





## 2. Where is a sediment preventive measure needed?

Sediment clogging of subsurface drain pipes can be a problem in soil with low clay and organic matter content. These soils have non-cohesive or weakly cohesive particles that do not stick together, so flow of water can wash them into the drain pipe. Example soils that may cause a sedimentation problem are sand, loamy sand, sandy loam, loam, silt loam, and silt (Stuyt et al., 2005). After fine sand or silt washes into the drain pipe, it remains near the entry point, builds up over time, and causes drain clogging (Figure 2).

If clay content at the drain depth is less than 30%, drain sedimentation may be a problem. In that case, use the Drain Sedimentation Tool ([www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/tools](http://www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/tools)) to determine if sedimentation is a problem. The tool evaluates the resistance of the soil to being washed into the perforations. For more information about the tool, see Ghane (2022b). For more information about sedimentation occurrence and mitigation strategies, see Ghane (2023c).



Figure 2- A 6-inch main, installed in 2013. The pipe was 2/3 filled with sand in 2020. The use of a regular-perforated pipe without a knitted-sock envelope in sandy loam soil was the cause of the drain sedimentation (photo credit: William Word).



## 3. A knitted-sock envelope maximizes water entry into the pipe

A knitted-sock envelope has two key properties that make it suitable as a drain envelope. It keeps fine sand and silt out of the drain pipe and considerably increases water entry into the pipe. Water enters a sock-wrapped pipe much faster than a sand-slot pipe. In fact, a sock-wrapped pipe maximizes water entry because it functions as a completely open conduit without walls, like mole drains.

The percent increase in drain inflow of a sock-wrapped pipe compared to a sand-slot pipe depends on the drain depth, drain spacing, and depth to restrictive layer. For example, a 4-inch diameter sock-wrapped pipe has 16% higher drain inflow than an 8-row sand-slot pipe and 29% higher drain inflow than a 4-row sand-slot pipe, when installed at 30-ft spacing and 2.5-ft depth in soils with varying saturated hydraulic conductivities and a 6.5-ft depth to restrictive layer (Figure 3). These differences grow to 18% and 32% when installed at 20-ft spacing, while other conditions are the same. Overall, the trend of higher drain inflow for a sock-wrapped pipe than a sand-slot pipe will remain the same for other combinations of conditions.




Figure 3- A sock-wrapped pipe has 29% higher drain inflow than a 4-row sand-slot pipe, when installed at 30-ft spacing and 2.5-ft depth. Depth to restrictive layer is 6.5 ft.



#### 4. A sock-wrapped pipe lowers the water table most quickly

A sock-wrapped pipe lowers the water table most quickly because it maximizes water entry into the pipe.

When installed at the same depth and spacing, a sock-wrapped pipe lowers the water table faster than a sand-slot pipe. The time to lower the water table from the soil surface to 1-ft depth depends on the pipe material, drain depth, drain spacing, and soil properties. For example, a sock-wrapped pipe lowers the water table 3.2 hours faster than a 4-row sand-slot pipe, when installed at 30-ft spacing and 2.5-ft depth in a sandy loam soil with a saturated hydraulic conductivity of 1.8 in/h, depth to restrictive layer of 6.5 ft, and drainable porosity of 0.1 (Figure 4).

When installed at the same depth and spacing, research showed that corn yield increase with a sock-wrapped pipe ranges from 0.2% to 2% compared to a 4-row sand-slot pipe over 30 years across the Midwest USA in a sandy loam soil (Ghane et al., 2021). While a sock-wrapped pipe provides a higher crop yield, the unit cost of a sock-wrapped pipe material is higher than a sand-slot pipe on a per-foot basis. The cost effectiveness of the pipes depends on site-specific conditions including soil, climate, drain depth, drain spacing, crop yield, crop price, and pipe cost.

The quicker lowering of the water table with a sock-wrapped pipe reduces the risk of crop damage from waterlogging after heavy rainfalls. It also reduces the risk of delayed planting because of wet soil.




Figure 4- A sock-wrapped pipe lowers the water table from the soil surface to 1-ft depth, 24% faster than a 4-row sand-slot pipe, when installed at 30-ft spacing and 2.5-ft depth. Drainable porosity is 0.1 and depth to restrictive layer is 6.5 ft.



#### 5. A sock-wrapped pipe allows for a wider spacing than a sand-slot pipe

Water enters a sock-wrapped pipe much faster than a sand-slot pipe. As a result, when installed at the same depth, a sock-wrapped pipe allows for a wider drain spacing to achieve the same water removal rate as in a system with a narrower-spaced sand-slot pipe (Figure 5). The wider drain spacing of a sock-wrapped pipe reduces the total length of lateral drain pipe needed for drainage design (Ghane 2022a). When installed at the same depth and designed at an equal water removal rate, both pipes provide similar crop yield (Ghane et al., 2021).




Figure 5- A sock-wrapped pipe allows for a wider drain spacing to achieve the same water removal rate as in a system with a narrower-spaced 4-row sand-slot pipe, when installed at the same depth.



## 6. Installation considerations for knitted-sock and sand-slot pipes

### 6.1. Installation issues and solutions

Not even the best envelope or drain pipe can work well under poor installation conditions. Both sock-wrapped and sand-slot pipes need good installation conditions to work efficiently and extend the life of the drainage system (Figure 6). The ideal installation conditions are when the ground is driest and the water table is as deep as possible, usually during summer. Typically, there is limited control over installation timing because conditions may be less than ideal when the drainage contractor is available to work during normal installation windows (before and after planting). To reduce the risk of drainage under-performance due to installation under wet conditions, one option is growing crops with an early harvest (wheat, barley, oats, rye, and corn silage) during the year planned for installation to provide ideal installation conditions after harvest. Another option is installing through a standing crop when the ground is driest.

Avoid installation or any other fieldwork during wet soil surface conditions as it leads to soil compaction, which is one of the causes of impeded infiltration and percolation. For more information about impeded infiltration and percolation, see Ghane (2023b).




Figure 6- Top: A photo of a sand-slot pipe. Bottom: A knitted-sock envelope wrapped around a regular-perforated pipe.

When the water table is above or near the drain installation depth, there is more risk of smearing the soil adjacent to the drain pipes, especially in heavy clay soil. Smearing slows down water entry into the drain pipes, so the system will not work well at first. It may take up to 3 years for the drainage system to work efficiently as the ground goes through cycles of drying, wetting, and frost to break up the compaction around the pipe.

In some fields, there is a mix of sand and clay where the sandy soil has a drain sedimentation problem. In that case, it is unfeasible to change the pipe material from one soil to the other over a short distance. The solution is to use a sock-wrapped or sand-slot pipe throughout the field. Sock-wrapped pipes have been used in fields with a mix of sand and clay in parts of Michigan without causing any problems.

### 6.2. Early period after installation

A knitted-sock envelope is designed to retain sediment and allow passage of clay particles through the sock openings (Figure 7). During installation of the drainage system, the soil around the pipe gets disturbed. In the early period after installation, some sediment may pass through the knitted sock and enter the pipe following flow events (Stuyt et al., 2005). Once the soil around the pipe stabilizes, only a limited amount of clay particles will pass through the sock openings, and water will carry them to the system outlet.




Figure 7- A microscope image of a knitted-sock envelope that keeps fine sand and silt out of the pipe, and allows clay particles to pass through.





## 9. Explanation for the faster water entry into a sock-wrapped pipe compared to a sand-slot pipe


The white lines in Figure 9 show how water moves into the pipe. In the sand-slot pipe, flowlines have to come together as they get close to the perforation. When flowlines come together, they slow down because there are limited openings available on the pipe for water to enter.

Imagine the sand-slot pipe in Figure 9 is a sport stadium with three entrance gates. Because there are only three entrance gates, the fans need to wait in line to get in. The fans standing in line resemble the flowlines. Because of the limited number of entrance gates, the fans will enter the stadium slowly.


In the sock-wrapped pipe, flowlines do not come together as they get close to the sock. Because the entire surface of the sock is permeable, flowlines can enter the sock from any location. That is why flowlines go straight without coming together, and they do not slow down.

Imagine the sock-wrapped pipe in Figure 9 is a sport stadium with no walls. The entire boundary of the stadium is open for entry. This means that the fans can enter the stadium without coming together to stand in line. Instead, fans will approach the stadium by going straight and entering the stadium. The movement of the fans in that case resembles flowlines.

In a sock-wrapped pipe, flowlines do not come together to enter the pipe, so they do not slow down. After water passes through the sock, flowlines come together to enter the perforations, but this process does not slow down the water because it is occurring away from the soil. When flowlines come together in water, they do not slow down.



Sand-slot pipe



Sock-wrapped pipe

Figure 9- A diagram showing how water enters a sock-wrapped and sand-slot pipe.



## Expert Reviewed

The author is grateful to the reviewers: Dr. Christopher H. Hay (Iowa Soybean Association), and Dr. Vinayak S. Shedekar (Ohio State University).

## References

- Broughton, R. S., Chirara, K., & Bonnell, R. B. (1987). Tests of drain tubes with pin holes and small slots. Proceedings of the 5th National Drainage Symposium, Chicago, USA, 362–371.
- Gameda, S., Jutras, P. J., & Broughton, R. S. (1983). Ochre in subsurface drains in a fine sandy soil. *Canadian Agricultural Engineering*, 25, 209–213.
- Ghane, E. (2023a). *Choosing between 8-row and 4-row regular-perforated pipes (E3468)*. Michigan State University Extension. [www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/](http://www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/)
- Ghane, E. (2023c). *Iron ochre (E3453)*. Michigan State University Extension. [www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/](http://www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/)
- Ghane, E. (2023b). *Why do subsurface drainage systems underperform? (E3451)*. Michigan State University Extension. [www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/](http://www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/)
- Ghane, E. (2022a). Choice of pipe material influences drain spacing and system cost in subsurface drainage design. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*. 38, 685–695. <https://doi.org/10.13031/aea.15053>
- Ghane, E. (2022b). *Drain sedimentation tool (E3455)*. Michigan State University Extension. [www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/](http://www.egr.msu.edu/bae/water/drainage/)
- Ghane, E., AbdalAal, Y., Dialameh, B., & Ghane, M. (2022). Knitted-sock geotextile envelopes increase drain inflow in subsurface drainage systems. *Agricultural Water Management*. 274, 107939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2022.107939>
- Ghane, E., Askar, M. H., & Skaggs, R. W. (2021). Design drainage rates to optimize crop production for subsurface-drained fields. *Agricultural Water Management*. 257, 107045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.107045>
- Rollin, A. L., Broughton, R. S., & Bolduc, G. F. (1987). Thin synthetic envelope materials for subsurface drainage tubes. *Geotextiles and Geomembranes*. 5(2), 99–122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-1144\(87\)90050-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0266-1144(87)90050-1)
- Stuyt, L. C. P. M., Dierickx, W., & Martinez Beltran, J. (2005). Materials for subsurface land drainage systems. *FAO Irrigation and Drainage paper 60 Rev. 1*. <https://www.fao.org/3/ah861e/ah861e00.htm>