



हर कदम, हर डगर
किसानों का हमसफर
भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद

Agrisearch with a human touch

**LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF
FARM HOUSEHOLDS FOR WATERSHED PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT**

GODADAHADAGI-2 (4D5B1N2d) MICROWATERSHED

Sydhapur Hobli, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

SUJALA – III

World Bank funded Project



ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING



ICAR - NBSS & LUP



**WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GOVT. OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE**



About ICAR - NBSS&LUP

The ICAR-National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning (ICAR-NBSS&LUP), Nagpur, a premier Institute of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), was set up during 1976 with the objective to prepare soil resource maps at national, state and district levels and to provide research inputs in soil resource mapping and its applications, land evaluation, land use planning, land resource management, and database management using GIS for optimising land use on different kinds of soils in the country.

The Bureau has been engaged in carrying out soil resource survey, agro-ecological and soil degradation mapping at the country, state and district levels for qualitative assessment and monitoring the soil health towards viable land use planning. The research activities have resulted in identifying the soil potentials and problems, and the various applications of the soil surveys with the ultimate objective of sustainable agricultural development. The Bureau has the mandate to correlate and classify soils of the country and maintain a National Register of all the established soil series. The Institute is also imparting in-service training to staff of the soil survey agencies in the area of soil survey, land evaluation and soil survey interpretations for land use planning. The Bureau in collaboration with Panjabrao Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola is running post-graduate teaching and research programme in land resource management, leading to M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees.

Citation: Rajendra Hegde, Ramesh Kumar, S.C., B.A. Dhanorkar, S. Srinivas, M. Lalitha, K.V. Niranjana, R.S. Reddy and S.K. Singh (2019), "Land Resource Inventory and Socio-Economic Status of Farm Households for Watershed Planning and Development of Godadahadagi-2 (4D5B1N2d) Microwatershed, Sydhapura Hobli, Yadgir Taluk & District, Karnataka", ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.193, ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. P.99 & 29.

TO OBTAIN COPIES,

Please write to:

Director, ICAR - NBSS & LUP,

Amaravati Road, NAGPUR - 440 033, India

Phone : (0712) 2500386, 2500664, 2500545 (O)

Telefax : 0712-2522534

E-Mail : director@nbsslup.ernet.in

Website URL : nbsslup.in

Or

Head, Regional Centre, ICAR - NBSS&LUP, Hebbal, Bangalore - 560 024

Phone : (080) 23412242, 23510350 (O)

Telefax : 080-23510350

E-Mail : nbssrcb@gmail.com

ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.193



हर कदम, हर डगर
किसानों का हमसफर
भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद

*Agri*search with a human touch

**LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC
STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS FOR WATERSHED
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

GODADAHADAGI-2 (4D5B1N2d) MICROWATERSHED

Sydhapur Hobli, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka


Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

Sujala-III

World Bank funded Project



**ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE
PLANNING**



ICAR - NBSS & LUP



**WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, GOVT. OF
KARNATAKA, BANGALORE**



PREFACE

In Karnataka, as in other Indian States, the livelihoods of rural people are intertwined with farming pursuits. The challenges in agriculture are seriously threatening the livelihood of a large number of farmers as they have been practicing farming in contextual factors beyond their control. Climatic factors are the most important ones and have become much more significant in recent times due to rapid climate changes induced by intensive anthropogenic activities affecting our ecosystem in multiple ways. Climate change has become the reality, it is happening and efforts to evolve and demonstrate climate resilient technologies have become essential. Due to the already over stressed scenario of agrarian sector, the climate change is resulting in manifold increase in the complexities, pushing the rural mass to face more and more unpredictable situations. The rising temperatures and unpredictable rainfall patterns are going to test seriously the informed decisions farmers have to make in order to survive in farming and sustain their livelihood.

It is generally recognized that impacts of climate change shall not be uniform across the globe. It is said that impact of climate change is more severe in South Asia. Based on the analysis of meteorological data, it is predicted that in India, there will be upward trend in mean temperature, downward trend in relative humidity, annual rainfall and number of wet days in a year. Also, in general, phenomena like erratic monsoon, spread of tropical diseases, rise in sea levels, changes in availability of fresh water, frequent floods, droughts, heat waves, storms and hurricanes are predicted. Each one of these adverse situations are already being experienced in various parts of India and also at the global level. Decline in agricultural productivity of small and marginal farmers becoming more vulnerable is already witnessed.

In Karnataka, more than 60 per cent of the population live in rural areas and depend on agriculture and allied activities for their livelihood. Though the state has achieved significant progress in increasing the yield of many crops, there is tremendous pressure on the land resources due to the growing and competing demands of various land uses. This is reflected in the alarming rate of land degradation observed. Already more than 50 per cent of the area is affected by various forms of degradation. If this trend continues, the sustainability of the fragile ecosystem will be badly affected. The adverse effects of change in the climatic factors are putting additional stress on the land resources and the farmers dependent on this.

The natural resources (land, water and vegetation) of the state need adequate and constant care and management, backed by site-specific technological interventions and investments particularly by the government. Detailed database pertaining to the nature of the land resources, their constraints, inherent potentials and suitability for various land

based rural enterprises, crops and other uses is a prerequisite for preparing location-specific action plans, which are in tune with the inherent capability of the resources. Any effort to evolve climate resilient technologies has to be based on the baseline scientific database. Then only one can expect effective implementation of climate resilient technologies, monitor the progress, make essential review of the strategy, and finally evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented programs. The information available at present on the land resources of the state are of general nature and useful only for general purpose planning. Since the need of the hour is to have site-specific information suitable for farm level planning and detailed characterization and delineation of the existing land resources of an area into similar management units is the only option.

ICAR-NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore has taken up a project sponsored by the Karnataka Watershed Development Project-II, (Sujala-III), Government of Karnataka funded by the World Bank under Component-1 Land Resource Inventory. This study was taken up to demonstrate the utility of such a database in reviewing, monitoring and evaluating all the land based watershed development programs on a scientific footing. To meet the requirements of various land use planners at grassroots level, the present study on “Land Resource Inventory and Socio-Economic Status of Farm Households for Watershed Planning and Development of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka” for integrated development was taken up in collaboration with the State Agricultural Universities, IISC, KRSRAC, KSNDMC as Consortia partners. The project provides detailed land resource information at cadastral level (1:7920 scale) for all the plots and socio-economic status of farm households covering thirty per cent farmers randomly selected representing landed and landless class of farmers in the micro-watershed. The project report with the accompanying maps for the Microwatershed will provide required detailed database for evolving effective land use plan, alternative land use options and conservation plans for the planners, administrators, agricultural extension personnel, KVK officials, developmental departments and other land users to manage the land resources in a sustainable manner.

It is hoped that this database will be useful to the planners, administrators and developmental agencies working in the area in not only for formulating location specific developmental schemes but also for their effective monitoring at the village/watershed level.

Nagpur

Date: 09.05.2019

S.K. SINGH

Director, ICAR - NBSS&LUP, Nagpur

Contributors

Dr. Rajendra Hegde Principal Scientist, Head & Project Leader, Sujala-III Project ICAR-NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore	Dr. S.K.Singh Director, ICAR-NBSS&LUP Coordinator, Sujala-III Project Nagpur
Soil Survey, Mapping & Report Preparation	
Dr. B.A. Dhanorkar	Sh. R.S. Reddy
Dr. K.V. Niranjana	Sh. Venkata Giriyappa
	Mr. Somashekar T N
	Smt. Chaitra, S.P.
	Dr. Gayathri. B.
	Dr. Gopali bardhan
	Dr. H.R. Savitha
	Sh. Nagendra, B.R
	Ms. Arpitha
Field Work	
Sh. C.BacheGowda	Sh. Mahesh, D.B.
Sh. Somashekar	Sh. Ashok S Sindagi
Sh. M. Jayaramaiah	Sh. Veerabhadrapa B.
Sh. Paramesha, K.	Sh. Shankarappa
Sh. B. M. Narayana Reddy	Sh. Anand
	Sh. Arun N Kambar.
	Sh Kamalesh Awate
	Sh. Sharaan Kumar Huppar
	Sh. Yogesh H.N.
	Sh. Kalaveerachari R Kammar
GIS Work	
Dr. S.Srinivas	Sh. A.G.Devendra Prasad
Sh. D.H.Venkatesh	Sh. Prakashanaik, M.K.
Smt.K.Sujatha	Sh. Abhijith Sastry, N.S.
Smt. K.V.Archana	Sh. Sudip Kumar Suklabaidya
Sh. N. Maddileti	Sh. Avinash, K.N.
	Sh. Amar Suputhra, S
	Sh. Deepak, M.J.
	Smt. K.Karunya Lakshmi
	Ms. Seema, K.V.
	Ms. A. Rajab Nisha

Laboratory Analysis	
Dr. K.M.Nair	Ms. Steffi Peter
Smt. Arti Koyal	Ms. Thara, V.R
Smt. Parvathy	Ms. Roopa, G.
	Ms. Swati, H.
	Sh. Shantaveera Swami
	Ms. Shwetha, N.K.
	Smt. Ishrat Haji
	Ms. P. Pavan Kumari
	Ms. Padmaja
	Ms. Veena, M.
Socio-Economic Analysis	
Dr. S.C. Ramesh Kumar	Sh. M.K. Prakashanaik
	Ms. Karuna V. Kulkarni
	Mrs. Sowmya A.N
	Sh. Vinod R
	Sh. Basavaraja
	Sh. Vijay Kumar Lamani
	Ms. Sowmya K.B
	Mrs. Prathibha, D.G
	Sh. Rajendra,D
Soil & Water Conservation	
Sh. Sunil P. Maske	
Watershed Development Department, GoK, Bangalore	
Sh. Rajeev Ranjan IFS Project Director & Commissioner, WDD	Dr. A. Natarajan NRM Consultant, Sujala-III Project
Dr. S.D. Pathak IFS Executive Director & Chief Conservator of Forests, WDD	

PART-A

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY

Contents

Preface		
Contributors		
Executive Summary		
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Geographical Setting	3
2.1	Location and Extent	3
2.2	Geology	3
2.3	Physiography	5
2.4	Drainage	5
2.5	Climate	5
2.6	Natural Vegetation	6
2.7	Land Utilization	7
Chapter 3	Survey Methodology	11
3.1	Base maps	11
3.2	Image interpretation for Physiography	11
3.3	Field Investigation	14
3.4	Soil Mapping	16
3.5	Land Management Units	16
3.6	Laboratory Characterization	17
Chapter 4	The Soils	21
4.1	Soils of Granite gneiss Landscape	21
4.2	Soils of Alluvial landscape	25
Chapter 5	Interpretation for Land Resource Management	31
5.1	Land Capability Classification	31
5.2	Soil Depth	33
5.3	Surface Soil Texture	34
5.4	Soil Gravelliness	35
5.5	Available Water Capacity	36
5.6	Soil Slope	37
5.7	Soil Erosion	38
Chapter 6	Fertility Status	41
6.1	Soil Reaction (pH)	41
6.2	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	41
6.3	Organic Carbon (OC)	41
6.4	Available Phosphorus	43
6.5	Available Potassium	43
6.6	Available Sulphur	43
6.7	Available Boron	44
6.8	Available Iron	44
6.9	Available Manganese	44
6.10	Available Copper	44

6.11	Available Zinc	48
Chapter 7	Land Suitability for Major Crops	49
7.1	Land suitability for Sorghum	49
7.2	Land suitability for Maize	51
7.3	Land suitability for Bajra	52
7.4	Land suitability for Groundnut	53
7.5	Land suitability for Sunflower	55
7.6	Land suitability for Red gram	56
7.7	Land suitability for Bengalgram	57
7.8	Land suitability for Cotton	58
7.9	Land suitability for Chilli	60
7.10	Land suitability for Tomato	61
7.11	Land suitability for Drumstick	62
7.12	Land suitability for Mango	63
7.13	Land suitability for Guava	65
7.14	Land suitability for Sapota	66
7.15	Land suitability for Pomegranate	67
7.16	Land Suitability for Musambi	68
7.17	Land Suitability for Lime	69
7.18	Land Suitability for Amla	71
7.19	Land Suitability for Cashew	72
7.20	Land suitability for Jackfruit	73
7.21	Land suitability for Jamun	74
7.22	Land Suitability for Custard Apple	75
7.23	Land Suitability for Tamarind	76
7.24	Land Suitability for Mulberry	77
7.25	Land Suitability for Marigold	78
7.26	Land Suitability for chrysanthemum	80
7.27	Land Management Units	81
7.28	Proposed Crop Plan	82
Chapter 8	Soil Health Management	85
Chapter 9	Soil and Water conservation Treatment Plan	91
9.1	Treatment Plan	91
9.2	Recommended Soil and Water Conservation measures	95
9.3	Greening of microwatershed	96
	References	99
	Appendix I	I-VIII
	Appendix II	IX-XIV
	Appendix III	XV-XVIII

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Mean Monthly Rainfall, PET, 1/2 PET at Yadgir Taluk, Yadgir District	6
2.2	Land Utilization in Yadgir Taluk	7
3.1	Differentiating Characteristics used for Identifying Soil Series	16
3.2	Soil Map Unit Description of Godadahadagi-2Microwatershed	17
4.1	Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Godadahadagi-2microwatershed	26
7.1	Soil-Site Characteristics of Godadahadagi-2Microwatershed	50
7.2	Land suitability for Sorghum	51
7.3	Land suitability for Maize	52
7.4	Land suitability for Bajra	53
7.5	Land suitability for Groundnut	54
7.6	Land suitability for Sunflower	55
7.7	Land suitability for Red gram	56
7.8	Land suitability for Bengalgram	58
7.9	Land suitability for Cotton	59
7.10	Land suitability for Chilli	60
7.11	Land suitability for Tomato	61
7.12	Land suitability for Drumstick	63
7.13	Land suitability for Mango	64
7.14	Land suitability for Guava	65
7.15	Land suitability for Sapota	66
7.16	Land suitability for Pomegranate	68
7.17	Land Suitability for Musambi	69
7.18	Land Suitability for Lime	70
7.19	Land Suitability for Amla	71
7.20	Land Suitability for Cashew	72
7.21	Land suitability for Jackfruit	73
7.22	Land suitability for Jamun	75
7.23	Land Suitability for Custard Apple	76
7.24	Land Suitability for Tamarind	77

7.25	Land Suitability for Mulberry	78
7.26	Land Suitability for Marigold	79
7.27	Land Suitability for chrysanthemum	80
7.28	Proposed Crop Plan for Godadahadagi-2Microwatershed	83

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Location map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	3
2.2	Rock formations in Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	4
2.3	Rainfall distribution in Yadgir Taluk, Yadgir District	6
2.4 a & b	Different Crops and Cropping Systems in Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	8
2.5	Current Land use – Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	9
3.1	Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	13
3.2	Satellite image of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	13
3.3	Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	13
3.4	Location of profiles in a transect	15
3.5	Soil phase or management units of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	19
5.1	Land Capability Classification of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	33
5.2	Soil Depth map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	34
5.3	Surface Soil Texture map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	35
5.4	Soil Gravelliness map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	36
5.5	Soil Available Water Capacity map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	37
5.6	Soil Slope map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	38
5.7	Soil Erosion map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	39
6.1	Soil Reaction (pH) map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	42
6.2	Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	42
6.3	Soil Organic Carbon (OC) map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	43
6.4	Soil Available Phosphorus map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	44
6.5	Soil Available Potassium map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	45
6.6	Soil Available Sulphur map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	45
6.7	Soil Available Boron map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	46
6.8	Soil Available Iron map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	46
6.9	Soil Available Manganese map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	47
6.10	Soil Available Copper map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	47

6.11	Soil Available Zinc map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed	48
7.1	Land suitability for Sorghum	51
7.2	Land suitability for Maize	52
7.3	Land suitability for Bajra	53
7.4	Land suitability for Groundnut	54
7.5	Land suitability for Sunflower	56
7.6	Land suitability for Red gram	57
7.7	Land suitability for Bengalgram	58
7.8	Land suitability for Cotton	59
7.9	Land suitability for Chilli	60
7.10	Land suitability for Tomato	62
7.11	Land suitability for Drumstick	63
7.12	Land suitability for Mango	64
7.13	Land suitability for Guava	65
7.14	Land suitability for Sapota	67
7.15	Land suitability for Pomegranate	68
7.16	Land Suitability for Musambi	69
7.17	Land Suitability for Lime	70
7.18	Land Suitability for Amla	72
7.19	Land Suitability for Cashew	73
7.20	Land suitability for Jackfruit	74
7.21	Land suitability for Jamun	75
7.22	Land Suitability for Custard Apple	76
7.23	Land Suitability for Tamarind	77
7.24	Land Suitability for Mulberry	78
7.25	Land Suitability for Marigold	79
7.26	Land Suitability for chrysanthemum	80
7.27	Land Management Units (LMU's) map of Godadahadagi-2microwatershed	82
9.1	Soil and Water Conservation Plan Map of Godadahadagi-2Microwatershed	96

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The land resource inventory of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed was conducted using village cadastral maps and IRS satellite imagery on 1:7920 scale. The false colour composites of IRS imagery were interpreted for physiography and the physiographic delineations were used as base for mapping soils. The soils were studied in several transects and a soil map was prepared with phases of soil series as mapping units. Random checks were made all over the area outside the transects to confirm and validate the soil map unit boundaries. The soil map shows the geographic distribution and extent, characteristics, classification, behavior and use potentials of the soils in the microwatershed.

The present study covers an area of 566 ha in Yadgir taluk & district, Karnataka. The climate is semiarid and categorized as drought-prone with an average annual rainfall of 866 mm, of which about 652 mm is received during south-west monsoon, 138 mm during north-east and the remaining 76 mm during the rest of the year. An area of 500 ha in the microwatershed is covered by soils, 65 ha by others (water body). The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below.

- ❖ The soils belong to 6 soil series and 6 soil phases (management units) and 4 land use class.*
- ❖ The length of crop growing period is about 120-150 days starting from 1st week of June to 4th week of October.*
- ❖ From the master soil map, several interpretative and thematic maps like land capability, soil depth, surface soil texture, soil gravelliness, available water capacity, soil slope and soil erosion were generated.*
- ❖ Soil fertility status maps for macro and micronutrients were generated based on the surface soil samples collected at every 320 m grid interval.*
- ❖ Land suitability for growing 26 major agricultural and horticultural crops was assessed and maps showing the degree of suitability along with constraints were generated.*
- ❖ Entire area in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture.*
- ❖ Maximum area of 69 per cent of the microwatershed has soils that are deep to very deep (100 to >150 cm), 14 per cent soils are moderately deep (75 to 100 cm) and very shallow soils (<25 cm) occur in 5 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- ❖ Entire area in the microwatershed has clayey soils at the surface.*
- ❖ Entire area in the microwatershed is non gravelly (<15%).*
- ❖ Maximum area of 69 percent in the microwatershed is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity, 14 per cent is medium (101-150 mm/m) and 5% is very low (<50 mm/m).*

- ❖ *Entire area in the microwatershed has very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands.*
- ❖ *Entire area in the microwatershed is moderately (e2) eroded.*
- ❖ *Small area of about 1 per cent soils are slightly to moderately acid (pH 5.5-6.0) in soil reaction, 9 per cent are neutral (pH 6.5-7.3), 57 per cent is slightly to moderately alkaline (pH 7.3-8.4) and about 21 per cent soils are strongly alkaline (8.4 - 9.0).*
- ❖ *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the soils in the microwatershed is non saline (<2 dSm⁻¹) in 83 per cent area, low (2-4 dSm⁻¹) in 2 per cent and medium (4-8 dSm⁻¹) in 4 per cent area.*
- ❖ *About 8 per cent soils are low (<0.5%) in organic carbon, 22 per cent of the soils are medium (0.5-0.75%) and 59 per cent high (>0.75).*
- ❖ *About 8 per cent area is low in available phosphorus, 30 per area is medium (23-57 kg/ha) and 51 per cent is high (>57 kg/ha).*
- ❖ *Entire area is high (>337 kg/ha) in available potassium.*
- ❖ *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in 6 per cent area of the microwatershed, medium (10 -20 ppm) in 11 per cent and high (>20 ppm) in 72 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- ❖ *Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in an area of about 52 per cent, medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in an area of 32 per cent and high (>1.0 ppm) in 5 per cent area.*
- ❖ *Available iron is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 70 per cent area and deficient in 18 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- ❖ *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in all the soils of the microwatershed.*
- ❖ *Available zinc is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of 31 per cent and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 57 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- ❖ *The land suitability for 26 major crops grown in the microwatershed were assessed and the areas that are highly suitable (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) are given below. It is however to be noted that a given soil may be suitable for various crops but what specific crop to be grown may be decided by the farmer looking to his capacity to invest on various inputs, marketing infrastructure, market price and finally the demand and supply position.*

Land suitability for various crops in the Microwatershed

Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)		Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)	
	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)		Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)
<i>Sorghum</i>	264(47)	208(37)	<i>Sapota</i>	-	-
<i>Maize</i>	-	472(83)	<i>Pomegranate</i>	-	472(83)
<i>Bajra</i>	-	472(83)	<i>Musambi</i>	168(30)	304(54)
<i>Groundnut</i>	-	-	<i>Lime</i>	168(30)	304(54)
<i>Sunflower</i>	41(7)	431(76)	<i>Amla</i>	251(44)	221(39)
<i>Redgram</i>	-	472(83)	<i>Cashew</i>	-	-
<i>Bengal gram</i>	391(69)	81(14)	<i>Jackfruit</i>	-	-
<i>Cotton</i>	391(69)	81(14)	<i>Jamun</i>	-	391(69)
<i>Chilli</i>	-	345(61)	<i>Custard apple</i>	472(83)	-
<i>Tomato</i>	-	13(2)	<i>Tamarind</i>	-	391(69)
<i>Drumstick</i>	-	472(83)	<i>Mulberry</i>	-	-
<i>Mango</i>	-	-	<i>Marigold</i>	-	472(83)
<i>Guava</i>	-	-	<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	-	472(83)

- ❖ *Apart from the individual crop suitability, a proposed crop plan has been prepared for the identified LMUs by considering only the highly and moderately suitable lands for different crops and cropping systems with food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops.*
- ❖ *Maintaining soil-health is vital for crop production and conserve soil and land resource base for maintaining ecological balance and to mitigate climate change. For this, several ameliorative measures have been suggested to these problematic soils like saline/alkali, highly eroded, sandy soils etc.,*
- ❖ *Soil and water conservation treatment plan has been prepared that would help in identifying the sites to be treated and also the type of structures required.*
- ❖ *As part of the greening programme, several tree species have been suggested to be planted in marginal and submarginal lands, field bunds and also in the hillocks, mounds and ridges. This would help in not only supplementing the farm income but also provide fodder and fuel and generate lot of biomass which would help in maintaining an ecological balance and also contribute to mitigating the climate change.*

INTRODUCTION

Land is a scarce resource and basic unit for any material production. It can support the needs of the growing population, provided they use the land in a rational and judicious manner. But what is happening in many areas of the state is a cause for concern to everyone involved in the management of land resources at the grassroots level. The area available for agriculture is about 51 per cent of the total geographical area and more than 60 per cent of the people are still dependant on agriculture for their livelihood. The limited land area is under severe stress and strain due to increasing population pressure and competing demands of various land uses. Due to this, every year there is significant diversion of farm lands and water resources for non-agricultural purposes. Apart from this, due to lack of interest in farmers for farming, large tracts of cultivable lands are turning into fallows in many areas and this trend is continuing at an alarming rate.

Further, land degradation has emerged as a serious problem which has already affected about 38 lakh ha of cultivated area in the state. Soil erosion alone has degraded about 35 lakh ha. Almost all the uncultivated areas are facing various degrees of degradation, particularly soil erosion. Salinity and alkalinity has emerged as a major problem in more than 3.5 lakh ha in the irrigated areas of the state. Nutrient depletion and declining factor productivity is common in both rainfed and irrigated areas. The degradation is continuing at an alarming rate and there appears to be no systematic effort among the stakeholders to contain this process. In recent times, an aberration of weather due to climate change phenomenon has added another dimension leading to unpredictable situations to be tackled by the farmers.

In this critical juncture, the challenge before us is not only to increase the productivity per unit area which is steadily declining and showing a fatigue syndrome, but also to prevent or at least reduce the severity of degradation. If the situation is not reversed at the earliest, then the sustainability of the already fragile crop production system and the overall ecosystem will be badly affected in the state. The continued neglect and unscientific use of the resources for a long time has led to the situation observed at present in the state. It is a known fact and established beyond doubt by many studies in the past that the cause for all kinds of degradation is the neglect and irrational use of the land resources. Hence, there is an urgent need to generate a detailed site-specific farm level database on various land resources for all the villages/watersheds in a time bound manner that would help to protect the valuable soil and land resources and also to stabilize the farm production.

Therefore, the land resource inventory required for farm level planning is the one which investigates not only the surface but also consider the other parameters which are critical for productivity *viz.*, soils, climate, water, minerals and rocks, topography, geology, hydrology, vegetation, crops, land use pattern, animal population, socio-economic conditions, infrastructure, marketing facilities and various schemes and developmental works of the government etc. From the data collected at farm level, the specific problems and potentials of the area can be identified and highlighted,

conservation measures required for the area can be planned on a scientific footing, suitability of the area for various uses can be worked out and finally viable and sustainable land use options suitable for each and every land holding can be prescribed.

The Land Resource Inventory is basically done for identifying the potential and problem areas, developing sustainable land use plans, estimation of surface run off and water harvesting potential, preparation of soil and water conservation plans, land degradation/desertification etc. The Bureau is presently engaged in developing an LRI methodology using high resolution satellite remote sensing data and Digital Elevation Model (DEM) data to prepare Landscape Ecological Units (LEU) map representing agro-ecosystem as a whole. The LEU is preferred over landform as the base map for LRI. LEU is the assemblage of landform, slope and land use. An attempt has already been made to upscale the soil resource information from 1:250000 and 1:50000 scale to the LEU map in Goa and other states.

The land resource inventory aims to provide site-specific database for Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed in Yadgir Taluk & District, Karnataka State for the Karnataka Watershed Development Department. The database was generated by using cadastral map of the village as a base along with high resolution IRS LISS IV and Cartosat-1 merged satellite imagery. Later, an attempt will be made to uplink this LRI data generated at 1:7920 scale under Sujala-III Project to the proposed Landscape Ecological Units (LEUs) map.

The study was organized and executed by the ICAR- National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Regional Centre, Bangalore under Generation of Land Resource Inventory Data Base Component-1 of the Sujala-III Project funded by the World Bank.

GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

2.1 Location and Extent

The Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed is located in the northern part of Karnataka in Yadgir Taluk & District, Karnataka State (Fig.2.1). It comprises parts of Goodura, Badiyala, Gonedagi, Kondapura and Sangavara villages. It lies between $16^{\circ} 28'$ and $16^{\circ} 31'$ North latitudes and $77^{\circ} 13'$ and $77^{\circ} 15'$ East longitudes covering an area of about 566 ha. It is about 41 km south of Yadgir town and is surrounded by Sangavara on the north, kondapura on the northeast, Gonedagi and Shahpur taluk on the west, Badiyala on the east and Goodura village on the southeaster and Telangana State on the southern side.




Fig.2.1 Location map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

2.2 Geology

Major rock formations observed in the microwatershed are granite gneiss and alluvium (Fig.2.2 a and b). Granite gneisses are essentially pink to gray and are coarse to

medium grained. They consist primarily of quartz, feldspar, biotite and hornblende. The gray granite gneisses are highly weathered, fractured and fissured upto a depth of about 10 m. Dolerite dykes and quartz veins are common with variable width and found to occur in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed. The most widespread and characteristic development of alluvium in the watershed region lying between the rivers Krishna and Bhima is a wide belt, the underlying formation is gneiss and alluvial soils occur over gneiss, limestone and shale. The thickness of the alluvium generally is limited to less than a meter, except in river valleys where it is very deep extending to tens of meters. Such soils are transported and represent palaeo black soils originally formed at higher elevation, but now occupying river valleys.



Fig.2.2a Granite and granite gneiss rocks



Fig. 2.2b Alluvium

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscapes based on geology. The area has been further subdivided into five landforms, viz; mounds/ridges, summits, side slopes and very gently sloping uplands, plains and valleys based on slope and its relief features. The elevation ranges from 367-379 m above MSL. The mounds and ridges are mostly covered by rock outcrops.

2.4 Drainage

The area is drained by several parallel streams like Bori, Amerja and Kanga which finally join the river Bhima along its course. Though, they are not perennial, during rainy season they carry large quantities of rain water. The microwatershed has only few small tanks which are not capable of storing the water that flows during the rainy season. Due to this, the ground water recharge is very much affected. This is reflected in the failure of many bore wells in the villages. If the available rain water is properly harnessed by constructing new tanks and recharge structures at appropriate places in the villages, then the drinking and irrigation needs of the area can be easily met. The drainage network is parallel to sub parallel and dendritic.

2.5 Climate

The Yadgir district lies in the northern plains of Karnataka and falls under semiarid tract of the state and is categorized as drought- prone with total annual rainfall of 866 mm (Table 2.1). Of the total rainfall, maximum of 652 mm is received during the south–west monsoon period from June to September, the north-east monsoon from October to early December contributes about 138 mm and the remaining 76 mm during the rest of the year. The summer season starts during the middle of February and continues up to the first week of June. The period from December to the middle of February is the coldest season. December is the coldest month with mean daily maximum and minimum temperatures being 29.5⁰C and 10⁰C respectively. During peak summer, temperature shoots up to 45⁰C. Relative humidity varies from 26% in summer to 62% in winter. Rainfall distribution is shown in Figure 2.3. The average Potential Evapo-Transpiration (PET) is 141 mm and varies from a low of 81 mm in December to 199 mm in the month of May. The PET is always higher than precipitation in all the months except July, August and September. Generally, the Length of crop Growing Period (LGP) is 120-150 days and starts from 1st week of June to 4th week of October.

Table 2.1 Mean Monthly Rainfall, PET, 1/2 PET at Yadgir Taluk, Yadgir District

Sl. no.	Months	Rainfall	PET	1/2 PET
1	January	4.30	86.0	43.0
2	February	2.30	125.5	62.7
3	March	15.10	166.0	83.0
4	April	18.50	179.8	89.9
5	May	36.0	198.8	97.9
6	June	118.0	175.1	87.5
7	July	171.80	156.3	78.1
8	August	182.9	150.3	75.1
9	September	179.7	142.0	71.0
10	October	105.3	138.5	69.2
11	November	26.4	97.60	48.6
12	December	6.0	80.90	40.4
Total		866.3		




Fig 2.3 Rainfall distribution in Yadgir Taluk, Yadgir District

2.6 Natural Vegetation

The natural vegetation is sparse comprising few tree species, shrubs and herbs. The mounds, ridges and boulders occupy very sizeable area which is under thin to moderately thick forest vegetation. Still, there are some remnants of the past forest cover which can be seen in patches in some ridges and hillocks in the microwatershed.

Apart from the continuing deforestation, the presence of large population of goats, sheep and other cattle in the microwatershed is causing vegetative degradation of whatever little vegetation left in the area. The uncontrolled grazing has left no time for the regeneration of the vegetative cover. This leads to the accelerated rate of erosion on the hill slopes resulting in the formation of deep gullies in the foot slopes that eventually result in the heavy siltation of tanks and reservoirs in the microwatershed.

2.7 Land Utilization


About 72 per cent area (Table 2.2) in Yadgir district is cultivated at present. An area of about 2 per cent is permanently under pasture, 20 per cent under current fallows and 6 per cent under non-agricultural land, and 5 per cent under currently barren. Forests occupy an area of about 7 per cent and the tree cover is in a very poor state. Most of the mounds, ridges and bouldery areas have very poor vegetative cover. Major crops grown in the area are sorghum, maize, cotton, sunflower, groundnut, red gram, mango, pomegranate, marigold and sapota. The different crops and cropping systems adopted in the microwatershed is presented in the Figures 2.4 a & b. The cropping intensity is 120 per cent in the taluk. While carrying out land resource inventory, the land use/land cover particulars are collected from all the survey numbers and a current land use map of the microwatershed is prepared. The current land use map prepared shows the arable and non-arable lands, other land uses and different types of crops grown in the area. The current land use map of Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed is presented in Fig.2.5.

Table 2.2 Land Utilization in Yadgir District

Sl. No.	Agricultural land use	Area (ha)	Per cent
1.	Total geographical area	516088	-
2.	Total cultivated area	373617	72.4
3.	Area sown more than once	74081	14.3
4.	Cropping intensity	-	119.8
5.	Trees and grooves	737	0.14
6.	Forest	33773	6.54
7.	Cultivable wasteland	2385	0.46
8.	Permanent Pasture land	11755	2.28
9.	Barren land	27954	5.41
10.	Non- Agriculture land	29623	5.73
11.	Current Fallows	105212	20.4



Maize



Marigold



Cotton



Sorghum

Fig 2.4 .Different Crops and Cropping Systems in Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.2.5 Current Land Use map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The purpose of land resource inventory is to delineate similar areas (soil series and phases), which respond or expected to respond similarly to a given level of management. This was achieved in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed by the detailed study of all the soil characteristics (depth, texture, colour, structure, consistence, coarse fragments, porosity, soil reaction, soil horizons etc.) and site characteristics (slope of the land, erosion, drainage, occurrence of rock fragments etc.) followed by grouping of similar areas based on soil-site characteristics into homogeneous (management units) units, and showing the area extent and their geographic distribution on the microwatershed cadastral map. The detailed survey at 1:7920 scale was carried out in an area of 566 ha. The methodology followed for carrying out land resource inventory was as per the guidelines given in Soil Survey Manual (IARI, 1971; Soil Survey Staff, 2006; Natarajan *et al.*, 2015) which is briefly described below.

3.1 Base Maps

The detailed survey of the land resources occurring in the microwatershed was carried out by using digitized cadastral map and satellite imagery as base supplied by KRSAC. The cadastral map shows field boundaries with their survey numbers, location of tanks, streams and other permanent features of the area (Fig. 3.1). Apart from the cadastral map, remote sensing data products from Cartosat-1 and LISS IV merged at the scale of 1:7920 were used in conjunction with the cadastral map to identify the landscapes, landforms and other surface features. The imagery helped in the identification and delineation of boundaries between hills, uplands and lowlands, water bodies, forest and vegetated areas, roads, habitations and other cultural features of the area (Fig. 3.2). The cadastral map was overlaid on the satellite imagery (Fig. 3.3) that helps to identify the parcel boundaries and other permanent features. Apart from cadastral maps and images, toposheets of the area (1:50,000 scale) were also used for initial traversing, identification of geology and landforms, drainage features, present land use and also for selection of transects in the microwatershed.

3.2 Image Interpretation for Physiography

False Colour Composites (FCCs) of Cartosat-I and LISS-IV merged satellite data covering microwatershed area was visually interpreted using image interpretation elements and all the available collateral data with local knowledge. The delineated physiographic boundaries were transferred on to a cadastral map overlaid on satellite imagery. Physiographically, the area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscapes. It was divided into five landforms, *viz.*; ridges and mounds, gently and very gently sloping uplands and lowlands based on slope and image characteristics. They were further subdivided into physiographic/image interpretation units based on image characteristics. The image interpretation legend for physiography is given below.

Image Interpretation Legend for Physiography

G- Granite Gneiss Landscape

G1	Hills/ Ridges/ Mounds
G11	Summits
G12	Side slopes
	G121 Side slopes with dark grey tones
G2	Uplands
G21	Summits
G22	Gently sloping uplands
	G221 Gently sloping uplands, yellowish green (eroded)
	G222 Gently sloping uplands, yellowish white (severely eroded)
G23	Very gently sloping uplands
	G231 Very gently sloping uplands, yellowish green
	G232 Very gently sloping uplands, medium green and pink
	G233 Very gently sloping uplands, pink and green (scrub land)
	G234 Very gently sloping uplands, medium greenish grey
	G235 Very gently sloping uplands, yellowish white (eroded)
	G236 Very gently sloping uplands, dark green
	G237 Very gently sloping uplands, medium pink (coconut garden)
	G238 Very gently sloping uplands, pink and bluish white (eroded)
G24	Valleys/ lowlands
	G241 Valleys, pink tones
	G242 Valleys gray mixed with pink tones

DSe – Alluvial Landscape

DSe 1 – Summit

DSe 11 –

DSe 12 –

DSe 2 – Very gently sloping

DSe 21 – Very gently sloping, dark gray tone

DSe 22 – Very gently sloping, medium gray tone

DSe 23 – Very gently sloping, yellowish grey tone

DSe 24 – Very gently sloping, whitish grey tone

DSe 25 – Very gently sloping, whitish/ eroded/ calcareous tone

DSe 26 – Very gently sloping, medium pink

DSe 3 – Valley/ Lowland

DSe 31 – Whitish gray/Calcareous

DSe 32 – Gray with pink patches

DSe 33 – Medium gray tone

DSe 34 – Lightish gray tone

DSe 35 – Dark gray tone




Fig 3.1 Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.3.2 Satellite Image of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.3.3 Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

3.3 Field Investigation

The field boundaries and survey numbers given on the cadastral sheet were located on the ground by following permanent features like roads, cart tracks, *nallas*, streams, tanks etc., and wherever changes were noticed, they were incorporated on the microwatershed cadastral map. Preliminary traverse of the microwatershed was carried out with the help of cadastral map, imagery and toposheets. While traversing, landforms and physiographic units identified were checked and preliminary soil legend was prepared by studying soils at few selected places. Then, intensive traversing of each physiographic unit like hills, ridges, uplands and valleys was carried out. Based on the variability observed on the surface, transects (Fig. 3.4) were selected across the slope covering all the landform units in the microwatershed (Natarajan and Dipak Sarkar, 2010).




Fig: 3.4. Location of profiles in a transect

In the selected transect, soil profiles were located (Fig. 3.4) at closely spaced intervals to take care of any change in the land features like break in slope, erosion, gravel, stones etc. In the selected sites, soil profiles (vertical cut showing the soil layers from surface to the rock) were opened upto 200 cm or to the depth limited by rock or hard substratum and studied in detail for all their morphological and physical characteristics. The soil and site characteristics were recorded for all profile sites on a standard proforma as per the guidelines given in USDA Soil Survey Manual (Soil Survey Staff, 2012). Apart from the transect study, profiles were also studied at random, almost like in a grid pattern, outside the transect areas.

Based on the soil characteristics, the soils were grouped into different soil series. Soil series is the most homogeneous unit having similar horizons and properties and behaves similarly for a given level of management. Soil depth, texture, colour, kind of horizon and horizon sequence, calcareousness, amount and nature of gravel present, nature of substratum etc, were used as the major differentiating characteristics for identifying soil series occurring in the area. The differentiating characteristics used for identifying the soil series are given in Table 3.1. Based on the above characteristics, 6 soil series were identified in the Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed.

Table 3.1 Differentiating Characteristics used for identifying Soil Series
(Characteristics are of Series Control Section)

Soils of Granite gneiss Landscape							
Sl. no	Soil Series	Depth (cm)	Colour (moist)	Texture	Gravel (%)	Horizon sequence	Calcareousness
1	BDP (Baddepalli)	<25	7.5YR 3/2,3/4 5YR 3/4	scl	-	Ap-Ac	es
2	GWD (Gowdagera)	75-100	10YR 3/1,3/2,4/2	scl	-	Ap-Bw	es
3	NGP (Naglapur)	100-150	10YR 3/2,3/1,2/1	c	-	Ap-Bss	es
4	BMN (Bhimanahalli)	>150	10YR 3/1	c	-	Ap-Bss	es
5	TMK (Thumakur)	>150	10YR 3/1,3/2,3/3,4/3	c	-	Ap-Bw	e
Soils of Alluvial Landscape							
6	HGN (Hegganakera)	>150	10YR 4/2,4/1,3/1,4/1	c	-	Ap-BA-Bss	e

3.4 Soil Mapping

The area under each soil series was further separated into soil phases and their boundaries delineated on the cadastral map based on the variations observed in the texture of the surface soil, slope, erosion, presence of gravel, stoniness etc. A soil phase is a subdivision of soil series based mostly on surface features that affect its use and management. The soil mapping units are shown on the map (Fig.3.5) in the form of symbols. During the survey many soil profile pits, few minipits and a few auger bores representing different landforms occurring in the microwatershed were studied. In addition to the profile study, spot observations in the form of minipits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map. The soil map shows the geographic distribution of 6 mapping units representing 6 soil series occurring in the microwatershed. The soil map unit (soil legend) description is presented in Table 3.2. The soil phase map (management units) shows the distribution of 6 soil phases mapped in the microwatershed. Each mapping unit (soil phase) delineated on the map has similar soil and site characteristics. In other words, all the farms or survey numbers included in one soil phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Land Management Units (LMU's)

The 6 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were grouped into 4 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan for sustained development of the microwatershed. The database (soil phases) generated under LRI was utilized for identifying Land Management Units (LMU's) based on the management needs. One or more than one soil site characteristic having influence on the management have been chosen for identification and delineation of LMUs. For Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely soil depth, soil

texture, slope, erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LMUs. The Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

3.6 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each soil series were collected from representative master profiles for laboratory characterization by following the methods outlined in the Laboratory Manual (Sarma *et al*, 1987). Surface soil samples collected from farmer's fields (51 samples) for fertility status (major and micronutrients) at 320 m grid interval in the year 2017 were analyzed in the laboratory (Katyal and Rattan, 2003). By linking the soil fertility data to the survey numbers through GIS, soil fertility maps were generated by using Kriging method for the microwatershed.

Table 3.2 Soil map unit description of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

Soil Map unit No.	Soil Series	Soil Phase	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite Gneiss Landscape				
	BDP		Baddeppalli soils are very shallow (<25 cm), well drained, have dark brown to dark reddish brown, calcareous sandy clay loam red soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation	28 (5.03)
1		BDPiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	28 (5.03)
	GWD		Gowdagera soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have dark grayish brown to very dark grayish brown, sodic, calcareous sandy clay loam black soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation	81 (14.28)
35		GWDiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	81 (14.28)
	NGP		Nagalapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to very dark grayish brown, black, calcareous cracking clay soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation	127 (22.39)
48		NGPiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	127 (22.39)
	BMN		Bhimanahalli soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray, calcareous cracking clay black soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation	13 (2.36)
62		BMNmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	13 (2.36)
	TMK		Thumakur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have brown to very dark grayish brown, sodic, slightly calcareous cracking clay black soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping lowlands under cultivation	223 (39.47)

104		TMKiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	223 (39.47)
Alluvial Landscape				
	HGN	Hegganakera soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark gray to very dark grayish brown and brown, slightly calcareous cracking clay black soils occurring on very gently sloping plains under cultivation		28 (4.93)
95		HGNmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	28 (4.93)
1000		Others	Water body	65 (11.55)




Fig 3.5 Soil Phase or Management Units - Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and their distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscapes based on geology. In all, 6 soil series are identified. Soil formation is the result of the combined effect of environmental and terrain factors that are reflected in soil morphology. In the granite gneiss landscape, it is by parent material, relief, time and climate and in alluvial landscape it is by parent material, climate and time.

A brief description of each of the 6 soil series identified followed by 6 soil phases (management units) mapped are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed are given in Table 4.1 along with soil classification. The soils in any one map unit differ from place to place in their depth, texture, slope, gravelliness, erosion or any other site characteristic that affect management. The soil phase map can be used for identifying the suitability of areas for growing specific crops or for other alternative uses and also for deciding the type of conservation structures needed. The detailed information on soil and site-characteristics like soil depth, surface soil texture, slope, erosion, gravelliness, AWC, LCC etc, with respect to each of the soil phase identified is given village/survey number wise for the microwatershed in Appendix-I.

4.1 Soils of granite gneiss landscape

In this landscape, 5 soil series are identified and mapped. Of these, TMK series occupies a maximum area of 223 ha (39%) followed by NGP 127 ha (22%), GWD 81 (14%), BDP 28 (5%) and BMN 13 ha (2%). Brief description of each series identified and number of soil phases mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Baddeppalli (BDP) Series: Baddeppalli soils are very shallow (<25cm), well drained, have dark brown to dark reddish brown, calcareous sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Baddeppalli series has been classified as a member of the loamy, mixed (calcareous), isohyperthermic family of Lithic Ustorthents.

The thickness of the soil is less than 25 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 4. The texture is sandy clay loam and is calcareous soils. The available water capacity is very low (<50 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Baddeppalli (BDP) Series

4.1.2 Gowdagera (GWD) Series: Gowdagera soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, very dark gray to dark grayish brown, sodic, calcareous sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Gowdagera series has been classified as a member of the fine-loamy, mixed (calcareous), isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 76 to 100 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 8 to 16 cm. Its colour is in hue 10 YR with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 4. Its texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay loam. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 61 to 91 cm. Its colour is in hue 10 YR with value 2 to 4 and chroma 1 to 4. Its texture is sandy clay loam and is calcareous, sodic soils. The available water capacity is medium (101-150 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Gowdagera (GWD) Series

4.1.3 Naglapur (NGP) Series: Naglapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have black to very dark grayish brown, calcareous cracking clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Naglapur series has been classified as a member of the very fine, smectitic (calcareous), isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 110 to 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 6 to 25 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 1 to 3. The texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay and clay. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 110 to 141 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 2 to 3 and chroma 1 to 2. Texture is clay and is calcareous. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Naglapur (NGP) Series

4.1.4 Bhimanahalli (BMN) Series: Bhimanahalli soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, very dark gray, calcareous cracking clay black soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Bhimanahalli series has been classified as a member of the fine, smectitic (calcareous), isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 6 to 13 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 2 with clay texture. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 163 to 176 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 2 to 4 and chroma 1. Its texture is clay and is calcareous. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Bhimanahalli (BMN) Series

4.1.5 Thumakur (TMK) Series: Thumakur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to dark brown, sodic, slightly calcareous clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping low lands under cultivation. The Thumakur series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 150-200 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 7 to 14 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 1 to 3. Texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay and clay. The thickness of B horizon is >150 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 1 to 3. Texture varies from sandy clay to clay and is slightly calcareous, sodic soils. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Thumakur (TMK) Series

4.2 Soils of Alluvial landscape

In this landscape, only one soil series is been identified and mapped. The HGN series occupies 28 ha (5%) area of the microwatershed. Brief description of the series and number of soil phases mapped is given below.

4.2.1 Hegganakera (HGN) Series: Hegganakera soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to dark grayish brown, slightly calcareous cracking clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on very gently sloping plains under cultivation. The Hegganakera series has been classified as a member of the fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 7 to 9 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 3 with clay texture. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 152 to 175 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 2 to 4 and chroma 1 to 3. Its texture is clay and is slightly calcareous. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.



Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Hegganakera (HGN) Series

Table: 4.1 Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed

Soil Series: Baddeppalli (BDP) **Pedon:** R-11

Location: 16°43'84.4"N 77°14'06.4"E, Halagera village, Yadgir hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Loamy, mixed (calcareous), isohyperthermic Lithic Ustorthents

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand							1/3 Bar	15 Bar
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)				
0-16	Ap	58.67	17.02	24.31	19.03	13.74	9.62	10.57	5.71	<15	scl	16.19	8.18

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	CaCO ₃	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/Clay	Base saturation	ESP
	Water	CaCl ₂	M KCl				Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
				dS m ⁻¹	%	%	cmol kg ⁻¹					%	%		
0-16	8.58	-	-	0.262	1.60	7.67	-	-	0.24	0.06	-	18.10	0.74	100	0.35

Contd...

Soil Series: Naglapur (NGP) **Pedon:** R-8

Location: 16°52'84.1"N 77°22'99.4"E, Gurumitkal village, Gurumitkal hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Very fine, smectitic (calcareous), isohyperthermic Typic Haplusterts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand							1/3 Bar	15 Bar
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)				
0-10	Ap	7.53	19.88	72.59	1.00	0.78	0.89	2.10	2.77	-	c	44.31	32.79
10-35	Bss1	6.55	18.76	74.68	0.80	0.92	0.80	1.72	2.30	-	c	43.09	31.62
35-60	Bss2	6.58	21.05	72.37	0.69	0.46	1.04	1.50	2.89	-	c	46.52	32.52
60-102	Bss3	7.48	19.74	72.78	1.61	1.38	0.69	1.61	2.19	-	c	51.12	35.62

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5) dS m ⁻¹	O.C. %	CaCO ₃ %	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/Clay	Base saturation %	ESP %
	Water	CaCl ₂	M KCl				Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
							cmol kg ⁻¹								
0-10	7.42	-	-	0.24	0.84	1.30	-	-	0.84	0.15	-	67.10	0.92	100	0.22
10-35	8.52	-	-	0.291	0.64	2.86	-	-	0.17	0.29	-	65.20	0.87	100	0.45
35-60	7.89	-	-	0.134	0.62	4.55	-	-	0.15	0.20	-	65.00	0.90	100	0.30
60-102	8.68	-	-	0.213	0.54	8.32	-	-	0.17	0.15	-	64.10	0.88	100	0.24

Contd...

Soil Series: Bhimanahalli (BMN) **Pedon:** R-3

Location: 16°31'82.4"N 77°12'70.8"E, Bheemanahalli village, Sydhapura hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine, smectitic (calcareous), isohyperthermic Typic Haplusterts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand							1/3 Bar	15 Bar
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)				
0-8	Ap	20.34	19.94	59.72	2.68	5.03	3.75	5.25	3.64	-	c	50.19	33.49
8-40	Bss1	19.61	22.76	57.62	1.94	2.59	5.28	4.96	4.85	-	c	43.22	29.05
40-70	Bss2	21.25	17.65	61.10	3.02	5.26	3.91	5.48	3.58	-	c	44.30	30.25
70-120	Bss3	19.08	22.29	58.63	1.75	5.04	3.84	5.15	3.29	-	c	43.26	30.31
120-170	Bss4	11.11	20.44	68.45	2.04	1.93	1.70	2.83	2.61	-	c	51.33	33.51

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5) dS m ⁻¹	O.C. %	CaCO ₃ %	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/Clay	Base saturation %	ESP %
	Water	CaCl ₂	M KCl				Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
0-8	8.2	-	-	0.284	0.72	4.94	-	-	1.20	0.34	-	52.70	0.88	100	0.65
8-40	8.44	-	-	0.139	0.40	7.28	-	-	0.30	0.48	-	52.06	0.90	100	0.93
40-70	8.32	-	-	0.202	0.40	6.37	-	-	0.18	0.40	-	52.52	0.86	100	0.77
70-120	9.3	-	-	0.282	0.36	6.89	-	-	0.27	0.38	-	50.97	0.87	100	0.75
120-170	8.47	-	-	0.305	0.37	8.19	-	-	0.28	0.91	-	58.19	0.85	100	1.57

Contd...

Soil Series: Thumakuru (TMK) **Pedon:** R-10

Location: 16°38'01.3"N 77°16'49.8"E, Kilankera village, Balichakra hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustepts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand							1/3 Bar	15 Bar
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coars (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)				
0-12	Ap	62.92	15.76	21.32	5.56	9.37	21.83	18.33	7.83	-	scl	17.98	6.60
12-29	Bw1	45.91	18.53	35.56	6.08	8.18	15.41	11.43	4.82	-	sc	33.40	11.79
29-74	Bw2	48.47	16.24	35.29	5.93	9.84	16.40	11.75	4.55	-	sc	28.66	11.19
74-132	Bw3	38.25	20.59	41.16	3.21	8.23	14.64	8.97	3.21	-	c	38.85	14.72
132-158	Bw4	36.87	19.99	43.14	3.54	7.61	13.08	8.57	4.07	-	c	44.36	15.75

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	CaCO ₃	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/Clay	Base saturation	ESP
	Water	CaCl ₂	M KCl				Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
				dS m ⁻¹	%	%	cmol kg ⁻¹							%	%
0-12	9.60	-	-	0.35	0.48	1.44	-	-	0.23	3.62	-	21.83	1.02	100	16.57
12-29	9.72	-	-	1.27	0.50	1.44	-	-	0.59	20.88	-	30.50	0.86	100	68.48
29-74	9.16	-	-	3.44	0.31	3.72	-	-	0.38	25.84	-	28.68	0.81	100	90.10
74-132	9.33	-	-	2.52	0.23	4.92	-	-	0.82	20.25	-	34.99	0.85	100	57.87
132-158	9.23	-	-	2.07	0.31	3.48	-	-	0.70	21.03	-	34.24	0.79	100	61.41

Contd...

Soil Series: Hegganakera (HGN) **Pedon:** R-12

Location: 16°46'19.9"N 77°04'34.0"E, Thumakura village, Yadgir hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic Typic Haplusterts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand							1/3 Bar	15 Bar
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)				
0-8	Ap	20.20	25.22	54.58	2.32	2.76	3.53	8.17	3.42	-	c	42.47	25.59
8-24	BA	21.18	21.70	57.12	2.07	3.28	4.69	7.31	3.82	-	c	41.88	24.67
24-50	Bss1	18.76	21.67	59.57	1.20	2.51	3.93	7.09	4.03	-	c	40.46	23.34
50-86	Bss2	16.74	22.24	61.02	0.88	1.53	4.27	6.02	4.05	-	c	42.18	24.76
86-146	Bss3	18.64	20.20	61.16	2.30	2.41	3.73	6.36	3.84	-	c	40.03	28.61
146-170	Bss4	16.08	19.33	64.59	0.88	2.75	3.41	5.95	3.08	-	c	40.28	29.90

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	CaCO ₃	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/Clay	Base saturation	ESP
	Water	CaCl ₂	M KCl				Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
				dS m ⁻¹	%	%	cmol kg ⁻¹						%	%	
0-8	8.77	-	-	1.33	1.16	8.19	-	-	1.10	5.21	-	36.23	0.66	100	14.38
8-24	8.93	-	-	1.11	0.64	5.46	-	-	0.87	4.23	-	35.50	0.62	100	11.93
24-50	8.85	-	-	0.984	0.32	3.38	-	-	0.71	3.78	-	36.69	0.62	100	10.30
50-86	8.54	-	-	0.562	0.24	3.38	-	-	0.58	3.07	-	39.16	0.64	100	7.84
86-146	8.45	-	-	0.526	0.24	3.38	-	-	0.62	2.82	-	38.52	0.63	100	7.31
146-170	8.64	-	-	0.517	0.20	4.29	-	-	0.60	2.99	-	36.87	0.57	100	8.12

INTERPRETATION FOR LAND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The most important soil and site characteristics that affect the land use and conservation needs of an area are land capability, land irrigability, soil depth, soil texture, coarse fragments, available water capacity, soil slope, soil erosion, soil reaction etc. These are interpreted from the data base generated through land resource inventory and several thematic maps are generated. These would help in identifying the areas suitable for growing crops and, soil and water conservation measures and structures needed thus helping to maintain good soil health for sustained crop production. The various interpretative and thematic maps generated are described below.

5.1 Land Capability Classification

Land capability classification is an interpretative grouping of soil map units (soil phases) mainly based on inherent soil characteristics, external land features and environmental factors that limit the use of land for agriculture, pasture, forestry, or other uses on a sustained basis (IARI, 1971). The land and soil characteristics used to group the land resources in an area into various land capability classes, subclasses and units are

Soil Characteristics: Depth, texture, gravelliness, calcareousness.

Land characteristics: Slope, erosion, drainage, rock outcrops.

Climate: Total rainfall and its distribution, and length of crop growing period.

The land capability classification system is divided into land capability classes, subclasses and units based on the level of information available. Eight land capability classes are recognized. They are

Class I: They are very good lands that have no limitations or very few limitations that restrict their use.

Class II: They are good lands that have minor limitations and require moderate conservation practices.

Class III: They are moderately good lands that have moderate limitations that reduce the choice of crops or that require special conservation practices.

Class IV: They are fairly good lands that have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of crops or that require very careful management.

Class V: Soils in these lands are not likely to erode, but have other limitations like wetness that are impractical to remove and as such not suitable for agriculture, but suitable for pasture or forestry with minor limitations.

Class VI: The lands have severe limitations that make them generally unsuitable for cultivation, but suitable for pasture or forestry with moderate limitations.

Class VII: The lands have very severe limitations that make them unsuitable for cultivation, but suitable for pasture or forestry with major limitations.

Class VIII: Soil and other miscellaneous areas (rock lands) that have very severe limitations that nearly preclude their use for any crop production, but suitable for wildlife, recreation and installation of wind mills.

The land capability subclasses are recognised based on the dominant limitations observed within a given land capability class. The subclasses are designated by adding a lower case letter like 'e', 'w', 's', or 'c' to the class numeral. The subclass "e" indicates that the main hazard is risk of erosion, "w" indicates drainage or wetness as a limitation for plant growth, "s" indicates shallow soil depth, coarse or heavy textures, calcareousness, salinity/alkalinity or gravelliness and "c" indicates limitation due to climate.

The land capability subclasses have been further subdivided into land capability units based on the kinds of limitations present in each subclass. Ten land capability units are used in grouping the soil map units. They are stony or rocky (0), erosion hazard (slope, erosion) (1), coarse texture (sand, loamy sand, sandy loam) (2), fine texture (cracking clay, silty clay) (3), slowly permeable subsoil (4), coarse underlying material (5), salinity/alkali (6), stagnation, overflow, high ground water table (7), soil depth (8) and fertility problems (9). The capability units thus identified have similar soil and land characteristics that respond similarly to a given level of management. The soils of the microwatershed have been classified upto land capability subclass level.

The 6 soil map units identified in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed are grouped under 2 land capability classes and 3 land capability subclasses. An area of 500 ha (83%) in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture and about 65 ha (12%) is covered by others (water body) (Fig. 5.1).

Good cultivable lands (Class II) cover 472 ha (83%) area of the microwatershed with minor problems of soil, drainage/wetness and erosion. About 28 ha (5%) area is fairly good cultivable lands (Class IV) and is distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with soil as the major limitation.




Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.2 Soil Depth

Soil depth refers to the depth of the soil occurring above the parent material or hard rock. The depth of the soil determines the effective rooting depth for plants and in accordance with soil texture, mineralogy and gravel content, the capacity of the soil column to hold water and nutrient availability. Soil depth is one of the most important soil characteristic that is used in differentiating soils into different soil series. The soil depth classes used in identifying soils in the field are very shallow (<25 cm), shallow (25-50 cm), moderately shallow (50-75 cm), moderately deep (75-100 cm), deep (100-150 cm) and very deep (>150 cm). They were used to classify the soils into different depth classes and a soil depth map was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution in the microwatershed is given in Fig. 5.2.

Very deep (>150 cm) soils cover a maximum area of 264 ha (47%) of the microwatershed and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Deep soils (100-150 cm) occur in an area of 127 ha (22%) and are distributed in the central, eastern and northeastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately deep (75-100 cm) soils occur in 81 ha (14%) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Very shallow soils (<25 cm) occupy 28 ha (9.5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed.

The most productive lands with respect to soil rooting depth are deep to very deep soils that occur in 391 ha (69%) area where all climatically adapted annual and perennial crops can be grown. The problem lands with respect to soil depth are very shallow (<25

cm) soils covering about 28 ha (5%) where only short duration crops can be grown. The probability of crop failure is very high. They may be used for alternative uses.




Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.3 Surface Soil Texture

Texture is an expression to indicate the coarseness or fineness of the soil as determined by the relative proportion of primary particles of sand, silt and clay. It has a direct bearing on the structure, porosity, adhesion and consistence. The surface layer of a soil to a depth of about 25 cm is the layer that is most used by crops and plants. The surface soil textural class provides a guide to understanding soil-water retention and availability, nutrient holding capacity, infiltration, workability, drainage, physical and chemical behaviour, microbial activity and crop suitability. The textural classes used for LRI were used to classify and a generalized surface soil texture (Sandy, Loamy, and Clayey) map was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution in the microwatershed is shown in Figure 5.3.

Entire area of 500 ha (88%) of the microwatershed has soils that are clayey at the surface. These soils have high potential for soil-water retention and availability, and nutrient retention and availability, but have more problems of drainage, infiltration, workability and other physical problems.




Fig. 5.3 Surface Soil Texture map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.4 Soil Gravelliness

Gravel is the term used for describing coarse fragments between 2 mm and 7.5 cm diameter and stones for those between 7.5 cm and 25 cm. The presence of gravel and stones in soil reduces the volume of soil responsible for moisture and nutrient storage, drainage, infiltration and runoff, and hinders plant growth by impeding root growth and seedling emergence, intercultural operations and farm mechanization. The gravelliness classes used in LRI were used to classify the soils and using these classes a gravelliness map was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution in the microwatershed is shown in Figure 5.4.

Non gravelly (<15%) soils cover entire 500 ha (88%) area of the microwatershed. These are the most productive soils, where all climatically adapted short and long duration crops can be grown.




Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.5 Available Water Capacity

The soil available water capacity (AWC) is estimated based on the ability of the soil column to retain water between the tensions of 0.33 and 15 bar in a depth of 100 cm or the entire solum if the soil is shallower. The AWC of the soils (soil series) as estimated by considering the soil texture, mineralogy, soil depth and gravel content (Sehgal *et al.*, 1990) and accordingly the soil map units were grouped into five AWC classes *viz*, very low (<50 mm/m), low (50-100 mm/m), medium (100-150 mm/m), high (150-200 mm/m) and very high (>200 mm/m) and using these values, an AWC map was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different AWC classes in the microwatershed is given in Figure 5.5.

Maximum area of 391 ha (69%) in the microwatershed is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. These areas are highly potential with regard to AWC where all climatically adapted annual and perennial crops can be grown. About 81 ha (14%) area is medium (101-150 mm/m) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Small area of 28 (5%) is very low (<50 mm/m) and is distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. In these areas only short duration and drought tolerant crops can be grown.




Fig. 5.5 Soil Available Water Capacity map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.6 Soil Slope

Soil slope refers to the inclination of the surface of the land. It is defined by gradient, shape and length, and is an integral feature of any soil as a natural body. Slope is considered important in soil genesis, land use and land development. The length and gradient of slope influences the rate of runoff, infiltration, erosion and deposition. The soil map units were grouped into single slope class and a slope map was generated showing the area extent and their geographic distribution in the microwatershed (Fig. 5.6).

Entire area of the microwatershed falls under very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands and have high potential in respect of soil slopes. In these areas, all climatically adapted annual and perennial crops can be grown without much soil and water conservation and other land development measures.




Fig. 5.6 Soil Slope map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

5.7 Soil Erosion

Soil erosion refers to the wearing away of the earth's surface by the forces of water, wind and ice involving detachment and transport of soil by raindrop impact. It is used for accelerated soil erosion resulting from disturbance of the natural landscape by burning, excessive grazing and indiscriminate felling of forest trees and tillage, all usually by man. The erosion classes showing an estimate of the current erosion status as judged from field observations in the form of rills, gullies or a carpet of gravel on the surface are recorded. Four erosion classes, viz, slight erosion (e1), moderate erosion (e2), severe erosion (e3) and very severe erosion (e4) are recognized. The soil map units were grouped into different erosion classes and a soil erosion map generated. The area extent and their spatial distribution in the microwatershed is given in Figure 5.7.

Soils that are moderately eroded (e2 class) cover an entire area of 500 ha (88%). Thus, the entire area in the microwatershed is problematic due to moderate erosion. For these areas, taking up of soil and water conservation and other land development measures are needed.




Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

FERTILITY STATUS

Soil fertility plays an important role in increasing crop yield. The adoption of high yielding varieties that require high amounts of nutrients has resulted in deficiency symptoms in crops and plants due to imbalanced fertilization and poor inherent fertility status as these areas are characterised by low rainfall and high temperatures. Hence, it is necessary to know the fertility (macro and micro nutrients) status of the soils of the watersheds for assessing the kind and amount of fertilizers required for each of the crop intended to be grown. For this purpose, the surface soil samples collected from the grid points (one soil sample at every 320 m interval) all over the microwatershed through land resource inventory in the year 2017 were analysed for pH, EC, organic carbon, available phosphorus and potassium, and for micronutrients like zinc, boron, copper, iron and manganese, and secondary nutrient sulphur.

Soil fertility data generated has been assessed and individual maps for all the nutrients for the microwatershed have been generated using Kriging method under GIS. The village/survey number wise fertility data for the microwatershed is given in Appendix-II.

6.1 Soil Reaction (pH)

The soil analysis of the Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that a very small area of 4 ha (1%) is moderately acid (pH 5.5-6.5) and is distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed, 5 ha (1%) is slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) and is distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed. About 52 ha (9%) area is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3) and is distributed in the central and northwestern part of the microwatershed, 97 ha (17%) is slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed, Maximum area of about 224 ha (40%) is moderately alkaline (pH 7.8-8.4) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of 121 ha (21%) is strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) and are distributed in the southeastern and southern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.1). Thus, majority of soils in the microwatershed are alkaline in soil reaction.

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

The Electrical Conductivity of 467 ha (83%) soils in the microwatershed is <2 dSm^{-1} (Fig 6.2) and as such the soils are non-saline and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. About 12 ha (2%) is low ($2-4$ dSm^{-1}) and is distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed and an area of 21 ha (4%) is medium ($4-8$ dSm^{-1}) and is distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed.

6.3 Organic Carbon

The soil organic carbon content (an index of available Nitrogen) in the soils of the microwatershed is high (>0.75) in maximum area of about 331 ha (59%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed and medium ($0.5-0.75$) covering an

area of about 125 ha (22%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Low (<0.5%) in 45 ha (8%) and is distributed in the northern, northeastern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.3).




Fig.6.1 Soil Reaction (pH) map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.3 Soil Organic Carbon map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

6.4 Available Phosphorus

Available phosphorus content is low (<23 kg/ha) in an area of 45 ha (8%) and are distributed in the northern, northeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Medium (23-57 kg/ha) in an area of about 168 ha (30%) and occur in all parts of the microwatershed and high (>57 kg/ha) in a maximum area of about 287 ha (51%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.4).

6.5 Available Potassium

Available potassium content is high (>337 kg/ha) in an entire cultivated area of about 500 ha (88%) of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.5).

6.6 Available Sulphur

Small area of about 32 ha (6%) is low (<10 ppm) in available sulphur and is distributed in the northern and eastern part of the microwatershed. (Fig. 6.6). 60 ha (11%) is medium (10-20 ppm) and is distributed in the northern and northeastern part of the microwatershed and high in a maximum area of 408 ha (72%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed.

6.7 Available Boron

Available boron content is medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in an area of 179 ha (362%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 292 ha (52%) is low (<0.5 ppm) in available boron and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. High in (>1.0 ppm) a small area of 31 ha (5%) and are distributed in the northeastern, northwestern, central and eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in a maximum area of 398 ha (70%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed and deficient (<4.5 ppm) in an area of 103 ha (18%) and are distributed in the eastern, central and northeastern part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.8).

6.9 Available Manganese

Available manganese content is sufficient (>1.0 ppm) in the entire microwatershed area (Fig 6.9).

6.10 Available Copper

Available copper content is sufficient (>0.2 ppm) in the entire microwatershed area (Fig 6.10).




Fig.6.4 Soil Available Phosphorus map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.5 Soil Available Potassium map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.6 Soil Available Sulphur map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.7 Soil Available Boron map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.8 Soil Available Iron map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.9 Soil Available Manganese map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed




Fig.6.10 Soil Available Copper map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of 175 ha (31%) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 325 ha (57%) is sufficient (>0.6 ppm) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.11).




Fig.6.11 Soil Available Zinc map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed were assessed for their suitability for growing food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops by following the procedure as outlined in FAO, 1976 and 1983. Crop requirements were developed for each of the crop from the available research data and also by referring to Naidu *et. al.* (2006) and Natarajan *et. al* (2015). The crop requirements were matched with the soil and land characteristics (Table 7.1) to arrive at the crop suitability. In FAO land suitability classification, two orders are recognized. Order S-Suitable and Order N- Not suitable. The orders have classes, subclasses and units. Order-S has three classes, Class S1-Highly Suitable, Class S2-Moderately Suitable and Class S3- Marginally Suitable. Order N has two classes, N1-Currently not Suitable and N2- Permanently not Suitable. There are no subclasses within the Class S1 as they will have very minor or no limitations for crop growth. Classes S2, S3, N1 and N2 are divided into subclasses based on the kinds of limitations encountered. The limitations that affect crop production are ‘c’ for erratic rainfall and its distribution and length of growing period (LGP), ‘e’ for erosion hazard, ‘r’ for rooting condition, ‘t’ for lighter or heavy texture, ‘g’ for gravelliness or stoniness, ‘n’ for nutrient availability, ‘l’ for topography, ‘m’ for moisture availability, ‘w’ for drainage, ‘s’ for sodium and ‘z’ for calcareousness. These limitations are indicated as lower case letters to the Class symbol. For example, moderately suitable lands with the limitations of soil depth and erosion are designated as S2re. For the microwatershed, the soil mapping units were evaluated and classified up to subclass level.

Using the above criteria, the soil map units of the microwatershed were evaluated and land suitability maps for 26 major agricultural and horticultural crops were generated. The detailed information on the kind of suitability of each of the soil phase for the crops assessed are given village/ survey number wise for the microwatershed in Appendix-III.

7.1 Land Suitability for Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*)

Sorghum is one of the major crop grown in Karnataka in an area of 10.47 lakh ha in Bijapur, Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar, Belgaum, Dharwad, Bellary, Chitradurga, Mysore and Tumakuru districts. The crop requirements for growing sorghum (Table 7.2) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing sorghum was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.1.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sorghum occur in a maximum area of 264 ha (47%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. About 208 ha (37%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for sorghum and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with minor imitations of drainage and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed.

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drainage Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m)	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC (dSm ⁻¹)	ESP (%)	CEC [Cmol (p ⁺)kg ⁻¹]	BS (%)
					Surface	Sub-surface	Surface (%)	Sub-surface (%)								
BDPiB2	866	150	WD	<25	sc	scl	-	-	<50	1-3	moderate	8.58	0.26	0.35	18.10	100
GWDiB2	866	150	MWD	75-100	sc	scl	-	-	101-150	1-3	moderate	9.89	0.74	43.51	8.35	100
NGPiB2	866	150	MWD	100-150	sc	c	-	-	>200	1-3	moderate	7.42	0.24	0.22	67.10	100
BMNmB2	866	150	MWD	>150	c	c	-	-	>200	1-3	moderate	8.20	0.28	0.65	52.70	100
TMKiB2	866	150	MWD	>150	sc	c	-	-	>200	1-3	moderate	9.60	0.35	16.57	21.83	100
HGNmB2	866	150	MWD	>150	c	c	-	-	>200	1-3	moderate	8.77	1.33	14.38	36.23	100

*Symbols and abbreviations are according to Field Guide for LRI under Sujala-III Project, Karnataka

Table 7.2 Crop suitability criteria for Sorghum

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	2-3	3-8	8-15	>15
LGP	Days	120-150	120-90	<90	
Soil drainage	Class	Well to mod. Well drained	imperfect	Poorly/ excessively	V. poorly
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-8.0	5.5-5.9,8.1-8.5	<5.5,8.6-9.0	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	c, cl, sicl, sc	l, sil, sic	sl, ls	s, fragmental skeletal
Soil depth	cm	100-75	50-75	30-50	<30
Gravel content	% vol.	5-15	15-30	30-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dSm ⁻¹	2-4	4-8	8-10	>10
Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-8	8-10	10-15	>15




Fig. 7.1 Land Suitability map of Sorghum

7.2 Land Suitability for Maize (*Zea mays*)

Maize is one of the most important food crop grown in an area of 13.37 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing maize (Table 7.3) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing maize was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.2.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing maize in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in maximum area of 472 ha (83%) of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and

drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.3 Crop suitability criteria for Maize

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil-site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	<3	3.5	5-8	
LGP	Days	>100	100-80	60-80	
Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. to imperfectly	Poorly/ excessively	V. poorly
Soil reaction	pH	5.5-7.5	7.6-8.5	8.6-9.0	
Surface soil texture	Class	l, cl, scl, sil	sl, siel, sic	c(s-s), ls	s,fragmental
Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-50	>50
Salinity (EC)	dSm ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	2.0-4.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	




Fig. 7.2 Land Suitability map of Maize

7.3 Land Suitability for Bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum*)

Bajra is one of the most important millet crop grown in an area of 2.34 lakh ha in the northern districts of Karnataka state. The crop requirements for growing bajra (Table 7.4) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing bajra was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.3.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing bajra in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing bajra and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have

minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable lands (ClassN1) occupy an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed.

Table 7.4 Crop suitability criteria for Bajra

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	2-3	3-8	8-15	>15
LGP	Days	120-150	120-90	<90	
Soil drainage	Class	Well to mod. Well drained	imperfect	Poorly/ excessively	V. poorly
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-8.0	5.5-5.9,8.1-8.5	<5.5,8.6-9.0	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	c, cl, sicl, sc	l, sil, sic	sl, ls	s,fragmental skeletal
Soil depth	cm	100-75	50-75	30-50	<30
Gravel content	% vol.	5-15	15-30	30-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dSm ⁻¹	2-4	4-8	8-10	>10
Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-8	8-10	10-15	>15




Fig. 7.3 Land Suitability map of Bajra

7.4 Land Suitability for Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*)

Groundnut is one of the major oilseed crop grown in an area of 6.54 lakh ha in Karnataka in most of the districts either as rainfed or irrigated crop. The crop requirements for growing groundnut (Table 7.5) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map

for growing groundnut was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.4.

Table 7.5 Crop suitability criteria for Groundnut

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil-site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	100-125	90-105	75-90	
Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. Well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-8.0	8.1-8.5,5.5-5.9	>8.5,<5.5	
Surface soil texture	Class	l, cl, sil, sc, sicl	sc, sic, c,	s, ls, sl c (>60%)	s,fragmental
Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	<35	35-50	>50	
CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	high	Medium	low	
Salinity (EC)	dSm ⁻¹	<2.0	2.0-4.0	4.0-8.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	>10	




Fig. 7.4 Land Suitability map of Groundnut

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for groundnut cultivation in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing groundnut occupy a maximum area of 472 ha (83%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of

texture, drainage and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.5 Land Suitability for Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*)

Sunflower is one of the most important oilseed crop grown in an area of 4.1 lakh ha in the State in all the districts. The crop requirements for growing sunflower (Table 7.6) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sunflower was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.5.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sunflower occupy an area of 41 ha (7%) and is distributed in the northeastern, northwestern, central and eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 431 ha (76%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for sunflower and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.6 Crop suitability criteria for Sunflower

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil-site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	>90	80-90	70-80	<70
Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well rained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.5-8.0	8.1-8.5 5.5-6.4	8.6-9.0; 4.5-5.4	>9.0<4.5
Surface soil texture	Class	l, cl, sil, sc	scl, sic, c,	c (>60%), sl	ls, s
Soil depth	Cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dS m ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	




Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

7.6 Land suitability criteria for Red gram (*Cajanus Cajan*)

Redgram is one of the most important pulse crop grown in an area of 7.28 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing red gram (Table 7.7) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing redgram was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.6.

Table 7.7 Land suitability criteria for Red gram

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	>210	180-210	150-180	<150
Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.5-7.5	5.0-6.5,7.6-8.0	8.0-9.0	>9.0
Sub Surface soil texture	Class	l, scl, sil, cl, sl	sicl, sic, c(m)	ls	
Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	3-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	ds m ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	




Fig. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Redgram

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands are available for growing redgram in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing redgram and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in 28 ha (5%) area and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.7 Land Suitability for Bengal gram (*Cicer arietinum*)

Bengal gram is one of the most important pulse crop grown in about 9.39 lakh ha area in Bijapur, Raichur, Kalaburgi, Dharwad, Belgaum and Bellary districts. The crop requirements for growing Bengal gram (Table 7.8) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing Bengal gram was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.7.

Highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing Bengal gram occupy a maximum area of 391 ha (69%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of 81 ha (14%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.8 Crop suitability criteria for Bengal gram

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	>100	90-100	70-90	<70
Soil drainage	class	Well drained	Mod. to well drained; imperfectly drained	Poorly drained; excessively drained	Very Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-7.5	5.5-5.7, 7.6-8.0	8.1-9.0;4.5-5.4	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	l, scl, sil, cl,	sicl, sic, c	sl, c>60%	
Soil depth	Cm	>75	51-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	>35	
Salinity (ECe)	dsm ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	




Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Bengal gram

7.8 Land Suitability for Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*)

Cotton is one of the most important fibre crop grown in the State in about 8.75 lakh ha area in Raichur, Dharwad, Belgaum, Kalaburgi, Bijapur, Bidar, Bellary, Chitradurga and Chamarajnarag districts. The crop requirements for growing cotton (Table 7.9) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing cotton was generated. The area extent and their geographical

distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.8.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing cotton crop occur in a maximum area of 391 ha (69%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in 81 ha (14%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed.

Table 7.9 Crop suitability criteria for Cotton

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil-site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Slope	%	1-2	2-3	3-5	>5
LGP	Days	180-240	120-180	<120	
Soil drainage	class	Well to mod. well	imperfectly drained	Poor somewhat excessive	Stagnant/ excessive
Soil reaction	pH	6.5-7.5	7.6-8.0	8.1-9.0	>9.0 >6.5
Surface soil texture	Class	sic, c	sicl, cl	si, sil, sc, scl, l	sl, s,ls
Soil depth	Cm	100-150	60-100	30-60	<30
Gravel content	% vol.	<5	5-10	10-15	15-35
CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	<3	3-5	5-10	10-20
Salinity (EC)	dSm ⁻¹	2-4	4.0-8.0	8.0-12	>12
Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-20	20-30	>30




Fig. 7.8 Land Suitability map of Cotton

7.9 Land Suitability for Chilli (*Capsicum annum*)

Chilli is one of the most important fruit and spice crop grown in about 0.42 lakh ha in Karnataka State. The crop requirements for growing chilli (Table 7.10) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing chilli was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.9.

Table 7.10 Crop suitability criteria for Chilli

Crop requirement		Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable(N)
Mean temperature in growing season	°C	20-30	30-35, 13-15	35-40, 10-12	>40,<10
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	>150	120-150	90-120	<90
Soil drainage	class	Well drained	Moderately drained	Imp./ poor drained/ excessively	Very poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.5-7.8,6.0-7.0	7.8-8.4	8.4-9.0,5.0-5.9	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	scl, cl, sil	sl, sc, sic,c(m/k)	c(ss), ls, s	
Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Salinity (ECe)	dsm ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	2.0-4.0	<4
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	




Fig 7.9 Land Suitability map of Chilli

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing chilli crop in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 345 ha (61%) in the microwatershed is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing chilli crop. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. About 127 ha (22%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for chilli and is distributed in the northeastern, eastern and southeastern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.10 Land Suitability for Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)

Tomato is one of the most important fruit crop grown in about 0.61 lakh ha covering almost all the district of the state. The crop requirements for growing tomato (Table 7.11) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tomato was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.10.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing tomato in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in a small area of 13 ha (2%) and are distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture and drainage. Maximum area of about 459 ha (81%) is marginally suitable for tomato (Class S3) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of drainage, calcareousness and texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. They have severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.11 Crop suitability criteria for Tomato

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season	°C	25-28	29-32 , 20-24	15-19 33-36	<15, >36
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	>150	120-150	90-120	
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V. poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	1, sl, cl, scl	sic,sicl,sc,c(m/k)	c (ss), ls	s
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.5-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Slightly calcareous	Strongly calcareous	
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Gravel content	%vol.	<15	15-35	>35	
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	slight	strongly	
	Sodicity(ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	-
Erosion	Slope	%	1-3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig 7.10 Land Suitability map of Tomato

7.11 Land Suitability for Drumstick (*Moringa oleifera*)

Drumstick is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in about 2403 ha in the state. The crop requirements for growing drumstick (Table 7.12) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing drumstick was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.11.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing drumstick in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for drumstick in the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.12 Crop suitability criteria for Drumstick

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc,scl,cl,c(red)	sl, c (black)	ls	s
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-6.5	5-5.5, 6.5-7.3	7.8-8.4	>8.4
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	Cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	0-35	35-60	60-80	>80
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-10	-	>10




Fig 7.11 Land Suitability map of Drumstick

7.12 Land suitability for Mango (*Mangifera indica*)

Mango is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 1.73 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.13) for growing mango were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mango was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.12.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing mango in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 472 ha (83%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing mango with moderate limitations of drainage, calcareousness, rooting depth and texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.13 Crop suitability criteria for Mango

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil-site characteristics	Unit		Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temp. in growing season	°C	28-32	24-27 33-35	36-40	20-24
	Min. temp. before flowering	°C	10-15	15-22	>22	
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	>180	150-180	120-150	<120
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. To imperfectly drained	Poor drained	Very poorly drained
	Water table	M	>3	2.50-3.0	2.5-1.5	<1.5
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, l, sil, cl	sl, sc, sic, l, c	c (<60%)	c (>60%),
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.5	7.6-8.5,5.0-5.4	8.6-9.0,4.0-4.9	>9.0,<4.0
	OC	%	High	medium	low	
	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	<5	5-10	>10
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>200	125-200	75-125	<75
	Gravel content	% vol	Non-gravelly	<15	15-35	>35
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	<2.0	2.0-3.0	>3.0
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	<10	10-15	>15
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	




Fig. 7.12 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.13 Land suitability for Guava (*Psidium guajava*)

Guava is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 6558 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.14) for growing guava were matched with the soil-site characteristics (7.1) and a land suitability map for growing guava was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.13.

Table 7.14 Crop suitability criteria for Guava

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	33-36 24-27	37-42 20-23	
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	>150	120-150	90-120	<90
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. to imperfectly	poor	Very poor
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, l, cl, sil	sl,sicl,sic.,sc,c	c (<60%)	c (>60%)
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.5	7.6-8.0:5.0-5.9	8.1-8.5:4.5-4.9	>8.5:<4.5
	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	<10	10-15	>15
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	Cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	>35	
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	<2.0	2.0-4.0	4.0-6.0	
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	10-15	15-25	>25
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig. 7.13 Land Suitability map of Guava

No highly (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing guava in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum 472 ha (83%) area and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.14 Land suitability for Sapota (*Manilkara zapota*)

Sapota is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 29373 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.15) for growing sapota were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sapota was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.14.

No highly (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing sapota in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sapota and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.15 Crop suitability criteria for Sapota

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season	^o C	28-32	33-36 24-27	37-42 20-23	>42 <18
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	>150	120-150	90-120	<120
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, l, cl, sil	sl, sicl, sc	c (<60%)	ls, s, c (>60%)
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.5	7.6-8.0,5.0-5.9	8.1-9.0,4.5-4.9	>9.0,<4.5
	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	<10	10-15	>15
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	75-150	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	Non gravelly	<15	15-35	<35
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	Up to 1.0	1.0-2.0	2.0-4.0
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	10-15	15-25	>25
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig. 7.14 Land Suitability map of Sapota

7.15 Land Suitability for Pomegranate (*Punica granatum*)

Pomegranate is one of the most important fruit crop commercially grown in about 18488 ha in Karnataka, mainly in Bijapur, Bagalkot, Koppal, Gadag and Chitradurga districts. The crop requirements for growing pomegranate (Table 7.16) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing pomegranate was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.15.

No highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing pomegranate in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing pomegranate and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.16 Crop suitability criteria for Pomegranate

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season		30-34	35-38,25-29	39-40 15-24	
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	>150	120-150	90-120	<90
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	class	Well drained	imperfectly drained		
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl, scl, l, cl	c, sic, sicl	cl, s, ls	
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.5	7.6-8.5	8.6-9.0	
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	nil	15-35	>35	
Soil toxicity	Salinity	ds/m	Nil	<9	>9	<50
	Sodicity	%	nil			
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	




Fig 7.15 Land Suitability map of Pomegranate

7.16 Land Suitability for Musambi (*Citrus limetta*)

Musambi is one of the important fruit crop grown in an area of 3446 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing musambi (Table 7.17) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for

growing musambi was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.16.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Musambi occur in an area of 168 ha (30%) and are distributed in the northwestern, northeastern, eastern and central part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 304 ha (54%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Musambi and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.17 Crop suitability criteria for Musambi

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. to imp.drained	poorly	Very poorly
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,l,sicl,cl,s	sc, sc, c	c (>70%)	s, ls
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.5	5.5-6.4,7.6-8.0	4.0-5.4,8.1-8.5	<4.0,>8.5
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Gravel content	%vol.	Non gravell	15-35	35-55	>55
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	




Fig. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Musambi

7.17 Land Suitability for Lime (*Citrus sp*)

Lime is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 0.11 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing lime (Table 7.18)

were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing lime was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7. 17.

Table 7.18 Crop suitability criteria for Lime

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season	⁰ C	28-30	31-35 24-27	36-40 20-23	>40 <20
Soil moisture	Growing period	Days	240-265	180-240	150-180	<150
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. to imp. drained	poorly	Very poorly
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, l, sicl, cl, s	sc, sc, c	c (>70%)	s, ls
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.5	5.5-6.4,7.6-8.0	4.0-5.4,8.1-8.5	<4.0,>8.5
Rooting conditions	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Upto 5	5-10	>10
	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
Soil toxicity	Gravel content	% vol.	Non gravelly	15-35	35-55	>55
	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	Upto 1.0	1.0-2.5	>2.5
Erosion	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	5-10	10-15	>15
	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>15




Fig. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Lime

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Lime occur in an area of 168 ha (30%) and are distributed in the northwestern, northeastern, eastern and central part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 304 ha (54%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing lime and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of drainage, rooting depth and calcareousness. Currently not suitable lands (Class N1) occupy an area of 28 ha (5%) and is distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.18 Land Suitability for Amla (*Phyllanthus emblica*)

Amla is one of the medicinal fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing amla (Table 7.19) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing amla was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.18.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Amla occur in a maximum area of 251 ha (44%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 221 ha (39%) has soils that are moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Amla with minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. They are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting dept.

Table 7.19 Land suitability criteria for Amla

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod.well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,cl,sc,c(red)	c (black)	ls, sl	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5	7.8-8.4	>8.4
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15-35	35-60	60-80	
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig. 7.18 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.19 Land Suitability for Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale*)

Cashew is one of the most important plantation nut crop grown in an area of 0.7 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing cashew (Table 7.20) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing cashew was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.19.

Entire area of the microwatershed is currently not suitable (Class N1) for cultivation of cashew which occupies an area of 500 ha (88%) with severe limitations of texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.20 Land suitability criteria for Cashew

Crop requirement		Rating				
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drainage
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc,c(red),scl,c	-	ls, sl	c (black)
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-6.5	5.0-5.5,6.5-7.2	7.3-7.8	>7.8
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-10	>10	




Fig. 7.19 Land Suitability map of Cashew

7.20 Land Suitability for Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*)

Jackfruit is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 5368 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing jackfruit (Table 7.21) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jackfruit was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.20.

No highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands are available for growing Jackfruit in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy a maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of drainage, calcareousness and texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.21 Land suitability criteria for Jackfruit

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit		Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	class	well	Mod. well	Poorly	V. Poorly
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	-	sl, ls, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5,7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	>5	-




Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.21 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

Jamun is an important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing jamun (Table 22) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jamun was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.21.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing Jamun in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 391 ha (69%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Jamun and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture and drainage. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy 81 ha (14%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.22 Land suitability criteria for Jamun

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well	Mod. well	Poorly	V. Poorly
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,cl,sc,c(red)	sl, c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.0-6.0	7.8-8.4	>8.4
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Jamun

7.22 Land Suitability for Custard Apple (*Annona reticulata*)

Custard apple is one of the most important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing custard apple (Table7.23) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing custard apple was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.22.

Maximum area of 472 ha (83%) in the microwatershed is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing custard apple and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occupy an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.23 Land suitability criteria for Custard apple

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,cl,sc,c (red),c(black)	-	sl, ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	7.3-8.4	5.0-5.5,8.4-9.0	>9.0
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15-35	35-60	60-80	-
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	>5	




Fig. 7.22 Land Suitability map of Custard Apple

7.23 Land Suitability for Tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*)

Tamarind is one of the most important spice crop grown in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing tamarind (Table 7.24) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tamarind was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Fig. 7.23.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing Tamarind in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 391 ha (69%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Tamarind and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture and drainage. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy an area of 81 ha (14%) and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class

N1) lands occupy 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.24 Land suitability criteria for Tamarind

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,c,l,sc,c(red)	sl, c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0;7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	75-100	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

7.24 Land Suitability for Mulberry (*Morus nigra*)

Mulberry is one of the important leaf crop grown for rearing silk worms in about 1.6 lakh ha area in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing mulberry (Table 7.25) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mulberry was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.24.

No highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands available for growing mulberry in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing mulberry with moderate limitations of texture,

calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.25 Crop suitability criteria for Mulberry

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately Suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, cl, scl	c (red)	c(black), sl, ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5,7.8-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	0-35	35-60	60-80	>80
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10




Fig 7.24 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

7.25 Land suitability for Marigold (*Tagetes sps.*)

Marigold is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 9108 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.26) for growing marigold were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing marigold was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.25.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing Marigold in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2)

for growing Marigold and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

Table 7.26 Land suitability criteria for Marigold

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit		Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season		18-23	17-15 24-35	35-40 10-14	>40 <10
		Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	l,sl,scl,cl, sil	sicl, sc, sic, c	c	ls, s
	pH	1:2.5	7.0-7.5	5.5-5.9,7.6-8.5	<5,>8.5	-
	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Slightly calcareous	Strongly calcareous	-
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	>35	-
Soil toxicity	Salinity	ds/m	Non saline	Slightly	Strongly	-
	Sodicity(ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	-
Erosion	Slope	%	1-3	3-5	5-10	-




Fig. 7.25 Land Suitability map of Marigold

7.26 Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum (*Dendranthema grandiflora*)

Chrysanthemum is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 4978 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.27) for growing chrysanthemum were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing chrysanthemum was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.26.

Table 7.27 Land suitability criteria for Chrysanthemum

Crop requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics	Unit		Highly suitable(S1)	Moderately suitable(S2)	Marginally suitable(S3)	Not suitable(N)
Climate	Temperature in growing season	°C	18-23	17-15 24-35	35-40 10-14	>40 <10
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	l ,sl,scl,cl, sil	sicl,sc,sic, c	c	ls, s
	pH	1:2.5	7.0-7.5	5.5-5.9,7.6-8.5	<5,>8.5	
Rooting conditions	CaCO ₃ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Slightly calcareous	Strongly calcareous	
	Soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
Soil toxicity	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	>35	
	Salinity	ds/m	Non saline	slightly	strongly	
Erosion	Sodicity(ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	-
	Slope	%	1-3	3-5	5-10	




Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing Chrysanthemum in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Chrysanthemum and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and drainage. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in 28 ha (5%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.

7.27 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 6 soil map units identified in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed have been grouped into 4 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan. Land Management Units are grouped based on the similarities in respect of the type of soil, the depth of the soil, the surface soil texture, gravel content, AWC, slope, erosion etc. and a Land Management Units map (Fig. 7.28) has been generated. These Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

The 6 map units that have been grouped into 4 Land Management Units along with brief description of soil and site characteristics are given below.

LMU NO.	Soil map units	Soil and site characteristics
1	104.TMKiB2	Very deep, lowland black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion
2	62.BMNmB2 95.HGNmB2 35. GWDiB2	Moderately deep to very deep, black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion
3	48.NGPiB2	Deep black loamy sand soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion
4	1.BDPiB2	Very shallow, black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion




Fig. 7.28 Land Management Units Map- Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

7.28 Proposed Crop Plan for Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

After assessing the land suitability for the 26 crops, the Proposed Crop Plan has been prepared for the 4 identified LMUs by considering only the highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands for each of the 26 crops. The resultant proposed crop plan is presented below in Table 7.28.

Table 7.28 Proposed Crop Plan for Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

LMU No	Mapping Units	Survey Number	Soil Characteristics	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
1	104.TMKiB2	Gondedagi: 127,128,138,139/1,142,143,144,145,146,147,148/1,148/2,149,150,151,152,153,154/1,154/2,155,156,157,158,159, 160, 163 Goodura: 50,59,60,61/2,62,63,64,65,66,67,75,76,77,78,79,80,81,82,88,114,115,116,117,118,120,121	Very deep, lowland black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion	Sunflower, Cotton, Bengal gram, Bajra	Fruit crops: Lime, Musambi, Amla, Jamun Vegetables: Drumstick, Chilli, Coriander Flowers: Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, suitable soil and water conservation practices
2	62.BMNmB2 95.HGNmB2 35. GWDiB2	Gondedagi: 124/2,125/1,125/2,126/1,126/2,129,130,139/2,140,141,161,162 Goodura: 18,86,89,90,91,92,108,109,112,113 Kondapura: 65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74 Sangavara: 103,104	Moderately deep to very deep, black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion	Sunflower, Sorghum, Maize, Cotton, Bengal gram, Soybean, Safflower, Linseed, Bajra	Fruit crops: Musambi, Pomegranate, Lime, Jamun, Tamarind, Amla, Custard apple Vegetables: Coriander Bhendi, Drumstick, Chilli, Flowers: Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, Mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
3	48.NGPiB2	Badiyala: 452,453,454 Goodura: 2,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,19,20,21,22,23,83,84,85,87,93,95,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,104,105,106,107, 110,111,119 Kondapura: 56,57	Deep black loamy sand soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion	Bajra	Fruit crops: Amla, Jamun, Custard apple, Tamarind Vegetables: Drumstick	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
4	1.BDPiB2	Goodura: 55/3,56,68,69,70,71,72,73,74 122/1,122/2	Very shallow, black clay soils, slopes 1-3%, non gravelly, moderate erosion	-	Glyricidia, <i>Styloxanthes hamata</i> , <i>Styloxanthes scabra</i>	Sowing across the slope, drip irrigation and mulching is recommended

SOIL HEALTH MANAGEMENT

8.1 Soil Health

Soil health is basic to plant health and plant health is basic to human and bovine health. Soil is fundamental to crop production. Without soil, no food could be produced nor would livestock be fed on a large scale. Because it is finite and fragile, soil is a precious resource that requires special care from its users.

Soil health or the capacity of the soil to function is critical to human survival. Soil health has been defined as: “the capacity of the soil to function as a living system without adverse effect on the ecosystem”. Healthy soils maintain a diverse community of soil organisms that help to form beneficial symbiotic associations with plant roots, recycle essential plant nutrients, improve soil structure with positive repercussions for soil, water and nutrient holding capacity and ultimately improve crop production and also contribute to mitigating climate change by maintaining or increasing its carbon content.

Functional interactions of soil biota with organic and inorganic components, air and water determine a soil’s potential to store and release nutrients and water to plants and to promote and sustain plant growth. Thus, maintaining soil health is vital to crop production and conserve soil resource base for sustaining agriculture.

The most important characteristics of a healthy soil are

- Good soil tilth
- Sufficient soil depth
- Good water storage and good drainage
- Adequate supply, but not excess of nutrients
- Large population of beneficial organisms
- Small proportion of plant pathogens and insect pests
- Low weed pressure
- Free of chemicals and toxins that may harm the crop
- Resistance to degradation
- Resilience when unfavorable conditions occur

Characteristics of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

- ❖ The soil phases identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series of TMK 223 ha (39%), NGP 127 ha (22%), GWD 81 (14%), BDP 28 (5%), HGN 28 (5%) and BMN 13 ha (2%).
- ❖ As per land capability classification entire area of the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II and IV). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil, drainage/wetness and erosion.
- ❖ On the basis of soil reaction, about 9 ha (1%) area is slightly to moderately acid (pH 5.5-6.5), 52 ha (9%) is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3), 321 ha (57%) is slightly to moderately

alkaline (pH 7.3-8.4) and 121 ha (21%) is strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 - 9.0). Thus maximum area of the soils in the microwatershed is alkaline in soil reaction.

❖ **Soil Health Management**

The following actions are required to improve the current land husbandry practices that provide a sound basis for the successful adoption of sustainable crop production system.

Acid soils

Acid soils occupy an area of about 9 ha (1%) in the microwatershed.

1. Growing of crops suitable for a particular soil pH.
2. Amelioration of soils through the application of amendments (liming materials).

Liming materials:

1. CaCO_3 (Calcium Carbonate).
2. Dolomite [$\text{Ca Mg} (\text{CO}_3)_2$]
3. Quick lime (CaO)
4. Slaked lime [$\text{Ca} (\text{OH})_2$]

For normal pH and pH 4.8 (35 t/ha) and pH 6.0-7.0 (4 t/ha) lime is required.

Alkaline soils

Alkaline soils cover about 442 ha (78%) in the microwatershed.

(Slightly alkaline to moderately alkaline soils)

1. Regular addition of organic manure, green manuring, green leaf manuring, crop residue incorporation and mulching needs to be taken up to improve the soil organic matter status.
2. Application of biofertilizers (Azospirillum, Azotobacter, Rhizobium).
3. Application of 25% extra N and P (125 % RDN&P).
4. Application of ZnSO_4 – 12.5 kg/ha (once in three years).
5. Application of Boron – 5kg/ha (once in three years).

Neutral soils

Neutral soils cover about 52 ha (9%) in the microwatershed.

1. Regular addition of organic manure, green manuring, green leaf manuring, crop residue incorporation and mulching needs to be taken up to improve the soil organic matter status.
2. Application of biofertilizers, (Azospirillum, Azotobacter, Rhizobium).
3. Application of 100 per cent RDF.
4. Need based micronutrient applications.

Besides the above recommendations, the best transfer of technology options are also to be adopted.

Soil Degradation

Soil erosion is one of the major factor affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. Entire soil area of about 500 ha is suffering from moderate erosion. These areas need immediate soil and water conservation and, other land development and land husbandry practices for restoring soil health.

Dissemination of Information and Communication of Benefits

Any large scale implementation of soil health management requires that supporting information is made available widely, particularly through channels familiar to farmers and extension workers. Given the very high priority attached to soil-health especially by the Central Government on issuing Soil-Health Cards to all the farmers, media outlets like Regional, State and National Newspapers, Radio and Dooradarshan programs in local languages but also modern information and communication technologies such as Cellular phones and the Internet, which can be much more effective in reaching the younger farmers.

Inputs for Net Planning (Saturation Plan) and Interventions needed

Net planning (Saturation Plan) in IWMP is focusing on preparation of

1. Soil and Water Conservation Plan for each plot or farm.
2. Productivity enhancement measures/ interventions for existing crops/livestock/other farm enterprises.
3. Diversification of farming mainly with perennial horticultural crops and livestock.
4. Improving livelihood opportunities and income generating activities.

In this connection, how various outputs of Sujala-III are of use in addressing these objectives of Net Planning (Saturation Plan) are briefly presented below.

- ❖ **Soil Depth:** The depth of a soil decides the amount of moisture and nutrients it can hold, what crops can be taken up or not, depending on the rooting depth and the length of growing period available for raising any crop. Deeper the soil, better for a wide variety of crops. If sufficient depth is not available for growing deep rooted crops, either choose medium or short duration crops or deeper planting pits need to be opened and additional good quality soil brought from outside has to be filled into the planting pits.
- ❖ **Surface Soil Texture:** Lighter soil texture in the top soil means, better rain water infiltration, less run-off and soil moisture conservation, less capillary rise and less evaporation losses. Lighter surface textured soils are amenable to good soil tilth and are highly suitable for crops like groundnut, root vegetables (carrot, raddish, potato etc) but not ideal for crops that need stagnant water like lowland paddy. Heavy textured soils are poor in water infiltration and percolation. They are prone for sheet erosion; such soils can be improved by sand mulching. The technology that is developed by the AICRP-Dryland Agriculture, Vijayapura, Karnataka can be adopted.

- ❖ **Gravelliness:** More gravel content is favorable for run-off harvesting but poor in soil moisture storage and nutrient availability. It is a significant parameter that decides the kind of crop to be raised.
- ❖ **Land Capability Classification:** The land capability map shows the areas suitable and not suitable for agriculture and the major constraints in each of the plot/survey number. Hence, one can decide what kind of enterprise is possible in each of these units. In general, erosion and soil are the major constraints in Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed.
- ❖ **Organic Carbon:** The OC content (an index of available Nitrogen) is high (>0.75%) in about 331 ha (59%), medium (0.5-0.75%) in 125 ha (22%) area and low (<0.5%) in 45 ha (8%). In the areas that are low and medium in OC needs to be further improved by applying farmyard manure and crop rotation with cereals and legumes or mixed cropping.
- ❖ **Promoting green manuring:** Growing of green manuring crops costs Rs. 1250/ha (green manuring seeds) and about Rs. 2000/ha towards cultivation that totals to Rs. 3250/- per ha. On the other hand, application of organic manure @ 10 tons/ha costs Rs. 5000/ha. The practice needs to be continued for 2-3 years or more. Nitrogen fertilizer needs to be supplemented by 25% in addition to the recommended level in 170 ha area where OC is low and medium (<0.5 - 0.75%). For example, for rainfed maize, recommended level is 50 kg N per ha and an additional 12 kg /ha needs to be applied for all the crops grown in these plots.
- ❖ **Available Phosphorus:** Available Phosphorus is low (<23 kg/ha) in an area of 45 ha (8%), medium (23-57 kg/ha) in 168 ha (30%) and high in 287 ha (51%) of the microwatershed. For all the crops 25% additional P needs to be applied where available P is low and medium.
- ❖ **Available Potassium:** Available potassium is high (>337 kg/ha) in an entire area of about 500 ha (88%) of the microwatershed.
- ❖ **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops, it is high (>20 ppm) in a maximum area of 408 ha (72%), medium (10-20 ppm) in 60 ha (11%) and low (<10 ppm) in 32 ha (6%). Low and medium areas need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or Factamphos (p) fertilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.
- ❖ **Available Boron:** An area of 31 ha (5%) is high in available boron, 179 ha (32%) is medium and 292 ha (52%) is low. For areas of low and medium, application of sodium tetra borate @ 10 kg/ha as soil application or 0.2 % borax as foliar spray is recommended.
- ❖ **Available Iron:** An area of about 398 ha (70%) is sufficient and 103 ha (18%) is deficient in available iron in the microwatershed. For deficient areas, application of iron sulphate @ 25 ka/ha is recommended.
- ❖ **Available Manganese:** Entire area in the microwatershed is sufficient in available manganese.
- ❖ **Available copper:** Entire area in the microwatershed is sufficient in available copper.


- ❖ **Available Zinc:** An area of about 175 ha (31%) is deficient in available zinc content. Application of zinc sulphate @25 kg/ha is to be recommended for these areas. Maximum area of 325 ha (57%) is sufficient in available zinc content.
- ❖ **Soil Alkalinity:** An area of 442 ha (78%) in the microwatershed has soils that are slightly to strongly alkaline. These areas need application of gypsum and wherever calcium is in excess, iron pyrites and element sulphur can be recommended. Management practices like treating repeatedly with good quality water to drain out the excess salts and provision of subsurface drainage and growing of salt tolerant crops like Sesbania, Dhaincha, Casuarina, Acasia, Neem, Ber etc, are recommended.

Land Suitability for various crops: Areas that are highly, moderately and marginally suitable and not suitable for growing various crops are indicated. Along with the suitability, various constraints that are limiting the productivity are also indicated. For example, in case of cotton, gravel content, rooting depth and salinity/alkalinity are the major constraints in various plots. With suitable management interventions, the productivity can be enhanced. In order to increase the water holding capacity of light textured soils, growing of green manure crops and application of organic manure is recommended.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION TREATMENT PLAN

For preparing soil and water conservation treatment plan for Godadahadagi-2 microwatershed, the land resource inventory database generated under Sujala-III project has been transformed as information through series of interpretative (thematic) maps using soil phase map as a base. The various thematic maps (1:7920 scale) generated were

- Soil depth
- Surface soil texture
- Available water capacity
- Soil slope
- Soil gravelliness
- Land capability
- Present land use and land cover
- Crop suitability
- Rainfall
- Hydrology
- Water Resources
- Socio-economic data
- Contour plan with existing features- network of waterways, pottissa boundaries, cut up/ minor terraces etc.
- Cadastral map (1:7920 scale)
- Satellite imagery (1:7920 scale)



Apart from these, Hand Level/ Hydro Marker/ Dumpy Level/ Total Station and Kathedars' List to be collected.

Steps for Survey and Preparation of Treatment Plan

The boundaries of Land User Groups' and Survey No. boundaries are traced in the field.

- Naming of user groups and farmers
- Identification of arable and non arable lands
- Identification of drainage lines and gullies
- Identification of non treatable areas
- Identification of priority areas in the arable lands
- Treatment plan for arable lands
- Location of water harvesting and recharge structures

9.1 Treatment Plan

The treatment plan recommended for arable lands is briefly described below

9.1.1 Arable Land Treatment

A. BUNDING

Steps for Survey and Preparation of Treatment Plan		USER GROUP-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cadastral map (1:7920 scale) is enlarged to a scale of 1:2500 scale Existing network of waterways, pothissa boundaries, grass belts, natural drainage lines/ watercourse, cut ups/ terraces are marked on the cadastral map to the scale Drainage lines are demarcated into 		
Small gullies	(up to 5 ha catchment)	
Medium gullies	(5-15 ha catchment)	
Ravines	(15-25 ha catchment) and	
Halla/Nala	(more than 25ha catchment)	

Measurement of Land Slope

Land slope is estimated or determined by the study and interpretation of contours or by measurement in the field using simple instruments like Hand Level or Hydromarker.



Vertical and Horizontal intervals between bunds as recommended by the Watershed Development Department.

Slope percentage	Vertical interval (m)	Corresponding Horizontal Distance (m)
2 - 3%	0.6	24
3 - 4%	0.9	21
4 - 5%	0.9	21
5 - 6%	1.2	21
6 - 7%	1.2	21

Note: (i) The above intervals are maximum.

(ii) Considering the slope class and erosion status (A1... A=0-1 % slope, 1= slight erosion) the intervals have to be decided.

Bund length recording: Considering the contour plan and the existing grass belts/partitions, the bunds are aligned and lengths are measured.

Section of the Bund

Bund section is decided considering the soil texture class and gravelliness class (bg₀... b=loamy sand, g₀ = <15% gravel). The recommended Sections for different soils are given below.

Recommended Bund Section

Top width (m)	Base width (m)	Height (m)	Side slope (Z:1;H:V)	Cross section (sq m)	Soil Texture	Remarks
0.3	0.9	0.3	01:01	0.18	Sandy loam	Vegetative bund
0.3	1.2	0.3	1.5:1	0.225	Sandy clay	
0.3	1.2	0.5	0.9:1	0.375	Red gravelly soils	
0.3	1.2	0.6	0.75:1	0.45		
0.3	1.5	0.6	01:01	0.54	Red sandy loam	
0.3	2.1	0.6	1.5:1	0.72	Very shallow black clayey soils	
0.45	2	0.75	01:01	0.92		
0.45	2.4	0.75	1.3:1	1.07	Shallow black clayey soils	
0.6	3.1	0.7	1.78:1	1.29	Medium black clayey soils	
0.5	3	0.85	1.47:1	1.49		

Formation of Trench cum Bund

Dimensions of the Borrow Pits/Trenches to be excavated (machinery are decided considering the Bund Section).

Details of Borrow Pit dimensions are given below:

TRENCH CUM BUND

WATER STORAGE AREA
0.45 Sq.m section
IDEAL FOR HORTICULTURE CROPS

'A' FRAME FOR INTERBUND MANAGEMENT

ಬೆಂಕಿ
ಬೆಂಕಿ
ಇಳಿಜಾರು
ಸಮಾನಾತಳ ರೇಖೆ

1. ಸಮಾನಾತಳ ಉಳುವೆ
2. ಸಮಾನಾತಳ ಬಿತ್ತನೆ/ನಾಟಿ

Size of Borrow Pits/ Trench recommended for Trench cum Bund (by machinery)

Bund section	Bund length	Earth quantity	Pit				Berm (pit to pit)	Soil depth class
			L(m)	W(m)	D(m)	Quantity (m ³)		
m ²	m	m ³					m	
0.375	6	2.25	5.85	0.85	0.45	2.24	0.15	Shallow
0.45	6	2.7	5.4	1.2	0.43	2.79	0.6	Shallow
0.45	6	2.7	5	0.85	0.65	2.76	1	Moderately Shallow
0.54	5.6	3.02	5.5	0.85	0.7	3.27	0.1	Moderately shallow
0.54	5.5	2.97	5	1.2	0.5	3	0.5	Shallow
0.72	6.2	4.46	6	1.2	0.7	5.04	0.2	Moderately shallow
0.72	5.2	3.74	5.1	0.85	0.9	3.9	0.1	Moderately deep

B. Water Ways

- Existing waterways are marked on the cadastral map (1:7920 scale) and their dimensions are recorded.
- Considering the contour plan of the MWS, additional waterways/ modernization of the existing ones can be thought of.
- The design details are given in the Manual.

C. Farm Ponds

Waterways and the catchment area will give an indication on the size of the Farm Pond. Location of the pond can be decided based on the contour plan/ field condition and farmers' need/desire.

D. Diversion Channel

Existing EPT/ CPT are marked on the cadastral map. Looking to the need, these can be modernized or fresh diversion channel can be proposed and runoff from this can be stored in *Gokatte*/ Recharge ponds.

9.1.2 Non-Arable Land Treatment

Depending on the gravelliness and crops preferred by the farmers, the concerned authorities can decide appropriate treatment plan. The recommended treatments may be Contour Trench, Staggered Trench, Crescent Bund, Boulder Bund or Pebble Bund.

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

- a) The cadastral map has to be updated as regards the network of drainage lines (gullies/ *nalas/ hallas*) and existing structures are marked to the scale and storage capacity of the existing water bodies are documented.
- b) The drainage line will be demarcated into Upper Reach, Middle Reach and Lower Reach.
- c) Considering the Catchment, *Nala* bed and bank conditions, suitable structures are decided.
- d) Number of storage structures (Check dam/ *Nala* bund/ Percolation tank) will be decided considering the commitments and available runoff from water budgeting and quality of water in the wells and site suitability.
- e) Detailed Leveling Survey using Dumpy Level / Total Station has to be carried out to arrive at the site-specific designs as shown in the Manual.
- f) The location of ground water recharge structures are decided by examining the lineaments and fracture zones from geological maps.
- g) Rainfall intensity data of the nearest Rain Gauge Station is considered for Hydrologic Designs.
- h) Silt load to the Storage/Recharge Structures is reduced by providing vegetative, boulder and earthen checks in the natural water course. Location and design details are given in the Manual.

9.2 Recommended Soil and Water Conservation Measures

The appropriate conservation structures best suited for each of the land parcel/ survey number (Appendix-I) are selected based on the slope per cent, severity of erosion, amount of rainfall, land use and soil type. The different kinds of conservation structures recommended are:

1. Graded / Strengthening of Bunds
2. Trench cum Bunds (TCB)
3. Trench cum Bunds / Strengthening
4. Crescent Bunds

A map (Fig. 9.1) showing soil and water conservation plan with different kinds of structures recommended has been prepared which shows the spatial distribution and extent of area. Maximum area of about 472 ha (83%) needs Graded Bunding and 28 ha (5%) area needs Trench Cum Bunding.

The conservation plan prepared may be presented to all the stakeholders including farmers and after considering their suggestions, the conservation plan for the microwatershed may be finalised in a participatory approach.




Fig. 9.1 Soil and Water Conservation Plan map of Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed

9.3 Greening of Microwatershed

As part of the greening programme in the watersheds, it is envisaged to plant a variety of horticultural and other tree plants that are edible, economical and produce lot of biomass which helps to restore the ecological balance in the watersheds. The lands that are suitable for greening programme are non-arable lands (land capability classes V, VI VII and VIII) and also the lands that are not suitable or marginally suitable and field bunds for growing annual and perennial crops. The method of planting these trees is given below.

It is recommended to open pits during the 1st week of March along the contour and heap the dug out soil on the lower side of the slope in order to harness the flowing water and facilitate weathering of soil in the pit. Exposure of soil in the pit also prevents spread of pests and diseases due to scorching sun rays. The pits should be filled with mixture of soil and organic manure during the second week of April and keep ready with sufficiently tall seedlings produced either in poly bags or in root trainer nurseries so that planting can be done during the 2nd or 3rd week of April depending on the rainfall.

The tree species suitable for the area considering rainfall, temperature and adaptability is listed below; waterlogged areas are recommended to be planted with species like Nerale (*Syzgium cumini*) and Bamboo. Dry areas are to be planted with species like Honge, Bevu, Seetaphal etc.

Dry Deciduous Species			Temp (°C)	Rainfall (mm)
1.	Bevu	<i>Azadiracta indica</i>	21–32	400 –1,200
2.	Tapasi	<i>Holoptelia integrifolia</i>	20-30	500 - 1000
3.	Seetaphal	<i>Anona Squamosa</i>	20-40	400 - 1000
4.	Honge	<i>Pongamia pinnata</i>	20 -50	500– 2,500
5.	Kamara	<i>Hardwickia binata</i>	25 -35	400 - 1000
6.	Bage	<i>Albezzia lebbek</i>	20 - 45	500 - 1000
7.	Ficus	<i>Ficus bengalensis</i>	20 - 50	500–2,500
8.	Sisso	<i>Dalbargia Sissoo</i>	20 - 50	500 -2000
9.	Ailanthus	<i>Ailanthus excelsa</i>	20 - 50	500 - 1000
10.	Hale	<i>Wrightia tinctoria</i>	25 - 45	500 - 1000
11.	Uded	<i>Steriospermum chelanoides</i>	25 - 45	500 -2000
12.	Dhupa	<i>Boswella Serrata</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
13.	Nelli	<i>Embllica Officinalis</i>	20 - 50	500 -1500
14.	Honne	<i>Pterocarpus marsupium</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
Moist Deciduous Species			Temp (°C)	Rainfall (mm)
15.	Teak	<i>Tectona grandis</i>	20 - 50	500-5000
16.	Nandi	<i>Legarstroemia lanceolata</i>	20 - 40	500 - 4000
17.	Honne	<i>Pterocarpus marsupium</i>	20 - 40	500 - 3000
18.	Mathi	<i>Terminalia alata</i>	20 -50	500 - 2000
19.	Shivane	<i>Gmelina arborea</i>	20 -50	500 -2000
20.	Kindal	<i>T.Paniculata</i>	20 - 40	500 - 1500
21.	Beete	<i>Dalbargia latifolia</i>	20 - 40	500 - 1500
22.	Tare	<i>T. belerica</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
23.	Bamboo	<i>Bambusa arundinasia</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2500
24.	Bamboo	<i>Dendrocalamus strictus</i>	20 – 40	500 – 2500
25.	Muthuga	<i>Butea monosperma</i>	20 - 40	400 - 1500
26.	Hippe	<i>Madhuca latifolia</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
27.	Sandal	<i>Santalum album</i>	20 - 50	400 - 1000
28.	Nelli	<i>Embllica officinalis</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
29.	Nerale	<i>Sizyzium cumini</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
30.	Dhaman	<i>Grevia tilifolia</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
31.	Kaval	<i>Careya arborea</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000
32.	Harada	<i>Terminalia chebula</i>	20 - 40	500 - 2000

References

1. FAO (1976) Framework for Land Evaluation, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.72 pp.
2. FAO (1983) Guidelines for Land Evaluation for Rainfed Agriculture, FAO, Rome, 237 pp.
3. IARI (1971) Soil Survey Manual, All India Soil and Land Use Survey Organization, IARI, New Delhi, 121 pp.
4. Katyal, J.C. and Rattan, R.K. (2003) Secondary and Micronutrients; Research Gap and Future Needs. Fert. News 48 (4); 9-20.
5. Naidu, L.G.K., Ramamurthy, V., Challa, O., Hegde, R. and Krishnan, P. (2006) Manual Soil Site Suitability Criteria for Major Crops, NBSS Publ. No. 129, NBSS & LUP, Nagpur, 118 pp.
6. Natarajan, A. and Dipak Sarkar (2010) Field Guide for Soil Survey, National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning (ICAR), Nagpur, India.
7. Natarajan, A., Rajendra Hegde, Raj, J.N. and Shivananda Murthy, H.G. (2015) Implementation Manual for Sujala-III Project, Watershed Development Department, Bengaluru, Karnataka.
8. Sarma, V.A.K., Krishnan, P. and Budihal, S.L. (1987) Laboratory Manual, Tech. Bull. 23, NBSS &LUP, Nagpur.
9. Sehgal, J.L. (1990) Soil Resource Mapping of Different States of India; Why and How?, National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Nagpur, 49 pp.
10. Shivaprasad, C.R., R.S. Reddy, J. Sehgal and M. Velayuthum (1998) Soils of Karnataka for Optimizing Land Use, NBSS Publ. No. 47b, NBSS & LUP, Nagpur, India.
11. Soil Survey Staff (2006) Keys to Soil Taxonomy, Tenth edition, U.S. Department of Agriculture/ NRCS, Washington DC, U.S.A.
12. Soil Survey Staff (2012) Soil Survey Manual, Handbook No. 18, USDA, Washington DC, USA.

Appendix I
Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed
Soil Phase Information

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Badiyala	452	0.75	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Badiyala	453	1.39	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Badiyala	454	0.25	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	124/2	0.66	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Redgram (Ct+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	125/1	2.15	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Redgram (Jw+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	125/2	4.27	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Redgram (Ct+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	126/1	4.3	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Jowar (Ct+Jw)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	126/2	4.57	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Redgram (Ct+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	127	4.59	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Redgram (Ct+Rg)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	128	4.56	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Jowar (Rg+Jw)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	129	6.9	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Jowar+Redgram (Ct+Jw+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	130	3.82	BMNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Jowar+Redgram (Ct+Jw+Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	138	0.05	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	139/1	1.53	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	139/2	1.87	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	140	4.73	BMNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Jowar (Rg+Jw)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	141	5.63	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	142	1.92	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Jowar (Ct+Jw)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	143	7.34	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	144	6.23	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy+Jowar (Pd+Jw)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	145	3.91	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	146	3.66	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Gonededagi	147	6.9	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Gonedagi	148/1	4.8	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	148/2	3.7	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	149	3.74	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	150	4.43	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	151	3.51	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	152	3.55	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	153	5.31	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	154/1	2.59	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	154/2	5.57	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	155	6.85	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	156	5.12	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	157	5.72	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	158	3.28	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	159	4.18	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	160	3.17	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	161	4.82	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	162	1.3	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	163	3.42	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Gonedagi	196	0.6	Water body	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Water body	Not Available	Others	Others
Goodura	1	0.19	Water body	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Water body	Not Available	Others	Others
Goodura	2	1.58	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	3	2.45	Water body	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Water body	Not Available	Others	Others
Goodura	4	1.28	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	5	0.33	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly	Very high (>200	Very gently	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not	Iles	Graded

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Goodura	6	0.13	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	sloping (1-3%) Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Available Not Available	Iles	bunding Graded bunding
Goodura	7	0	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	8	8.35	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	9	6.25	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	10	6.45	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	11	2.51	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	12	1.95	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	13	3.82	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	14	2.92	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	15	3.73	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	18	0.45	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	19	4.95	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	20	7.83	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	21	1.59	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	22	3.04	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	23	0.89	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	43	0.62	Water body	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Water body	Not Available	Others	Others
Goodura	50	0.42	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	55/3	0.05	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	56	1.65	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	59	0.01	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	60	2.6	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	61/1	0.36	Water body	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Water body	Not Available	Others	Others
Goodura	61/2	3.48	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
					cm)		(<15%)	mm/m)	sloping (1-3%)			Available		bunding
Goodura	62	2.42	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	63	2.26	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	64	3.95	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	65	2.58	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	66	3.63	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	67	3.31	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	68	3.86	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	69	3.12	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy+ Scrub land (Pd+Sl)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	70	2.61	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	71	0.6	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	72	1.94	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	73	8.53	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	74	6.74	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	75	7.31	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	76	6.82	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	77	8.77	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	78	5.6	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	79	4.65	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	80	2.06	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	81	2.92	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	82	8.66	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	83	4.9	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	84	7.53	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	85	5.86	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly	Very high (>200	Very gently	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not	Iles	Graded

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Goodura	86	0.33	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	(<15%) Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m) Medium (101-150 mm/m)	sloping (1-3%) Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Available Not Available	Iles	bunding Graded bunding
Goodura	87	7.99	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	88	5.44	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIws	Graded bunding
Goodura	89	9.72	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	90	3.91	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	91	1.49	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	92	3.93	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	93	8.92	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	95	0.05	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Groundnut (Rg+Gn)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	96	3.53	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	97	2.04	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	98	0.22	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	99	1.88	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	100	1.82	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	101	0.17	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	102	0.35	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	103	1.98	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	104	2.95	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	105	1.75	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	106	1.29	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	107	3.51	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	108	0.85	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	109	0.99	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	110	3.77	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly	Very high (>200	Very gently	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not	Iles	Graded

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Goodura	111	2.52	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	<15% Non gravelly (<15%)	mm/m Very high (>200 mm/m)	sloping (1-3%) Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Available Not Available	Iles	bunding Graded bunding
Goodura	112	5.73	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	113	7.66	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	114	1.82	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	115	3.54	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	116	4.9	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	117	1.62	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	118	5.84	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	119	1.66	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Goodura	120	0.21	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	121	1.66	TMKiB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Ilws	Graded bunding
Goodura	122/1	0.65	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Goodura	122/2	0.71	BDPiB2	LMU-4	Very shallow (<25 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IVs	Trench cum bunding
Kondapura	56	0.35	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	57	0	NGPiB2	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	65	5.39	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	66	6.84	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Cotton (Jw+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	67	6.09	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	68	8.25	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	69	4.97	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar (Jw)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	70	6.45	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	71	1.75	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Cotton (Jw+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	72	0.02	HGNmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Kondapura	73	5.83	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep	Sandy clay	Non gravelly	Medium (101-150	Very gently	Moderate	Jowar+Cotton	Not	Iles	Graded

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
					(75-100 cm)		(<15%)	mm/m)	sloping (1-3%)		(Jw+Ct)	Available		bunding
Kondapura	74	0.99	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Cotton (Rg+Ct)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Sangavara	103	0.61	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding
Sangavara	104	0.25	GWDiB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Iles	Graded bunding

Appendix III
Godadahadagi-2 Microwatershed
Soil Suitability Information

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Drum stick	Mulberry
Badiyala	452	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2w	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Badiyala	453	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2w	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Badiyala	454	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2w	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	124/2	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	125/1	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	125/2	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	126/1	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	126/2	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	127	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	128	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	129	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	130	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	138	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	139/1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	139/2	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	140	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	141	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	142	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	143	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	144	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	145	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	146	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	147	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	148/1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	148/2	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	149	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	150	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	151	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	152	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	153	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	154/1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	154/2	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	155	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	156	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	157	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	158	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	159	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	160	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goneddagi	161	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Goneddagi	162	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Drum stick	Mulberry
Goodura	120	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goodura	121	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S1	S3tw	S1	S2tw	S2zw	S1	S2rw	S2tw	S1	S3tw	S1	N1tz	S2tw	S2zw	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Goodura	122/1	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r
Goodura	122/2	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r	N1r
Kondapura	56	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2w	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	57	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2w	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	65	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	66	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	67	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Kondapura	68	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	69	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	70	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	71	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	72	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2tw	S1	S3t	S1	N1tz	S2t	S1	S3tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S2t	S2tw	S3tw
Kondapura	73	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Kondapura	74	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Sangavara	103	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz
Sangavara	104	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2zw	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2zw	S2rz	S2rz	S2zw	S3tz	S1	N1t	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S3tz

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

1.	Findings of the socio-economic survey	1-2
2.	Introduction	3
3	Methodology	5-6
4	Salient features of the survey	7-24
5	Summary	25-29

LIST OF TABLES

1	Households sampled for socio economic survey	7
2	Population characteristics	7
3	Age wise classification of household members	7
4	Education level of household members	8
5	Occupation of household heads	8
6	Occupation of family members	8
7	Institutional participation of household members	9
8	Type of house owned by households	9
9	Durable assets owned by households	9
10	Average value of durable assets owned by households	10
11	Farm implements owned by households	10
12	Average value of farm implements	10
13	Livestock possession by households	11
14	Average labour availability	11
15	Adequacy of hired labour	11
16	Distribution of land (ha)	11
17	Average land value (Rs./ha)	12
18	Cropping pattern	12
19	Cropping intensity	12
20	Possession of bank account and saving	12
21	Borrowing status	12
22	Source of credit	13
23	Avg. credit borrowed	13
24	Purpose of credit borrowed from institutional sources	13
25	Purpose of credit borrowed from private sources	13
26	Repayment status of household from institutional sources	14
27	Repayment status of household from private sources	14
28	Opinion on non-institutional sources of credit	14
29.a	Cost of cultivation of Paddy	15
29.b	Cost of cultivation of Jowar	16
29.c	Cost of cultivation of Cotton	17

29.d	Cost of cultivation of Red gram	18
30	Adequacy of fodder	19
31	Annual gross income	19
32	Average annual expenditure	19
33	Forest species grown	19
34	Average additional investment capacity	20
35	Source of funds for additional investment	20
36	Marketing of the agricultural produce	20
37	Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce	21
38	Mode of transport of agricultural produce	21
39	Incidence of soil and water erosion problems	21
40	Interest shown towards soil testing	21
41	Soil and water conservation practices and structures	21
42	Status soil and water conservation structures	22
43	Agencies involved in the soil and water conservation structures	22
44	Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use	22
45	Source of drinking water	22
46	Source of light	23
47	Existence of sanitary toilet facility	23
48	Possession of public distribution system (PDS) card	23
49	Participation in NREGA programme	23
50	Adequacy of food items	23
51	Inadequacy of food items	24
52	Farming constraints experienced	24

FINDINGS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY

- ❖ *The survey was conducted in Godadahadagi-2 is located at North latitude 16^o 52' 25.18" and 16^o 51' 10.235" and East longitude 77^o 9' 47.358" and 77^o 8' 6.025" covering an area of about 565.45 ha coming under Kondapura, Badiyala, Goodyura and Gonedagi villages of Yadagiri taluk.*
- ❖ *Socio-economic analysis indicated that, out of the total sample of 34 respondents, 7 (20.59%) were marginal, 15(44.12%) were small and 5 (14.71%) were semi medium, 2 (5.88%) were medium farmers.*
- ❖ *The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 92 (55.76%) men and 73 (44.24%) were women.*
- ❖ *Majority of the respondents (40%) were in the age group of 16-35 years. Education level of the sample households indicated that, majority there were 49.70 per cent illiterates, 1.82 per cent attained graduation.*
- ❖ *About, 79.41 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 8.82 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers.*
- ❖ *Agriculture was the major occupation for 54.55 per cent of the household members.*
- ❖ *In the study area, 82.35 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 11.76 per cent possess pucca house.*
- ❖ *The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 73.53 per cent possess TV, 2.94 per cent possess mixer grinder and 91.18 per cent possess mobile phones.*
- ❖ *Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 41.18 per cent of the households possess plough and only 17.65 per cent sprayer.*
- ❖ *Regarding livestock possession by the households, 5.88 per cent possess local cow and 2.94 per cent possess buffalo respectively.*
- ❖ *The average labour availability in the study area showed that, own men labour availability was 1.55 and women labour availability in the micro watershed was 1.35, while the hired labour (men) availability was 8.81 and hired labour (women) availability was 7.35.*
- ❖ *Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents (39.83 ha), 73.77 per cent of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 26.23 per cent area is irrigated land.*
- ❖ *The major crops grown by sample farmers are Paddy, Jowar, Cotton and Red gram and cropping intensity was recorded as 100 per cent.*
- ❖ *The sample households possessed 97.06 per cent bank account and 35.29 per cent of them have savings in the account.*
- ❖ *About 97.06 per cent of the respondents borrowed credit from various sources. Among the credit borrowed by households, 53.85 per cent have borrowed loan from commercial banks and 30.77 per cent from Cooperative bank.*
- ❖ *Majority of the respondents (100 %) have borrowed loan for agriculture purpose.*

- ❖ *The per hectare cost of cultivation for Paddy, Jowar, Cotton and Red gram was Rs.48516.56 , 34337.48, 41268.24, 25510.13, and 20719.54 with benefit cost ratio of 1:1.50, 1: 0.50, 1: 1.90, 1: 1.80, and 1:2.90 , respectively.*
- ❖ *Further, 50 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate.*
- ❖ *The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 156705.88 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 83426.47 comes from agriculture.*
- ❖ *Sampled households have grown forest species neem (29) and 1 tamarind trees in the fields,*
- ❖ *Households have an average investment capacity of Rs 11.76. for land development. Rs 73529.41 for irrigation facility creation.*
- ❖ *Source of funds for additional investment is concerned and 11.76 per cent depends on government for land development, and for irrigation facility was 32.35.*
- ❖ *Loan from bank was the source for land development was 5.88 per cent.*
- ❖ *Own funds for the source for land development, improved crop production and improved livestock management was 23.53 per cent.*
- ❖ *Regarding marketing channels, 85.29 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants.*
- ❖ *Further, 85.29 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.*
- ❖ *Majority of the farmers (50 %) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 85.29 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.*
- ❖ *About, 8.82 per cent of farmers practicing field bunding as soil and water conservation practice.*
- ❖ *Firewood connection was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 76.47 per cent of the households and 26.47 per cent households has LPG.*
- ❖ *Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 97.06 per cent of the households.*
- ❖ *Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households.*
- ❖ *In the study area, 52.94 per cent of the households possess toilet facility.*
- ❖ *Regarding possession of PDS card, 100 per cent of the households possessed BPL card. Cereals and pulses (97.06%), oilseeds (70.59%) were adequate for consumption.*
- ❖ *Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (70.59%) wild animal menace on farm field (64.71%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (85.29%), inadequacy of irrigation water (58.82%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (85.29%), high rate of interest on credit (85.29%), low price for the agricultural commodities (58.82%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (35.29%), inadequate extension services (17.65%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (64.71%).*

INTRODUCTION

Soil and water are the two precious natural resources which are essential for crop production and existence of life on earth. Rainfed agriculture is under severe stress due to various constraints related to agriculture like uneven and erratic distribution of rainfall, indiscriminate use of fertilizers, chemicals and pesticides, adoption of improper land management practices, soil erosion, decline in soil fertility, decline in ground water resources leading to low crop productivity. The area under rainfed agriculture has to be managed effectively using the best available practices to enhance the production of food, fodder and fuel. This is possible if the land resources are characterized at each parcel of land through detailed land resource inventory using the best available techniques of remote sensing, GPS and GIS. The watershed development programs are aimed at the sustainable distribution of its resources and the process of creating and implementing plans, programs, and projects to sustain and enhance watershed functions that affect the plant, animal and human communities within a watershed boundary.

World Bank funded KWDP II, SUJALA III project was implemented in with Broad objective of demonstrating more effective watershed management through greater integration of programmes related to rain-fed agriculture, innovative and science based approaches and strengthen institutional capacities and If successful, it is expected that the systems and tools could be mainstreamed into the overall IWMP in the State of Karnataka and in time, throughout other IWMP operations in India. With this background the socio-economic survey has been carried out with following specific objectives:

1. To understand the demographic features of the households in the micro-watershed
2. To understand the extent of family labour available and additional employment opportunities available within the village.
3. To know the status of assets of households in the micro-watershed for suggesting possible improvements.
4. To study the cropping pattern, cropped area and productivity levels of different households in micro-watershed.
5. To determine the type and extent of livestock owned by different categories of HHs
6. Availability of fodder and level of livestock management.

Scope and importance of survey

Survey helps in identification of different socio-economic and resource use-patterns of farmers at the Micro watershed. Household survey provides demographic features, labor force, and levels of education; land ownership and asset position (including livestock and other household assets) of surveyed households; and cropping patterns, input intensities, and average crop yields from farmers' fields. It also discusses crop utilization and the degree of commercialization of production in the areas; farmers' access to and utilization of credit from formal and informal sources; and the level of adoption and use of soil, water, and pest management technologies.

METHODOLOGY

The description of the methods, components selected for the survey and procedures followed in conducting the baseline survey are furnished under the following heads.

1. Description of the study area

Yadgir District is one of the 30 districts of Karnataka state in southern India. This district was carved out from the erstwhile Gulbarga district as the 30th district of Karnataka on 10 April 2010. Yadgir town is the administrative headquarters of the district. The district comprises of 3 taluks namely, Shahapur, Yadgiri and Shorapur (There are 16 hoblies, 117 Gram Panchayats, 4 Municipalities, 8 Towns/ Urban agglomeration and 487 inhabited & 32 un-inhabited villages The district occupies an area of 5,160.88 km².

Yadgir district is the second smallest district in the state, area wise is very rich in cultural traditions. The vast stretch of fertile black soil of the district is known for bumper red gram and jowar crops. The district is a "Daal bowl" of the state. The district is also known for cluster of cement industries and a distinct stone popularly known as "Malakheda Stone". Two main rivers, Krishna and Bhima, and a few tributaries flow in this region. Krishna and Bhima Rivers drain the district. They constitute the two major river basins of the district. Kagna and Amarja are the two sub - basins of Bhima River, which occur within the geographical area of the district

According to the 2011 census Yadgir district has a population of 1, 172,985, roughly equal to the nation of Timor-Leste or the US state of Rhode Island. This gives it a ranking of 404th in India (out of a total of 640). The district has a population density of 224 inhabitants per square kilometre (580/sq mi). Its population growth rate over the decade 2001-2011 was 22.67%. Yadgir has a sex ratio of 984 females for every 1000 males, and a literacy rate of 52.36%.

2. Locale of the survey and description of the micro-watershed and

The study was conducted in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed (Belagunda sub-watershed, Yadgiri taluk & District) is located at North latitude 16⁰ 52' 25.18" and 16⁰ 51' 10.235" and East longitude 77⁰ 9' 47.358" and 77⁰ 8' 6.025" covering an area of about 565.45 ha coming under Kondapura, Badiyala, Goodyura and Gonedagi Villages

3. Selection of the respondents for the study

The micro-watershed is marked with 320 square meters grids. One farmer from every alternate grid in the micro-watershed was selected for the study and interviewed for socio-economic data. Totally 34 households were interviewed for the survey.

4. The parameters considered for socio-economic survey of households

Two forms of data were collected from the micro-watershed which includes primary data from the farm households and secondary data about the villages under the micro-watershed jurisdiction.

The following parameters were considered for the primary data collection about the socio-economic data of the households, (1) Demographic information, (2) Farm and durable assets owned by households, (3) Livestock possession, (4) Labour availability, (5) Level of migration in the village, Land holding, (7) Cropping pattern, (8) Source of irrigation, (9) Borrowing status, (10) Cost of cultivation of major crops, (11) Economics of subsidiary activities, (12) Fodder availability, (13) Family annual income from different sources, (14) Horticulture and forestry species grown, (15) Additional investment capacity, (16) Marketing practices, (17) Status of soil and water conservation structure, (18) Access to basic needs and (19) Constraints and suggestion.

The following parameters were considered for the secondary data regarding the villages under the micro-watershed jurisdiction, (1) Number of villages in each micro-watershed jurisdiction, (2) Village wise number of households, (3) Geographical area of the villages, (4) Cultivable area including rainfed and irrigated, (5) Number and type of house in each village, (6) Human and livestock population, (7) Facilities in the village such as roads, transport facility for conveyance, drinking water supply, street light and (8) Community based organizations in the villages.

5. Development of interview schedule and data collection

Taking into the consideration the objectives of the survey, an interview schedule was prepared after thorough consultation with the experts in the field of social sciences. A comprehensive interview schedule covering all the major parameters for measuring the socio-economic situation was developed.

6. Tools used to analyze the data

The statistical components such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze the data.

Abbreviations used in the report

LL=Landless

MF=Marginal Farmers

SF=Small farmers

SMF=Semi medium farmers

MDF=Medium farmers

LF=Large Farmers

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

This chapter deals with systematic presentation of results of the survey. Keeping in view the objectives, the salient features of the survey are presented under the following headings.

Households sampled for socio-economic survey: The data on households sampled for socio economic survey in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 34 farmers were sampled in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed among households surveyed 7 (20.59%) were marginal, 15(44.12%) were small, 5 (14.71 %) were semi medium and 2 (5.88 %) were medium. 5(14.7%) were landless farmers were also interviewed for the survey.

Table 1. Households sampled for socio economic survey in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	5	14.7	7	20.6	15	44.1	5	14.7	2	5.88	34	100

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that, there were 92 (55.76%) men and 73 (44.24%) were women. The average family size of the households was landless was 4.2, marginal farmers was 4.6, small farmers was 5.1, semi medium and medium farmers was 5.

Table 2. Population characteristics in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (21)		MF (32)		SF (77)		SMF (25)		MDF (10)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Men	12	57.1	19	59	42	55	15	60	4	40	92	55.8
2	Women	9	42.9	13	41	35	45	10	40	6	60	73	44.2
Total		21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100
Average		4.2		4.6		5.1		5.0		5.0		4.9	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 3. The indicated that, 56 (33.94%) of population were 0-15 years of age, 66 (40%) were 16-35 years of age, 40(24.24%) were 36-60 years of age and 3 (1.82 %) were above 61 years of age.

Table 3: Age wise classification of members of the household in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (21)		MF (32)		SF (77)		SMF (25)		MDF (10)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	8	38.1	10	31.3	27	35.1	8	32	3	30	56	33.94
2	16-35 years of age	8	38.1	12	37.5	31	40.3	10	40	5	50	66	40
3	36-60 years of age	4	19.1	10	31.3	17	22.1	7	28	2	20	40	24.24
4	> 61 years	1	4.76	0	0	2	2.6	0	0	0	0	3	1.82
Total		21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that, there were 49.70 per cent of illiterates, 29.70 per cent of them had primary school education, 10.30 per cent high school education, 4.24 per cent of them had PUC education, 1.21 per cent of them had Diploma, 1.82 per cent attained graduation and 3.03 them had other education.

Table 4. Education level of members of the household in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No	Particulars	LL (21)		MF(32)		SF (77)		SMF(25)		MDF(10)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	11	52.4	19	59.4	36	46.8	12	48	4	40	82	49.7
2	Primary School	5	23.8	11	34.4	24	31.2	6	24	3	30	49	29.7
3	High School	5	23.8	1	3.13	7	9.09	3	12	1	10	17	10.3
4	PUC	0	0	0	0	5	6.49	1	4	1	10	7	4.24
5	Diploma	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	1	4	0	0	2	1.21
6	Degree	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	2	8	0	0	3	1.82
Total		21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100

Occupation of head of households: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 79.41 per cent of household's heads were practicing agriculture, 8.82 per cent of the household heads were agricultural Labour and 2.94 per cent of the households head were household industry.

Table 5: Occupation of heads of households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF(5)		MDF(2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	1	20	6	86	13	86.6	5	100	2	100	27	79.41
2	Agricultural Labour	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8.82
3	Household industry	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.94
Total		5	100	7	100	13	100	5	100	2	100	32	100

Table 6: Occupation of members of the household in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.N	Particulars	LL (21)		MF (32)		SF(77)		SMF(25)		MDF(10)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	3	14	19	59	48	62	13	52	7	70	90	54.6
2	Agricultural Labour	9	42.	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6.06
3	Household industry	1	4.7	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.21
4	Government Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	0.61
5	Private Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	2	1.21
6	Student	6	28	10	31	26	33	9	36	2	20	53	32.1
7	Others	1	4.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.61
8	Housewife	1	4.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.61
9	Children	0	0	1	3.1	3	3.9	0	0	1	10	5	3.03
Total		21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100

Occupation of the members of the household: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 6. The results indicate that, agriculture was the major occupation for 54.55 per cent of the household members, 6.06 per cent were agricultural labour, 0.61 per cent were working in government sector, 32.12 per cent were working in pursuing education, 0.61 per cent were involved as housewife, and 3.03 per cent were children's.

Institutional Participation of household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 7. The results show that, out of the total family members in the households 100 per cent of them were not participating in any of the institutions.

Table 7: Institutional Participation of household member in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL(21)		MF (32)		SF (77)		SMF (25)		MDF (10)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100
	Total	21	100	32	100	77	100	25	100	10	100	165	100

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that, 5.88 percent possess thatched house, 82.35 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 11.76 per cent possess pacca house.

Table 8. Type of house owned by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	0	0	1	14	0	0	1	20	0	0	2	5.88
2	Katcha	4	80	6	86	12	80	4	80	2	100	28	82.35
3	Pucca/RCC	1	20	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	4	11.76
	Total	5	100	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	34	100

Durable assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 9. The results shows that, 73.53 per cent possess TV, 2.94 per cent possess mixer grinder, 5.88 per cent possess Bicycle, 32.35 per cent possess motor cycle, 91.18 per cent possess mobile phones.

Table 9. Durable assets owned by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	3	60	5	71	11	73.3	4	80	2	100	25	73.53
2	Mixer/Grinder	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.94
3	Bicycle	1	20	0	0	1	6.67	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
4	Motor Cycle	1	20	1	14	5	33.3	2	40	2	100	11	32.35
5	Mobile Phone	5	100	7	100	14	93.3	3	60	2	100	31	91.18

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 10. The result shows that, the average value of television was Rs.5060, mixer grinder was Rs.1000, bicycle was Rs.1000, motor cycle was Rs. 48181, mobile phone was Rs.2452.

Table 10. Average value of durable assets owned in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed
Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Television	4833	3600	5909	4500	5500	5060
2	Mixer/Grinder	1000	0	0	0	0	1000
3	Bicycle	1000	0	1000	0	0	1000
4	Motor Cycle	45000	40000	56000	32500	50000	48181
5	Mobile Phone	2500	2275	2406	2500	2800	2452

Farm implements owned: The data regarding the farm implements owned by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 11. About 2.94 per cent of the households possess Bullock Cart, 41.18 per cent possess plough and 2.94 per cent possess Seed/Fertilizer Drill and Sprinkler, 17.65 per cent possess Sprayer, 55.88 per cent possess Weeder and 5.88 per cent possess tractor.

Table 11. Farm implements owned in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock Cart	0	0	0	0	1	6.67	0	0	0	0	1	2.94
2	Plough	0	0	4	57.1	5	33.33	4	80	1	50	14	41.18
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	2.94
4	Tractor	0	0	0	0	2	13.33	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
5	Sprayer	0	0	0	0	4	26.67	1	20	1	50	6	17.65
6	Weeder	1	20	5	71.4	9	60	4	80	0	0	19	55.88
7	Blank	4	80	2	28.6	4	26.67	0	0	1	50	11	32.35

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.2592, bullock Cart was Rs.20000, seed/fertilizer drill was Rs.3316, sprayer and weeder was Rs.89 and tractor Rs. 650000

Table 12. Average value of farm implements in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed
Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Bullock Cart	0	0	20000	0	0	20000
2	Plough	0	2575	2200	2750	4000	2592
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0	0	0	0	3500	3500
4	Tractor	0	0	650000	0	0	650000
5	Sprayer	0	0	3575	2800	2800	3316
6	Weeder	100	100	85	84	0	89

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 13. The results indicate that, 41.18 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 5.88 per cent possess local cow and 2.94 per cent possess buffalo.

Table 13. Livestock possession by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	0	0	4	57	5	33.33	4	80	1	50	14	41.18
2	Local cow	0	0	0	0	2	13.33	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
3	Buffalo	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0	1	2.94
4	blank	5	100	3	43	8	53.33	0	0	1	50	17	50

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 14. The indicated that, own labour men available in the micro watershed was 7.35, women available in the micro watershed was 1.35, hired labour (men) available was 1.55 and hired labour (women) available was 8.81.

Table 14. Average labour availability in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Hired labour Female	5	5.14	8.13	6	15	7.35
2	Own Labour Female	1	1.29	1.47	1.2	1.5	1.35
3	Own labour Male	2.5	1.43	1.53	1.4	1.5	1.55
4	Hired labour Male	5	7.29	9.47	7	17.5	8.81

Adequacy of hired labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 91.18 per cent of the household opined that hired labour was adequate.

Table 15. Adequacy of hired labour in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate	2	40	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	31	91.2

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, 29.38 ha (73.77%) of dry land and 10.45 ha (26.23 %) of irrigated land.

Table 16. Distribution of land (ha) in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particular	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Dry	0	0	5	100	16.62	86.5	7.69	71.8	0	0	29.3	73.7
2	Irrigated	0	0	0	0	2.58	13.4	3.01	28.1	4.8	100	10.4	26.2
Total		0	100	5	100	19.2	100	10.7	100	4.8	100	39.8	100

Average value of land (ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 17. The results show that the

average value of dry land was Rs.500123.96 and the average value of irrigated land was Rs.612238.58.

Table 17. Average value of land (ha) in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Dry	0	886363.6	493278.1	260000	0	500124
2	Irrigated	0	0	1084013	597580.7	370500	612238.6

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, farmers have grown red gram (9.79 ha), paddy (8.78 ha), jowar (0.81 ha) and cotton (20.47 ha).

Table 18. Cropping pattern in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL(5)	MF (7)	SF(15)	SMF(5)	MDF(2)	All (34)
1	Kharif - Cotton	0	2.59	8.51	9.37	0	20.47
2	Kharif - Red gram	0	1.68	8.11	0	0	9.79
3	Kharif - Paddy	0	0	2.58	1.34	4.86	8.78
4	Kharif - Jowar	0	0.81	0	0	0	0.81

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 19. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity was 100 per cent.

Table 19. Cropping intensity (%) in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Cropping Intensity	0	100	100	100	100	100

Possession of bank account and savings: The data regarding the possession of bank account and saving in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 20. The results indicate that, 97.06 cent of the household's posse's bank account and 35.29 per cent of them have savings.

Table 20. Possession of Bank account and savings in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Account	5	100	6	85.71	15	100	5	100	2	100	33	97.06
2	Savings	2	40	1	14.29	6	40	2	40	1	50	12	35.29

Borrowing status: The data regarding the borrowing status in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 21. The results indicate that, 97.06 percent of the sample farmers have borrowed credit from different sources.

Table 21. Borrowing status in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Credit Availed	4	80	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	33	97.06

Source of credit: The data regarding the source of credit availed by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 22. The results show that, 53.85 per cent have borrowed loan from commercial banks and 15.38 per cent have borrowed loan from Cooperative bank, 30.77 per cent have borrowed loan from Grameena Bank and 84.62 per cent have borrowed loan from money lender.

Table 22. Source of credit borrowed by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (1)		SF (8)		SMF(2)		MDF(1)		All (13)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Commercial Bank	0	0	0	0	5	62.5	1	50	1	100	7	53.8
2	Cooperative Bank	0	0	1	100	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	2	15.3
3	Grameena Bank	0	0	0	0	2	25	2	100	0	0	4	30.7
4	Money Lender	2	100	1	100	6	75	2	100	0	0	11	84.6

Avg. Credit amount: The data regarding the avg. Credit amount in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 23. The results show that, farmers have borrowed Avg. Credit of Rs.32333.33 from different sources.

Table 23. Avg. Credit amount in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL(2)	MF (1)	SF (8)	SMF(2)	MDF(1)	All (13)
1	Average Credit	17000	15000	12000	25000	125000	32333.3

Purpose of credit borrowed (institutional Source): The data regarding the purpose of credit borrowed - Institutional Credit in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 24. The results indicate that, 100 per cent of the households have borrowed loan for agriculture.

Table 24. Purpose of credit borrowed (institutional Source) by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

SN	Particulars	LL (0)		MF (1)		SF (8)		SMF (3)		MDF (1)		All (13)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture production	0	0	1	100	8	100	3	100	1	100	13	100

Table 25. Purpose of credit borrowed (Private Source) by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (1)		SF (6)		SMF (2)		All (11)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture production	0	0	1	100	4	66.7	2	100	7	63.64
2	Purchase-land	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	9.09
3	Household consumption	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.09
4	Healthcare	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	9.09
5	Social functions like marriage	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.09

Purpose of credit borrowed (Private Source): The data regarding the purpose of credit borrowed – Private Source in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, 63.64 per cent of the households have borrowed loan for

agriculture, purchase-land, household consumption and social functions like marriage (9.09 %).

Repayment status of household (institutional Source): The data regarding the repayment status of credit borrowed from institutional Source by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 26. The results indicate that, 100 per cent have unpaid there loan in institutional status.

Table 26. Repayment status of household (institutional Source) in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (0)		MF (1)		SF (8)		SMF (3)		MDF (1)		All (13)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Un paid	0	0	1	100	8	100	3	100	1	100	13	100

Repayment status of household (Private Source): The data regarding the repayment status of credit borrowed from private sources by households in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, 9.09 per cent of the households have partially paid and 90.09 percent have unpaid there loan in private sources.

Table 27. Repayment status of household (Private Source) in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (1)		SF (6)		SMF (2)		MDF (0)		All (11)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Partially paid	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.09
2	Un paid	1	50	1	100	6	100	2	100	0	0	10	90.9

Opinion regarding Non- institutional sources of credit: The data regarding the opinion on non-institutional sources of credit in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, 36.36 per cent Higher rate of interest.

Table 28. Opinion regarding Non- institutional sources of credit in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (1)		SF (6)		SMF(2)		All (11)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Loan amount was adequate to fulfil the requirement	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.1
2	Higher rate of interest	1	50	1	100	0	0	2	100	4	36

Cost of Cultivation of Paddy: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Paddy in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 29.a. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Paddy was Rs. 48516.56. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 74860.90. The net income from Paddy cultivation was Rs.26344.34, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.50.

Table 29(a). Cost of Cultivation of Paddy in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	Cost A1				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	39.5	8448.76	17.41
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	0.14	109.78	0.23
3	Tractor	Hours	3.15	1910.95	3.94
4	Machinery	Hours	1	598.79	1.23
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	63.95	6265.88	12.91
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM	Quintal	0.82	1235	2.55
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	17.62	15083.4	31.09
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs / liters	3.76	2877.49	5.93
10	Irrigation	Number	3.63	0	0
11	Repairs		0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)		0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges		0	40.09	0.08
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0	0	0
II	Cost B1				
16	Interest on working capital			3056.61	6.3
17	Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)			39626.74	81.68
III	Cost B2				
18	Rental Value of Land			166.67	0.34
19	Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)			39793.41	82.02
IV	Cost C1				
20	Family Human Labour		16.26	4302.56	8.87
21	Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)			44095.97	90.89
V	Cost C2				
22	Risk Premium			10	0.02
23	Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)			44105.97	90.91
VI	Cost C3				
24	Managerial Cost			4410.6	9.09
25	Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)			48516.56	100
VII	Economics of the Crop				
		a) Main Product (q)	48.82	74860.9	
a.	Main Product	b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)		1533.33	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)			74860.9	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)			26344.34	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)			993.74	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)			1:1.5	

Cost of Cultivation of Jowar: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Jowar in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 29.b. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Jowar was Rs. 34337.48. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 18525. The net income from Jowar cultivation was Rs.-15812.48, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.50.

Table 29(b). Cost of Cultivation of Jowar in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	Cost A1				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	41.99	8892	25.9
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	3.71	2964	8.63
3	Tractor	Hours	0	0	0
4	Machinery	Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	12.35	988	2.88
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM	Quintal	2.47	4940	14.39
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	7.41	5928	17.26
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs/liters	1.24	1235	3.6
10	Irrigation	Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs		0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)		0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges		0	74.1	0.22
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0	0	0
II	Cost B1				
16	Interest on working capital			1572.12	4.58
17	Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)			26593.22	77.45
III	Cost B2				
18	Rental Value of Land			166.67	0.49
19	Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)			26759.89	77.93
IV	Cost C1				
20	Family Human Labour		19.76	4446	12.95
21	Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)			31205.89	90.88
V	Cost C2				
22	Risk Premium			10	0.03
23	Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)			31215.89	90.91
VI	Cost C3				
24	Managerial Cost			3121.59	9.09
25	Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)			34337.48	100
VII	Economics of the Crop				
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		12.35	18525
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1500
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)			18525	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)			-15812.48	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)			2780.36	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)			1:0.5	

Cost of Cultivation of Cotton: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Cotton in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 29.c. The results indicate, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Cotton was Rs.41268.24. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 77728.68. The net income from Cotton cultivation was Rs. 36460.44, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.90.

Table 29(c). Cost of Cultivation of Cotton in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	Cost A1				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	51.93	9094.76	22.04
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	3.88	3075.91	7.45
3	Tractor	Hours	0.56	299.17	0.72
4	Machinery	Hours	0.69	413.24	1
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	4.61	6350.8	15.39
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM	Quintal	1.52	3490.52	8.46
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	7.61	6762.01	16.39
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs/liters	2.07	1403.82	3.4
10	Irrigation	Number	0.6	0	0
11	Repairs		0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)		0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges		0	634.24	1.54
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0	0	0
II	Cost B1				
16	Interest on working capital			2162.06	5.24
17	Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)			33686.52	81.63
III	Cost B2				
18	Rental Value of Land			166.67	0.4
19	Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)			33853.18	82.03
IV	Cost C1				
20	Family Human Labour		14.63	3653.4	8.85
21	Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)			37506.58	90.88
V	Cost C2				
22	Risk Premium			10	0.02
23	Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)			37516.58	90.91
VI	Cost C3				
24	Managerial Cost			3751.66	9.09
25	Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)			41268.24	100
VII	Economics of the Crop				
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		16.15	77728.68
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4814.29
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				77728.68
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				36460.44
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2556.03
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.9

Cost of Cultivation of Red gram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Red gram in Godadahadagi-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 29.d. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Red gram was Rs. 25510.13. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs.46190.93. The net income from Red gram cultivation was Rs. 20680.80, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.80.

Table 29(d). Cost of Cultivation of Red gram in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	Cost A1				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	31.08	5725.35	22.44
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	1.49	1462.44	5.73
3	Tractor	Hours	4.22	2849.05	11.17
4	Machinery	Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	8.13	676.1	2.65
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM	Quintal	1.32	2570.52	10.08
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	2.92	2813.54	11.03
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs /liters	1.28	888.87	3.48
10	Irrigation	Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs		0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)		0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges		0	1345.92	5.28
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0	0	0
II	Cost B1				
16	Interest on working capital			835.08	3.27
17	Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)			19166.88	75.13
III	Cost B2				
18	Rental Value of Land			166.67	0.65
19	Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)			19333.55	75.79
IV	Cost C1				
20	Family Human Labour		16.02	3847.48	15.08
21	Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)			23181.02	90.87
V	Cost C2				
22	Risk Premium			10	0.04
23	Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)			23191.02	90.91
VI	Cost C3				
24	Managerial Cost			2319.1	9.09
25	Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)			25510.13	100
VII	Economics of the Crop				
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)	9.85	46190.93	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)		4687.5	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)			46190.93	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)			20680.8	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)			2588.79	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)			1:1.8	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, 50 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 5.88 per cent of them opined dry fodder was inadequate.

Table 30. Adequacy of fodder in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	4	57.14	7	46.67	4	80	2	100	17	50
2	Inadequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	0	0	1	6.67	1	20	0	0	2	5.88

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the annual gross income in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross income of Rs. 156705.88 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 83426.47 is from agriculture itself.

Table 31. Average annual gross income in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Service/salary	0	0	0	20000	0	2941.18
2	Business	0	0	28633.3	60000	0	21455.9
3	Wage	81000	26428.6	52466.7	49000	20000	48882.4
4	Agriculture	0	42214.3	94000	149400	192000	83426.5
	Income(Rs.)	81000	68642.9	175100	278400	212000	156706

Average annual Expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross expenditure of Rs. 589758.33 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 37750 is from agriculture itself.

Table 32. Average annual Expenditure in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Service/salary	0	0	0	38000	0	1117.65
2	Business	0	0	68666.7	120000	0	9588.24
3	Wage	36000	13666.7	29857.1	29500	28000	24294.1
4	Agriculture	0	15750	43517.9	76800	90000	37750
	Total	36000	29416.7	142042	264300	118000	589758

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicate that, households have planted 29 neem and 1 tamarind trees in their field.

Table 33. Forest species grown in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Neem	0	0	6	0	16	0	5	0	2	0	29	0
2	Tamarind	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0

*F= Field B=Back Yard

Average additional investment capacity: The data regarding average additional investment capacity in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 34. The

results indicate that, households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 10970.59 for land development, Rs. 73529.41 for creation of irrigation facility, Rs.1000 for adoption of improved livestock breeds, Rs.4794.12 for adoption of improved crop production activities.

Table 34. Average additional investment capacity of households in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (15)	SMF (5)	MDF (2)	All (34)
1	Land development	0	17000	16000	2800	0	10970.6
2	Irrigation facility	0	35714.3	106667	130000	0	73529.4
3	Improved crop production	0	2142.86	466.67	2400	0	1000
4	Improved livestock management	0	1000	3533.33	600	50000	4794.12

Source of funds for additional investment: The data regarding source of funds for additional investment in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicate that, the sources of finance raised from government for land development was 11.76 and for irrigation facility was 32.35. loan from bank was the source for land development was 5.88 per cent. Own funds for the source for land development, improved crop production and improved livestock management was 23.53 per cent,

Table 35. Source of funds for additional investment in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No	Item	Land development		Irrigation facility		Improved crop production		Improved livestock management	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Government subsidy	4	11.76	11	32.4	0	0	0	0
2	Loan from bank	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
3	Own funds	8	23.53	0	0	8	23.53	8	23.5

Marketing of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicated that, 100 percent of output of cotton was sold in the market, 50 percent of output of jowas was sold in the market, 90.24 percent of output of paddy was sold in the market, 73.68 percent of output of red gram was sold in the market.

Table 36. Marketing of agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Cotton	327	0	327	100	4814
2	Jowar	10	5	5	50	1500
3	Paddy	410	40	370	90	1533
4	Redgram	95	25	70	74	4688

Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicated that, 85.29 cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants,

Table 37. Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Local/village Merchant	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicated that, 85.29 cent of the households have used tractor.

Table 38. Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Tractor	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicate that, 50 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 39. Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF(2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0	6	86	7	46.7	3	60	1	50	17	50

Interest towards soil testing: The data regarding Interest shown towards soil testing in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicated that, 85.29 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.

Table 40. Interest regarding soil testing in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29

Soil and water conservation practices and structures adopted: The data regarding soil and water conservation practices and structures adopted in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicated that 8.82 per cent of farmers practicing field bunding as soil and water conservation practice.

Table 41. Soil and water conservation practices and structures adopted in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Field Bunding	0	0	1	14	1	6.7	0	0	1	50	3	8.82

Status of soil and water conservation structures: The data regarding status soil and water conservation structures adopted in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in

Table 42. The results indicated that, the households have adopted field bunding as a soil and water conservation structures out of which 66.67 per cent was in good condition and 33.33 per cent was slightly damaged.

Table 42. Status of soil and water conservation structures in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Item	Good		Slightly Damaged	
		N	%	N	%
1	Field Bunding	2	66.67	1	33.33

Agencies involved in the soil and water conservation structures: The data regarding Agencies involved in the soil and water conservation structures adopted in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicated that, 2.94 per cent of the households have adopted by their own and 5.88 per cent were done by Govt.

Table 43. Agencies involved in the soil and water conservation structures in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Own	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	2.94
2	Govt.	0	0	1	14	1	6.67	0	0	0	0	2	5.88

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data on usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicated that, firewood was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 76.47 per cent of the households followed by LPG (26.47%).

Table 44. Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	3	60	4	57.1	14	93.3	4	80	1	50	26	76.47
2	LPG	2	40	3	42.9	1	6.67	2	40	1	50	9	26.47

Source of drinking water: The data on source of drinking water in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, piped supply of water was the major source for drinking water for 97.06 per cent of the households followed by open well water for (2.94%).

Table 45. Source of drinking water in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	4	80	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	33	97.06
2	Open well	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.94

Source of light: The data on source of light in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 46. The results indicated that, electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households.

Table 46. Source of light in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	5	100	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	34	100

Existence of sanitary toilet facility: The data on availability of toilet facility in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 47. The results indicated that, 52.94 per cent of the households possess toilets.

Table 47. Existence of sanitary toilet facility in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	1	20	2	29	9	60	5	100	1	50	18	52.9

Possession of PDS card: The data regarding possession of PDS card in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 48. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households possessed BPL card.

Table 48. Possession of PDS card in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	BPL	5	100	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	34	100

Participation in NREGA programme: The data regarding Participation in NREGA programme in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 49. The results indicated that, only 2.94 percent of the participate have participated in NREGA programme.

Table 49. Participation in NREGA programme in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.94

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 50. The results indicated that, the extent of adequacy of food items for cereals and pulses, Oilseeds and vegetables were 97.06, 70.59, 47.06 per cent respectively, similarly for milk (5.88%) and Egg (2.94%).

Table 50. Adequacy of food items in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	3	60	7	100	15	100	6	120	2	100	33	97.06
2	Pulses	3	60	7	100	15	100	6	120	2	100	33	97.06
3	Oilseed	0	0	6	85.7	12	80	5	100	1	50	24	70.59
4	Vegetables	1	20	5	71.4	6	40	3	60	1	50	16	47.06
5	Milk	1	20	0	0	1	6.67	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
6	Egg	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.94

Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding in adequacy of food items in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 51. The results indicated that, the extent of in adequacy of food items for cereals and pulses, Oilseeds and vegetables were 5.88, 29.41, 52.94 and 79.41 per cent respectively, similarly for fruits (76.47%), milk (97.06%), egg (70.59%) and meat (79.41%).

Table 51. Inadequacy of food items in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
2	Pulses	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.88
3	Oilseed	5	100	1	14.3	3	20	0	0	1	50	10	29.41
4	Vegetables	4	80	2	28.6	9	60	2	40	1	50	18	52.94
5	Fruits	5	100	3	42.9	13	86.67	3	60	2	100	26	76.47
6	Milk	4	80	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	33	97.06
7	Egg	4	80	3	42.9	13	86.67	2	40	2	100	24	70.59
8	Meat	5	100	3	42.9	13	86.67	4	80	2	100	27	79.41

Farming constraints: The data regarding farming constraints experienced by households in Godadahadagi-2 Micro watershed is presented in Table 52. The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by (70.59 %) per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (64.71%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (85.29%), inadequacy of irrigation water (58.82%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (85.29%), high rate of interest on credit (85.29%), low price for the agricultural commodities (58.82 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (35.29%), inadequate extension services (17.65 %), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (64.71%).

Table 52. Farming constraints experienced in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed

SN	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (15)		SMF (5)		MDF (2)		All (34)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	0	0	6	85.71	12	80	5	100	1	50	24	70.59
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	0	0	5	71.43	12	80	4	80	1	50	22	64.71
3	Frequent incidence of pest and diseases	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	0	0	6	85.71	10	66.67	4	80	0	0	20	58.82
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29
6	High rate of interest on credit	0	0	7	100	15	100	5	100	2	100	29	85.29
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	0	0	3	42.86	12	80	3	60	2	100	20	58.82
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	0	0	2	28.57	7	46.67	1	20	2	100	12	35.29
9	Inadequate extension services	0	0	1	14.29	4	26.67	0	0	1	50	6	17.65
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	0	0	3	42.86	13	86.67	3	60	3	150	22	64.71

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed 34 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey. The study was conducted in Godadahadagi-2 micro-watershed (Belagunda sub-watershed, Yadgiri taluk & District) is located at North latitude 16⁰ 52' 25.18" and 16⁰ 51' 10.235" and East longitude 77⁰ 9' 47.358" and 77⁰ 8' 6.025" covering an area of about 565.45 ha coming under Kondapura, Badiyala, Goodyura and Gonedagi Villages.

Socio-economic analysis indicated that, out of the total sample of 34 respondents, 7 (20.59%) were marginal, 15(44.12%) were small and 5 (14.71%) were semi medium, 2 (5.88%) were medium, 0(0%) were large farmers. The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 92 (55.76%) men and 73 (44.24%) were women. Majority of the respondents (40%) were in the age group of 16-35 years. Education level of the sample households indicated that, majority there were 49.70 per cent illiterates, 1.82 per cent attained graduation. About, 79.41 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 8.82 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers. Agriculture was the major occupation for 54.55 per cent of the household members.

In the study area, 82.35 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 11.76 per cent possess pucca house. The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 73.53 per cent possess TV, 2.94 per cent possess mixer grinder and 91.18 per cent possess mobile phones. Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 41.18 per cent of the households possess plough and only 17.65 per cent sprayer. Regarding livestock possession by the households, 5.88 per cent possess local cow and 2.94 per cent possess buffalo respectively.

The average labour availability in the study area showed that, own men labour availability was 1.55 and women labour availability in the micro watershed was 1.35, while the hired labour (men) availability was 8.81 and hired labour (women) availability was 7.35.

Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents (39.83 ha), 73.77 per cent of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 26.23 per cent area is irrigated land. The major crops grown by sample farmers are Paddy, Jowar, Cotton and Red gram and cropping intensity was recorded as 100 per cent.

The sample households possessed 97.06 per cent bank account and 35.29 per cent of them have savings in the account. About 97.06 per cent of the respondents borrowed credit from various sources. Among the credit borrowed by households, 53.85 per cent have borrowed loan from commercial banks and 30.77 per cent from Cooperative bank. Majority of the respondents (100 %) have borrowed loan for agriculture purpose.

The per hectare cost of cultivation for Paddy, Jowar, Cotton, Red gram and 0 was Rs.48516.56 , 34337.48, 41268.24, 25510.13, and 20719.54 with benefit cost ratio of 1:1.50, 1: 0.50, 1: 1.90, 1: 1.80, and 1:2.90 , respectively.

Further, 50 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate. The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 156705.88 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 83426.47 comes from agriculture.

Sampled households have grown forest species neem (29) and 1 tamarind trees in the fields,

Households have an average investment capacity of Rs 11.76. for land development. Rs 73529.41 for irrigation facility creation. Source of funds for additional investment is concerned and 11.76 per cent depends on government for land development, and for irrigation facility was 32.35. Loan from bank was the source for land development was 5.88 per cent. Own funds for the source for land development, improved crop production and improved livestock management was 23.53 per cent.

Regarding marketing channels, 85.29 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants. Further, 85.29 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.

Majority of the farmers (50 %) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 85.29 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing. About, 8.82 per cent of farmers practicing field bunding as soil and water conservation practice.

Firewood connection was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 76.47 per cent of the households and 26.47 per cent households has LPG. Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 97.06 per cent of the households. Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households. In the study area, 52.94 per cent of the households possess toilet facility. Regarding possession of PDS card, 100 per cent of the households possessed BPL card. Cereals and pulses (97.06%), oilseeds (70.59%) were adequate for consumption.

Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (70.59%) wild animal menace on farm field (64.71%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (85.29%), inadequacy of irrigation water (58.82%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (85.29%), high rate of interest on credit (85.29%), low price for the agricultural commodities (58.82%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (35.29%), inadequate extension services (17.65%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (64.71%).

Implications of the survey

- ✓ Result indicated that, there were 49.70 per cent were illiterate hence, extension methodologies such as demonstration, street play, drama, video shows will be effective in dissemination of the technologies in the micro watershed.
- ✓ The data indicate that, 82.35 per cent of the households possess katcha house. Hence, the development department while implementing the watershed plan should focus on agriculture to enhance the productivity of major crops in the area to increase the income of the farmers.
- ✓ Results indicated that the local institutional participation of the household members in the micro watershed is minimal hence, activities like membership campaign, awareness creation about the benefits of membership in local institutions and strengths of organized groups must be conveyed.
- ✓ Majority of the households in the watershed have experience in use of mobile phones, and television hence, these mass media can be effectively utilized for transfer of technology as well as for information dissemination.
- ✓ The farm machinery/implement possession in the micro watershed was found to be minimum the reasons may lack of knowledge or lack of financial ability which can be addressed through training on use of different farm implements, providing information on different sources of finance for purchase of farm implements.
- ✓ The possession of livestock such as crossbred cow found is less hence, farmers must be made aware of the benefits of crossbred cow in increased milk production.
- ✓ The possession of livestock such as sheep, goat and poultry was found to be low hence, farmers may be informed the role of subsidiary enterprises in enhancing the income and information on financial support for subsidiary activities.
- ✓ The data indicate that, job/work was the reason for all the migrants hence, farmers may be trained on profitable agriculture or self employment such as animal husbandry, plate making, sheep rearing, goat rearing, rabbit rearing with suitable information on sources of financial support.
- ✓ The results indicate that there was a change in quality of life due to migration hence, the developmental departments should take actions to arrest migration and to improve the quality of the life in rural areas.
- ✓ Households possess 29.38ha (73.77 %) of dry land and 10.45ha (26.23 %) of irrigated land hence, the availability of the dryland agricultural technologies such as short duration crops, high yielding drought resistance crop varieties, drip irrigation technology and subsidy information will be helpful for the farmers to enhance the productivity of land and as well as farmers income.
- ✓ Few of the bore well in micro watershed found non functional hence, farmers may be trained on possibility of bore well rejuvenation.

- ✓ Bore well was major source of irrigation for 0 per cent of the households. hence, in order to increase the area under irrigation as well as to increase the water use efficiency farmers may be trained on drip irrigation and provided the information on subsidy for drip irrigation equipment's along with the information on different agencies which provides the financial assistance for drip irrigation.
- ✓ Farmers have grown forest species 29 neem and 1 tamarind trees in the fields.
- ✓ The cropping intensity in the micro watershed was found to be (100 %) hence, care must be taken by the implementing agency to bring uncultivated land into cultivation through suitable measures.
- ✓ Many of the household members have borrowed loan from cooperative banks which has higher rate of interest hence, farmers may be sensitized on the different sources of credit with lesser interest rate such SHGs etc.
- ✓ The results indicated the non availability of both green and dry fodder throughout the year hence, fodder development activities can be taken up in the micro watershed.
- ✓ The average annual gross income of the households Rs.83426.47 from agriculture, Rs.21455.88 from business and Rs. 48882.35 from wages and. Agriculture was found to be the major source of income for households hence; the development activities should focus on productivity enhancement, marketing arrangements and agricultural technology dissemination to have a direct impact on the farmers.
- ✓ The cultivation of forest species is found minimal hence, information and production technology related to agro-forestry and integrated farming system.
- ✓ The data indicated that, 50 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems. Hence, those farmers who reported the soil and water erosion problems may be given attention while implementation of the watershed development plan.
- ✓ The data indicated that, 85.29 per cent of the households have interest in soil testing hence, farmers must be provided with the information on various institutions which are involved in soil testing for the benefit of the farmers.
- ✓ Except summer ploughing the adoption of other soil and water conservation structures is minimum hence, the farmers in the micro watershed should be sensitized on the use of different conservation structures for soil water conservation.
- ✓ Cereals and pulses found to be adequate for per cent of the households respectively hence, farm households and the farm women must be trained on importance of balanced nutrition and role of vegetable, milk, egg, meat in balanced diet.
- ✓ Lower fertility status of the soil (70.59%), wild animal menace on farm field (64.71%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (85.29%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (85.29%), high rate of interest on credit (85.29%), low price for the agricultural commodities (58.82%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (35.29%), inadequate extension services (17.65%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (64.71%) were the major farming

constraints experienced hence, these constraints must be addressed immediately for the welfare of the farmers. Awareness to be created among the farmers to approach nearest KVKs/RSKs and other developmental departments for technical and for subsidized inputs and utilize the well established regulated markets, approaching the contract firms, direct markets to avoid the involvement of middlemen.