

Simulations of the flow in the Mahakam river–lake–delta system, Indonesia

Pham Van, Chien; de Brye, Benjamin; Deleersnijder, Eric; Hoitink, A. J F; Sassi, Maximiliano; Spinewine, Benoit; Hidayat, Hidayat; Soares-Frazão, Sandra

DOI

[10.1007/s10652-016-9445-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10652-016-9445-4)

Publication date

2016

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Environmental Fluid Mechanics

Citation (APA)

Pham Van, C., de Brye, B., Deleersnijder, E., Hoitink, A. J. F., Sassi, M., Spinewine, B., Hidayat, H., & Soares-Frazão, S. (2016). Simulations of the flow in the Mahakam river–lake–delta system, Indonesia. *Environmental Fluid Mechanics*, 16(3), 603-633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10652-016-9445-4>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Simulations of the flow in the Mahakam river-lake-delta system, Indonesia

Chien Pham Van^{1,2,*}, Benjamin de Brye³, Eric Deleersnijder^{4,5}, A.J.F. (Ton) Hoitink⁶,
Maximiliano Sassi⁷, Benoit Spinewine¹, Hidayat Hidayat⁶, and Sandra Soares-Frazão¹

¹Université catholique de Louvain, Institute of Mechanics, Materials and Civil Engineering (IMMC), Place du Levant 1, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

²Thuyloi University, Faculty of Hydrology and Water Resources, Tayson 175, Dongda District, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

³Free Field Technologies, Axis Park Louvain-la-Neuve, rue Emile Francqui 1, Mont-Saint-Guibert, Belgium.

⁴Université catholique de Louvain, Institute of Mechanics, Materials and Civil Engineering (IMMC) & Earth and Life Institute (ELI), Avenue Georges Lemaître 4, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

⁵Delft University of Technology, Delft Institute of Applied Mathematics (DIAM), Mekelweg 4, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands

⁶Wageningen University, Department of Environmental Sciences, Hydrology and Quantitative Water Management Group, Droevendaalsesteeg 3, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

⁷Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, NIOZ, Den Burg, The Netherlands.

*Corresponding author: Tel.: +32/10/472124, Fax.: +32/10/472179, Email.: chien.phamvan@uclouvain.be
or Pchientvct_tv@tlu.edu.vn

1 **Abstract**

2 Large rivers often present a river-lake-delta system, with a wide range of temporal and spatial scales
3 of the flow due to the combined effects of human activities and various natural factors, e.g. river
4 discharge, tides, climatic variability, droughts, floods. Numerical models that allow for simulating
5 the flow in these river-lake-delta systems are essential to study them and predict their evolution
6 under the impact of various forcings. This is because they provide information that cannot be easily
7 measured with sufficient temporal and spatial detail. In this study, we combine one-dimensional
8 sectional-averaged (1D) and two-dimensional depth-averaged (2D) models, in the framework of the
9 finite element model SLIM, to simulate the flow in the Mahakam river-lake-delta system
10 (Indonesia). The 1D model representing the Mahakam River and four tributaries is coupled to the
11 2D unstructured mesh model implemented on the Mahakam Delta, the adjacent Makassar Strait,
12 and three lakes in the central part of the river catchment. Using observations of water elevation at
13 five stations, the bottom friction for river and tributaries, lakes, delta, and adjacent coastal zone is
14 calibrated. Next, the model is validated using another period of observations of water elevation,
15 flow velocity, and water discharge at various stations. Several criteria are implemented to assess the
16 quality of the simulations, and a good agreement between simulations and observations is achieved
17 in both calibration and validation stages. Different aspects of the flow, i.e. the division of water at
18 two bifurcations in the delta, the effects of the lakes on the flow in the lower part of the system, the
19 area of tidal propagation, are also quantified and discussed.

20 **Keywords**

21 Mahakam River, coupled 1D / 2D model, SLIM, river-lake-delta system

1 Introduction

Large rivers such as the Mekong River (Southeast Asia) hosting a river-lake-delta system consist of various interconnected regions such as a river and its tributaries, lakes, floodplains, delta or estuary, and adjacent coastal ocean. In such river-lake-delta systems, continuous interactions and exchange of water between interconnected regions exist, under the combined effects of riverine and marine forcings (e.g. river discharge, tides), mutual influences of natural processes (e.g. climatic variability, droughts, floods), and human activities [1,2]. As a result, a wide range of temporal and spatial scales of motion can be observed [2]. Such systems also feature complex geometries, especially in deltaic or estuarine regions [2,3]. Therefore, a global system approach that is able to handle the flow in the whole river-lake-delta system is required, to understand the complex flow processes occurring at different temporal and spatial scales and to study related issues, e.g. transport processes of sediment, morphology, ecological status of coastal waters.

Detailed and long-term field measurements (e.g. flow velocity, flow depth, water discharge) allow for an accurate study of the flow, but are generally time-consuming and rarely obtained over long time intervals and at different locations due to the highly spatial and temporal variability of the phenomena. **As regards** numerical simulations, an integrated model, which allows for representing the flow from the upstream end of the system to the coastal ocean and the deep margin, is essential to take into account properly the interactions between river flow, hydraulic processes, and tidal effects on the entire river-lake-delta systems. **While** existing studies primarily investigate the flow processes locally in each interconnected region of river-lake-delta systems, taken individually, it is becoming computationally feasible to adopt such an integrated approach, without excessive simplification of the physical processes resolved by the model.

Using a full three-dimensional (3D) model for simulating the flow in river-lake-delta systems is however likely to exceed the available computer resources because the area of such systems is of the order of thousands of square kilometers. The data required to run such models are also not easily available, as well as field measurements to validate the implementation of the model. Among

48 different simpler models developed for simulating the flow in riverine and marine water
49 environments as well as in continuums such as river-lake-delta systems, a coupled one-dimensional
50 section-averaged and two-dimensional depth-averaged (1D / 2D) model is a tool of choice, for it is
51 more efficient in terms of computational cost than a full 2D or 3D model [3-7].

52 Wu and Li [4] applied a coupled 1D / 2D quasi-steady model to study the flow in the fluctuating
53 backwater region of the Yangtze River while Zhang [5] used a 1D / 2D unsteady model to simulate
54 the flow in the offshore area near the Yellow River mouth (China). Martini *et al.* [6] applied a
55 coupled 1D / 2D model for simulating the flood flows in the Brenta River (Veneto, Italy). Later,
56 Cook and Merwade [7] combined the simulation results from a coupled 1D / 2D model and datasets
57 obtained from different river bathymetry sources in order to quantify the resulting differences in the
58 inundation maps for Strouds Creek reach and Brazos River (USA). Recently, de Brye *et al.* [3]
59 developed a coupled 1D / 2D finite element model for reproducing the flow dynamics in the Scheldt
60 Estuary and tidal river network. These examples strongly suggest that a coupled 1D / 2D model can
61 be used to reproduce the flow in river-lake-delta systems.

62 In the framework of a coupled 1D / 2D model, the 2D model is often developed in the part of the
63 domain of interest, e.g. delta or estuary, where the accurate representation of the topography and
64 complex coastlines is required. In this 2D calculation area, different numerical methods and grids
65 were used, for example, finite difference method by Wu and Li [4] and Zhang [5], finite element
66 method and structured mesh by Cook and Marwade [7], finite element method and an unstructured
67 mesh by Martini *et al.* [6] and de Brye *et al.* [3]. Finite-element or finite-volume models using
68 unstructured meshes constitute a promising option to deal with the multi-physics and multi-scale
69 features of the problem [8,9], especially in deltaic and estuarine regions exhibiting a large number
70 of narrow channels [3]. This is because unstructured meshes allow for a more accurate
71 representation of complex topographies and an increase in spatial resolution in areas of interest, as
72 was done, for example, in the simulations of the flow in the Great Barrier Reef [10].

73 The present study aims at (i) applying an existing unstructured-mesh, finite element model, i.e.

74 SLIM (www.climate.be/slim), in which one-dimensional sectional-averaged and two-dimensional
75 depth-averaged shallow-water equations are coupled, to simulate the flow in the Mahakam
76 river-lake-delta system, (ii) accurately reproducing the observations of the flow (i.e. water elevation,
77 flow velocity, and water discharge) at various locations in the system, (iii) investigating the division
78 of water at two bifurcations in the deltaic region, (iv) providing a preliminary investigation of the
79 effects of the lakes on the flow in the lower part of the system, and (v) identifying the area of tidal
80 propagation in the system. Besides these objectives, the study also allowed to represent the
81 numerous distributaries in the deltaic region with a refined accuracy and to determine appropriate
82 values of the bottom friction coefficients in different parts of the considered river-lake-delta system.

83 The paper first introduces the Mahakam river-lake-delta system. Then, the finite element model
84 used in the study and the model established for the studied system are described. The detailed
85 calibration procedure of the modelling parameters and the validation of the model using available
86 observations of the flow (e.g. water elevation, flow velocity, and water discharge) are also presented
87 before discussing related issues, e.g. effects of grid resolution. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

88 **2 The Mahakam river-lake-delta system**

89 The Mahakam River is located in the East Kalimantan province of Borneo, Indonesia (Fig. 1). The
90 river-lake-delta system consists of the Mahakam River and its tributaries, lakes, the Mahakam Delta,
91 and the adjacent Makassar Strait. The river meanders over 900 km and its catchment area covers
92 about 75,000 km², with a mean annual river discharge of the order of 3,000 m³/s [11]. The river is
93 characterized by a tropical rain forest climate with a dry season from May to September and a wet
94 season from October to April. In the river catchment, the mean daily temperature varies from 24 to
95 29°C while the relative humidity lies between 77 and 99% [12]. The mean annual rainfall varies
96 between 4,000 and 5,000 mm/year in the central highlands and decreases from 2,000 to 3,000
97 mm/year near the coast [13]. A bimodal rainfall pattern with two **peaks** of rainfall occurring
98 generally in December and May is reported in the river catchment [12]. Due to the regional climate
99 and the global air circulation, the hydrological conditions in the river catchment vary significantly,

100 especially in ENSO (El Nino-Southern Oscillation) years such as in 1997, leading to significant
101 variations of flow in the river and downstream region, i.e. the delta [12].

102 In the middle part of the Mahakam River catchment, there are four tributaries (i.e. Kedang Pahu,
103 Belayan, Kedang Kepala, and Kedang Rantau) and over thirty shallow-water lakes covering a total
104 area of about 400 km². These lakes are connected to the Mahakam River system through small
105 channels (Fig. 1). The water collected over vast regions of the land around these lakes can be stored
106 in the lakes. Obviously, the water from the connected channels can flow into or out of the lakes,
107 depending on the season, e.g. flood or drought periods. For instance, these lakes act as a buffer of
108 the Mahakam River and regulate the water discharge in the lower part of the river through the
109 damping of flood surges [14]. During the dry season, tides can also force a flow into the lakes.
110 Therefore, studies of the flow in the Mahakam river-lake-delta system have to take into account the
111 interconnections between these lakes and the river.

112 Downstream of the Mahakam River, the Mahakam Delta presents a multi-channel network
113 including a large number of active distributaries and tidal channels. The delta is symmetrical with a
114 radius of approximately 50 km, as measured from the delta shore to the delta apex. The width of the
115 channels in the deltaic region ranges from 10 m to 3 km. The delta discharges into the Makassar
116 Strait, whose width varies between 200 and 300 km, with a length of about 600 km. Located
117 between the islands of Borneo and Sulawesi, the Makassar Strait is the main passage for the transfer
118 of water and heat from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean by the Indonesian Throughflow [15,16].

119 Complex coastlines are present in the delta (Fig. 1). Such complex coastlines might have a
120 significant impact on the flow [17]. This means that the effects of complex coastlines have to be
121 taken into account in studies of the flow. In addition, because of the multi-channel network, many
122 bifurcations are also inherently exhibited in the delta. Division of water discharge at these
123 bifurcations should be accurately represented since it affects not only the flow dynamics [2] but also
124 the sediment distribution and morphology in the adjacent channels [18].

125 The Mahakam Delta is a mixed tidal and fluvial delta. The tide in the delta is dominated by

126 semidiurnal and diurnal regimes, with a predominantly semidiurnal one. The **tidal range** decreases
127 from the delta front to upstream Mahakam River and its value varies between 3 and 1 m, depending
128 on the location and the tidal phase (e.g. neap or spring tides) under consideration.

129 Partial mixing is reported in the delta, based on the vertical distribution of salinity collected at
130 different locations [14]. The limit of salt intrusion is located around the delta apex [14,19,20].
131 Temperature data collection at 29 locations in the whole delta [20] shows that the temperature
132 varies from 29.2 to 30.5°C at the surface and from 29.2 to 30.8°C at the bottom. This suggests that
133 there is no large difference of water temperature in the water column and between stations for
134 different tidal conditions.

135 Large parts of the open waters in the delta are sheltered from wind action by vegetation and thus
136 the influence of the wind will not be taken into account in the calculations presented hereinafter.
137 The effect of wind on the flow in the lakes is also disregarded, mainly because there are not
138 available wind data in this region. In the Makassar Strait, the effect of the wind is limited due to
139 low-level wind speed. In terms of wind-induced surface waves, the average wave height is about 0.3
140 m at a distance of 14 km offshore and the maximum wave height is less than 0.6 m with the largest
141 waves approaching from the southeast [21]. Due to the limited fetch in the narrow strait of the
142 Makassar and low-level wind speed, the mean value of the significant wave height is also less than
143 0.6 m and the wave energy that affects the deltaic processes is very small [14]. Therefore, the
144 effects of wind and waves are assumed to be negligible in this study.

145 **3 Model**

146 **3.1 Governing equations**

147 The two-dimensional depth-averaged shallow-water equations are applied in the Mahakam Delta,
148 lakes, and the Makassar Strait. The elevation η of the water surface above the reference level and
149 the depth-averaged horizontal velocity vector $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ are obtained by solving the following
150 equations:

$$\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (H\mathbf{u}) = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{u}) + f\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{u} + g\nabla \eta = \frac{1}{H} \nabla \cdot [H\nu(\nabla \mathbf{u})] - \frac{\boldsymbol{\tau}_b}{\rho H} \quad (2)$$

151 where t is the time and ∇ is the horizontal del operator; $H = \eta + h$ is the water depth, with h being
 152 the water depth below the reference level (taken as the mean sea level); $f = 2\omega \sin\phi$ is the Coriolis
 153 parameter, ω is the Earth's angular velocity and ϕ is the latitude, \mathbf{k} is the unit upward vector; g is
 154 the gravitational acceleration; ρ is the water density (assumed constant); ν is the horizontal eddy
 155 viscosity; $\boldsymbol{\tau}_b$ is the bottom shear stress, which is parameterized using the Manning-Strickler
 156 formulation:

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_b = \rho \frac{gn^2 \|\mathbf{u}\|}{H^{1/3}} \mathbf{u} \quad (3)$$

157 where n is the Manning coefficient, generally depending on the physical properties of the riverbed
 158 and the seabed. Basically, the value of n is calibrated in order to reproduce the flow as well as
 159 possible.

160 The eddy viscosity ν is evaluated using the Smagorinsky formula [22]:

$$\nu = (0.1\Delta)^2 \sqrt{2\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\right)^2 + 2\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial y}\right)^2} \quad (4)$$

161 where Δ is the local characteristic length scale of the element, i.e. the longest edge of a triangle in
 162 the 2D unstructured mesh. The Smagorinsky formula arises from the unresolved turbulence at the
 163 subgrid scale and depends on the strain-rate of the velocity field. The energy production and
 164 dissipation of the small scales are assumed to be in equilibrium in this formula.

165 The continuity and momentum equations are integrated over the river cross-section in the
 166 Mahakam River and tributaries, yielding the following one-dimensional equations

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (Au)}{\partial x} = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + g \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\nu A \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\tau_b}{\rho H} \quad (6)$$

167 where A is the cross-sectional area, $H = A/b$ is the effective water depth, and b is the river width.

168 The bottom shear stress τ_b in the 1D model is computed using Manning's formula as:

$$\tau_b = \rho \frac{gn^2 |u|}{H^{1/3}} u. \quad (7)$$

169 The eddy viscosity is parameterized using the zero-equation turbulent model [23], under the form:

$$v = 0.16u_*H \quad (8)$$

170 where u_* is the shear velocity, which is calculated as $u_*^2 = c_f u^2$, with c_f being a coefficient obtained
 171 from Manning's formula ($c_f = gn^2 H^{-1/3}$).

172 3.2 Wetting and drying algorithm

173 In the river-lake-delta system and particular in the deltaic region, several areas can be wet or dry
 174 depending on the water elevation and tidal conditions. An accurate representations of these wetting
 175 / drying areas is crucial and mandatory in any model aimed at reproducing the flow in such systems.

176 In this paper, we use the wetting and drying algorithm designed by Kärnä *et al.* [24]. This means
 177 that the actual bathymetry (i.e. the water depth h below the reference level) is modified according to
 178 a smooth function $f(H)$ as $h_m = h + f(H)$, to ensure a positive water thickness at any time. The
 179 smooth function has to satisfy the following properties. Firstly, the modified water depth (i.e.
 180 $H_m = h_m + \eta$) is positive at any time and position. Secondly, the difference between the real and
 181 modified water depths is negligible when the water depth is significantly positive. Thirdly, the
 182 smooth function is continuously differentiable to ensure convergence of Newton iterations when
 183 using an implicit time stepping. The following function, which satisfies the properties described
 184 above, is used:

$$f(H) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{H^2 + \xi^2} - H \right) \quad (9)$$

185 where ξ is a free parameter controlling the smoothness of the transition between dry and wet
 186 situations, with the smaller value of ξ corresponding to the smaller the transition zone [24]. The
 187 modified water depth, i.e. $H_m = h_m + \eta$ will be equal to $\xi/2$ when $H = 0$, revealing that ξ also
 188 directly controls the water depth in the dry area. In our calculations, a value $\xi = 0.5$ m is adopted for
 189 modifying the bathymetry, in order to maintain the positive water depth.

190 Using the redefined total water depth, the depth-averaged shallow-water equations (1)-(2) are

191 modified slightly, resulting in the following forms:

$$\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial h_m}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (H_m \mathbf{u}) = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot (\nabla \mathbf{u}) + f \mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{u} + g \nabla \eta = \frac{1}{H_m} \nabla \cdot [H_m \mathbf{v}(\nabla \mathbf{u})] - \frac{\boldsymbol{\tau}_b}{\rho H_m}. \quad (11)$$

192 The appearance of the second term in eq. (10) is due to the redefinition of the bathymetry.

193 **3.3 Finite element implementation**

194 The governing equations (5)-(6) and (10)-(11) are solved by means of an implicit discontinuous
195 Galerkin finite element method (DG-FEM) in the framework of the unstructured-mesh, finite
196 element model SLIM (www.climate.be/slim, [3,24,25]). To avoid a repeated description of the
197 model and its capabilities, only general information about the finite element (FE) implementation of
198 these equation is presented below. The computational domain is discretized into triangle elements
199 and line segments as shown in Fig. 4. The governing equations are multiplied by test functions and
200 then integrated by parts over each element or segment, resulting in element-wise surface and
201 contour integral terms for the spatial operators. The surface term is estimated using a linear shape
202 function. An approximate Riemann solver is used for computing the fluxes at the interfaces between
203 two adjacent elements or segments in order to represent properly the water-wave dynamics in
204 contour terms [25]. A second-order diagonally implicit Runge-Kutta method is used for the
205 temporal derivative operator [24] and a time step of 10 minutes is used in this study. At the
206 interfaces between the 1D and 2D models, the local conservation is **guaranteed** by compatible one
207 and two dimensional numerical fluxes [3].

208 **3.4 Treatment of channel confluences in the 1D model**

209 To impose suitable conditions at the interface of a confluence point (where waters in two channels
210 flow into a single channel) in the Mahakam River, a special treatment is needed **because of the**
211 **following reasons. Firstly, one computational confluence node is associated with three nodal values**
212 **and the usual Riemann solver [40] cannot be resorted to compute the numerical fluxes at the**
213 **interface of a confluence node. Secondly, a confluence node can be handled rather easily in**
214 **conservative finite difference models, but not in finite element ones [26]. In this study, we**

215 implemented a method inspired by Sherwin *et al.* [26] for arterial systems. This means that the
 216 characteristic variables are used to compute the fluxes at the interface of the confluence point,
 217 together with the continuity of mass and momentum. The detailed derivation of these characteristic
 218 variables from the governing equations is described below. The governing equations (5) and (6) can
 219 be expressed in a vector form as

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{A} \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial x} = \mathbf{S} \quad (12)$$

220 where $\mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ u \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} u & A \\ g/b & u \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{S} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(vA \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\tau_b}{\rho H} \end{pmatrix}$.

221 The eigenvalues of the eq. (12) can be easily obtained by solving the equation $\det(\mathbf{A} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = 0$. The
 222 eigenvalues, λ_1 and λ_2 , are real:

$$\lambda_1 = u + \sqrt{\frac{gA}{b}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = u - \sqrt{\frac{gA}{b}}. \quad (13)$$

223 The characteristic variables \mathbf{W} can be determined by using the expression $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{U}$, with \mathbf{K} being
 224 the eigenmatrix whose elements are determined from the eigenvalues:

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ \sqrt{\frac{g}{Ab}} & -\sqrt{\frac{g}{Ab}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

225 Finally, the characteristic variables \mathbf{W} are obtained:

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \left(A + u \sqrt{\frac{Ab}{g}} \right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(A - u \sqrt{\frac{Ab}{g}} \right) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

226 Because the discontinuous Galerkin method is applied at a confluence point, one computational
 227 confluence node is associated with 3 nodal values (Fig. 2) and thus six unknowns, i.e. sectional area
 228 and velocity of each node. If these six variables (A_l , u_l , A_{r1} , u_{r1} , A_{r2} , and u_{r2}) at the interface are
 229 known, we can compute the six upwind variables (A_{ul} , u_{ul} , A_{ur1} , u_{ur1} , A_{ur2} , and u_{ur2}) by imposing the
 230 characteristic variables from eq. (15) and by using the continuity of mass and momentum fluxes at
 231 the confluence. The characteristic variables at the interfaces of the confluence point are assumed to
 232 remain constant:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(A_l + u_l \sqrt{\frac{A_l b_l}{g}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(A_{ul} + u_{ul} \sqrt{\frac{A_{ul} b_l}{g}} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(A_{r1} - u_{r1} \sqrt{\frac{A_{r1} b_{r1}}{g}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(A_{ur1} - u_{ur1} \sqrt{\frac{A_{ur1} b_{r1}}{g}} \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(A_{r2} - u_{r2} \sqrt{\frac{A_{r2} b_{r2}}{g}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(A_{ur2} - u_{ur2} \sqrt{\frac{A_{ur2} b_{r2}}{g}} \right) \quad (18)$$

$$A_{ul} u_{ul} = A_{ur1} u_{ur1} + A_{ur2} u_{ur2} \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} u_{ul}^2 + g \eta_{ul} = \frac{1}{2} u_{ur1}^2 + g \eta_{ur1} \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} u_{ul}^2 + g \eta_{ul} = \frac{1}{2} u_{ur2}^2 + g \eta_{ur2} \quad (21)$$

233 where η_{ui} and b_i are respectively the elevations and widths corresponding to the river cross-section
 234 areas A_i , with $i=l, r1, r2$. The non-linear system of six algebraic equations (16)-(21) is solved by
 235 means of the Newton-Raphson method. The fluxes at the interfaces are directly calculated from the
 236 characteristic variables.

237 It is worth realizing that a confluence point in the Mahakam River can become a bifurcation
 238 point (where water in a single channel is divided into two channels) due to the variations of the
 239 water discharge and tides. In that case, the numerical fluxes at the interfaces of the bifurcation point
 240 are computed using the computational procedure introduced above.

241 **4 Model setup**

242 **4.1 Computational domain**

243 The domain of interest in this study is limited to the region of tidal influence of the Mahakam
 244 river-lake-delta system (Fig. 1). This domain comprises 300 km of the Mahakam River and four
 245 tributaries, the three largest lakes (i.e. Lake Jempang, Lake Melintang, and Lake Semayang)
 246 located about 150 km upstream of the delta, the Mahakam Delta, and the Makassar Strait. The four
 247 tributaries (i.e. Kedang Pahu, Belayan, Kedang Kepala, and Kedang Rantau) located in the middle
 248 part of the Mahakam River are included because they greatly contribute to the river flow. Also,
 249 among over thirty shallow-water lakes in the middle river catchment, the three largest lakes

250 mentioned above are taken into account in the computational domain since, again, these lakes act as
251 a buffer of the river and regulate the water discharge in the lower part of the river. Finally, the
252 multi-channel network in the delta is included in detail in the computational domain for taking into
253 account several physical processes in the calculations.

254 **4.2 Bathymetry**

255 Data sets from various sources are available to represent the bathymetry of the studied system. The
256 bathymetric data obtained from fieldwork campaigns with a single-beam echosounder during a
257 period between 2008 and 2009 [27] are employed for the delta, the three lakes, and the river. The
258 depth of the deltaic channels ranges from 5 to 15 m (see Fig. 3) while the water depth is of the order
259 of 5 m in the three lakes. The water depth in the river varies greatly, and can reach up to 45 m in
260 some meanders. In the Mahakam River and the four tributaries, the bathymetric data are used to
261 interpolate river cross-sections. The global bathymetric GEBCO database (www.gebco.net) is used
262 in the Makassar Strait and for the adjacent continental shelf.

263 **4.3 Grid of the computational domain**

264 The grid of the computational domain consists of a 2D sub-domain covering the three lakes, the
265 whole delta, and the Makassar Strait and a 1D sub-domain representing the Mahakam River and
266 four tributaries. The 2D sub-domain is discretized by means of an unstructured triangular grid
267 whose resolution varies greatly in space while the river network within the 1D sub-domain has a
268 resolution of about 100 m between cross-sections (Fig. 4). The 2D sub-domain allows for a very
269 detailed representation of the delta. The resolution in the deltaic channels is such that there are at
270 least two triangles (or elements) over the width of each tidal channel in the delta. The element (or
271 mesh) size varies from 5 m in the narrowest branches of the delta to around 10 km in the deepest
272 part of the Makassar Strait. The grid shown in Fig. 4 comprises 60,819 triangular elements and
273 3,700 line segments. This grid is generated using the open-source mesh generation software GMSH
274 (www.geuz.org/gmsh, [28,29]).

275 The current unstructured grid allows for an accurate representation of the very complex

276 shorelines. The refinement criteria of the grid takes into account (i) the speed of the external gravity
277 wave (\sqrt{gh}) [3,30,31] and (ii) the distance to the delta apex and coastlines in order to cluster grid
278 nodes in regions where small scale processes are likely to take place.

279 It must be emphasized that in comparison with the computational grids used in previous studies
280 [2,27,32] of the Mahakam Delta, the present computational grid is the first attempt to include most
281 of the meandering and tidal branches as well as the creeks in the delta together with the main deltaic
282 channels. The use of a model with such refinement of the computational grid is an important
283 achievement because a wide range of temporal and spatial scales of several physical processes (e.g.
284 tides, river flow) interacting with each other in the narrow and meandering tidal branches can be
285 included in the calculations. For instance, Mandang and Yanagi [32] studied the dynamics of tide
286 and tidal currents in the delta using a three-dimensional finite difference model, ECOMSED, with a
287 structured grid that had a resolution of 200 meters. Such a horizontal grid resolution is unlikely to
288 be suitable to represent the complex shorelines as well as the many small tidal channels existing in
289 the delta. This is the reason why only the main deltaic channels are included in their study. An
290 unstructured mesh comprising only the main deltaic channels is also used in the study of de Brye *et*
291 *al.* [2], who quantified the division of water discharge through the main channels of the delta. Then,
292 Sassi *et al.* [27] used exactly the same mesh to study the tidal impact on the division of water
293 discharge at the delta apex (DAN and DAS) and first (FBN and FBS, in Fig. 4) bifurcations.

294 **4.4 Boundary and initial conditions**

295 As shown in Fig. 4, the downstream boundaries of the system are located at the entrance and the
296 outlet of the Makassar Strait. The upstream boundaries are imposed at the city of Melak in the
297 Mahakam River, where the tidal influence on the flow is negligible, and at the upstream end of the
298 four tributaries (see Fig. 4b). The measured daily water discharge is imposed at the upstream
299 boundary of the Mahakam River and the calculated daily water discharge from a rainfall-runoff
300 model is prescribed at the upstream boundaries of the four tributaries. The tidal components
301 (elevation and velocity harmonics) from the global ocean tidal model TPXO7.1 [33] are imposed at

302 the downstream boundaries. This global ocean tidal model allows for combining rationally both
303 dynamic information from hydrodynamic equations and direct observation data from tide gauges
304 and satellite altimetry [33]. In addition, this model also provides the best fits, in the least-squares
305 sense, of the Laplace tidal equations and along-track averaged data from Topex/Poseidon and Jason
306 satellites data [3,33].

307 Along the impermeable boundaries of coastlines, lakes, and the multi-channel network in the
308 delta, the tangential stress is estimated using the following formulation:

$$v \frac{\partial u_t}{\partial n} = \alpha u_t \quad (22)$$

309 where α is the slip coefficient, $\partial u_t / \partial n$ is the normal derivative of the tangential velocity u_t . The
310 constant coefficient α lies between zero and infinity, corresponding to free slip and no-slip
311 conditions, respectively [34]. A finite value of α corresponds to a partial slip condition. In the
312 current calculations, the adopted value $\alpha = 10^{-3}$ m/s [2] is applied, to allow for taking into account
313 the effect of the transversal and tangential momentum flux along the impermeable boundaries.

314 The initial velocity in the computational domain is set equal to zero and an arbitrary value of 0.5
315 m is used for the initial water elevation, except in the lakes where a measured value of water
316 elevation is imposed in the calibration step and a calculated value is used in the validation step. A
317 spin up period of one neap-spring tidal cycle (about 15 days) is applied before the beginning of the
318 period of interest. Regime conditions can be reached quickly after a few days and thus the effects of
319 the initial conditions can be eliminated completely.

320 Calculations were performed using the high-performance computing facilities of the Université
321 catholique de Louvain (www.uclouvain.be/cism). We used 24 processors in parallel for calculations
322 and it takes about 1.5 days to simulate a period of 1 month using the refined computational grid
323 shown in Fig. 4.

324 5 Calibration and validation results

325 5.1 Observations and simulation periods

326 In situ measurements including water elevation, flow velocity, and water discharge at various
327 stations are available for estimating approximate values of the Manning coefficient in the system.
328 Observations of water elevation at five stations (i.e. JWL, Pela Mahakam, Delta Apex, Delta North,
329 Delta South, see Fig. 1) from May to August 2008 are used for calibration purposes (Section 5.3)
330 while the long-term observations of water elevation (at Pela Mahakam, Muara Karman, Delta Apex,
331 Delta North, and Delta South), flow velocity and water discharge (at Samarinda, DAN, DAS, FBN,
332 and FBS) between October 2008 and June 2009 are employed for the validation of the model
333 (Section 5.4). The water discharge at the upstream boundary in the Mahakam River varies between
334 1,200 and 2,300 m³/s during the calibration period while it ranges from 870 to 2,800 m³/s in the
335 validation period.

336 5.2 Error estimates

337 Three different types of error, i.e. the root mean square (RMS) error, mean absolute error (MAE),
338 and the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE) are used to assess the quality of the simulations. The RMS
339 error, MAE, and NSE are computed as follows:

$$\text{RMS error} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (X_{data,j} - X_{model,j})^2} \quad (23)$$

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |X_{data,j} - X_{model,j}| \quad (24)$$

$$\text{NSE} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N (X_{model,j} - X_{data,j})^2}{\sum_{j=1}^N (X_{data,j} - X_{data,m})^2} \quad (25)$$

340 where $X_{data,j}$ and $X_{model,j}$ are respectively the observations and model results of the quantity of
341 interest, at the point number j in a time-series, $X_{data,m}$ is the mean value of observed quantity of
342 interest, and N is the total number points in the considered time-series.

343 The RMS error is the most commonly used in practical applications. However, as shown in eq.

344 (23) for the RMS error, the differences between observed and computed values are calculated as
 345 square values (inside the square). Thus, the importance of larger values in time-series may be
 346 overestimated whereas lower values are neglected [35]. This is the reason why the MAE is
 347 additionally used. The RMS error and MAE are valuable indicators because they provide the error
 348 in the units of the quantity of interest, which is helpful in the analysis of the results. The NSE
 349 coefficient, that determines the relative magnitude of the residual variance (or noise) compared to
 350 the observations variance, is used to provide extensive information of comparisons.

351 The Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) is also applied for assessing the trend between
 352 computed results and observed data. The coefficient r is calculated as:

$$r = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N (X_{data,j} - X_{data,m})(X_{model,j} - X_{model,m})}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (X_{data,j} - X_{data,m})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (X_{model,j} - X_{model,m})^2}}, \quad (26)$$

353 where $X_{model,m}$ is the mean value of computed results.

354 5.3 Calibration results

355 To calibrate the Manning coefficient, the computational domain of the Mahakam river-lake-delta
 356 system is provisionally divided into three regions, i.e. Mahakam River and tributaries, lakes, and
 357 delta and Makassar Strait. Different simulations are performed by using a constant Manning
 358 coefficient in each flow region. The Manning coefficient in the lakes changes from $0.023 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ to
 359 $0.045 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ while its value lies between $0.0175 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ and $0.0325 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ in the river and tributaries.
 360 In the remaining flow region, the Manning coefficient ranges from $0.019 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ to $0.035 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$.
 361 Three values in each of the abovementioned ranges are selected for calibration purposes, resulting
 362 in twenty seven simulations (Table 1). According to the RMS errors of water elevation at five
 363 stations, the optimal value of the roughness coefficient is obtained in simulation a.14 (Table 1), with
 364 a value of $0.0275 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$, $0.0305 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$, and $0.023 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ for the river and tributaries, lakes, and delta
 365 and Makassar Strait, respectively. A slight improvement is obtained with an additional simulation
 366 where the Manning coefficient is taken as in simulation a.14 in the river and the lakes (i.e. 0.0275

367 and 0.0305), and then in the delta its value decreases linearly with the distance from the 1D / 2D
368 connecting location (Fig. 4b) to the delta front, from $0.0275 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ to $0.023 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$. Finally, the
369 Manning coefficients corresponding to this additional simulation are considered as the optimal
370 values. The computed water elevation obtained from this optimal distribution of the Manning
371 coefficient is shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 while the RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r coefficient at five
372 stations are listed in Table 2.

373 Fig. 5 shows comparisons between observed and computed water elevations at JWL and Pela
374 Mahakam stations. The model reproduces very well the observed water elevation at these stations.
375 The RMS error of water elevation is only 6 cm at Pela Mahakam and 13 cm at JWL station during
376 the comparable period. The MAE is less than 10 cm and the NSE coefficient is greater than 0.93,
377 indicating that the model reproduces very well the observations. The correlation coefficient r is
378 close to unity, revealing that both computed and observed water elevations show similar behaviors
379 or variation trends during the calibration period.

380 In Lake Jempang, both simulations and observations show clearly that the tidal signal is of a
381 marginal importance (Fig. 5a). These results suggest that the tide propagates up to a location located
382 downstream of the lakes or around the Pela Mahakam. A discrepancy in the water elevation of
383 about 20 cm occurs on 2008-06-16 at JWL station in the lake. This difference between observations
384 and simulated water elevation can be explained by the lateral flow into the lake that is not taken into
385 account in our simulations. At station Pela Mahakam, which is located closer to the delta, the tidal
386 signal is felt more clearly than in the Lake Jempang (Fig. 5b). However, the fluctuation of the water
387 elevation due to the tide at this station is still relatively small.

388 Fig. 6 shows the computed water elevation and the observations at Delta Apex, Delta South, and
389 Delta North. A very good agreement between computed and observed water elevations is obtained
390 at all three stations in the delta. **The largest value of RMS errors at these stations is less than 13 cm**
391 **in the two months period that is available for calibration.** This error is only about 6.5% of the
392 observed tidal range (i.e. about 2.0 m) at these stations. The MAE is more or less 5 cm while both

393 NSE and r coefficients are very close to unity.

394 An overestimation of low water elevation is observed at Delta Apex station. The use of
395 approximate river discharges at the upstream tributaries, which are estimated from a rainfall-runoff
396 model, could be the main reason for the error, as these estimates are less accurate for low flows.
397 Another reason may be the use of a constant value of the bottom friction in the Mahakam River
398 upstream of the station.

399 **5.4 Validation results**

400 Using the optimal values of the Manning coefficient obtained in the calibration step, a simulation
401 for a 9 months period (from October 2008 to June 2009) is performed to validate the model and the
402 parameters. The calculation errors and the detailed comparisons between computed results and
403 observed data are presented for water elevation, flow velocity, and water discharge at various
404 stations along the system under study.

405 **5.4.1 Water elevation**

406 As shown in Fig. 7a, the model reproduces very well the observed water elevation at Pela Mahakam
407 station during the period from 2008-11-11 to 2008-11-19. The RMS error is only about 4 cm while
408 the MAE is 3 cm (Table 3). The NSE and r coefficients are respectively 0.97 and 0.98 (Table 3),
409 revealing that the model reproduces very well the observed values. These results suggest that
410 appropriate values of the Manning coefficient were obtained for the upstream Mahakam River and
411 tributaries and lakes.

412 In addition, there is only a minor tidal signal at Pela Mahakam station as shown in the calibration
413 step. This result shows again that the tide propagates up to the Pela Mahakam location in the
414 Mahakam River.

415 At Muara Karman station, which is located in the region downstream of the three tributaries
416 (River Belayan, Kelang Kepala, and Kedang Rantau) and the lakes, the model reproduces rather
417 well the observed water elevation (Fig. 7b). The RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r coefficient are equal
418 to 10 cm, 7 cm, 0.89, and 0.95, respectively, for a two weeks period from 2008-11-04 to

419 2008-11-19. However, an overestimation and underestimation of the computed water elevation is
420 observed at this station. Again, this difference can be explained by the inaccuracy of the water
421 discharge imposed at the upstream boundaries in the tributaries.

422 **As is the case** for the calibration results, the model predicts very well the observed water
423 elevation at three stations, namely Delta Apex, Delta South, and Delta North as shown in Fig. 8.
424 The RMS error of water elevation is less than 12 cm at these stations. The MAE is about 9 cm while
425 the NSE and r coefficients are about 0.95 (Table 3), indicating that the model correctly simulates
426 the observed water elevation. However, an overestimation of the computed water elevation is
427 observed in the low tidal situations.

428 **5.4.2 Flow velocity**

429 Fig. 9 illustrates the comparisons of the simulation results for the flow velocity and the
430 measurement data in a long-term simulation period from 2009-02-20 to 2009-06-10 at Samarinda
431 station. The model reproduces reasonably well the observed flow velocity in different neap-spring
432 tidal cycles during the long-term simulation. The RMS error of flow velocity is 0.087 m/s, i.e. about
433 13% of the average value of the measured velocity while MAE of velocity is 0.07 m/s (Table 4).
434 The r coefficient is 0.95 and the NSE coefficient is 0.89 (Table 4). These results show that the
435 model successfully reproduces the flow velocity in the Mahakam River.

436 Fig. 10 shows the comparisons between computed and observed flow velocity at DAN, DAS,
437 FBN, and FBS stations. The observed flow velocity in different spring and neap tides in the period
438 from 2008-12-26 to 2009-01-05 are represented reasonably well by the model in general. As shown
439 in Table 4, the RMS errors of flow velocity at DAN and DAS are 0.053 and 0.081 m/s, respectively.
440 At FBN and FBS stations, these errors are 0.104 and 0.09 m/s (<20% of the average value of the
441 measured velocity). A value of 0.042 and 0.063 m/s is obtained for the MAE at DAN and DAS,
442 respectively, while the MAE respectively equals to 0.095 and 0.065 m/s at FBN and FBS. The NSE
443 coefficient at all four stations is greater than 0.76 while the r coefficient is higher than 0.85.

444 At the low flow velocity situations (see Fig. 10), an overestimation of the calculated flow

445 velocity in the spring tides is obtained while an underestimation of the calculated velocity in the
446 neap tides is achieved at DAS, FBN, and FBS stations. The difficulty in obtaining good
447 reproduction of flow velocity at these stations is due to the complex flow around the bifurcations,
448 which is highly variable, and probably also to the constant Manning coefficient in our simulations
449 that does not represent well all the head-loss processes occurring around bifurcations.

450 *5.4.3 Water discharge*

451 The predicted and observed water discharges in a long-term simulation period from 2009-02-20 to
452 2009-06-10 at Samarinda station are shown in Fig. 11. The model reproduces reasonably well the
453 observed water discharge in different neap-spring tidal cycles during the long-term simulation. The
454 RMS error for the water discharge is $530 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (about 11% of the average value of the measured
455 water discharge) while the value of MAE of water discharge is $420 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (Table 5). In addition, as
456 for the flow velocity, the r coefficient is 0.95 and the NSE coefficient is 0.86 for water discharge.
457 These results confirm again that the model successfully reproduces the flow in the Mahakam River.

458 The comparisons between computed and observed water discharges at four stations, namely
459 DAN, DAS, FBN, and FBS are shown in Fig. 12. The results show that the simulations generally
460 agree well with the observed water discharges measured in different spring and neap tides in the
461 period from 2008-12-26 to 2009-01-05. The RMS errors of water discharge at DAN and DAS
462 (Table 5) are 340 and $760 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$, respectively and are equal to about 8% and 12% of the observed
463 magnitude of water discharges at these stations. At FBN and FBS stations (Table 5), these errors are
464 17% ($410 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) and 13% ($720 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) of the measured water discharge. A value of 270 and $610 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
465 is obtained for the MAE at DAN and DAS, respectively, while the MAE respectively equals to 370
466 and $540 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ at FBN and FBS. The NSE coefficient at these stations is more or less 0.80 while the r
467 coefficient is about 0.85 (Table 5).

468 Water discharges vary significantly in the northern and southern channel sections, depending on
469 the tidal conditions. Due to wider channel sections in the southern channels, a larger amount of
470 water discharges into the southern channels (DAS and FBS) in comparison with the northern

471 channels (DAN and FBN). As shown in Fig. 12b and Fig. 12d for the channel sections in the
472 southern channels, the model predicts very well the observations at large discharges. At low
473 discharges (corresponding to high water situations), the model overestimates the water discharge
474 observations at the high water of spring tide on 2008-12-26 at DAS and on 2008-12-27 at FBS. The
475 computed water discharge underestimates the observations at the high water of neap tide on
476 2009-01-04 at DAS and on 2009-01-03 at FBS. These discrepancies may be due to the use of a
477 constant value of the Manning coefficient and the inability of the model to take into account **lateral**
478 **secondary circulation flows caused by local channel curvature**. A vertical wall is assumed at
479 impermeable coastlines. This assumption may result in inaccuracy of the wetted channel section
480 area corresponding to high waters in calculations and, hence, can be another reason for the
481 discrepancies in the water discharge.

482 **6 Discussion**

483 **6.1 Water division at bifurcations in the delta**

484 The delta presents many bifurcations (Fig. 1) that can affect the division of water discharge in the
485 downstream channels. Fig. 13 shows the variation in water discharge division over the downstream
486 channels of the delta apex (DAN and DAS) and first (FBN and FBS) bifurcations at different tidal
487 conditions, e.g. neap or spring tide. The model represents very well the observed division of water
488 discharge at both bifurcations, with an improvement compared to the numerical simulations
489 reported by Sassi *et al.* [27], in which (i) the water discharge division over the downstream channels
490 is only biased towards the northern channels, (ii) **the simulated water discharge division at delta**
491 **apex bifurcation during spring tide is too asymmetrical**, and (iii) **the simulations of the water**
492 **discharge division lead to values smaller than those measured *in situ***. This improvement may be due
493 **to the use, in the present study, of different values of the Manning coefficient in the upstream region**
494 **of the delta and in the delta itself**.

495 Fig. 14 shows the specific water discharge ($q = Q / b$) at different cross-sections in the northern
496 and southern channels downstream of the delta apex and first bifurcations in the delta (Fig. 4b).

497 Both computed results and observations show that the specific water discharge is directed towards
498 the northern channel at the delta apex bifurcation (Fig. 14a). This trend in specific water discharge
499 division may result from the differences in local flow, e.g. tidal motion in northern and southern
500 branch channels.

501 Results for the first bifurcation (FBN and FBS) are shown in Fig. 14b. For low discharges, a
502 similar trend as in Fig. 14a is observed, i.e. the specific water discharge is directed towards the
503 northern channel. However, for high discharges (corresponding to low tides), the specific water
504 discharge is generally directed towards the southern channel (FBS), presenting an opposite trend in
505 comparison with the delta apex bifurcation. There is a local depositional area (sand bar) in the
506 middle channel downstream of DAS (Fig. 4b) that extends over few kilometers before the first
507 bifurcation. Due to this sand bar, the water flow is divided into two parts, with the dominant water
508 directed towards the northern channel (FBN). This is the reason why the specific water discharge is
509 directed towards the northern branch at low discharges. At high flow discharges, an opposite trend
510 of specific water discharge is obtained. Indeed, the effects of the sand bar become negligible, as for
511 higher water levels the channel in the southern branch is much deeper and wider than the northern
512 branch.

513 **6.2 Effects of the lakes**

514 In order to investigate the influence of the three largest lakes, one simulation including these lakes
515 and one simulation excluding these lakes are performed for a low flow period from June to
516 November 2009. The optimal values of the Manning coefficient in Section 5 are used in both
517 simulations. The computational grid shown in Fig. 4 is also used, with the particular grid of the
518 three lakes being removed for the later simulation. Fig. 15 shows the computed water elevation
519 from these simulations at three stations, namely Pela Mahakam, Muara Karman, and Samarinda
520 (see Fig. 1). The discrepancy in the water elevation with and without including the lakes is about 35
521 cm (i.e. 28% of the water elevation magnitude that is obtained in the case without the lakes) at Pela
522 Mahakam, 25 cm (i.e. 18% of the water elevation magnitude) at Muara Karman, and 10 cm (i.e. 6%

523 of the water elevation magnitude) at Samarinda station, revealing that the influence of the lakes on
524 the water elevation in the Mahakam River decreases in the downstream direction as expected. At
525 Delta Apex, Delta North, and Delta South stations, this difference (not shown) is less than 5 cm.
526 **These results suggest that the effect of the lakes is not negligible and, hence, is worth investigating**
527 **in detail. This will be done in the next stage of the research.**

528 The computed water discharges at Pela Mahakam, Muara Karman, and Samarinda when
529 including and excluding the lakes into the computational domain are shown in Fig. 16. If the three
530 lakes are added in the computational domain, the **magnitude of** water discharge will be increased by
531 $340 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (i.e. 11% of the mean annual river discharge of the Mahakam River), $400 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (i.e. 13% of
532 the mean annual river discharge of the Mahakam River), and $500 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (i.e. 17% of the mean annual
533 river discharge of the Mahakam River) at the Pela Mahakam, Muara Karman, and Samarinda
534 station, respectively, for situations of water flowing in seaward direction. Conversely, when water
535 flows in the direction from the sea to the river corresponding to the negative water discharge in Fig.
536 16, a water discharge of about $800 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (i.e. 27% of the mean annual river discharge of the
537 Mahakam River) will flow in these three lakes, as shown in Fig. 16a. These results suggest that the
538 model is able to reproduce the interconnection between the lakes and the river.

539 **6.3 Effects of the computational grid**

540 To investigate the effects of grid resolution on the computed results, a simulation on a coarser grid
541 (denoted by mesh A) and a simulation on a finer grid (denoted by mesh C) are also performed. The
542 total numbers of triangular elements in the 2D sub-domain is 49,175 for mesh A and 80,222 for
543 mesh C and both meshes have 3,700 line segments in the 1D sub-domain. The procedure for
544 generating mesh A and mesh C is exactly the **same as** those using for creating the computational
545 grid shown in Fig. 4 (denoted by mesh B). The boundary conditions and the optimal values of the
546 Manning coefficient ($n = 0.0275 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ in the river and tributaries, $n = 0.0305 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ in the three
547 lakes, $n = 0.023 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ in the Makassar Strait, and $n = 0.023\text{-}0.0275 \text{ s/m}^{1/3}$ in the delta) presented in
548 the previous section are used in both additional simulations. The statistical evaluation of the

549 different type of errors when using mesh A and mesh C is summarized in Table 6 while, again,
550 these errors when using mesh B are listed in Table 2. It can be observed that slight differences are
551 observed when using different meshes, but the overall statistical evaluation of the different type of
552 errors at all five water elevation stations appears to be similar when using different meshes. This is
553 because the resolution of each computational grid is still defined by physical processes, i.e. the local
554 mesh size is defined to be proportional to the square root of the bathymetry and the refinement of
555 each grid also still depends on the distance to the delta apex and coastlines.

556 **6.4 Reasons for the discrepancies and future work**

557 A constant value of the bottom friction was assumed for the tributaries and along the Mahakam
558 River, in order to render the calibration as simple as possible. The use of such constant values may
559 not be suitable when considering the roughness coefficient of the tributaries and the river in reality.
560 In addition, the effects of secondary flows can be significant in the meandering channels of the delta
561 as well as in the Mahakam River itself [36]. These secondary flows are not taken into account in the
562 calculations, which could explain some of the differences between simulations and observations at
563 **some** stations. Moreover, the uncertainty in the determination of the water discharge at the upstream
564 boundaries of the tributaries in the model, caused by using a rainfall-runoff model, can be another
565 reason for the observed discrepancy. **Furthermore, the absence of baroclinic effects, which cannot**
566 **be taken into account in the present depth- and section-averaged model, may be an additional reason**
567 **for the discrepancy between observations and simulations.** Finally, regarding the comparisons
568 between computed and observed flow velocity as well as water discharges at four channel sections
569 located downstream of the delta apex and first bifurcations, the difference between them can be
570 explained by several factors, e.g. a bend upstream of bifurcations, the width-depth ratio of the
571 upstream channel, local bank irregularities, differences of roughness [37].

572 In each flow region such as Mahakam River and tributaries or lakes, variation of the Manning
573 coefficient corresponding to the change of the local water depth was not considered in this study.
574 Previous studies [38,39] suggested that the Manning coefficient can be changed with the variation

575 of the water depth. Regarding the Mahakam River, the water depth can vary considerably,
576 depending on the location. Further investigation of the Manning coefficient as a function of the
577 local water depth will be considered in the future modelling effort for exploring the spatial variation
578 of the Manning coefficient in each region of the studied system.

579 Previous study [12] on flooding in the middle Mahakam River catchment shows that bank
580 overtopping can occur during a flood situation in floodplain regions located around the Melintang
581 Lake. During flood periods, these regions are flooded and water flows through these regions to the
582 lake. In the connecting channels between the lakes and the Mahakam River, flow overtopping can
583 also happen in flood situations. Due to the effects of flow overtopping, the channel banks can be
584 eroded, resulting in an increase of the channel width. However, in the framework of the present
585 numerical model, the increase of channel width caused by flow overtopping has not been
586 considered yet and a vertical wall is assumed to be used in such situations, preventing the
587 inundation of the floodplain. Treatments of overtopping flow and simulations in a long-term period
588 of several years are foreseen in the future to further quantify the balance of water inputs to and
589 outputs from the lakes.

590 **7 Summary and conclusion**

591 The Mahakam river-lake-delta system presents a continuous riverine and marine environment
592 including various interconnected regions, i.e. a river and its tributaries, lakes, a delta, and the
593 adjacent coastal ocean, with complicated processes of the flow. In this study, the unstructured-mesh,
594 finite element model SLIM was applied to this river-lake-delta system, using a coupled 1D / 2D
595 version of the model, (i) to allow for reproducing the flow from the upstream to the open sea and (ii)
596 to have better understanding of the flow processes occurring at different temporal and spatial scales
597 in the system. The complex geometry, especially in the deltaic region, was represented in detail in
598 the computational domain in order to take into account several physical processes in the
599 calculations.

600 The appropriate values of the Manning coefficient in each part of the system, i.e. Mahakam

601 River and tributaries, lakes, delta, and Makassar Strait were calibrated. The model was then
602 validated to confirm the appropriate values of the Manning coefficient. A good agreement was
603 achieved between the computed results and observations for the water elevation at six stations, and
604 for the velocity and water discharge at the other five stations. The RMS error and MAE were only
605 about 10 cm at all water elevation stations while the maximum value of these errors for water
606 discharge was of the order of 12% of the observed values. The RMS error and MAE of velocity
607 were smaller than 20% of the observed velocity. The NSE coefficient was 0.95 at six water
608 elevation stations and its value was about 0.80 at the stations of velocity and water discharge. The
609 Pearson's correlation coefficient between computed results and field data was very close to unity at
610 all stations. The coupled 1D / 2D model of the unstructured-mesh, finite element model SLIM
611 successfully reproduced the observations of the flow in the Mahakam river-lake-delta system.

612 Using the computations, firstly, in terms of division of water at the bifurcations, the model
613 reproduced reasonably well the observations at the delta apex and at the first bifurcations in the
614 delta. Secondly, the effects of three lakes on the flow in the lower part of the Mahakam River were
615 also quantified, showing that these lakes contribute about 20% of the mean annual river discharge
616 of the Mahakam River in the considered low flow period. Thirdly, the region of the lakes, which is
617 located about 150 km upstream of the Mahakam Delta, was found as the limit of the tidal
618 propagation in the Mahakam river-lake-delta system. Finally, the grid resolution was preliminarily
619 explored, revealing that the overall evaluation of the errors at five water elevation stations appears
620 to be similar when using three different meshes, because the resolution of each mesh is still defined
621 by the same physical processes.

622 The results obtained in the present study are believed to be useful for studying transport
623 processes of various constituents (e.g. sediment, salinity) in the system as well as water renewal
624 timescales in the deltaic regions in the future. In addition, the coupled 1D / 2D model of the
625 unstructured-mesh, finite element model SLIM uses a computational grid that allows for an accurate
626 representation of complex topographies and an increase in spatial resolution in areas of interest,

627 which makes the model to be very suitable and computationally efficient for simulating the flow in
628 other river-lake-delta systems like the one associated with the Mahakam River. Fine mesh can be
629 used in the domain of interest instead of in the whole computational domain, and thus, this can
630 reduce the computational time due to a decrease of the number of elements. Moreover, different
631 spatial scales of the flow processes from the river to the coastal ocean and deep margin can be also
632 simulated.

633 **Acknowledgements**

634 This study was conducted under the auspices of the project “Taking up the challenges of multi-scale
635 marine modelling” which is funded by the Communauté Française de Belgique under contract ARC
636 10/15-028 (Actions de Recherche Concertées) with the aim of developing and using SLIM.
637 Computational resources have been provided by the high-performance computing facilities of the
638 Université catholique de Louvain (CISM/UCL) and the Consortium des Equipements de Calcul
639 Intensif en Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles (CECI) funded by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique
640 de Belgique (F.R.S.-FNRS). Eric Deleersnijder and Sandra Soares-Frazão are honorary research
641 associates with this institution.

References

1. Peters DL, Buttle JM (2010) The effects of flow regulation and climatic variability on obstructed drainage and reverse flow contribution in a Northern river–lake–Delta complex, Mackenzie basin headwaters River Research and Applications 26:1065-1089.
2. de Brye B, Schellen S, Sassi M, Vermeulen B, Karna T, Deleersnijder E, Hoitink T (2011) Preliminary results of a finite-element, multi-scale model of the Mahakam Delta (Indonesia). Ocean Dynamics 61:1107-1120.
3. de Brye B, de Brauwere A, Gourgue O, Kärnä T, Lambrechts J, Comblen R, Deleersnijder E (2010) A finite-element, multi-scale model of the Scheldt tributaries, river, estuary and ROFI. Coastal Engineering 57:850-863.
4. Wu W, Li Y (1992) One- and two-dimensional nesting mathematical model for river flow and

sedimentation; Karlsruhe, Germany. p 547-554.

5. Zhang SQ (1999) One-D and two-D combined model for estuary sedimentation. *International Journal of Sediment Research* 14(1):37-45.
6. Martini P, Carniello L, Avanzi C (2004) Two dimensional modelling of flood flows and suspended sediment transport: the case of Brenta river, Veneto (Italy). *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 4:165-181.
7. Cook A, Merwade V (2009) Effect of topographic data, geometric configuration and modeling approach on flood inundation mapping. *Journal of Hydrology* 377:131-142.
8. Pietrzak J, Deleersnijder E, Schröter J (2005) Special Issue: The second International workshop on unstructured mesh numerical modelling of coastal, shelf and ocean flows Delft, The Netherlands, September 23-25, 2003. *Ocean Modelling* 10(1-2):1-3.
9. Deleersnijder E, Legat V, Lermusiaux PFJ (2010) Multi-scale modeling of coastal, shelf and global ocean dynamic. *Ocean Dynamics* 60:1357-1359.
10. Lambrechts J, Hanert E, Deleersnijder E, Bernard P-E, Legat V, Remacle J-F, Wolanski E (2008b) A multi-scale model of the hydrodynamics of the whole Great Barrier Reef. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 79:143-151.
11. Allen GP, Chambers JLC (1998) Sedimentation in the modern and Miocene Mahakam delta; Jakarta. p 236.
12. Hidayat H, Hoekman DH, Vissers MAM, Hoitink AJF (2012) Flood occurrence mapping of the middle Mahakam lowland area using satellite radar. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 16:1805-1816.
13. Roberts HH, Sydow J (2003) Later quaternary stratigraphy and sedimentology of the offshore Mahakam delta, East Kalimantan (Indonesia). *Tropical Deltas of Southeast Asia: Sedimentology, Stratigraphy, and Petroleum Geology* 76:125-145.
14. Storms JEA, Hoogendoorn RM, Dam RAC, Hoitink AJF, Koonenberg SB (2005) Late-Holocene evolution of the Mahakam delta, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Sedimentary*

Geology 180:149-166.

15. Hall R, Cloke IR, Nur'aini S (2009) The North Makassar Straits: what lies beneath? *Petroleum Geoscience* 15:147-158.
16. Susanto RD, Ffield A, Gordon AL, Adi TR (2012) Variability of Indonesian throughflow within Makassar Strait, 2004-2009. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 117, C09013, doi:10.1029/2012JC008096.
17. Adcroft A, Marshall D (1998) How slippery are piecewise-constant coastlines in numerical ocean models? . *Tellus* 50A(1):95-108.
18. Edmonds DA, Slingerland RL (2010) Significant effect of sediment cohesive on delta morphology. *Nature Geoscience* 3:105-109.
19. Budhiman S, Salama SM, Vekerdy Z, Verhoef W (2012) Deriving optical properties of Mahakam Delta coastal waters, Indonesia using *in situ* measurements and ocean color model inversion. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 68:157-169.
20. Budiyanto F, Lestari (2013) Study of metal contaminant level in the Mahakam Delta: Sediment and dissolved metal perspectives. *Journal of Coastal Development* 16(2):147-157.
21. Salahuddin, Lambiase JJ (2013) Sediment dynamics and depositional systems of the Mahakam Delta, Indonesia: ongoing delta abandonment on a tide-dominated coast. *Journal of Sedimentary Research* 83:503-521.
22. Smagorinsky J (1963) General circulation experiments with the primitive equations. *Monthly Weather Review* 91:99-164.
23. Darby SE, Thorne CR (1996) Predicting stage-discharge curves in channels with bank vegetation. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 122(10):583-586.
24. Kärnä T, de Brye B, Gourgue O, Lambrechts J, Comblen R, Legat V, Deleersnijder E (2011) A fully implicit wetting-drying method for DG-FEM shallow water models, with an application to the Scheldt Estuary. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 200:509-524.

25. Comblen R, Lambrechts J, Remacle J-F, Legat V (2010) Practical evaluation of five partly discontinuous finite element pairs for the non-conservative shallow water equations. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* 63:701-724.
26. Sherwin S, Formaggia L, Peiro J (2003) Computational modelling of 1D blood flow with variable mechanical properties and its applications to the simulation of wave propagation in the human arterial system. *Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* 43:673-700.
27. Sassi M, Hoitink AJF, de Brye B, Vermeulen B, Deleersnijder E (2011) Tidal impact on the division of river discharge over distributary channels in the Mahakam Delta. *Ocean Dynamics* 61:2211-2228.
28. Lambrechts J, Comblen R, Legat V, Geuzaine C, Remacle J-F (2008a) Multiscale mesh generation on the sphere. *Ocean Dynamics* 58:461-473.
29. Geuzaine C, Remacle J-F (2009) GMSH: a finite element mesh generator with built-in pre-and post-processing facilities. *International Journal for Numerical Method in Engineering* 79(11):1309-1331.
30. Legrand S, Deleersnijder E, Hanert E, Legat V, Wolanski E (2006) High-resolution unstructured meshes for hydrodynamic models of the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 68:36-46.
31. Legrand S, Deleersnijder E, Delhez EJM, Legat V (2007) Unstructured anisotropic mesh generation for the Northwestern European continental shelf, the continental slope and the neighbouring ocean. *Continental Shelf Research* 27:1344-1356.
32. Mandang I, Yanagi T (2008) Tide and tidal current in the Mahakam Estuary, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Coastal Marine Science* 32(1):1-8.
33. Egbert GD, Bennet AF, Foreman MGG (1994) TOPEX/POSEIDON tides estimated using a global inverse model. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 99(C12):24821-24852.
34. Haidvogel DB, McWilliams JC, Gent PR (1991) Boundary current separation in a quasigeostrophic, eddy-resolving ocean circulation model. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*

22:882-902.

35. Legates DR, McCabe JGJ (1999) Evaluating the use of "goodness-of-fit" measures in hydrologic and hydroclimatic model validation. *Water Resources Research* 35(1):233-241.
36. Sassi M, Hoitink AJF, Vermeulen B, Hidayat H (2013) Sediment discharge division at two tidally influenced river bifurcations. *Water Resources Research* 49(4):2119-2134.
37. Kleinhans MG, Jagers HRA, Mosselman E, Sloff CJ (2008) Bifurcation dynamics and avulsion duration in meandering rivers by one-dimensional and three-dimensional models. *Water Resources Research* 44, W08454; doi:10.1029/2007WR005912.
38. Shih SF, Rahi GS (1982) Seasonal variation of Manning's roughness coefficient in a subtropical marsh. *Transaction of the ASAF* 25(1):116-119.
39. Bao W-M, Zhang Z-Q, Qu S-M (2009) Dynamic Correction of Roughness in the Hydrodynamic Model. *Journal of Hydrodynamics* 21(2):255-263.
40. Toro, E. (1997). *Riemann Solvers and Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics, a Practical Introduction*. Springer, Berlin.

Tables

Table 1 RMS error of water elevation at five measurement stations for the calibration phase

Simulation	Manning coefficient			RMS error of water elevation (cm)				
	lakes	river and tributaries	delta and Makassar Strait	JWL	Pela Mahakam	Delta North	Delta South	Delta Apex
a.01			0.019	28.1	20.5	8.4	7.6	14.6
a.02		0.0175	0.023	27.3	19.3	8.3	7.4	15.1
a.03			0.035	24.8	16.2	8.8	8.1	23.6
a.04			0.019	13.5	6.0	8.4	7.6	15.2
a.05	0.023	0.0275	0.023	13.2	5.7	8.3	7.4	13.9
a.06			0.035	12.6	5.3	8.8	8.1	21.5
a.07			0.019	14.1	8.5	8.4	7.6	16.2
a.08		0.0325	0.023	14.2	8.9	8.3	7.4	13.9
a.09			0.035	14.8	10.2	8.8	8.1	20.3
a.10			0.019	28.1	20.6	8.4	7.6	14.6
a.11		0.0175	0.023	27.2	19.4	8.3	7.4	15.1
a.12			0.035	24.7	16.3	8.8	8.1	23.6
a.13			0.019	13.5	6.0	8.4	7.6	15.2
a.14	0.0305	0.0275	0.023	13.2	5.7	8.3	7.4	12.8
a.15			0.035	13.7	5.9	9.2	8.3	21.4
a.16			0.019	14.1	8.5	8.4	7.6	16.2
a.17		0.0325	0.023	14.3	8.9	8.3	7.4	13.9
a.18			0.035	14.8	10.1	8.8	8.1	20.3
a.19			0.019	27.9	20.9	8.5	7.7	14.7
a.20		0.0175	0.023	27.1	19.7	8.3	7.4	15.2
a.21			0.035	24.6	16.4	8.8	8.1	23.6
a.22			0.019	13.5	6.1	8.4	7.6	15.2
a.23	0.045	0.0275	0.023	13.3	5.8	8.3	7.4	12.9
a.24			0.035	12.7	5.4	8.8	8.1	21.5
a.25			0.019	14.2	8.5	8.4	7.6	16.2
a.26		0.0325	0.023	14.4	8.8	8.3	7.4	13.9
a.27			0.035	15.0	10.1	8.8	8.1	20.3

Table 2 RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r at water elevation stations for the calibration phase

Station	Water elevation			
	RMS error (cm)	MAE (cm)	NSE	r
JWL	13.1	10.4	0.93	0.96
Pela Mahakam	5.6	4.6	0.96	0.98
Delta North	8.3	6.7	0.98	0.99
Delta South	7.4	6.0	0.98	0.99
Delta Apex	10.2	8.0	0.93	0.97

Table 3 RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r at water elevation stations for the validation phase

Station	Water elevation			
	RMS error (cm)	MAE (cm)	NSE	r
Pela Mahakam	3.9	3.3	0.97	0.98
Muara Karman	10	7.1	0.89	0.95
Delta North	10.9	8.8	0.96	0.98
Delta South	10.4	8.4	0.96	0.98
Delta Apex	11.7	9.3	0.92	0.96

Table 4 RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r at flow velocity stations for the validation phase

Station	Flow velocity			
	RMS error (m/s)	MAE (m/s)	NSE	r
Samarinda	0.087	0.069	0.89	0.95
DAN	0.053	0.042	0.88	0.94
DAS	0.081	0.063	0.79	0.85
FBN	0.104	0.095	0.76	0.90
FBS	0.090	0.065	0.77	0.88

Table 5 RMS error, MAE, NSE, and r at water discharge stations for the validation phase

Station	Water discharge			
	RMS error (m ³ /s)	MAE (m ³ /s)	NSE	r
Samarinda	530	420	0.86	0.95
DAN	340	270	0.85	0.92
DAS	760	610	0.71	0.83
FBN	410	370	0.75	0.87
FBS	720	540	0.79	0.89

Table 6 Statistical evaluation of the different type of errors at water elevation stations when using different meshes

Station	Mesh	Mesh A				Mesh C			
		RMS error	MAE	NSE	r	RMS error	MAE	NSE	r
JWL		13.2	10.7	0.93	0.97	12.7	10.5	0.93	0.97
Pela Mahakam		5.6	4.7	0.96	0.98	5.6	4.7	0.96	0.98
Delta North		8.2	6.7	0.98	0.99	8.0	6.6	0.98	0.99
Delta South		7.4	6.0	0.98	0.99	7.3	5.8	0.98	0.99
Delta Apex		10.3	8.3	0.93	0.97	9.8	8.0	0.93	0.97

Figures




Fig. 1 Map of the tropical Mahakam river-lake-delta system, Indonesia: *blue dots* indicate the water elevation stations while *red square* denotes the flow velocity and water discharge station.




Fig. 2: Schematic diagram of line segments and nodes at a confluence point, where the space coordinate x increases in the flow direction.




Fig. 3: Bathymetry in the Mahakam Delta.





Fig. 4 Computational grid of the Mahakam river-lake-delta system: (a) mesh of the whole computational domain, with 60,819 triangles and 3,700 line segments and (b) zoom on the delta and upstream part of the computational domain: *blue dash-lines* indicate the interfaces between the 1D and 2D grids, *black dots* denote upstream boundaries locations, and *red squares* represent the flow velocity and water discharge stations.




Fig. 5 Observed and computed water elevation at: (a) JWL and (b) Pela Mahakam stations (Fig. 1) during the calibration period.




Fig. 6 Observed and computed water elevation at: (a) Delta North, (b) Delta South, and (c) Delta Apex stations (Fig. 1) during the calibration period.




Fig. 7 Observed and computed water elevation at: (a) Pela Mahakam and (b) Muara Karman stations (Fig. 1) during the validation period.




Fig. 8 Observed and computed water elevation at: (a) Delta North, (b) Delta South, and (c) Delta Apex stations (Fig. 1) during the validation period.




Fig. 9 Observed data and computed results of flow velocity at Samarinda station, where positive velocity coincides with seaward direction.




Fig. 10 Computed and measured flow velocity at: (a) DAN, (b) DAS, (c) FBN, and (d) FBS stations (Fig. 4) during the validation period. In each panel, observations in the left site were performed in spring tides while observations in the right site were performed in neap tides.




Fig. 11 Observed data and computed results of water discharge at Samarinda station, where positive water discharge coincides with seaward direction.




Fig. 12 Computed and measured water discharges at: (a) DAN, (b) DAS, (c) FBN, and (d) FBS stations (Fig. 4) during the validation period. In each panel, observations in the left hand site were performed in spring tides while observations in the right hand site were performed in neap tides.




Fig. 13 Discharge difference between southern and northern channels obtained with the simulations and with observations. Each dot is calculated from the water discharge in the northern channel section (denoted by Q_{North}) and the water discharge in the southern channel section (denoted by Q_{South}). The quantity $(Q_{\text{South}} - Q_{\text{north}})$ in the vertical axis of the figure is calculated from the observation data while the one in the horizontal axis is computed from the numerical simulations.




Fig. 14 Specific water discharge in the northern and southern channels at: (a) delta apex and (b) first bifurcations in the delta.




Fig. 15 Water elevation at: (a) Pela Mahakam, (b) Muara Karman, and (c) Samarinda, in the cases with and without the lakes.




Fig. 16 Water discharge at: (a) Pela Mahakam, (b) Muara Karman, and (c) Samarinda, in the cases with and without the lakes. The positive water discharge coincides with the seaward direction.