

Topographic control on soil function evaluation - a case study from South Tyrol

Fabian E. Gruber^{a,*}, Jasmin Baruck^a, Volkmar Mair^b, Clemens Geitner^a

^a*Institute of Geography, University of Innsbruck, Innrain 52f, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

^b*Amt für Geologie und Baustoffprüfung, Eggentaler Straße 48, 39053 Kardaun, Autonomous Province Bolzano – South Tyrol, Italy*

Abstract

Keywords: soil function evaluation, Alpine environment

1. Introduction

Information on soil, a, at least from a human time perspective, non-renewable resource, is of increasing importance given erosion, soil degradation and soil sealing. It is necessary to know where and where not certain practises are applicable and to adjust land-use planning appropriately. According to, soil function evaluation is an invaluable tool for the future.

Haslmayr et al. (2016) and further literature

10 In this study, we present the soil evaluation tool *Soil Evaluation for Planning Procedures (SEPP)* and investigate topographic and parent material control of the different soil functions by applying a cross-validated machine learning approach based on available soil pit information in the Oltradige/Überetsch region of the Autonomous Province Bolzano - South Tyrol.

*Corresponding author

Email address: `Fabian.Grubert@uibk.ac.at` (Fabian E. Gruber)

2. Data and methods

2.1. Study area and soil data

2.2. SEPP - Soil Evaluation for Planning Procedures

The software SEPP currently computes a soil function evaluation based
20 on soil pit descriptions. It requires that the pit descriptions are performed
following the Austrian Soil classification (Nestroy et al., 2000, 2011) and re-
lated mapping manuals. The minimum soil profile site characteristics are
local slope, thickness of organic horizons, soil depth, groundwater table, soil
parent material, soil type, humus form, altitudinal zone, moisture level, land
25 use ... For each horizon, the minimum characteristics necessary for comput-
ing the soil function are the master horizon designation, depth, pH value,
proportion of the dominant soil structure type and class membership with
regard to carbonate content, soil texture, organic content, abundance of rock
fragments, bulk density, soil structure. These class attributes can be substi-
30 tuted by exact values if available. The soil functions, for which 15 different
potentials are computed, are *habitat for living organisms* (specifically the
potential as habitat for drought-tolerant species, moisture tolerant species,
soil organisms and crops), *infiltration and drainage regulation* (minimum,
average and heavy precipitation retention capacity as well as groundwater
35 reformation rate), *natural soil fertility* as well as *filter and buffer for pollu-*
tants (heavy metal, organic, acidifying and water-soluble). The result is a
grade between 1 and 5 for each soil function potential, with 1 signifying a
high potential and 5 a low one.

Potential as a habitat for drought-tolerant species. The evaluation of a soil's
40 potential as a habitat for drought-tolerant species is based on the parameters
land use, soil type and available field capacity. While the first two parameters
are applied to distinguish especially suited (ruderal locations and correspond-
ing soil types) or unsuited (mire deposits and soil types commonly found on
these) sites, the latter is used to grade those soil profile sites showing the
45 remaining landuse and soil type combinations.

Potential as a habitat for moisture-tolerant species.

Habitat for soil organisms.

Habitat for crops.

Average and minimum precipitation retention capacity.

50 *Retention capacity for heavy precipitation events.*
groundwater reformation rate.
Potential for providing nutrients for plants.
Potential as a CO₂ sink.
Potential for retention of heavy metals.
55 *Potential for transforming organic contaminants.*
Potential as filter and buffer for organic contaminants.
Potential for retention of water-soluble contaminants.
Potential as buffer for acidic contaminants.

3. Results

60 A first evaluation of the feature selection procedure shows that mostly 2 parameters are sufficient, that is that there is no increase in cross-validated prediction accuracy by adding more predictors, and most of the time these a combination of a landform classification and a roughness or also local terrain parameter.

65 3.1. *Potential as a habitat for drought-tolerant species*

Distribution of the grades for the potential amongst the soil profiles. Of the 108 soil profile sites in the study area, 38 fall into class 4 (35%) and 32 into class 5. The intermediate class 3 contains 21 soil profiles whereas the high potential classes 1 and 2 are attribute to only 4 and 13 sites, respectively. As the predictor set does not contain landuse nor soil type, the SVM
70 classification essentially attempts to model the different classes of available field capacity. In the majority of the feature selection runs a landform map based on a flatness threshold between 3 and 5°, a spatial resolution of 10 m and a search radius of 100 m was chosen as the first predictive feature. The
75 landform flat is dominant amongst the profile sites with a graded potential of 5, which is accordingly connected to minimal curvature values around 0. The landform slope is most common for profiles with a potential of 4, whereas spurs and hollow can present profile locations with a potential score of 2 and, as expected, have increasingly negative minimum curvature values.

80 A support vector classifier using these two predictor variables results in a
cross-validated prediction accuracy of 47%, where the most common error
is that a large number of sites are mistakenly classified as having grade 4.
Nevertheless, the general implications of the feature selection are plausible,
as flat areas can be expected to have higher field capacity values than sloping
85 regions with negative curvature values.

4. Conclusion

Acknowledgements

This research was performed within the project 'Terrain Classification
of ALS Data to support Digital Soil Mapping', funded by the Autonomous
90 Province Bolzano – South Tyrol (15/40.3).

References

- Haslmayr, H.P., Geitner, C., Sutor, G., Knoll, A., Baumgarten, A., 2016.
Soil function evaluation in austria development, concepts and exam-
ples. *Geoderma* 264, 379 – 387. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016706115300951>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.09.023>. soil mapping, classification, and
95 modelling: history and future directions.
- Nestroy, O., Aust, G., Blum, W., Englisch, M., Hager, H., Herzberger, E.,
Kilian, W., Nelhiebel, P., G. Ortner and, E.P., und J. Wagner, A.P.W.S.,
100 2011. Systematische Gliederung der Böden Österreichs. Österreichische
Bodensystematik 2000 in der revidierten Fassung von 2011. Mitt. Österr.
Bodenkd. Ges. 79.
- Nestroy, O., Danneberg, O., Englisch, M., Geßl, A., Hager, H., Herzberger,
E., Kilian, W., Nelhiebel, P., Pecina, E., Pehamberger, A., Schneider, W.,
105 Wagner, J., 2000. Systematische Gliederung der Böden Österreichs
(Österreichische Bodensystematik 2000). Mitt. Österr. Bodenkd. Ges. 60.

u