

Review Paper

ANALYSIS OF HYDROLOGIC RESPONSE UNITS AND IMPACT OF FLOODING IN KUALA TERENGGANU SUB-BASINS RIVER CATCHMENT IN MALAYSIA

Abstract

One of the fundamental environmental disasters occurring in a wet tropical environment is flood influenced by the climatic factor of rainfall with high intensity. Flood is the most frequent catastrophe in Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia. The flood occurs during the monsoon season inundating riverbank and displacing the inhabitant rendering them homeless. The application of the Soil Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is employed to identify the Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs). The flood vulnerability simulation in the Terengganu sub-basins river catchment was done using the most affected sub-basins. In this study, the impacts of Five out of the 25 sub-basins have been affected by high flooding risk. The sub-basin with the highest impact of Hydrologic Response Unit is the sub-basin Three and the lowest is found in sub-basin Five.

Keywords: flood, climate, SWAT, Catchment, Sub-basins

1.1 Introduction

There is a need to address the issue of flooding in the sub-basin catchment area of Kuala Terengganu because of the high amount of rainfall received during the monsoon. Flood is high water flow naturally or artificially from the river bank that dominates the surrounding area to cause overflow. The high the flow of the water over the floodplain, the more it becomes a hazard to the surrounding environment [1]. The flood risk is one of the world's fundamental issues affecting areas around Peninsular Malaysia with a range of consequences such as economic, political, social, psychological, ecological and environmental impacts. There is substantial literature that provides evidence of existing damages caused by the flood.

Comment [IAC1]: rewrite

Comment [IAC2]: Please note that "Fundament" is incorrect: it means basis

Comment [IAC3]: Please re-revise abstract as previously suggested in v2

Comment [IAC4]: Please cite

Formatted: Highlight

33 the application of 3D simulation in this study has brought a new dimension of solving the
34 complex flood problems in Terengganu river catchment.

35
36 Through the application of remote sensing and geographic information system (GIS)
37 technologies areas vulnerable to flooding can be located, analyzed, mitigated or obtain
38 valuable information. This study involved the application of soil water assessment tool
39 (SWAT) to determine the fundamental Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs) as well as to
40 develop watershed delineation within the river catchment area of Kuala Terengganu. The
41 flood mitigation measures require analytical management of the watershed as affluent to
42 engineering approaches in controlling flood risk and hazard in the environment. The use of
43 3D to develop flood simulation is paramount especially for quick flood alert warning and
44 emergency relief to flood victims.

45
46 The attempt to employ modern techniques of software to determine better warning system,
47 decision making as well as mitigation are however incorporated based on hydrological model
48 and Geographic Information System which was considered as the new technology of solving
49 flood problems [2]. Terengganu is located on the east coast of Peninsula Malaysia which is
50 experiencing heavy rainfall during the Northeast monsoon occurs between October and March
51 that has resulted in a flood in most of Malaysia. But most of the coastal areas along the
52 Eastern location including Terengganu were affected by coastal flooding [3] Another flood
53 event that concurrently happened in Malaysia, were in Johor, Pahang, Melaka and Negara
54 Sembilan. It is essential to identify land cover changes and their classification over time for
55 easy comparison [4]. For instance, the forest land cover changes in Peninsula Malaysia.
56 Previous studies showed and indicated a promising result using SWAT as a hydrologic model
57 [5], [6], [7], [8], [2]. SWAT was used to simulate soil moisture in the large River basin in
58 Taxes by [9]. SWAT was also used by [10] to model soil erosion and the impact of sediment
59 reduction. In India SWAT was used to simulate daily rainfall from 1951 to 2014 [11]. [12]
60 described a simulation stream flow impact with SWAT in response to historical land use at
61 San Pedro watershed in South Arizona.

62
63 Flood is frequently occurring in the catchment area of Terengganu. There is an issue of flash
64 flood during the monsoon period around November to January most of the year. The flood

Comment [IAC6]: EWS?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

65 along the river banks are mostly influenced by the high among of the rainfall while over
 66 2500mm to 3500mm per annum. This has a lot of impacts on environmental resources such as
 67 the land use/land cover, local soil types and the slope. The impact of land cover, soil and the
 68 slopes are the primary concern in visualizing the effects of flood risk within the watershed of
 69 Terengganu. The land cover detection and changes have influenced the water flow, the
 70 sediment yield as well as the concentration of predominant vegetation. The local soils have
 71 played an important role in water retention and flow. The slope determines the degree and
 72 gradient of the water movement, the particle sizes and erosion [13].

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [IAC7]: cite

73 Table 1: Malaysian History of Flood Events

Flood Events	Risk Encountered	Year of Occurrence	Number of Human Casualties/ Death
Flood hazard is known as "the storm forest flood."	Land cover destruction, properties, and crops	1926	NA
Flood hazard as a result of Tropical Storm Greg in Keningua (Sabah State)	About 300 million RM	1996	241
Flood hazard caused by excess rainfall in Kelantan and Terengganu	Million of RM	2000	15
Tsunami in Asia	Millions of RM	2004	68
Flood in Johor State	489 million RM	Dec2006/Jan 2007	18
Flood Hazard in the state of Johor	21.19 Million RM	2008	29
Flood Hazard in Kedah and Perlis	8.48 Million RM	2010	4
La Nina that brought a flood	NA	2011 & 2012	NA

74 Source: [14]

75
 76 In Table 1, the major catastrophe in Malaysia is flooding. the flood claimed not only human
 77 lives but also animals and farmlands. The resultant effect is a loss of millions of Dollars to
 78 recover from such a disaster.

79

However, there is a limited study of combining SWAT and 3D to obtain flood impacts assessment in the watershed. Most of the researches conducted by SWAT discuss more of sediment yield and deposits, soil erosion, nutrients loss, stream flow, rainfall intensity and groundwater movement and not on impact assessment of flood in Terengganu.

For this purpose, this study will focus on how both SWAT and GIS analysis on assessment are combined to obtain the 3D of flood assessment zones in Terengganu River catchment area. The recent application of geographic information system (GIS) and remote sensing helps in monitoring flood activities. The issue is how to overcome causalities if flooding occurs at a particular point in time and the main objectives include; to Used 3D in visualizing flooded zones, list HRUs affected by flood risk zones and find the impacts of the flood in the catchment.

Calculation of flood hazard according to [15] is based on the following formula below;

Flood Hazard Rating (HR) = DX (V + 0.5) Where

V = velocity (m/s)

D = Depth (m)

DF = debris factor can (0, 0.5, 1 depending on probability that debris will lead to a significant greater hazard)

Flood risk can be evaluated using the criterion of weight index which also is adapted base on the flood risk assessment model.

$$\begin{aligned} Risk_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n W_i l_i(x, y) \\ &= w_1 l_1(x, y) + w_2 l_2(x, y) + w_3 l_3(x, y) + w_4 l_4(x, y) + w_5 l_5(x, y) \\ &\quad + w_6 l_6(x, y) + w_7 l_7(x, y) + w_8 l_8(x, y) + w_9 l_9(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

Where w_i can be the weight $l_i(x, y)$ as criterion index, x, y as the geographical coordinate and the other sequences can be the remaining variables such as the slope, elevation, density, flow depending on the site selection and the input data of the study area.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Area

The study focuses on the flood risk hazard in one of the flood-prone regions in the Eastern part of Peninsula Malaysia called Kuala Terengganu River Catchment. The Terengganu catchment has a total area of the Terengganu River catchment area is 286,507 [ha] or 707,973 [acres]. There are about 25 sub-basin parameters and 305 Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs) the catchment lies within the wet tropical equatorial climate that exhibits vital roles in manipulating weather that generate monsoon from the North-East, soil, organic matter and sediment yield are all drained into the South China Sea. It is located at upper left corner $5^{\circ}30'40''\text{N}$, $102^{\circ}23'15''\text{E}$ and the lower right corner is $4^{\circ}39'25''\text{N}$, $103^{\circ}11'62''\text{E}$.

Comment [IAC8]: cite




Figure 1: Map of the Study Area, showing

Kuala Terengganu River Catchment

128

129 2.2. Study Flow


- 130 1. The Digital Elevation Model DEM was set up and loaded from the stored location in C
- 131 drive from the computer
- 132 2. The DEM coordinate was transformed and setup
- 133 3. The Masked of River Terengganu was superimposed and loaded from the C drive
- 134 4. The Burn-In was also defined and loaded
- 135 5. The River Flow direction and accumulation were calculated based on the DEM
- 136 6. The result of the stream definition was obtained of the total area in hectares and the
- 137 calculated raster cells of the catchment.
- 138 7. Stream network and outlets were created
- 139 8. The whole watershed outlets from the Terengganu River mouth was formed
- 140 9. All the watershed in the River Terengganu Catchment has been delineated
- 141 10. The Sub-basins parameters within the catchment area under study were also calculated

142

143

144 3. Result and Discussion

145 Delineation of the watershed was done using ArcSWAT 2012, the result is showing the
146 boundary of the watershed of the Terengganu River, refer to figure 2.



147

Figure 2: the Delineated Terengganu watershed

3.3 Stream network

The streams network in figure 3 is interconnected to each of the sub-basin, meaning that the river flows through the channels and drain toward the opening to the river mouth and empty into the sea. Most of the river banks are flooded during the high flow of monsoon season from November to January each year. The more the rainfall intensity the more the river flows and that cause flooding in Terengganu.




Figure 3: The monitoring point and the Stream network of Terengganu watershed

The Digital Elevation Model obtained from satellite ASTER-DEM clearly show from SWAT analysis, the stream links and the stream outflow toward the South China Sea close to the Terengganu River mouth as shown in figure 4.




Figure 4: The satellite image DEM and the main rivers of Terengganu watershed

3.4 Flood Risk Model of Terengganu River Catchment Area

The flood risk model was shown in figure 5. The yardstick is to measure the magnitude of the flood risk in the catchment area of River Terengganu. The model categorizes the flood risk from the highest risk to moderate and to no risk zones within the watershed. The flood risk map represents the risk zones which can be used for mitigation, planning, and a warning to the public. From the model in the figure 5, people occupying residence near the river banks are at very high flood risk in Terengganu, followed by those on the flatlands from 1 to 2m which are on very high flood risk. The slopes to the lower course of the Terengganu River entered into the South China Sea through the significant outlet.




Figure 5: High and Low Flood Risk model of Terengganu River Catchment Area

Figure 5, is the model produce using 3D simulation and this has identified the major flood risk zones within the catchment area. The very high-risk area is cropped for detail analysis of the impact of HRU within the sub-basins.

3.5 Sub-basins Parameter

There are about 25 different sub-basins in the study area created by the SWAT. Each of the sub-basins was characterized by a distinct parameter for easy classification and hydrologic analyses. The figure 6, shows the classified sub-basins in Kuala Terengganu catchment. From this analysis, 5 major sub-basins are found to fall within the very high flood risk zone. These are sub-basin number 3, 5, 7, 8 and 18 with associated HRU from each one of the sub-basin.




Figure 6: The total sub-basins found in the Terengganu watershed

The impact of individual HRU was done using the appropriate index to calculate the magnitude of the flood in each of the sub-basin.

3.6 The result of the Individual Impacts of Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs)

The hydrologic response units (HRUs) results in consist of the land use, soil types, and the catchment slope. They are characterized by unique performance and distributions of the individual report within the catchment area. In this study, 5 different sub-basins with their Hrus are categorized have a very high flood risk. the details of each Sub-basin are discussed in figure 8, 9,10,11 and 12.




Figure 7: showing the affected sub-basin and its HRUs

Comment [IAC9]: full labl needed for all




Figure 8: the impact of HRU in Sub-basin Three

209 the impact of Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs) in sub-basin three is 9 with each having a
 210 unique combination of land use, soil type and slope. The detail contribution of flooding
 211 impacts is listed in Table 2. The sub-basin three has the largest impact of HRUs with about
 212 36,323 of the total catchment.
 213




Figure 9: the Impact of HRU in Sub-basin 5

214
 215
 216
 217 | The sub-basin Five in Figure 9, consists of 8 different Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs).
 218 Its the last sub-basin with the major stream outlet that drained into the South China Sea
 219 through the Kuala Terengganu River mouth. The total flood impact in this sub-basin is 2,394.




Figure 10: the impact of HRU in Sub-basin 7

The sub-basin 7 contained 14 HRUs . its total flood impact on HRUs is 34,582 as shown in Figure 10.




Figure 11: the impact of HRU in Sub-basin 8

The sub-basin 8 of the Terengganu river catchment has 8 HRUs and the total flood risk impact is 19,780, as shown in Figure 11.




Figure 12: the impact of HRU in Sub-basin 18

The last sub-basin 18 ~~is having~~ has about 3 HRUs with least effect within the Terengganu catchment. It also has the total impact of flood risk of about 14,350. The summaries of all flooding impacts in the Kuala Terengganu river catchment are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The Summary of Impacts of HRUs in selected Sub-basin in Terengganu River Catchment Area

No. Sub-basins involved in Flood	No. HRUs	Total flood Impacts
3	9	36,323
5	8	2,394
7	14	34,582
8	8	19,780
18	3	14,350
Total	42	107,429

246

247 **Conclusion**

248 The new method of identifying flood risk zones is applicable to all watersheds using the Soil
249 Water Assessment Tool (SWAT). Among the 5 sub-basins that are vulnerable to high flood
250 risk in Terengganu River catchment area, the most affected HRUs with high flood risk
251 impacts are found in sub-basin 3 with 36,323 ha, followed by sub-basin 7 with 34,582 ha then
252 sub-basin 8 with 19,750 ha, followed by the sub-basin 18 with 14,350 ha and the lowest
253 impact are found in sub-basin 5 with 2,394 ha.

254 However, out of the total area of Terengganu River catchment area of (286, 507 ha) from the
255 SWAT output refer to Table, (107, 429 ha) of the area are expected to have affected by the
256 flood risk impacts. The remaining 179, 078 ha of the Terengganu River catchment area is
257 located at flood free zones.

258

259 The flood risk simulations overlaid with the major HRUs that are vulnerable to flood are
260 presented in figure 5. Out of 305 HRUs, about 42 HRUs falls within the range of 0-10 meter
261 of slope and are located at very high flood risk zones in Terengganu River catchment area.

262

263

264

265

266

267

268 **References**

269 [1] G.-F. Lin, Y.-C. Chou, and M.-C. Wu, "Typhoon flood forecasting using integrated
270 two-stage support vector machine approach," *J. Hydrol.*, vol. 486, pp. 334–342, 2013.

271 [2] T. J. Baker and S. N. Miller, "Using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to
272 assess land use impact on water resources in an East African watershed," *J. Hydrol.*,
273 vol. 486, pp. 100–111, 2013.

274 [3] G. Muhammad-Barzani, B. S. Ismail, and S. Rahim, "Hydrology and Water Quality
275 Assessment of the Tasik Chilli's Feeder Rivers, Pahang, Malaysia," 2007.

276 [4] P. Coppin, I. Jonckheere, K. Nackaerts, B. Muys, and E. Lambin, "Review

- 277 Article Digital change detection methods in ecosystem monitoring: a review,” *Int. J.*
278 *Remote Sens.*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 1565–1596, 2004.
- 279 [5] L. Galván *et al.*, “Application of the SWAT model to an AMD-affected river (Meca
280 River, SW Spain). Estimation of transported pollutant load,” *J. Hydrol.*, vol. 377, no. 3,
281 pp. 445–454, 2009.
- 282 [6] G. Onuşluel Gül and D. Rosbjerg, “Modelling of hydrologic processes and potential
283 response to climate change through the use of a multisite SWAT,” *Water Environ. J.*,
284 vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 21–31, 2010.
- 285 [7] A. Stehr, P. Debels, F. Romero, and H. Alcayaga, “Hydrological modeling with SWAT
286 under conditions of limited data availability: evaluation of results from a Chilean case
287 study,” *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 588–601, 2008.
- 288 [8] S. G. Thampi, K. Y. Raneesh, and T. V Surya, “Influence of scale on SWAT model
289 calibration for streamflow in a river basin in the humid tropics,” *Water Resour.*
290 *Manag.*, vol. 24, no. 15, pp. 4567–4578, 2010.
- 291 [9] B. Narasimhan, R. Srinivasan, J. G. Arnold, and M. Di Luzio, “Estimation of long-term
292 soil moisture using a distributed parameter hydrologic model and verification using
293 remotely sensed data,” *Trans. ASAE*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 1101–1113, 2005.
- 294 [10] G. D. Betrie, Y. A. Mohamed, A. van Griensven, and R. Srinivasan, “Sediment
295 management modeling in the Blue Nile Basin using the SWAT model,” *Hydrol. Earth*
296 *Syst. Sci.*, vol. 15, no. 3, p. 807, 2011.
- 297 [11] A. Singh, M. Imtiyaz, R. K. Isaac, and D. M. Denis, “Assessing the performance and
298 uncertainty analysis of the SWAT and RBNN models for simulation of sediment yield
299 in the Nagwa watershed, India,” *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 351–364, 2014.
- 300 [12] L. B. Leopold, M. G. Wolman, and J. P. Miller, *Fluvial processes in geomorphology*.
301 Courier Corporation, 2012.
- 302 [13] M. Marghany, Z. Ibrahim, and J. Van Genderen, “Azimuth cut-off model for
303 significant wave height investigation along coastal water of Kuala Terengganu,
304 Malaysia,” *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 147–160, 2002.

- 305 [14] N. W. Chan, "Managing urban rivers and water quality in Malaysia for sustainable
306 water resources," *Int. J. Water Resour. Dev.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 343–354, 2012.
- 307 [15] S. Wade, D. Ramsbottom, P. Floyd, E. Penning-Roswell, and S. Surendran, "Risks to
308 people: developing new approaches for flood hazard and vulnerability mapping," 2005.
- 309

UNDER PEER REVIEW