International Journal of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2517-942X
Vol:4, No:8, 2010

Investigation of Some Methodologies in Providing Erosion Maps of Surface, Rill and Gully and Erosion Features

A. Mohammadi Torkashvand [1] and N. Haghighat [2]

***Abstract*—**Some methodologies were compared in providing erosion maps of surface, rill and gully and erosion features, in research which took place in the Varamin sub-basin, north-east Tehran, Iran. A photomorphic unit map was produced from processed satellite images, and four other maps were prepared by the integration of different data layers, including slope, plant cover, geology, land use, rocks erodibility and land units. Comparison of ground truth maps of erosion types and working unit maps indicated that the integration of land use, land units and rocks erodibility layers with satellite image photomorphic units maps provide the best methods in producing erosion types maps.

***Keywords*—**Erosion Features, Geographic Information System, Remote Sensing.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE possibility of using aerial photographs for soil mapping has been recognised for a long time [1]. Commonly, the photographs were used to support conventional geomorphological methods [2], and also for direct identification of sheet, rill and gully erosion [3, 4]. But we know that field survey and photo interpretation for erosion mapping at the national scale is time consuming and expensive [5]. The extension of the use of modern spatial information technologies, such as geographical information systems (GIS), digital elevation modeling and remote sensing, have created new possibilities for research into improved methods of erosion mapping [6] that are economical due to low costs as well as speed [5]. Therefore, this study investigates some methodologies of preparing erosion types maps by integrating effective data layers from GIS and satellite images and data.

Most erosion and sediment studies have been carried out to provide a quantitative erosion map [6, 7, 8] rather than to prepare an erosion features map. Qualitative erosion mapping approaches are adapted to regional characteristics and data availability. Resulting maps usually depict classes ranging from very low to very high erosion risk. There is no standard method for qualitative data integration, and consequently there are many different methods [9]. Watershed Studies Office of Iran [10] prepared a design for erosion types maps at the national level at a scale of 1:250,000. The maps integrate data layers of soil, slope, lithology, land type and land use to produce working units maps, but field investigations indicated that this approach is not feasible for the total area of Iran because of time and financial constraints. In Isfahan Province, as a pilot design, Rahnama [11] investigated the possibility of preparation of a soil erosion features map by aerial photographic interpretation and obtained similar results. He recommended satellite imagery and GIS as a better approach.

Erosion types mapping is one of the most important and basic methods in erosion and sediment yield studies to determine suitable soil conservation programs [12]. It seems that the distinct methodology for providing erosion maps with regards to statistical factors has not been done; therefore, the aim of this study is to develop a methodology based on data layers integration with GIS and satellite images processing to improve the accuracy, error and precision of erosion types mapping at the national scale (1:250,000).

II. METHODS

The Varamin sub-basin, between $51°34'$E and $52°6'$E, $35°13'$N and $35°48'$N, was considered for the investigation of erosion features. The area of this basin is 162,558 ha and Jajrood River originating in the northern Miegoon region and in the northern Varamin region flow into alluvial plains. Land types include rangeland, badland, sand borrow desert, agricultural land and urban regions (Figure 1). Basic land units in the major part of basin are 1.1, 1.6, 2.7, 4.27, 6.5, 8.1 and 9.7. Within the basin, different lithic units include pyroclastic stones, tuffs, andesite, shale, conglomerate, gypsum and limestone. Quaternary deposits are also in the major part of the southern basin, particularly in the Varamin plain (covering 47.8% of the area of the basin). The climate, according to the De Martonne method, is sub-humid, semi-arid and arid in the northern, central and southern regions, respectively. The maps used, such as topographic, geologic, plant cover type and land unit maps, were scanned and georeferenced. A digital elevation model was prepared using 1:50,000 topographic digital data, and the derived slope map was classified into eight slope classes – 0–2%, 2–5%, 5–8%, 8–12%, 12–20%, 20–40%, 40–70% and >70% based on Mahler's [13] classification; land use was derived using ETM^+ a satellite image and rocks erodibility layer based on Feiznia [14]. According to their sensitivity to erosion, the rocks were categorized into the following five classes: very sensitive,

[1] A.Mohammadi Torkashvand is assistant professor of Islamic Azad University-Rasht Branch, Rasht, Iran. (Tel.0098-131-4247058; Fax:0098-131-4223621,email:m.torkashvand54@yahoo.com; Torkashvand@iaurasht.ac.ir)
[2] N. Haghighat, of Islamic Azad University-Rasht Branch, Rasht, Iran. (Tel.0098-131-4247058;Fax:0098-131-4223621,

sensitive, moderately sensitive (Quaternary deposits have been considered as a separate class), resistant and very resistant.

Seven methods were used to prepare working unit maps, of which four methods were used to integrate different data layers including: a) plant cover type, geology and slope, b) land use, geology and slope, c) land use, rocks sensitivity to erosion and slope, and d) land use, rocks sensitivity to erosion and land unit layers. The other three methods were based on: e) land units, f) sensitivity of rocks to erosion, and g) image photomorphic unit maps. Selection of the data layers was carried out after exploratory studies in Kan sub-basin [15]. Slope, plant cover type, geology, land use and land unit are important factors in soil-water erosion features. Image processing was done for preparation of different color composites. All color composites were compared and the best color image was selected to differentiate photomorphic units with attention to color, tone, texture, drainage pattern and other characteristics were on color composites by screen digitizing methods [16].

In this study, erosion features are soil–water erosion types including surface, rill and gully erosion. Different methods were incorporated for the classification of surface, rill and gully erosion severity, such as those in Flugel et al. [17], Refahi [18], and Sirvio et al. [19], and the classifications are based on experience [15]. A total of 314 points on the color composite images has been considered for field investigation by classified randomized sampling. A primary polygon was determined for each control point with respect to image characteristics. The magnitude of erosion in each erosion feature was investigated in these ground control points and then frontiers of each primary polygon were corrected with attention to the field views for each surface, rill and gully erosion feature. Modified polygons with regard to the intensity of each erosion feature in the field were marked. Polygons with the same intensity were combined and ground truth maps of surface, rill and gully erosion features were prepared.

The map of the erosion features was obtained from the combination of the surface, rill and gully erosion maps. Erosion features maps were combined with working unit maps to investigate the ability of each method to separate erosion features. Equation 1 was used to investigate each method's accuracy:

$$A = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z*_{(x_i)} c_i) / (\sum_{i=1}^{n} Z*_{(xi)}) \qquad (1)$$

where A is the map accuracy or map conformity, $Z*_{(x_i)}$ is the actual condition (%) in working units area (ha), and c_i is the maximum area of each working unit that is uniform compared to actual conditions (%).

The precision of each method was investigated by applying the working unit accuracy coefficient of variation (Equation 2):

$$CV = (S / \overline{X}) * 100 \qquad (2)$$

where S is the working unit accuracy standard deviation and $\overline{X}$ the method accuracy.

III. Results

Table 1 indicates the integrated results of different data layers. The largest and the smallest numbers of working units were related to maps "a" and "d", respectively, and most of the polygons in maps "a", "b" and "c" covered small areas which could not be included on 1:250,000 maps due to cartographic limitations. The largest and smallest accuracy are in maps "a" and "c", with 68.3% and 53.4%, respectively. The difference in accuracy between maps "a", "b" and "d" is small, but is significant with map "c". Although map "c" has a low accuracy its precision is greatest in providing an erosion types map (i.e. a high coefficient of variation). A ground truth map of erosion types, when compared with map "g", indicates that the uniformity in photomorphic units of the erosion features is greater than that obtained from other methods. On this map erosion features are completely uniform in some units, even those of a large area. According to reasons which will be discussed, map "d" derived from the integration of land units, land use and rocks erodibility layers as a working units map was compared with three more maps included maps "e", "f" and "g". Maps "d", "e", "f" and "g" are land units, rocks erodibility, photomorphic units and integrated layers methods, respectively.

TABLE I
THE ACCURACY AND ERROR OF WORKING UNITS MAP

Working Units Map	Crossed Data Layers	Accuracy (%)	Coefficient of Variation (%)	Total Number of Working Units
A	Slope, Plant cover and Lithology	68.3	34.8	902
B	Slope, Land use and Lithology	67.4	40.1	436
C	Slope, Land use and Rocks erodibility	53.4	30.9	149
D	Land units, Land use and Rock erodibility	66.6	36.5	86

Figure 1 indicates the accuracy of different methods of producing erosion types maps. The least and the greatest accuracy are related to rocks erodibility and image processing, respectively, in providing all erosion types maps, although integrated layers and image processing methods have the same accuracy in preparing a gully erosion map (89.0% versus 89.8%). All methods have the least accuracy in providing an erosion types map, while the greatest accuracy is related to the preparation of a gully erosion map. The photomorphic units map had 72% conformity with ground truth. The difference between the rocks erodibility and other methods is considerable.

Figure 2 shows the coefficient of variation of different methods in preparing erosion types maps. Every method that has a small coefficient of variation has higher precision. The trend in the precision trend is similar with accuracy for different methods. The difference in precision between integrated layers and image processing methods in providing erosion types maps and surface erosion maps is compared with the difference in accuracy.



Fig. 1 Accuracy of different methods in providing erosion types maps



Fig. 2 Root Mean Squared Error of different methods in providing erosion types maps

IV. Discussion

Investigation of the four models derived from data layer integration indicates that three models, "a", "b" and "d", have the same accuracies, but "d" has less precision than "a" and "b". A slope layer was included in models "a", "b" and "c". In other studies, the slope layer is an important data layer in integration with other data layers. In quantitative erosion maps, the slope layer is a basic layer [19, 20] and in qualitative erosion maps, such as landslide maps [21, 22] and erosion risk maps [23]. However, when the slope layer is used to produce erosion features maps, as it establishes a large number of units in a small area. Large numbers of working units increase the expense of map preparation. In maps at a scale of 1:250,000, representation of small working units is difficult and results in map confusion, and low quality [12]. In addition to accuracy and precision, economic and practical aspects are very important factors in preparing erosion features maps on a national scale [11]. Large numbers of working units, replication of units and increasing numbers of field control points are the most important factors affecting the cost of map preparation. On the other hand, it is natural to have more uniformity in small units than in large ones, resulting in greater accuracy in maps "a" and "b" than in maps "c" and "d". On the whole, regarding the quality of results and economic and practical concerns, integration of land use, rocks sensitivity to erosion and land units as a method with other three method including "e", "f" and "g" as working units maps applied for preparing of erosion features maps. Maps "d", "e", "f" and "g" are land units, rocks erodibility, photomorphic units and integrated layers methods, respectively.

Investigations show that the photomorphic units maps and rock sensitivity maps had the most and the least accurate results with minimum and maximum RMS error, respectively. Nejabat [24] also provides indirect detection of surface erosion on ETM+ satellite images in part of Fars Province, Iran. He calculated 68% accuracy when the ground truth map of surface erosion was compared with the photomorphic units map. In the Taleghan basin in Tehran Province, Iran, a gully erosion map (direct image obtained from the fusion of ETM+ bands and Cosmos image) with a ground truth map indicated approximately 80%accuracy [5].

A land units map has also shown the same results of using a rocks erodibility map in preparing erosion types maps. These maps have large units, but they are not homogenous with the view of surface, rill and gully erosion intensity. Increasing the unit area causes an increase in the diversity of erosion features intensity due to the effect a greater number of variables has on these erosion features, consequently, accuracy, error and precision of these maps reduce. Using these two maps (land units and rocks erodibility), by Mohammadi-Torkashvand and Nikkami [25] for preparing erosion features maps, has not been shown to be a suitable method. Therefore, in addition to economic and practical regards, accuracy and precision are important in producing erosion features maps.

The use of photomorphic units derived from visual interpretation of satellite images with careful consideration of color, tone, texture, drainage patterns and other image characteristics, is suitable for studying surface features [26]. This provides homogeneous data over large regions with a regular revisit capability, and can therefore greatly contribute to regional erosion assessment [27, 28]. Investigations showed that photomorphic unit maps had good conformity compared with gully erosion ground truth maps. Integration of land units, land use and rocks erodibility layers established units with greater conformity than the gully erosion maps compared with rill and surface erosion maps. It appears that gully erosion intensity is more influenced by land units, land use and rocks erodibility than surface and rill erosion. When only land unit and rocks erodibility maps were used to produce erosion features maps, accuracy and precision were low, but the maps derived from the integration of these maps with a land use layer had greater accuracy and precision. This reduces the diversity of erosion intensity to increase accuracy and precision of the maps.

V. Conclusion

The investigations indicated that land units and rocks erodibility methods, taking into consideration accuracy, error and precision, are not suitable methods for preparing erosion features maps, although land units maps can be used for providing approximate gully erosion maps. Differentiating photomorphic units in satellite imagery makes more uniform units available for use as working units in erosion features studies. On national scales, representation of small working units is difficult and results in map confusion, and low quality. Therefore, use of the slope layer to produce an erosion features map in four models established a high number of units within a small area. A large number of working units, unit replication and increasing numbers of field control points are the most important factors affecting map preparation costs. The model derived from the integration of rocks erodibility, land use and land units layers was better than other models. This model, as the second most precise method, is especially applicable in providing gully erosion maps with 89% accuracy. It is suggested that satellite images with higher resolution and integration of other layers, such as soil, be investigated to improve accuracy further. This study was carried out in a basin with a variety of climates and land uses, and the results compared with previously published methods.

REFERENCES

[1] Goosen, D., 1967. Aerial photo interpretation in soil survey. Soil Bulletin. 6. FAO, Rome.
[2] Stromquist, L., 1990. A multilevel approach to soil-erosion surveys, Examples from the Lesotho lowlands, P. 1-12. In L. Stromquist (ed.) Monitoring soil loss at different observation levels-Case studies of soil erosion in the Lesotho Lowlands. UNGI Uppasala University, Uppasala.
[3] Frazier, B.E., Mc Cool, D.K. Engle, C.F., 1983. Soil erosion in the palouse: An aerial perspective. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 38, 70-74.
[4] Stromquist, L., Lunden, B., Chakela, Q., 1985. Sediment sources, sediment transfer in a small Lesotho catchmaent- A pilot study of the spatial distribution of erosion features and their variation with time and climate. South African Georgraphy Journal 67, 3-13.
[5] Raoofi, M., Refahi, H., GH., Jalali, N., Sarmadian, F., 2004. A study of the efficiency of digital processing methods of satellite images to map and locate soil erosion (In Iranian). Iranian Journal of Agriculture Sciences 35 (4), 797-807.
[6] Martinez-Casasnovas, J.A., 2003. A spatial information technology approach for the mapping and quantification of gully erosion, Catena 50 (2-4), 293-308.
[7] Singh, G., Babu, R., Narain, P., Bhushan, L.S., Abrol, I.P., 1992. Soil erosion rates in India. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 47 (1), 97-99.
[8] Ygarden, L., 2003. Rill and gully development during an extreme winter runoff event in Norway. Catena 50 (2-4), 217-242.
[9] Vrieling, A., 2006. Satellite remote sensing for water erosion assessment: A review. Catena 65 (1), 2-18.
[10] Iran watershed evaluation and studies office, 2000. A design for providing Iran erosion features map at 1:250000 scale. Underministry for education and research, Ministry of Jihad-e-Agriculture, Iran.
[11] Rahnama, F., 2003. International design for providing erosion features map in the part of Isfahan province, Iran. Workshop of modern technologies designs (GIS-RS) in soil conservation. 7-8 febrevery 2003. Soil Conservation and Watershed management Research Institute, Tehran, Iran.
[12] Mohammadi-Torkashvand, A., 2008. GIS: some models for preparing erosion features map. In the Proceeding 15th International Congress of the International Soil Conservation Organization (ISCO), 18- 23 May, Budapest, Hungary.
[13] Mahler, P.J., 1979. Manual of land classification for irrigation. Soil Institute of Iran Publications, No. 205.
[14] Feiznia, S., 1995. Rocks resistant to erosion in Iran different climates. Journal of Iran Natural Resources 47, 95-116.
[15] Mohammadi Torkashvand, A., Nikkami, D., Esfandiari, M., 2005. Investigation of methodology for preparing erosion features map, case study: Tehran Kan-Sologhan basin. In the Proceeding 3rd Erosion and Sediment National Conference, September, 2005. Soil Conservation and Watershed management Research Institute, Tehran, Iran.
[16] Daeles, L., Artrope, M., 1977. The extraction of soil information from remote sensing documents. Pedologic 27, 123-190.
[17] Flugel, W.A., Marker, M., Moretti, S., Rodolfi, G. Staudenrausch, H., 1999. Soil erosion hazard assessment in the Mkomazi river catchment (Kwazulu/Natal-south Africa) by aerial photo interpretation. Zentralblatt fur Geologie und Palaontologie; Teil I., 3 (4), 641-653.
[18] Refahi, H.GH., 2000. Soil erosion by water & conservation (In Iranian). Second ed., Tehran University Publications. 551 p.
[19] Sirvio, T., Rebeiro-Hargrave, A., Pellikka, P., 2004. Geo-information in gully erosion studies in Taita hills, SE-Kenya, preliminary results. Proceedings of the 15th Africa Association of Remote Sensing of Environment Conference, 17-22 oct. 2004. Nairobi, Kenya.
[20] Feoli, E., Vuerich, L.G., Zerihun, W., 2002. Evaluation of environmental degredation in northern Ethiopia using GIS to integrate vegetation, geomorphological, erosion and socio- economic factors. Agricultur, Ecosystem & Environment 91 (1-3), 313-325.
[21] Bayramin, I., Dengiz, O., Baskan, O., Parlak, M., 2003. Soil erosion risk assessment with ICONA model, case study: Beypazari area. Turk Journal of Agriculture Forest 27, 105-116.
[22] Esmali, A., Ahmadi, H., 2003. Using GIS and RS in mass movements' hazard zonation.A case study in Germichay watershed, Ardabil, Iran. http://www.gisdevelopment.net/application/natural_hazards/landslides/mao3004.htm.
[23] Khawlie, M., Awad, M., Shaban, A., Bou Kheir, R., Abdallah, C., 2002. Remote sensing for environmental protection of the eastern Mediterranean rugged mountainous areas, Lebanon. ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing 57, 13-23.
[24] Nejabat, M., 2003. Possibility satellite images digital processing for detection and preparation of soil surface erosion map in Fars province, Iran. 1st workshop of modern technologies designs (GIS-RS) in soil conservation. Febrevery. Soil Conservation and Watershed management Research Institute, Tehran, Iran.
[25] Mohammadi-Torkashvand, A., Nikkami, D., 2006. Erosion features map: A basic map for soil sustainable management. In the Proceeding Soil, Environment and Sustainable Development National Conference, 8-9 Novemmber, 2006. Water and Soil Engineering College, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
[26] Alavipanah, S. K., 2004. Application of remote sensing in the earth sciences (soil). Second ed., University of Tehran Press, Tehran, Iran.
[27] King C., Delpont, G., 1993. Spatial assessment of erosion: contribution of remote sensing, a review, Remote Sensing Reviews 7, 223–232.
[28] Siakeu, J., Oguchi, T., 2000. Soil erosion analysis and modelling: a review, Transactions of the Japanese Geomorphological Union 21 (4), 413–429.