

1 **Hydrological dynamics of water sources in a Mediterranean** 2 **lagoon**

3

4 **C. Stumpp¹, A. Ekdal², I.E. Gönenc³, and P. Maloszewski¹**

5 [1]{Helmholtz Zentrum München, German Research Center for Environmental Health,
6 Institute of Groundwater Ecology, Neuherberg, Germany}

7 [2]{Istanbul Technical University, Environmental Engineering Department, Maslak, Istanbul,
8 Turkey}

9 [3]{IGEM Research & Consulting Co., Istanbul, Turkey}

10 Correspondence to: C. Stumpp (christine.stumpp@helmholtz-muenchen.de)

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Lagoons are important ecosystems occupying large coastal areas worldwide. Lagoons contain
14 various mixtures of marine and freshwater sources which are highly dynamic in time.
15 However, it often remains a challenge to identify and quantify dynamic changes of water
16 sources, particularly in heterogeneous lagoon systems like the Köycegiz-Dalyan Lagoon
17 (KDL), which is located at the southwest of Turkey on the Mediterranean Sea coast. The
18 objective of this study was to quantify different contributions of potential water sources i.e.
19 surface water, groundwater and seawater in the lagoon and how these water sources changed
20 over time and space. In the wet and dry season stable isotopes of water, chloride
21 concentration (Cl^-) and salinity were measured in two depths in the lagoon and surrounding
22 water bodies (sea, lake, groundwater). Different components of water sources were quantified
23 with a three component endmember mixing analysis. Differences in Cl^- and stable isotopes
24 over time indicated the dynamic behaviour of the system. Generally, none of the groundwater
25 samples was impacted by water of the Mediterranean Sea. During the wet season, most of the
26 lagoon water (>95%) was influenced by freshwater and vertically well mixed. During the dry
27 season, high Cl^- in the deeper sampling locations indicated a high contribution of marine
28 water throughout the entire lagoon system due to salt water intrusion. However, a distinct

1 layering in the lagoon was obvious from low Cl^- and depleted isotope contents close to the
2 surface supporting freshwater inflow into the system even during the dry season. Besides
3 temporal dynamics also spatial heterogeneities were identified. Changes in water sources
4 were most evident in the main lagoon channel compared to more isolate lagoon lakes, which
5 were influenced by marine water even in the wet season, and compared to side branches
6 indicating slower turnover times. We found that environmental tracers helped to quantify
7 highly dynamic and heterogeneous contributions of different water sources in the Köycegiz-
8 Dalyan Lagoon.

9

10 **1 Introduction**

11 Lagoons are important ecosystems occupying 13% of the coastal areas worldwide (Barnes,
12 1980). Along the Mediterranean coastline, more than 100 lagoons are found but only little
13 hydrological and biological data of most of these ecosystems are available (Perez-Ruzafa et
14 al., 2011a). Generally, lagoons are shallow, coastal water bodies with marine water influence.
15 Mostly they have limited connectivity to the open sea through coastal barriers or connecting
16 inlets. Further freshwater input can come from upstream rivers or groundwater. Lagoons are
17 important ecosystems being a habitat for rare species like seagrass, fishes and turtles, and with
18 a high productivity and diversity (Alongi, 1998;Pérez-Ruzafa et al., 2011b;Remane and
19 Schlieper, 1971). Lagoons not only are valued for fauna and flora, but also due to recreational
20 and industrial purposes by society. These societal values are, however, difficult to quantify
21 (Anthony et al., 2009) also due to conflicts of interest in lagoon ecosystems (fishery,
22 aquaculture, tourism) (Perez-Ruzafa et al., 2011a). Particularly in the context of global change
23 lagoon ecosystems require a proper management for a sustainable use and to protect the
24 ecosystem (Kløve et al., 2014;Anthony et al., 2009). Here, management must not impact the
25 quality and quantity of the lagoon water in terms of chemical and ecological status on the one
26 hand. On the other hand, also groundwater management (drinking water/irrigation) must not
27 impact lagoons depending on groundwater and vice versa. For example, pumping of
28 groundwater can influence the quality of the withdrawn drinking/irrigation water due to
29 increased marine water influence or due to the mobilization of groundwater from deeper
30 layers. In addition, groundwater withdrawal can change the fraction of freshwater source in
31 the lagoon water body which strongly would influence its functions as a habitat for species
32 specifically adapted to the environment. This example highlights the vulnerability of lagoon

1 systems. It shows the strong need to protect and manage these ecosystems and to identify
2 seawater intrusions and groundwater dependencies in the lagoon catchment area.

3 Here, a detailed knowledge about the water sources and water dynamics in lagoon ecosystems
4 is fundamental before studying further ecological and chemical processes. It has been shown
5 that lagoon systems are heterogeneous and dynamic systems. The quality of the water and
6 subsequent seawater quality or adjacent groundwater quality strongly depends on the water
7 flow and origin of water and nutrients (Gattacceca et al., 2009;Niencheski et al., 2007;Santos
8 et al., 2008a;Santos et al., 2008b). Land use can impact the interaction of lagoon with
9 surrounding groundwater resulting in lagoon infiltration processes under pine tree plantations
10 compared to negligible interactions under natural dune vegetation (Schmidt et al., 2011). Such
11 spatial impacts can be identified using environment tracer methods. Further, they can also be
12 used to study temporal dynamics of water sources and hydrological processes like seasonal
13 changes in evaporation and seawater contribution (Lecuyer et al., 2012;Schmidt et al., 2011).
14 Salinity and stable isotopes of water were used to identify spatiotemporal changes of water in
15 the Akyatan lagoon, Turkey (Lecuyer et al., 2012). Assuming two different end members,
16 river and seawater, it was found that in the wet season the contribution of freshwater and
17 seawater was 62% and 38% on average. Throughout spring to autumn, progressively
18 evaporation of lagoon water results in hypersaline conditions with strongly enriched isotope
19 values suggesting limited input of freshwater in the system (Lecuyer et al., 2012). Still, it
20 remains unknown in many lagoon systems what the contribution of different water sources is
21 and how they change not only over time i.e. wet and dry seasons but also over space i.e. both
22 horizontal, spatial locations in the lagoon and vertical, depth locations in the lagoon; the latter
23 is of particular interest in wetland type lagoon systems or lagoons with stratification expecting
24 a not well mixed hydrological systems. Therefore, the objective of the current study was (i) to
25 identify and quantify different water sources in a lagoon, (ii) how they change over time and
26 space, and (iii) thus how heterogeneous and dynamic the hydrology of the lagoon and
27 adjacent groundwater was. We achieved these objectives by applying environmental tracer
28 methods and developing a three component endmember mixing approach. Different sources
29 of water (seawater, groundwater, lake water) were identified at different locations in the
30 lagoon, including top and bottom water column depths, for wet and dry season. Thus, the
31 novelty of this study is to present an environmental tracer method identifying and quantifying
32 both temporal dynamics (wet and dry season) and spatial heterogeneities (depth of the water
33 column and distance to coastline) of water sources in a wetland type lagoon system. With

1 improved, detailed understanding of heterogeneous and dynamic hydrological processes in
2 groundwater influenced lagoon ecosystems, targeted strategies to better manage may be
3 developed.

4 **2 Material and methods**

5 **2.1 Study area**

6 Köycegiz-Dalyan Coastal Lagoon is located at the southwest of Turkey on the Mediterranean
7 Sea coast within the province of Mugla (Figure 1a). The geology in this region is mainly
8 composed of allochthonous and autochthonous Flysch and karstic facies overlain by plio-
9 quaternary sediments (Garciansky 1968). Due to tectonic activities, several faults were
10 formed in this area. Details about the geology and more maps can be found in Bayari et al.
11 (1995).

12 The total area of the watershed of Köycegiz Lake is approximately 830 km² and of the lagoon
13 is 130 km². The upstream located Köycegiz Lake (2 m asl.) is directly connected through
14 surface water with the lagoon and further to the Mediterranean Sea by the lagoon and its
15 various branches (Figure 1b). The discharge from the Köycegiz Lake is 33 m³/s on average
16 with up to 110 m³/s during winter times (Bayari et al. 2001). During winter, most of the
17 branches in the wetland areas in the lagoon are connected. In summer, Köycegiz Lake water
18 level decreases (-0.9 m) reducing the hydraulic gradient to the Mediterranean Sea
19 considerably. The depth of the main Dalyan channel decreases from 5 m upstream near the
20 lake to about 1 m downstream near the Sea. In addition to the Dalyan Channel and its
21 branches, the lagoon also includes the lakes Alagöl and Sülüngür. Maximum depths of these
22 lakes are 4 m and 13 m, respectively. Aquaculture activities are conducted in Sülüngür Lake.
23 Both, Köycegiz Lake and the Köycegiz-Dalyan Coastal Lagoon are part of the area declared
24 as a Special Protection Area in 1988, as it is a unique and important ecosystem with a high
25 diversity of species. It hosts one of the rare breeding and nesting sites for endangered sea
26 turtles, *caretta caretta*, and possesses the ruins of Ancient City of Caunos and 4th century BC
27 Lycian rock tombs that are found near the seaside by the river (Gurel et al. 2005).
28 Groundwater is used as irrigation and drinking water in the area. We expect that the
29 groundwater is mainly recharged locally from the surrounding forested mountains (up to 565
30 m asl.; Figure 1) of the karstic areas. The main sectors driving the economy in the watershed

1 are agriculture, tourism and forestry. Aquaculture and capture fishing are among the
2 important beneficial uses of the lagoon together with recreational activities.

3 The area is under the influence of typical Mediterranean climate characteristics, with a hot,
4 dry summer season and a warm, rainy winter season with mean annual air temperatures of
5 18.3°C and mean annual precipitation of 1083 mm. These data were taken in the study area
6 from the State Meteorology Services of Turkish Republic for Köycegiz Meteorology Station
7 covering the period 1976-2010, and monthly averages are presented in Figure 2. Thus,
8 precipitation usually occurs during the cold winter period and drought condition prevails
9 during the hot summer period.

10 An environmental isotopic and hydrochemical study was conducted by Bayari et al. (1995)
11 for determination of the dynamics of the upstream Köycegiz Lake. Köycegiz and Sultaniye
12 are the two major basins that comprise Köycegiz Lake. According to their statements the
13 important sources that feed the lake are mainly alluvial groundwater, streamwater (Namnam
14 and Yuvarlakçay), and rain. The main components of outflow from the lake are discharge to
15 Mediterranean Sea through the Dalyan Channel and evaporation from the lake surface. Their
16 environmental isotopic data and chemical data indicate that rainfall and stream flow are low
17 density waters and thermal groundwater is the high density water; complete annual mixing
18 cannot be observed due to the density effects. The main geothermal inflow at the southern
19 lake coast (Sultaniye Basin) is the Sultaniye spring. It is located at a depth of 8-10 m and
20 about 4 km north-west of the lake exit into the Dalyan channel which is shallow (0-6 m)
21 (Bayari et al., 2001); too shallow for receiving any geothermal influenced water from the
22 Sultaniye Basin.

23 **2.2 Conceptual Model**

24 Identifying different water sources in the lagoon we set up a conceptual model distinguishing
25 between dry (Figure 3a) and wet season (Figure 3b). For the dry season our hypothesis was
26 that evaporation results in low water tables in the lagoon favouring both fluxes from Köycegiz
27 Lake and the Sea into the lagoon. However, higher water levels maintain in the main Dalyan
28 channel with freshwater flow from Köycegiz Lake to the Sea. Thus, we expected a density
29 driven layering in the lagoon with (i) freshwater input from the lake in the top layer which is
30 influenced by evaporation and (ii) saltwater input in the bottom layer mixed with groundwater
31 (Figure 3a). We further expected that the seawater influence decreases with distance to the

1 coastline. For the wet season our hypothesis was that freshwater input, mainly from
2 groundwater and lake during baseflow conditions and additionally from precipitation during
3 events, results in high water tables in the lagoon favouring freshwater flow from the lake
4 through the lagoon into the Sea. We expected the lagoon water to be well mixed without
5 distinct density driven layering (Figure 3b). For both season, we excluded any direct influence
6 of the geothermal Sultaniye spring to the lagoon, because the spring's influence was found
7 only for the bottom layers of the Köycegiz Lake (Bayari et al. 1995) not outflowing into the
8 shallow Dalyan channel and the lagoon but discharging northwards. Still, other unknown
9 geothermal springs in the lagoon cannot be excluded.

10 **2.3 Sampling campaigns**

11 To quantify the different contributions of potential water sources like surface water,
12 groundwater and seawater in the lagoon and how these water sources change over time and
13 space, two sampling campaigns were conducted one representing the dry season (July 2011)
14 and the other one representing the wet season (March 2012). Sampling in both seasons was
15 without major antecedent rain events. Consequently, precipitation as major source in the
16 lagoon can be neglected. Particularly in the wet season, water residence times in the lagoon
17 are short due to high outflow rates from the lake (up to 110 m³/s; Bayari et al. 2001) and
18 which is also supported by modeling results of Ekdal (2008) indicating residence times <2
19 days for the wet season in the main lagoon channel.

20 Water samples were taken in the lagoon along the main channel (L1, L2, L3, L22, L4, L7,
21 L33, L10, L29, L9, L8), surrounding lakes (L5, L13, L14) and their inflow/outflow
22 connections to the lagoon system (L6, L11, L12, L15) as well as in the Köycegiz Lake and
23 Mediterranean Sea in two depths at the top (T), just below the surface, and at the very bottom
24 (B). The samples were taken by boat used for transportation from Dalyan town to Iztuzu
25 Beach, except for Sülüngür Lake. Since aquaculture activities are conducted in this lake boat
26 of the fishing cooperative was used for sampling. Further samples were taken from
27 surrounding groundwater wells. Groundwater samples were taken with the pump of the well,
28 which is used for abstracting water. In total, samples were taken at 18 lagoon, 11
29 groundwater, 1 sea and 1 lake locations (Figure 1b) which were further analysed for chemical
30 analysis.

1 2.4 Water isotopes and chemical analysis

2 Water samples were analysed for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ (± 0.15 ‰) and $\delta^2\text{H}$ (± 1 ‰) contents without any pre-
3 treatment of the samples using a water isotope analyser (L2120-i, Picarro Inc., Santa Clara,
4 CA, USA). The contents are given in the delta notation as δ -value (‰), which is the relative
5 deviation of the sample from the V-SMOW (Vienna-Standard Mean Ocean Water). The
6 results of the stable water isotope analysis from the observation area were compared to public
7 available isotope contents in precipitation accessible through the IAEA (International Atomic
8 Energy Agency) web database WISER ([http://www-
9 naweb.iaea.org/napc/ih/IHS_resources](http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/ih/IHS_resources) isohis.html; 2014). Here, Antalya is the closest
10 location of the Global Network of Isotopes in Precipitation (GNIP) having long-term isotope
11 records in precipitation, which is 200 km east of the studied lagoon and 49 m asl. Based on
12 these data, the Local Meteoric Water Line (LMWL; $\delta^2\text{H} = 8 \delta^{18}\text{O} + 14.3$) and the annual
13 weighed average isotope contents in precipitation ($\delta^{18}\text{O}=-4.9$ ‰; $\delta^2\text{H}=-24.9$ ‰) were
14 calculated; monthly long-term weighed averages are shown in Figure 2.

15 Chloride concentrations (± 0.22 mg/L) were measured by using Merck test kits (catalog
16 number 1.14897.0001). NaCl stock solution, which has 1 mg Cl⁻ in 1 mL, was used in order to
17 prepare standard solutions for controlling the reliability of chloride measurements carried out
18 with Merck test kits. Salinity measurements (± 0.1 mg/L) were conducted *in-situ* with YSI
19 6600V2 Multiparameter Water Quality Sonde.

20 2.5 Endmember mixing analysis

21 Calculating different water fractions in the lagoon system (top and bottom), three
22 endmembers were defined that differed in isotopic composition and chloride
23 concentrations/salinity: (i) Köycegiz Lake water, (ii) groundwater, and (iii) Mediterranean
24 Seawater. The concentrations (C) of the endmembers were defined for both seasons
25 separately. For lake (C_{LW}) and seawater (C_{SW}), the surface near water samples were taken and
26 for groundwater an average concentration (C_{GW}) was calculated from all groundwater wells
27 without considering GW011 due to increased chloride concentrations compared to other
28 groundwater locations. Thus, the isotope contents (^{18}O) and chloride concentrations (Cl⁻) or
29 salinity (S) in the lagoon (C_{Lag}) were calculated from the three component mixing analysis:

$$30 \quad C_{Lag^{18O}} = f_{GW} \cdot C_{GW^{18O}} + f_{LW} \cdot C_{LW^{18O}} + f_{SW} \cdot C_{SW^{18O}} \quad (1)$$

1 $C_{LagCl} = f_{GW} \cdot C_{GW_G} + f_{LW} \cdot C_{LW_G} + f_{SW} \cdot C_{SW_G}$ (2)

2 $C_{LagS} = f_{GW} \cdot C_{GW_S} + f_{LW} \cdot C_{LW_S} + f_{SW} \cdot C_{SW_S}$ (3)

3 $1 = f_{GW} + f_{LW} + f_{SW}$ (4)

4 where f refers to the fraction of groundwater (GW), lake water (LW), and seawater (SW),
5 respectively. Getting information about the uncertainty of the method, we calculated the
6 mixing ratios based on two different approaches considering simultaneously $\delta^{18}O$ (Eq.1) and
7 Cl^- (Eq.2) or $\delta^{18}O$ (Eq.1) and salinity (Eq.3), both in combination with Eq.4.

8

9 **3 Results**

10 **3.1 Stable isotopes of water**

11 Results of stable isotope analysis are presented in Table 1. All analysed water samples plotted
12 close or below the LMWL for both the dry (Figure 4a) and wet season (Figure 4b).
13 Groundwater samples were the most depleted samples ranging from -6.2 to -5.7‰ for $\delta^{18}O$,
14 and were even lower compared to average precipitation contents (-4.9‰ for $\delta^{18}O$). Assuming
15 only negligible differences in isotopic composition of precipitation between Antalya and our
16 observation area due to close proximity and similar location on the Mediterranean Sea, these
17 differences support our assumption of higher altitude precipitation from surrounding
18 mountains as major recharge source of groundwater. Average differences in elevation (400 m)
19 and isotope contents (1.17‰ for $\delta^{18}O$; 9.9‰ for δ^2H) give an altitude gradient of 0.29‰/100
20 m for $\delta^{18}O$ (2.5‰/100 m for δ^2H). These gradients are in accordance with values reported for
21 Southern Adriatic region (0.24‰/100 m; Vreca et al. 2006), the global and Italian gradients
22 (0.2‰/100 m; Bowen and Wilkison 2002, Longinelli and Selmo 2003) and simulated values
23 for the Mediterranean Sea region (Lykoudis and Argiriou 2007).

24 In groundwater, more depleted contents were generally observed in the wet season compared
25 to the dry season; however, absolute differences between seasons were small (0.21‰ for
26 $\delta^{18}O$; 2.8‰ for δ^2H). These differences can either result from a fraction of local seepage
27 water with short residence times, from influence of seawater or from uncertainties of
28 groundwater sampling. Well screening depths were unknown and therefore we expected some

1 minor uncertainties when taking groundwater samples, i.e. water from same depths and taken
2 with same flow rates during sampling.

3 Isotope contents of seawater were positive with more enriched contents in dry (1.5‰ for
4 $\delta^{18}\text{O}$) compared to wet seasons (0.5‰ for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$). All Köycegiz Lake water samples plotted
5 below the LMWL (Figure 4) indicating enrichment due to evaporation and potential
6 geothermal water origin as found in previous studies (Bayari et al. 1995; 2001). When
7 considering isotope contents of reported geothermal origin in the area (-0.81‰, -4.87‰, -4-
8 76‰ and -2.9‰, -30.0‰, -27.2‰ for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^2\text{H}$, respectively; Bayari et al. 1995), it is
9 evident that the geothermal origin is hidden in the evaporation signal and therefore these two
10 sources cannot be distinguished considering isotope contents only. Additionally, a Local
11 Evaporation Line (LEL) was determined considering the top lake samples for both seasons
12 only. The resulting LEL ($\delta^2\text{H} = 5.40 \delta^{18}\text{O} - 0.3$) is similar to another Turkish lagoon ($\delta^2\text{H} =$
13 $5.29 \delta^{18}\text{O} - 0.55$; Lecuyer et al. 2012). It intersects the LWML in -5.85‰ $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ (-31.9‰ $\delta^2\text{H}$)
14 which is also close to the average groundwater contents (-6.08‰ $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and -34.84‰ $\delta^2\text{H}$)
15 supporting assumption of higher elevation recharge area for the catchment.

16 Water samples from the lagoon mainly plotted on/below the LMWL and between
17 groundwater and seawater samples. Distinct differences in isotopic contents were found (i) for
18 the dry (Figure 4a) and wet season (Figure 4b) indicating a seasonally dynamic water body
19 and (ii) for samples close to the surface (open squares, Figure 4) and the bottom of the lagoon
20 (closed square, Figure 4) indicating a layered vs well mixed system in the dry and wet season,
21 respectively. Particularly in the dry season, differences between top and bottom lagoon
22 samples were obvious. Here, most interestingly, water samples at the bottom of the lagoon
23 were more enriched compared to top water samples. This clearly indicates that the enrichment
24 was not caused by evaporation but rather by mixing with enriched seawater which is more
25 pronounced at the bottom due to salt water density effects. In the wet season, similar isotope
26 contents were found for top and bottom samples except for samples from Alagöl (L5; -2.7‰,
27 $\delta^{18}\text{O}$) and Sülüngür Lake (L13, L14; +0.64-0.68‰, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$) which had more enriched isotope
28 contents at the bottom only. Here, top water samples showed similar ranges in isotope
29 contents (-4.5 to -4.0 ‰, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$) compared to other lagoon samples (-5.0 to -4.0‰, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$).

1 **3.2 Chloride vs. stable isotopes of water**

2 Results of geochemical analysis are given in Table 1. Chloride and salinity showed similar
3 spatiotemporal results and therefore, chloride results are discussed in more detail only.
4 Chloride concentrations were in line with the results of stable isotope of water. Chloride was
5 lowest in groundwater samples for both sampling times suggesting no or negligible seawater
6 influence for most of these groundwater locations. Only one sampling site (GW11) showed
7 increased chloride concentrations (460 mg/L in wet season and 2300 mg/L in dry season),
8 which was also accompanied by higher water isotope contents in the dry compared to the wet
9 season (Table 1). If this was caused by mixing with seawater, it would result in an increased
10 seawater contribution of $7\pm 5\%$ for the dry season in GW11. Another reason could be short
11 residence times of recharge from the unsaturated zone. Consequently, chloride originating
12 from agricultural activities (irrigation, pomegranates) would be leached and diluted by winter
13 precipitation with low isotope contents in the wet season.

14 Chloride concentrations were similar during both sampling campaigns in the dry and wet
15 season at the bottom of the Köycegiz Lake (4500 and 4800 mg/L), but differences were
16 measured at the top (2200 and 920 mg/L). High chloride concentrations were measured in
17 seawater with 21700 mg/L and 20800 mg/L during the wet and dry season, respectively.

18 In the lagoon, chloride concentrations were generally higher in the dry season compared to
19 the wet season (Figure 5, Table 1). In the dry season, a clear layering was also supported by
20 the chloride concentrations which were higher at the bottom of the lagoon compared to its top.
21 When looking at the chloride isotope relationship, lagoon samples were mainly plotting in the
22 triangle of groundwater, Köycegiz Lake water and seawater samples suggesting three main
23 endmembers in the system (Figure 5a). In the wet season, high chloride concentrations were
24 only measured in the lagoon lake systems that also had enriched isotope contents (Figure 5b).
25 All other lagoon samples had chloride concentrations lower than 5000 mg/L plotting in the
26 triangle of groundwater, Köycegiz Lake water and seawater samples suggesting three main
27 endmembers in the system (Figure 5b).

28 **3.3 Endmember mixing analysis**

29 The three component endmember mixing analysis was calculated for (i) the wet and dry
30 season and (ii) for the top and bottom layer. The selected endmembers are given in Table 1
31 (asterisks) and the resulting source fractions for each location and season are given in Table 2.

1 For the wet season, average fractions of water sources were similar in the top and bottom of
2 the lagoon (Figure 6b). The arithmetic average (median) of groundwater, lake and seawater
3 contribution was 0.24 (0.25), 0.72 (0.73) and 0.04 (0.04) for the top and 0.21 (0.22), 0.62
4 (0.74), and 0.17 (0.02) for the bottom layer, respectively. Thus, the entire lagoon contained
5 little seawater, and the main source was freshwater, either from the Köycegiz Lake or the
6 groundwater. Certainly, we cannot exclude direct influence from precipitation having similar
7 chemical composition compared to groundwater which will be further discussed below. High
8 fractions of seawater were mainly found in the bottom of the lagoon lake systems (Figure 7d,
9 Table 2). The more shallow Alagöl lake (L5; 3.3 m) contained about 34% seawater and 98%
10 seawater were calculated for the deeper Sülüngür lake (L13, L14; 3.6-5.4 m) (Table 2). The
11 branches of the lagoon showed slightly increased salt water contributions (9% top layer, 10%
12 bottom layer) compared the Dalyan channel locations (2% top layer, 3% bottom layer)
13 (Figure 7c,d). Besides, no variability in seawater and freshwater contribution was found with
14 distance from the shore line (Figure 7c,d); the error bars in Figure 7 indicate the variability of
15 the results when using $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and Cl^- or $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and salinity as signatures for the endmember
16 mixing analysis.

17 For the dry season, average fractions of water sources were different compared to the wet
18 season, and more variability was found within the lagoon and when comparing top and
19 bottom of the lagoon (Figure 6a). The arithmetic average (median) of groundwater, lake and
20 seawater contribution was 0.03 (0.01), 0.54 (0.43) and 0.43 (0.57) for the top and 0.09 (0.00),
21 0.20 (0.18), and 0.71 (0.83) for the bottom layer, respectively. Particularly the contribution of
22 groundwater was little during the dry season (Table 2, Figure 6a). The lagoon contained more
23 seawater in the dry season compared to the wet season and at the bottom compared to the top
24 layers. Further, there was a gradient of salt water contribution in the lagoon with nearest
25 distance to the shoreline (Figure 7a,b). The closer to the sea, the higher is the fraction of
26 seawater. Still, the lagoon lake systems contained on average higher fractions of salt water
27 (60%, top; 88%, bottom) compared to the Dalyan channel locations (35%, top; 69%, bottom)
28 (Figure 7a). The branches of the lagoon seem to be more mixed compared to lake and channel
29 locations (Figure 7a,b) containing on average 51% and 67% of seawater on top and bottom,
30 respectively.

1 4 Discussion

2 The results clearly indicated differences in contribution of various water sources in the dry
3 and wet season. We proved that it is an extremely dynamic system dominated by seawater in
4 the dry season (>55%) and freshwater in the wet season (>95%). Lecuyer et al. (2012) also
5 found higher contribution of freshwater (62%) compared to seawater (38%) in winter (wet
6 season) assuming seawater and stream water as sole endmembers. Still, their open water
7 lagoon on the Turkish coast was generally more dominated by seawater throughout the rest of
8 the year; particularly in summer and autumn freshwater contribution seemed to be mostly
9 absent and hypersaline conditions formed due to evaporation of seawater. In contrast, our
10 study site had freshwater influence even in the dry season. Here, the freshwater mainly came
11 from the upstream lake and groundwater contribution was minor. Thus, the lagoon is
12 groundwater influenced only in the wet season. In addition, we cannot exclude direct
13 precipitation as additional water source for the wet season; due to little precipitation in
14 summer (3 mm in average) its influence during the dry season was assumed to be negligible.
15 We expect that winter precipitation has similar isotopic composition compared to the local
16 groundwater and therefore, any contribution of direct precipitation was hidden in the
17 groundwater term. However, this hidden precipitation is suggested to be little when looking at
18 the upstream Köyceğiz Lake water balance and the size of the entire catchment (960 km²)
19 compared to the lagoon size (130 km²). In the Köyceğiz Lake precipitation is for example
20 more than 15 times smaller compared to its outflow into the lagoon (Bayari et al., 1995).
21 Additionally, we sampled during a period without precipitation and therefore, our results are
22 representative for base flow conditions in the lagoon system.

23 We found different dynamics for the bottom and top layers and also for the different locations
24 in the lagoon. Particular seasonal changes were dramatic in the main Dalyan channel closer to
25 the coast and at its bottom (Figure 7b,d). We assume that the terrestrial water levels
26 (groundwater, lake, lagoon) declined in the dry season influencing the hydraulic gradients and
27 also density driven flow of the seawater further inland. Here, the intrusion reached up to 4 km
28 inland at the bottom of the lagoon. A 50:50 mixing of salt and freshwater is expected for
29 bottom layers at 4.9 km distance from the coast (Figure 7b) and for top layer at 1 km. The
30 freshwater (seawater) mixing relationship with distance from the shoreline was best
31 approximated by logarithmic (exponential) function (Figure 7). Still, the salt water intrusion
32 was mainly restricted to the lagoon system itself as the groundwater wells were unaffected by

1 seawater influence in the dry season. Our findings are in agreement with previous studies on
2 hydrodynamic modelling in this area (Ekdal et al., 2005; Erturk et al., 2003; Gönenc et al.,
3 2004). In these studies, similar spatial and temporal dynamics were obtained concluding that
4 intrusion causes strong stratification throughout almost the entire lagoon especially in the dry
5 season. The flow direction in the upper layer was from Köycegiz Lake towards the
6 Mediterranean Sea, while flow in the bottom layer was from the Mediterranean Sea towards
7 the Köycegiz Lake. Barotrophy was found to be the driving force of the surface flow, whereas
8 the bottom flow was baroclinic (Gönenc et al. 2004).

9 In the present study, the endmember mixing analysis yielded lower uncertainties in the wet
10 compared to the dry season (Figure 7), which is also obvious when looking at the endmember
11 mixing triangles in Figure 5. For the wet season, the composition of the seawater endmember
12 was adequate (Figure 5b). For the dry season though, higher chloride concentration as well as
13 more enriched $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ were expected (Figure 5a) and thus, samples plot outside of the mixing
14 triangle. This indicates that either the endmember was chosen wrongly or/and evaporation is
15 crucial. Evaporation of surface water explains an increase in salt concentrations and isotopic
16 enrichment like observed in a close-by lagoon (Lecuyer et al., 2012). Even though
17 evaporation was actually considered indirectly by the lake endmember, evaporation of lagoon
18 water could be higher due to the smaller water volume compared to the lake. Therefore, a
19 stronger enrichment of stable isotopes explains the deviations of top surface water samples
20 located outside of the mixing triangle in the dry season (Figure 5a). However, also enrichment
21 of bottom samples was found in the dry season which is unusual and cannot be explained by
22 evaporation only. Even hypersaline conditions in some of the bottom samples were found
23 (compared to the Seawater sample). Interestingly, the slope of the Cl^- - $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ relationship was
24 steeper for bottom compared to top lagoon samples. It remained unknown whether an
25 additional water source in the system has to be considered which was of geothermal origin as
26 found for Köycegiz Lake (Bayari et al., 1995) and as common in this area due to geology and
27 tectonic activity (Mutlu and Gülec, 1998).

28 Further assessing the two discussed uncertainties (i.e. choice of endmember and evaporation)
29 and neglecting the small contributions of groundwater to the lagoon, a two component
30 endmember mixing analysis was additionally conducted after correction of the data due to
31 evaporation (Figure 5a; 2 EMMA mixing line). First, the seawater surface sample was
32 replaced by the deep lagoon sample at the very end of the Dalyan Channel exiting into the Sea

1 (L08B). Here, chloride concentrations and also isotopes were even higher compared to the
2 seawater sample. It was measured in the depth and we expect it to be representative to the
3 actual seawater not influenced by any freshwater compared to the actual seawater sample
4 from the surface. Therefore, L08B could be used as endmember for the dry season being
5 representative for seawater too. Second, all lagoon samples were forced onto the mixing line
6 accounting for enrichment due to evaporation. Therefore, an Evaporation Line was calculated
7 considering the top lake sample for both seasons only ($Cl^- = 670 \delta^{18}O + 4000$). Here, 10%
8 increase in chloride was accompanied by 3.4% increase in $\delta^{18}O$. This regression was used to
9 correct the lagoon data back to the mixing line. Similar procedures were done with salinity
10 and isotope data (data not shown). The difference between measured and corrected chloride
11 concentrations (salinity) was further used to do a mass balance calculation. Thus, relative,
12 average evaporation were estimated at all sites (Table 3); they have to be seen as relative
13 because the actual surface Köycegiz Lake water already comprised evaporation which was
14 estimated to 6.8% (Bayari et al. 1995). The calculated evaporation in the lagoon ranged from
15 0 to 7%. There was only one outlier L2B (Figure 5a) with high chloride concentrations
16 resulting in 54% evaporation based on chloride data; but with 0.2% evaporation based on
17 salinity data. We attributed it to erroneous chloride analysis rather than to water influenced by
18 geothermal origin because of differences in chemical and isotope characteristics compared to
19 geothermal springs in this area (Bayari et al., 1995). The results of the two component
20 endmember mixing approach yielded similar fractions of freshwater and marine water as the
21 three component approach (Figure 8, Table 3). Considering uncertainties of the methods
22 (Figure 7), no distinct differences in freshwater or saltwater sources were found hence. This
23 suggested that for the dry season both groundwater and evaporation could be neglected in the
24 system. Still, the correction of the data due to evaporation is kind of arbitrary forcing all
25 values onto the mixing line. Only knowing the actual evaporation at individual locations and
26 in the lake would help to adequately correct the data which even might push some results into
27 the 3 endmember mixing triangle. Hence, fractions of groundwater even in the dry season
28 would be underestimated by the current procedure of data correction.

29 Independent on the mixing approach, there were not only spatial differences in top and
30 bottom layers for the main Dalyan channel, but also differences between different locations
31 within the lagoon. The main channel responded quickly to changes and showed seasonal
32 dynamics. The lake structures in the lagoon system were, however, responding differently.
33 Here, the salt water was found in the bottom layer even in the wet season indicating

1 maintenance of stratification; particularly in the larger and deeper Sülüngür Lake. A partial
2 mixing was found for the smaller and shallower Alagöl Lake where salt water contribution
3 was 34% ($\pm 20\%$). Also the side branches of the lagoon had less extreme changes as the main
4 channel indicating higher water transit times in these areas and thus slower renewal.
5 Particularly in the dry season, the contribution of fresh and salt water was about equal for the
6 top layer and 2/3 to 1/3 for the bottom layer and independent on the distance to the coastline.
7 These findings are in agreement with residence time calculations of a previous study (Ekdal,
8 2008) using the Water Quality Analysis Simulation Model. Average residence times of
9 Sülüngür Lake (especially deeper parts of the lake) were considerably higher (16-700 d) when
10 compared to other parts of the system (>16 d). The residence time in Alagöl (5-16 d) was also
11 high when compared to the main channel. The main channel had a low residence time (<5 d),
12 which showed the dynamic characteristics of the lagoon, and which is in agreement with the
13 results of this study.

14

15 **5 Conclusion**

16 We showed that environmental tracers can be used not only to identify but also to quantify
17 different water sources in a lagoon ecosystem. Freshwater and marine water sources were
18 strongly dynamic and heterogeneous in time and space. We found different water sources and
19 mixing ratios for dry and wet seasons and for top and bottom layers in the lagoon. In the wet
20 season, freshwater was found in all locations and all depths except at the bottom of a larger
21 lagoon lake. Generally, the freshwater was a mixture of upstream lake water and groundwater.
22 The groundwater influence was, however, mainly restricted to the wet season and almost
23 absent in the dry season. It was assumed that water levels decline and the input of seawater in
24 the lagoon gets more pronounced; particularly in the main flow channel of the lagoon. Here, a
25 clear stratification was observed in the dry season only, with higher salt water contributions at
26 the lagoon bottom compared to its top. At some of these locations, the lagoon changed from a
27 complete freshwater system to a complete salt water system which certainly has implications
28 for the ecosystem which has to be highly adapted to such dynamic conditions. At side
29 branches and lake structures in this wetland type lagoon, changes in water sources were less
30 extreme and variable. From these findings, we conclude that the lagoon and the groundwater
31 could be vulnerable to certain global change scenarios like sea level rise and decrease in
32 precipitation. Consequently, water levels in the groundwater and lake would drop and the

1 seawater influence would increase in the lagoon system affecting its ecosystem functions and
2 probably also affecting the groundwater quality. In future, it needs to be analysed how the
3 ecosystem itself reacts to changes of water sources to investigate the vulnerability of the
4 ecosystem functions.

5

6 **Acknowledgements**

7 Funding by the EU GENESIS Project no. 226536 (FP7-ENV-2008-1) is kindly
8 acknowledged. We would also like to acknowledge Melike Gürel, Nusret Karakaya, Ali
9 Ertürk, Gökhan Cüceloglu and Çigdem Güzel for their contribution in taking the samples
10 during the field studies. We thank one anonymous reviewer and K. Rozanski for their helpful
11 comments that improved the quality of the manuscript.

12

1 **References**

- 2 Alongi, D. M.: Coastal Ecosystem Processes, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1998.
- 3 Anthony, A., Atwood, J., August, P., Byron, C., Cobb, S., Foster, C., Fry, C., Gold, A.,
4 Hagos, K., Heffner, L., Kellogg, D. Q., Lellis-Dibble, K., Opaluch, J. J., Oviatt, C., Pfeiffer-
5 Herbert, A., Rohr, N., Smith, L., Smythe, T., Swift, J., and Vinhateiro, N.: Coastal Lagoons
6 and Climate Change: Ecological and Social Ramifications in US Atlantic and Gulf Coast
7 Ecosystems, *Ecology and Society*, 14, 8, 2009.
- 8 Barnes, R. S. K.: Coastal lagoons, Cambridge University press, Cambridge, UK, 106 pp.,
9 1980.
- 10 Bayari, S. C., Kazanci, N., Koyuncu, H., Çağlar, S. S., and Gökçe, D.: Determination of the
11 origin of the waters of Köycegiz Lake, Turkey, *Journal of Hydrology*, 166, 171-191,
12 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(94\)02554-O](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(94)02554-O), 1995.
- 13 Bayari, C.D., Kurittas, T., Tezcan, L., 2001. Dynamics of Lake Köycegiz, SW Turkey: An
14 Environmental Isotopic and Hydrogeochemical Study. In: Use of isotope techniques in lake
15 dynamics investigations, IAEA-TECDOC-1206, Vienna, Austria.
- 16 Ekdal, A.: Water Quality Modeling of Köycegiz – Dalyan Lagoon, Ph.D. thesis, Istanbul
17 Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey, 236 pp., 2008.
- 18 Bowen, G.J. and Wilkinson, B.: Spatial distribution of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ in meteoric precipitation.
19 *Geology*, 30, 315-318, 2002.
- 20 Ekdal, A., Gurel, M., Erturk, A., and Tanik, A.: Hydrodynamic and Water Quality Modeling
21 Approach for a Dynamic Lagoon System, *Environmental Hydraulics and Sustainable Water
22 Management, Proceedings*, 15-18 December, Hong Kong, China, 621-627, 2005.
- 23 Erturk, A., Gurel, M., Koca, D., Ekdal, A., Tanik, A., Seker, D. Z., Kabdasli, S., and Gönenc,
24 I. E.: Determination of Model Dimensions for a Complex Lagoon System - A Case Study
25 From Turkey, *Proceedings of XXX IAHR Congress Water Engineering and Research in a
26 learning Society: Modern Developments and Traditional Concepts*, 24-29 August 2003,
27 Thessaloniki, Greece, 53-60, 2003.
- 28 Graciansky, P.C., 1968. Stratigraphy of the overlapped units of the Lycien Nappes in the Teke
29 Peninsula and their position within the Dinaro-Taurids. *Bull. Miner. Res. Explor. Inst.*,
30 Ankara, 71: 73-92 (in Turkish).

- 1 Gattacceca, J. C., Vallet-Coulomb, C., Mayer, A., Claude, C., Radakovitch, O., Conchetto, E.,
2 and Hamelin, B.: Isotopic and geochemical characterization of salinization in the shallow
3 aquifers of a reclaimed subsiding zone: The southern Venice Lagoon coastland, *Journal of*
4 *Hydrology*, 378, 46-61, 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.09.005, 2009.
- 5 Gönenc, I. E., Tanik, A., Seker, D. Z., Gurel, M., Erturk, A., Ekdal, A., Yuceil, K., Kose, C.,
6 Beyazgul, M., and Bilir, L. Z.: Ecosystem modeling for the sustainable management of
7 lagoons, Final Report, The Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, TUBITAK
8 YDABCAG Project No: 100Y047, Ankara, 2004.
- 9 Google Earth, <http://www.google.com/earth/>, access: 25.05.2014, 2014.
- 10 Gurel, M., Tanik, A., Erturk, A., Dogan, E., Okus, E., Seker, D. Z., Ekdal, A., K., Y., Bederli
11 Tumay, A., Karakaya, N., Beler Baykal, B., and Gönenc, I. E.: Köycegiz – Dalyan Lagoon: A
12 case study for sustainable use and development, in: *Coastal Lagoons: Ecosystem Processes*
13 *and Modeling for Sustainable Use and Development*, edited by: Gönenc, I. E., and Wolflin, J.,
14 CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 440-474, 2005.
- 15 Kløve, B., Ala-Aho, P., Bertrand, G., Gurdak, J. J., Kupfersberger, H., Kværner, J., Muotka,
16 T., Mykrä, H., Preda, E., Rossi, P., Uvo, C. B., Velasco, E., and Pulido-Velazquez, M.:
17 Climate change impacts on groundwater and dependent ecosystems, *Journal of Hydrology*,
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.06.037>, in press, 2014.
- 19 Lecuyer, C., Bodergat, A. M., Martineau, F., Fourel, F., Gurbuz, K., and Nazik, A.: Water
20 sources, mixing and evaporation in the Akyatan lagoon, Turkey, *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf*
21 *Science*, 115, 200-209, 10.1016/j.ecss.2012.09.002, 2012.
- 22 Longinelli, A. and Selmo, E.: Isotopic composition of precipitation in Italy: a first overall
23 map. *J. Hydrol.*, 270, 75-88, 2003.
- 24 Lykoudis, S. P. and Argiriou, A. A.: Gridded data set of the stable isotopic composition of
25 precipitation over the eastern and central Mediterranean. *Journal of Geophysical Research-*
26 *Atmospheres* 112, D18, 2007.
- 27 Mutlu, H., and Gülec, N.: Hydrogeochemical outline of thermal waters and geothermometry
28 applications in Anatolia (Turkey), *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 85, 495-
29 515, 10.1016/s0377-0273(98)00068-7, 1998.

1 Niencheski, L. F. H., Windom, H. L., Moore, W. S., and Jahnke, R. A.: Submarine
2 groundwater discharge of nutrients to the ocean along a coastal lagoon barrier, Southern
3 Brazil, *Marine Chemistry*, 106, 546-561, 10.1016/j.marchem.2007.06.004, 2007.

4 Pérez -Ruzafa, A., Marcos, C., and Pérez -Ruzafa, I. M.: Mediterranean coastal lagoons in an
5 ecosystem and aquatic resources management context, *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*,
6 36, 160-166, 10.1016/j.pce.2010.04.013, 2011a.

7 Pérez-Ruzafa, A., Marcos, C., Pérez-Ruzafa, I., and Pérez-Marcos, M.: Coastal lagoons:
8 “transitional ecosystems” between transitional and coastal waters, *J Coast Conserv*, 15, 369-
9 392, 10.1007/s11852-010-0095-2, 2011b.

10 Remane, A., and Schlieper, C.: *Biology of Brackish Water*, Wiley Interscience, New York,
11 372 pp., 1971.

12 Santos, I. R., Machado, M. I., Niencheski, L. F., Burnett, W., Milani, I. B., Andrade, C. F. F.,
13 Peterson, R. N., Chanton, J., and Baisch, P.: Major ion chemistry in a freshwater coastal
14 lagoon from southern Brazil (Mangueira Lagoon): Influence of groundwater inputs, *Aquatic*
15 *Geochemistry*, 14, 133-146, 10.1007/s10498-008-9029-0, 2008a.

16 Santos, I. R., Niencheski, F., Burnett, W., Peterson, R., Chanton, J., Andrade, C. F. F., Milani,
17 I. B., Schmidt, A., and Knoeller, K.: Tracing anthropogenically driven groundwater discharge
18 into a coastal lagoon from southern Brazil, *Journal of Hydrology*, 353, 275-293,
19 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.02.010, 2008b.

20 Schmidt, A., Santos, I. R., Burnett, W. C., Niencheski, F., and Knöller, K.: Groundwater
21 sources in a permeable coastal barrier: Evidence from stable isotopes, *Journal of Hydrology*,
22 406, 66-72, 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.06.001, 2011.

23 Vreca, P., Bronic, I.K., Horvatincic, N. and Baresic, J.: Isotopic characteristics of
24 precipitation in Slovenia and Croatia: Comparison of continental and maritime stations. *J.*
25 *Hydrol.*, 330, 457-469, 2006.

26 WISER, available at: http://www-naweb.iaea.org/naweb/ih/IHS_resources_isohis.html, last
27 access: 19 May 2014.

28

1 Table 1. Chemical analysis of water samples for the dry and wet season; asterisks indicate
 2 values used for endmember mixing analysis using either a three (3EMMA) or two (2EMMA)
 3 mixing approach.

4

Location	dry season					wet season				
	Depth (m)	Chloride (mg/l)	Salinity (g/l)	$\delta^{18}\text{O}$ (‰)	$\delta^2\text{H}$ (‰)	Depth (m)	Chloride (mg/l)	Salinity (g/l)	$\delta^{18}\text{O}$ (‰)	$\delta^2\text{H}$ (‰)
L01T	0.1	2400	3.8	-2.90	-16.4	0.1	930	3.1	-4.70	-24.9
L02T	0.1	2600	3.8	-2.87	-16.0	0.1	930	3.1	-4.51	-26.3
L03T	0.1	2800	4.0	-2.97	-16.4	0.1	930	3.2	-4.78	-24.8
L04T	0.1	3700	7.0	-2.71	-14.9	0.1	940	3.0	-4.93	-25.4
L05T	0.1	11400	23.6	-0.15	-1.3	0.1	2350	4.6	-4.50	-22.5
L06T	0.1	14900	22.3	-0.16	-0.7	0.1	1500	4.2	-4.72	-22.8
L07T	0.1	7800	16.1	-1.86	-10.8	0.1	1050	3.2	-4.68	-24.8
L08T	0.1	18600	37.9	1.45	9.2	0.1	1300	4.2	-4.74	-23.3
L09T	0.1	14700	29.3	0.59	3.3	0.1	1300	4.5	-4.44	-24.5
L10T	0.1	14700	27.6	0.47	2.2	0.1	840	3.4	-4.76	-24.7
L11T	0.1	15800	27.6	0.30	2.4	0.1	2150	5.9	-4.95	-27.8
L12T	0.1	13200	25.7	0.20	0.6	0.1	2500	6.9	-4.28	-22.9
L13T	0.1	18200	30.6	1.00	4.2	0.1	1400	7.6	-4.17	-21.9
L14T	0.1	17400	30.6	0.95	-0.6	0.1	1350	7.6	-3.97	-21.0
L15T	0.1	13900	-	-0.33	-1.3	0.1	1200	7.3	-4.43	-22.5
L22T	0.1	8700	16.7	-1.51	-8.8	0.1	950	3.2	-4.73	-24.4
L29T	0.1	13700	29.3	0.50	3.2	0.1	750	3.3	-4.62	-25.0
L33T	0.1	12000	25.0	-0.56	-2.9	0.1	950	3.4	-4.76	-23.8
L01B	3.8	3300	26.3	-2.86	-16.4	3.8	940	3.1	-4.73	-24.7
L02B	4.4	3600	27.8	-0.12	-0.8	4.4	940	3.2	-4.7	-24.4
L03B	2.5	3700	31.8	-2.90	-16.6	2.4	950	3.2	-4.7	-24.8
L04B	2.1	20000	32.7	0.73	4.3	2.0	970	3.1	-5.01	-27.0
L05B	3.3	22300	38.2	1.43	8.1	3.2	7100	19.4	-2.7	-12.3
L06B	1.4	12800	32.1	-0.09	-0.9	1.7	1600	4.7	-4.58	-23.1
L07B	2.0	21400	35.8	1.13	7.5	1.9	1100	3.1	-4.90	-23.8
L08B*, 2EMMA	1.1	23800	39.7	1.16	7.4	1.1	1300	4.3	-4.44	-23.9
L09B	1.3	24200	39.0	1.35	7.9	1.2	1700	5.4	-4.33	-23.4
L10B	1.1	21800	33.8	1.30	7.1	1.3	930	3.4	-4.78	-24.0
L11B	1.5	17100	31.2	1.02	4.4	1.5	3500	7.5	-4.34	-21.3
L12B	1.5	14300	34.6	0.66	2.4	1.5	3600	7.3	-4.31	-21.4
L13B	3.4	18300	36.5	1.07	4.6	3.6	21600	41.2	0.64	4.9
L14B	5.4	18100	36.9	0.76	4.3	5.4	21000	41.2	0.68	3.0
L15B	1.6	16400	-	0.65	4.0	1.6	1320	8.0	-4.05	-21.9
L22B	3.0	22100	35.9	0.97	5.9	3.0	980	3.3	-4.66	-24.8
L29B	1.8	17500	35.5	0.93	5.5	1.8	850	3.3	-4.58	-24.8
L33B	3.8	19800	38.8	1.11	7.0	3.8	3400	11.3	-3.71	-18.5
GW03	-	132	0.4	-5.27	-25.8	-	-	-	-	-
GW04	-	117	0.4	-6.10	-34.7	-	111	0.4	-6.08	-34.1
GW05	-	146	0.5	-6.03	-34.3	-	88	0.4	-6.25	-34.8
GW11	-	2300	1.3	-6.39	-36.1	-	460	1.1	-6.66	-43.4
GW14	-	69	0.3	-6.35	-35.5	-	41	0.3	-6.46	-38.3
GW15	-	41	0.3	-6.32	-36.0	-	40	0.3	-6.22	-36.6
GW18	-	42	0.4	-6.02	-32.9	-	16	0.5	-5.62	-35.2
GW19	-	25	0.3	-6.63	-37.6	-	-	0.3	-6.55	-38.9
GW20	-	56	0.4	-5.77	-30.0	-	18	0.2	-6.60	-39.5
GW25	-	57	0.6	-5.24	-29.0	-	50	0.5	-5.25	-31.0
GW29	-	46	0.4	-5.87	-33.5	-	26	0.4	-6.00	-34.1
GW*	-	73	0.4	-6.00	-32.9	-	49	0.4	-6.17	-36.6
Sea*, 3EMMA	0.1	20800	40.0	1.45	9.1	0.1	21700	39.2	0.49	1.1
Lake*	0.1	2200	3.7	-2.88	-15.9	0.1	920	3.2	-4.38	-23.4
Lake	12.8	4500	11.2	-2.26	-11.5	12.7	4800	13.6	-2.27	-12.0

1 Table 2. Average results of the three component endmember mixing analysis giving the
 2 contributions of groundwater (f_{GW}), lake water (f_{LW}) and seawater (f_{SW}) in the lagoon top and
 3 bottom for dry and wet season.

	dry season			wet season		
	f_{GW}	f_{LW}	f_{SW}	f_{GW}	f_{LW}	f_{SW}
Location -TOP						
L01	0.020	0.975	0.005	0.210	0.780	0.010
L02	0.015	0.970	0.015	0.080	0.915	0.005
L03	0.070	0.905	0.025	0.265	0.720	0.015
L04	0.075	0.830	0.095	0.360	0.620	0.020
L05	0.000	0.559	0.441	0.255	0.675	0.070
L06	0.045	0.400	0.551	0.320	0.630	0.050
L07	0.140	0.530	0.335	0.210	0.775	0.015
L08	0.000	0.189	0.811	0.320	0.640	0.040
L09	0.000	0.431	0.569	0.130	0.835	0.035
L10	0.000	0.447	0.549	0.260	0.730	0.010
L11	0.000	0.335	0.665	0.605	0.290	0.105
L12	0.000	0.513	0.488	0.230	0.665	0.105
L13	0.000	0.307	0.693	0.135	0.790	0.070
L14	0.000	0.332	0.668	0.065	0.825	0.110
L15	0.030	0.650	0.320	0.250	0.665	0.085
L22	0.055	0.580	0.360	0.240	0.745	0.015
L29	0.000	0.468	0.532	0.150	0.840	0.010
L33	0.040	0.400	0.560	0.265	0.720	0.015
Location - BOTTOM						
L01	0.335	0.420	0.245	0.225	0.765	0.010
L02	0.020	0.645	0.335	0.220	0.775	0.005
L03	0.360	0.380	0.258	0.235	0.760	0.005
L04	0.088	0.140	0.772	0.425	0.555	0.020
L05	0.056	0.050	0.894	0.200	0.460	0.340
L06	0.100	0.250	0.650	0.250	0.695	0.050
L07	0.073	0.075	0.852	0.355	0.630	0.015
L08	0.145	0.000	0.855	0.115	0.865	0.020
L09	0.108	0.015	0.874	0.130	0.815	0.060
L10	0.061	0.168	0.770	0.280	0.705	0.015
L11	0.000	0.349	0.651	0.375	0.480	0.145
L12	0.030	0.305	0.674	0.350	0.505	0.145
L13	0.000	0.150	0.850	0.025	0.000	0.975
L14	0.060	0.060	0.880	0.025	0.000	0.975
L15	0.000	0.300	0.700	0.110	0.815	0.075
L22	0.107	0.055	0.838	0.205	0.785	0.010
L29	0.000	0.175	0.825	0.135	0.855	0.010
L33	0.045	0.005	0.950	0.150	0.675	0.175

1 Table 3. Average results of 2 component endmember mixing analysis giving the contributions
 2 of lake water (f_{LW}) and seawater (f_{SW}) in the lagoon top and bottom for the dry season;
 3 average relative percentages of evaporation calculated for dry season based on data correction
 4 (details given in text).

	f_{LW}	f_{SW}	evaporation (%)
Location - TOP			
L01T	0.993	0.007	-
L02T	0.989	0.011	0.1
L03T	0.975	0.025	-
L04T	0.913	0.087	-
L05T	0.540	0.460	5.3
L06T	0.469	0.531	3.3
L07T	0.689	0.311	-
L08T	0.179	0.821	3.7
L09T	0.389	0.611	4.7
L10T	0.412	0.588	4.7
L11T	0.376	0.624	3.1
L12T	0.472	0.528	5.0
L13T	0.292	0.708	4.3
L14T	0.312	0.688	4.5
L15T	0.472	0.528	2.1
L22T	0.671	0.329	0.7
L29T	0.413	0.587	5.0
L33T	0.483	0.517	1.6
Location - BOTTOM			
L01B	0.598	0.402	-
L02B	0.667	0.333	0.2
L03B	0.494	0.506	-
L04B	0.198	0.802	1.4
L05B	0.075	0.925	1.9
L06B	0.365	0.635	2.4
L07B	0.126	0.874	1.7
L08B	0.000	1.000	-
L09B	0.016	0.984	0.8
L10B	0.156	0.844	2.9
L11B	0.312	0.688	4.8
L12B	0.315	0.685	3.6
L13B	0.194	0.806	2.6
L14B	0.181	0.819	1.4
L15B	0.374	0.626	4.2
L22B	0.100	0.900	0.8
L29B	0.226	0.774	2.7
L33B	0.118	0.882	1.5

1 **Figure Captions**

2

3 Figure 1. Geographic location of the Köycegiz-Dalyan Coastal Lagoon (a) and sampling
4 locations (b); source of modified satellite picture was Google Earth (2014).

5 Figure 2. Long-term monthly data of average precipitation (grey bars) and air temperature
6 (solid line) from Köycegiz meteorology station (1976-2010) and isotopic composition of
7 precipitation in Antalya (dashed line). Data from Antalya are available at the IAEA database
8 WISER (<http://www-naweb.iaea.org/napc/ih/index.html>; accessed 19.05.2014).

9 Figure 3. Conceptual model of flow connections between the lagoon and surrounding water
10 bodies for (a) the dry and (b) wet season.

11 Figure 4. Dual isotope plot for (a) dry season and (b) wet season sampling campaign; LMWL
12 and average precipitation taken from closest station of the GNIP data base i.e. Antalya. Figure
13 5. Chloride concentrations and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ ratios for (a) dry season and (b) wet season sampling
14 campaign; the dashed lines connect the three (bold) or two (light) endmembers used for the
15 three component mixing analysis.

16 Figure 6. Fractions of different sources of the lagoon water for (a) dry and (b) wet season
17 sampling campaign.

18 Figure 7. Changing fractions of freshwater (circles) and marine water (triangles) with distance
19 from the coastline for (a) the top layer in the dry season, (b) bottom layer in the dry season,
20 (c) top layer in the wet season, (d) bottom layer in the wet season; closed dark symbols
21 indicate locations at the main lagoon channel, open symbols indicate surrounding lake
22 locations and closed light symbols indicate their inflow/outflow connections to the lagoon
23 system; error bars were determined from variability of endmember mixing analysis using
24 salinity and chloride data individually in combination with $\delta^{18}\text{O}$.

25 Figure 8. Fractions of freshwater (a) and seawater (b) contributions in the top and bottom
26 lagoon samples calculated from two and three endmember mixing approaches; dashed line
27 gives 1:1 line.