

**Evaluation of soil erosion in the Harerge region of Ethiopia
using soil loss models, rainfall simulation and field trials**

by

Bobe Bedadi Woreka

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree Doctor of Philosophy: Soil Science
in the Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria**

Supervisor: Prof. A.S. Claassens

July 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables	viii
List of figures	x
Acronyms and abbreviations used	xiii
Abstract	xv
Introduction	1
CHAPTER 1	
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.1 Soil erosion mechanisms and processes	4
1.2 Soil surface sealing and crusting	4
1.3 Effect of soil texture on sealing and erosion	5
1.4 Effect of slope gradient on runoff and soil loss	6
1.5 Effect of rainfall intensity on runoff and soil loss	7
1.6 Soil erosion impacts	8
1.6.1 Soil physical properties	8
1.6.2 Soil chemical properties	8
1.6.3 Productivity	9
1.6.4 Off-site effects of soil erosion	10
1.7 Soil erosion models	11
1.7.1 Empirical models	11
1.7.2 Conceptual models	12
1.7.3 Physically based models	13
1.7.4 Selection of models for use in the present study	13
1.8 Role of crop residue mulching on soil properties and erosion control	15
1.8.1 Soil physical properties	17
1.8.2 Soil chemical and biological properties	17
1.8.3 Soil erosion control	18
CHAPTER 2	
ERODIBILITY ASSESSMENT OF SOME SOILS OF HARERGE, EASTERN ETHIOPIA, BY USING RAINFALL SIMULATION	21
2.1 Introduction	21
2.2 Materials and methods	22
2.2.1 Description of the study sites	23
2.2.2 Soil sampling and analysis of some physical and chemical properties	27
2.2.3 Soil packing, rainfall simulation and data acquisition	27
2.2.4 Statistical analysis	32
2.3 Results and discussion	32

2.3.1	Infiltration and runoff	32
2.3.2	Splash detachment and sediment yield	38
2.3.3	Relationships between runoff, splash detachment and sediment yield	41
2.3.4	Relationships between soil properties and erosion parameters	43
2.4	Conclusion	48

CHAPTER 3

PREDICTION OF SOIL LOSS USING SOIL EROSION MODELS	49	
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Soil loss estimation using SLEMSA	49
3.2.1	Introduction	51
3.2.2	Materials and method	52
3.2.2.1	Estimation of K for SLEMSA	52
3.2.2.2	Assumptions and procedures used to estimate the C values for SLEMSA	54
3.2.2.3	Procedures used to estimate the topographic factor X for SLEMSA	56
3.2.3	Results and discussion	57
3.2.3.1	Estimated soil losses using SLEMSA	58
3.2.3.2	Sensitivity of soil loss estimated by SLEMSA to changes in input variables	59
3.3	Soil loss estimation using USLE	64
3.3.1	Introduction	64
3.3.2	Materials and methods	65
3.3.2.1	Procedures used to estimate the factors in USLE	65
3.3.3	Results and discussion	68
3.3.3.1	Estimated soil loss at the study sites using USLE	68
3.3.3.2	Sensitivity analysis of USLE to its input variables	70
3.4	Comparison of soil loss estimated by SLEMSA and USLE	73
3.5	Qualitative comparison of soil erodibility indices determined in the laboratory trials and soil loss estimated using the SLEMSA and USLE models	74
3.6	Estimation of tolerable soil loss and soil life for the study sites	78
3.7	Conclusion	81

CHAPTER 4

EFFECT OF SOIL TEXTURE, SLOPE GRADIENT AND RAINFALL INTENSITY ON RUNOFF AND EROSION	83
4.1 Introduction	83
4.2 Materials and methods	85
4.3 Results and discussion	90
4.3.1 Analysis of total erosion parameters as affected by soil texture, slope gradient and rainfall intensity	90
4.3.1.1 Runoff	90
4.3.1.2 Sediment yield	92
4.3.1.3 Splash erosion	95
4.3.2 Trends of erosion parameters during rainfall event	97
4.3.2.1 Infiltration rate	97
4.3.2.2 Runoff	99
4.3.2.3 Sediment yield	101
4.3.2.4 Splash detachment rate	105
4.3.3 Correlation between some erosion parameters	106
4.4 Conclusion	107

CHAPTER 5

CHANGES IN SOIL ERODIBILITY UNDER SIMULATED RAINFALL AS INFLUENCED BY MULCHING RATES AND APPLICATION METHODS	109
5.1 Introduction	109
5.2 Materials and methods	110
5.3 Results and discussion	111
5.3.1 Runoff	111
5.3.2 Sediment yield	113
5.3.3 Splash detachment of soil	115
5.3.4 Rend of splash detachment with increasing cumulative rainfall	118
5.3.5 Relationships among the erosion parameters	120
5.3.6 Comparison of laboratory results with model values	122
5.4 Conclusion	122

CHAPTER 6

ROLE OF MULCHING ON RUNOFF AND SOIL LOSS IN FIELD PLOTS UNDER NATURAL RAINFALL 124

6.1	Introduction	124
6.2	Materials and methods	126
6.3	Results and discussion	129
6.3.1	Runoff	129
6.3.2	Soil loss	132
6.3.3	Runoff and soil loss at each rainfall event	135
6.3.4	Trends of runoff and soil loss with cumulative rainfall	137
6.4	Comparison of measured and estimated soil losses under mulching treatments	139
6.5	Conclusion	140

CHAPTER 7

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 141

7.1	Soil erodibility	141
7.2	Soil loss modelling	143
7.3	Soil conservation	144
7.4	General remarks	145
7.5	Research needs	146

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 148

REFERENCES 175

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Description of the study sites in Harerge, Eastern Ethiopia
Table 2.2	Methods used for determination of some of the physical and chemical properties of soils
Table 2.3	Some physical and chemical properties of the soils at the study sites in eastern Harerge, Ethiopia
Table 2.4	Runoff and infiltrated water for the one-hour rainfall simulation runs
Table 2.5	Soil groupings and selection of representative soils for trend analysis
Table 2.6	Mean time taken from initiation of rainfall to initiation of runoff and drainage in a laboratory rainfall simulation study at 60mm/hr rainfall intensity
Table 2.7	Mean final splash and sediment yield rates and total splash and sediment yield masses for replicated one-hour rainfall simulation runs
Table 2.8	Regression equations and correlation coefficients between selected soil properties and erosion parameters of some soils in eastern Ethiopia
Table 3.1	Estimated input variables of SLEMSA model and calculated soil loss ($\text{tons ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$) for some sites in eastern Ethiopia
Table 3.2	Response of soil loss estimated by SLEMSA to changes in some input variables
Table 3.3	Estimated values of erosion factors and soil loss estimated by using USLE for some soils of Harerge, eastern Ethiopia
Table 3.4	Changes in soil loss with changes in input variables of USLE for soils of Harerge, eastern Ethiopia
Table 3.5	Comparison of soil loss values from laboratory trials and that estimated using the USLE and SLEMSA models as well as visual field observations
Table 3.6	Estimated tolerable soil loss and soil life for some sites in Harerge, eastern Ethiopia
Table 4.1	Correlation among some of the erosion parameters
Table 5.1	Correlation coefficients R^2 and P values among some erosion

parameters measured in the study

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Table 6.1 | Some physical and chemical properties of Alemaya Regosols |
| Table 6.2 | Percent surface cover by the wheat straw applied at two rates and patterns |
| Table 6.3 | Percentage reductions in runoff due to mulching as compared to the control |
| Table 6.4 | Percentage reduction in soil loss at residue treated plots as compared to the control |

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1 The soil conservation effect of crop residue mulching
- Figure 2.1 Location map of Ethiopia and the study site
- Figure 2.2 The study sites
- Figure 2.3 The erosion tray and parts of the simulator system
- Figure 2.4 Infiltration rates of selected soils over a one-hour rainfall simulation
- Figure 2.5 Runoff rates for selected soils during a one-hour simulated rainfall
- Figure 2.6 Sediment yield rate vs. cumulative rainfall during a one-hour rainfall simulation on selected soils
- Figure 2.7 Soil splash rate vs. cumulative rainfall during a one-hour rainfall simulation on selected soils
- Figure 2.8 Total sediment yield vs. total runoff from a one hour rainfall simulation on the studied soils
- Figure 2.9 Aggregate stability values for the soils of the study sites (Y-error bars indicate standard deviations]
- Figure 2.10 Relationships between percent water stable aggregates and total (a) runoff, (b) sediment yield, and (c) splash weight
- Figure 2.11 The relationship between aggregates stability and ESP of the soils in the study areas
- Figure 3.1 Relationships among the indices of erosion factors and soil loss as estimated by using SLEMSA at the study sites
- Figure 4.1 Textures of selected soils from Harerge, eastern Ethiopia
- Figure 4.2 Mean runoff at different slope gradients and rainfall intensities for the three soil textural classes
- Figure 4.3 The influence of rainfall intensity, slope and texture on sediment yield
- Figure 4.4 Mean splash weight as affected by slope gradient and rainfall intensity within soil textural classes
- Figure 4.5 Infiltration curves of three soil textures under three slope gradients at 60mm/hr rainfall intensity
- Figure 4.6 Runoff trends at various slope gradients for the sand, silt and clay dominated soils

- Figure 4.7 Trends of sediment yield at various slope gradients for the sand, silt and clay dominated soils at rainfall intensity of 60mm/hr
- Figure 4.8 Trends of splash detachment rates at various slope gradients for the sand, silt and clay dominated soils
- Figure 5.1 Mean runoff volume collected under 30 and 60mm/hr intensity of rainfall
- Figure 5.2 Mean weight of sediment yield collected under 30 and 60mmhr⁻¹ intensity of rainfall
- Figure 5.3 Mean splash weight as affected by wheat residue rates and patterns at rainfall intensities of 30 and 60mm/hr
- Figure 5.4 Splash weight as affected by percent residue cover and rainfall intensity
- Figure 5.5 Trends of splash detachment as influenced by rates and application methods of wheat straw under simulated rainfall intensities of (A) 30mm/hr and (B) 60mm/hr
- Figure 5.6 Relationship between runoff and sediment yield under laboratory rainfall simulation
- Figure 6.1 Illustrations of (A) Experimental layout of the runoff plots and (B) accessories for runoff collection
- Figure 6.2 Picture illustrating development of runoff pathways (rills) on the control (no straw) plot A, and absence of this on the residue treated plot, B
- Figure 6.3 Total runoff collected during the 2002 rainfall season from the field runoff plots at Alemaya University experimental field station
- Figure 6.4 Total soil loss collected during the 2002 rainfall season from the field runoff plots at Alemaya University experimental station
- Figure 6.5 Erosive rainfall, runoff and soil loss during the 2002 rainfall events at Alemaya erosion plots
- Figure 6.6 The relationship between cumulative rainfall and cumulative runoff (A), soil loss (B) for three rates and two application methods of mulching during the 2002 rainfall season at Alemaya
- Figure 6.7 Measured and estimated (using the USLE and SLEMSA models) soil loss

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

ACRU	Agricultural Catchments Research Unit
ANOVA	Analysis Of Variance
ASA	American Society of Agronomy
ASAE	American Society of Agricultural Engineering
AU	Alemaya University
BD	Bulk Density
CEC	Cation Exchange Capacity
CSSA	Crop Science Society of America
ESP	Exchangeable Sodium Percentage
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IAHS	International Association of Hydrological Sciences [formerly International Association of Scientific Hydrology, Netherlands]
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
IR	Infiltration Rate
ISCO	International Soil Conservation Organization
ISCW	Institute for Soil, Climate and Water
MOA	Ministry Of Agriculture
MOMS	Modular Optoelectronic Multi-Wavelength Scanner
NH ₄ OAC	Ammonium Acetate
OC	Organic Carbon
ODU	Old Dominion University [Norfolk, Virginia, US]
RUSLE	Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SADCC	Southern African Development Coordination Conference
SAS	Statistical Analysis System
SCRP	Soil Conservation Research Project
SFSCDD	Community Forest and Soil Conservation and Development main Department
SLEMSA	Soil Loss Estimation Model for Southern Africa

SSSA	Soil Science Society of America
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USLE	Universal Soil Loss Equation
WEPP	Water Erosion Prediction Project
WSA	Water Stable Aggregates

Evaluation of soil erosion in the Harerge region of Ethiopia using soil loss models, rainfall simulation and field trials

By

Bobe Bedadi

Supervisor: Prof. A.S. Claassens

Department: Plant Production and Soil Science

Degree: Ph D (Soil Science)

Abstract

Accelerated soil erosion is one of the major threats to agricultural production in Ethiopia and the Harerge region is not exceptional. It is estimated that about 1.5 billion tones of soil is being eroded every year in Ethiopia. In the extreme cases, especially for the highlands, the rate of soil loss is estimated to reach up to $300 \text{ t ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ with an average of about $70 \text{ t ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ which is beyond any tolerable level. The government have made different attempts to avert the situation since 1975 through initiation of a massive program of soil conservation and rehabilitation of severely degraded lands. Despite considerable efforts, the achievements were far bellow expectations.

This study was aimed at assessing the effect of some soil properties, rainfall intensity and slope gradients on surface sealing, soil erodibility, runoff and soil loss from selected sites in the Harerge region, eastern Ethiopia, using simulated rainfall. Soil loss was also estimated for the sites using Soil Loss Estimation Model for Southern Africa (SLEMSA) and the Universal soil Loss Equation (USLE). Moreover, the effectiveness of various rates and patterns of wheat residue mulching in controlling soil loss was also evaluated for one of the study sites, (i.e. Regosol of Alemaya University), under both rainfall simulation and field natural rainfall conditions.

For most of the erosion parameters, the interaction among soil texture, slope gradient and rainfall intensity was significant. In general however, high rainfall intensity induced high runoff, sediment yield and splash. The effect of slope gradients on most of the erosion parameters was not significant as the slope length was too small to bring about a concentrated flow. The effect of soils dominated by any one of the three soil separates on the erosion parameters was largely dependent on rainfall intensity and slope gradient.

The soils from the 15 different sites in Harerge showed different degrees of vulnerability to surface sealing, runoff and sediment yield. These differences were associated with various soil properties. Correlation of soil properties to the erosion parameters revealed that aggregate stability was the main factor that determined the susceptibility of soils to sealing, runoff and soil loss. This was in turn affected by organic carbon content, percent clay and exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP). Soils with relatively high ESP such as those at Babile (13.85) and Gelemso (7.18) were among the lowest in their aggregate stability (percent water stable aggregates of 0.25 –2.0mm diameter); and have highest runoff and sediment yield as compared to other soils in the study. Similarly, most of those soils with relatively low ESP, high organic carbon content (OC%) and high water stable aggregates such as Hamaressa, AU (Alemaya University) vertisol and AU regosol were among the least susceptible to sealing and interrill erosion. Nevertheless, some exceptions include soils like those of Hirna where high runoff was recorded whilst having relatively high OC%, low ESP and high water stable aggregates.

Both the SLEMSA and USLE models were able to identify the erosion hazards for the study sites. Despite the differences in the procedures of the two models, significant correlation ($r = 0.87$) was observed between the values estimated by the two methods. Both models estimated higher soil loss for Gelemso, Babile, Karamara and Hamaressa. Soil loss was lower for Diredawa, AU-vertisol and AU-Alluvial all of which occur on a relatively low slope gradients. The high soil loss for Babile and Gelemso conforms with the relative soil erodibility values obtained under rainfall simulation suggesting that soil erodibility, among others, is the main factor contributing to high soil

loss for these soils. The difference in the estimated soil losses for the different sites was a function of the interaction of the various factors involved. Though the laboratory soil erodibility values were low to medium for Hamaressa and Karamara, the estimated soil loss was higher owing to the field topographic situations such as high slope gradient.

SLEMSA and USLE showed different degrees of sensitivities to their input variables for the conditions of the study sites. SLEMSA was highly sensitive to changes in rainfall kinetic energy (E) and soil erodibility (F) and less sensitive to the cover and slope length factors. The sensitivity of SLEMSA to changes in the cover factor was higher for areas having initially smaller percentage rainfall interception values. On the other hand, USLE was highly sensitive to slope gradient and less so to slope length as compared to the other input factors.

The study on the various rates and application patterns of wheat residue on runoff and soil loss both in the laboratory rainfall simulation and under field natural rainfall conditions revealed that surface application of crop residue is more effective in reducing soil loss and runoff than incorporating the same amount of the residue into the soil. Likewise, for a particular residue application method, runoff and soil loss decreased with increasing application rate of the mulch. However, the difference was not significant between 4 Mg ha⁻¹ and 8 Mg ha⁻¹ wheat straw rates suggesting that the former can effectively control soil loss and can be used in areas where there is limitation of crop residues provided that other conditions are similar to that of the study site (AU Regosols). The effectiveness of lower rates of straw (i.e. less than 4 Mg ha⁻¹) should also be studied. It should however be noted that the effectiveness of mulching in controlling soils loss and runoff could be different under various slope gradients, rainfall characteristics and cover types that were not covered in this study.

Integrated soil and water conservation research is required to develop a comprehensive database for modelling various soil erosion parameters. Further research is therefore required on the effect of soil properties (with

special emphasis to aggregate stability, clay mineralogy, exchangeable cations, soil texture and organic matter), types and rates of crop residues, cropping and tillage systems, mechanical and biological soil conservation measures on soil erosion and its conservation for a better estimation of the actual soil loss in the study sites.

Keywords: Erosion models, Infiltration rate, mulching, rainfall intensity, rainfall simulator, runoff, sediment yield, SLEMSA, slope gradient, soil properties, splash, surface sealing, texture, USLE, water stable aggregates

INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognized that accelerated erosion is one of the major factors responsible for soil degradation (Dudal, 1982; Kovda, 1983; Lal, 1990; 1994; Piccolo et al., 1997). Mismanagement, neglect and exploitation can ruin the fragile resource and become a threat to human survival (Lal and Pierce, 1991). Brown et al. (1990) estimated that the world could be losing 14 million tons of grain output because of environmental degradation, mainly due to soil erosion. According to Dudal (1981), the rate of agricultural degradation world wide by soil erosion and other factors is leading to an irreversible loss in productivity in about six million hectares of fertile land a year. Buringh (1981) estimated the annual global loss of agricultural lands due to soil erosion to be about 3 million hectares. Crop productivity is reduced to zero or becomes uneconomic because of soil erosion or erosion induced degradation on about 20 million hectares every year (UNEP, 1991) in the world. According to Kovda (1983), soil erosion has destroyed about 430 million hectares of productive lands since the beginning of settled agriculture. Human induced soil degradation has affected 24 % of the inhabited land area of the world. The values for the individual continents range from 12% in North America, 18% in South America, 19% in Oceania, 26 % in Europe, 27% in Africa and 31% in Asia (Oldeman, 1991-92).

Despite a wide recognition of accelerated erosion as a serious global problem, assessing the dimensions like: the magnitude, extent and the rate of soil erosion and its economic and environmental consequences precisely and reliably however, is still difficult (Lal, 1988, 1994). Besides, the readily available information in the literature is often based on reconnaissance surveys and extrapolations based on sketchy data.

Ethiopia has a total surface area of 111.8 million hectares; of which 60 million hectares are estimated to be agriculturally productive. Out of the estimated agriculturally productive lands, about 27 million hectares are significantly eroded, 14 million hectares are seriously eroded and 2 million hectares have reached the point of no return; with an estimated total loss of 2 billion m³ of top soil per year (Fikru, 1990; Sertsu, 2000). According to the Soil Conservation Research Project (SCRCP, 1985) of Ethiopia, the rate of soil loss in extreme cases ranges from 0 to 300 t ha⁻¹yr⁻¹ with an

average loss (observed from SCRP experiments conducted in six different agro-climatic regions namely Maybar, Gununo, Hunde Lafto, Andit Tid, Anjeni and Dizi) of $70\text{t ha}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$, which is beyond the concept of any tolerable soil loss. This SCRP project also estimated that about 1.5 billion tones of soil are eroded away every year in Ethiopia.

The Ethiopian government first recognized the impact of soil degradation after the 1973-74 famine. Since then, it initiated a massive program of soil conservation and rehabilitation in the highly degraded areas (Hurni, 1985) which involved the mobilization of peasant associations and the involvement of over 30 million peasant workdays per year. Reports indicate that, between 1975 and 1989, terraces were built on 980000 hectares of cropland; 208000 hectares of hillside terraces were constructed and 310000 hectares of highly denuded lands were revegetated (Kruger et al., 1996). Yet these achievements are far bellow expectations, and despite considerable efforts, the country is still losing an appreciable amount of precious topsoil annually.

Sustainable soil management systems must be developed to reduce further degradation and restore the productivity of the eroded land. Lal and Pierce (1991) suggested that the scientific community must develop agricultural technology to: (a) reduce input while maximizing economic returns, (b) decrease soil degradation, (c) minimize risks of pollution of natural waters and environments, (d) restore productivity of degraded land and (e) maintain productive capacity of existing land by preserving a soil's life support processes.

Two soil conservation approaches, the barrier approach and the cover approach, have been developed and are in use world wide to control soil loss by water erosion (Young, 1989). Soil conservation methods including terraces, channels (bunds) and stonewalls as well as semi-permeable structures like grass strips and hedgerows are used as barriers to obstruct runoff and sediment carried with it. The cover approach usually involves use of plant materials and others like stones, plastics and industrial wastes, to obstruct raindrops beating of the soil surface and reduce the flow volume and velocity of runoff.

Although the two approaches are not alternative but complementary (Hudson, 1984), the fact that most of the physical or mechanical structures like terraces and channels that involve land shaping and manipulation, are expensive (Rodriguez, 1997) and time consuming (Tripathi and Singh, 1993) and deserve careful thought and planning, makes the use of the cover approach very important under farmers' conditions. Surface mulching with crop residues is found to be one of the most cost effective means of erosion control (Shelton et al., 1995).

Therefore, this study emphasizes on some factors affecting soil erodibility; estimates erosion hazard using some empirical soil loss models; and evaluates the role of different rates and patterns of surface cover materials (mulches) on control of erosion.

The specific objectives are outlined below:

- ◆ To assess the erodibility of some soils of Harerge, eastern Ethiopia, under laboratory rainfall simulation and relate erodibility to the physico-chemical properties of the soils.
- ◆ To study the effect of soil texture on seal formation, infiltration, runoff and soil erosion under different rainfall intensities on various slope gradients.
- ◆ To predict soil loss in the study areas using the SLEMSA and USLE models and correlate the predicted soil loss and measured soil erodibility.
- ◆ To study the effect of surface application and incorporation of different rates of crop residues on seal formation, infiltration, and runoff and soil loss under different rainfall intensities using laboratory rainfall simulation.
- ◆ To investigate the role of rates and application methods of straw mulches on runoff and soil loss from field plots using natural rainfall.

To achieve the above objectives, the research involved a preliminary survey of the study sites and soil sampling. Erodibility of the soils collected from the different areas of the region was assessed in the laboratory under rainfall simulation. The effect of some soil properties, slope and rainfall intensity on soil surface sealing and erodibility was also evaluated. Moreover, soil loss was estimated for the various study sites using the USLE and SLEMSA models. The role of various rates and application methods of straw mulches on soil erosion control was assessed under both laboratory rainfall simulation and natural rainfall in field experimental plots.