

# PROTECTING STEEP SLOPES AGAINST SOIL EROSION: **GEOTEXTILES AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS UNDER HEAVY RAINFALL**

Tomas Laburda (1), Petr Kavka (1), Martin Neumann (1), David Zumr (1), Adam Tejkl (1), Dušan Dufka (2), Martin Vaníček (3) (1) Czech Technical University in Prague, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Departement of Landscape Water Conservation, (2) STRIX Chomutov, a.s., Chomutov, CZ, (3) Geosyntetika, s.r.o., Praha, CZ

# **A. INTRODUCTION**

Soil erosion is a natural phenomenon that creates significant geomorphological changes on the Earth's surface. The most prone places for soil erosion are steep slopes with unprotected bare soil, which can be found on civil and transportation construction sites. Moreover, these slopes are even more vulnerable as they often arise during periods of heavy rainfall.



Figure 1 Field rainfall simulator and experimental plots for testing rolled erosion control products (RECPs)

Experimental testing of selected types of rolled erosion control products (RECPs) generally known as geotextiles was carried out at two sites. Both synthetic and natural fiber materials used in construction were tested. The aim was to find out how different types of geotextiles are able to mitigate surface runoff and prevent soil erosion, i.e., to determine their effectiveness.

## **C. RESULTS**

Figures 5 and 6 show how increasing slope (from 22° - 1:2,5 to 34° 1:1,5) increases the effect of protection material in term of surface runoff and soil loss compare to bare soil. During the simulation erosion rills are formed, but their growth is hindered. First simulations show grater variability because of the rill formation. In the case of sediment production, slope is not a primary factor.

050	22		30			34		
250 -	FALSE BARE SOIL							
200 -	TRUE WITH PROTECT	ION						MIC
150 -					<b>a</b>			_
100 -								100
50-								0.000
0-								
250 -								
200 -					4			100
150 -								N
100 -								10.0
50 -								800
0 -								1 A
250 -								1
200 -					-			19
150 -		-			-	/		ω
100 -						/		
50 -		-						120
0 -								1
250 -		4						3
200 -					4			100
150 -								4
100 -								4
50 -								24.50
0 -								1
0	10	20 0	10	20	0	10	20	

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Research has been supported by grant TH02030428 - "Design of technical measures for slopes stabilization and soil erosion prevention" and SGS17/173/OHK1 - "Experimental research of erosion and transport processes in agricultural landscapes". **CONTACT:** tomas.laburda@fsv.cvut.cz, petr.kavka@fsv.cvut.cz

# **B. METHODOLOGY**

Testing selected types of soil erosion control materials was performed at two sites, both equipped with rainfall simulators and experimental plots. The following products were selected to represent both category: erosion control blankets (ECB) made from degradable natural or polymer fibers and turf reinforcement mats (TRM) made from nondegradable synthetic fibers.

	C. E. Aller	a constant of		
	Product name	Description		
	Biomac-C	Jute-coir fibres reinforced with polypropylen scrim netting		
	K700 (K400)	100% coir fibres		
	Enkamat 7220	3D polyamid geomat with open structure and one side flat back		
	Enkamat 7010	3D polyamid geomat with open structure		
	Macmat 8.1	3D polyamid geomat		
	Macmat 18.1	3D polyamid geomat		
	the set of the set	The State State States		

### **FIELD RAINFALL SIMULATOR**

- Jet type outdoor simulator with stable metal construction
- Tarpaulin cover to avoid influence of wind
- 4 spraying nozzles (WSQ 40) 2,6 m above surface
- Water pressure: 0,75 bar
- Christiansen uniformity index: 71,3%
- 5 experimental plots— each with area of 2 x 4 m
- 3 plots with simulated rainfall
- (different slopes 1:1,5, 1:1,75, 1:2,5)
- 2 plots for longterm observation under natural rainfall



Figure 3 Experimental plots at the field rainfall simulator.

Figures 7 and 8 show variability of effectiveness against soil loss and surface runoff. While there is no obvious difference in reduction of runoff, in soil loss the differences are more noticeable. Higher effectiveness in reduction of soil loss at the natural material based materials (ECB). Main difference is in the rigidity of the material. Erosion control blankets are softer and their contact with surface is tighter, thus they hold more soil mass. These materials also absorb water and thereby adhere even better to the surface. Geotextiles based on artificial materials (TRM), layed on the surface and anchored on several spots, do not contact with soil very well, thus forming of rills under the geotextile and movement of the soil particles is possible.



Time interval from the beginning of experiment [min]

Figure 7 and 8



based on the comparison of the Methodology is sediment fluxes from plots with bare soil and plots with rolled erosion control products. During all experiments are measured following parameters: Surface runoff and soil loss (and its texture) in fixed time intervals Soil moisture in different soil depths

Surface changes with photogrammetry method "Structure from Motion"

Each material is tested in two replicates consisted of dry and wet 30-Figure 2 Experimental plot diveded on 2 halves minutes long simulations with another dry-wet experiment with rills and left one covered with tested geotextile and right cracks already formed. one with bare soil without any protection

#### LABORATORY RAINFALL SIMULATOR

- Two spraying systems
- swing plane nozzles (V jet type)
- intermittent spraying system (WSQ jet type)
- Soil sample (plot) up to 1 x 5 m
- Variable height of nozzles with the maximum of 2,6 m
- Precipitation intesity from 10 to 200 mm/h
- Variable slope from 0 to 40°
- Adjustable soil temperature from -15 °C to +60 °
- Constructed in 2018

Figure 9 shows example of results from photogrammetry analysis of surface changes. Left plots with protection geotextiles shows on DoD (digital elevation model of difference) very low detected difference before and after simulated rainfall. Right plots without any protection are eroded by large rills. These rills account for about 30 % of the soil loss, while the remainder is the soil loss from sheer erosion.



Figure 9 Orthophoto and DoD of experimental plots.







Figure 4 Laboratory rainfall simulator.

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

Rainfall simulation is a useful technique for measuring the effect of artificial slopes protection measures

High reduction of the net soil loss from the experimental plots due to the protection measures, as the rills do not develop on the covered plots.

Development of the rills can be observed on the untreated plots (bare soil surface). The rills propagate especially during the repeated simulation under the wet initial conditions.

#### OUTLOOK

Evaluation of the effect of the surface cover on soil water regime.

Assessment of the impact and suitability of individual measures.

Effect of the soil temperature on the rills development in laboratory conditions.