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We collected soil moisture data during the growing seasons of 2001 and 2002 on over 100 points at
the Zaleski State Forest in Vinton County, southern Ohio as part of a prescribed fire and thinning
study (Iverson and others in press). These data were collected with a portable time domain
reflectometry unit (TRIME) which measured volumetric soil water through PVC tubes via an
electromagnetic field measurement of the dielectric constant of soil at 0-18, 18-36, and 36-54 cm.
Measurements were taken 8 times during the growing season in 2001 and 10 times in 2002. The
intention was to sample every two weeks but equipment failure plagued this effort. The PVC tubes
were located on a 50 m grid throughout the study area (control and thin + burn treatments), and were
accurately located via differentially corrected global positioning.

We developed the Integrated Moisture Index (IMI) some years ago to represent the long-term moisture
condition of forested habitats in irregular terrain (Iverson and others 1997). Based on a conceptual
model of topographic hillshading, flow accumulation downslope, curvature, and soil water holding
capacity, it has been related successfully to vegetation composition (Iverson and others 1996,
Hutchinson and others 1999), productivity (Iverson and others 1997), soil characteristics (Boerner and
others 2000), and bird distributions (Dettmers and Bart 1999), but hitherto not measured soil
moisture. IMI values traditionally have been calculated using ArcInfo Grid from 30 m digital elevation
models (DEMs) that were smoothed by bilinearly resampling the 30 m pixels to 7.5 m or even smaller
subcells. We modified and improved the traditional IMI algorithm by using the GRASS software
function “r.flowmd”, which computes flow under an infinite number of aspects, rather than the
flowaccumulation function in GRID, which computes flow with only 8 possible aspects. We also
acquired LIDAR data which allowed the production of 1, 2, and 4 m DEMs. Through multiple trials,
we determined that the 4 m DEM best captured the flowlines downslope, so it was used for all
landscape metrics. These data provide a much more detailed DEM, and consequently IMI map, where
smaller drainage patterns can be captured as compared to the 30 m data.

Another index of long-term moisture is the topographic wetness index (TWI), or topographic
convergence index (TCI) (Bevin and Kirkby 1979), which uses the upslope contributing areas and
slope to determine an index of moisture for each cell. It has been used in several hydrological and
landscape studies (e.g., Urban et al. 2000). This index was also computed with the 4 m LIDAR DEM
for our study area and related to IMI and actual soil moisture values.

Extraction of landscape variables for a 6 m radius around each PVC sampling tube was accomplished
via ArcInfo (ESRI 2001). This radius was selected because it roughly matches a 3x3 cell area for the 4
m cells. Average values for the circles were calculated for each of the landscape variables and joined
with the moisture data for statistical treatment. Pearson correlations were calculated between landscape
variables and soil moisture variables. For this analysis, grand means of soil moisture were calculated for
the surface, middle, and deeper horizons (plus all horizons together) for 2001, 2002, and both years
together. A subset of seven dates was also selected that had average percentages below 16 percent
moisture; these represented ‘dry’ conditions. Multiple linear regression and stepwise regression were
also run to assess the relationship of combinations of landscape variables to moisture.

The relationship between the landscape variables and recorded moisture conditions was explored by
date and depth over the two years. Though expected trends of increasing soil water with increasing
TWI or IMI were apparent, the correlations were low (table 1). Regression analysis revealed that a combination of hillshade and TWI provided slightly more explanatory power than any single index, so it too was included here. The table lists the variables in increasing overall relationship with the 15 soil moisture variables. Even with the high resolution DEM and the precise spatial location of the moisture tubes, the relationships account for little variance, though the correlations are mostly significant (P<0.05). All IMI and hillshade values tend to have relatively higher correlations with the surface moisture, whereas TWI correlates relatively higher with deeper soil moistures. As expected, the 4 m DEM is better than the 30 m DEM for this purpose, although the coarser data also do allow general mapping of stress zones over broader areas during drought periods (as evidenced by a relatively high correlation on the dry September 2002 sampling date). Curvature, total water holding capacity, and flow accumulation, three components of the 4-variable IMI, were not independently correlated to soil moisture. Hillshade, the largest component of IMI (40 percent for the 4-variable IMI and 50 percent for the 3-variable IMI), overall rated higher than IMI, but IMI_3var correlated slightly higher at the surface horizon. The combination of hillshade and TWI had the best correlations, regardless of moisture variables. TWI weighted 60 percent and hillshade at 40 percent was slightly better than the reverse weightings (table 1). TWI is not correlated with hillshade or IMI.

We believe that micro-scale phenomena near the PVC tubes and poor contact between tube and soil may be responsible for a large part of the unaccounted for variance in the relationships. The TRIME technology only measures soil moisture in a ~25 cm radius of the tube, and needs good contact (no air space) between tube and soil. Any air space would curtail the dielectric constant and underestimate the water contact. Tree roots near the tube can quickly dry out the soil moisture in the vicinity regardless of landscape position. In any case, the TRIME is not a fully dependable technology at this point. On the other hand, small depressions or rills, even if only several cm in size near the tubes, can collect and hold moisture even if the overall landscape is prone to dryness. Variability in the amount of litter, duff, and soil organic matter can also account for variation in either direction, as can variation in soil texture or coarse fragments. Finally, there may still a spatial mismatch between tube and the landscape variables being tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moisture</th>
<th>IMI_30m</th>
<th>IMI_4var</th>
<th>TWI</th>
<th>IMI_3var</th>
<th>HILL</th>
<th>HILL60TWI</th>
<th>HILL40TWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G01.top</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G01.mid</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G01.bot</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G01.all</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02.top</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02.mid</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02.bot</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G02.all</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2yr.top</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2yr.mid</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2yr.bot</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2yr.all</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry2y.top</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry2y.all</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep02.top</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.—Correlation coefficients of landscape variables with measured soil moisture variables. First column is moisture variables for 2001 (top, middle, and bottom horizons), 2002, average of both years, average for 7 of the 18 dates with average moisture <16 percent, and a single (dry) date in September 2002. Remaining columns pertain to IMI calculated with 30 m DEM and 4 m DEM (with all four variables), the topographic wetness index, and IMI with total available water capacity removed), hillshade, and combinations of hillshade and TWI with 60:40 and 40:60 ratios, respectively. N=98, all values > 0.203 are significant at P<0.05 and values > 0.327 at P<0.001.
We have shown that some landscape variables do have weak, but significant, relationships to actual measured soil moisture for this one site in southern Ohio. The IMI, previously shown to relate well to many soil and vegetation characteristics, relates weakly to surface soil moistures. We intend to determine if these relationships hold on another site, and will explore whether a combination metric of hillshade and TWI relates well to vegetation and soil patterns.
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