) BOD, (c) Faecal coliform, (d) Ammonia, (e) Nitrate, (f) total nitrogen, (g) organic- ,(h) inorganic- and (i) total phosphorous for Shahzadpur

494

495

496

497

498

499

3.4 Water quality for socio-environmental scenarios

The treatment units are usually designed considering only the population aspect. The above section 3.3 shows climate change, land use, and industrial growth also affect water quality considerably. The water quality is analyzed for the future considering population growth, industrial growth, climate change and LULC and the effectiveness of the treatment proposals are analyzed with the help of socio-environmental scenarios. The point loads calculated for socio-environmental scenarios are given in Supplementary Text S7. The results of important scenarios for the critical checkpoints are shown in Figures 9 and 10. The results of all scenarios for the entire study area are given in Supplementary Figures S9 & S10. For the scenarios 'C45LP' and 'C85LP', DO goes below 4 mgL^{-1} a 35km, and 51km stretch, respectively, downstream of Kanpur drains (Figure 9(a) & Supplementary Figure S9). It shows the intensification of pollution for future climate change, land use, industry and population if no actions are taken. Also, it can be noted that the pollution for the RCP 8.5 scenario is higher than RCP 4.5 (Figure 9 & Supplementary Figure S9). With all sewer lines laid and STPs working at full capacity, DO improves considerably for the entire stretch, making it fit for aquatic life. For the scenarios 'C45LPSPSM' and 'C85LPSPSM', the DO rises above 4 mgL^{-1}, revealing that the river is safe for aquatic life even with the present and proposed treatment plants. The increase in treatment level to tertiary didn't have much effect on DO concentration. It can be noted that even in the adverse climate change scenario of RCP 8.5, with the proposed STPs, the goals of GAP can be achieved in terms of DO concentration (Figure 9 & Supplementary Figure S9).

The BOD concentration increases drastically for 'C45LP' and 'C85LP' from the baseline due to the high pollution load due to climate change, LULC, industry and population. Even for the baseline scenario, the stretch after the confluence of Kanpur drains exceeds the bathing class limit of 3mgL^{-1}. The only scenario in which the entire stretch achieves the objective of GAP is 'C45LPS50SD' (Figure 9(b) & Supplementary Figure S9). However, a significant reduction in concentration is observed from scenarios 1 to 5. The tertiary treatment greatly reduces the pollutant concentration concerning BOD (Supplementary Figure S9). Also, it can be seen that BOD concentration improves if domestic sewage only reaches the STPs, implying that STP capacity for 2050 population demand is essential to have good water quality (Supplementary Figure S9). The 2020 demand STP capacity will not be sufficient even if we provide tertiary treatment (Figure 9(b)). For scenario 'C45LPS50SM', the entire stretch except for the 10km downstream of Kanpur drains falls within bathing class limits.

533

Figure 9: Water quality for future under proposed treatment. (a) DO, (b) BOD and (c) Faecal

coliform (FC) for socio-environmental scenarios. 'C45LPS20SM' is the treatment proposed by

authorities for 2050; 'C45LPS50SD' is the scenario proposed in this paper to contain the

pollution.

538

539 Figure 10: Nutrient projections for future under proposed treatment. (a) Nitrogen components

540 (ammonia, nitrate and total nitrogen); (b) Phosphorous components (organic-, inorganic- and

541 total phosphorous). 'C45LPS20SM' is the treatment proposed by authorities for 2050;

542 'C45LPS50SD' is the scenario proposed in this paper to contain the pollution.

543 Microbial pollution is a significant challenge that requires great attention. Most drains carry

544 wastewater with a very high FC concentration (in the order of 10^8). Faecal coliform profile

545 plots for socio-environmental scenarios 1-5 and climate change scenarios are given in Figure

546 9(c). A drastic reduction in FC concentration is observed with increased STP capacity. It is

547 noticed that only for scenario 5b, the entire stretch is fit for bathing concerning FC

548 concentration (Figure 9(c)). Even if we provide STPs to meet the demand of the 2050

549 population (Scenario 5a), due to the added flow from industrial discharge, the capacity of the

550 STPs will not be sufficient to cater to domestic and industrial wastewater flow. Hence, some

551   amount of the sewage overflows or gets bypassed, and as a result, some portion of untreated

552   sewage reaches the river, further adding to pollution. In scenario 5b, only domestic sewage

553   reaches the STP; hence the capacity can meet the demand, and the treated industrial wastewater

554   is discharged downstream of the STP influent point of the drain or through separate drains and

555   discharged to the river. Unlike other pollutants, due to very high FC loading in the untreated

556   sewage, mixing with treated water, even though it reduces the concentration, fails to comply

557   with the standards. The proposed treatment cannot contain FC pollution due to aggravated

558   pollution in future with climate change, land use, industry and population.

559   The high concentration of ammonia, nitrate and TN is drastically reduced for scenarios 2 to 5

560   (Figure 10 (a) & Supplementary Figure S10). The tertiary treatment brings down ammonia

561   concentration considerably. Scenarios 3 and 4 do not change much of the nitrate concentration

562   because the existing STPs are efficient in removing nitrates, and tertiary treatment is not

563   required. Nitrate is a crucial water quality parameter as most people depend on groundwater

564   for drinking. Nitrate concentration for the study area is below 7mg/L, well within drinking

565   water limits (45mg/L), hence no health hazards. TN and ammonia follow the same trend

566   (Figure 10 (a)& Supplementary Figure S10).

567   The organic P pollution increases with future climate, LULC, industry and population, which

568   gets drastically reduced for all scenarios 2 to 5 (Figure 10 (b) & Supplementray Figure S10).

569   The significant contribution of phosphorous loading is diffuse sources. Only Jajmau drains

570   carry a phosphorous load. The treatment given at the STPs reduces the pollution from point

571   loads. Inorganic P also varies in the same order as organic P. The initial variation up to Kanpur

572   is the contribution of non-point source pollution (Supplementary Figure S10). High

573   concentration of nitrogen and phosphorous can lead to eutrophication, a severe issue for river

574   health. Also, with the second scenario of proposed STPs, sewage gets treated fully at Jajmau,

575   and hence P pollution is under control for the future.

576   The ranking of the socio-environmental scenario is given in Table 3, with rank 1 for the best

577   water quality. 'C45LPS50SD' has resulted in good water quality in terms of bathing standards.

578   Hence, the STP capacity to meet 2050 population demand and separate treatment for industrial

579   and domestic wastewater is very important in achieving GAP goals. The treated industrial

580   wastewater should be discharged into the river directly or used for irrigation instead of draining

581   it into the drains that find their way to STP. The water quality for scenarios 2 to 5 (Table 1) fits

582   aquatic life. Hence, the planning scenario successfully achieves good water quality, except for

583 BOD and microbial pollution, which is a significant concern, mainly if the water is used for

584 irrigation, bathing, or drinking purposes.

585 Table 3: Ranking of treatment scenarios with rank 1 for the best water quality

Scenarios	DO	BOD	FC	Ammonia	Nitrate	TN	Organic P	Inorganic P	TP
C45LP	15	15	16	15	16	15	3	3	3
C45LPSPSM	14	9	14	14	8	14	1	2	1
C45LPS20SM	6	6	7	6	3	4	1	2	1
C45LPS20SD	5	5	5	5	5	6	1	2	1
C45LPS20TM	7	7	6	7	4	5	1	2	1
C45LPS20TD	4	4	4	4	6	7	1	2	1
C45LPS50SM	3	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	1
C45LPS50SD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
C85LP	16	16	9	16	15	16	4	4	4
C85LPSPSM	8	12	15	8	14	8	2	1	2
C85LPS20SM	11	13	13	11	10	9	2	1	2
C85LPS20SD	10	11	10	10	12	11	2	1	2
C85LPS20TM	12	14	11	12	11	10	2	1	2
C85LPS20TD	9	10	12	9	13	12	2	1	2
C85LPS50SM	13	8	8	13	9	13	2	1	2
C85LPS50SD	2	3	2	2	7	3	2	1	2

586

4. Conclusions:

588 After the Ganga Action Plan (GAP) was launched in 1986 (Environment & Forests Division

589 and Water Resources Division Planning Commission Government of India, 2009), there have

590 been efforts toward a pollution-free Ganga River. Water quality has considerably improved but

591 it does not comply with bathing class limits, the objective of GAP. The individual effects of

592 significant drivers of pollution, climate change, land use land cover, population and industry

593 on water quality are analyzed for the most polluted stretch of Ganga river passing through

594 Kanpur in the mid-21st century using a coupled HEC-HMS and QUAL2K model. Climate

595 change, land use land cover, population and industry growth affect water quality. However,

596 climate change is found to dominate the effect of other drivers for the low flow period due to

597 lower dilution volume followed by a reduction in low flows simulated for the future with a

598 percentage contribution of above 70% at Kanpur.

599 The major factors affecting water quality in the future- population, land use land cover, sewer

600 lines connectivity, STP capacity, treatment level and the type of sewage, domestic or mixed

601 reaching STP, treatment proposals for Ganga river - are considered in developing five socio-

602 environmental scenarios. Five socio-environmental scenarios were developed for the study
603 area to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment proposals made by the authorities to achieve
604 the GAP objective by the mid-21st century. The results show that the proposed and tendered
605 STPs will not be sufficient to bring water quality to the bathing class, the objective of GAP.
606 However, DO and nutrient pollution is improved with this proposed treatment. The BOD and
607 microbial pollution are the parameters which need additional attention to save the Ganga river
608 from future pollution. The only scenario by which BOD and FC can be brought to bathing class
609 limits are 'C45LPS50SD' and 'C85LPS50SD', where the STPs to meet the demand of the 2050
610 population is provided. By increasing the STP capacity, the water quality is found to improve.
611 Also, water quality is improved by increasing the treatment level to tertiary. However,
612 treatment capacity is more important than treatment level, especially for microbial pollution.
613 Raw sewage has a significantly high FC concentration; hence, no untreated sewage should
614 reach the river, as it will deteriorate water quality, especially in the low flow period.

615 This study will be highly beneficial for the policymakers and the authorities as it will help them
616 take the mitigation actions to reach GAP's objective. Also, the study shows the quantum of
617 benefits of segregating sewage reaching STPs. Even if the STP capacity of 2050 is in place and
618 the mixed sewage reaches STPs, the objective of GAP cannot be achieved unless the treatment
619 is increased to the tertiary level. The missing data of some water quality parameters at some
620 stations, model uncertainty, and parameter uncertainty contribute to some uncertainty in our
621 work. However, we believe that the qualitative results will not be affected. Also, the land use
622 projections considered assumes the transition in the past to occur in future too which can lead
623 to some uncertainty.

624 This study considers a hypothetical growth in the industry in the future and hence can affect
625 the results slightly. As the industrial effluent discharge is significantly less than the municipal
626 discharge, its effect will not be dominant on water quality, provided they are discharging at the
627 effluent disposal limits. The climate change, LULC, growth industry and population effects on
628 water quality for the monsoon season and extreme events for the hotspots of the Ganga River
629 can be a future scope of the study. In our study, we have not considered the cost incurred for
630 the mitigation strategy adopted; hence a waste load allocation model along with our present
631 study would give an idea of the ideal treatment required at the industries and STPs to reach the
632 objective of GAP.

633

634 Data Availability

635 The data that support the findings of this study are available from Ministry of Water Resources,
636 Government of India but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used
637 under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available.

638 Author contributions

639 Sneha Santy developed the model, made computational runs and prepared first draft of the
640 manuscript including figures. Mujumdar conceptualized the model, facilitated data collection
641 and edited the manuscript. Bala helped in devising climate change scenarios and review of
642 manuscript.

643 Competing interests

644 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

645 Acknowledgement

646 We thank the Chief Engineer, Upper Ganga Basin Organisation, Central Water Commission,
647 Lucknow for providing very useful data on streamflow, water quality and hydraulic
648 characteristics for the river stretch studied, India Meteorological Department for providing
649 temperature data, National Remote Sensing Centre, Hyderabad for providing us land use land
650 cover data, United States Geological Survey for providing DEM data, the European Centre for
651 Medium-Range Weather Forecasts for providing atmospheric data and NASA Center for
652 Climate Simulation for providing NASA Earth Exchange Global Daily Downscaled Climate
653 Projections. We thank Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board and State Mission for Clean
654 Ganga Uttar Pradesh for providing data on drain, STP capacity and sewer network. The authors
655 thank Dr. Ila Chawla for sharing the land use projection files. We also thank the Divecha Centre
656 for Climate change, IISc, Bangalore, for providing Grantham Fellowship to the first author.
657 The funding received from the Ministry of Earth Sciences (MoES), Government of India,
658 through the project, "Advanced Research in Hydrology and Knowledge Dissemination",
659 Project No.: MOES/PAMC/H&C/41/2013-PC-II, is also gratefully acknowledged. The second
660 author acknowledges the support received through the JC Bose Fellowship (Number,
661 JCB/2018/000031). The authors are thankful to Dr. Pankaj Dey for the help with proof reading
662 the manuscript.

663

664 **References:**

665   1. Al-Ahmad A, Daschner FD, Kummerer K (1999). Biodegradability of cefotiam,
666   ciprofloxacin, meropenem, penicillin G, and sulfamethoxazole and inhibition of
667   wastewater bacteria. Arch Environ Contam Toxicol 37:158–63.

668   2. Astaraie-Imani M, Zoran Kapelan, Guangtao Fu, David Butler (2012). Assessing the
669   combined effects of urbanization and climate change on the river water quality in an
670   integrated urban wastewater system in the UK. Journal of Environmental Management
671   112 (2012) 1-9.

672   3. Bonus, CA (Ed.), 2018. Ganga River Basin Planning Assessment Report. Main volume
673   and Appendices. Deltares with AECOM and Future Water for the World Bank and the
674   Government of India, Report 1220123-002-ZWS-0003.

675   4. Bourdeau-Goulet S, Hassanzadeh E (2021). Comparisons Between CMIP5 and CMIP6
676   Models: Simulations of Climate Indices Influencing Food Security, Infrastructure
677   Resilience, and Human Health in Canada. Earth's Future 9, e2021EF001995.
678   https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF001995

679   5. Central Water Commission & National Remote Sensing Centre (2014). Government of
680   India Ministry of Water Resources GANGA BASIN.

681   6. Central Pollution Control Board. Pollution Assessment: River Ganga (CPCB (2013)

682   7. Chawla I. and Mujumdar P. P., 2018. Partitioning uncertainty in streamflow projections
683   under nonstationary model conditions. Advances in Water Resources 112: 266–282.

684   8. Chapra S C and Pelletier G J 2003. QUAL2K: A Modeling Framework for Simulating
685   River and Stream Water Quality: Documentation and User's Manual. Civil and
686   Environmental Engineering Dept., Tufs University, Medford, MA.

687   9. Choi K, Kima Y, Park J, Park CK, Kim M, Kim HS, Kim P (2008). Seasonal variations
688   of several pharmaceutical residues in surface water and sewage treatment plants of Han
689   River. Sci Total Environ 405:102–28.

690   10. Davids, J. C. et al. Quantifying the connections—linkages between land-use and water
691   in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 190, 304
692   (2018).

693   11. Environment & Forests Division and Water Resources Division Planning Commission
694   Government of India, 2009. Report on utilization of funds and assets created through
695   Ganga Action Plan in states under GAP

696   12. Fohrer, N., Haverkamp, S., Eckhardt, K., & Frede, H.-G. (2001). Hydrologic response
697   to land-use changes on the catchment scale. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Part
698   B: Hydrology, Oceans and Atmosphere, 26, 577-582

699   13. Gyawali, S., Techato, K., Monprapussorn, S. & Yuangyai, C. Integrating Land use and
700   Water quality for Environmental based land use planning for U-tapao River Basin.
701   Thailand. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences 91, 556–563 (2013).

702   14. Hernando MD, Mezcua M, Fernandez-Alba AR, Barcelo D (2006). Environmental risk
703   assessment of pharmaceutical residues in wastewater effluents, surface waters and
704   sediments. Talanta 69:334–42.

705   15. Hunter P. Climate change and waterborne and vector-borne diseases. Journal of
706   Applied Microbiology, 94 (2003), pp. 37S-46S

707   16. Hurst AM, Edwards MJ, Chipps M, Jefferson B, Parsons SA (2004). The impact of
708   rainstorm events on coagulation and clarifier performance in potable water treatment.
709   Sci Total Environ 321:219–30.

710   17. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010a. Guidelines for the Preparation of Urban River
711   Management Plan (URMP) for all Class I Towns in Ganga River Basin. GRB EMP:
712   Ganga   River   Basin   Environment   Management   Plan.   Report   code:
713   002_GBT_IIT_EQP_S&R_01_Ver 1_Dec2010.

714   18. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010b. River Ganga at a Glance: Identification of
715   Issues and Priority Actions for Restoration. GRB EMP: Ganga River Basin
716   Environment Management Plan. Report code: 001_GBT_IIT_GEN_DAT_01_Ver
717   1_Dec2010.

718   19. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010c. Guidelines for Implementation of Sewage
719   Collection, Diversion, Pumping, Treatment, and Reuse (Sewage CDPTR)
720   Infrastructure in Class I Towns. GRB EMP: Ganga River Basin Environment
721   Management Plan. Report code: 004_GBT_IIT_EQP_S&R_03_Ver 1_Dec2010.

722   20. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2010d. Sewage Treatment in Class I Towns:
723   Recommendations and Guidelines. GRB EMP: Ganga River Basin Environment
724   Management Plan. Report code: 003_GBT_IIT_EQP_S&R_02_Ver 1_Dec2010.

725   21. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2011. Prevention of River Pollution by Urban Sewage:
726   Recommendations from Policy and Governance Perspective based on a Model Case
727   Study. GRB EMP: Ganga River Basin Environment Management Plan. Report code:
728   010_GBT_IIT_PLG_ANL_04_Ver 1_Dec2011.

729   22. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2012. Water Quality in the Ganga River and Efficacy
730   of Sewage Treatment Process in Coliform Removal: A Case for Adopting Tertiary
731   Treatment. GRB EMP: Ganga River Basin Environment Management Plan. Report
732   code: 023_GBP_IIT_EQP_ANL_01_Ver 1_June2012.

733   23. Indian Institutes of Technology, 2013. Status of Urbanization and Industrialization
734   in Middle Ganga Basin. GRBMP: Ganga River Basin Management Plan. Report Code:
735   051_GBP_IIT_SEC_ANL_13_Ver 1_Dec 2013

736   24. Jacobs, S. R. et al. Using high-resolution data to assess land use impact on nitrate
737   dynamics in East African Tropical Montane Catchments. Water Resources Research
738   54, 1812–1830 (2018).

739   25. Jin, L. et al. Assessing the impacts of climate change and socio-economic changes on
740   flow and phosphorus flux in the Ganga river system. Environmental Science: Processes
741   and Impacts 17(6), https://doi.org/10.1039/c5em00092k (2015).

742   26. Khattiyavong C and Lee H S. Performance Simulation an Assessment of an
743   Appropriate Wastewater Treatment Technology in a Densely Populated Growing City
744   in a Developing Country: A Case Study in Vientiane, Laos. Water 2019, 11, 1012;
745   doi:10.3390/w11051012

746   27. Li J, Huo R, Chen H, Zhao Y, and Zhao T (2021). Comparative Assessment and Future
747   Prediction Using CMIP6 and CMIP5 for Annual Precipitation and Extreme
748   Precipitation Simulation. Front. Earth Sci. 9:687976. doi: 10.3389/feart.2021.687976.

749   28. Marx A, Kumar R, Thober S, Rakovec O, Wanders N, Zink M, Wood E F, Pan M,
750   Sheffield J, and Samaniego L (2018). Climate change alters low flows in Europe under
751   global warming of 1.5, 2, and 3 °C. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 22: 1017–1032

752   29. Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India, Kanpur Nagar Nigam and
753   Administrative Staff College of India, 2016. City Sanitation Plan for Kanpur.

754   30. Namugizea J N, Jewitta G, Graham M (2018). Effects of land use and land cover
755   changes on water quality in the uMngeni river catchment, South Africa. Physics and
756   Chemistry of the Earth 105: 247–264.

757   31. Pascual-Benito M , Nadal-Sala D, Tobella M, Ballest E, García-Aljaro C, Sabat S,
758   Sabater F, Martí E,. Gracia C.A, Blanch A.R., Lucena F. (2020). Modelling the seasonal
759   impacts of a wastewater treatment plant on water quality in a Mediterranean stream
760   using microbial indicators. Journal of Environmental Management 261 (2020) 110220.

761 32. Permatasari P A, Setiawan Y, Khairiah R N and Effendi H (2017). The effect of land-
762   use change on water quality: A case study in Ciliwung Watershed. IOP Conf. Ser.:
763   Earth Environ. Sci. 54 012026

764 33. Rehana S and Mujumdar P P 2012. Climate change induced risk in water quality control
765   670 problems. Journal of Hydrology 444-445 63-77.

766 34. Rosario-Ortiz FL, Snyder SA, Suffet IH (2007). Characterization of dissolved organic
767   matter in drinking water sources impacted by multiple tributaries. Water Res 41:4115–
768   28.

769 35. Santy, S., Mujumdar, P. P. and Bala, G., 2020. Potential Impacts of Climate and Land
770   Use Change on the Water Quality of Ganga River around the Industrialized Kanpur
771   Region. Scientific Reports, 10:9107.

772 36. Santy, S., Mujumdar, P. P. and Bala, G., 2022. Increased risk of water quality
773   deterioration under climate change in Ganga River. Front. Water 4:971623. doi:
774   10.3389/frwa.2022.971623

775 37. Shukla, S., Khire, M. V., and Godan, S. S. (2018). Effects of urbanization on surface
776   and subsurface hydrologic variables of upper bhima river basin, Maharashtra, India.
777   Model. Earth Syst. Environ. 4, 699–728. doi: 10.1007/s40808-018-0446-9

778 38. The Economic Times, 2021. UP targets industrialization to raise economic growth and
779   lift incomes of poorer regions. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/indl-
780   goods/svs/construction/up-targets-industrialisation-to-raise-economic-growth-and-lift-
781   incomes-of-poorer-regions/articleshow/87332486.cms?from=mdr.

782 39. THE TIMES OF INDIA, 14Jan2021. Kanpur will be first city to formulate river
783   management plan. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/kanpur/kanpur-will-be-
784   first-city-to-formulate-river-mgmt-plan/articleshow/80256831.cms.

785 40. Unnao Nagar Palika Parishad, 2016. Final Report of City Sanitation Plan Unnao.

786 41. US Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center 2000. Hydrologic
787   Modeling System HEC-HMS Technical Reference Manual.

788 42. Uttar Pradesh Jal Nigam, Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board,bNational Mission for
789   Clean Ganga, MoWR, RD & GR, Central Pollution Control Board, MoEF&CC (2016).
790   Assessment of Pollution of Drains Carrying Sewage /Industrial Effluent Joining River
791   Ganga and its Tributaries (Kali-East/Ramganga) between Haridwar (Down) to Kanpur
792   (Down)"

793 43. Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board (2019). Action Plan for Restoration of Polluted
794   stretch of River Ganga from district Kannauj to district Varanasi.

795   44. Whitehead, P. G. et al. Modelling impacts of climate change and socio-economic
796   change on the Ganga, Brahmaputra, Meghna, Hooghly and Mahanadi river systems in
797   India and Bangladesh. Science of The Total Environment 636, 1362–1372,
798   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.362 (2018).

799   45. Whitehead, P. G. Biophysical Modelling of the Ganges, Brahmaputra, and Meghna
800   Catchment. (ed. Nicholls, R., Hutton, C., Adger, W.Hanson, S., Rahman, M., Salehin,
801   M.) Ecosystem Services for Well-Being in Deltas 249–262,
802   https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71093-8 (Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2018).

803   46. Whitehead, P. G.et al. Dynamic modeling of the Ganga river system: impacts of future
804   climate and socio-economic change on flows and nitrogen fluxes in India and
805   Bangladesh. Environmental Science: Processes and Impacts,
806   https://doi.org/10.1039/c4em00616j (2015).

807   47. Whitehead P G et al., 2015. Impacts of climate change and socio-economic scenarios
808   on flow and water quality of the Ganges, Brahmaputra and Meghna (GBM) river
809   systems: low flow and flood statistics. Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts

810   48. Zhou, F., Xu, Y., Chen, Y., Xu, C.-Y., Gao, Y., & Du, J. (2013). Hydrological response
811   to urbanization at different spatio-temporal scales simulated by coupling of CLUE-S
812   and the SWAT model in the Yangtze River Delta region. Journal of Hydrology, 485,
813   113-125

814   49. Zou M., Niu J., Kang S., Li X. & Lu H. (2017). The contribution of human agricultural
815   activities to increasing evapotranspiration is significantly greater than climate change
816   effect over Heihe agricultural region. Scientific Reports 7: 8805.

817