

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COCONUT COIR BLANKET IN CONTROLLING
SLOPE EROSION**

AIZAT BIN MOHD TAIB @ TAIB

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the
degree of Bachelor of Civil Engineering**

**Faculty of Civil Engineering & Earth Resources
Universiti Malaysia Pahang**

DECEMBER 2010

ABSTRACT

A research to determine the effectiveness of coconut coir blanket in controlling slope erosion was conducted. There were two major division of testing made. One was the material analysis on the soil sample taken and the coconut coir blanket used and another was the simulation of rainfall pouring on sloped surface soil to analyze the erosion rate. Apparently, the division of material testing involved Soil Mechanics Engineering and Light Structure Engineering. Soil Mechanics Engineering assisted this research in soil analyzing in terms of the Soil Classification, Atterberg Limit, Specific Gravity, Shear Strength, Standard Proctor and Direct Shear testing. On the other hand, Light Structure Engineering focused on Tensile Strength of the coconut coir blanket. Generally, the major testing was the simulation of rainfall on the sloped surface soil. The soil sample which was taken from construction site in Bukit Gambang, Pahang was distributed into four cases. The parameters manipulated were the degree of slope, type of vegetation and the condition of the slope surface. The selected degree of slope were 0°, 10°, 20°, 30°, 40° and 50°. The vegetations planted were based on the norm slopes grasses used which were the Signal Grass and Japanese Millet. The conditions of the slope surface were divided into two. They were bare controlled case and protected slope case using coconut coir blanket. The main parameter which was the application of coconut coir blanket as the protection to the slope was proven effective. By comparing the bare controlled slope and the protected slope, the result showed that protected slope using the coconut coir blanket decreases the erosion rate by the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) test conducted. The bare controlled slope collected 0.014345 g/L amount of TSS while protected slope using coconut coir blanket collected only 0.001368 g/L. The difference of 0.012977 g/L TSS amount proved that coconut coir blanket was effective in controlling slope erosion assisted by the vegetation of Signal Grass which has longer leaves and gripping fibre roots in increasing the mode of slope strength.

ABSTRAK

Satu kajian untuk menentukan keberkesanan karpit sabut kelapa untuk mengawal hakisan cerun telah dijalankan. Terdapat dua bahagian bagi ujikaji yang dijalankan iaitu analisa ke atas sampel tanah diambil termasuklah sabut kelapa yang digunakan dan simulasi proses hujan ke atas cerun tanah untuk menganalisa hakisan cerun. Bahagian ujikaji untuk bahan yang digunakan merangkumi Kejuruteraan Mekanik Tanah dan Kejuruteraan Struktur Ringan. Kejuruteraan Mekanik Tanah membantu ujikaji ini dengan usaha menganalisa Pengelasan Tanah, Had Atterberg, Graviti Tentu, Kekuatan Ricih, Proktor Piawai and ujikaji Ricih Terus. Sebaliknya, Kejuruteraan Struktur Ringan menumpukan kepada ujikaji Kekuatan Tegangan bagi bahan karpit sabut kelapa yang digunakan. Secara amnya, ujikaji utama adalah simulasi hujan ke atas cerun tanah. Sampel tanah yang diambil dari kawasan pembinaan di Bukit Gambang, Pahang dibahagikan kepada empat kes. Pembolehubah yang dimanipulasikan adalah darjah kecerunan, jenis tumbuhan dan keadaan cerun itu. Darjah kecerunan yang dipilih adalah 0° , 10° , 20° , 30° , 40° dan 50° . Tumbuhan yang ditanam merujuk kepada rumput yang biasa ditanam di kawasan cerun iaitu Signal Grass dan Japanese Millet. Keadaan cerun telah dibahagikan kepada dua iaitu kes tanah kosong yang dikawal dan kes cerun tanah yang dilindungi. Pembolehubah utama adalah aplikasi oleh karpit sabut kelapa sebagai pelindung cerun dibuktikan berkesan. Dengan membandingkan cerun kosong yang dikawal dengan cerun yang dilindungi, keputusan ujikaji menunjukkan cerun yang dilindungi mengurangkan hakisan tanahnya melalui ujikaji Sisa Pepejal Terampai yang telah dijalankan. Cerun yang kosong mengumpul 0.014345 g/L sisa pepejal terampai sementara cerun yang dilindungi menggunakan karpit sabut kelapa mengumpul hanya 0.001368 g/L. Perbezaannya adalah 0.012977 g/L yang membuktikan karpit sabut kelapa lebih berkesan dalam mengawal hakisan cerun yang ditanam dengan rumput Signal Grass dimana daunnya yang lebih panjang dan akar serabutnya yang kuat bagi meningkatkan mod kekuatan cerun.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	ITEM	PAGE
	TITLE	i
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
	LIST OF TABLES	xviii
	LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xix
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxi
1	INTRODUCTION	
	1.1 Background of Research	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	3
	1.3 Objectives	5
	1.4 Scope of Study	6
	1.5 Significant of Study	7

2	LITERATURE REVIEW	
	2.1 Introduction	9
	2.2 Causes of Erosion	10
	2.3 Effects of Erosion	11
	2.4 Erosion Control	14
	2.5 Erosion Control Blanket	16
	2.6 Coir Fibre	20
	2.6.1 Coir Fibre Processing	21
	2.7 Laboratory Testing	23
	2.7.1 Particle Size Distribution	23
	2.7.2 Moisture Content	24
	2.7.3 Atterberg Limit	25
	2.7.4 Direct Shear	26
	2.7.5 Triaxial Compression	26
	2.8 Case Study	27
3	METHODOLOGY	
	3.1 Introduction	31
	3.2 Preparation of Soil Sample and Coconut Coir Blanket	33
	3.2.1 Soil Sample	34
	3.2.1.1 Particle Size Analysis	34
	3.2.1.2 Specific Gravity	37
	3.2.1.3 Atterberg Limits	38
	a. Liquid Limit	39
	b. Plastic Limit	40
	c. Shrinkage Limit	41
	3.2.1.4 Standard Proctor Test	43
	3.2.1.5 Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial Test	45

3.2.2	Coconut Coir Blanket	47
3.2.2.1	Tension Test	47
3.2.2.2	Direct Shear Test	48
3.3	Preparation of Slope and Rainfall Simulation Model	48
3.4	Testing	48
3.5	Result Analysis and Discussion	50

4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Soil Analysis	52
4.2.1	Soil Sampling	52
4.2.2	Particle Sieve Distribution	52
4.2.3	Particle Size Analyzer	53
4.2.4	Specific Gravity	54
4.2.5	Atterberg Limit	55
4.2.6	Standard Proctor Test	57
4.2.7	Shear Strength	58
4.3	Coconut Coir Blanket Analysis	61
4.3.1	Tensile Strength	61
4.3.2	Direct Shear	63
4.4.	Rainfall on Slope Model Simulation Testing	65
4.4.1	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 0°	65
4.4.2	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 10°	66
4.4.3	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 20°	67
4.4.4	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 30°	68
4.4.5	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 40°	69

4.4.6	Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 50°	70
4.4.7	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 0°	71
4.4.8	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 10°	72
4.4.9	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 20°	73
4.4.10	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 30°	74
4.4.11	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 40°	75
4.4.12	Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 50°	76
4.4.13	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 0°	77
4.4.14	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 10°	78
4.4.15	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 20°	79
4.4.16	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 30°	80
4.4.17	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 40°	81
4.4.18	Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 50°	82
4.4.19	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 0°	83

4.4.20	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 10°	84
4.4.21	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 20°	85
4.4.22	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 30°	86
4.4.23	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 40°	87
4.4.24	Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 50°	90
4.4.25	Controlled Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation against Controlled Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation	91
4.4.26	Protected Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation against Protected Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation	92
4.4.27	Controlled Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation against Protected Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation	93
4.4.28	Controlled Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation against Protected Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation	94
4.5	Factors Affecting Results	96
4.5.1	Ambience Factor	96
4.5.2	Time Factor	96
4.5.3	Procedures Factor	96

5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	5.1 Introduction	99
	5.2 Conclusion	100
	5.2 Recommendations	102
	REFERENCES	104
	APPENDIX A	108
	APPENDIX B	113
	APPENDIX C	115
	APPENDIX D	117
	APPENDIX E	120
	APPENDIX F	124
	APPENDIX G	128
	APPENDIX H	134
	APPENDIX I	143

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Erosion control blankets for soil slope stabilization	19
2.2	Coconut layers	20
2.3	Original topography and design profiles	28
2.4	Front View of Failed Slope	28
2.5	Interpreted subsoil weathering profile	30
3.1	Flow chart for the sequences of methodology	32
3.2	Sieve set	35
3.3	Particle size analyzer	36
3.4	Density bottle and specific gravity apparatus	37
3.5	Atterberg limit stages diagram	42
3.6	Cone penetration apparatus	42
3.7	Standard proctor apparatus	44
3.8	Compression device	46
3.9	Coconut coir blanket	47
4.1	Particle size distribution curve	53
4.2	Particle size analyzer curve	54
4.3	Liquid limit determination	56
4.4	Graph of dry unit weight against moisture content	57
4.5	Triaxial compression test result for soil sample BH1	59
4.6	Triaxial compression test result for soil sample BH2	60
4.7	Triaxial compression test result for soil sample BH3	60
4.8	Coconut coir blanket was tested on tensile strength machine	61

4.9	Tensile Strength graph	62
4.10	Soil sample with coconut coir blanket after shear test	63
4.11	Shear strength linear graph	64
4.12	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 0°	65
4.13	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 10°	66
4.14	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 20°	67
4.15	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 30°	68
4.16	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 40°	69
4.17	Rate of Sedimentation for Control Sample with Signal Grass Vegetation for Slope of 50°	70
4.18	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 0°	71
4.19	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 10°	72
4.20	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 20°	73
4.21	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 30°	74
4.22	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Control Sample with Japanese Millet Vegetation for Slope of 40°	75
4.23	Slope failure	76
4.24	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 0°	77
4.25	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 10°	78

4.26	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 20°	79
4.27	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 30°	80
4.28	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 40°	81
4.29	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Signal Grass Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 50°	82
4.30	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 0°	83
4.31	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 10°	84
4.32	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 20°	85
4.33	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 30°	86
4.34	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for Slope of 40°	87
4.35	High amount of collection in TSS for every 10 minutes	88
4.36	The collection decreased for every 10 minutes	89
4.37	Rate of Sedimentation Graph for Slope Model with Japanese Millet Vegetation and Coconut Coir Blanket for	90

	Slope of 50°	
4.38	The comparison of Type of Grass in TSS for Controlled Slope	91
4.39	The comparison of Type of Grass in TSS for Protected Slope	92
4.40	The comparison of Type of Slope Protection using the same Vegetation in TSS	93
4.41	The comparison of Type of Vegetation using the same Slope Protection in TSS	94
5.1	Total Suspended Solids against Degree of Slope for all the Slope Model	100

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Physical properties of coir fibre	22
2.2	Fabric categories	22
2.3	Interpreted shear strength parameters	29
4.1	Data of specific gravity testing	55
4.2	Shear strength parameters	58

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

A	-	Soil loss in tons/acre/year
R	-	Rain factor
K	-	Soil erodibility
LS	-	Topographic factor
C	-	Cover factor
P	-	Practice factor
c	-	Soil cohesion
E	-	Young's Modulus
v	-	Poisson's ratio
c'	-	Effective cohesion
Φ°	-	Effective friction angle
LL	-	Liquid limit
PL	-	Plastic limit
SL	-	Shrinkage limit
Su	-	Undrained shear strength
ΔL	-	Length deformation
L_0	-	Initial length
ϵ	-	Strain
Gs	-	Specific gravity
γ	-	Dry unit weight
Cu	-	Shear strength
%	-	Percentage
μm	-	Micrometer
$^\circ$	-	Degree
mic	-	Micron

w%	-	Water content
M_0	-	Initial mass
σ	-	Stress
MD	-	Machine direction
CD	-	Cross direction
lbs	-	Pounds
in	-	Inch
ac	-	Acre
tan	-	Tangent
f	-	Internal friction
kPa	-	Kilo Pascal
°C	-	Degree Celcius
ASTM	-	American Society for Testing and Materials
AASHTO	-	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Soil Classification	108
B	Specific Gravity	113
C	Atterberg Limit	115
D	Standard Proctor	117
E	Shear Strength	120
F	Tensile Test	124
G	Direct Shear	128
H	Total Suspended Solids	134
I	Comparison of Results	143

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Research

The surface of planet earth consists of mountains, flat grounds and water-filled sea. Each of these places needs to play roles in locating developments as the world has limited ground areas for all mankind to live in. As these places are built up to meet advanced civilization, the nature on their own is changing. The ground surface of earth basically is having crust movement as the planet rotates on its axis. The ambience which lives in the atmosphere too becomes the factors which lead to the adjustment of nature physically. Thereafter, the geological cycle of earth may be classified as disturbed.

Geologically, Malaysia is greatly disturbed by one of the major natural disaster which is landslide. Landslide occurs mostly at the surface of mountainous slopes that engaging danger to the residents. This alarming phenomenon can be predicted by geologists but on many cases, it happens unexpectedly leaving the residents in chaos. Lives are taken away and private properties are damaged which concurrently affect the residents spiritually and the country's economic sustainment. Many cases involved in the previous years and now seems like there is very minor improvement has been implemented in slope reinforcement due to the numerous agendas.

In Peninsular Malaysia, the states located in the region of north, west and south are having the gradual and evenly distributed rainfall season throughout the month of April to May and September to December. These states comprising of Kedah, Perak, Selangor and Johor are slightly affected to the landslide occurrence as a result from heavy rainfall. Based on climatology, these places basically have a dry season starting from January. Due to this, they are least in the dilemma of landslide. Out of jurisdiction, flooding may occur from time to time in the raining season.

Apparently, landslide which takes place due to human activities is normally because of major construction on the existing site. Construction works such as the cuts and excavations, removal of retaining wall or sheet piles and drawdown of water bodies can easily take leads to slope failure. Certain construction uses high technologies in order to cut hill slopes. Explosive are one of the major practice and most expensive method which being carried out. Any misleading of the explosion could simply produce unnecessary vibrations to the slope area.

Another example of human activities effects will be mining and quarrying process for the purpose of construction materials trading and entrepreneurship. Underprivileged monitoring of these activities might cause the area of site to be exposed for landslide. Additionally, the construction for tunnel without proper soil investigation and effective work may contribute in slope failure too. The hill that has been drilled may be subjected to undesired settlement. More to this construction industry, the building of a damn have a major risk in developing a landslide. Water which run underneath the ground level and water pressure against the wall of the dam may create a downfall.

Due to poor site investigation, a critical landslide may sweep off the entire construction area. This may happen too to completed projects for example in Malaysia itself, Jalan Semantan and Bukit Antarabangsa had landslide particularly in 2008 which killed a number of residents. Both projects are residential areas which stand aside to a retaining wall that protects the slope from settling down. These two cases were most likely the repetition of previous Highland Tower collapse back in 1985. It was a massive destruction as the whole tower fell to the side leaving few

survivors. It is learnt that, construction within slope areas is still unsecured due to natural effects not human errors.

Though high technology and recognized philosophies had been practiced into the matter of slope protection, flaws seemed to rise and slowly engaging total disaster. Effort on improving of the reinforcement to slope have to be revised continuously as the analogy changes because of the transition made to the environment naturally or man-made. As the deformation keeps going on, slope erosion occurs because of the soil which eroded by water and wind factor. The slope erosion is one major reason why landslide phenomenon exists. The landslide proved that better technology is highly recommended for slope embankment and more protection is seriously needful in order to have a promising Factor of Safety.

1.2 Problem Statement

Soil erosion is one factor why landslide occurs. The erosion involved the human activities which development is engaged over the existing area. Due to uncontrollable scenario, the soil surface is exposed to wind and water. As the soil is being eroded, the changes made to the originality of the soil. Numerous elements are taken into discussion for the basic properties of the soil are altered. The soil will be losing nutrients and moisture, change in its structure and vegetation, and running through a salinization. Hence, the behaviour of the soil is deformed form its original state leaving it ineligible for many purposes.

Once an area of soil becomes degraded and eroded, the particular area shall be put up for sale as it cannot be used for farmland anymore. The elements of the soil which are altered made the soil become unsuitable for plantation to grow especially at highland grounds. The maintenance fee may go higher as the soil has to be modified in order to regain its natural behaviour. Unfortunately, the value of the soil too will decrease therefore the people farming it would be harvesting lesser or

reducing stock and eventually end up poorer. Regarding to this, it can be assumed that erosion causes social, economic and political consequences to farm industries.

Whenever there is any presence of soil erosion, the existing ground is no longer safe for construction unless remedial measures are implemented. In residential divisions, high value residential nowadays favours the location of highland grounds that overlook scenic environment. However, the safety measures promised are vulnerable as any changes made by Mother Nature are unpredictable. Most cases that relates to residential happens when the slopes holding the houses overturn and slide resulting the houses to collapse. Lives were taken at stake. A home which is the safest area for people to live in becomes dangerous unexpectedly.

Other than residential area, high rise building such as offices, academic institutions, private organizations are too exposed to landslide caused by soil erosion. These multi-storeys building faces higher risk of destruction if the foundation of the structure is disrupted by the soil erosion scenario. The foundation which holds the main structure of the building may fail and bring down the whole building. Many cases have been highlighted in previous years as soil erosion keep on occurring after intense improvement on the slope reinforcement.

Most importantly, roadways which have been the network to human connections too seemed to be invaded by the severity of slope erosion. Highways which cut through a hill will be facing the dilemma of soil erosion by both sides of the excavated hill. The soil erosion which affects the roadway condition will be hazardous to the road users. Rocks, dust, and soil particles deposited by water certainly blocks the sight for the drivers. In a worsened scenario, the slope may fail thoroughly and engaging into landslide. Vehicles on the road during that particular moment may be having fatal accidents. If the destruction continues and the roadway itself collapses into lower ground, the structure of the main road is impaired. Road network is barred and transport connection is limited.

Seemingly, slope erosion by means of soil erosion leads to many difficulties to the nature and its surroundings. Most of the factor is withstood by the human activities themselves. The failure that damaging farmland, residential areas, high rise buildings and roadways are the major places involved. Lives are taken and properties are swept off each time a landslide occurs. As protecting slope is very important, this study leads to one of the many preventive measures by reinforcing the slope literally.

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

1. To determine the strength and durability of coconut coir matting.
2. To determine the effectiveness of the coir blanket in controlling slope erosion.

1.4 Scope of Study

In the real world, the phenomenon of landslide cannot be forecasted of its time of occurring and how bad it is going to be. Many factors affected the movement of particles in the soil layers which were clearly subjective. The safety protections suggested and applied too were occasionally vulnerable due to the changes made by the Mother Nature. To gain such safety protections, many measures were taken into consideration. Due to this, testing was carried out based on the objectives of this study. The effectiveness of coconut coir in controlling slope erosion was determined by several testing.

The related laboratory testing in this study covers in two specific engineering division. It included both Geotechnical Engineering testing and Structural Engineering testing. These two majors were mainly for the soil sample analysis and the coconut coir properties assessment respectively. For Geotechnical Engineering testing, there were Soil Classification, Atterberg Limit, Specific Gravity, Standard Proctor, Shear Strength and Direct Shear tests. While Structural Engineering highlighted on the coconut coir blanket properties assessment based on the Tensile test.

In this study, a rainfall simulation model was built which contain a sloped surface of soil sample. An artificial rainfall was spurred all over the soil sample area, filtered into the layer of soil and the deposited amount of water was collected at the edge of the model. The rainfall water supplied came from a direct water supply from a water tab. The rainfall was designed to distribute the water uniformly over the soil sample area. Sprinklers were installed as to contribute in the distribution of the artificial rainfall thoroughly. Pressure gauge was connected to the main pipeline of the water supply for monitoring the water pressure so to alter the intensity of the rainfall as favoured in the testing. Each testing was gone for a one-hour raining session. The data accumulated were averaged out over 60 minutes.

One controlled condition of slope was to be tested with bare surface. The other condition was the sloped surfaces covered with coconut coir blanket. Both of the conditions were varied by the vegetations used which were the Signal Grass and Japanese Millet. The angles for the slope tested were 0°, 10°, 20°, 30°, 40° and 50°. Therefore, the total number of cases was 144. The soil sample was collected from a construction site in Bukit Gambang, Pahang. Soil which was altered extremely is most likely being disapproved as the originality of the soil content will be needed to assure the properties of natural soil.

1.5 Significant of Study

The phenomenon of landslide can be factored by many aspects. There are ground conditions, geomorphological processes, physical processes and man-made processes. One of the main factors is erosion that belongs in the category of geomorphological processes as it is a norm occurrence in Malaysia. Out of the many factors, erosion is chosen to be discussed in this study in a way that excessive rainfall season in Malaysia generates the soil particles movement settled in the slope area. It is without a doubt that the well-known relationship between heavy rainfall and landslides is the major contributions to slope erosion.

Remediation processes are highly important to slope failures. But practising such operation is not recognizable as prevention save lives and the human properties at the first place. Hence, remedial measures are the ones that need to be stressed out in controlling slope erosion. Geotextile proves that it is effective to reduce erosion in slopes. However, geosynthetic fibre is a new material which has better advantages than the polymerized geotextile already has. Coconut coir is the base material selected to be used in this study as it certainly belongs in eco-friendly element. A coconut coir based blanket is fully produced naturally. The raw material used is the coconut coir alone without any additives.