# Monitoring soil-based ecosystem services in El Salvador





March 8, 2014

Sean Patrick Kearney, Edwin Garcia, Rolando Barillas, Steven J. Fonte, Aracely Castro, Kai M. A. Chan, Nicholas C. Coops, Sean M. Smukler

## Outline

- Introduction
  - Research objectives
- Methods
  - Project location and sampling
  - GIS analysis
- Preliminary Results
   Maps of soil properties and nutrient deficiencies
- Next steps and applications
   Translating soil properties into ecosystem services



#### Introduction



Agroforestry for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (ABES) Project

Develop and promote management strategies to protect and/or enhance ecosystem services

Evaluate a "slash-and-mulch" agroforestry system (SMAS)

Quantify current ecosystem services and assess degradation at the landscape scale







THE EARTH INSTITUTE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



#### Introduction

Quantify current ecosystem services (ES) and assess degradation at the landscape scale





## Methods

#### Baseline Landscape Assessment (BLA)



#### Sampling (Nov-Dec 2012)

- $\circ ~~100 ~km^2$
- $\circ$  144 sites

4 km

- Based on the LDSF methodology
- Hierarchical cluster sampling
  - Soils cores up to 1m
  - Infiltration rate
  - All woody vegetation
  - Canopy/ground cover
  - Observations

#### Methods Soil analysis

	Soil Property	Analysis Method	
Chemical Properties	SOM	FT-MIR (Walkeley-Black)	
	Total C	FT-MIR	
	Total N	FT-MIR (Keidel)	
	Ρ	Mehlich - 1	
	К	Mehlich - 1	
	exch-Ca	FT-MIR (KCI)	
	exch-Mg	FT-MIR (KCI)	
	Zn	Mehlich - 1	
	рН	Soil:Water (1: 2.5)	
Physical Properties	Sand	Hydrometer	
	Silt	Hydrometer	
	Clay	Hydrometer	
	Soil Depth	Auger Restriction (up to 1m)	
	Infiltration Rate	Decagon MDI	



FT-IR spectrometer (Tensor 37 with HTS-XT)



Micro-plate prepped for FT-MIR analysis

## Methods Mapping using geostatistics

#### **Co-Kriging**

- Predict values at unsampled locations
- Incorporate cross-correlation with remote sensing variables that are:
  - Higher resolution
  - Easier/cheaper to measure

![](_page_7_Figure_7.jpeg)

Source: sciencegl.com

#### Methods Choosing co-variates

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Soil Properties

-1

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

**Prediction Map:** Predicted soil property values

**Probability Maps:** Probability of not exceeding recommended threshold values

![](_page_9_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Results Example: Potassium

#### Sample Results

Topsoil K (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )					
Mean (n = $143$ )	115	(± 65) <sup>1</sup>			
Median	109				
Minimum	13				
Maximum	335				
Sufficiency Threshold	175	(86%) <sup>2</sup>			
Critical Threshold	60	(26%) <sup>2</sup>			
<ol> <li><sup>1</sup> Standard deviation</li> <li><sup>2</sup> Percent of sample sites below threshold</li> </ol>					

#### **Co-Kriging Map Results**

![](_page_11_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### Results

#### **Example:** Potassium

#### **Probability of Low Soil K**

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

#### **Probability of Critical Deficiency**

![](_page_12_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_10.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

## Topsoil Constraint Index (TCI)

Raster Math:  

$$TCI = \frac{\left(\sum_{(P_1)^2}^{(P_n)^2} \times 100 / n\right)}{\left(\frac{P_{SOM}}{Max(P_{SOM})} + \frac{P_{Depth}}{Max(P_{Depth})}\right) / 2}$$

14

P1...n = probability of
value below sufficiency
threshold

n =Soil property

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

## Next Steps and Applications

#### Next steps and applications Provisioning Services

16

#### Spatially specific dataset:

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### What about Liebig's Law of the Minimum and soil interactions?

#### Next steps and applications Regulatory Services

Carbon storage
Erosion Risk
Biodiversity

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_3.jpeg)

## Next steps and applications **Community Perspectives**

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

ıl	Buenas Prácticas	
ímites Administrativos	Ŷ	Fincas Diversificadas
Ríos	Ø	Turismo
Calles	X	No Quema
Casco Urbano	X	Pastos Mejorados
Cantones	А	Protección de Fuentes de Agua
	В	Brechas Corta Fuego
Fuentes de Agua	HC	Huertos Caseros
	CS	Conservación de Suelos
	R	Restauración
orabilidad	R Usos	Restauración del Suelo
Prabilidad	R Usos	Restauración del Suelo Ganadería
prabilidad Deforestación Derrumbes	R Usos ଜୁ ଜୁ	Restauración del Suelo Ganadería Caña
Prabilidad Deforestación Derrumbes Contaminación	R Usos Ƴ Ƴ ℣	Restauración del Suelo Ganadería Caña Granos Básicos
Prabilidad Deforestación Derrumbes Contaminación Incondice Forestales	R Usos M M M M	Restauración del Suelo Ganadería Caña Granos Básicos Bosques
Prabilidad Deforestación Derrumbes Contaminación Incendios Forestales Quemas Agrícolas	R Usos Ƴ Ƴ ♥ ♥	Restauración <b>del Suelo</b> Ganadería Caña Granos Básicos Bosques

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_5.jpeg)

P5: Zona de nacimiento de agua

![](_page_17_Picture_7.jpeg)

## Acknowledgements

- Supervisor: Dr. Sean Smukler
- Committee Members: Dr. Kai Chan, Dr. Nicholas Coops
- Earth Institute at Columbia University, NY
  - 🗖 Rolando Barillas
- International Centre for Tropical Agriulture (CIAT)
  - Steve Fonte
  - Aracely Castro
  - Edwin Garcia
- PRIMSA, El Salvador

## Acknowledgements

#### The dedicated field crew

Luis, Victor, Jose, Jenny and many others!

![](_page_19_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

Thank you

Contact Info: Sean Patrick Kearney sean.kearney@alumni.ubc.ca | 604-724-9197

http://sal-lab.landfood.ubc.ca/

#### Co-Kriging Results Nitrogen (Total N)

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

El Zapotal

EL Zapotal

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_6.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

#### **Co-Kriging Results** Phosphorus (P)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_3.jpeg)

Road River

Road

3 km

#### Co-Kriging Results Calcium (exch-Ca)

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

### **Co-Kriging Results**

Magnesium (exch-Mg)

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

#### Co-Kriging Results Soil Organic Matter (SOM)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Co-Kriging Results Acidity (pH)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

## Co-Kriging Results

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

![](_page_27_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Co-Kriging Results

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

Road River

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

![](_page_28_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_7.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

![](_page_28_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_11.jpeg)

0 0.75 1.5 3 km

#### Deforestation

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

\*Created using data from Hansen et al. 2013 'Global Forest Change 2000-2012'

## Randomizing sample plots

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)