



Development and testing of a modified ground sediment trap
by Leslie Carol Bush

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in
Range Science

Montana State University

© Copyright by Leslie Carol Bush (1985)

Abstract:

A modified version of a ground sediment trap was tested in a greenhouse study for its effectiveness in collecting overland flow and soil loss. Four degrees of slopes, three ground cover levels, varying rainfall and overland flow conditions, and one soil type were used in erosion studies to determine their interactions and influences on overland flow and soil loss. Overland flow and soil losses (a) increased with slope steepness, storm intensity, and storm duration; and (b) decreased with increasing ground cover. Rate of soil loss increased during the first 40 minutes and then decreased as overland flow continued while rate of overland flow increased during the first 40 minutes and then remained constant. The traps were more efficient and less variable in collecting overland flow and soil losses on slopes steeper than 10%. The traps worked more effectively under storms of moderate to high intensities, and with storms of 40 minutes to extended durations; consequently, they should function adequately during semi-arid and arid region natural precipitation events over rangelands in moderate to poor conditions.

DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF A MODIFIED GROUND SEDIMENT TRAP

by

Leslie Carol Bush

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Range Science

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

August, 1985

MAIN LIB.
N378
B9633
Cop. 2

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Leslie Carol Bush

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

26 August 1985
Date

Clayton Marburn
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

August 26, 1985
Date

William C. Hunter
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

8-26-85
Date

W. Malone
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Director of Libraries when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

John Wells

Date

20 August 1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep gratitude that I acknowledge the help and advice given by Mr. Don Donham while the microsite was at Fort Ellis, my graduate committee, Mr. Dennis Neuman and the use of his lab facilities, my curriculum professors, friends, and family. I would like to especially thank Dr. Clayton Marlow for his moral and financial support, and advice; the United States Forest Service Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station for the use of their greenhouse facility; Ms. Gayle Barthel for her secretarial assistance; Ms. Linda Kisha for her assistance in obtaining literature; Mr. Terry Koral for his computer programming assistance; Dr. Richard Lund and Dr. Michael Huffman for their guidance in statistical analysis; Mr. Gene Kennon for his draftmanship; and Mr. Henry Tacon for his mathematical consultations and assistance. Lastly, I would like to particularly thank Mrs. Paula Ross for her word processing assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VITA	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABSTRACT	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Erosion Analysis	3
Simulated Rainfall Studies on Natural Terrain	6
Natural Rainfall Studies vs Simulated Rainfall Studies	7
Simulated Rainfall Studies on Constructed Microsites	8
METHODS AND MATERIALS	13
Wood Box and Sediment Trap Construction	13
Wood Box	13
Ground Sediment Trap	13
Ground Cover	14
Seeding	14
Monitoring	15
Thinning	16
Sediment Collection and Surface Runoff Determination via Rainfall Simulator	16
Sediment Collection and Surface Runoff Determination via Overland Flow Mechanism	21
Statistical Analysis	22
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	25
Ground Sediment Trap Performance	25
Ground Cover Influences on Overland Flow and Soil Loss	25
Overland Flow Condition Influences on Overland Flow and Soil Loss	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS--continued.

	Page
Slope Influences on Overland Flow and Soil Loss.	37
Conclusions	41
SUMMARY.	42
LITERATURE CITED	44
APPENDICES	49
Appendix A - Overland Flow Results.	50
Appendix B - Microsite Soil Characteristics	57
Appendix C - Ground Sediment Trap Designs	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Box Draining Period Prior to Each Rainfall Simulation Run	20
2. Box Draining Period Prior to Each Overland Flow Run	24
3. Cover Type Treatment Means for Soil Loss and Overland Flow.	33
4. Overland Flow Intensity and Overland Flow Duration Interaction Effects on Overland Flow for All Slopes and Cover Types	34
5. Overland Flow Intensity Treatment Means for Soil Loss and Overland Flow	36
6. Overland Flow Duration Treatment Means for Soil Loss and Overland Flow	36
7. Mean Overland Flow Under Bare Ground Via Overland Flow.	38
8. Mean Soil Loss Under Bare Ground Via Overland Flow.	38
9. Mean Soil Loss Under Bare Ground Via Overland Flow.	40
10. Surface Runoff per Plot, Surface Runoff Means, and Coefficient of Variances for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific Overland Flow Durations at 7 mm/min.	51
11. Surface Runoff per Plot, Surface Runoff Means, and Coefficient of Variances for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific Overland Flow Durations at 12 mm/min.	52
12. Surface Runoff per Plot, Surface Runoff Means, and Coefficient of Variances for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific Overland Flow Durations at 19 mm/min.	53
13. Soil Loss per Plot, Soil Loss Means, and Coefficient of Variances for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific	

LIST OF TABLES--continued.

Table	Page
Overland Flow Durations at 7 mm/min	54
14. Soil Loss per Plot, Soil Loss Means, and Coefficient of Variance for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific Overland Flow Durations at 12 mm/min	55
15. Soil Loss per Plot, Soil Loss Means, and Coefficient of Variance for All Cover Types at All Slopes and Specific Overland Flow Durations at 19 mm/min	56
16. Mean Soil Texture, Organic and Mineral Matter Contents and Other Soil Characteristics Following All Plant Cover and Bare Ground Treatments.	58

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Diagram of Microsite Wood Box	14
2. General Ground Sediment Trap Design (a) Support Frame, and (b) Removable Trap.	14
3. Top View of Removable Trap.	15
4. Top View of Microsite Plot and Ground Sediment Trap Positions	17
5. Photo of 62 X 62 cm Rainfall Simulator.	18
6. Mean Rainfall Simulator Volume Distribution	18
7. Raindrop Delivery Position at (a) 0% Slope, (b) 5% Slope, (c) 10% Slope, and (d) 15% Slope.	18
8. Diagram of Overland Flow Mechanism.	23
9. Overland Flow Mechanism Positioned on Microsite	23
10. Overland Flow vs Overland Flow Intensity for Heavy Cover at 15% Slope.	26
11. Overland Flow vs Overland Flow Intensity for Medium Cover at 15% Slope.	27
12. Overland Flow vs Overland Flow Intensity for Bare Ground at 15% Slope.	28
13. Soil Loss vs Overland Flow Intensity for Heavy Cover at 15% Slope	29
14. Soil Loss vs Overland Flow Intensity for Medium Cover at 15% Slope.	30
15. Soil Loss vs Overland Flow Intensity for Bare Ground at 15% Slope.	31
16. Cross-sectional Side View of Up-slope Frame Side.	62
17. Illustration of Frame Tapering for Slope Gradient	62

LIST OF FIGURES--continued.

Figure	Page
18. Protective Screen Cover (a) Side View of Metal Skeleton, (b) Bottom View of Metal Skeleton, (c) Side View of Mesh on Skeleton, and (d) Bottom View of Mesh on Skeleton. . .	62
19. Overflow System Set-up for (a) Low Surface Runoff Volume Yielding Storms, (b) Details of Overflow Connections in (a), (c) High Surface Runoff Volume Yielding Storms, and (d) Details of Overflow Connections in (c) on Trap Frame.	63

ABSTRACT

A modified version of a ground sediment trap was tested in a greenhouse study for its effectiveness in collecting overland flow and soil loss. Four degrees of slopes, three ground cover levels, varying rainfall and overland flow conditions, and one soil type were used in erosion studies to determine their interactions and influences on overland flow and soil loss. Overland flow and soil losses (a) increased with slope steepness, storm intensity, and storm duration; and (b) decreased with increasing ground cover. Rate of soil loss increased during the first 40 minutes and then decreased as overland flow continued while rate of overland flow increased during the first 40 minutes and then remained constant. The traps were more efficient and less variable in collecting overland flow and soil losses on slopes steeper than 10%. The traps worked more effectively under storms of moderate to high intensities, and with storms of 40 minutes to extended durations; consequently, they should function adequately during semi-arid and arid region natural precipitation events over rangelands in moderate to poor conditions.

INTRODUCTION

Soil erosion, "a process of detachment and transportation of soil materials by erosive agents" (Ellison 1947a), is "one of the three components in the overall sedimentation process (erosion, transport, and deposition)" (Ekern 1950). There are two basic categories of erosion (a) normal erosion, degradation of the soil at a rate equivalent to the geological normal, and (b) accelerated erosion, degradation of the soil at a rate greater than geologic normal (Croft et al. 1943).

Accelerated erosion occurs through the destructive modification or removal of soil resulting from impairment of the protective influence exerted by the plant and litter cover (Croft et al. 1943). It has been recognized that erosion is a serious problem of farm- and rangelands over a large part of the earth (Smith and Wischmeier 1962). Consequently, proper land management practices are needed to reduce, rectify, and solve erosional problems on noncultivated and cultivated land bases. An important facet of these management practices is the evaluation of their effectiveness; consequently, there are demands for accurate means of quantitative erosion measurement and monitoring.

Ideally, methods of quantifying normal and accelerated erosion on semi-arid rangelands should alter natural ecosystem processes as little as possible. The use of ground sediment traps may be one way to meet this requirement. This study analyzed the feasibility and effectiveness of such traps. There were three primary objectives in this study:

(a) to design and develop a versatile ground sediment trap, (b) to test the effectiveness of prototype traps in controlled erosion studies and (c) to evaluate the influences of ground cover, slope and overland flow conditions on overland flow and soil loss. Hypothetically, sediment collection by in-situ traps varies with changes in slope, storm conditions, soil characteristics, and ground cover. Four slopes, three different ground covers, varying rainfall and overland flow conditions, and one soil type were used in the erosion study to determine their interactions and influences on overland flow and sediment production, and to analyze trap effectiveness.

The study was conducted in the United States Forest Service's Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station greenhouse on Montana State University's campus in Bozeman, Montana. Test dates were September 1983 through July 1984.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Erosion Analysis

Studies dealing with soil erosion problems need to take into account the four factor classes involving erosion. These factor classes are (a) pedologic; including texture, structure, and other soil characteristics involving erodibility; (b) physiographic; including slope, length of overland flow, surface roughness, depression storage, etc.; (c) hydrologic; including precipitation intensity and duration, infiltration capacity, and surface runoff characteristics; and (d) hydraulic; including fluid conductivity, routing and physical characteristics (Horton 1938). The physiographic and hydrologic factors operate indirectly through hydraulic factors and independent variables such as depth and velocity of overland flow, and type of overland flow. Erosion studies which simulate natural conditions need accurate representation of these factor classes in order to obtain results applicable to those expected from studies done under natural climatic and environmental conditions. Erosion studies also need runoff and soil loss collection apparatus which operate efficiently and accurately. Several methods have been developed to better understand the influences and interactions of factors influencing erosion.

Ellison (1944) developed devices that measured overland flow and splash erosion under natural and simulated storms. His overland flow sampler was adjustable for slope and could be carried around for use on

random plots or used on permanent transects. Debris was troublesome in the collection slots, and erosion by overland flow only could not be determined if there was any raindrop erosion (Ellison 1944). Ellison's splash sampler was as portable as the overland flow sampler, and together they could help determine the distribution and nature of the erosional activity occurring over a watershed (Ellison 1944).

Numerous studies have been done under natural and/or simulated storm conditions through use of plots with barriers, troughs, flumes, recording gages, and collection containers for the collection and measurement of surface runoff (SRO) and soil loss. Erosion plots with wood barriers and wood catchment troughs of variable dimensions were used by Lowdermilk (1930), Marston (1952), Rowe and Reimann (1961), and Osborn et al. (1964). Natural rainfall events were used in all these studies. Troughs used by Marston and Rowe and Reimann did not have flumes, recording gages, or collection containers. Lowdermilk's plots (1930) had pipes which transported surface runoff and seepage water from the plots into tipping bucket gages to obtain rates of flow. Osborn et al.'s (1964) troughs had pipes which transferred runoff into silt tanks. Van Doren et al.'s (1940) plots had wood barriers and metal troughs with flumes from which iron pipes transported surface runoff of natural rainfall events into silt tanks. Various modifications of plots equipped with metal sidewalls and metal catchment troughs have been used by Pearse and Woolley (1936), Dunford (1954), Haupt (1967), and Orr (1970). Pearse and Woolley's plots (1936) were supplied by simulated overland flow. The overland flow was funneled through a metal spout into collection cans and jars placed beneath the

downslope frame side. Dunford's plots (1954) were supplied by natural rainfall. Metal flumes were incorporated into Dunford's troughs from which pipes fed runoff into silt tanks. Haupt (1967) used plots with metal sidewalls and metal troughs on which natural and simulated precipitation was supplied. Orr (1970) used plots with metal sidewalls and troughs supplied by natural rainfall. Runoff was funneled from the troughs into buried pipes which emptied into collection tanks. Erosion plots equipped with concrete sidewalls and troughs have been used. Nichols and Sexton (1932) delineated plots with concrete sidewalls and applied simulated rainfall. Surface runoff was collected in concrete cisterns which fed into collection cans at the end of each slope. Leopold (1964) used plots equipped with concrete sidewalls and concrete troughs that fed natural rainfall runoff into collection tanks.

Although there are many advantages of using delineated erosion plots, there are several disadvantages. Advantages are (a) controlled collection of runoff leading to accurate measures of SRO and soil loss; (b) simplified manipulation of vegetal and soil conditions; (c) capabilities for simulating precipitation events over controlled plot conditions resulting in regulated erosion events; and (d) potential correlation of plot erosion conditions to those expected on unaltered areas. Major disadvantages in using constructed erosion plots are (a) alteration of natural erosion patterns over areas where plots were placed; (b) alterations of vegetal and soil conditions which changed erosion patterns and potentials; (c) slow availability of data and variability of data under natural precipitation events; and (d) variability in control of simulated precipitation and other drawbacks

with the use of precipitation simulators. Runoff and erosion data vary greatly due to dissimilar precipitation conditions (Martson 1952).

Simulated Rainfall Studies on Natural Terrain

Similar SRO and soil loss collection apparatus as those described in the proceeding section have been used in simulated rainfall studies on smaller erosion plots on natural terrain. Smaller erosion plots were used primarily due to the higher costs, more frequent inaccuracies of measurement, and greater disturbance to natural erosion patterns which were common with large erosion plots. Six infiltrometer models used often in studies on natural terrain are (1) Type-F infiltrometer, (2) Rocky Mountain infiltrometer, (3) modified North Fork equipment, (4) Pearse square foot apparatus, (5) "raindrop applicator", and (6) "rainulator" (Wilm 1941). Their predominant designs involved non-adjustable metal plot frames with metal troughs usually equipped with gages. Runoff may or may not be funneled from the troughs into collection jars and cans depending on the model. Precipitation was supplied by type-F nozzle sprinklers, or a suspended graduated container which fed into a perforated pipe. Dortignac's Rocky Mountain infiltrometer (1951) had a frame with troughs which were adjusted to slope and had fly screen trash collectors to prevent clogging of SRO flows. SRO and soil loss were then passed from each trough through garden hose and drain pipe into 1 gallon containers. Osborn (1952) and Rauzi (1960) used "raindrop applicators" and metal plot frames for erosion study. Osborn's (1952) frame had splash collection troughs on the left and right frame sides and a SRO collection jar positioned at

the end of a metal spout on the downslope frame side. In contrast, Rauzi's (1960) frame had a metal spout covered with burlap which funneled runoff into a collection jar. Meyer and McCune (1958) and Meyer (1960) used a "rainulator" on plots with metal barriers. SRO was collected in metal troughs, measured by gages, and funneled into collection cans. Their trough flumes had water level recorders, and sampling wheels.

As mentioned in the preceding section, there were advantages and disadvantages prevalent with the use of simulated rainfall. Many of these will be discussed in the following section.

Natural Rainfall Studies vs Simulated Rainfall Studies

There has been much debate over the need and use of natural vs simulated rainfall in erosion studies. Although natural rainfall studies provide the most direct means of correlating erosion and precipitation actions they also (a) are slow to yield results, (b) are less efficient than simulated rainfall studies, and (c) are less controlled than simulated rainfall studies (Mech 1965). Simulated rainfall studies have been found to yield SRO volumes comparable to those from natural rainfall of similar intensity and duration. However, simulated rainfall studies tend to yield underestimations of expected SRO and erosion from similar natural rainfall conditions (Mech 1965, and Barnett and Dooley 1972). There are other drawbacks to the use of simulated rain. Raindrop energy remains constant with changing simulated intensities while it changes with changes in natural rainfall intensities. There is variation in height of fall of raindrops, rate

of delivery, and rainfall distribution (Dortignac 1951). Rainfall simulators have operational limitations due to their expense and operation complexities (Mech 1965, Young and Burwell 1972). There are limitations on the modeling of environmental and climatic condition constraints in simulated rainfall studies (Mech 1965, Young and Burwell 1972). Natural erosion patterns are altered by plot boundary construction. The results of simulated rainfall studies have also been found to be primarily qualitative (Meyer and McCune 1958). Consequently, there is a need for more effective and efficient erosion analysis methods to be used under natural rainfall conditions since simulated rainfall studies have numerous drawbacks.

Simulated Rainfall Studies on Constructed Microsites

The number and variation of factors affecting soil erosion are such that it is difficult to determine the importance of each individual factor. In order to determine the effect of any one factor, the other factors need to be held constant or measured while the variable being studied is altered (Neal 1937). The manipulation and control of factors affecting soil erosion is very difficult under natural conditions. Consequently, microsites have been used in erosion studies so factors affecting soil erosion could be controlled.

Neal (1937) constructed a wood soil tank to use in analyzing the interactions of various factors on SRO, soil loss, and infiltration. He studied (a) the influences that slope, precipitation intensity and duration, initial soil moisture, soil surface condition, and infiltration had on SRO and soil loss; and (b) the influences that slope,

rainfall intensity, initial soil moisture, and rate of infiltration had on infiltration. No ground cover was used while Neal controlled soil conditions, slope, and precipitation intensities and durations. Six slopes were used. Five rainfall intensities and seven rainfall durations were provided with an oscillating nozzle sprinkler system. SRO was collected in a galvanized iron trough at the tank base which fed into collection cans. Soil loss per can was determined for each 10 minute period. Percolation water was collected in a can fed from a trough on the box bottom. Three infiltration cylinders placed in the soil surface were used for obtaining infiltration rates during each run.

Relative density of runoff material increased as slope and rainfall intensity increased (Neal 1937). Soil loss from a saturated soil increased as the 0.7 power of slope, the 2.2 power of rainfall intensity, and directly to rain duration. Neal concluded that rainfall intensity was the most important factor affecting runoff and soil loss in that it (a) had a greater effect on soil loss than on runoff, and (b) had a greater effect on soil loss than percent slope.

Meyer and Monke (1965) used a microsite to establish basic relationships between soil erosion and various factors influencing it: slope length, slope steepness, and soil particle size. No ground cover was used while they controlled soil and slope conditions, and rainfall intensities and durations. Four particle sizes of glass beads ranging from that of a very fine sand to a medium sand were dried and smoothed prior to each run. Six slope steepnesses and four slope lengths were used. Two rainfall intensities were supplied from a rainfall simulator

for 30 minutes. SRO was collected in a metal trough at the plot base which drained into collection cans.

Runoff erosion was found to increase with slope length and steepness except at small steepnesses and lengths where essentially no erosion occurred (Meyer and Monke 1965). Rainfall plus runoff increased erosion of smaller particle sizes but decreased erosion of larger sizes as compared with runoff alone. Meyer and Monke (1965) determined that increased sediment availability and runoff carrying capacity were dominant for more easily transported small particles whereas decreased carrying capacity of runoff was dominant for larger particles.

Farmer and Van Haveren (1971) used a wood constructed microsite to (a) develop information about the effects of soil, slope, and rainfall variables on the erodibility of bare soil; (b) determine the magnitude of these effects; and (c) identify relationships between these variables. Three surface soil samples were tested. Three slopes were used. Two rainfall intensities were provided from F-type nozzles for 30 minute runs. Soil splash was collected on four concentric interlocking trays on the plot perimeter, and on a large unsegmented pan on the floor at the plot base. All SRO was collected into cans and weighed. One pint SRO samples were periodically collected during the runs to find the concentration of soil material.

Farmer and Van Haveren (1971) found that rainfall intensity, slope steepness, and percent by weight of soil particles greater than 2 mm had the greatest effects on erosion by overland flow (OLF). Slope steepness and rainfall intensity strongly interacted to influence soil

erosion by OLF. The interactive strength of slope and rainfall intensity was at least a full order of magnitude greater than any soil variable.

Although information yielded from these studies are very accurate and reliable sources of soil erosion behavior explanation, more information on rainfall patterns and characteristics, and topographic effects needs to be assembled before real expertise can be developed in explaining soil erosion behavior. These studies and others of similar principle could be used as a basis in future erosion studies under more natural conditions, and to provide increased understanding of the soil-erosion process. For this study, various equipment designs used by formerly discussed researchers were incorporated into a modified ground sediment trap that can be used under natural precipitation events. A rectangular metal frame to be left buried with its surface at ground level and to serve as a support for a removable trough was incorporated from Ellison's (1944) and Dortignac's (1951) designs. Trough or trap shapes used by Dortignac (1951), Meyer and McCune (1958), Haupt (1967) and Orr (1970) were combined into a removable metal-trap design. The trap has its downslope rim slide into a lip of the frame and its upslope rim lie over the frame rim. A metal baffle for reducing downslope overflow potentials was installed on the downslope trap side. Modifications of overflow system designs used by Lowdermilk (1930), Pearse and Woolley (1936), Ellison (1944), Meyer and McCune (1958), Rowe and Reimann (1961) and Orr (1970) were incorporated into trap overflow systems in which collection containers would be placed (a) within the frame beneath the trap for low runoff yielding storms, and

(b) downslope of the traps for high runoff volume yielding storms.

Prototype traps were tested on a constructed microsite (Neal 1937, Farmer and Van Haveren 1971) with three ground cover levels and various simulated rainfall and overland flow conditions.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Wood Box and Sediment Trap Construction

Wood Box. An adjustable 2.4 m x 1.2 m x 24.8 cm box was constructed to contain soil and vegetation (Figure 1). The box sides were tapered to facilitate drainage. Four steel braces were nailed to the box front for support. Finally, burlap was placed over the front opening to prevent soil loss. Caulking was added to inner box seams.

Drainage holes were made to facilitate soil drainage (Figure 1). Twenty 0.5 cm holes were made through the front sides and covered on the inside with burlap. Very coarse sand was then spread at a depth of 4.1 cm on the box bottom to further facilitate drainage.

Ground Sediment Trap. A general trap design is shown in Figure 2 with a top view of the removable trap shown in Figure 3. The traps were made of sheet metal with $i \times 0.3i \times 0.4i$ (i = frame length) dimensions for the stationary frame and $i' \times 0.2i' \times 0.3i'$ (i' = trap length) dimensions for the removable trap where $i' = 0.95i$. The frame is designed to be left buried with the surface rim being even with the soil surface. Length of frame, i , should be the same as desired sample plot width. Three prototype removable traps were used in the greenhouse study in which $i' = 30.5$ cm. Trap frames were not used in the study due to their expense. Surface runoff (SRO) was manually removed from the traps with pipettes, a handpump, and/or siphons.

FIGURE 1. Diagram of Microsite Wood Box.






FIGURE 2. General Ground Sediment Trap Design (a) Support Frame, and (b) Removable Trap.

Ground Cover

Seeding. The box was filled with clay loam topsoil from nearby garden plots, and saturated with water. A 62 X 62 cm frame with 9 20 X 20 cm internally welded quadrats was placed in the upper right corner of the box. Twelve 0.5 cm deep holes per quadrat were randomly made and

filled with Garrison Creeping Foxtail (Alopercurus pratensis L.) seed. Garrison Creeping Foxtail was chosen due to its water tolerance and its being a common species on subirrigated soils. The frame was moved to consecutive areas and seeds planted until the entire surface was planted.

FIGURE 3. Top View of Removable Trap.



Monitoring. Three cover conditions were used to evaluate vegetal influences on sediment and overland flow under variable overland flow and slope conditions. These cover conditions and their mean coverage were (a) heavy, 64%, (b) medium, 48%, and (c) bare ground, 0%. The latter two cover conditions were achieved by thinning after all heavy and medium cover tests were completed respectively. Only heavy coverage averaging 51% was used during the rainfall simulator study.

Seedling counts were obtained after shoot emergence with the 62 X 62 cm frame. Plant numbers were obtained with the frame at the initiation of each cover condition for a density estimation. The canopy cover method (Daubenmire 1959) was used to obtain initial percent canopy cover and final percent canopy cover estimates for each cover condition.

Thinning. Number of plants per quadrat was determined with the 62 X 62 cm frame after completion of heavy cover tests. One-third of the plants per quadrat were randomly removed by clipping their crown tissue out and discarding their leaves. This provided the medium cover.

All plants were removed from the microsite in the same manner as before after all medium cover tests were completed. Soil clods and root systems were removed, and the surface raked. A superconcentrated solution of the herbicide, Spike¹, was poured on the microsite to insure vegetation removal. The soil surface was then graded to an uniform condition with a fine-toothed handsaw.

Sediment Collection and Surface Runoff Determination via Rainfall Simulator


The microsite was divided into three plots 0.75 m in width (Figure 4). A ground sediment trap was installed in the center of each plot. Slope lengths were 77 cm for plots 1 and 3, and 82.5 cm for plot 2. Traps 1 and 3 had shorter slope lengths due to the box tapering.

A 62 X 62 cm rainfall simulator was suspended on two parallel greased steel pipes 2 m above the microsite (Figure 5). Tap water entered the simulator through a plastic tube fed from a garden hose and was regulated by a Gilmont 100 ml flowmeter. The simulator was rotated at a constant speed by an electrical engine and drive chain. The simulator regulation was achieved by (1) placing plastic over the microsite, (2) centering the simulator over the plot to be tested, (3) adjusting water flow to the desired volume, (4) spacing three large

¹Tebuthiuron manufactured by Lanco, Indianapolis, Indiana.

cans under the simulator, and (5) measuring volume output per can during one-minute trials and reregulating the flowmeter until a constant average volume was maintained. It was noted that water volume delivered from the simulator was not consistent. The front third of the simulator consistently delivered twice as much water as the rear third, and three times as much water than the middle third (Figure 6). The location of raindrop delivery also varied as slope was altered (Figure 7) because of the pipes' location being stationary for all tests. Raindrop delivery was directly behind trap #2 at 0% slope; near the box's back side at 15% slope; and proportionally placed between the traps and box back at the 5% and 10% slopes.

FIGURE 4. Top View of Microsite Plot and Ground Sediment Trap Positions.



The soil was then supersaturated with water and allowed to drain to near field capacity if not pre-moistened from prior tests. The sediment traps were drained and cleaned. The simulator was regulated and plot runs performed while the flowmeter was monitored and reregulated between runs if necessary. Four intensities (0.2, 0.9,

FIGURE 5. Photo of 62 X 62 cm Rainfall Simulator.




FIGURE 6. Mean Rainfall Simulator Volume Distribution.





FIGURE 7. Raindrop Delivery Position at (a) 0% Slope, (b) 5% Slope, (c) 10% Slope, and (d) 15% Slope.



2.4, and 4.4 mm/minute) were run for five durations (10, 20, 40, 60, and 80 minutes) on each of four slopes (0%, 5%, 10%, and 15%). Six runs, 2 per plot, were performed at all intensities for the 10 and 20 minute durations. Three runs, 1 per plot, were performed at all intensities for the other durations. Only three runs were done at the longer durations due to time constraints. A total of 336 runs were done in a progressive order of intensity and duration with pre-set box draining periods. Plots #1, #2, and #3 were done in a successive order. Draining periods (Table 1) were based on those used in infiltration studies by Rauzi and Hanson (1966) and Gifford et al. (1970).

Surface runoff (SRO) containing sediment was withdrawn from the traps with a handpump or pipettes during and after each run and placed in cups. SRO volume per plot and mean SRO per intensity/duration was determined by noting the number of cups collected. Collected sediment from each plot was drained through a 230 μ m mesh seive and then into a nickel crucible. The crucibles were dried at 105°C for 16-18 hours and allowed to cool completely. Net sediment masses were determined by weighing each crucible to the nearest hundred thousandth gram. Mean dry sediment mass per intensity/duration was calculated from the averages of sediment collected from all three plots. The box was raised with hydraulic jacks to the next slope desired for testing and the process repeated. Box weight support was supplied through a steel pipe, cinder blocks and wood.

TABLE 1. Box Draining Period Prior to Each Rainfall Simulation Run.

RAINFALL DURATION (minutes)	RAINFALL INTENSITY (mm/min)	DRAINING PERIOD (time after prior intensity's run completion)
10	0.2	First runs of the day
10	0.9	1.5 hours
10	2.4	First runs of the day
10	4.4	2.5 hours
20	0.2	First runs of the day
20	0.9	2.5 hours
20	2.4	First runs of the day
20	4.4	4 hours
40	0.2	First runs of the day
40	0.9	5 hours
40	2.4	First runs of the day
40	4.4	7 hours
60	0.2	First runs of the day
60	0.9	8 hours
60	2.4	18 hours
60	4.4	20 hours
80	0.2	20 hrs after 43 mm/min for 60 minutes
80	0.9	20 hours
80	2.4	20 hours
80	4.4	20 hours

Sediment Collection and Overland Flow Determination via Overland Flow Mechanism

Due to irregularities in simulated rainfall application, it was decided to discontinue this portion of the study after heavy cover tests were completed. Instead, a modified version of an overland flow mechanism used by Tsai (1983) was built for use on the microsite (Figure 8). Forty-seven 0.2 cm diameter holes were made 5 cm apart on a PVC pipe. A metal elbow and a metal valve were glued on opposite pipe ends. Water was supplied to the pipe from a garden hose. The overland flow mechanism was regulated by (1) turning the pipe to flow onto the greenhouse floor; (2) filling the pipe with water voiding it of all air; (3) setting up six food cans (2 pipe holes per can) under the pipe flow line; and (4) measuring volume output per can during one-minute trials until a constant average volume was maintained. Although water volume delivered from the pipe was consistent there was a pressure head loss from the water inlet to the end valve. The pressure head loss resulted in a mean decrease of 15 ml output from the water source to the valve.

The same plot and trap positions were used as in the rainfall simulator tests. The soil was supersaturated with water and allowed to drain to approximate field capacity if not moistened from previous tests. The traps were drained and cleaned, and trap overflow siphon systems set up. The overland flow mechanism was regulated and turned onto the microsite making sure all holes were flowing without obstruction (Figure 9). Three intensities (7, 12, and 19 mm/minute) were run for five durations (10, 20, 40, 60, and 80 minutes) on each

slope (0%, 5%, 10%, and 15%). One run was performed for all intensities and durations resulting in a total of 60 runs. The tests were done in a progressive order of intensity and duration with pre-set draining periods. Draining periods (Table 2) were determined from the mean time it took the microsite to drain to near field capacity between each intensity/duration run. Overland flow (OLF) with sediment was withdrawn from the traps during and after the runs. OLF volume per plot and mean OLF per run were determined. Collected sediment was transferred into nickel crucibles as done in the rainfall simulator study. The crucibles were dried at 105°C for 16-18 hours and allowed to cool completely. Net dry sediment mass per intensity/duration was calculated from the averages of sediment collected per plot. The box was raised to the next slope after all tests were complete. The same procedures were followed for all cover treatments; however, the soil surface was graded with a fine-toothed handsaw to an uniform surface condition after each bare ground run.

Statistical Analysis

Ground sediment masses and surface runoff volumes for the rainfall simulator and overland flow treatments were analyzed with the Analysis of Variance for Multiple Factors (AVMF) program at a $P = 0.05$ level². Treatment factor means, treatment combination means, and multiple comparisons using the least significant difference (t-test) for all factors were obtained.

²Lund, R. 1983. MSUSTAT. A statistical package. Mont. State Univ., Bozeman, MT.

FIGURE 8. Diagram of Overland Flow Mechanism (modification of Tsai design, 1983).




FIGURE 9. Overland Flow Mechanism Positioned on Microsite.




TABLE 2. Box Draining Period Prior to Each Overland Flow Run.

OVERLAND FLOW DURATION (minutes)	OVERLAND FLOW INTENSITY (mm/minute)	DRAINING PERIOD (time after prior intensity's run)
10	7	First run of the day
10	12	45 minutes
10	19	45 minutes
20	7	2 hrs after 70 mm/min for 10 minutes
20	12	1.5 hours
20	19	2 hours
40	7	First run of the day
40	12	1 hr 15 minutes
40	19	1.5 hours
60	7	First run of the day
60	12	2 hours
60	19	3 hours
80	50	First run of the day
80	60	2.5 hours
80	70	3.5 hours

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Ground Sediment Trap Performance

Resulting magnitudes of standard deviation were too great to effectively compare treatments because of the very large overland flow volumes and very small sediment loads. Sediment loads per trap ranged from 0.0000 g to 0.0908 g in the overland flow portion of the study. Therefore, the coefficient of variability (CV) was used instead of standard deviations for comparing trap difference [where CV equals treatment standard deviation divided by treatment mean (n = no. of samples for each run) times one-hundred]. Overland flow (OLF) and soil loss per plot, microsite means, and coefficient of variability for all cover types on all slopes during 20 and 40 minutes of overland flow at 7, 12, and 19 mm/min intensities are shown in Appendix A. Coefficient of variability ranged from 72 to 176% for OLF, and from 0.0010 to 0.1732% for soil loss except for medium cover which had a CV of 231% for its 40 minute OLF on 10% slope. Dortignac (1951) found the CV of a single vegetation-soil complex varied between 25 and 70% for areas as small as 5 to 10 acres in size. Lower CV indicated less variation about sample mean.

Ground Cover Influences on Overland Flow and Soil Loss

Average OLF over the microsite generally increased as canopy cover decreased (Figures 10, 11 and 12). Mean soil loss from the microsite shown in Figures 13, 14, and 15 also generally increased as canopy

FIGURE 10. Overland Flow Vs Overland Flow Intensity for Heavy Cover at 15% Slope.




FIGURE 11. Overland Flow Vs Overland Flow Intensity for Medium Cover at 15% Slope.




FIGURE 12. Overland Flow Vs Overland Flow Intensity for Bare Ground at 15% Slope.




FIGURE 13. Soil Loss Vs Overland Flow Intensity for Heavy Cover at 15% Slope.




FIGURE 14. Soil Loss Vs Overland Flow Intensity for Medium Cover at 15% Slope.

