

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Publications from USDA-ARS / UNL Faculty

U.S. Department of Agriculture: Agricultural  
Research Service, Lincoln, Nebraska

1-1-2022

## Carbon-sensitive pedotransfer functions for plant available water

Dianna K. Bagnall

*Soil Health Institute*, [dbagnall@soilhealthinstitute.org](mailto:dbagnall@soilhealthinstitute.org)

Cristine L.S. Morgan

*Soil Health Institute*

Michael Cope

*Soil Health Institute*

Gregory M. Bean

*Soil Health Institute*

Shannon Cappellazzi

*Soil Health Institute*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfacpub>

See next page for additional authors



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#)

---

Bagnall, Dianna K.; Morgan, Cristine L.S.; Cope, Michael; Bean, Gregory M.; Cappellazzi, Shannon; Greub, Kelsey; Liptzin, Daniel; Norris, Charlotte L.; Rieke, Elizabeth; Tracy, Paul; Aberle, Ezra; Ashworth, Amanda; Bañuelos Tavarez, Oscar; Bary, Andy; Baumhardt, R. Louis; Borbón Gracia, Alberto; Brainard, Daniel; Brennan, Jameson; Briones Reyes, Dolores; Bruhjell, Darren; Carlyle, Cameron; Crawford, James; Creech, Cody; Culman, Steven; Deen, William; Dell, Curtis; Derner, Justin; Ducey, Thomas; Duiker, Sjoerd Willem; Dyck, Miles; Ellert, Benjamin; Entz, Martin; Espinosa Solorio, Avelino; Fonte, Steven J.; Fonteyne, Simon; Fortuna, Ann Marie; Foster, Jamie; Fultz, Lisa; Gamble, Audrey V.; and Geddes, Charles, "Carbon-sensitive pedotransfer functions for plant available water" (2022). *Publications from USDA-ARS / UNL Faculty*. 2531.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfacpub/2531>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Department of Agriculture: Agricultural Research Service, Lincoln, Nebraska at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications from USDA-ARS / UNL Faculty by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

---

## Authors

Dianna K. Bagnall, Cristine L.S. Morgan, Michael Cope, Gregory M. Bean, Shannon Cappellazzi, Kelsey Greub, Daniel Liptzin, Charlotte L. Norris, Elizabeth Rieke, Paul Tracy, Ezra Aberle, Amanda Ashworth, Oscar Bañuelos Tavares, Andy Bary, R. Louis Baumhardt, Alberto Borbón Gracia, Daniel Brainard, Jameson Brennan, Dolores Briones Reyes, Darren Bruhjell, Cameron Carlyle, James Crawford, Cody Creech, Steven Culman, William Deen, Curtis Dell, Justin Derner, Thomas Ducey, Sjoerd Willem Duiker, Miles Dyck, Benjamin Ellert, Martin Entz, Avelino Espinosa Solorio, Steven J. Fonte, Simon Fonteyne, Ann Marie Fortuna, Jamie Foster, Lisa Fultz, Audrey V. Gamble, and Charles Geddes

# Carbon-sensitive pedotransfer functions for plant available water

Dianna K. Bagnall<sup>1</sup>  | Cristine L. S. Morgan<sup>1</sup> | Michael Cope<sup>1</sup> | Gregory M. Bean<sup>1</sup> |  
 Shannon Cappellazzi<sup>1</sup> | Kelsey Greub<sup>1</sup> | Daniel Liptzin<sup>1</sup>  | Charlotte L. Norris<sup>1</sup> |  
 Elizabeth Rieke<sup>1</sup> | Paul Tracy<sup>1</sup> | Ezra Aberle<sup>2</sup> | Amanda Ashworth<sup>3</sup> |  
 Oscar Bañuelos Tavaréz<sup>4</sup> | Andy Bary<sup>5</sup> | R. Louis Baumhardt<sup>6</sup> |  
 Alberto Borbón Gracia<sup>7</sup> | Daniel Brainard<sup>8</sup> | Jameson Brennan<sup>9</sup> |  
 Dolores Briones Reyes<sup>7</sup> | Darren Bruhjell<sup>10</sup> | Cameron Carlyle<sup>11</sup> | James Crawford<sup>12</sup> |  
 Cody Creech<sup>13</sup>  | Steven Culman<sup>14</sup> | William Deen<sup>15</sup> | Curtis Dell<sup>16</sup> |  
 Justin Derner<sup>17</sup> | Thomas Ducey<sup>18</sup> | Sjoerd Willem Duiker<sup>19</sup>  | Miles Dyck<sup>20</sup>  |  
 Benjamin Ellert<sup>21</sup> | Martin Entz<sup>22</sup> | Avelino Espinosa Solorio<sup>23</sup> | Steven J. Fonte<sup>24</sup> |  
 Simon Fonteyne<sup>25</sup>  | Ann-Marie Fortuna<sup>26</sup> | Jamie Foster<sup>27</sup> | Lisa Fultz<sup>28</sup>  |  
 Audrey V. Gamble<sup>29</sup> | Charles Geddes<sup>21</sup>  | Deirdre Griffin-LaHue<sup>30</sup>  | John Grove<sup>31</sup> |  
 Stephen K. Hamilton<sup>32</sup> | Xiyang Hao<sup>21</sup> | Z. D. Hayden<sup>8</sup> | Julie Howe<sup>33</sup>  |  
 James Ippolito<sup>24</sup>  | Gregg Johnson<sup>34</sup> | Mark Kautz<sup>35</sup> | Newell Kitchen<sup>36</sup> |  
 Sandeep Kumar<sup>37</sup>  | Kirsten Kurtz<sup>38</sup> | Francis Larney<sup>21</sup> | Katie Lewis<sup>39</sup>  |  
 Matt Liebman<sup>40</sup> | Antonio Lopez Ramirez<sup>41</sup> | Stephen Machado<sup>42</sup> |  
 Bijesh Maharjan<sup>13</sup>  | Miguel Angel Martinez Gamiño<sup>7</sup> | William May<sup>43</sup> |  
 Mitchel McClaran<sup>44</sup> | Marshall McDaniel<sup>40</sup>  | Neville Millar<sup>32</sup> | Jeffrey P. Mitchell<sup>45</sup> |  
 Philip A. Moore<sup>3</sup> | Amber Moore<sup>46</sup>  | Manuel Mora Gutiérrez<sup>7</sup> | Kelly A. Nelson<sup>47</sup>  |  
 Emmanuel Omondi<sup>48</sup> | Shannon Osborne<sup>49</sup> | Leodegario Osorio Alcalá<sup>7</sup> |  
 Philip Owens<sup>3</sup> | Eugenia M. Pena-Yewtukhiw<sup>50</sup> | Hanna Poffenbarger<sup>51</sup> |  
 Brenda Ponce Lira<sup>52</sup> | Jennifer Reeve<sup>53</sup> | Timothy Reinbott<sup>54</sup> | Mark Reiter<sup>55</sup> |  
 Edwin Ritchey<sup>31</sup> | Kraig L. Roozeboom<sup>56</sup> | Ichao Rui<sup>57</sup> | Amir Sadeghpour<sup>58</sup> |  
 Upendra M. Sainju<sup>59</sup> | Gregg Sanford<sup>60</sup> | William Schillinger<sup>61</sup> |  
 Robert R. Schindelbeck<sup>62</sup> | Meagan Schipanski<sup>24</sup> | Alan Schlegel<sup>63</sup> | Kate Scow<sup>64</sup> |  
 Lucretia Sherrod<sup>65</sup>  | Sudeep Sidhu<sup>66</sup>  | Ernesto Solís Moya<sup>7</sup> | Mervin St. Luce<sup>67</sup> |  
 Jeffrey Strock<sup>68</sup>  | Andrew Suyker<sup>69</sup> | Virginia Sykes<sup>70</sup> | Haiying Tao<sup>71</sup> |  
 Alberto Trujillo Campos<sup>7</sup> | Laura L. Van Eerd<sup>72</sup> | Nele Verhulst<sup>73</sup>  |

**Abbreviations:** NAPESHM, North American Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements; SOC, soil organic carbon;  $\theta_{AWHC}$ , plant available water holding capacity;  $\theta_{FC}$ , volumetric water content at field capacity;  $\theta_{PWP}$ , volumetric water content at permanent wilting point.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2022 The Authors. Soil Science Society of America Journal © 2022 Soil Science Society of America

**Tony John Vyn**<sup>74</sup>  | **Yutao Wang**<sup>75</sup> | **Dexter Watts**<sup>76</sup> | **David Wright**<sup>66</sup> |  
**Tiequan Zhang**<sup>75</sup> | **Charles Wayne Honeycutt**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Soil Health Institute, Morrisville, NC 27560, USA

<sup>2</sup>Carrington Research Extension Center, North Dakota State Univ., Carrington, ND 58421, USA

<sup>3</sup>Poultry Production and Product Safety Research Unit, USDA ARS, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA

<sup>4</sup>Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT) Tlaltizapán, Mor 62770, Mexico

<sup>5</sup>Dep. of Crop and Soil Sciences, Washington State Univ., Puyallup, WA 98371, USA

<sup>6</sup>Soil and Water Management Research, USDA-ARS, Bushland, TX 79012, USA

<sup>7</sup>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias (INIFAP), Ciudad de México, CDMX 04010, Mexico

<sup>8</sup>Dep. of Horticulture, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

<sup>9</sup>West River Ag Center, South Dakota State Univ., Rapid City, SD 57703, USA

<sup>10</sup>Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Edmonton, AB T5J 4C3, Canada

<sup>11</sup>Food and Nutritional Science, Univ. of Alberta Dep. of Agriculture, Edmonton, AB T6G 2P5, Canada

<sup>12</sup>Extension Agricultural Engineering, Univ. of Missouri, Rock Port, MO 64482, USA

<sup>13</sup>Panhandle Research and Extension Center, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln, Scottsbluff, NE 69361, USA

<sup>14</sup>School of Environment & Natural Resources, Ohio State Univ., Wooster, OH 44691, USA

<sup>15</sup>Dep. of Plant Agriculture, Univ. of Guelph, Guelph, ON N1G 2W1, Canada

<sup>16</sup>Pasture Systems & Watershed Management Research Unit, USDA ARS, University Park, PA 16802, USA

<sup>17</sup>Rangeland Resources and Systems Research Unit, USDA ARS, Cheyenne, WY 82009, USA

<sup>18</sup>Coastal Plains Soil, Water, & Plant Research Center, USDA-ARS, Florence, SC 29501, USA

<sup>19</sup>Dep. of Plant Science, Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, PA 16802, USA

<sup>20</sup>Dep. of Renewable Resources, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2H1, Canada

<sup>21</sup>Lethbridge Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, AB T1J 4B1, Canada

<sup>22</sup>Dep. of Plant Science, Univ. of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada

<sup>23</sup>Santiago de Querétaro, Sustentabilidad Agropecuaria Querétaro (SAQ), Qro 76030, Mexico

<sup>24</sup>Dep. of Soil and Crop Sciences, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

<sup>25</sup>Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT) Texcoco, Ver 56237, Mexico

<sup>26</sup>Agroclimate and Natural Resources Research, USDA-ARS, El Reno, OK 73036, USA

<sup>27</sup>Texas A&M AgriLife Research, Beeville, TX 78102, USA

<sup>28</sup>Environment & Soil Sciences, Louisiana State Univ. School of Plant, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

<sup>29</sup>Dep. of Crop, Soil and Environmental Sciences, Auburn Univ., Auburn, AL 36849, USA

<sup>30</sup>Dep. of Crop and Soil Sciences, Washington State Univ., Mount Vernon, WA 98273, USA

<sup>31</sup>Dep. of Plant and Soil Science, Research and Education Center, Univ. of Kentucky, Princeton, KY 42445, USA

<sup>32</sup>W.K. Kellogg Biological Station, Michigan State Univ., Hickory Corners, MI 49060, USA

<sup>33</sup>Dep. of Soil and Crop Sciences, Texas A&M AgriLife Research, College Station, TX 77843, USA

<sup>34</sup>Southern Research and Outreach Center, Univ. of Minnesota, Waseca, MN 56093, USA

<sup>35</sup>USDA ARS, Tucson, AZ 85719, USA

<sup>36</sup>Cropping Systems and Water Quality Research Unit, USDA ARS USDA-ARS, Columbia, MO 65211, USA

<sup>37</sup>Dep. of Agronomy, Horticulture and Plant Science, South Dakota State Univ., Brookings, SD 57007, USA

<sup>38</sup>Dep. of Natural Resources Cornell Soil Health Laboratory, Dep. of Soil and Crop Sciences, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, NY 14853, USA

<sup>39</sup>Dep. of Soil and Crop Sciences, Texas A&M Agrilife Research, Lubbock, TX 79403, USA

<sup>40</sup>Dep. of Agronomy, Iowa State Univ., Ames, IA 50011, USA

<sup>41</sup>Centro de Bachillerato Tecnológico Agropecuario, No. 305 - CBTA 305 Molcaxac, Pue 75650, Mexico

<sup>42</sup>Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center, Oregon State Univ., Adams, OR 97810, USA

<sup>43</sup>Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Canada, Indian Head Research Farm, Indian Head, SK S0G 2K0, Canada

<sup>44</sup>School of Natural Resources & the Environment, Univ. of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

<sup>45</sup>Davis Dep. of Plant Sciences, Univ. of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

- <sup>46</sup>Dep. of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, OR 97331, USA
- <sup>47</sup>Greenley Research Center, Univ. of Missouri, Novelty, MO 63460, USA
- <sup>48</sup>Dep. of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Tennessee State Univ., Nashville, TN 37209, USA
- <sup>49</sup>North Central Agricultural Research Laboratory, USDA ARS, Brookings, SD 57006, USA
- <sup>50</sup>Davis College of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Design, West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, WV 26506, USA
- <sup>51</sup>Dep. of Plant and Soil Science, Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40546, USA
- <sup>52</sup>Universidad Politécnica de Francisco I. Madero (UPFIM) San Juan Tapa, Hgo 42660, Mexico
- <sup>53</sup>Soils and Climate Dep., Utah State Univ. Plants, Logan, UT 84322, USA
- <sup>54</sup>Bradford Research Center College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources, Univ. of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65201, USA
- <sup>55</sup>Eastern Shore Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Virginia Tech, Painter, VA 23420, USA
- <sup>56</sup>Dep. of Agronomy, Kansas State Univ., Manhattan, KS 66506, USA
- <sup>57</sup>Rodale Institute Farming Systems Trial, Kutztown, PA 19530, USA
- <sup>58</sup>Crops, Soils, and Environmental Management Program, School of Agricultural Sciences, Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale, IL 62901, USA
- <sup>59</sup>Northern Plains Agricultural Research Laboratory, USDA ARS, Sidney, MT 59270, USA
- <sup>60</sup>Dep. of Agronomy, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA
- <sup>61</sup>Dryland Research Station, Washington State Univ., Lind, WA 99341, USA
- <sup>62</sup>Dep. of Soil and Crop Sciences, Cornell Univ. Cornell Soil Health Laboratory, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA
- <sup>63</sup>SW Research - Extension Center, Kansas State Univ., Tribune, KS 67879, USA
- <sup>64</sup>Davis Dep. of Land, Air, and Water Resources, Univ. of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA
- <sup>65</sup>Center for Agricultural Resources Research, USDA ARS, Fort Collins, CO 80526, USA
- <sup>66</sup>Univ. of Florida, Quincy, FL 32351, USA
- <sup>67</sup>Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Swift Current Research and Development Centre, Swift Current, SK S9H 3×2, Canada
- <sup>68</sup>Dep. of Soil, Water and Climate, SW Research & Outreach Center, Univ. of Minnesota, Lamberton, MN 56152, USA
- <sup>69</sup>Lincoln School of Natural Resources, Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA
- <sup>70</sup>Dep. of Plant Sciences, Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA
- <sup>71</sup>Dep. of Crop & Soil Sciences, Washington State Univ., Pullman, WA 99164, USA
- <sup>72</sup>School of Environmental Sciences - Ridgetown Campus, Univ. of Guelph, Ridgetown, ON N0P 2C0, Canada
- <sup>73</sup>International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT), Carretera Mexico-Veracruz km 45, Texcoco, Mexico
- <sup>74</sup>Agronomy Dep., Purdue Univ., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA
- <sup>75</sup>Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Harrow Research and Development Center, Harrow, ON N0R 1G0, Canada
- <sup>76</sup>National Soil Dynamics Laboratory, USDA-NSDL, Auburn, AL 36832, USA

**Correspondence**

Dianna K. Bagnall, Soil Health Institute,  
Morrisville, NC 27560, USA.  
Email: [dbagnall@soilhealthinstitute.org](mailto:dbagnall@soilhealthinstitute.org)

Assigned to Associate Editor Ryan Stewart.

**Abstract**

Currently accepted pedotransfer functions show negligible effect of management-induced changes to soil organic carbon (SOC) on plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{AWHC}$ ), while some studies show the ability to substantially increase  $\theta_{AWHC}$  through management. The Soil Health Institute's North America Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements measured water content at field capacity using intact soil cores across 124 long-term research sites that contained increases in SOC as a result of management treatments such as reduced tillage and cover cropping. Pedotransfer functions were created for volumetric water content at field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ) and permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ). New pedotransfer functions had predictions of  $\theta_{AWHC}$  that were similarly accurate compared with Saxton and Rawls when tested on samples from the National Soil Characterization database. Further, the new pedotransfer functions showed substantial effects of soil calcareousness and SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . For an increase in SOC of 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> (1%) in noncalcareous soils, an average increase in  $\theta_{AWHC}$  of 3.0 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> soil (0.03 m<sup>3</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>) on average across all soil texture classes was found. This SOC related increase in  $\theta_{AWHC}$  is about double previous estimates. Calcareous soils had an increase in  $\theta_{AWHC}$  of 1.2 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> soil associated with a 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in SOC, across all soil texture classes. New equations can aid in quantifying benefits of soil management practices that increase SOC and can be used to model the effect of changes in management on drought resilience.

**1 | INTRODUCTION**

If plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{AWHC}$ ) increases in a meaningful way when soil organic carbon (SOC) increases, the outcome is that management practices that increase SOC in soils simultaneously change water retention by soils. This change in water retention has implications for hydrology, the energy balance, and crop production. Thus, a positive, causal, relationship between SOC and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  has direct benefit through increased cropping system resilience to drought and provides an incentive for the adoption of practices that benefit society through climate change mitigation and adaptation (Lal, 2004; Lal, 2006; A. Williams et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2014). Soil science literature is inconclusive on whether this relationship exists to a meaningful degree in agricultural soils. Some studies have demonstrated substantial improvements in  $\theta_{AWHC}$  as a result of increasing SOC (Ankenbaur & Loheide, 2017; Bouyoucos, 1939; Hudson, 1994; Maynard, 2000; Salter & Howarth, 1961) and others have not (Bauer & Black, 1992; Bell & Van Keulen, 1995; Feustal & Byers, 1936). A recent review concluded that the effect of SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$  was limited; a 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in SOC concentration resulted in a  $\theta_{AWHC}$  increase of 1.2 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> soil (0.012 m<sup>3</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>) across all soil textures (Minasny & McBratney, 2018). Meanwhile, those that promote management changes to improve soil health and functioning in agri-

cultural landscapes, such as drought resilience, are limited to providing regional and anecdotal evidence that increased SOC improves  $\theta_{AWHC}$ .

While this debate is ongoing, researchers in disciplines like hydrology and land surface modeling, are relying on existing pedotransfer functions relating SOC to water characteristics. Pedotransfer functions allow practical estimation of field and laboratory soil measurements that are costly, time-consuming, and can be impractical to measure (Bouma, 1989) using proxy variables such as particle size, bulk density, and organic C to predict soil hydraulic properties of interest (Wösten et al., 2001). Soil scientists and engineers have a long history of estimating soil water characteristics that are difficult to measure (Brooks & Corey, 1964; Campell, 1974; Rawls et al., 1992; Van Genuchten, 1980) and early efforts demonstrated that soil particle size could predict soil water characteristics to provide adequate estimates for many decisions (Ahuja et al., 1985; Arya & Paris, 1981; Gupta & Larson, 1979; Saxton et al., 1986; J. Williams et al., 1983). Early pedotransfer functions were accurate, but many had limited geographic use because they were based on regional data (Gijssman et al., 2002).

Saxton and Rawls (2006) updated pedotransfer functions (Saxton, Rawls, Romberger & Papendick, 1986) for volumetric water content at field capacity (estimated by water retained at -33 kPa) and permanent wilting point (estimated by water



retained at  $-1,500$  kPa). The difference between volumetric water content held at field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ) and wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ) estimates  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . The Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions were created with approximately 2,000 soil samples from A horizons obtained from the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) National Soil Characterization database (Soil Survey Staff, 2004). Saxton and Rawls (2006) did not report the depth of A horizon used, but the depth is likely well represented by the horizons in the National Cooperative Soil Survey Characterization (NCSS) Microsoft Access database, in which A master horizons were log normally distributed and ranged in depth from 0 to 60 cm with a median depth of 13 cm. The pedotransfer functions were fit using continuous sand, clay, and soil organic matter content and two-way interaction terms as predictor variables in a multiple linear regression. To improve the fit, a second nonlinear function was added resulting in two combined, dependent equations for prediction of  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ .

The accuracy and continental distribution of the input data enabled these pedotransfer functions to be widely used (1,185 citations according to Scopus as of August 2021), while their simplicity resulted in their incorporation into many models. The high degree of use of these pedotransfer functions is illustrated by the number of agronomic, ecological, hydrological, land surface, and meteorological models listed in publications that cite Saxton and Rawls (2006) including the Soil Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), AquaCROP, Agricultural Policy/Environmental eXtender (APEX), Noah-MP land surface model, Soil-Plant-Air-Water (SPAW), Variable Infiltration Capacity (VIC), TOPMODEL, Agricultural Production System Simulator (APSIM), Annualized Agricultural Non-Point Source Pollution Model (AnnAGNPS), DeNitrification-DeComposition and DayCent. Because pedotransfer functions may be either hardcoded into models or used in the data preparation step to generate model input, this is not an exhaustive measure of the use of these functions.

Pedotransfer functions may be as simple as a look-up tables or as complex as machine learning techniques, including artificial neural networks and bootstrapping (Moosavi & Sepaskhah, 2012), support vector machines (Twarakavi et al., 2009), classification and regression trees (Pachepsky et al., 2006), and random forests and boosted regression trees (Jorda et al., 2015). Machine learning can provide more accurate predictions (Jorda et al., 2015) but their complexity means that the mathematical structure of the pedotransfer function is not easily published. Pedotransfer functions built using machine learning require software development to support them (Zhang & Schaap, 2017) and reduce the ease of implementing the function in larger computer models (Schaap et al., 2004). A comparison of 11 pedotransfer functions with varying levels of complexity for water retention found no superior model (Schaap, Nemes & van Genuchten, 2004), indicating that simple models can be adequate.

### Core Ideas

- New pedotransfer functions show organic C increases plant available water.
- Noncalcareous soils show greater effects of organic C on plant available water.
- Increase in plant available water from organic C is more than double previous estimates.
- These pedotransfer functions can easily be used in hydrologic models.
- A gap is bridged for modeling the effect of increased soil organic C on plant available water.

Most existing pedotransfer functions include SOC (or soil organic matter), but the effects of SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$  are reported as negligible (e.g., Saxton & Rawls, 2006; Minasny & McBratney, 2018). There is a mismatch between soil science textbooks and pedotransfer functions on the effects of SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . For example, a textbook by Brady and Weil (2002) states that “Recognizing the beneficial effects of organic matter on plant available water is essential to wise soil management” indicating that SOC increases  $\theta_{AWHC}$  to a meaningful degree in terms of crop production, yet pedotransfer functions do not give such results. This discrepancy could be explained by two nonmutually exclusive elements of the underlying data. First,  $\theta_{FC}$  measurements may lack the effects of soil structure. This is particularly relevant for soil samples that are dried and sieved prior to  $\theta_{FC}$  measurement. Disturbed soils may show the direct effect of SOC on water retention, but do not capture the secondary effects of SOC that manifest through soil structure because they do not contain interpedal pores. It is preferable to use intact soil clods or cores because they are more likely to capture both direct effect of SOC on water retention and the secondary effects of SOC that manifest through soil structure (Dane & Hopmans, 2018; J. Williams et al., 1983). Soil organic C has a strong link to soil structure (Bronick & Lal, 2005), and soil structure is linked to pore size distribution, which affects soil water at the macro scale (Nimmo & Akstin, 1988; Pachepsky & Rawls, 2003; J. Williams et al., 1983). Second, many datasets may include measurements of intact soil structures for building pedotransfer functions but were collected to represent changes between soil pedons (at the m scale) for the purpose of mapping and inventory. Hence when considering a given texture class, changes in SOC in such databases are not primarily influenced by management, but rather the landscape position and climate from which the soils were collected.

An additional consideration in creating pedotransfer functions for  $\theta_{AWHC}$  is the effect of calcareousness. Calcareous soils have been reported to require more frequent irrigation

than noncalcareous soils to achieve the same crop yield, indicating that they may have lower  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . Substantial amounts of calcium carbonate have been found to lower water retention in repacked soil samples (Stakman & Bishay, 1975) and to increase bulk density (Habel, 2014). It has been proposed that presence of calcium carbonate may alter water retention not only through changes in effective soil texture (e.g., carbonates the size of silicate clays), but also via alteration of soil structure and pores (Jackson & Eire, 1973), although analysis on intact samples would be needed to confirm such an effect. We found, in this data set, a significant effect of calcium carbonate on predictions of  $\theta_{AWHC}$ .

The Soil Health Institute's North America Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements (NAPESHM) provided a unique dataset to investigate whether increases in SOC as a result of management correspond to increases in  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . The NAPESHM dataset contains a broad distribution of agricultural soils, primarily managed for row crops, across the major cropland regions of United States, Canada, and Mexico. Data were collected on replicated experimental units (either plots or fields that represent one replication of a treatment) under long-term treatments (10 yr or more) within research sites ( $n = 124$ ). This approach is expected to capture variation in SOC and measured  $\theta_{AWHC}$  that are both management induced (within pedons) and inherent (between pedons). Additionally,  $\theta_{FC}$  (estimated by water retained at  $-33$  kPa) was measured on intact cores, thus capturing the effect of SOC on the soil matrix and bulk soil (including soil structure).

The goal of this work was to create a simple-to-implement pedotransfer function for  $\theta_{AWHC}$  that is sensitive to changes in SOC. To meet our goal, we used simple linear regression to fit functions for  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  using NAPESHM data. We assessed the accuracy of predicted  $\theta_{FC}$ ,  $\theta_{PWP}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  (by subtraction of predicted  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ ) to the accuracy of Saxton and Rawls (2006) on 1,797 soils from NCSS. The Saxton and Rawls (2006) approach was chosen as a comparison because of its ubiquity in hydrology and energy models, its representation of similar geographical extent, and its similar simplicity of modeling approach. We also considered how four levels of SOC affected predictions made by the new pedotransfer functions and compared these results to Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions and literature.

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data used to develop new pedotransfer functions were drawn from the NAPESHM database, which captured a range in climate, management practices, and inherent soil properties using 124 long-term agricultural research sites across North America and were uniformly sampled in 2019 (Norris et al., 2020). Soil orders in the dataset included the Soil Taxonomy orders of Ultisol, Alfisol, Mollisol, Vertisol, Aridisol,

Inceptisol, and Entisol. The replicated treatments included tillage, residue management, cover crop use and type, crop rotation, grazing, and nutrient type and rate (including organic amendments). At the time of sampling, most treatments in the NAPESHM database were continuous for 10 or more years.

To develop new pedotransfer functions, we used measurements of particle size distribution, SOC, inorganic C, bulk density, and gravimetric water content measured at field capacity ( $-33$  kPa) and permanent wilting point ( $-1,500$  kPa). Soil particle size analysis, pH, and SOC were measured at The Ohio State Soil Water and Environmental Lab. Bulk density and all measures of water retention were done at the Cornell Soil Health Laboratory (Ithaca, NY). Particle size distribution, SOC, and  $\theta_{PWP}$  were measured using a composite soil sample collected from 0-to-15-cm depth from four to six sampling locations within each experimental unit (Norris et al., 2020). The sieve and pipette method with three size classes (2,000–50, 50–2, and  $<2$   $\mu\text{m}$ ) was used to measure soil particle size distribution (Gee & Bauder, 1986). Total C was measured by dry combustion (Nelson & Sommers, 1996) using an NC 2100 soil analyzer made by CE instruments (Lakewood, NJ). Soils were oven dried and ground. Soils with  $>7.2$  pH (1:2, soil/water) (Thomas, 1996) were tested for effervescence with 10% HCl. Those that effervesced were analyzed for carbonates using the Chittick's volumetric calcimeter method (Dreimanis, 1962). For soils with carbonates, SOC was calculated by subtracting the value of inorganic C from total C obtained by dry combustion. For all other samples, total C obtained using dry combustion represented SOC.

In addition to the composite soil sample, four 7.6-cm diam. soil cores were collected to a depth of 7.6 cm in each experimental unit and maintained intact using a plastic sleeve. Two of the four cores were kept intact for measuring bulk density and  $\theta_{FC}$ . The remaining two cores were composited into one bag, sieved to remove coarse fragments  $>2$  mm, and used to calculate soil bulk density. For any sample with  $<2\%$  coarse fragments by weight (determined during preparation for particle size analysis), bulk density was calculated as the mean bulk density of all four cores—two intact and two composited. Ninety percent of the experimental units in this study had  $<2\%$  coarse fragments by weight. For the remaining 10% with coarse fragments  $>2\%$  by weight, bulk density was calculated as the mean of the two composited cores, following removal of coarse fragments and adjustments for the weight and volume of coarse fragments.

Gravimetric water content at permanent wilting point was measured on pressure plates at 1,500 kPa (Reynolds & Topp, 2008) using repacked soil from the composite sample. Each sample used 15 g of soil that was dried ( $105$   $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), ground (2-mm sieve), saturated, repacked, and equilibrated for 7 d on the pressure plate at 1,500 kPa. Two replications were measured per experimental unit and the mean was calculated to represent  $\theta_{PWP}$  for each experimental unit. Gravimetric water



content at field capacity was measured on both intact cores using a tension table at 33 kPa (Hao et al., 2008; Topp et al., 1993). The mean of the two intact cores represented the  $\theta_{FC}$  for each experimental unit. For the intact cores used to calculate  $\theta_{FC}$ , the cores were first saturated (4–7 d), equilibration times on the tension table were between 4 and 7 d, and reference samples were used (weight recorded daily) for quality control. Both  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  were calculated by multiplying gravimetric water content by the mean bulk density of the experimental unit and assuming a density of water of  $1.0 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ . Plant available water-holding capacity was calculated as the difference between  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ .

We removed extreme values from our analysis. Experimental units that were excluded were those with a mean bulk density  $>1.8 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and SOC concentrations  $>46.5 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ . No samples had mean bulk density of  $<1.0 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ . Our threshold values for bulk density and SOC were the same as those used to develop the Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions. The final NAPESHM dataset used in this study included 1,731 samples for development of pedotransfer functions. These 1,731 samples represented 547 unique management treatments across 119 sites. Most sites (107) had been managed continuously for 10 or more years, although 12 sites had at least one treatment that had been in place for between 5 and 10 yr. Figure 1 shows the distribution of site locations across North America, with Hargreaves' moisture deficit, to demonstrate the range in climatic conditions. Eleven of the 12 USDA soil texture classes were represented in the NAPESHM data used in this study (Table 1); sandy clay textures were not represented. The most abundant texture classes were silt loam and loam. Soils were predominantly sampled in the United States, with 1,335 experimental units from 91 sites. Fifteen sites (237 experimental units) were in Canada, and 13 sites (161 experimental units) were in Mexico. Soil organic C ranged from 2 to  $44 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  with a median of  $14 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ . In total, 335 samples from 35 sites effervesced when treated with 10% HCl. Few calcareous soils had relatively high SOC; there were 63 experimental units with  $>20 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  SOC, including 12  $>30 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  SOC, and 3  $>40 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  SOC (Figure 2a). For noncalcareous soils, there were 322, 32, and 2 experimental units that were  $>20$ , 30, and  $40 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  SOC, respectively. Most of the noncalcareous soils with greater SOC were between 10 and 40% clay content (Figure 2a) and two experimental units were  $>30 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  SOC and more than 40% clay. Calcareous soils were well distributed across the observed clay contents and largely followed the same trends as noncalcareous soils when  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  were plotted against clay content (Figure 2b,c). There was greater variance in water content for  $\theta_{FC}$  than for  $\theta_{PWP}$ , which is consistent with theory and practice (Pachepsky & Rawls, 2003; Saxton & Rawls, 2006).


Hargreaves' moisture deficit used for the map in this study was generated with the ClimateNAv5.10 software package

(available at <http://tinyurl.com/ClimateNA>) based on methodology described by Wang et al. (2016). Hargreaves' moisture index has a value of zero for any month within a year that has greater precipitation than reference evapotranspiration. For all months in which the precipitation is less than reference evapotranspiration, the difference is summed to arrive at the annual moisture deficit (mm).

To test the accuracy of the new pedotransfer functions, we obtained data from 1,797 soils from the National Cooperative Soil Survey Characterization (NCSS) database (<http://ncsslabsdatamart.sc.egov.usda.gov/>; Soil Survey Staff, 1995). These data included sampling locations from 39 U.S. states. All 12 USDA soil texture classes were represented in the noncalcareous soils and 10 classes were represented within calcareous soils. Each horizon started at 0 cm and ended at or before 15-cm depth and had measurements of bulk density (volume measured at  $-33 \text{ kPa}$ ), gravimetric water content at both permanent wilting point ( $-1,500 \text{ kPa}$ ) and field capacity (at  $-33 \text{ kPa}$ ; clod method; Soil Survey Staff, 2014), and total C, calcium carbonate, sand, and clay content. We multiplied gravimetric water content by bulk density to obtain  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ . Soil organic C was calculated by subtracting the quantity of inorganic C in carbonates from total C. The NCSS data were developed with standard laboratory procedures (Klute, 1986; USDA-SCS, 1982).

We developed pedotransfer functions by initially fitting multiple linear regression models to the NAPESHM data using ordinary least squares for  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  using clay, sand, SOC content (all units are in  $10 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ , which is equivalent to 1.0%), and all two-way interaction terms as predictor variables. To determine whether there was a significant difference in the predictions of the pedotransfer functions for soils that were and were not calcareous, we conducted a one-way ANOVA on the regression residuals using a categorical indicator for effervescence when treated with HCl as the only factor. For all statistical analyses, R statistical software (R Development Core Team, 2020) and  $\alpha = .001$  were used.

The ANOVA  $p$  value for the effect of calcareousness on water content was significant for model predictions of  $\theta_{FC}$  ( $p = .03$ ) but not for  $\theta_{PWP}$  ( $p = .45$ ). We fit separate models for calcareous soils (those that effervesced when treated with HCl) and noncalcareous soils. We then used backwards stepwise selection for each model by applying the step function from the stats package in R (Hastie & Pregibon, 1992). For both calcareous and noncalcareous soils, stepwise selection for  $\theta_{FC}$  models showed the lowest AIC for the full models (clay, sand, SOC content, and all two-way interaction terms). For calcareous soils, the  $\theta_{PWP}$  model that had the lowest AIC included clay, sand, and SOC content, and the two-way interaction terms for both SOC by sand content and SOC by clay content. For calcareous soils, stepwise selection for the  $\theta_{PWP}$  model found that the lowest AIC resulted from clay, sand, and SOC content, and the two-way interaction term between sand



**FIGURE 1** Soils were sampled at 124 sites for the North American Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements. The map shows Hargreaves' climate moisture deficit for the 119 sites used in this study

and clay content. For each linear model, plots of model residuals against model-fitted values and predictors were used to verify equal error variance and the Breusch–Pagan test against heteroskedasticity was also used. Plots of residuals vs. leverage (Cook's distance cutoff of 0.5) were used to check for influential values, and theoretical quantile-quantile plots were used to check normality of the residuals.

To investigate whether  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  were responding to effects of soil management that were not manifested in SOC changes, we plotted model residuals against aggregate stability measured with a Cornell rainfall simulator, the average Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR, Karlen et al., 2008; U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2019) calculated for the past 5 yr, and categorical variables designating crop category (row crop, perennial, integrated row crop and perennial, non-farmed, or woody perennial) and nutrient type (none, organic, synthetic, or synthetic and organic). We tested the strength of the relationship between model residuals and these variables (aggregate stability, STIR, crop category, nutrient type) using regression for continuous variables and ANOVA for categorical variables and found they did not explain substantial variance as shown by an  $R^2$  of .03 or less for each regression or ANOVA. We reported the root mean square error (RMSE) and

adjusted  $R^2$  from regressions of predictions on measurements for  $\theta_{FC}$ ,  $\theta_{PWP}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$

We predicted  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  for 1,797 soils from the NCSS database using both the new pedotransfer functions and Saxton and Rawls (2006). We computed the deviation from measured values (predicted-measured) and RMSE for  $\theta_{FC}$ ,  $\theta_{PWP}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  ( $\theta_{AWHC}$  calculated by subtraction) for both pedotransfer function predictions by USDA particle size class. We used a paired  $t$  test to determine significant differences from measured water content for both pedotransfer functions. Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions include an organic matter parameter, but we used a SOC parameter. Because the van Bemmelen factor (0.58) was used to convert SOC to organic matter to develop the Saxton and Rawls (2006) functions, we converted NCSS SOC values to organic matter by multiplying SOC by the reciprocal of the van Bemmelen factor.

To investigate the effect of SOC on predicted  $\theta_{AWHC}$ , we generated values that represent possible combinations of SOC, clay, and sand content. These combinations of possible SOC, clay, and sand content values were not measured soil samples – rather they were created to evaluate a wide range of sand, clay, and SOC content. Soil organic C values of 10, 20,

**TABLE 1** Count of experimental units ( $n = 1,731$ ) and sites ( $n = 119$ ) by USDA soil texture class. A single site may have multiple soil texture classes, so the sum of sites shown is greater than the number of sites in the study. Data shown is from North American Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements


USDA soil texture class	Sites	Experimental units
<b>Noncalcareous</b>		
Clay	7	17
Clay loam	20	148
Loam	34	265
Loamy sand	14	96
Sand	5	31
Sandy loam	26	193
Sandy clay loam	10	46
Silt	5	10
Silt loam	40	480
Silty clay	4	9
Silty clay loam	14	85
<b>Calcareous</b>		
Clay	6	60
Clay loam	12	25
Loam	18	112
Sandy loam	4	20
Sandy clay loam	1	2
Silt loam	6	23
Silty clay	6	63

30, and 40 g kg<sup>-1</sup> (1, 2, 3, and 4%) and clay and sand values from 5 to 95% in 5% increments were used and repeated so that each sand content was paired with every clay content and every level of SOC; resulting in 760 combinations in all. We used these combinations of SOC, clay, and sand content to generate predictions of  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$  using the new pedotransfer functions (both noncalcareous and calcareous) and Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions. Locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) curves were fit to the predictions for each level of SOC for visual evaluation.

### 3 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The pedotransfer functions for volumetric water content at  $\theta_{PWP}$  and  $\theta_{FC}$  are given in Equations 1 and 2 for noncalcareous soils and in Equations 3 and 4 for calcareous, respectively. All units are in 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup>.

$$\theta_{PWP} = 7.222 + 0.296\text{Clay} - 0.074\text{Sand} - \underline{0.309\text{SOC}} + 0.022 (\text{Sand} \times \text{SOC}) + 0.022 (\text{Clay} \times \text{SOC}) \quad (1)$$




**FIGURE 2** Organic C (%) and volumetric water content for permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ) and field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ), plotted against clay content. Data shown is from North American Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements

$$\theta_{FC} = 37.217 - 0.140\text{Clay} - 0.304\text{Sand} - \underline{0.222\text{SOC}} + 0.051 (\text{Sand} \times \text{SOC}) + 0.085 (\text{Clay} \times \text{SOC}) + 0.002 (\text{Clay} \times \text{Sand}) \quad (2)$$

$$\theta_{PWP,calc} = 7.907 + 0.236\text{Clay} - 0.082\text{Sand} + 0.441\text{SOC} + 0.002 (\text{Clay} \times \text{Sand}) \quad (3)$$

$$\theta_{FC,calc} = 33.351 + \underline{0.020\text{Clay}} - 0.446\text{Sand} + \underline{1.398\text{SOC}} + 0.052 (\text{Sand} \times \text{SOC}) - 0.077 (\text{Clay} \times \text{SOC}) + 0.011 (\text{Clay} \times \text{Sand}) \quad (4)$$





**FIGURE 3** (a and b) Measured vs. predicted volumetric water content at permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ) (c and d) field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ), and (e and f) plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{AWHC}$ ) for (left) noncalcareous and (right) calcareous soils. Measured values are from the from North American Project to Evaluate Soil Health Measurements and predicted values are from new pedotransfer functions. Predictions of  $\theta_{AWHC}$  are calculated by subtraction of predicted  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ . Regressions are significant ( $p$  value  $< .001$ ). Blue, solid lines are regression fits and black, dashed lines are one-to-one. RMSE is root mean square error

All terms were significant or were nonsignificant main effects that were retained as a component of a significant two-way interaction. The nonsignificant main effect coefficients are underlined in the equations above.

### 3.1 | Accuracy of new pedotransfer functions

We used regressions between pedotransfer function predictions and the measured NAPESHM data that was used to create the models as one test of accuracy (Figure 3). Models for predicting  $\theta_{PWP}$  had better accuracy than for  $\theta_{FC}$ , indicated by  $R^2$  and RMSE. The models for noncalcareous soils performed better than models for calcareous soils. The new pedotransfer

functions are near the lower end of RMSE values for water retention predictions reported by Schaap et al. (2004), who found that of the 11 modes they considered, mean RMSE was between 3.2 and 6.9 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup>. The error was slightly greater for  $\theta_{AWHC}$ , ranging from 5.8 to 8.0 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup>. Model performance of the Saxton and Rawls (2006) equations were also similar with  $R^2$  and RMSE of 0.86 and 2.0 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> for  $\theta_{PWP}$  and 0.63 and 5.0 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> for  $\theta_{FC}$ , respectively. The lesser accuracy of the models for calcareous soils is likely from two sources. One being fewer experimental units used in the fit; the calcareous fit had 335, while the noncalcareous model had 1,396, and about 2,000 were used in Saxton and Rawls (2006). Secondly, the physical complexity of calcareous soils could also add to the poorer fit.

As a further test of accuracy and to provide context to evaluate the new pedotransfer functions, the new pedotransfer functions and Saxton and Rawls (2006) were used to calculate predictions of  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  (by subtraction of predicted  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{PWP}$ ) for 1,797 soils from the National NCSS database. Because the Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions were developed using NCSS data including  $\theta_{FC}$ , it was expected that they would be more accurate in this test compared with the new pedotransfer functions using NAPESHM data including  $\theta_{FC}$ . However, in general, new pedotransfer functions for noncalcareous soils performed similarly to Saxton and Rawls (2006) in regard to their RMSE (Table 2), although there were differences between particle size classes. Specifically, the new pedotransfer functions for noncalcareous soils had smaller RMSE values than Saxton and Rawls (2006) functions for  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  for coarse texture classes (sand, loamy sand, sandy loam, and silt loam). Saxton and Rawls (2006) functions had smaller RMSE values for  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  in finer textures (silty clay loam, sandy clay loam, clay loam, and all clays). For loams, the new pedotransfer functions had smaller RMSE values compared with Saxton and Rawls (2006) for  $\theta_{FC}$  and  $\theta_{AWHC}$ , but not for  $\theta_{PWP}$ , while in silts, the reverse was true (Table 2). The greatest difference in RMSE magnitude for  $\theta_{AWHC}$  of noncalcareous soils occurred in clay where the RMSE of the new pedotransfer functions was 3.3 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> greater than the Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions (Table 2). In calcareous soils, unlike noncalcareous soils, RMSE values for the new pedotransfer functions were greater in coarser textures; sand had an RMSE for  $\theta_{AWHC}$  that was 7.4 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> greater compared with Saxton and Rawls (2006) but both pedotransfer functions had a relatively large RMSE for sand.

Deviations from measured NCSS data for both Saxton and Rawls (2006) and new pedotransfer function predictions are shown in Figure 4, and asterisks indicate that paired  $t$  tests found significant differences between predicted and measured water content ( $\alpha = .001$ ). In noncalcareous soils, the new pedotransfer function predictions were significantly different

**TABLE 2** Root mean square error (RMSE) values for volumetric water content at permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ), field capacity ( $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ ), and plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$ ) predicted using both Saxton and Rawls (2006) (S&R) and the new pedotransfer functions using 1,797 soil samples from the National Cooperative Soil Survey Characterization database. The RMSEs are grouped by USDA soil texture classes and the number of samples ( $n$ ) are shown for each texture class

USDA soil texture class	$n$	$\theta_{\text{PWP}}$		$\theta_{\text{FC}}$		$\theta_{\text{AWH}}$	
		RMSE (mm 100 mm <sup>-1</sup> )					
		S&R	New	S&R	New	S&R	New
<b>Noncalcareous</b>							
Sand	39	3.4	2.3	10.2	7.8	7.9	6.9
Loamy sand	45	3.9	2.7	10.6	6.0	7.3	5.0
Sandy loam	169	7.3	6.5	13.6	9.0	8.3	5.8
Silt loam	273	4.9	4.0	8.9	6.0	6.3	5.4
Silt	4	3.6	2.1	5.6	6.1	5.4	6.6
Loam	198	4.5	4.9	9.6	7.3	7.0	5.2
Silty clay loam	201	2.8	4.7	4.2	5.2	4.7	4.8
Sandy clay loam	39	4.1	6.8	6.9	9.5	5.3	5.5
Clay loam	87	4.0	7.0	5.7	9.6	4.9	5.6
Silty clay	71	4.3	8.0	5.5	10.9	7.0	7.5
Sandy clay	10	3.1	8.4	4.8	13.6	4.9	7.0
Clay	113	5.2	8.1	5.1	14.0	5.1	8.4
<b>Calcareous</b>							
Sand	5	3.0	2.1	18.3	25.7	17.1	24.5
Loamy sand	12	5.3	4.7	12.6	15.9	8.5	12.4
Sandy loam	88	3.4	3.2	9.7	11.0	8.5	10.2
Silt loam	77	7.8	6.3	11.6	10.0	10.4	10.6
Loam	88	5.1	4.8	10.9	10.7	12.8	12.9
Silty clay loam	62	4.8	5.5	6.4	5.8	4.8	4.9
Sandy clay loam	51	2.9	3.2	4.4	4.3	3.4	3.6
Clay loam	55	7.0	6.0	4.3	5.3	8.7	8.3
Silty clay	34	5.6	6.8	6.6	6.8	3.9	3.9
Clay	75	10.1	7.6	5.8	9.2	9.7	9.4


from  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$  measurements in 11 texture classes, and Saxton and Rawls (2006) predictions were different for eight texture classes (Figure 4a). In calcareous soils, both the new pedotransfer function predictions and Saxton and Rawls (2006) were significantly different from  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$  measurements in four texture classes (Figure 4b). For  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ , and in noncalcareous soils, the new pedotransfer function predictions were significantly different from measurement in nine texture classes and Saxton and Rawls (2006) were significantly different in eight (Figure 4c). For calcareous soils, the new pedotransfer functions were significantly different from measured  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$  in six texture classes and five for Saxton and Rawls (2006) (Figure 4d). For the new pedotransfer functions, deviations

from NCSS measurements in  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$  had bias in the same direction, and the bias was lost in subtraction when calculating  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$ . This resulted in improved performance for  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  (Figure 4e,f). The new pedotransfer functions predictions for noncalcareous soil were different from measurements in clay and silty clay loam textures, while Saxton and Rawls (2006) predictions were different from measurements in six texture classes (Figure 4e). For calcareous soils, both pedotransfer functions were similarly different from NCSS measurements in four to five texture classes (Figure 4f). For  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  predictions, there was only one soil texture in which new pedotransfer function predictions were different from NCSS measurements. For noncalcareous soils, the difference occurred in clay and in loamy sand for calcareous soil.

For noncalcareous soils, the largest mean deviation from measured  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  was from Saxton and Rawls (2006) predictions in sandy loams and was 5.9 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 4e). For calcareous soils, the largest mean deviation from measured  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  was from the new pedotransfer function in sand and was 19.8 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 4f). Sand was under-represented in the model and the next highest mean deviation (loamy sand) was half as large at 10.8 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup>. The comparison to NCSS data points out the new pedotransfer functions provided less accurate predictions of  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$  and  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$  than Saxton and Rawls (2006), but predictions of  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  that were as or more accurate. The accuracy of the new pedotransfer functions is notable and encouraging, given that Saxton and Rawls (2006) functions were trained on NCSS data all using the same laboratory methodology for measurement (the clod method).

### 3.2 | Effect of soil organic C on predicted $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$

The point of presenting the new set of pedotransfer functions is their greater response to increases in SOC relative to existing equations. The overlapping of all four gold LOESS fits in Figure 5a through 5f demonstrate that while organic matter content is statistically significant in Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer function there is little discernable change in  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ,  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ , and  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  as SOC varies (<0.074% volumetric water content in response to an increase from 1 to 4% SOC content). Conversely, the new pedotransfer functions show changes in  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ,  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ , and  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  with discernable changes in SOC values. The LOESS curves fit to predictions of water content show that changes in response to SOC were greatest at  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$  and least for  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$  (Figure 5). Earlier knowledge described uniform effect of SOC on water retention (Jong, 1983; Riley, 1981); however, our results agree with later findings by Minasny & McBratney (2018) that changes in water retention respond to SOC more for field capacity than for permanent wilting point. This effect of SOC was more pro-



**FIGURE 4** Deviation from measured (measured minus predicted) water contents. Measured data is from soil samples from the National Cooperative Soil Survey Characterization database for permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ), field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ), and plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{AWHC}$ ). Predicted values were generated with Saxton and Rawls (2006) and the new pedotransfer functions


nounced for noncalcareous soils. Importantly, the effect of SOC on water retention was consistent across for all levels of SOC, that is, a  $10 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  increase in SOC produced the same increase in volumetric water content regardless of the initial SOC content (Figure 5).

For noncalcareous soils with clay content not represented in the NAPESHM dataset ( $>60\%$ ) and SOC  $<20 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ , the new pedotransfer functions predicted negative changes  $\theta_{AWHC}$  values resulting from increased SOC. At these high clay contents, greater SOC causes  $\theta_{PWP}$  to increase at a greater rate than  $\theta_{FC}$ . This phenomenon was not expected, though similar outcomes have been reported in pedotransfer functions for saturated hydraulic conductivity ( $K_s$ ). For example,

Nemes et al. (2005) found negative correlations between  $K_s$  and organic matter increases in several pedotransfer functions and the range of soils that exhibited this negative correlation was dataset dependent. The pedotransfer function may be improved by adding observations representing these greater clay contents. At present, we recommend restricting clay contents to  $60\%$  when using Equations 1 and 2, which is the same range of clay content for the dataset used to create Saxton and Rawls (2006) as well as other datasets, for example, UNSODA (Nemes et al., 2001).

Increases in SOC for calcareous soils with  $>35\%$  clay content are also not represented well in the new pedotransfer functions, and there were only four calcareous experimental





**FIGURE 5** LOESS fits to predicted volumetric water contents for permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{PWP}$ ), field capacity ( $\theta_{FC}$ ), and plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{AWHC}$ ) using simulated data for both new and Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions. Lines for Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions at the four levels of soil organic C overlap

units that had 20 g kg<sup>-1</sup> SOC or more. Because of this, we conclude that the usefulness of the calcareous functions are to illustrate that calcareous soils have different relationships with water holding capacity than noncalcareous soils. This difference is not well discussed in the soil science literature and needs more development. The new pedotransfer functions for calcareous soils (Equations 3 and 4) is not useful in soils with >35% clay, and we have limited Figure 3e and f accordingly.

It is notable that Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions have similar predictions to the new pedotransfer functions in situations of high and low clay content and correspondingly low and high SOC. For example, the LOESS curves fit to predictions in Figure 5c are all similar for 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> SOC at 10% clay content and 40 g kg<sup>-1</sup> SOC at 60% clay content. We speculate that this is because SOC (and its effects on  $\theta_{AWHC}$ ) in the NCSS data used to fit Saxton and Rawls (2006) is not management induced. Rather, it is driven largely by inherent properties so that, in essence, the effects of SOC are indistinguishable from the effects of clay content. For

this reason, Saxton and Rawls (2006) pedotransfer functions are not able to capture the effects of improved soil management on  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$ .

To quantify the effect of SOC on the new predictions, we calculated summary statistics for predictions of  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  using the same simulated soil samples to which we fit LOESS curves. The summary statistics demonstrate that effects of SOC on predicted  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  are not constant across soil texture classes (Table 3). For noncalcareous soils, the effect of increasing SOC is most prominent in  $\theta_{AWHC}$ , because of the combined effects at  $\theta_{PWP}$  and  $\theta_{FC}$ . This absolute effect is largest for fine textured soils. For example, changes in  $\theta_{AWHC}$  due to increased SOC for fine textured soils is 30% greater relative to the mean of all textures, and coarse soils are 30% less relative to the mean of all textures. In calcareous soils, because SOC has no interaction term with texture for  $\theta_{PWP}$ , the effect of increasing SOC is only in  $\theta_{FC}$ . Coarse-textured calcareous soils have twice the water retention due to increased SOC compared with the mean of all textures (Table 3). Previous findings have shown that the magnitude of change resulting from increases in SOC was greatest in coarse-textured soil and least in fine-textured soils for  $\theta_{PWP}$ ,  $\theta_{FC}$ , and  $\theta_{AWHC}$  (Hudson, 1994; Minasny & McBratney, 2018). Our findings agree with past literature for the repacked cores used to make new  $\theta_{PWP}$  pedotransfer functions, but our findings are not consistent with the literature for noncalcareous soils for either  $\theta_{FC}$  or  $\theta_{AWHC}$ . The differences between our study and previous work are likely caused by differences in procedures, especially (a) the experimental design of the NAPESHM dataset was developed to capture changes in SOC and water retention due to management (treatment) effects within sites as well as across sites; (b) previous studies combined calcareous and noncalcareous soils, but we separate them; and (c) differences in the  $\theta_{FC}$  measurement methodology from some past studies.

Increases in SOC can in some cases result in small reductions in predicted water content for the new pedotransfer functions. For noncalcareous soils, there was one simulated example of a silt (sand and clay at 5%) in which predicted  $\theta_{PWP}$  decreased with more SOC (Table 3). This negative prediction was smaller than the RMSE (Equation 2) and is represented as the minimum value for noncalcareous  $\theta_{PWP}$  predictions in medium textures soils in Table 3. For calcareous soils, there were 25 simulated examples that resulted in negative predicted changes in water content when SOC increased and these contributes to the negative values in Table 3 for calcareous soils. All were less than one-third of the RMSE for their respective equations. Thus, the new pedotransfer functions can predict small decreases in water content as the result of increased SOC. Given that the magnitude of these predictions is less than the RMSE of the equations, users may choose to interpret them as no change in water content.

**TABLE 3** Summary statistics for the effects of increase in soil organic C for predicted volumetric water content at permanent wilting point ( $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ), field capacity ( $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ ), and plant available water holding capacity ( $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$ ) using the new pedotransfer functions on simulated data. For calcareous soils  $n = 270$  and for noncalcareous soil  $n = 384$ . Particle size group, clay, sandy clay, silty clay, clay loam and silty clay loam are fine; loam, silt loam, silt, and sandy clay loam are medium; and sand, loamy sand, and sandy loam are coarse

Particle size group	Change in water content (mm 100 mm <sup>-1</sup> ) from 10 g kg <sup>-1</sup> Increase in soil organic C		
	Min.	Mean	Max.
<b>Noncalcareous</b>			
$\theta_{\text{PWP}}$			
Coarse	0.9	1.5	1.9
Medium	-0.1	0.8	1.9
Fine	0.5	1.3	1.9
All	-0.1	1.2	1.9
$\theta_{\text{FC}}$			
Coarse	2.8	4.2	5.2
Medium	0.5	3.1	5.9
Fine	2.6	5.1	7.0
All	0.5	4.1	7.0
$\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$			
Coarse	1.9	2.7	3.4
Medium	0.6	2.2	4.0
Fine	2.1	3.8	5.0
All	0.6	3.0	5.0
<b>Calcareous</b>			
$\theta_{\text{PWP}}$			
Coarse	0.5	0.5	0.5
Medium	0.5	0.5	0.5
Fine	0.5	0.5	0.5
All	0.5	0.5	0.5
$\theta_{\text{FC}}$			
Coarse	3.0	4.1	5.6
Medium	-0.2	1.7	3.3
Fine	-0.9	0.2	1.2
All	-0.9	2.0	5.6
$\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$			
Coarse	2.5	3.6	5.2
Medium	-0.7	1.2	2.9
Fine	-1.3	-0.3	0.8
All	-1.1	1.5	5.2

For noncalcareous soils across texture classes, the increase in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  associated with a 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in SOC ranged from 3.0 to 5.0 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3). In calcareous soils, predicted changes in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  from a 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase on SOC were smaller on average, but some larger changes were pre-

dicted. The range was 1.6–5.5 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup>. For comparison to these predicted changes, the mean change in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  associated with a 10 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in SOC reported by Minasny and McBratney (2018) was 1.2 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> across all textures. Thus, the mean effect of SOC on  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  reported by Minasny and McBratney (2018) is about the same as our findings for calcareous soil and about a third as large as our findings for noncalcareous soils. We attribute the greater increase in predicted  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  for the new pedotransfer functions to the fact that NAPESHM data used to create the function captures variance in SOC and measured  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  within pedons due to management practices. Another source of improvement may be the somewhat larger sample size for measures  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ ; the intact clods used by Saxton and Rawls (2006) would have been approximately 8 × 6 × 6 cm so that they would fit snugly in the clod box (Soil Science Division Staff, 2017). The volume of a soil clod fitting in a clod box is approximately 72–78% of the volume of the core used in this investigation.

This study demonstrates that, while there are cases in which the magnitude of change in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  resulting from increased SOC will be negligible, other cases will show meaningful benefits of increasing SOC. To illustrate how these changes might be meaningful to crop production, a fine-textured soil with a 20 g kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in SOC would increase  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  by 7.6 mm 100 mm<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3). Extending this to 150-mm depth would result in 11.4 mm of additional plant available water. Assuming that plants took up this 11.4 mm of additional water and that it was recharged in five rainfall events throughout a growing season, the additional water available to plants over the growing season would be 57 mm (2.2 in, 570,000 L ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>). For reference as to whether this may be a meaningful increase, an estimate for the amount of water that corn needs for transpiration during the reproductive phase is about 5 mm per day. To determine whether increases in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  are meaningful to stakeholders, considerations such as rainfall amount and timing and planting and harvesting of crops should inform situational analysis. This study enables such situational analyses by making available new pedotransfer functions for  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ,  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ , and  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  that meaningfully respond to changes in SOC that result from soil management.

## 4 | CONCLUSIONS

The newly developed pedotransfer functions for soil water retention have similar performance compared with previous models and is more sensitive to changes in SOC. The new functions provided robust estimates for 1,731 surface soils from the NCSS database. The magnitude of predicted increases in  $\theta_{\text{PWP}}$ ,  $\theta_{\text{FC}}$ , and  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  in response to increased SOC was greater for noncalcareous soils, which showed a mean increase in  $\theta_{\text{AWHC}}$  across all texture classes that was more than double that reported in earlier studies. The

accuracy of new functions provides confidence that they are suitable to incorporate into models. Because they demonstrate a change in response to varying levels of SOC, they bridge the long-standing discrepancy between soil science textbooks and pedotransfer functions on the effects of SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$ .

While there was broad representation in soil types in the NAPESHM dataset used to develop the new pedotransfer functions, there were some conditions with limited data to train the model. For example, the functionality of the new pedotransfer function for noncalcareous soil is limited to no more than 60% clay. This study highlights the need for more mechanistic investigation and pedotransfer function development to understand water retention in calcareous soils.

The newly developed pedotransfer functions show substantial effects of SOC on  $\theta_{AWHC}$  and will enable future modeling to illuminate scenarios for which changes in soil management that result in increased SOC are likely to provide changes in water supplied to plants by the soil that are meaningful for stakeholders.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The NAPESHM project is part of a broader effort titled, "Assessing and Expanding Soil Health for Production, Economic, and Environmental Benefits". The project is funded by the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (grant ID 523926), General Mills, and The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation. The content of this publication is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research. The application of NAPESHM data to develop pedotransfer functions for plant available water was supported by the United Soybean Board (project number 1920-172-0118). The authors acknowledge the following individuals and groups for their contribution to the long-term research sites: Melissa Bell, Nancy Creamer, Alan Franzluebbbers, Tomas Moreno, Paul Mueller, Chris Reberg-Horton, Mike Zink, Matthew Helmers, Lisa Schulte-Moore, Matt Mortenson, Sean Vink, George Kapusta, Ronald Krausz, Karla Gage, Dr. Rachel Cook, Amanda Weidhuner, Orla Willoughby, Deanna L. Osmond, Bob Blevins, Donald C. Watts, Dr. Kenneth A. Barbarick, Robert S. Dungan, Joshua L. Heitman, James Custis, John Mason, April B. Leytem, Mark A. Liebig, Amy L. Shober, Michael L. Thompson, Bryan B. William, and Lamesa Cotton Growers. Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (grant ID 523926), United Soybean Board (project no. 1920-172-0118), General Mills, and The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Dianna K. Bagnall: Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Writing-original draft. Cristine L. S. Morgan: Conceptualization; Funding acquisition; Supervision; Writing-review & editing, Michael Cope: Writing-

review & editing. Gregory M. Bean: Writing-review & editing. Shannon Cappellazzi: Writing-review & editing. Kelsey Greub: Writing-review & editing. Daniel Liptzin: Formal analysis. Charlotte L. Norris: Writing-review & editing. Elizabeth Rieke: Writing-review & editing. Paul Tracy: Data curation. Ezra Aberle: Data curation. Oscar Bañuelos Tavarez: Data curation. Andy Bary: Data curation. R. Louis Baumhardt: Data curation. Alberto Borbón Gracia: Data curation. Daniel Brainard: Data curation. Jameson Brennan: Data curation. Dolores Briones Reyes: Data curation. Darren Bruhjell: Data curation. Cameron Carlyle: Data curation. James Crawford: Data curation. Cody Creech: Data curation. Steven Culman: Data curation. William Deen: Data curation. Curtis Dell: Data curation. Justin Derner: Data curation. Thomas Ducey: Data curation. Sjoerd Willem Duiker: Data curation. Miles Dyck: Data curation. Benjamin Ellert: Data curation. Martin Entz: Data curation. Avelino Espinosa Solorio: Data curation. Steven J. Fonte: Data curation. Simon Fonteyne: Data curation. Ann-Marie Fortuna: Data curation. Jamie Foster: Data curation. Lisa Fultz: Data curation. Audrey V. Gamble: Data curation. Charles Geddes: Data curation. Deirdre Griffin-LaHue: Data curation. John Grove: Data curation. Stephen K. Hamilton: Data curation. Xiying Hao: Data curation. Z. D. Hayden: Data curation. Julie Howe: Data curation; Writing-review & editing. James Ippolito: Data curation. Gregg Johnson: Data curation. Mark Kautz: Data curation. Newell Kitchen: Data curation. Sandeep Kumar: Data curation. Kirsten Kurtz: Data curation. Francis Larney: Data curation. Katie Lewis: Data curation. Matt Liebman: Data curation. Antonio Lopez Ramirez: Data curation. Stephen Machado: Data curation. Bijesh Maharjan: Data curation. Miguel Angel Martinez Gamiño: Data curation. William May: Data curation. Mitchel McClaran: Data curation. Marshall McDaniel: Data curation. Neville Millar: Data curation. Jeffrey P. Mitchell: Data curation. Philip A. Moore: Data curation. Amber Moore: Data curation. Manuel Mora Gutiérrez: Data curation. Kelly A. Nelson: Data curation. Emmanuel Omondi: Data curation. Shannon Osborne: Data curation. Leodegario Osorio Alcalá: Data curation. Philip Owens: Data curation. Eugenia M. Pena-Yewtukhiw: Data curation; Writing-review & editing. Hanna Poffenbarger: Data curation. Brenda Ponce Lira: Data curation. Jennifer Reeve: Data curation. Timothy Reinbott: Data curation. Mark Reiter: Data curation. Edwin Ritchey: Data curation. Kraig L. Roozeboom: Data curation. Ichao Rui: Data curation. Amir Sadeghpour: Data curation. Upendra M. Sainju: Data curation. Gregg Sanford: Data curation. William Schillinger: Data curation. Robert R. Schindelbeck: Data curation. Meagan Schipanski: Data curation. Alan Schlegel: Data curation. Kate Scow: Data curation. Lucretia Sherrod: Data curation. Sudeep Sidhu: Data curation. Ernesto Solís Moya: Data curation. Mervin St. Luce: Data curation. Jeffrey Strock: Data curation. Andrew Suyker: Data curation.

Virginia Sykes: Data curation. Haiying Tao: Data curation. Alberto Trujillo Campos: Data curation. Laura L. Van Eerd: Data curation. Nele Verhulst: Data curation. Tony John Vyn: Data curation. Yutao Wang: Data curation. Dexter Watts: Data curation. David Wright: Data curation. Tiequan Zhang: Data curation. Charles Wayne Honeycutt: Data curation

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## ORCID

Dianna K. Bagnall  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6687-1923>

Daniel Liptzin  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8243-267X>

Cody Creech  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5334-4814>

Sjoerd Willem Duiker  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7885-7061>

Miles Dyck  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4986-673X>

Simon Fonteyne  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9965-5266>

Lisa Fultz  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2461-6016>

Charles Geddes  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8088-224X>

Deirdre Griffin-LaHue  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5711-797X>

Julie Howe  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7687-309X>

James Ippolito  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8077-0088>

Sandeep Kumar  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2717-5455>

Katie Lewis  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9393-9284>

Bijesh Maharjan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4728-7956>

Marshall McDaniel  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6267-7293>

Amber Moore  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2719-1885>

Kelly A. Nelson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8334-7488>

Lucretia Sherrod  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1537-2160>

Sudeep Sidhu  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6694-9230>

Jeffrey Strock  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5357-0638>

Nele Verhulst  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5032-4386>

Tony John Vyn  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9860-4475>

## REFERENCES

- Ahuja, L. R., Naney, J. W., & Williams, R. D. (1985). Estimating soil water characteristics from simpler properties or limited data. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *49*, 1100–1105. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1985.03615995004900050005x>
- Ankenbauer, K. J., & Loheide, S. P. (2017). The effects of soil organic matter on soil water retention and plant water use in a meadow of the Sierra Nevada, CA. *Hydrological Processes*, *31*, 891–901. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.11070>
- Arya, L. M., & Paris, J. F. (1981). A physioempirical model to predict the soil moisture characteristic from particle-size distribution and bulk density data. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *45*, 1023–1030. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1981.03615995004500060004x>
- Bauer, A., & Black, A. L. (1992). Organic carbon effects on available water capacity of three soil textural groups. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *56*, 248–254. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1992.03615995005600010038x>
- Bell, M. A., & Van Keulen, H. (1995). Soil pedotransfer functions for four Mexican soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *59*, 865–871. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1995.03615995005900030034x>
- Bouma, J. (1989). Using soil survey data for quantitative land evaluation. In B. A. Stewart (Ed.), *Advances in soil science* (Volume 9). Springer.
- Bouyoucos, G. J. (1939). Effect of organic matter on the water holding capacity and the wilting points of mineral soils. *Soil Science Journal*, *47*, 377–383. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00010694-193905000-00005>
- Brady, N. C., & Weil, R. R. (2002). *The nature and properties of soils*. Prentice Hall.
- Bronick, C. J., & Lal, R. (2005). Soil structure and management: A review. *Geoderma*, *124*, 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.03.005>
- Brooks, R. H., & Corey, A. T. (1964). *Hydraulic properties of porous media* (Hydrology Paper no. 3). Colorado State University.
- Campbell, G. S. (1974). A simple method for determining unsaturated conductivity from moisture retention data. *Soil Science Journal*, *117*, 311–314. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00010694-197406000-00001>
- Dane, J. H., & Hopmans, J. W. (2018). 3.3.1 Introduction. In J. H. Dane & G. C. Topp (Eds.), *Methods of soil analysis: Part 4, physical methods*, 5.4 (pp. 671–673). SSSA.
- Dreimanis, A. (1962). Quantitative gasometric determination of calcite and dolomite by using Chittick apparatus. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, *32*, 520–529.
- Feustal, I. C., & Byers, H. G. (1936). *The comparative moisture-absorbing and moisture-retaining capacities of peat and soil mixtures* (USDA Technical Bulletin 532). USDA.
- Gee, G. W., & Bauder, J. W. (1986). Particle-size analysis. In A. Klute (Ed.), *Methods of soil analysis. Part 1* (2nd ed., pp. 383–411). ASA and SSSA.
- Gijsman, A. J., Jagtap, S. S., & Jones, J. W. (2002). Wading through a swamp of complete confusion: How to choose a method for estimating soil water retention parameters for crop models. *European Journal of Agronomy*, *18*, 75–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00098-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00098-9)
- Gupta, S. C., & Larson, W. E. (1979). Estimating soil water retention characteristics from particle size distribution, organic matter content, and bulk density. *Water Resource Research*, *15*, 1633–1635. <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR015i006p01633>
- Habel, A. (2014). The Impact of calcium carbonate on the bulk density of selected Libyan calcareous soils in Al Jabal Al Al-kdhar Region. *Al Mukhtar Journal of Sciences*, *30*, 1
- Hao, X., Ball, B. C., Culley, J. L., Carter, M. R., & Parkin, G. W. (2008). Soil density and porosity. In M. R. Carter & E. G. Gregorich (Eds.), *Soil sampling and methods of analysis* (pp. 743–760). CRC Press.
- Hastie, T. J., & Pregibon, D. (1992). Generalized linear models. In J. M. Chambers & T. J. Hastie (Eds.), *Statistical models* (pp. 195–248). Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole
- Hudson, B. D. (1994). Soil organic matter and available water capacity. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, *49*, 189–194.
- Jackson, R. D., & Erie, L. J. (1973). Soil and water management practices for calcareous soils. In *Calcareous soils* (Bulletin 21). FAO.
- Jong, R. D. (1983). Soil water desorption curves estimated from limited data. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science*, *63*, 697–703. <https://doi.org/10.4141/cjss83-071>
- Jorda, H., Bechtold, M., Jarvis, N., & Koestel, J. (2015). Using boosted regression trees to explore key factors controlling saturated and



- near-saturated hydraulic conductivity. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 66, 744–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.12249>
- Karlen, D. L., Tomer, M. D., Neppel, J., & Cambardella, C. A. (2008). A preliminary watershed scale soil quality assessment in north central Iowa, USA. *Soil & Tillage Research*, 99, 291–299.
- Klute, A. (Ed.). (1986). *Methods of soil analysis. Part I* (2nd ed.). SSSA.
- Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change and food security. *Science*, 304, 1623–1627. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1097396>
- Lal, R. (2006). Enhancing crop yields in the developing countries through restoration of the soil organic carbon pool in agricultural lands. *Land Degradation & Development*, 17, 197–209.
- Maynard, A. A. (2000). *Compost: The process and research* (Bulletin–Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station No. 966). Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Minasny, B., & McBratney, A. B. (2018). Limited effect of organic matter on soil available water capacity. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 69, 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.12475>
- Moosavi, A. A., & Sepaskhah, A. (2012). Artificial neural networks for predicting unsaturated hydraulic soil characteristics at different applied tensions. *Archives of Agronomy & Soil Science*, 58, 125–153.
- Nelson, D. W., & Sommers, L. E. (1996). Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In D. L. Sparks (Ed.), *Methods of soil analysis: Part 3. Chemical methods* (2nd ed., pp. 961–1010). SSSA.
- Nemes, A., Rawls, W. J., & Pachepsky, Y. A. (2005). Influence of organic matter on the estimation of saturated hydraulic conductivity. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 69, 1330–1337. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2004.0055>
- Nemes, A., Schaap, M. G., Leij, F. J., & Wösten, J. H. M. (2001). Description of the unsaturated soil hydraulic database UNSODA Version 2.0. *Journal of Hydrology*, 251, 151–162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694\(01\)00465-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(01)00465-6)
- Nimmo, J. R., & Akstin, K. C. (1988). Hydraulic conductivity of a sandy soil at low water content after compaction with various methods. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 52, 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1988.03615995005200020001x>
- Norris, C. E., Bean, G. M., Cappellazzi, S. B., Cope, M., Greub, K. L. H., Liptzin, D., Rieke, E. L., Tracy, P. W., Morgan, C. L. S., & Honeycutt, C. W. (2020). Introducing the North American project to evaluate soil health measurements. *Agronomy Journal*, 112(4), 3195–3215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20234>
- Pachepsky, Y. A., & Rawls, W. J. (2003). Soil structure and pedotransfer functions. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 54, 443–451. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2389.2003.00485.x>
- Pachepsky, Y. A., Rawls, W. J., & Lin, H. S. (2006). Hydropedology and pedotransfer functions. *Geoderma*, 131, 308–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2005.03.012>
- Rawls, W. J., Ahuja, L. R., & Brakensiek, D. L. (1992). Estimating soil hydraulic properties from soils data. In M. Th. van Genuchten & F. J. Leij (Eds.), *Indirect methods for estimating the hydraulic properties of unsaturated soils* (pp. 329–340). University of California.
- R Development Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation Statistical Computing.
- Reynolds, W. D., & Topp, G. C. (2008). Soil water desorption and imbibition: Tension and pressure techniques. In M. R. Carter & E. G. Gregorich (Eds.), *Soil sampling and methods of analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 981–997). CRC Press.
- Riley, H. (1981). *Relationships between soil moisture-holding properties and soil texture, organic matter content, and bulk density* (NASA Technical Memorandum NASA-TM-76674). NASA
- Salter, P. J., & Haworth, F. (1961). The available-water holding capacity of a sandy loam soil, II. The effects of farmyard manure and different primary cultivations. *Journal of Soil Science*, 12, 335–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.1961.tb00923.x>
- Saxton, K. E., & Rawls, W. J. (2006). Soil water characteristic estimates by texture and organic matter for hydrologic solutions. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 70, 1569–1578. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2005.0117>
- Saxton, K. E., Rawls, W. J., Romberger, J. S., & Papendick, R. I. (1986). Estimating generalized soil water characteristics from texture. *Transactions of ASAE*, 50, 1031–1035.
- Schaap, M. G., Nemes, A., & Genuchten, M. T. (2004). Comparison of models for indirect estimation of water retention and available water in surface soils. *Vadose Zone Journal*, 3, 1455–1463. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2004.1455>
- Soil Science Division Staff. (2017). C. Ditzler, K. Scheffe, & H. C. Monger (Eds.), *Soil survey manual* (USDA Handbook 18). U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Soil Survey Staff (1995). *Natural resources soil characterization and profile description data*. U.S. Department of Agriculture National Resources Conservation Services (USDA-NRCS).
- Soil Survey Staff. (2004). *Kellogg soil survey laboratory methods manual* (Soil Survey Investigations Report no. 42. Version 5.0). Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Soil Survey Staff. (2014). *National soil characterization data*. NRCS National Soil Survey Center
- Stakman, W. P., & Bishay, B. G., (1975). Moisture retention and plasticity of highly calcareous soils in Egypt. *Netherland Journal of Agricultural Science*, 24, 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.18174/njas.v24i1.17164>
- Thomas, G. W. (1996). Soil pH and soil acidity. In D. L. Sparks (Ed.), *Methods of soil analysis: Part 3. Chemical methods* (pp. 474–490). SSSA.
- Topp, G. C., Galganov, Y. T., Ball, B. C., & Carter, M. R. (1993). Soil water desorption curves. *Soil Sampling and Methods of Analysis*, 569–579.
- Twarakavi, N. K. C., Šimůnek, J., & Schaap, M. G. (2009). Development of pedotransfer functions for estimation of soil hydraulic parameters using support vector machines. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 73, 1443–1452. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2008.0021>
- USDA-ARS. (2019). *Revised universal soil loss equation 2 - download RUSLE2*. <https://www.ars.usda.gov/southeast-area/oxfordms/national-sedimentation-laboratory/watershed-physical-processes-research/research/rusle2/revised-universal-soil-loss-equation-2-download-rusle2>
- USDA Soil Conservation Service (USDA-SCS). (1982). *Procedures for collecting soil samples and methods of analysis for soil survey* (Soil Survey Investigations Report I). USDA-SCS.
- Van Genuchten, M. Th. (1980). A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 44, 892–898. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1980.03615995004400050002x>
- Wang, T., Hamann, A., Spittlehouse, D., & Carroll, C. (2016). Locally downscaled and spatially customizable climate data for historical and future periods for North America. *PLOS ONE*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0156720>

- Williams, A., Hunter, M. C., Kammerer, M., Kane, D. A., Jordan, N. R., Mortensen, D. A., Smith, R. G., Snapp, S., & Davis, A. S. (2016). Soil water holding capacity mitigates downside risk and volatility in US rainfed maize: Time to invest in soil organic matter? *PLOS ONE*, *11*(8), e0160974. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0160974>
- Williams, J., Prebble, R., Williams, W., & Hignett, C. (1983). The influence of texture, structure, and clay mineralogy on the soil moisture characteristic. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*, *21*, 15–32. <https://doi.org/10.1071/SR9830015>
- Wösten, J. H. M., Pachepsky, Y. A., & Rawls, W. J. (2001). Pedotransfer functions: Bridging the gap between available basic soil data and missing soil hydraulic characteristics. *Journal of Hydrology*, *251*, 123–150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694\(01\)00464-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(01)00464-4)
- Yang, F., Zhang, G.-L., Yang, J.-L., Li, D.-C., Zhao, Y.-G., Liu, F., Yang, R.-M., & Yang, F. (2014). Organic matter controls of soil water retention in an alpine grassland and its significance for hydrological processes. *Journal of Hydrology*, *519*, 3086–3093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.10.054>
- Zhang, Y., & Schaap, M. G. (2017). Weighted recalibration of Rosetta pedotransfer model with improved estimates of hydraulic parameter distributions and summary statistics (Rosetta 3). *Journal of Hydrology*, *547*, 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.01.004>

**How to cite this article:** Bagnall, D. K., Morgan, C. L.S., Cope, M., Bean, G. M., Cappellazzi, S., Greub, K., Liptzin, D., Norris, C. L., Rieke, E., Tracy, P., Aberle, E., Ashworth, A., Bañuelos Tavarez, O., Bary, A., Baumhardt, R. L., Borbón Gracia, A., Brainard, D., Brennan, J., Briones Reyes, D., . . . Honeycutt, C. W. (2022). Carbon-sensitive pedotransfer functions for plant available water. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/saj2.20395>