

University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

International Grassland Congress Proceedings

21st International Grassland Congress / 8th International Rangeland Congress

The Efficiency of Some Infiltration Models in Three Rangeland Conditions (Case Study: Savojbolagh Rangelands)

M. Mohseni Saravi University of Tehran, Iran

M. Vafakhah University of Tarbiat Modares, Iran

A. Kohandel University of Tehran, Iran

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc

Part of the Plant Sciences Commons, and the Soil Science Commons

This document is available at https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc/21/4-2/11

The 21st International Grassland Congress / 8th International Rangeland Congress took place in Hohhot, China from June 29 through July 5, 2008.

Proceedings edited by Organizing Committee of 2008 IGC/IRC Conference

Published by Guangdong People's Publishing House

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Plant and Soil Sciences at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Grassland Congress Proceedings by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

The efficiency of some infiltration models in three rangeland conditions (case study : Savojbolagh rangelands)

M. Mohseni Saravi¹

Associate professor, University of Tehran, Iran, E-mail: msaravi@ut.ac.ir, M. Vafakhah², Lecturer, University of Tarbiat Modares, Iran, A. Kohandel³, Assistant professor, University of Tehran, Iran

Key words : Horton's equation , Kostiakov's equation , Green-Ampt's equation , rangeland , Savojbolagh region

Introduction Infiltration is one of the important hydrological processes and its accurate quantification is essential for many studies. Infiltration can be either measured in the field or estimated using mathematical models which vary from empirical to physically based models, including physically based models (e.g. Green and Ampt, 1911, Richards, 1931, Philip, 1957, Morel-Seytoux, 1978, Haverkamp *et al.*, 1990 and Corradini *et al.*, 1994), conceptual models (e.g. Nash, 1957 and Diskin and Nazimov, 1995), or empirical relations (e.g. Horton, 1933, Kostiakov, 1932, Holtan, 1961 and Soil Conservation Service-USDA, 1972) (Chahinian *et al.*, 2005). The objective of this paper is to compare the performance of three widely used infiltration models with infiltration measured in Central Iran.

Material and methods The study field is located in South-west of Tehran province and South-west of Nazarabad city in Savojbolagh experimental rangeland site located. The slope, elevation and annual precipitation of the study field are 0-2 percent, 1150-1180m and 229. 3mm, respectively. The climate is also cold dry according to Emberger climatic classification system. The rangelands of the study area are steppe that was divided into three regions (critical, key and reference sites) with attention to utilization type and different grazing intensities which each region comprises 5 ha in the area. The critical, key and reference sites were selected in regions with annual long and heavy grazing, proper grazing and desertification station of Savojbolagh region with no grazing condition grazed over past 13 years, respectively. The infiltration rate was determined by using concentric ring infiltrometer in three mentioned regions (i.e. critical, key and reference sites) in May, June and September of 2004 and 2005. First, the rings were inserted into the soil at the minimum depth necessary to prevent lateral leakage from the rings. Then, water was applied at a constant depth. Finally, infiltration rate was directly determined by reading of the burettes at 1, 5, 10, 30, 60, 90 and 120 minutes intervals. Table 1 shows average infiltration rate in different times.

Site	Year Time(min) Month	2004							2005						
		1	5	10	30	60	90	120	1	5	10	30	60	90	120
	May	20	9.13	9.37	5.23	4.02	3.48	3.11	67 ,21	9.13	6.83	3.49	3.05	2 .61	2 .47
Key	June	27	12 2	9.83	6.01	5.04	4.54	4.34	30	9	8.33	5.83	4.08	4.02	3.87
	September	20	9.73	8.07	5.49	4 25	3.79	3.53	67 .17	9 27	7 23	5.11	4.07	3.65	3.38
	May	33 .18	11 .33	8.17	5.04	4.09	3.35	3.01	20	6.83	5.83	3 29	2.58	2 25	2.01
Reference	June	67 21	13	10	6.27	5 24	4.53	4.39	25	7.1	5.3	3.33	2.61	2 .36	2.18
	September	33.14	10.17	7.93	5.61	4.68	4.19	3.9	33 .13	5.6	5.63	3.44	2.78	2 .49	2 .27
	May	15	8.87	7.7	3.85	2.88	2.55	2.32	33 .18	7.33	5.73	2.84	2.79	2 .44	2.35
Critical	June	33 .14	10.33	8.83	5.77	4.39	3.94	3.80	15	6	6.5	3.42	2.66	2 .44	2.19
	September	33 .11	8.93	7.07	4.89	3.91	3.52	3 .24	33 .11	6.93	6	4.02	3 23	2 .87	2.64

Table 1 Avarage infiltration rate (mm) in different times

Three algebraic infiltration equations (Kostiakov's, Horton's and Green and Ampt's) were examined to determine the best fitted formula to the collected infiltrometer data. For this reason, infiltrometer data of 2004 was applied to compute the models. Then, the estimated models efficiency was determined by using relative error index and infiltrometer data of 2005. If the relative error index was under 40 percent, model will be selected (Das, 2000).

Results and discussion The results of current research indicate that , Horton's equation provided a best fit to the infiltrometer data . Horton's equation was better than Kostiakov's and Green-Ampt's equation . The relative error for Horton equation was 14.59%, 20.84%, and 80.31% for the Kostiakov model and Green-Ampt model, respectively. The relative error percent increase in each three models with increase of infiltration time .

Conclusions Since relative error of Horton and Kostiakov equations was lower than 40%, these models were selected as the best equations in this research. This result is the similar to those obtained by Gifford (1976) and Oku (2005).

Grasslands/Rangelands Resources and Ecology Indicators for Sustainable Use and Conservation of Grasslands/Rangelands Resources