

**Land Resource Unit**

Brandon Research Centre

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

**Rural Municipality of Thompson**

**Information Bulletin 97-14**

## **Soils and Terrain**

An introduction  
to the land resource



G REEN PL A N



C M A A S



Agriculture and  
Agri-Food Canada      Research  
Branch



Canada

**Rural Municipality of Thompson**  
**Information Bulletin 97-14**

Prepared by:

Manitoba Land Resource Unit,  
Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch,  
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Department of Soil Science, University of Manitoba.

Manitoba Soil Resource Section,  
Soils and Crops Branch, Manitoba Agriculture.

Printed March ,1998

## PREFACE

This is one of a new series of information bulletins for individual rural municipalities of Manitoba. They serve to introduce the newly developed digital soil databases and illustrate several typical derived and interpretive map products for agricultural land use planning applications. The bulletins will also be available in diskette format for each rural municipality.

Information contained in this bulletin may be quoted and utilized with appropriate reference to the originating agencies. The authors and originating agencies assume no responsibility for the misuse, alteration, re-packaging, or re-interpretation of the information.

This information bulletin serves as an introduction to the land resource information available for the municipality. More detailed information, including copies of the primary soil and terrain maps at larger scales, may be obtained by contacting

Manitoba Land Resource Unit  
Room 360 Ellis Bldg, University of Manitoba,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2  
Phone: 204-474-6118 FAX: 204-474-7633.

## CITATION

Manitoba Land Resource Unit, 1997. Soils and Terrain. An Introduction to the Land Resource. Rural Municipality of Thompson. Information Bulletin 97-14, Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was financially supported in part by the Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Agricultural Sustainability, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration (PFRA), and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

The following individuals and agencies contributed significantly to the compilation, interpretation, and derivation of the information contained in this report.

Managerial and administrative support was provided by:


R.G. Eilers, Head, Manitoba Land Resource Unit, Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.  
G.J. Racz, Head, Dept. of Soil Science, University of Manitoba.  
F. Wilson, Manager, Manitoba Land and Soil Programs, PFRA, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada  
K.S. McGill, Manager, Soil Resource Section, Soils and Crops Branch, Manitoba Agriculture.

Technical support was provided by:

G.W. Lelyk, Manitoba Land Resource Unit, Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.  
J. Fitzmaurice, N. Lindberg, A. Waddell, M. Fitzgerald and S. Grift, Dept. of Soil Science, University of Manitoba.  
J. Griffiths, C. Aglugub, Soil Resource Section, Soils and Crops Branch, Manitoba Agriculture.  
R. Lewis, PFRA, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.  
G.F. Mills, P.Ag, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Professional expertise for data conversion, correlation, and interpretation was provided by:

W.R. Fraser and W. Michalyna, Manitoba Land Resource Unit, Brandon Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.  
P. Haluschak and G. Podolsky, Soil Resource Section, Soils and Crops Branch, Manitoba Agriculture.



**Figure 1.** Rural municipalities of southern Manitoba.

## INTRODUCTION


The location of the Rural Municipality of Thompson is shown in Figure 1. A brief overview of the database information, and general environmental conditions for the municipality are presented. A set of maps derived from the data for typical agricultural land use and planning applications are also included.

The soil map and database were compiled and registered using the Geographic Information System (PAMAP GIS) facilities of the Manitoba Land Resource Unit. These databases were used in the GIS to create the generalized, derived and interpretive maps and statistics in this report. The final maps were compiled and printed using Coreldraw.

This bulletin is available in printed or digital format. The digital bulletin is a Windows based executable file which offers additional display options, including the capability to print any portion of the bulletin.

## LAND RESOURCE DATA

The soil and terrain information presented in this bulletin was compiled as part of a larger project to provide a uniform level of land resource information for agricultural and regional planning purposes throughout Agro-Manitoba. This information was compiled and analysed in two distinct layers as shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2.** Soil and Base Map data.

### Base Layer

Digital base map information includes the municipality and township boundaries, along with major streams, roads and highways. Major rivers and lakes from the base layer were also used as common boundaries for the soil map layer. Water bodies larger than 25 ha in size were digitized as separate polygons.

### Soil Layer

The most detailed soil information currently available was selected as the data source for the digital soil layer for each rural municipality.

Comprehensive detailed soil maps (1:20 000 to 1:50 000 scale) have been published for many rural municipalities. Where they were available, the individual soil map sheets were digitized and compiled as a single georeferenced layer to match the digital RM base. Map polygons have one or more soil series components, as well as slope and stoniness classes. Soil database information was produced for each polygon, to meet national standards (MacDonald and Valentine, 1992). Slope length classes were also added, based on photo-interpretation.

Older, reconnaissance scale soil maps (1:126 720 scale) represented the only available soil data source for many rural municipalities. These maps were compiled on a **soil association** basis, in which soil landscape patterns were identified with unique surficial geological deposits and textures. Each soil association consists of a range of different soils ("associates") each of which occurs in a repetitive position in the landscape. Modern soil series that best represent the soil association were identified for each soil polygon. The soil and modifier codes provide a link to additional databases of soil properties. In this way, both detailed and reconnaissance soil map polygons were related to soil drainage, surface texture, and other soil properties to produce various interpretive maps. Slope length classes were also added, based on photo-interpretation.

## LAND RESOURCE OVERVIEW

The Rural Municipality (RM) of Thompson covers 5.5 Townships (approximately 53 000 ha) in south-central Manitoba. The town of Miami is the largest population centre. Land use within the rural municipality is predominantly agriculture.

Soils in the municipality have been mapped in detail (1:20 000 and 1:50 000 scale) and published in report D60, Soils of the Rural Municipalities of Grey, Dufferin, Roland, Thompson, and part of Stanley (Michalyna et al, 1988).

Based on climatic data from Graysville (Environment Canada, 1993), mean annual temperature is 2.7°C; mean annual precipitation is 538.7 mm; average frost-free period is 116 days (Environment Canada, 1982) and growing degree days above 5°C are 1647. The calculated seasonal moisture deficit between May and September is 250 to 300 mm; effective growing degree days (EGDD) above 5°C accumulated from May to September are 1500 to 1600. This parameter provides an indication of heat energy available for crop growth (Agronomic Interpretations Working Group, 1992).

The RM of Thompson contain portions of four physiographic regions, Pembina Hills, Pembina Escarpment, Red River Valley, and Lower Assiniboine Delta (Canada-Manitoba Soil Survey, 1980). A bedrock-controlled, hummocky glacial moraine landscape (Pembina Hills) occurs in the western portion of the municipality. This upland area ranges in elevation from 380 to 495 m a.s.l. with a local relief of 5 to 15 m on isolated knolls. Surface deposits consist dominantly of a variable thickness of loamy to fine loamy, slightly stony glacial till over shale bedrock. Dark Gray Chernozems and Luvisols have developed on these well drained, moderately permeable soils. In this upland area runoff is rapid and the water table is usually well below the rooting depth. The soils are commonly mapped as Dezwood, Oakley, and Pembina series. Nikkel soils can be found in the imperfectly drained sites. The well drained Altamont and imperfectly drained Ullrich soils are common where the till is overlain by shallow lacustrine deposits. Humic

Gleysols (Cazlake, Horose, Narish and Guerra series) occur in depressional areas associated with the upland knolls. Drainage in these lows is poor and surface ponding is common. Steeply sloping uplands are mostly wooded, with some cleared for grazing. Gently sloping uplands are mostly deforested and cultivated for cereal crop production. Localized areas of lacustrine loam over coarse textured glacial fluvial deposits occur within the Pembina Hills. Croyon and Vandal soils are dominant in these well drained sites. Carvey series (Rego Humic Gleysol) is found in depressional areas where drainage is restricted. A steeply sloping escarpment dissected by several streams marks the eastern edge of the Pembina Hills. Due to their erosional origin the soils on these steep slopes and channels are undifferentiated and classified as Eroded Slope Complex.

Capability for dryland agriculture varies greatly within this region. The more level areas are rated as class 2 or 3 due to topography and drainage. Areas with steeper slope gradients have agricultural capability ratings that can vary from class 4T to 6T.

The Pembina Escarpment is a prominent feature in the RM, and consists of a steep sloping escarpment, and a lacustrine plain which slopes east to the Red River Valley. Elevation drops from 380 in the east to 305 m.a.s.l at the eastern boundary with the Red River Valley area. Beach and outwash sand and gravel deposits are interspersed throughout the area and are commonly mapped as rapid to moderately well drained Birkenhead and Agassiz series (Black Chernozem), or the Leary series (Dark Gray Chernozem). Well drained Vandal series and imperfectly drained Vartel series (both Dark Gray Chernozems) are common where beach or outwash deposits have a thin overlay of loamy lacustrine materials. Glencross and Roseisle soils (Black Chernozems) are found in areas where a thin veneer of medium to fine textured lacustrine sediments overlie glacial till. Fine textured shaly alluvium is often found between the escarpment and glacial beaches, especially in the southern portions of this region. The water table is often near the surface (1m to 2m) and these soils are commonly mapped as the imperfectly drained, Blumengart series (Gleyed Cumulic Regosol) and Gretna series (Gleyed Solonetzic Black Chernozem). Saline

phases of these two soils are commonly found in areas where seepage of water containing soluble salts from the Pembina Hills has occurred.

Agriculture capability of the soils in this area generally fall into classes 2 and 3. Soils formed on beach and outwash deposits are rated class 4 and 5 due to their low water holding capacity. Saline soils, such as Blumengart and Gretna series range from class 3 to class 5 depending upon the extent and severity of soil salinity. This area has an irrigation suitability of fair to poor depending upon drainage, water holding capacity and salinity. Areas with Vandal and Vartel soils are commonly rated fair to good for irrigation.

The northeast corner of the RM is a portion of the Red River Valley. This is a level to very gently sloping, lacustrine plain characterized by nearly level fluvial lacustrine loams and clays. Elevation ranges from 305 m.a.s.l in the western portion to a low of 260 in the east. Low relief and medium to fine textured deposits at or near the surface have resulted in imperfect drainage over much of this area. The soils in this area can be described by two general groupings based upon surface texture. Areas where the dominant surface texture is clayey are represented by the imperfectly drained Red River, Deadhorse, Dugas, Scanterbury and Plum Coulee series (all Black Chernozems). Poorly drained soils have been mapped as Osborne series (Rego Humic Gleysol). Included with this group are the imperfectly drained Blumengart and Gretna series which are developed on fine textured shaly alluvium. Black Chernozem soils developed on well to imperfectly drained coarse loamy to fine loamy fluvial lacustrine deposits are commonly mapped as the Eigenhoff, Edenburg, Gnadenthal, Graysville, Neuenberg, Neuhorst and Rignold series.

The finer textured soils in this area are rated as class 2 and 3 for agricultural capability and fair to poor for irrigation suitability. Excess moisture and the occurrence of salinity being the main limitations. Soils with a coarser surface texture have slightly improved drainage and are generally rated as class 1 and 2 for

agricultural capability and good for irrigation suitability.

A small portion of the Lower Assiniboine Delta extends along the extreme eastern edge of Township 7, Range 6 in the northwest corner of the RM of Thompson. It is characterized by level to gently undulating lacustrine sands overlying fine textured materials at depths of 3 to 4 m. Soils in this area are dominantly imperfectly drained Almassipi, Willowcrest, and St. Claude series (Black Chernozems) with inclusions of poorly drained Lelant series (Rego Humic Gleysols). Wind modified lacustrine sands are also common within this area and are represented by well drained Skelding series and imperfectly drained Long Plain series (Orthic Regosol and Gleyed Regosol respectively). Most soils within the Lower Assiniboine Delta are affected by high water tables.

Capability for dryland agriculture is class 3 and 4 for the imperfectly drained soils and class 5 or 6 for the poorly drained soils. The Lower Assiniboine Delta is generally suitable for irrigation, however, the high water tables and rapid permeability results in a high potential for adverse environmental impact. These soils are also very susceptible to wind erosion and proper management of crop residues is needed. As a result of increased slope gradients and lower fertility levels, the Skelding and Long Plain series are less suitable for dryland agriculture (class 4 to class 6). These soils are generally not suited for irrigation because of their very low water holding capacity.

Several areas of organic soils occur in depressional areas within the RM of Thompson. These are very poorly drained fen peats which are mapped as Perillo series (Terric Mesisol). Perillo soils are not suited to agriculture and generally remain in their native state.

Land use in the RM of Thompson is primarily agricultural, with small areas of woodland, pasture, urban development and recreation. Annual crops are the dominant use of land through the RM (73.7 %). Areas with steep relief or other soil factors that prevent annual crop production is either in native forest (10.6%), grassland (9.4%) and forage (1.6%). These areas are often utilized

for livestock production. The remainder (4.7%) is being utilized for various non-agricultural applications.

Due to local relief, soil erosion from water can be a serious problem in the Pembina Hills. In the lacustrine plains east of the Pembina Hills, coarser textured materials may be susceptible to wind erosion. In both cases proper management techniques must be applied to minimize soil losses.

## DERIVED AND INTERPRETIVE MAPS

A large variety of computer derived and interpretive maps can be generated from the digital soil and landscape databases. These maps are based on selected combinations of database values and assumptions.

**Derived maps** show information that is given in one or more columns in the computer map legend (such as soil drainage, soil salinity, or slope class).

**Interpretive maps** portray more complex land evaluations based on a combination of soil and landscape information. Interpretations are based on soil and landscape conditions in each polygon. Interpretive maps typically show land capabilities, suitabilities, or risks related to sustainability.

Several examples of derived and interpretive maps are included in this information bulletin:

### Derived Maps

- Slope
- Surface Texture
- Drainage
- Salinity
- Management Considerations

### Interpretive Maps

- Agricultural Capability
- Irrigation Suitability
- Potential Environmental Impact
- Water Erosion Risk
- Land Use.

The maps have all been reduced in size and generalized (simplified) in order to portray conditions for an entire rural municipality on one page. These generalized maps provide a useful overview of conditions within a municipality, but are not intended to apply to site specific land parcels. On-site evaluations are recommended for

localized site specific land use suitability requirements.

Digital databases derived from recent detailed soil inventories contain additional detailed information about significant inclusions of differing soil and slope conditions in each map polygon. This information can be portrayed at larger map scale than shown in this bulletin.

Information concerning particular interpretive maps, and the primary soil and terrain map data, can be obtained by contacting the Manitoba Soil Resource Section of Manitoba Agriculture, the local PFRA office, or the Manitoba Land Resource Unit.

**Slope Map.**


Slope describes the steepness of the landscape surface. The slope classes shown on this map are derived from the digital soil layer database. Specific colours are used to indicate the dominant slope class for each soil polygon in the RM. Additional slope classes may occur in each polygon area, but cannot be portrayed at this reduced map scale.

**Table 1. Slope Classes<sup>1</sup>**

| <b>Slope Class</b>  | <b>Area<br/>(ha)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>of RM</b> |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>0 - 2 %</b>      | <b>40014</b>         | <b>74.9</b>              |
| <b>2 - 5 %</b>      | <b>7489</b>          | <b>14.0</b>              |
| <b>5 - 9 %</b>      | <b>2789</b>          | <b>5.2</b>               |
| <b>9 - 15 %</b>     | <b>202</b>           | <b>0.4</b>               |
| <b>15 - 30 %</b>    | <b>44</b>            | <b>0.1</b>               |
| <b>&gt; 30 %</b>    | <b>2902</b>          | <b>5.4</b>               |
| <b>Unclassified</b> | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Water</b>        | <b>0</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>53441</b>         | <b>100.0</b>             |

<sup>1</sup> Area has been assigned to the dominant slope class in each soil polygon.

## Slope Map



**Surface Texture Map.**


The soil textural class for the upper most soil horizon of the dominant soil series within a soil polygon was utilized for classification. Texture may vary with soil depth and location within the polygon.

**Table 2. Surface Texture<sup>1</sup>**

| <b>Surface Texture</b> | <b>Area<br/>(ha)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>of RM</b> |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Organics</b>        | <b>1869</b>          | <b>3.5</b>               |
| <b>Coarse Sands</b>    | <b>0</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Sands</b>           | <b>2808</b>          | <b>5.3</b>               |
| <b>Coarse Loamy</b>    | <b>5709</b>          | <b>10.7</b>              |
| <b>Loamy</b>           | <b>23292</b>         | <b>43.6</b>              |
| <b>Clayey</b>          | <b>16860</b>         | <b>31.5</b>              |
| <b>Eroded Slopes</b>   | <b>2902</b>          | <b>5.4</b>               |
| <b>Marsh</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Unclassified</b>    | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Water</b>           | <b>0</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>53441</b>         | <b>100.0</b>             |

<sup>1</sup> Based on the **dominant** soil series for each soil polygon.


## Surface Texture Map



### Surface Textures

- Organic
- Coarse Sands
- Sands
- Coarse Loamy
- Loamy
- Clayey
- Unclassified
- Muskrat
- Eroded slopes
- Water

### Scale



Universal Transverse Mercator  
(NAD27) Projection

Land Resource Unit  
Brandon Research Centre  
April 1998

**Soil Drainage Map.**

Drainage is described on the basis of actual moisture content in excess of field capacity, and the length of the saturation period within the plant root zone. Six drainage classes plus four land classes are shown on this map.

**Very Poor** - Water is removed from the soil so slowly that the water table remains at or on the soil surface for the greater part of the time the soil is not frozen. Excess water is present in the soil throughout most of the year.

**Poor** - Water is removed so slowly in relation to supply that the soil remains wet for a large part of the time the soil is not frozen. Excess water is available within the soil for a large part of the time.

**Imperfect** - Water is removed from the soil sufficiently slowly in relation to supply to keep the soil wet for a significant part of the growing season. Excess water moves slowly down the profile if precipitation is the major source.

**Well** - Water is removed from the soil readily but not rapidly. Excess water flows downward readily into underlying materials or laterally as subsurface flow.


**Rapid** - Water is removed from the soil rapidly in relation to supply. Excess water flows downward if underlying material is pervious. Subsurface flow may occur on steep slopes during heavy rainfall.

Drainage classification is based on the dominant soil series within each individual soil polygon.

**Table 3. Drainage Classes<sup>1</sup>**

| Drainage Class      | Area (ha)    | Percent of RM |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|
| <b>Very Poor</b>    | <b>1853</b>  | <b>3.5</b>    |
| <b>Poor</b>         | <b>3154</b>  | <b>5.9</b>    |
| <b>Imperfect</b>    | <b>27918</b> | <b>52.2</b>   |
| <b>Well</b>         | <b>16979</b> | <b>31.8</b>   |
| <b>Rapid</b>        | <b>3537</b>  | <b>6.6</b>    |
| <b>Marsh</b>        | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>    |
| <b>Unclassified</b> | <b>1</b>     | <b>0.0</b>    |
| <b>Water</b>        | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>    |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>53441</b> | <b>100.0</b>  |

<sup>1</sup> Area has been assigned to the dominant drainage class for each soil polygon.



## Soil Drainage Map

### Drainage Classes

|             |              |
|-------------|--------------|
| Dark Green  | Rapid        |
| Light Green | Well         |
| Yellow      | Imperfect    |
| Orange      | Poor         |
| Red         | Very poor    |
| Grey        | Unclassified |
| Purple      | Marsh        |
| Cyan        | Water        |

### Scale

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  
(Km.)

Tp 4

Landsat Thematic Mapper  
(NASC) Project

R 7

R 6

R 5 W

Land Resource Unit  
Brandon Research Centre  
April 1998

**Soil Salinity Map.**

A saline soil contains soluble salts in such quantities that they interfere with the growth of most crops. Soil salinity is determined by the electrical conductivity of the saturation extract in decisiemens per metre (dS/m). Approximate limits of salinity classes are:

|                          |              |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| <b>non-saline</b>        | < 4 dS/m     |
| <b>weakly saline</b>     | 4 to 8 dS/m  |
| <b>moderately saline</b> | 8 to 15 dS/m |
| <b>strongly saline</b>   | > 15 dS/m.   |


The salinity classification of each individual soil polygon was determined by the most severe salinity classification present within that polygon.

**Table 4. Salinity Classes<sup>1</sup>**

| Salinity Class           | Area<br>(ha) | Percent<br>of RM |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>Non Saline</b>        | <b>42208</b> | <b>79.0</b>      |
| <b>Weakly Saline</b>     | <b>5253</b>  | <b>9.8</b>       |
| <b>Moderately Saline</b> | <b>2513</b>  | <b>4.7</b>       |
| <b>Strongly Saline</b>   | <b>563</b>   | <b>1.1</b>       |
| <b>Eroded Slopes</b>     | <b>2902</b>  | <b>5.4</b>       |
| <b>Marsh</b>             | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Unclassified</b>      | <b>1</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Water</b>             | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>53441</b> | <b>100.0</b>     |

<sup>1</sup> Area has been assigned to the most severe salinity class for each soil polygon.

## Soil Salinity Map



### **Management Considerations Map.**

Management consideration maps are provided to focus on awareness of land resource characteristics important to land use. This map does not presume a specific land use. Rather it portrays the most common and wide spread attributes that apply to most soil landscapes in the province.

These maps **highlight attributes** of soil-landscapes that the land manager must consider for any intended land use.

- Fine texture
- Medium texture
- Coarse texture
- Topography
- Wetness
- Organic
- Bedrock

**F = Fine texture** - soil landscapes with **fine textured soils (clays and silty clays)**, have low infiltration and internal permeability rates. These require special considerations to mitigate surface ponding (water logging), runoff and trafficability. Timing and type of tillage practices used may be restricted.

**M = Medium texture** - soil landscapes with medium to moderately fine textures (**loams to clay loams**), and good water and nutrient retention properties. Good management and cropping practices are required to minimize leaching and the risk of erosion.

**C = Coarse texture** - soil landscapes with **coarse to very coarse textured soils (loamy sands, sands and gravels)** have a high permeability throughout the profile and require special management practices related to application of agricultural chemicals, animal wastes, and municipal effluent to protect and sustain the long term quality of the soil and water resources. The risk of soil erosion can be minimized through the use of shelterbelts and maintenance of crop residues.

**T = Topography** - soil landscapes with **slopes greater than 5 %** are steep enough to require special management practices to minimize the risk of erosion.

**W = Wetness** - soil landscapes that have **poorly drained soils and/or >50 % wetlands** (due to seasonal and annual flooding, surface ponding, permanent water bodies (sloughs), and/or high water tables), require special management practices to mitigate adverse impact on water quality, protect subsurface aquifers, and sustain crop production during periods of high risk of water logging.

**O = Organic** - soil landscapes with organic soils, requiring special management considerations of drainage, tillage, and cropping to sustain productivity and minimize subsidence and erosion.


**R = Bedrock** - soil landscapes that have **shallow depth to bedrock (< 50 cm) and/or exposed bedrock** which may prevent the use of some or all tillage practices as well as the range of potential crops. They require special cropping and management practices to sustain agricultural production.

**Table 5. Management Considerations<sup>1</sup>**

| Land Resource Characteristics        | Area<br>(ha) | Percent<br>of RM |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>Fine Texture</b>                  | <b>15120</b> | <b>28.3</b>      |
| <b>Fine Texture and Wetness</b>      | <b>1742</b>  | <b>3.3</b>       |
| <b>Fine Texture and Topography</b>   | <b>38</b>    | <b>0.1</b>       |
| <b>Medium Texture</b>                | <b>24093</b> | <b>45.1</b>      |
| <b>Coarse Texture</b>                | <b>2419</b>  | <b>4.5</b>       |
| <b>Coarse Texture and Wetness</b>    | <b>292</b>   | <b>0.5</b>       |
| <b>Coarse Texture and Topography</b> | <b>511</b>   | <b>1.0</b>       |
| <b>Topography</b>                    | <b>5155</b>  | <b>9.6</b>       |
| <b>Topography and Bedrock</b>        | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Wetness</b>                       | <b>2207</b>  | <b>4.1</b>       |
| <b>Wetness and Topography</b>        | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Bedrock</b>                       | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Organic</b>                       | <b>767</b>   | <b>1.4</b>       |
| <b>Marsh</b>                         | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Unclassified</b>                  | <b>1</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Water</b>                         | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>53441</b> | <b>100.0</b>     |

<sup>1</sup> Based on **dominant** soil series for each soil polygon.

## Management Considerations Map



**Agricultural Capability Map.**

This evaluation utilizes the 7 class Canada Land Inventory system (CLI, 1965). Classes 1 to 3 represent the prime agricultural land, class 4 land is marginal for sustained cultivation, class 5 land is capable of perennial forages and improvement is feasible, class 6 land is capable of producing native forages and pasture but improvement is not feasible, and class 7 land is considered unsuitable for dryland agriculture. Subclass modifiers include structure and/or permeability (D), erosion (E), inundation (I), moisture limitation (M), salinity (N), stoniness (P), consolidated bedrock (R), topography (T), excess water (W) and cumulative minor adverse characteristics (X).

This generalized interpretive map is based on the dominant soil series and phases for each soil polygon. The CLI subclass limitations cannot be portrayed at this generalized map scale.

**Table 6. Agricultural Capability<sup>1</sup>**


| <b>Class</b>    | <b>Area<br/>(ha)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>of RM</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Subclass</b> |                      |                          |
| <b>1</b>        | <b>8424</b>          | <b>15.7</b>              |
| <b>2</b>        | <b>18165</b>         | <b>34.0</b>              |
| 2D              | 968                  | 1.8                      |
| 2I              | 71                   | 0.1                      |
| 2M              | 1879                 | 3.5                      |
| 2MT             | 71                   | 0.1                      |
| 2T              | 5238                 | 9.8                      |
| 2TD             | 78                   | 0.1                      |
| 2TP             | 48                   | 0.1                      |
| 2TW             | 117                  | 0.2                      |
| 2W              | 7795                 | 14.6                     |
| 2WP             | 44                   | 0.1                      |
| 2X              | 1858                 | 3.5                      |
| <b>3</b>        | <b>13728</b>         | <b>25.7</b>              |
| 3D              | 3532                 | 6.6                      |
| 3DN             | 1858                 | 3.5                      |
| 3I              | 2362                 | 4.4                      |
| 3M              | 1494                 | 2.8                      |
| 3MT             | 118                  | 0.2                      |
| 3N              | 1076                 | 2.0                      |
| 3NI             | 681                  | 1.3                      |

**Table 6. Agricultural Capability<sup>1</sup>(cont)**

| <b>Class</b>        | <b>Subclass</b> | <b>Area<br/>(ha)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>of RM</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 3NW                 |                 | 163                  | 0.3                      |
| 3P                  |                 | 1                    | 0.0                      |
| 3T                  |                 | 1849                 | 3.5                      |
| 3TE                 |                 | 122                  | 0.2                      |
| 3TI                 |                 | 58                   | 0.1                      |
| 3W                  |                 | 412                  | 0.8                      |
| <b>4</b>            |                 | <b>2945</b>          | <b>5.5</b>               |
| 4M                  |                 | 392                  | 0.7                      |
| 4N                  |                 | 699                  | 1.3                      |
| 4NI                 |                 | 652                  | 1.2                      |
| 4R                  |                 | 985                  | 1.8                      |
| 4RP                 |                 | 62                   | 0.1                      |
| 4RT                 |                 | 42                   | 0.1                      |
| 4T                  |                 | 112                  | 0.2                      |
| <b>5</b>            |                 | <b>5342</b>          | <b>10.0</b>              |
| 5M                  |                 | 1850                 | 3.5                      |
| 5ME                 |                 | 3                    | 0.0                      |
| 5N                  |                 | 23                   | 0.0                      |
| 5NI                 |                 | 432                  | 0.8                      |
| 5RM                 |                 | 71                   | 0.1                      |
| 5T                  |                 | 29                   | 0.1                      |
| 5W                  |                 | 1374                 | 2.6                      |
| 5WI                 |                 | 1560                 | 2.9                      |
| <b>6</b>            |                 | <b>4127</b>          | <b>7.7</b>               |
| 6NW                 |                 | 104                  | 0.2                      |
| 6T                  |                 | 2915                 | 5.4                      |
| 6W                  |                 | 399                  | 0.7                      |
| 6WI                 |                 | 709                  | 1.3                      |
| <b>Unclassified</b> |                 | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Organic</b>      |                 | <b>769</b>           | <b>1.4</b>               |
| <b>Total</b>        |                 | <b>53501</b>         | <b>100.0</b>             |

<sup>1</sup> Based on dominant soil, slope gradient, and slope length of each soil polygon.


## Agriculture Capability Map



### Canada Land Inventory Classes

- Class 1
- Class 2
- Class 3
- Class 4
- Class 5
- Class 6
- Class 7
- Organic
- Unclassified
- Water

### Scale



Source: Landbase Monitor  
(NAD83) Project

Land Resource Unit  
Winnipeg Manitoba  
June 2003

### Irrigation Suitability Map.

Irrigation ratings are based on an assessment of the most limiting combination of soil and landscape conditions. Soils in the same class have a similar relative suitability or degree of limitation for irrigation use, although the specific limiting factors may differ. These limiting factors are described by subclass symbols at detailed map scales. The irrigation rating system does not consider water availability, method of application, water quality, or economics of irrigated land use.

Irrigation suitability is a four class rating system. Areas with no or slight soil and/or landscape limitations are rated **Excellent** to **Good** and can be considered irrigable. Areas with moderate soil and/or landscape limitations are rated as **Fair** and considered marginal for irrigation providing adequate management exists so that the soil and adjacent areas are not adversely affected by water application. Soil and landscape areas rated as **Poor** have severe limitations for irrigation.


This generalized interpretive map is based on the dominant soil series for each soil polygon, in combination with the dominant slope class. The nature of the subclass limitations and the classification of subdominant components is not shown at this generalized map scale.

**Table 7. Irrigation Suitability<sup>1</sup>**

| Class               | Area<br>(ha) | Percent<br>of RM |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b>    | <b>1541</b>  | <b>2.9</b>       |
| <b>Good</b>         | <b>17276</b> | <b>32.3</b>      |
| <b>Fair</b>         | <b>12771</b> | <b>23.9</b>      |
| <b>Poor</b>         | <b>21085</b> | <b>39.5</b>      |
| <b>Organic</b>      | <b>767</b>   | <b>1.4</b>       |
| <b>Unclassified</b> | <b>1</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Water</b>        | <b>0</b>     | <b>0.0</b>       |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>53441</b> | <b>100.0</b>     |

<sup>1</sup> Based on **dominant** soil, slope gradient, and slope length of each soil polygon.


## Irrigation Suitability Map



### Irrigation Suitability Classes

|        |              |
|--------|--------------|
| Green  | Excellent    |
| Yellow | Good         |
| Orange | Fair         |
| Red    | Poor         |
| Purple | Organic      |
| Grey   | Unclassified |
| Cyan   | Water        |

### Scale



Universal Transverse Mercator  
(NAD83) Reference

Land Resource Unit:  
Brandon Research Centre  
Apr 1998

### Potential Environmental Impact Under Irrigation Map.

A major environmental concern for land under irrigated crop production is the possibility that surface and/or ground water may be impacted. The potential environmental impact assessment provides a relative rating of land into 4 classes (minimal, low, moderate and high) based on an evaluation of specific soil factors and landscape conditions that determine the impact potential.

Soil factors considered are those properties that determine water retention and movement through the soil; topographic features are those that affect runoff and redistribution of moisture in the landscape. Several factors are specifically considered: soil texture, hydraulic conductivity, salinity, geological uniformity, depth to water table and topography. The risk of altering surface and subsurface soil drainage regimes, soil salinity, potential for runoff, erosion and flooding is determined by specific criteria for each property.

Use of this rating is intended to serve as a warning of potential environmental concern. It may be possible to design and/or give special consideration to soil-water-crop management practices that will mitigate any adverse impact.


This generalized interpretive map is based on the dominant soil series and slope class for each soil polygon. The nature of the subclass limitations, and the classification of subdominant components is not shown at this generalized map scale.

**Table 8. Potential Environmental Impact Under Irrigation<sup>1</sup>**

| Class        | Area (ha)    | Percent of RM |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Minimal      | 11687        | 21.9          |
| Low          | 21617        | 40.5          |
| Moderate     | 10803        | 20.2          |
| High         | 8566         | 16.0          |
| Organic      | 767          | 1.4           |
| Unclassified | 1            | 0.0           |
| Water        | 0            | 0.0           |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>53441</b> | <b>100.0</b>  |

<sup>1</sup> Based on dominant soil, slope gradient, and slope length of each soil polygon.


## Potential Environmental Impact Under Irrigation



### Potential Impact Classes

|        |              |
|--------|--------------|
| Green  | Minimal      |
| Yellow | Low          |
| Orange | Moderate     |
| Red    | High         |
| Purple | Organic      |
| Grey   | Unclassified |
| Cyan   | Water        |

### Scale



Univ. of Manitoba Map 40  
(NAD 27) Projection

Land Resource Unit  
Brandon Research Centre  
April 1998

### **Water Erosion Risk Map.**

The risk of water erosion was estimated using the universal soil loss equation (USLE) developed by Wischmeier and Smith (1965). The USLE predicted soil loss (tons/hectare/year) is calculated for each soil component in each soil map polygon. Erosion risk classes are assigned based on the weighted average soil loss for each map polygon. The map shows 5 classes of soil erosion risk based on bare unprotected soil:


**negligible**  
**low**  
**moderate**  
**high**  
**severe.**

Cropping and residue management practices will significantly reduce this risk depending on crop rotation program, soil type, and landscape features.

**Table 9. Water Erosion Risk**

| <b>Class</b>        | <b>Area<br/>(ha)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>of RM</b> |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Negligible</b>   | <b>9102</b>          | <b>17.0</b>              |
| <b>Low</b>          | <b>29182</b>         | <b>54.6</b>              |
| <b>Moderate</b>     | <b>4851</b>          | <b>9.1</b>               |
| <b>High</b>         | <b>3592</b>          | <b>6.7</b>               |
| <b>Severe</b>       | <b>6713</b>          | <b>12.6</b>              |
| <b>Unclassified</b> | <b>1</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Water</b>        | <b>0</b>             | <b>0.0</b>               |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>53441</b>         | <b>100.0</b>             |


## Water Erosion Risk Map



### Mean Risk Values

|        |            |
|--------|------------|
| Green  | Negligible |
| Yellow | Low        |
| Orange | Moderate   |
| Red    | High       |
| Purple | Severe     |
| Blue   | Water      |

### Scale



Universal Transverse Mercator  
(1:100,000) projection

Land Resource Unit  
Brandon Research Centre  
April 1996

### Land Use Map.

The land use classification of the RM has been interpreted from LANDSAT satellite imagery, using supervised computer classification techniques. Many individual spectral signatures were classified and grouped into the seven general land use classes shown here. Although land use changes over time, and some land use practices on individual parcels may occasionally result in similar spectral signatures, this map provides a general representation of the current land use in the RM.

The following is a brief description of the land use classes:

**Annual Crop Land** - land that is normally cultivated on an annual basis.

**Forage** - perennial forages, generally alfalfa or clover with blends of tame grasses.

**Grasslands** - areas of native or tame grasses, may contain scattered stands of shrubs.

**Trees** - lands that are primarily in tree cover.

**Wetlands** - areas that are wet, often with sedges, cattails, and rushes.


**Water** - open water - lakes, rivers streams, ponds, and lagoons.

**Urban and Transportation** - towns, roads, railways, quarries.

**Table 10. Land Use<sup>1</sup>**

| Class                           | Area<br>(ha) | Percent<br>of RM |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>Annual Crop Land</b>         | <b>39784</b> | <b>73.7</b>      |
| <b>Forage</b>                   | <b>875</b>   | <b>1.6</b>       |
| <b>Grasslands</b>               | <b>5075</b>  | <b>9.4</b>       |
| <b>Trees</b>                    | <b>5734</b>  | <b>10.6</b>      |
| <b>Wetlands</b>                 | <b>690</b>   | <b>1.3</b>       |
| <b>Water</b>                    | <b>66</b>    | <b>0.1</b>       |
| <b>Urban and Transportation</b> | <b>1732</b>  | <b>3.2</b>       |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>53956</b> | <b>100.0</b>     |

<sup>1</sup> Land use information (1995) and map supplied by Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration. Areas may vary from previous maps due to differences in analytical procedures.



## REFERENCES

- Agronomic Interpretations Working Group. 1995. Land Suitability Rating System for Agricultural Crops: 1. Spring-seeded Small Grains. Edited by W.W. Pettapiece. Tech. Bull. 1995-6E. Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa. 90 pages, 2 maps.
- Ash, G.H.B. 1991. An Agroclimatic Risk Assessment of Southern Manitoba and Southeastern Saskatchewan. M.A. Thesis. Department of Geography, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Canada Land Inventory. 1965. Soil Capability Classification for Agriculture. Canada Land Inventory Report No. 2. ARDA, Dept. of Forestry, Canada, Ottawa.
- Canada-Manitoba Soil Survey. 1980. Physiographic Regions of Manitoba. Ellis Bldg., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg. Revised. Unpublished Report.
- Canada-Manitoba Soil Survey. 1979. Ecological Regions and Subregions in Manitoba. Ellis Bldg., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg. Revised. Unpublished Report.
- Environment Canada. 1982. Canadian Climatic Normals 1951-1980. Frost, Vol. 6; Atmospheric Environment, Downsview, Ontario.
- Environment Canada. 1993. Canadian Climatic Normals 1961-1990. Prairie Provinces. Atmospheric Environment, Downsview, Ontario.
- Expert Committee on Soil Survey. 1987. The Canadian System of Soil Classification. Second Edition. Publ. No. 1646. Research Branch, Agriculture Canada.
- Irrigation Suitability Classification Working Group. 1987. An Irrigation Suitability Classification System for the Canadian Prairies. LRRC contribution no. 87-83, Land Resource Research Centre, Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa.
- MacDonald, K.B., and Valentine, K.W.G. 1992. CanSIS Manual 1 CanSIS/NSDB: A General Description. Land Resource Division, Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research, Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa.
- Manitoba Land Resource Unit. 1998. Soil and Terrain Classification System Manual. In preparation. Ellis Bldg. University of Manitoba. Winnipeg.
- Michalyna, W., Podolsky, G., and St. Jacques, E., 1988. Soils of the Rural Municipalities of Grey, Dufferin, Roland, Thompson, and part of Stanley. Report No. D-60. Canada-Manitoba Soil Survey. Winnipeg.
- Wischmeier, W.H. and Smith, D.D. 1965. Predicting Rainfall-erosion Loss from Cropland East of the Rocky Mountains. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook No. 282, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.