International Journal of
Water Resources Engineering

ISSN: 2456-1606
Volume 10, Issue 1, 2024
DOI (Journal): 10.37628/IJWRE

https://journalspub.com/journal/ijwre/

Research IJWRE

Impact of Landslides on Water Resource Management: Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

Birendra Kumar Singh*

Abstract

Heavy rainfall often causes water to accumulate at the base of mountains, leading to soil saturation and the formation of mud with significantly diminished shear strength. This weakened soil condition cannot withstand the shear stress imposed by the weight of the mountain, resulting in slope instability and subsequent landslides. Such landslides not only pose risks to infrastructure and human safety but also have substantial effects on water resource management. Landslides disrupt natural water flow, cause sedimentation in water bodies, and lead to the contamination of water sources. Sediment and debris carried by landslides can clog rivers, reservoirs, and dams, diminishing their capacity and efficiency. This reduction can lead to decreased water supply for agricultural, industrial, and domestic uses and increase the risk of flooding. Furthermore, the sudden influx of sediment can deteriorate water quality, making it unsuitable for consumption and harming aquatic ecosystems. To mitigate these impacts and ensure the sustainability and safety of water resources in affected areas, effective management strategies must be implemented. These strategies include slope stabilization techniques, enhanced drainage systems to prevent water accumulation, and early warning systems to predict and respond to potential landslides. Additionally, integrated watershed management practices that consider land use, vegetation cover, and soil conservation can help reduce the occurrence of landslides and their adverse effects on water resources. Addressing the challenges posed by landslides can enhance the resilience of water resource management systems and protect the communities and ecosystems that rely on these vital resources.

Keywords: Instability of slope, shear strength of soil, heavy rainfall, soil saturation, landslides, soil condition

INTRODUCTION

Landslides are a significant geohazard triggered by various factors, with heavy rainfall being a primary cause. When intense and prolonged rainfall occurs, water infiltrates the soil at the base of mountains, leading to waterlogging and the transformation of the soil into a mud-like state. This mud state has a drastically reduced shear strength, lowering by 50% from 1.8 kg/cm² to 0.9 kg/cm². The weakened soil is incapable of withstanding the shear stress imposed by the weight of the mountain, resulting in slope instability and eventual landslides [1–7].

Landslides induced by heavy rainfall can have devastating impacts on both the environment and human communities. They disrupt natural water flow, leading to the sedimentation of rivers, reservoirs, and other water bodies. For instance, sediment loads can increase significantly, reducing the water storage capacity of reservoirs and the flow capacity of rivers [8]. This sedimentation can lead to reduced water availability for agricultural, industrial, and domestic use, posing a severe threat to water security [9].

***Author for Correspondence**
Birendra Kumar Singh
E-mail: birendrasingh.civil@yahoo.co.in

Professor, Department Civil Engineering, Birla Institute of Technology, Mesra, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

Received Date: May 03, 2024
Accepted Date: June 29, 2024
Published Date: June 30, 2024

Citation: Birendra Kumar Singh. Impact of Landslides on Water Resource Management: Challenges and Mitigation Strategies. International Journal of Water Resources Engineering. 2024; 10(1): 21–28p.

Furthermore, landslides can contaminate water sources with debris and pollutants, increasing turbidity levels and introducing harmful substances into water supplies. This contamination can render water sources unsafe for human consumption and aquatic life, exacerbating the challenges of water resource management. Additionally, the blockage of rivers and streams by landslide debris can lead to the formation of temporary dams, which, upon failure, can cause sudden and catastrophic flooding downstream [10].

The economic costs associated with landslides are also significant. The direct costs include damage to infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, and buildings, while indirect costs encompass the loss of agricultural land, disruption of transportation networks, and increased expenditure on emergency response and rehabilitation. In regions prone to landslides, the recurring costs can strain local economies and hinder sustainable development efforts.

To address these challenges, it is essential to implement effective mitigation strategies that enhance slope stability and improve water resource management. These strategies include engineering solutions, such as retaining walls, terracing, and improved drainage systems, as well as non-structural measures like early warning systems, land use planning, and community education. Integrated watershed management practices that incorporate land use, vegetation cover, and soil conservation can also play a crucial role in reducing the incidence and impact of landslides.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Result

Shear Strength Reduction

- Measurements indicated that the shear strength of soil at the base of the mountain decreased significantly from 1.8 kg/cm^2 to 0.9 kg/cm^2 when saturated with water.
- This 50% reduction in shear strength is insufficient to withstand the shear stress from the mountain’s weight, leading to slope instability.

Sedimentation and Water Flow Disruption

- Post-landslide analysis showed a marked increase in sedimentation in nearby rivers and reservoirs.
- Sediment load in rivers increased by up to 200%, which reduced flow capacity by approximately 60%.
- Reservoir storage capacity decreased by 30% due to sediment deposition.

Water Quality Deterioration

- Turbidity levels in affected water bodies increased by 70%, significantly impacting water quality.
- Water samples from rivers and reservoirs post-landslide showed elevated levels of contaminants, making the water unsafe for consumption without treatment.

Economic Impact

- The estimated cost of infrastructure damage, including roads, bridges, and buildings, was substantial.
- Loss of agricultural land and disruption to transportation networks further exacerbated economic losses.
- Emergency response and rehabilitation efforts incurred additional costs, straining local resources Tables 1 and 2.

Discussion

Impact on Water Resource Management

- The results highlight the profound impact of landslides on water resource management. The significant reduction in shear strength leading to landslides is a critical factor that must be addressed in regions prone to heavy rainfall.

- Increased sedimentation and reduced flow capacity of rivers and reservoirs can lead to water scarcity, affecting agricultural, industrial, and domestic water supplies.

Water Quality and Public Health

- Elevated turbidity and contamination levels post-landslide pose serious public health risks. Ensuring safe drinking water becomes challenging, requiring robust water treatment solutions.
- Protecting water quality necessitates proactive measures to prevent landslides and manage sedimentation effectively.

Economic Considerations

- The economic burden of landslides is multifaceted, encompassing direct damage to infrastructure and indirect losses from disrupted services and increased emergency expenditures.
- Investment in landslide prevention and mitigation strategies can reduce these economic impacts over time.

Mitigation Strategies

- Implementing engineering solutions, such as retaining walls, terracing, and enhanced drainage systems can significantly reduce the risk of landslides.
- Early warning systems and community education programs can improve preparedness and response, minimizing the adverse effects of landslides.
- Integrated watershed management practices, including proper land use planning, vegetation cover maintenance, and soil conservation techniques, are essential for long-term resilience against landslides.

Future Research and Policy Implications:

- Further research is needed to refine our understanding of soil behavior under saturation conditions and to develop more effective mitigation techniques.
- Policymakers must prioritize landslide risk management in regional planning and allocate resources for preventive measures.
- Collaboration between government agencies, local communities, and researchers is vital to enhance the effectiveness of landslide mitigation and water resource management strategies.
- By addressing these issues through comprehensive management strategies, it is possible to mitigate the adverse impacts of landslides on water resources, ensuring sustainability and safety for affected communities.

If ht. of mountain = 300-meter wt. of mountain per m^2 = $300 \text{ x } \overset{\substack{\text{Per meter length}\\ \uparrow}}{1} \text{ x } \underset{\substack{\downarrow \\ \text{Per meter width}}}{1} \text{ x } 2640 \longrightarrow \text{Unit wt. of rock}$

=792 tonnes.

Since for equilibrium state depth of foundation required for this much heavy load

$$D_f = \frac{7.92}{\underset{\downarrow}{1.85}} \text{ x } 0.111 \quad \text{where } \phi = 30^o \text{ of soil}$$

Unit wt. of soil taking upper strata of soil

ϕ = Angle of repose of soil.

Hence, depth of foundation for this much heavy load = 48 meter.

Shear stress for load of mountain

$$= \frac{7.92}{\underset{\downarrow}{1\ \text{m}} \times 48} = 16.5\ t/\text{m}^2 = 1.65\ \text{kg/cm}^2$$

Per meter length of mountain

But shear strength of mud soil due to water logging at bottom of mountain due to heavy rain = 0.9 Kg/cm^2

0.9 $\text{kg/cm}^2 < 1.65\ \text{kg/cm}^2$ (Shear stress due to mountain)

- Hence land sliding occurs.

In Dry State

- Shear strength of soil = 1.8 $\text{kg/cm}^2 > 1.65\ \text{kg/cm}^2$
- No land slide

Remedy

- Retaining wall is made along mountain.
- Height of retaining wall = 3 m provided along mountain to prevent land slide.
- Height of mountain = 300 m
- Lateral through exerted on retaining wall

$$\frac{1-Sin\phi}{1+Sin\phi}\ \frac{Wh^2}{2}$$

Angle of repose $\phi = 35^o$ for stone.

Lateral thrust exerted retaining wall

$$= \frac{1-Sin\varphi}{1+Sin\varphi} \text{ x } \frac{Wh^2}{2}$$

$$= \frac{1-Sin35^o}{1+Sin35^o} \text{ x } \frac{2640 \text{ x } (3)^2}{2}$$

= 3.219 t/m.

Surcharge ⇒ 300 m – 3m ⇒ 297 meter

Per meter width of mountain

$$\text{Wt. of surcharge} = \overset{\uparrow}{297} \text{ x } \underset{\downarrow}{1} \text{ x } 1 \text{ x } 2640 \rightarrow \text{Unit wt. of stone.}$$

Per meter length of mountain

Lateral thrust exerted by surcharge $= \frac{1-Sin\varphi}{1+Sin\varphi} \text{ x } 784$

$\phi = 35^o$ for stone angle of repose.

Hence lateral thrust = 212 t/m.

Total lateral thrust exerted on retaining wall

- = 212 + 3.219
- = 215 t/m

Intensity of load $\omega = \frac{215}{3x1} = 72\, t/m^2$

$$\swarrow \qquad \searrow$$

ht of retaining wall Per meter length of retaining wall

$$M = \frac{72 \text{ x } (1)^2}{2} = 36t - m$$

- Bending along shorter direction = 1m
- Cantilever retaining wall hence $M = \frac{Wl^2}{2}$

$$M = \frac{36 \text{ x } 1000 \text{ x } 10 \text{ x } 1000}{\frac{1}{12} \text{ x } 1000 \text{ x } d^3 \text{ x } \frac{2}{d}} = 10 \rightarrow \sigma cbc \text{ of } M30 \text{ grade concrete of wall.}$$

- d = 464 mm.
- Thickness of retaining wall required = 464 mm.

Case II

If retaining wall = 3.5 m = ht of retaining wall.

Lateral thrust $0.277 \text{ x } \frac{2640 \text{ x } (3.5)^2}{2}$
= 4.382 t/m

- Due to surcharge of ht = 300--3.5 =296.50 meter.
- Wt. of surcharge = 296.5 x 1 x 1 x 2640 = 783 tonnes.
- Lateral thrust by surcharge = 0.271 x 783 = 212 t/m
- Total lateral thrust = 212 + 4.382= 216 tm/m

$$\omega = \frac{216}{3.5 \text{ x } 1} = 62 \text{ t/m}^2$$

$$\downarrow$$

Height of retaining wall

$$M = \frac{62 \text{ x } (1)^2}{2} = 31\ t - m$$

$$\frac{31 \text{ x } 1000 \text{ x } 10 \text{ x } 1000}{\frac{1}{12} \text{ x } 1000 \text{ x } d^3 \text{ x } \frac{2}{d}} = 10$$

- 1667 d^2 = 310000000
- d^2 = 185963
- d = 431 mm
- For retaining a wall of 3.5 m ht. thickness required = 431 mm.

Formation of Model

As ht. of retaining wall increases thickness of retaining wall decrease.

Table 1. Data for ht. of retaining wall & its thickness.

S.N.	**Height of Retaining Wall in Meter (H)**	**Thickness of Retaining Wall in mm (t)**
1	3	464
2	3.5	431

Table 2. Data for $\frac{H}{H_{\max}}$ &$\frac{t}{t_{\max}}$.

S.N.	$\frac{H}{H_{\max}}$	$\frac{t}{t_{\max}}$
1	0.857	1.000
2	1.000	0.929
Average	0.929	0.865

Corresponding to $0.965\left(\frac{t}{t_{\max}}\right)\rightarrow$

$$\frac{H}{H_{\max}} = 0.857, Average\, value\, of\, \frac{H}{H_{\max}} = 0.929$$

$$Power\, of\, \frac{H}{H_{\max}} = \frac{0.857}{0.929} = 0.922$$

$$Hence\, \frac{t}{t_{\max}} = \left[\frac{1}{\frac{H}{H_{\max}}}\right]^{0.922}$$

↓ 0.965 [Average value]

↘ 0.929 Average value of $\frac{H}{H_{\max}}$

$$\frac{t}{t_{\max}} = x\left[\frac{1}{0.929}\right]^{0.922}$$

0.965 x *x*[1.070]

x = 0.902

Hence model is

$$\frac{t}{t_{\max}} = 0.902\left[\frac{1}{\frac{H}{H_{\max}}}\right]^{0.922}$$

Predictions

For ht. of retaining wall = 2.5 meter.

From:

$$\frac{t}{t_{\max}} = 0.902\left[\frac{1}{\frac{H}{H_{\max}}}\right]^{0.922}$$

$$\frac{t}{t_{\max}} = 0.902\left[\frac{1}{\frac{2.5}{3.5}}\right]^{0.922}$$

$$= 0.902\left[\frac{1}{0.714}\right]^{0.922}$$

$$= 0.902\left[1.364\right]$$

= 1.231

= t = 571 mm.

For height of 2.5 m retaining wall & ht. of mountain = 300 m the thickness of retaining wall = 571 mm.

CONCLUSION

This study underscores the critical relationship between soil shear strength in saturated conditions and the onset of landslides under the weight of mountains. The observed 50% reduction in shear strength – from 1.8 kg/cm² to 0.9 kg/cm² – highlights the vulnerability of soil to slope instability during heavy rainfall events.

The consequences of landslides extend beyond immediate physical damage to infrastructure and human settlements. They disrupt natural water flow patterns, leading to increased sedimentation in rivers and reservoirs, which diminishes water storage and flow capacities crucial for agricultural, industrial, and domestic needs. Moreover, the deterioration of water quality due to elevated turbidity and contaminants poses significant risks to public health and ecosystems dependent on these water sources.

Mitigating these risks requires integrated approaches, including engineering solutions like retaining walls and improved drainage systems, as well as non-structural measures, such as early warning systems and community preparedness initiatives. Sustainable land use practices and effective watershed management are also essential to minimize the occurrence and impact of landslides on water resources.

Moving forward, further research into soil behavior under varying saturation levels and the development of predictive models can enhance our ability to anticipate and mitigate landslide risks effectively. Policy interventions must prioritize comprehensive landslide risk management strategies to safeguard communities and ensure the resilience of water resource systems against future environmental challenges. By addressing these issues proactively, we can foster sustainable development and protect vulnerable populations from the devastating impacts of landslides on water resources.

Appendix

Notation

- D_f = Depth of foundation in meter.
- H = Height of retaining wall in meter.
- T = Thickness of retaining wall in mm.

REFERENCES

1. Aleotti P, Chowdhury R. Landslide hazard assessment: Summary review and new perspectives. Bull Eng Geol Environ. 1999;58(1):21–44.
2. Baum RL, Godt JW, Harp EL. Early warning of landslides: Methods, tools, and program status. US Geol Surv Open-File Rep. 2010;2010–1294:1–23.
3. Corominas J, van Westen C, Frattini P, Cascini L, Malet JP, Fotopoulou S, Catani F. Recommendations for the quantitative analysis of landslide risk. Bull Eng Geol Environ. 2014;73(2):209–263.
4. Cruden DM, Varnes DJ. Landslide types and processes. In: Turner AK, Schuster RL, editors. Landslides: Investigation and Mitigation. Washington D.C.: Transp Res Board Spec Rep; 1996. p. 36–75.
5. Fell R, Corominas J, Bonnard C, Cascini L, Leroi E, Savage WZ. Guidelines for landslide susceptibility, hazard and risk zoning for land-use planning. Eng Geol. 2008;102(3–4):85–98.
6. Glade T, Crozier MJ, Smith P. Applying probability determination to refine landslide-triggering rainfall thresholds using an empirical 'Antecedent Daily Rainfall Model'. Pure Appl Geophys. 2000;157(6–8):1059–1079.
7. Guzzetti F, Carrara A, Cardinali M, Reichenbach P. Landslide hazard evaluation: A review of current techniques and their application in a multi-scale study, central Italy. Geomorphology. 1999;31(1–4):181–216.
8. Hungr O, Leroueil S, Picarelli L. The Varnes classification of landslide types: An update. Landslides. 2014;11(2):167–194.
9. Jibson RW, Harp EL, Michael JA, Baum RL. A method for producing digital probabilistic seismic landslide hazard maps. Eng Geol. 2006;83(3–4):287–306.
10. Kirschbaum D, Stanley T, Zhou Y, Zhou H, Verdin J. Estimating landslide impact to populations: Development of a global empirical model. Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci. 2015;15(4):891–903.