

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**A COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL RISK MODELS  
DEVELOPED FROM  
NZLRI AND TOPOCLIMATE SOUTH SOIL  
SURVEY DATA**

Tabitha Anthony

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for a Masters  
Degree in Applied Science at Massey  
University, Palmerston North, New  
Zealand

July 2002

---

## **Abstract**

Land evaluation models can be prepared with an environmental focus to assist policy makers to determine areas at risk to a particular issue. The Southland Region of New Zealand has seen an increasing number of dairy farm conversions over recent years. The environmental risks due to the intensive nature of dairy farming are well documented, two of the issues are decreased water quality from nutrients and sediment and decreased soil quality from structural breakdown and erosion.

Two models for evaluating the risk of environmental degradation due to dairy farming in Southland were developed. One re-classified the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory within existing Land Use Capability units and the other was based on a recently completed soil survey of the valleys and floodplains of the Southland Region undertaken by Topoclimate South. The models were entitled Land Environmental Risk (LER) and Soil Environmental Risk (SER), respectively.

Using a framework that allowed for differences in the information held in each data source meant different limiting factors were addressed with the two models. The framework listed a number of land characteristics for rural land evaluation that were applicable to environmental issues, but also detailed how other land qualities can be used once a relative ranking is applied to each factor of interest. A limitation method was used for the overall classification. The overall classification is represented numerically one to five, with the environmental risk represented by a letter.

Each model had three limiting factors, the LER model Soil Vulnerability (SVI), Potential Erosion and Slope; the SER, Soil Vulnerability, Leaching risk and flooding risk. One key difference in the results stemmed from the fact that data collected during the Topoclimate Soil survey meant the SVI could be calculated for each soil mapped. Compared with the LER where the SVI was applied from averages of the soil group noted for the LUC.

A range of GIS software packages were used to add attributes to existing data sources, generate maps of the individual models, and to allow comparison of the models by overlaying the attributes. The data generated was examined statistically using a spreadsheet.

---

Both models reduced the complexity of the data to result in maps that should be understandable by a wide range of users. The LER model resulted in 10 classes, from an original 37 LUC units and complexes. The SER model resulted in 27 classes, from an original 190 soil units and complexes.

The LER model classified 93% of the study area as having a high risk of environmental degradation. The influence of the SVI was the single most dominating factor of the LER classifications. Two classifications, 4 LER S e, and 4 LER sl S e accounted for 88.1% of the study area. Only two SVI rankings were able to be applied which limited the overall rank of classifications generated.

The SER model presented a wider range of ranking, from 1 – 5, the percentage of land under the respective risk rankings were 0.6%, 6.2%, 24%, 52.2% and 17%. Soil vulnerability featured heavily as the most limiting factor, three classes with SVI as the most limiting factor, 4 SER l S, 3 SER LS and 4 SER f l S, accounted for close to 50% of the study site.

The greater detail of data available from the soil survey resulted in what was felt to be a more robust classification. The LER model resulted in an over simplified classification. If the LER model was used to identifying areas to target policy implementation, areas of land would be both under and over-rated in terms of their risk of environmental degradation from dairy farm conversion.

The limitation of working with data that was already classified in the LUC was seen as restrictive for this evaluation. This needs to be understood if evaluation systems based on LRI are to be used for regional planning purposes.

Using the subclass limitation of the LUC units could be a first step in identifying areas for more detailed study if the focus was on soil limitations, if other detailed soil surveys were not available. LUC units with soils as the subclass were all found to have SVI as a limiting factor.

Further research as a result of this study could take the form of a model that addressed a wider number of issues and incorporated information from both data sets.

---

## **Acknowledgements**

My supervisor Mike Tuohy, thanks especially for all the help with the GIS component.

My previous employer, the Ministry for the Environment thank you for the opportunity to the work on a project that allowed travel to Invercargill where I was able to speak with the Topoclimate South team, and generous study leave. For my current employers horizons.mw, thank you for study leave for the final stages of completion of this work.

I am very grateful to Topoclimate South for allowing me access to their mapping information, both GIS maps and laboratory reports. Thank you especially to Nick Round-Turner for being so helpful in advising what areas to concentrate on, and providing me with the data.

Thanks to Garth Eyles, for taking time to talk to me about his first-hand experiences and understanding of the LRI in New Zealand. Who would have thought a garage could hold such interesting boxes of papers.

Lastly thank you to Andrew, for the discussions, advice and assistance. It wouldn't have looked so good without you.

---

# CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	LAND EVALUATION.....	1
1.2	ROLE OF LAND EVALUATION IN NZ, LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS.....	3
1.3	SOUTHLAND REGION – DAIRYING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE AND LAND EVALUATION OPPORTUNITY .....	4
1.4	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES .....	6
<b>2.</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	LAND EVALUATION GENERAL.....	7
2.2	USDA FRAMEWORK .....	8
	2.2.1 <i>Soil capability classes for agriculture (Canadian Land Inventory,     1970)</i> .....	10
	2.2.2 <i>Land use capability classes of the Soil Survey scheme</i> .....	12
2.3	FAO FRAMEWORK .....	13
2.4	EVALUATION SYSTEMS.....	15
	2.4.1 <i>Parametric/arithmetic methods</i> .....	16
	2.4.2 <i>Limiting conditions</i> .....	19
	2.4.3 <i>Subjective/empirical methods</i> .....	20
2.5	SOILS MAPS – AS A BASIS FOR LAND EVALUATION.....	21
<b>3.</b>	<b>THE NEW ZEALAND LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	22
	3.1.1 <i>Components of the LRI</i> .....	23
	3.1.2 <i>Other Factors</i> .....	27
	3.1.3 <i>Land use capability</i> .....	28
	3.1.4 <i>ASSUMPTIONS MADE WHEN ASSESSING LUC</i> .....	30
3.2	COMPARING THE LRI/LUC SYSTEM WITH SOIL MAPS .....	30
	3.2.1 <i>Benefits of the LRI/LUC System – with particular comparison to     soil maps</i> .....	30
	3.2.2 <i>Limitations of the LRI/LUC system</i> .....	34
3.3	INTERPRETATIONS OF LRI/LUC DATA.....	37
3.4	A MANUAL OF LAND CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE EVALUATION OF RURAL LAND     41	
3.5	TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL.....	43
<b>4.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>45</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	45
	4.1.1 <i>Study Sites</i> .....	45
	4.1.2 <i>Data sources</i> .....	47
4.2	LAND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK.....	57
	4.2.2 <i>Accommodating LRI data</i> .....	59
	4.2.3 <i>Accommodating Topoclimate South soils data</i> .....	62
4.3	DATA PROCESSING AND MAP PREPARATION .....	65
	4.3.1 <i>Geographical Information Systems</i> .....	65
4.4	COMPARING CLASSIFICATION RESULTS .....	68
<b>5.</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>69</b>
5.1	LAND ENVIRONMENTAL RISK .....	69

5.2	SOIL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK MODEL.....	76
5.3	COMPARISON OF MODELS.....	85
5.3.2	<i>Comparing LUC with Indexes Generated from Soils data</i> .....	88
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>91</b>
6.1	FURTHER RESEARCH .....	93
<b>7.</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>94</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>99</b>
8.1	APPENDIX I: LUC DATA .....	99
8.2	APPENDIX II: TOPOCLIMATE SOUTH SOIL SURVEY REPORT .....	100
8.3	APPENDIX III: COMPARISON OF LUC DATA WITH TOPOCLIMATE RESULTS.....	108

### List of figures

Figure 1:	Five factor code used in the NZLRI
Figure 2:	The three levels of the land use capability classification
Figure 3:	Erosion Map codes
Figure 4:	Four steps of the land evaluation framework
Figure 5:	Comparison of land use capability class with land environmental risk class
Figure 6:	Effect of SVI on overall SER ranking
Figure 7:	Distribution of LER classes
Figure 8;	Distribution of SER classes
Figure 9:	Overlay 4 LER S e with SER ranks
Figure 10:	LUC unit 3s12 with SVI from Topoclimate Soils data
Figure 11:	LUC unit 3s12 with leaching rank from Topoclimate soils data
Figure 12:	LUC unit 3w3 with SVI from Topoclimate Soils data

### List of tables

Table 1:	Comparison of basic data recorded in Land Resource Surveys and soil resource surveys
Table 2:	Example of land characteristic rating for Profile Available Water
Table 3:	Summary of Land Classification Criteria – Productive Land in the Tasman District
Table 4:	Comparison of Agriculture new Zealand and LUC classes based on soil types
Table 5:	LUC class areas with the study area
Table 6:	Areas of soil grouped by landforms

---

Table 7:	Potential Erosion Rank
Table 8:	Soil Vulnerability Index Rank
Table 9:	Slope classes
Table 10:	Leaching classes
Table 11:	Flooding classes
Table 12:	Land Environmental Risk Classification – Description and total areas
Table 13:	Land Environmental Risk Classification – Land use capability units
Table 14:	Area of SVI rankings for LER classification
Table 15:	Soil Environmental Risk Classification – Description and total areas
Table 16:	Soil Environmental Risk Classification – SVI
Table 17:	Overlay – Leaching and SVI
Table 18:	Overlay – Flooding risk rank and SVI
Table 19:	GIS Overlay – comparison of environmental risk models

### **List of maps**

Map 1:	Location of Study Area
Map 2	Land Use Capability for the Balfour District
Map 3	Land Use Capability for the Heriot District
Map 4	Land Use Capability for the Lumsden District
Map 5	Land Use Capability for the Waikaia Plains District
Map 6	Topoclimate South's Soils of the Balfour District
Map 7	Topoclimate South's Soils of the Heriot District
Map 8	Topoclimate South's Soils of the Lumsden District
Map 9	Topoclimate South's Soils of the Waikaia Plains District
Map 10	Land Environmental Risk for the Balfour District
Map 11	Land Environmental Risk for the Heriot District
Map 12	Land Environmental Risk for the Lumsden District
Map 13	Land Environmental Risk for the Waikaia Plains District
Map 14	Soil Environmental Risk for the Balfour District
Map 15	Soil Environmental Risk for the Heriot District
Map 16	Soil Environmental Risk for the Lumsden District
Map 17	Soil Environmental Risk for the Waikaia Plains District