ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.107

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

Agrisearch with a human touch

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORYAND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDSFOR WATERSHED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ADAVALLI-1 (4D4A2P3b) MICROWATERSHED

Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

SUJALA – III

World Bank funded Project

THE WORLD BANK

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., K.V. Niranjana, S. Srinivas, M.Lalitha, B.A. Dhanorkar, R.S. Reddy and S.K. Singh (2018). “Land Resource Inventory and Socio-Economic Status of Farm Households for Watershed Planning and Development of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka”, ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.107, ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. p.99 &.28

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

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS FOR WATERSHED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ADAVALLI-1 (4D4A2P3b) MICROWATERSHED

Koppal 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

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. Thechallenges 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 Inventry. 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 for Adavalli-1 microwatershed in Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka" for integrated development was taken up in collaboration with the State Agricutural Universities, IISC, KSRSAC, 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 randomely selected representing landed and landless class of farmers in the micowatershed. 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, agricutural extention 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: 16.08.2018

S.K. SINGH
Director, ICAR - NBSS&LUP Nagpur

PART-A

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY

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. K.V. Niranjana	Sh. R.S. Reddy
Dr. B.A. Dhanorkar	Ms. Arpitha, G.M
	Smt. Chaitra, S.P.
	Dr. Savitha, H.R.
	Dr. Gayathri, B.
	Dr. Gopali Bardhan
	Dr. Mahendra Kumar, M.B
	Sh. Nagendra, B.R.
	Mr. Somashekar T.N
Field Work	
Sh. C. Bache Gowda	Sh. Mayur Patil
Sh. Somashekar	Sh. Arun Kumar, S.
Sh. M. Jayaramaiah	Sh. Sunil Raj
	Sh. Yogesh Kumar, B.
	Sh. Vikas, N.K.
	Sh. Arun Kumar, S.G.
	Sh. Umesh Jadiyappa Madolli
	Sh. Praveen Kumar P. Achalkar
	Sh. Veerabhadraswamy
	Sh. Vinay
	Sh. Shankarappa, K.
	Sh. Lankesh, R.S.
	Sh. Appanna B. Hattigoudar
	Sh. Maharudra
GIS Work	
Dr. S.Srinivas	Sh. A.G. Devendra Prasad
Sh. D.H.Venkatesh	Sh. Abhijith Sastry, N.S.
Smt. K.Sujatha	Sh. Nagendra Babu Kolukondu
Smt. K.V.Archana	Sh. Avinash
Sh. N.Maddileti	Sh. Amar Suputhra, S.
	Sh. Deepak M.J.
	Sh. Madappaswamy
	Smt. K.Karunya Lakshmi
	Ms. Seema, K.V.
	Ms. Ramireddy Lakshmi Silpa
	Ms. Bhanu Rekha, T.
	Ms. Rajata Bhat
	Ms. Shruthi
	Ms. Suman, S.

Laboratory Analysis	
Dr. M. Lalitha	Ms. Thara, V.R.
Smt. Arti Koyal	Ms. Roopa, G.
Smt. Parvathy, S.	Ms. Vindhya, N.G.
	Ms. Shwetha N.K.
	Ms. Pavana Kumari, P.
	Ms. Leelavathy, K.U.
	Ms. Rashmi, N.
	Ms. Padmaja, S.
	Ms. Veena, M.
	Ms. Chaithrashree B
	Ms. Shwetha N
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	

Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The land resource inventory of Adavalli-1 microwatershed was conducted using village cadastral maps and IRS satellite imagery on 1:7920 scale. The false color composites of IRS imagery were interpreted for Physiography and these 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 353 ha in Koppal taluk and district, Karnataka. The climate is semiarid and categorized as drought - prone with an average annual rainfall of 662 mm, of which about 424 mm is received during south –west monsoon, 161 mm during north-east and the remaining 77 mm during the rest of the year. An area of about 99 per cent is covered by soils, less than one per cent by water bodies, settlements and others. The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below.

- *The soils belong to 8 soil series and 15 soil phases (management units) and 5 land use classes.*
- *The length of crop growing period is <90 days and starts from 2nd week of August to 2nd week of November.*
- *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 250 m grid interval.*
- *Land suitability for growing 28 major agricultural and horticultural crops were assessed and maps showing the degree of suitability along with constraints were generated.*
- *Entire area is suitable for agriculture.*
- *About 9 per cent of the soils are shallow (25-50 cm), 54 per cent moderately shallow (50-75 cm), 20 per cent moderately deep (75- 100 cm) and 11 per cent has deep to very deep soils (100 ->150 cm).*
- *About 32 per cent of the area is having loamy soils and 62 per cent has clayey soils at the surface.*
- *About 23 per cent of the area has non-gravelly (<15%) soils, 51 per cent has gravelly soils (15-35 % gravel) and 20 per cent has very gravelly (35- 60% gravel) soils.*
- *With respect to available water capacity 21 per cent of the area has very low (<50mm/m), 42 per cent of the area has low (51-100 mm/m), 20 per cent medium (101-150 mm/m) and 11 per cent area has very high (>200mm/m).*

- *An area of about <1 per cent has nearly level (0-1%) lands and 94 per cent has very gently sloping (1-3%) lands.*
- *An area of about 42 per cent is slightly eroded (e1) and 52 per cent is moderately eroded (e2) lands.*
- *An area of about <1 per cent has neutral (pH 6.5 to 7.3) soils, 4 per cent slightly alkaline(pH 7.3 to 7.8), 21 per cent moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 to 8.4) ,60 per cent strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 to 9.0) and 9 per cent soils very strongly alkaline (pH>9.0).*
- *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the soils are dominantly <2 dsm^{-1} indicating that soils are non saline.*
- *Organic carbon is low (<0.5%) in about 35 per cent, medium (0.5-0.75%) in 45 per cent and high (>0.75%) in 15 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available phosphorus is low (<23 kg/ha) in 57 per cent and medium (23-57 kg/ha) in 37 per cent of the soils.*
- *Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in 64 per cent and high (>337 kg/ha) in 30 per cent of the soils.*
- *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in <1 per cent, medium (10-20 ppm) in 29 per cent and high (>20 ppm) in 65 per cent area of the soils*
- *Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in about 25 per cent, medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in 67 per cent and high (>1.0 ppm) in 2 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available iron is deficient in 84 per cent of the area and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 13 per cent of the area.*
- *Available zinc is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in 32 per cent of the area and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 62 per cent of the area.*
- *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in the entire area.*
- *The land suitability for 28 major crops grown in the microwatershed was 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)
Sorghum	*41(12%)*	*184 (52%)*		*Pomegranate*	-	*111(31%)*
Maize	-	-		*Guava*	-	-
Bajra	-	*75(21%)*		*Jackfruit*	-	-
Redgram	-	*79(22%)*		*Jamun*	-	*39 (11%)*
Bengal gram	*41(12%)*	259 (73%)		*Musambi*	*1(<1%)*	*109 (31%)*
Groundnut	-	*1(<1%)*		*Lime*	*1(<1%)*	*109 (31%)*
Sunflower	*1 (<1%)*	*109(31%)*		*Cashew*	-	-
Cotton	*41 (12%)*	*184(52%)*		*Custard apple*	*41(12%)*	*260(74%)*
Chilli	-	-		*Amla*	-	*301(85%)*
Tomato	-	-		*Tamarind*	-	*39 (11%)*
Drumstick	-	*111(31%)*		*Marigold*	-	*225 (64%)*
Mulberry	-	*73(21%)*		*Chrysanthemum*	-	*225 (64%)*
Mango	-	-		*Jasmine*	-	*115 (33%)*
Sapota	-	-		*Crossandra*	-	*32(9%)*

Apart from the individual crop suitability, a proposed crop plan has been prepared for the 5 identified LUCs 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 to 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 sub marginal lands, field bunds and also in the hillocks, mounds and ridges. That would help in supplementing the farm income, provide fodder and fuel, and generate lot of biomass which in turn would help in maintaining the ecological balance and contribute to mitigating the climate change.*

Chapter 1

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 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 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 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 was 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 Adavalli-1 microwatershed in Koppal Taluk, Koppal 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.

Chapter 2

GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

2.1 Location and Extent

The Adavalli-1 micro-watershed is located in the central part of Karnataka in Koppal taluk and district (Fig2.1). It lies between $15^0$13' and $15^0$15' North latitudes and $75^0$58' and $76^0$0' East longitudes and covers an area of about 353 ha. It comprises parts of Alavandi and Kampli village. It is about 70 km from Koppal town and bounded by Kampli village on the south and Alawandi village on the northern, eastern and western side of the microwatershed.



Fig.2.1 Location map of Adavalli-1 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 Adavalli-1 village. 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 paleo black soils originally formed at higher elevation, but now occupying river valleys.

Fig.2.2 a Granite and granite gneiss rocks

Fig.2.2 b Alluvium

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as Granite gneiss and Alluvial landscapes based on geology. The microwatershed area has been further divided into mounds/ridges, summits, side slopes and very gently sloping uplands and nearly level plains based on slope and its relief features. The elevation ranges from 540 to 566 m in the gently sloping uplands. The mounds and ridges are mostly covered by rock outcrops.

2.4 Drainage

The area is drained by several small seasonal streams that join Hire *halla* and Chenna *halla* along its course. Though, the streams are not perennial, during rainy season they carry large quantities of rain water. The microwatershed has only few small tanks which are not able to store the water flowing during the rainy season. Due to this, the ground water recharge is very much affected in the villages. This is reflected in the failure of many bore wells in the villages. If the available rain water is properly harnessed by constructing 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 dendritic to sub parallel.

2.5 Climate

The district falls under semiarid tract of the state and is categorized as drought - prone with total annual rainfall of 662 mm (Table 2.1). Of this a maximum of 424 mm precipitation is received during south–west monsoon period from June to September, north-east monsoon contributes about 161 mm and prevails from October to early December and the remaining 77 mm is received during the rest of the year. The winter season is from December to February. During April and May, the temperatures reach up to 45°C and in December and January, the temperatures will go down to 16°C. Rainfall distribution is shown in Figure 2.3. The average Potential Evapo Transpiration (PET) is 145 mm and varies from a low of 101 mm in December to 193 mm in the month of May. The PET is always higher than precipitation in all the months except in the month of September. Generally, the Length of crop Growing Period (LGP) is <90 days and starts from 2nd week of August to 2nd week of November.

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

Sl. No.	Months	Rainfall	PET	1/2 PET
1	January	1.60	116.70	58.35
2	February	1.50	129.20	64.60
3	March	14.10	169.80	84.90
4	April	18.10	180.60	90.30
5	May	41.60	193.50	96.75
6	June	85.80	167.90	83.95
7	July	72.10	156.20	78.10
8	August	110.50	152.50	76.25
9	September	155.60	138.50	69.25
10	October	116.30	122.30	61.15
11	November	36.00	106.40	53.20
12	December	9.10	101.00	50.50
TOTAL		**662.30**	**144.55**	



Fig. 2.3 Rainfall distribution in Koppal Taluk and District

2.6 Natural Vegetation

The natural vegetation is sparse comprising few tree species, shrubs and herbs. The mounds, ridges and boulders occupy sizeable areas which are 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 (Fig 2.4).

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 and eventually resulting in the heavy siltation of few tanks and reservoirs in the microwatershed.

Fig 2.4 Natural vegetation of Adavalli-1 microwatershed

2.7 Land Utilization

About 91 per cent area (Table 2.2) in Koppal district is cultivated at present and about 17 per cent of the area is sown more than once. An area of about 3 per cent is currently barren. Forests occupy a small area of about 5 per cent and the tree cover is in a very poor state. Most of the mounds, ridges and boulder areas have very poor vegetative cover. Major crops grown in the area are sorghum, maize, bajra, cotton, safflower, sunflower, red gram, horse gram, onion, mulberry, pomegranate, sugarcane, bengalgram and groundnut (Fig 2.5). 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 Adavalli-1 microwatershed is presented in Fig.2.6. Simultaneously, enumeration of existing wells (bore wells) and conservation structures is made and their location in different survey numbers is marked on the cadastral map. Map showing the location of wells in Adavalli-1 microwatershed is given Fig.2.7.

Table 2.2 Land Utilization in Koppal District

Sl.No.	Agricultural land use	Area (ha)	Per cent
1	Total geographical area	552495	
2	Total cultivated area	500542	90.6
3	Area sown more than once	92696	16.8
4	Trees and groves	210	0.04
5	Cropping intensity	-	118
6	Forest	29451	5.33
7	Cultivable wasteland	2568	0.46
8	Permanent Pasture land	14675	2.66
9	Barren land	16627	3.01
10	Non agricultural land	40591	7.35
11	Current fallow	19660	3.56

Fig.2.5 (a) Different crops and cropping systems in Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Fig.2.5 (b) Different crops and cropping systems in Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.2.6 Current Land Use – Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.2.7 Location of wells– Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 3

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 Adavalli-1 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 (slope, 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 their extent and geographic distribution on the microwatershed cadastral map. The detailed soil survey at 1:7920 scale was carried out in 353 ha area. 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 as a base. 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 geology, 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 used for initial traversing, identification of geology, landscapes 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 (FCC) of Cartosat-I and LISS-IV merged satellite data covering the 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 and is divided into landforms such as ridges, mounds and uplands based on slope. 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)

DSe -Alluvial landscape

DSe 1 Summit
- DSe 11 Nearly level Summit with dark grey tone
- DSe 12 Nearly level Summit with medium grey tone
- DSe 13 Nearly level Summit with whitish grey tone
- DSe 14 Nearly level Summit with whitish tone (Calcareousness)
- DSe 15 Nearly level Summit with pinkish grey tone
- DSe 16 Nearly level Summit with medium pink tone
- DSe 17 Nearly level Summit with bluish white tone
- DSe 18 Nearly level Summit with greenish grey tone

DSe 2 Very genetly sloping
- DSe 21 Very gently sloping, whitish tone
- DSe 22 Very gently sloping, greyish pink tone
- DSe 23 Very gently sloping, whitish grey tone
- DSe 24 Very gently sloping, medium grey tone
- DSe 25 Very gently sloping, medium pink tone
- DSe 26 Very gently sloping, dark grey tone
- DSe 27 Very gently sloping, bluish grey tone
- DSe 28 Very gently sloping, greenish grey tone
- DSe 29 Very gently sloping, Pinkish grey



Fig 3.1 Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.3.2 Satellite Image of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.3.3 Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Adavalli-1 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 plains 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 (Fig.3.4) were located 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, 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 to validate the soil map unit boundaries.

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, amount and nature of gravel present, calcareousness, 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, 8 soil series were identified in Adavalli-1 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	Lakkur (LKR)	50-75	2.5YR2.5/3,2.5/4,3/4,3/6	gsc	40-60	Ap-Bt-Bc-Cr	-
2	Nagalapur (NGP)	100-150	5YR 2.5/2,3/2, 2.5YR3/6,4/6	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
Soils of Alluvial Landscape							
3	Muttal(MTL)	25-50	10YR 3/2,3/3,4/2, 7.5YR 3/2,3/3,6/4	c	15-35	Ap-Bw-Ck	e-ev
4	Ravanki (RNK)	50-75	7.5YR 3/2,3/3,5/2,5/3 10YR3/1,3/2,4/1,4/2,5/1, 6/1	c	<15	Ap-Bw-Cr	e-ev
5	Dambarahalli (DRL)	75-100	10YR 2/1, 3/1, 4/3	c	<15	Ap-Bw-Ck	e-es
6	Narsapura (NSP)	75-100	10YR 3/1,3/2, 4/2	c	-	Ap-Bw-Ck	es
7	(Kadagathur) (KDT)	>150	10 YR 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 7.5YR 3/3, 3/4	sc-c	-	Ap-Bw	-
8	Murlapur (MLR)	>150	10YR2/1,2/2,3/1,3/2,4/1	c	10-20	AP-Bss	e-es

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 mini pits 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 mini pits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map.

The soil map shows the geographic distribution of 15 mapping units representing 8 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 15 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 phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Land Use Classes

The 15 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were regrouped into five Land Use Classes (LUC'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 Use Classes (LUC'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 LUCs. For Adavalli-1 microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely soil depth, soil texture, slope, erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LUCs. The land use classes are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

3.5 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each 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 in the year 2017 from farmer's fields in Adavalli-1 microwatershed (34 samples) for fertility status (major and micronutrients) at 250 m grid interval 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 using Kriging method for the microwatershed.

Table 3.2 Soil map unit description of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase Symbol	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite and Granite gneiss landscape				
	LKR	Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red, red gravelly sandy clay soils occurring on very gently to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation		**74 (21.13)**
43		LKRcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	19 (5.42)
44		LKRcB2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	55 (15.71)
	NGP	Nagalapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**1 (0.17)**
263		NGPiB1g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	1 (0.17)
Soils of Alluvial landscape				
	MTL	Muttal soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have very dark grayish brown to dark brown, calcareous black gravelly clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping plains under cultivation		**31 (8.75)**
310		MTLmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	14 (4.02)
311		MTLmB2g1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	17 (4.73)
	RNK	Ravanaki soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown and dark gray, calcareous clay black soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**116 (32.2)**
334		RNKmB1g1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	45 (12.61)
337		RNKmB2g1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	54 (15.25)
338		RNKmB2g2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	17 (4.79)
	DRL	Dambarahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark gray, calcareous black cracking clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**31 (8.82)**
348		DRLmB1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	27(7.61)
351		DRLmB2g1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	4 (1.21)
	NSP	Narasapura soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have dark grayish brown to very dark grayish brown and very dark gray, black calcareous cracking clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**40 (11.45)**

353		NSPcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	39 (11.14)
362		NSPmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	1(0.31)
	KDT	Kadagathur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown, sandy clay to clay black soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**1 (0.2)**
403		KDTmA1	Clay surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion	1(0.2)
	MLR	Murlapur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark grayish brown to very dark gray, calcareous black cracking clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**38 (10.76)**
415		MLRmB1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	37(10.51)
418		MLRmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	1(0.25)
1000		Others	Habitation and water body	22(6.1)

*Soil map unit numbers are continuous for the taluk, not the microwatersheds



Fig 3.5 Soil Phase or Management Units- Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 4

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Adavalli-1 microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscape based on geology. In all, 8 soil series were identified. Soil formation is the result of the combined effect of environmental and terrain factors that are reflected in soil morphology. The soil formation is dominantly influenced by the parent material, climate, time and relief.

A brief description of each of the 8 soil series identified followed by 15 soil phases (management units) mapped under each series (Fig. 3.5) are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Adavalli-1 microwatershed are given in Table 4.1. 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 and Granite gneiss landscape

In this landscape, two soil series were identified and mapped. The brief description of the soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Lakkur (LKR) Series: Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay red soils. They have developed from granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently and gently sloping uplands. The Lakkur series has been classified as a member of the clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Rhodustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 51 to 74 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 12 to 18 cm. Its colour is in 5YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. The texture varies from loamy sand to sandy clay loam with 15 to 50 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 39 to 58 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture is sandy clay with 40 to 60 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (50-100 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Lakkur (LKR) Series.

4.1.2 Nagalapur (NGP) Series: Nagalapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 105 to 145 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 14 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. The texture ranges from sandy loam to sandy clay with 10 to 50 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 90 to 128 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR, 5 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 3 to 6. Texture is sandy clay to clay with 35 to 80 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Nagalapur (NGP) Series.

4.2 Soils of Alluvial Landscape

In this landscape, 6 soil series were identified and mapped. Of these series, Ravanki (RNK) Series occupies maximum area of 166 ha (32%) followed by Narsapura (NSP) 40 ha (11 %).The brief description of soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.2.1 Muttal (MTL) Series: Muttal soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown, calcareous clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains. The Muttal series has been classified as a member of the clayey, mixed, isohyperthermic (calc) family of (Paralithic) Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 30 to 50 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 15 to 18 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value 2 to 3 and chroma 2.5 to 4. The texture varies from sandy clay to clay with 10 to 15 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 18 to 32 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 2 to 6 and chroma 2 to 4. Its texture is clay. The available water capacity is low (50-100 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Muttal (MTL) Series

4.2.2 Ravanaki (RNK) Series: Ravanaki soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown, calcareous clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains. The Ravanaki series has been classified as a member of the very fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 50 to 75 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 15 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value 2 to 3 and chroma 2.5 to 4. The texture varies from sandy clay to clay with 10 to 15 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 35 to 60 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR

hue with value 2 to 6 and chroma 2 to 4. Its texture is clay with gravel content of < 15per cent. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). Three soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile Characteristics of Ravanaki (RNK) Series

4.2.3 Dambarahalli (DRL) Series: Dambarahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have black and very dark gray to dark brown calcareous cracking clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on very gently to gently sloping plains under cultivation.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 75 to 99 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 13 to 24 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 2. The texture is clay. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 54 to 85 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 2 to 4 and chroma 1 to 3. Its texture is clay and is calcareous. The available water capacity is high (150-200 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Dambarahalli (DRL) Series

4.2.4 Narsapura (NSP) Series: Narasapura soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have dark grayish brown to very dark grayish brown and very dark gray, black cracking clay soils They have developed from alluvium and occur on very gently sloping plains. The Narsapura series has been classified as a member of the very fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 76 to 98 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 15 to 19 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1 to 2.The texture is clay with no gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 57 to 83 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 1 to 3. Its texture is clay and is calcareous. The available water capacity is medium (101-150 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Narsapura (NSP) Series

4.2.5 Kadagathur (KDT) Series: Kadagathur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown, sandy clay to clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 8 to 14 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 4. The texture varies is sandy loam to sandy clay loam and clay. The thickness of B horizon is more than 150 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1 to 4. Its texture is sandy clay to clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kadagathur (KDT) Series

4.2.6 Murlapur (MLR) Series: Murlapur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark grayish brown to very dark gray, calcareous black cracking clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains. The Murlapur series has been classified as a member of the very fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) family of Typic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum is >150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 20 to 25 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1.The texture is clay with no gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 150 to 190 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 2. Its texture is clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Murlapur (MLR) Series

Table: 4.1 Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Adavalli-1 microwatershed

Soil Series: Lakkur (LKR), **Pedon:** RM-8.
Location: $15^0$04'26.3"N, $75^0$37'84.1"E, (4D4A3I1f), Belhatti village, Shirahatti taluk, Gadag distrtict
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Rhodustalfs

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-21	Ap	74.00	8.34	17.66	9.62	11.57	15.76	23.13	13.92	20	sl	-	-
21-35	Bt1	54.37	10.48	35.14	16.33	8.64	9.69	11.59	8.11	40	sc	-	-
35-56	Bt2	48.37	13.46	38.17	10.96	7.69	9.17	11.28	9.27	60	sc	-	-

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-21	8.18	-	-	0.30	0.56	0.94	-	-	0.31	0.55	0.86	12.19	0.69	100.00	4.51
21-35	8.17	-	-	0.30	0.52	1.29	-	-	0.19	0.84	1.03	22.18	0.63	100.00	3.79
35-56	7.95	-	-	0.46	0.48	1.99	-	-	0.24	0.58	0.82	22.94	0.60	100.00	2.53

Contd…

Series Name: Muttal (MTL), Pedon: RM-13
Location: $15^0$14'30.8"N, $75^0$56'50.6"E, Gatareddihalla village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore **Classification:** Clayey, mixed, isohyperthermic (calc) (Paralithic) Haplustepts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-20	Ap	39.05	13.74	47.21	3.05	5.05	8.21	14.63	8.11	15-30	c	29.95	17.94
20-34	Bwk	28.77	19.57	51.66	4.81	4.71	4.92	9.09	5.24	10	c	33.44	21.56

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-20	8.27			0.202	0.79	6.10			0.62	0.25		36.64	0.78	-	0.69
20-34	8.36			0.177	0.99	23.04			0.29	0.38		39.60	0.77	-	0.96

Contd…

Series Name: Ravanaki (RNK), **Pedon:** RM-20
Location: $15^0$14'22.7"N, $75^0$57'45.8"E, Gatareddihalla village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore **Classification:** Very fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) Typic Haplustepts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-28	Ap	24.43	17.76	57.81	5.30	3.89	3.78	7.14	4.32	20	c	41.40	29.60
28-55	Bw	18.77	15.59	65.64	2.74	3.73	2.85	4.83	4.61	10	c	46.71	35.18
55-80	Bc	12.53	15.43	72.04	2.60	1.92	1.47	3.16	3.39	10	c	56.82	43.73

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-28	8.86	-	-	0.483	0.63	15.48	-	-	0.86	6.27		37.00	0.64	-	16.94
28-55	8.61	-	-	1.4	0.23	13.68	-	-	0.68	12.27		53.20	0.81	-	23.06
55-80	8.35	-	-	4.53	0.91	11.40	-	-	0.75	28.97		54.80	0.76	-	52.86

Contd…

Series Name: Narsapura (NSP), Pedon: A2/RM-2

Location: $15^0$19'86.9"N, $75^0$57'86.1"E, Kavalura village, Koppal taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore **Classification:** Very fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) Typic Haplustepts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-29	Ap	31.32	16.52	52.16	5.51	5.40	5.51	9.83	5.08	10	c	38.86	27.64
29-52	Bw1	13.30	22.08	64.62	2.52	2.41	2.41	3.67	2.29	05	c	49.88	40.05
52-77	BW2	13.22	17.39	69.40	3.56	2.41	1.95	2.76	2.53	05	c	51.33	41.55

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-29	9.16			0.615	0.23	9.36			0.72	10.98		51.09	0.98		21.49
29-52	8.69			2.01	0.5	8.64			0.55	24.42		60.63	0.94		40.27
52-77	8.52			2.68	0.46	7.68			0.50	25.65		60.74	0.88		42.24

Contd…

Series Name: Murlapur (MLR), Pedon: R-A1/16

Location: $15^0$19'42.9"N, $75^0$55'84.7"E, Kavalura village, Koppal taluk and district

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

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-30	Ap	27.97	13.96	58.07	4.22	4.77	6.66	8.10	4.22	10	c	36.24	25.90
30-53	BA	26.34	17.48	56.17	4.17	5.05	6.04	7.24	3.84	05	c	38.55	28.98
53-83	Bss1	19.35	19.55	61.10	3.13	3.91	4.03	5.48	2.80	05	c	44.48	33.69
83-105	Bss2	16.63	17.47	65.90	2.70	3.93	2.92	3.93	3.15	<5	c	50.55	38.11
105-160	Bss3	14.69	20.34	64.97	0.79	2.26	4.07	4.18	3.39	<5	c	51.54	40.19

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-30	9.19	-	-	0.313	0.57	10.08	-	-	0.64	5.67	-	42.08	0.72	-	13.48
30-53	9.22	-	-	0.449	0.24	13.08	-	-	0.35	8.23	-	41.02	0.73	-	20.06
53-83	9.17	-	-	0.377	0.82	16.92	-	-	0.39	14.28	-	51.20	0.84	-	27.90
83-105	9.18	-	-	0.477	0.61	15.48	-	-	0.35	13.19	-	53.11	0.81	-	24.84
105-160	9.01	-	-	1.17	0.24	16.92	-	-	0.43	19.61	-	53.95	0.83	-	36.35

Chapter 5

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 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: Soil depth, soil texture, coarse fragments, soil reaction, available water capacity, calcareousness, salinity/alkali *etc*.

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 severe 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 15 soil map units identified in the Adavalli-1 microwatershed are grouped under two land capability classes and four land capability subclasses (Fig. 5.1).



Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Entire area in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture. Good lands (Class II) cover maximum area of about 245 ha (69 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate problems of soil and erosion. Moderately good lands (Class III) occupy an area of about 87 ha (25 %) and distributed in the southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of soil and erosion.

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 (Fig. 5.2). The area extent and their geographical distribution in the microwatershed is given in Fig. 5.2



Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Shallow soils (25-50 cm) occupy an area of about 31 ha (9 %) and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately shallow soils (50-75 cm) occupy maximum area of about 190 ha (54 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 72 ha (20 %) is moderately deep (75-100 cm) and distributed in the

northern part of the microwatershed. Deep to Very deep (100- >150 cm) soils occupy an area of about 40 ha (11%) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed.

The most productive lands cover about 40 ha (11%) where all climatically adopted long duration crops be grown. The problem lands cover about 31 ha (9%) where only short duration crops can be grown. The probability of crop failure is very high.

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 surface soil texture map was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution in the microwatershed is shown in Fig 5.3.

An area of about 114 ha (32%) is loamy at the surface and distributed in the northern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 218 ha (62 %) is clayey at the surface and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Clayey and loamy soils are most productive lands that have high potential for soil-water retention and availability, and nutrient retention and availability, but clayey soils have problems of drainage, infiltration, workability and other physical problems.



Fig. 5.3 Surface Soil Texture map of Adavalli-1 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 Fig. 5.4.

The soils that are non-gravelly (<15% gravel) cover an area of about 81 ha (29 %) and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 179 ha (51%) is covered by gravelly (15-35% gravel) soils and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Very gravelly (35-60%) soils cover an area of about 72 ha (20 %) and distributed in the western and southeastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 5.4).

The most productive lands with respect to gravelliness are found to be 23 per cent. They are non-gravelly with less than 15 per cent gravel and have potential for growing both annual and perennial crops. The problem soils that are very gravelly (35-60%) cover about 20 per cent where only short duration can be grown.



Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Adavalli-1 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 shown in Fig. 5.5.

An area of about 75 ha (21%) in the microwatershed has soils that are very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 147 ha (42 %) has soils that are low (51 to 100 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 72 ha (20 %) has soils that are medium (101-150 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 39 ha (11 %) is very high (>200 mm/min) in available water capacity and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed.



Fig. 5.5 Soil Available Water Capacity map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

An area of about 75 ha (21 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are problematic with regard to available water capacity. Here, only short duration crops can be grown and the probability of crop failure is very high. These areas are best put to other alternative uses. An area of about 39 ha (11 %) has soils that have high potential (>200 mm/m) with

regard to available water capacity where all climatically adapted long duration crops can be grown successfully.

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 two slope classes and a slope map was generated showing the area extent and their geographic distribution of different slope classes in the microwatershed (Fig. 5.6).

A small area of about 1 ha (<1%) falls under nearly level (0-1% slope) lands and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Very gently sloping (1-3%) lands cover a maximum area of about 331 ha (94 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. In all 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 Adavalli-1 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.

Slightly eroded lands cover an area of about 149 ha (42 %) and distributed in the northern and central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 183 ha (52 %) is moderately eroded (e2 class) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Moderately eroded lands are problematic and need appropriate soil and water conservation and other land development measures.



Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 6

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 characterized 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 250 m grid interval) all over the microwatershed through land resource inventory in the year 2017 were analyzed 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 by using the 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 Adavalli-1 microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that neutral soils cover an area of about 2 ha (<1%) and distributed in the southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 87 ha (25 %) is slightly to moderately alkaline (pH 7.3-8.4) and is distributed in the southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) soils cover maximum area of about 212 ha (60%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 30 ha (9 %) is very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0) and distributed in the northeastern part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.1).Thus, majority of the soils are alkaline in reaction.

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

The Electrical Conductivity of the soils of the entire microwatershed area is <2 dSm^{-1} (Fig 6.2) and as such the soils are non-saline.

6.3 Organic Carbon

An area of about 123 ha (35%) is low (<0.5%) in organic carbon and distributed in the northeastern, southeastern and central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 157 ha (45%) is medium (0.5-0.75%) in organic carbon content and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Organic carbon content is high (0.75%) in 52 ha (15%) and distributed in the western part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.3).

6.4 Available Phosphorus

Maximum area of about 202 ha (57 %) is low (<23 kg/ha) in available phosphorus and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Available phosphorus is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in an area of about 130 ha (37 %) and distributed in the southeastern and northwestern part of the microwatershed. In areas that are low to medium in available phosphorous apply extra 25 per cent over the RDF to realize better crop performance (Fig 6.4).

6.5 Available Potassium

Maximum area of about 225 ha (64 %) is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in available potassium content and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 106 ha (30 %) is high in available potassium content and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed. The areas with high potassium content reduce 25 per cent from the recommended dose to avoid the excess application of fertilizer and apply additional 25% potassium in areas where it is medium (Fig 6.5).



Fig.6.1 Soil Reaction (pH) map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.3 Soil Organic Carbon map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.4 Soil Available Phosphorus map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

6.6 Available Sulphur

Soil analysis of available sulphur content in Adavalli-1 microwatershed showed that an area of about < 1 ha (< %) is low (<10 ppm) in available sulphur content and distributed in the southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 103 ha (29 %) is medium (10-20 ppm) and distributed in the northern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 229 ha (65%) is high (>20ppm) in available sulphur and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.6). The areas that are low and medium in available sulphur need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or factomphos (p) fertilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.

6.7 Available Boron

Soil analysis of available boron content in Adavalli-1 microwatershed showed that an area of about 88 ha (25 %) is low (<0.5ppm) in available boron content and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 237 ha (67 %) is medium (0.5-1.0ppm) in available boron content and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 6 ha (2%) is high (>1.0ppm) in available boron and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content in the soils of the Adavalli-1 microwatershed is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in maximum area of about 295 ha (84 %) and distributed in the major part. A small area of about 44 ha (13 %) showed sufficiency (>4.5 ppm) with respect to iron content and distributed in the southeastern 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).

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of about 112 ha (32 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 220 ha (62 %) is sufficient (>0.6) in zinc content and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.11).



Fig.6.5 Soil Available Potassium map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.6 Soil Available Sulphur map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.7 Soil Available Boron map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.8 Soil Available Iron map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.9 Soil Available Manganese map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.10 Soil Available Copper map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed



Fig.6.11 Soil Available Zinc map of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 7

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Adavalli-1 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 and N1 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, 'z' for calcareousness and 'w' for drainage. 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 28 major annual and perennial 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 crops grown in Karnataka in an area of 10.47 lakh ha in Bijapur, Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar, Belgaum, Dharwad, Bellary, Chitradurga, Mysore and Chamarajnagar 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 occupy an area of about 41 ha (12 %) for growing sorghum and occur in the northwestern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 184 ha (52 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing sorghum and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of calcareousness, nutrient availability and rooting depth.

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Adavalli-1 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 (%)
					Surf-ace	Sub-surface	Sur-face	Sub-surface								
LKRcB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	15-35	40-60	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.18	0.3	4.51	12.19	100
LKRcB2g2	662	<90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	35-60	40-60	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.18	0.3	4.51	12.19	100
NGPiB1g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sc	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	-	-	-	-	-
MTLmB2	662	<90	WD	25-50	c	gc	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.27	0.20	0.69	36.64	-
MTLmB2g1	662	<90	WD	25-50	c	gc	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.27	0.20	0.69	36.64	-
RNKmB1g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	c	c	15-35	<15	51-100	1-3	slight	8.86	0.48	16.94	37.00	-
RNKmB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	c	c	15-35	<15	51-100	1-3	mod	8.86	0.48	16.94	37.00	-
RNKmB2g2	662	<90	MWD	50-75	c	c	35-60	<15	151-200	1-3	moderate	8.86	0.48	16.94	37.00	-
DRLmB1	662	<90	MWD	75-100	c	c	-	-	>200	1-3	slight	-	-	-	-	-
DRLmB2g1	662	<90	MWD	75-100	c	c	15-35	-	>200	0-1	moderate	-	-	-	-	-
NSPcB1g1	662	<90	MWD	75-100	sl	c	15-35	-	>200	1-3	slight	9.16	0.61	21.49	51.09	-
NSPmB2	662	<90	MWD	75-100	c	c	-	10-20	>200	0-1	moderate	9.16	0.61	21.49	51.09	-
KDTmA1	662	<90	MWD	>150	c	sc-c	-	10-20	>200	0-1	slight	-	-	-	-	-
MLRmB1	662	<90	MWD	>150	c	c	-	10-20	>200	1-3	slight	9.19	0.24	13.48	42.08	-
MLRmB2	662	<90	MWD	>150	c	c	-	10-20	>200	1-3	moderate	9.19	0.24	13.48	42.08	-

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

An area of about 107 ha (30 %) is marginally suitable for growing sorghum and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness.

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 are given in Figure 7.2.

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, sicl, 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

There are no highly (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) lands for growing maize. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an entire area of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.3 Land Suitability for Bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum)*

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



Fig. 7.3 Land Suitability map of Bajra

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	5.5-8.0	5.0-5.5,7.8-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	c(red), sicl, sc,sl, cl	l, c (black) scl, sil, sic	sl, ls	S, fragmental skeletal
Soil depth	cm	100-75	50-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	15-35	35-60	60-80	-
Salinity (EC)	dSm^{-1}	2-4	4-8	8-10	>10
Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-8	8-10	10-15	>15

Moderately suitable (S2) lands cover an area of about 75 ha (21%) and occur in the southeastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting depth, and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 257 ha (73%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.4 Land Suitability for Redgram (*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 redgram (Table 7.5) 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 7.4.

Table 7.5 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)	dsm^{-1}	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	



Fig. 7.4 Land Suitability map of Redgram

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing redgram. An area of about 79 ha (22 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing redgram and occur in the northern and northwestern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness and gravelliness. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occupy maximum area of about 222 ha (63 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, texture, gravelliness and calcareousness. Area not suitable (Class N1) for growing redgram cover about 31 ha (9%) and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

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

Bengal gram is one of the major pulse crop grown in an area of 9.39 lakh ha in northern Karnataka in Bijapur, Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar, Belgaum, Dharwad and Bellary districts. The crop requirements for growing Bengal gram (Table 7.6) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing Bengal gram was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.5.

An area of about 41 ha (12 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Bengal gram and are distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 259 ha (73 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing bengalgram and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and texture. Marginally suitable (class S3) lands cover an area of about 32 ha (9 %) and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.6 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; Imperf.drained	Poorly drained; excessively drained	Very Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-7.5	5.5-5.77.6-8.0	8.1-9.0;4.5-5.4	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	l, scl, sil, cl,	sicl, sic, c	sl, c>60%	s, fragmental
Soil depth	cm	>75	51-75	25-50	<25
Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dSm^{-1}	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	



Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Bengal gram

7.6 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 7.7) 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 7.6.

Table 7.7 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. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Groundnut

A small area of about 1 ha (<1%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing groundnut and distributed in the southeastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitation of gravelliness. Maximum area of about 331 ha (94 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing groundnut and occupy the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.7 Land Suitability for Sunflower (*Helianthus annus*)

Sunflower is one of the most important oilseed crop grown in an area of 3.56 lakh ha in the State in all the districts. The crop requirements for growing sunflower (Table 7.8) 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 7.7.

A small area of about 1 ha (<1 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sunflower and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 109 ha (31 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy maximum area of about 191 ha (54 %) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.8 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 drained	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)	dSm^{-1}	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	



Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

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, Gulbarga, Bijapur, Bidar, Bellary, Chitradurga and Chamarajnagar 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.

An area of about 41 ha (12 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing cotton and are distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 184 ha (52 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing cotton and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness Marginally suitable (class S3) lands cover an area of about 106 ha (30%) and are distributed in the southern, eastern, and southeastern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness.

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 some what 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 annuum L*)

Chilli is one of the major fruit and spice crop grown in an area of 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) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing chilli was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are 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	^{0}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 (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) lands for growing Chilli. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an entire area of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.10 Land Suitability for Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*)

Tomato is one of the most important vegetable and fruit crop grown in an area of 0.65 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.11) for growing tomato 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.10.

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	^{0}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	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	l,sl, cl,scl	Sic,sicl,sc,c(m/k)	C (ss)	ls, s
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.0	5.0-5.9:7.1-8.5	<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	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

There are no highly (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) lands for growing tomato. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an entire area of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth, drainage and calcareousness.

7.11 Land Suitability for Drumstick (*Moringa oleifera)*

Drumstick is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in 2403 ha area 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 are given in Figure 7.11.

Table 7.12 Land 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

An area of about 111 ha (31 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing drumstick and are distributed in the northern part. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 190 ha (54 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing drumstick and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.12 Land Suitability for Mulberry (*Morus nigra*)

Mulberry is the most important leaf crop grown for rearing silkworms in about 1.66 lakh ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing mulberry (Table 7.13) 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 7.12.

An area of about 73 ha (21 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing mulberry and distributed in the northwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, gravelliness, drainage and calcareousness. Marginally suitable lands cover an area of about 228 ha (65 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing mulberry and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.13 Land 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				
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

Note: Suitability evaluation only for Mulberry leaf not for Silk worm rearing



Fig. 7.12 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

7.13 Land suitability for Mango (*Mangifera indica*)

Mango is one of the most important fruit crop grown in about 1.73 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.14) 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 are given in Figure 7.13.

There are no highly (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) lands for growing mango. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 111 ha (31 %) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, texture, gravelliness and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 221 ha (63 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing mango and occur in the major part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, texture and calcareousness.

Table 7.14 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 growingseason	^{0}C	28-32	24-27 33-35	36-40	20-24
	Min. temp. before flowering	^{0}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 imperf. 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	Nonsaline	<2.0	2.0-3.0	>3.0
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	<10	10-15	>15
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	



Fig. 7.13 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.14 Land suitability for Sapota (*Manilkara zapota*)

Sapota is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of about 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.14.

Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 301 ha (85 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, texture, gravelliness and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9%) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing sapota and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

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	^{0} 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 commercially grown fruit crop 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) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing pomegranate was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.15.

Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 111 ha (31 %) and are distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and texture. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands for growing pomegranate occupy an area of about 191 ha (54 %) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

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	^{0}C	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	S,fragmental
Rooting conditions	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.5	7.6-8.5	8.6-9.0	
	Soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Gravel content	%vol.	nil	15-35	35-60	>60
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 Guava (*Psidium guajava*)

Guava is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of about 6558 ha in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.17) for growing guava were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing guava was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.16.

Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 301 ha (85%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing guava and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.

Table 7.17 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	^{0}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. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Guava

7.17 Land Suitability for Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*)

Jackfruit is one of the most important fruit crop grown in 5368 ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table.7.18) for growing jackfruit 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in figure 7.17.

Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 301 ha (85%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing jackfruit and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.

Table 7.18 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. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.18 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

Jamun is an important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.19) for growing jamun were matched with the soil-site characteristics and a land suitability map for growing jamun was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.18.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing jamun. An area of about 39 ha (11%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 261 ha (74 %) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness, gravelliness and texture. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing jamun and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.

Table 7.19 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. 7.18 Land Suitability map of Jamun

7.19 Land Suitability for Musambi (*Citrus limetta*)

Musambi is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 5446 ha in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.20) for growing musambi 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.19.

An area of about 1 ha (<1 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing musambi and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 109 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (54%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing musambi and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing musambi and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.20 Crop suitability criteria for Musambi

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 imperf. 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
	$CaCO_3$ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Upto 5	5-10	>10
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	Non gravelly	15-35	35-55	>55
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	Upto 1.0	1.0-2.5	>2.5
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	



Fig. 7.19 Land Suitability map of Musambi

7.20 Land Suitability for Lime (*Citrus sp*)

Lime is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 11752 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing lime (Table 7.21) 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.20.

An area of about 1 ha (<1 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing lime and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 109 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (54%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing lime and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing lime and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.21 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 imperfectly 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
	$CaCO_3$ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Upto 5	5-10	>10
Rooting conditions	Soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Gravel content	% vol.	Non gravelly	15-35	35-55	>55
Soil toxicity	Salinity	dS/m	Non saline	Upto 1.0	1.0-2.5	>2.5
	Sodicity	%	Non sodic	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	



Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Lime

7.21 Land Suitability for Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale)*

Cashew is one of the most important nut crop grown in an area of 7052 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing cashew (Table 7.22) 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.21.

An area of about 76 ha (21 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing cashew and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 256 ha (73 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing cashew and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.

Table 7.22 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				
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-6.5	5.0-5.5,6.5-7.3	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. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Cashew

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

Custard apple is one of the most important fruit crop grown in 1426 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements(Table 7.23) for growing custard apple 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.22.

An area of about 41 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing custard apple and are distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands cover maximum area of about 260 ha (74 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing custard apple and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of gravelliness and calcareousness.

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 Amla (*Phyllanthus emblica*)

Amla is one of the most important fruit and medicinal crop grown in an area of 151 ha and distributed in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.24) for growing amla 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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.23.

Moderately suitable lands (Class S2) for growing amla occupy a maximum area of about 301 ha (85%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, texture and calcareousness. An area of about 31 ha (9 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing amla and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of gravelliness and calcareousness.

Table 7.24 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. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.24 Land Suitability for Tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*)

Tamarind is one of the most important spice crop grown in 14897 ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.25) for growing tamarind 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 are given in Figure 7.24.

Table 7.25 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,cl,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	<75
	Gravel content	% vol.	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Erosion	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

There are no highly suitable lands (Class S1) for growing tamarind. An area of about 39 ha (11 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. An area of about 72 ha (20 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and

calcareousness. Maximum area of about 221 ha (63 %) is not suitable (Class N1) for growing tamarind and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have severe limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness.

7.25 Land Suitability for Marigold (*Tagetes erecta*)

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 and a land suitability map for growing marigold was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.25.

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	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	-
	$CaCO_3$ 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

Maximum area of about 225 ha (64 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing marigold and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness, gravelliness, drainage and texture. An area of about 106 ha (30 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and distributed in the eastern, southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7.26 Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum indicum*)

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 geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is 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		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 avail ability	Texture	Class	l,sl,scl,cl,sil	sicl,sc,sic,c	czZ	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	



Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

Maximum area of about 225 ha (64 %) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing chrysanthemum and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have

minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness, gravelliness, drainage and texture. An area of about 106 ha (30 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and distributed in the eastern, southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness.

7. 27 Land Suitability for Jasmine *(Jasminum sp.)*

Jasmine is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 803 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.28) for growing jasmine were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jasmine was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.27.

Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands for growing jasmine cover an area of about 115 ha (33 %) and occur in the western and central part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 216 ha (61 %) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing jasmine and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth, drainage and calcareousness.

Table 7.28 Land suitability criteria for jasmine (irrigated)

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	
Soil aeration	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	Scl, l, scl, cl, sil	sicl,sc,sic,c (m/k)	C(ss),	ls, s
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.5	5.5-5.9:7.6-8.5	<5: >8.5	
	$CaCO_3$ in root zone	%	Non calcareous	Slightly calcareous	Strong 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	%	Non sodic	Slight	Strongly	
Erosion	Slope	%	1-3	3-5	5-10	



Fig. 7.27 Land Suitability map of Jasmine

7. 28 Land Suitability for Crossandra *(Crossandra infundibuliformis)*

Crossandra is one of the most important flower crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing crossandra were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing crossandra was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.28.

Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands for growing crossandra cover an area of about 32 ha (9%) and occur in the northern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. An area of about 299 ha (85%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing crossandra and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.28 Land Suitability map of Crossandra

7.29 Land Use Classes (LUCs)

The 15 soil map units identified in Adavalli-1 microwatershed have been grouped into five Land Use Classes (LUCs) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan. Land Use Classes 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 Use Classes map (Fig.7.29) has been generated. These Land Use Classes are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

The map units that have been grouped into four Land Use Classes along with brief description of soil and site characteristics are given below.

LUC	Mapping unit	Soil and site characteristics
1	DRLmB1,DRLmB2g1, NSPcB1g1,NSPmB2 KDTmA1,MLRmB1 MLRmB2	Moderately deep to very deep, black calcareous to non calcareous clay soils with slopes of 0-3%, slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
2	NGPiB1g1	Deep, gravelly red clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
3	RNKmB1g1, RNKmB2g1, RNKmB2g2	Moderately shallow, black calcareous clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-60%)
4	LKRcB2g1,LKRcB2g2	Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils with slopes of 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly to very gravelly (15-60%)
5	MTLmB2, MTLmB2g1	Shallow, calcareous black gravelly sandy clay to clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly(15-35%)



Fig 7.29 Land Use Classes map of Adavalli-1 microwatershed

7.30 Proposed Crop Plan for Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

After assessing the land suitability for the 28 crops, the proposed crop plan has been prepared for the five identified LUCs by considering only the highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands for each of the 28 crops. The resultant proposed crop plan is presented in Table 7.29.

Table 7.29 Proposed Crop Plan for Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

Proposed LUC	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
1	348.DRLmB1 351.DRLmB2g1 353.NSPcB1g1 362.NSPmB2 403.KDTmA1 415.MLRmB1 418.MLRmB2 (Moderately deep to very deep, black calcareous to non calcareous clay soils)	**Alavandi:** 288,289,290,291,292, 293,294,320,321,322, 323,324,325,326,327, 328,329,330,333,420, 430,459,460,461,530 **Kampli:** 70	Sorghum, Sunflower, Cotton, Bengal gram, Safflower, Linseed, Bajra	**Fruit crops:** Pomegranate, Jamun, Lime, Musambi, Tamarind, Amla, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Drumstick, Chilli, Coriander **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Crossandra, Jasmine	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
2	263.NGPiB1g1 (Deep, gravelly red clay soils)	**Alavandi :** 531	Groundnut, Redgram, Bajra, Horsegram, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Lime, Musambi**,** Jackfruit, Jamun, Amla, Cashew, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Drumstick	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
3	334. RNKmB1g1 337. RNKmB2g1 338.RNKmB2g2 (Moderately shallow, black calcareous clay soils)	**Alavandi:**295,296,297,298,299, 300,301,302,303,304,305,306, 307,308,309,310,311,312,313, 314,315,316,317,318,319,432, 545,546,547,548/1,548/2,549, 550,551 **Kampli :** 71,72,73	Sorghum, Bajra, Bengal gram, Linseed, Safflower, Coriander	**Fruit crops:** Amla, Custard apple **Flowers:** Marigold, Jasmine , Chrysanthemum, Crossandra, Jasmine	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
4	43.LKRcB2g1 44.LKRcB2g2 (Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils)	**Alavandi:**442,443,444,445,446, 447,448,449,450,451, 452,453,454,455,456, 457,458,532,536,537, 538,539,540,541,542, 543,544	Bajra, Horse gram, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Amla, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Drumstick	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)

		Kampli : 1,2			
5	310.MTLmB2 311.MTLmB2g1 (Shallow, calcareous black gravelly sandy clay to clay soils)	**Alavandi:**431,433,434,435,437, 438	Bengal gram, Horse gram, Coriander	**Agri-Silvi-Pasture:** Hybrid Napier, Styloxanthes hamata, Styloxanthes scabra	Sowing across the slope, drip irrigation and mulching is recommended

Chapter 8

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 unfavourable conditions occur

Characteristics of Adavalli-1 Microwatershed

- The soil phases with sizeable area identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series of RNK (116 ha), LKR (74 ha), NSP (40 ha), MLR (38 ha), DRL (31 ha), MTL (31) KDT (1 ha) and NGP (1 ha).
- As per land capability classification, entire area in the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II and III). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil and erosion.
- On the basis of soil reaction, an area of about 2 ha (<1%) is neutral (pH 7.3-7.8), 13 ha (4%) is slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8), 74 ha (21 %) is moderately alkaline (pH 7.8-8.4),

212 ha (60 %) under strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) and 30 ha (9 %) (pH >9.0) is very strongly alkaline in reaction. Thus almost entire area in alkaline in 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.

Alkaline soils

(Slightly alkaline to strongly 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 (Azospirullum, Azatobacter, 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 – 5 kg/ha (once in three years).

Neutral 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, (Azospirullum, 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 factors affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. An area of about 183 ha (52 %) is under moderate erosion. The areas with moderate erosion 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 in IWMP is focusing on preparation of

1. Soil and Water Conservation Treatment Plans 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 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 Adavalli-1 Microwatershed.
- **Organic Carbon:** An area of about 123 ha (35 %) is low in OC content, 157 ha (45%) is medium (0.5-0.75%) and 52 ha (15%) is high in OC content. The areas that are low and medium in OC needs to be further improved by applying farmyard manure and rotating crops 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 280 area where OC is less

than 0.75 per cent. 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 202 ha (57%) and medium (23-57 kg/ha) in 130 ha (37 %) of the soils. Apply additional 25% phosphorus in areas where it is medium or low.
- **Available Potassium:** Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in 225 ha (64 %) and high (>337 kg/ha) in 106 ha (30 %) area of the microwatershed. The areas with high potassium content reduce 25% from the RDF to avoid the excess application of fertilizer and apply additional 25% potassium in area where it is medium.
- **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops. Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in <1 ha (<1 %), medium in 103 ha (29 %) and high (>20ppm) in 229 ha (65 %) area of the microwatershed. Areas with low and medium in available sulphur need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or Factamphos (p) fertitilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.
- **Available Boron:** An area of about 88 ha (25 %) is low (<0.5 ppm), 237 ha (67 %) is medium (05-1.0 ppm) and 6 ha (2%) is high (>20 ppm) in available boron content. The areas with low and medium in boron content need to be applied with sodium borate @ 10kg/ha as soil application or 0.2% borax as foliar spray to correct the deficiency.
- **Available iron:** It is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in 295 ha (84 %) and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 44 ha (13 %) area of the microwatershed. To manage iron deficiency iron sulphate @ 25 kg/ha needs to be applied for 2-3 years.
- **Available Zinc:** It is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in 112 ha (32 %) and sufficient (>0.6ppm) in 220 ha (62 %) area of the microwatershed. Application of zinc sulphate @ 25kg/ha is to be followed in areas that are deficient in available zinc.
- **Available manganese**: It is sufficient in the entire area of the microwatershed**.**
- **Available copper:** It is sufficient in the entire area of the microwatershed**.**
- **Soil alkalinity:** The major area in the microwatershed has soils that are 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 Casuarina, Acasia, Neem, Ber etc, are recommended.

  Land Suitability for various crops: Areas that are highly, moderately and marginally 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 water holding capacity of light textured soils, growing of green manure crops and application of organic manure is recommended.

Chapter 9

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION TREATMENT PLAN

For preparing soil and water conservation treatment plan for Adavalli-1 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 maps
- Rainfall map
- Hydrology
- Water Resources
- Socio-economic data



- Contour plan with existing features- network of waterways, pothissa 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 has 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	
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)

USER GROUP-1



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 (bg_0 .....b = loamy sand, g_0 = <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 clayey black soils	
0.45	2	0.75	01:01	0.92		
0.45	2.4	0.75	1.3:1	1.07	Shallow clayey black soils	
0.6	3.1	0.7	1.78:1	1.29	Medium clayey black 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



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
m^2	m	m^3	L(m)	W(m)	D(m)	QUANTITY (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. Waterways

a) Existing waterways are marked on the cadastral map (1:7920 scale) and their dimensions are recorded.

b) Considering the contour plan of the MWS, additional waterways/ modernization of the existing ones can be thought of.

c) 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 are formed in the field.

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

a) The cadastral map has to be updated as regards the network of drainge 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 in 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. A maximum area of about 256 ha (72 %) needs graded bunding, an area of about 75 ha (21%) needs trench cum bunding and a small area of about 1 ha (<1%) requires strengthening of existing bunds. 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 Adavalli-1 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 for growing annual and perennial crops. The method of planting these trees is given below.

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

Adavalli - 1 Micro-watershed

Soil Phase Information

Village	Sy No.	Total Area (ha)	Soil Phase	Parent Material	LUC	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Alavandi	13	0.27	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	Others	Others
Alavandi	16	0.36	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	Others	Others
Alavandi	19	0.01	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	Others	Others
Alavandi	20	0	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	Others	Others
Alavandi	288	1.69	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Current fallow (Mz+Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	289	3.77	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton+Sunflower (Ct+Sf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	290	4.98	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Pomegranate+Sugarcane+Cotton (Pg+Sc+Ct)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	291	4.06	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Sugarcane (Mz+Sc)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	292	6.4	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Sugarcane+Cotton+Subabulu (Sc+Ct+Su)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	293	3.19	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Sugarcane+Cotton (Sc+Ct)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	294	1.12	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	295	2.79	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Maize (Ct+Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	296	0.75	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	297	1.35	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sunflower (Sf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	298	1.65	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	299	0.75	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	300	1.36	RNKmB2g2	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane (Sc)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	301	2.95	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	302	4.18	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Current fallow (Ct+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	303	7.43	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Sugarcane+Current fallow (Sc+Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	304	2.32	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Current fallow (Ct+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	305	4.03	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding

Village	Sy No.	Total Area (ha)	Soil Phase	Parent Material	LUC	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Alavandi	306	0.55	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	307	0.27	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	308	0.57	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	309	1.34	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	310	0.9	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	311	3.62	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Habitation	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	312	5.09	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Sunflower+Cotton+Bajra (Sf+Ct+Bj)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	313	4.22	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	314	5.14	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow+Sugarcane+Sunflower (Cf+Sc+Sf)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	315	1.9	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	316	1.75	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	317	6.51	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Drumstick+Maize+Sugarcane (Ds+Mz+Sc)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	318	9.36	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow+Maize+Sugarcane(Cf+Mz+Sc)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	319	10.15	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane+Cotton (Sc+Ct)	1 Borewell	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	320	6.8	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	321	3.72	NSPcB1g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Mulberry+Maize+Sunflower (Mu+Mz+Sf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	322	13.03	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Bajra+Current fallow+Sparse veg. (Mz+Bj+Cf+Sv)	2 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	323	8.66	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Teak+Current fallow+Maize (Te+Cf+Mz)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	324	6.08	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	325	6.58	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	326	9.55	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	327	1.33	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Sugarcane (Sc)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	328	3.94	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding

Village	Sy No.	Total Area (ha)	Soil Phase	Parent Material	LUC	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Alavandi	329	2.9	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	330	0.09	DRLmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	333	0.33	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton+Current fallow (Ct+Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	420	2.82	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	430	7.61	MLRmB1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	431	7.22	MTLmB2	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	432	10.16	RNKmB1g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Sparse vegetation (Mz+Sv)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Alavandi	433	8.95	MTLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Current fallow +Cotton(Mz+Cf+Ct)	2 Borewell	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	434	6.66	MTLmB2	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	435	0.66	MTLmB2	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	437	7.32	MTLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Current fallow (Mz+Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	438	0.05	MTLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-5	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar (Jw)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	442	0.74	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	443	0.58	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	444	0.86	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	445	1.22	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	446	3.12	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	447	6.47	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	448	0.69	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	449	0.66	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	450	0.66	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	451	0.57	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	452	0.62	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	453	3.15	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Sy No.	Total Area (ha)	Soil Phase	Parent Material	LUC	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Alavandi	454	3.2	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	455	3.58	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	456	3.74	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	457	8.53	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Bajra+Groundnut (Mz+Bj+Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	458	2.23	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra (Bj)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	459	1.56	DRLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Current fallow (Mz+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	460	0.43	DRLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	461	0.05	DRLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra+Maize+Cotton (Bj+Mz+Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	530	0.2	DRLmB2g1	SALS	LUC-1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	531	0.52	NGPiB1g1	SGGGLS	LUC-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Bajra+Sugarcane+Soybean (Bj+Sc+Sb)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	532	4.2	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra+Maize+Sparse vegetation (Bj+Mz+Sv)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	536	1.22	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	537	2.89	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	538	4.26	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Maize (Ct+Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	539	6.13	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Bajra+Groundnut (Mz+Bj+Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	540	2.84	LKRcB2g1	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	541	2.84	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	542	5.49	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	543	4.54	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	544	2.82	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar (Jw)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Alavandi	545	2.5	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sunflower (Sf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	546	1.61	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane (Sc)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	547	0.37	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	548/1	0.9	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane (Sc)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding

Village	Sy No.	Total Area (ha)	Soil Phase	Parent Material	LUC	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Alavandi	548/2	0.35	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane (Sc)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	549	1.78	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sunflower (Sf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	550	2.84	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sunflower (Sf)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	551	1.16	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Alavandi	552	0.03	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	Others	Others
Alavandi	553	0	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Sparse vegetation (Sv)	Not Available	Others	Others
Kampli	1	0.62	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sunflower+Sugarcane +Current fallow (Sf+Sc+Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Kampli	2	0.01	LKRcB2g2	SGGGLS	LUC-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow+ Groundnut+Maize (Cf+Gn+Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Kampli	70	0.07	KDTmA1	SALS	LUC-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Strengthening of existing bunds/bunding
Kampli	71	0.6	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Fallow land (Fl)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Kampli	72	0.07	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Kampli	73	0.61	RNKmB2g1	SALS	LUC-3	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Fallow land (Fl)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding

Appendix II

Soil Fertility Information

Village	Survey No.	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Alavandi	13	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	16	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	19	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	20	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	288	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	High (> 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	289	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	290	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	291	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	292	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	293	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	294	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	295	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	296	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	297	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	298	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	299	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	300	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	301	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	302	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	303	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	304	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	305	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	306	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	307	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)

Village	Survey No.	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Alavandi	308	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	309	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	310	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	311	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	312	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	313	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	314	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	315	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	316	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	317	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	318	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	319	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	320	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	321	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	322	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	323	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	324	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	325	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	326	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	327	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	328	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	329	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	330	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	333	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	420	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)

Village	Survey No.	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Alavandi	430	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	431	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	432	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	433	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	434	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	435	Very strongly alkaline (pH > 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	437	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	438	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	442	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	443	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	444	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	445	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	446	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	447	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	448	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	449	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	450	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	451	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	452	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	453	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	454	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	455	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	456	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	457	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	458	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)

Village	Survey No.	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Alavandi	459	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	460	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	461	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	530	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (< 10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	531	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	532	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	536	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	537	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	538	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	539	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	540	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 - 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	541	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	542	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	543	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	544	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	545	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	546	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	547	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	548/ 1	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	548/ 2	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	549	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	550	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	551	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Alavandi	552	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	553	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others

Village	Survey No.	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Kampli	1	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Kampli	2	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 - 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Kampli	70	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Kampli	71	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Kampli	72	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Kampli	73	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (>0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Medium (0.5 - 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 2.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)

Appendix III

Soil Suitability Information

Village	Sy No.	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorg ham	Gua va	Cot ton	Tama rind	Lime	B. gram	Sunfl ower	Redg ram	Amla	Jackfr uit	C.app le	Cas hew	Ja mun	Musa mbi	G.nut	Chilly	To mato	Mari gold	Chrysanth emum	Pome granate	Bajra	Jas mine	Crsndara	D.stic k	Mulbr y
Alavandi	13	Other s	Othe rs	Other s	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Others	Others	Othe rs	Othe rs	Others	Othe rs	Other s
Alavandi	16	Other s	Othe rs	Other s	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Others	Others	Othe rs	Othe rs	Others	Othe rs	Other s
Alavandi	19	Other s	Othe rs	Other s	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Others	Others	Othe rs	Othe rs	Others	Othe rs	Other s
Alavandi	20	Other s	Othe rs	Other s	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Othe rs	Othe rs	Othe rs	Other s	Others	Others	Othe rs	Othe rs	Others	Othe rs	Other s
Alavandi	288	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	289	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	290	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	291	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	292	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	293	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	294	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	295	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	296	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	297	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	298	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	299	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	300	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	301	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	302	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	303	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	304	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	305	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	306	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	307	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	308	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	309	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	310	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	311	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz

Village	Sy No.	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorg ham	Gua va	Cot ton	Tama rind	Lime	B. gram	Sunfl ower	Redg ram	Amla	Jackfr uit	C.app le	Cas hew	Ja mun	Musa mbi	G.nut	Chilly	To mato	Mari gold	Chrysanth emum	Pome granate	Bajra	Jas mine	Crsndara	D.stic k	Mulbr y
Alavandi	312	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	313	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	314	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	315	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	316	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	317	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	318	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	319	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	320	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	321	S3rt	S3t	S3rt	S1	S3t	S1	S3r	S2rg	S1	S2rg	S2tg	S2tg	S3t	S1	N1t	S3rt	S2rg	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2tg	S2tg	S2rt	S3t	S3tg	S3t	S2rt	S2tg
Alavandi	322	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	323	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	324	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	325	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	326	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	327	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	328	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	329	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	330	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	333	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	420	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	430	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2z	S2tz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2tz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S3tz
Alavandi	431	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	432	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	433	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	434	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	435	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	437	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	438	N1rt	S3tz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rt	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz	S3tz	N1rt	S3zg	N1rt	N1rt	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz	N1rz	N1rz
Alavandi	442	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	443	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg

Village	Sy No.	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorg ham	Gua va	Cot ton	Tama rind	Lime	B. gram	Sunfl ower	Redg ram	Amla	Jackfr uit	C.app le	Cas hew	Ja mun	Musa mbi	G.nut	Chilly	To mato	Mari gold	Chrysanth emum	Pome granate	Bajra	Jas mine	Crsndara	D.stic k	Mulbr y
Alavandi	444	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	445	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	446	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	447	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	448	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	449	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	450	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	451	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	452	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	453	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	454	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	455	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	456	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	457	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	458	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	459	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	460	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	461	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	530	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S2nz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S3tz	S3tz	S2z	S2rz	S2tz
Alavandi	531	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Alavandi	532	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	536	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	537	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	538	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	539	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	540	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	541	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	542	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	543	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	544	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Alavandi	545	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz

Village	Sy No.	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorg ham	Gua va	Cot ton	Tama rind	Lime	B. gram	Sunfl ower	Redg ram	Amla	Jackfr uit	C.app le	Cas hew	Ja mun	Musa mbi	G.nut	Chilly	To mato	Mari gold	Chrysanth emum	Pome granate	Bajra	Jas mine	Crsndara	D.stic k	Mulbr y
Alavandi	546	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	547	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	548 /1	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	548 /2	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	549	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	550	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	551	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Alavandi	552	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Alavandi	553	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Kampli	1	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Kampli	2	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Kampli	70	S3t	S3t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Kampli	71	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Kampli	72	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Kampli	73	N1rz	S3tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

FINDINGS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY

- *The survey was conducted in Adavalli-1 is located at North latitude 15^0 18' 20.293" and 15^0 17' 21.033" and East longitude 75^0 59' 25.404" and 75^0 57' 22.576" covering an area of about 427.04 ha coming under Kavalura villages of Koppal taluk.*
- *Socio-economic analysis of Adavalli-1 micro watersheds of Bannikoppa sub-watershed, Koppal taluk & District indicated that, out of the total sample of 40 total respondents, 7 (17.50 %) were marginal, 14 (35.00%) were small, 6 (15.00 %) were Semi medium and 8 (20.00 %) were medium farmers.*
- *The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 112 (58.64%) men and 79 (41.36 %) were women.*
- *Majority of the respondents (46.07%) were in the age group of 16-35 years.*
- *Education level of the sample households indicated that, there were 29.84 per cent illiterates, 0.52 percent were functional literates, 18.85 per cent of them had primary school education, 2.62 per cent middle school education, and 18.32 per cent high school education, 9.42 per cent of them had PUC education, 0.52 per cent of them had Diploma, 11.52 per cent attained graduation.*
- *About, 20.00 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 77.50 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers.*
- *Agriculture was the major occupation for 10.47 per cent of the household members.*
- *In the study area, 80.00 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 2.50 per cent possess pucca house.*
- *The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 70.00 per cent possess TV, 17.50 per cent possess mixer grinder, 85.00 per cent possess mobile phones and 37.50 per cent possess motor cycles.*
- *Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 2.50 per cent of the households possess plough, 7.50 per cent possess tractor, 5.00 per cent possess bullock cart and 2.50 per cent possess sprayer.*
- *Regarding livestock possession by the households, 5.00 per cent possess local cow and 2.50 per cent possess buffalo.*
- *The average labour availability in the study area showed that, own men and women labour availability in the micro watershed was 11.06 each, while the hired labour (men) availability was 2.11.*
- *Further, 12.50 per cent of the households opined that hired labour was inadequate during the agricultural season.*
- *Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents 96.29 per cent (80.09 ha) of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 2.54 per cent area is irrigated land.*
- *There were 1.00 live bore wells among the sampled households.*
- *Bore/open well was the major source of irrigation for 2.50 per cent of the households.*
- *The major crops grown by sample farmers are Maize, Sunflower, Bengal gram, Redg gram and Cotton and cropping intensity was recorded as 81.55 per cent.*

- *The per hectare cost of cultivation for Maize, Sunflower, Bengal gram, Red gram and Cotton was Rs.143546.48 , 30428.73, 32954.11, 33744.81 and 30837.06 with benefit cost ratio of 1:2.10, 1: 1.50, 1: 1.60, 1: 1.40 and 1:1.90 respectively.*
- *Further, 10.00 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 10.00 per cent of the households have opined that the green fodder was adequate.*
- *The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 74242.50 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 56842.50 comes from agriculture.*
- *Sampled households have grown 7 forestry trees together in the fields and back yards.*
- *Households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 3425.00 for land development; Rs.2225 for adoption of improved livestock breeds and Rs.1125 for adoption of improved crop production activities.*
- *Source of funds for additional investment is concerned, 40.00 and 17.50 per cent, for irrigation facility was 2.50, for improved crop production was 32.5 and 12.5 per cent and for improved livestock adoption was 20 and 2.5 per cent.*
- *Regarding marketing channels, 97.50 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants, while, 2.50 per cent have sold in regulated markets.*
- *Further, 110.00 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.*
- *Majority of the farmers (50.00%) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 75.00 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.*
- *Fire was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 80.00 per cent of the households and 20.00 per cent households has LPG connection.*
- *Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 87.50 per cent of the households.*
- *Electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households.*
- *In the study area, 62.50 per cent of the households possess toilet facility.*
- *Regarding possession of PDS card, 92.50 per cent of the households possessed BPL card, 2.50 per cent of the household's possessed APL card and 5.00 per cent of the household's were not having ration cards.*
- *Households opined that, the requirement of cereals (100.00%) and pulses (87.50%) are adequate for consumption.*
- *Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (77.50%) wild animal menace on farm field (37.50%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (50.00%), inadequacy of irrigation water (5.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (75.00%), high rate of interest on credit (62.50%), low price for the agricultural commodities (62.50%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (57.50%), inadequate extension services (5.00%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (12.50%), Less rainfall (12.50%) and Source of Agri-technology information (Newspaper/ TV/Mobile) (12.50%).*

Chapter 2

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.

Chapter 3

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

Koppal district is an administrative district in the state of Karnataka in India. In the past Koppal was referred to as 'Kopana Nagara'. Koppal, now a district headquarters is ancient Kopana a major holy place of the Jainas. The district occupies an area of 7,190 km² and has a population of 1,196,089, which 16.58% were urban as of 2001. The Koppal district was formed after split of Raichur district.

Geographers are very particular about the physiography or relief of a region. It plays a very important role in the spatial analysis of agricultural situation of the study area. The undulating topography with black cotton soil shrips, cut across by numerous nalas or streams is the major characteristic feature of the study region. Three physiographic divisions have made considering the local conditions of landforms and crops grown in the district. On the basis of physiography, Koppal district can be divided into three major divisions. They are (a) Koppal & Yelburga plateau, (b) Maidan division, (c) Tungabhadra valley. The district is part of Krishna basin the main streams draining the area are Maskinala, Ilkal-nadi and Hirenala. These are Ephemaral in nature, these come under Tungabhadra sub-basin. The drainage exhibit dentritic to subdentric with drainage density varies from 1.4 to7.0kms/sq.km.

According to the 2011 census Koppal district has a population of 1,391,292, roughly equal to the nation of Swaziland or the US state of Hawaii. This gives it a ranking of 350th in India (out of a total of 640). The district has a population density of 250 inhabitants per square kilometre (650/sq mi). Its population growth rate over the decade 2001-2011 was 16.32%.Koppal has a sex ratio of 983 females for every 1000 males, and a literacy rate of 67.28%.

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

The study was conducted in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed (Bannikoppa sub-watershed, Koppal taluk & District) is located at North latitude 15^0 18' 20.293" and 15^0 17' 21.033" and East longitude 75^0 59' 25.404" and 75^0 57' 22.576"covering an area of about 427.04 ha bounded by under Kavalura 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 40 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 are a 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

Chapter 4

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 Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 40 farmers were sampled in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed among households surveyed 7 (17.50%) were marginal, 14 (35.00%) were small, 6 (15.00 %) were semi medium and 8 (20.00 %) were medium farmers. 5 landless farmers were also interviewed for the survey.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	5	12.5	7	17.5	14	35	6	15	8	20	40	100

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that, there were 112 (58.64%) men and 79 (41.36%) were women. The average family size of micro-watershed was 4.8.

Table 2. Population characteristics in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (24)		MF (43)		SF (59)		SMF (34)		MDF (31)		All (191)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Men	14	58.3	24	56	35	59	22	64.7	17	54.8	112	58.6
2	Women	10	41.7	19	44	24	41	12	35.3	14	45.2	79	41.4
Total		24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100
Average		4.8		6.1		4.2		5.7		3.9		4.8	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 3. The indicated that, 33 (17.28%) of population were 0-15 years of age, 88 (46.07%) were 16-35 years of age, 55(28.80%) were 36-60 years of age and 15 (7.85 %) were above 61 years of age.

Table 3: Age wise classification of members of the household in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (24)		MF (43)		SF (59)		SMF (34)		MDF (31)		All (191)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	11	45.8	4	9.3	8	13.6	6	17.65	4	13	33	17.28
2	16-35 years of age	7	29.2	24	55.8	29	49.2	18	52.94	10	32	88	46.07
3	36-60 years of age	5	20.8	12	27.9	16	27.1	8	23.53	14	45	55	28.8
4	> 61 years	1	4.17	3	6.98	6	10.2	2	5.88	3	9.7	15	7.85
Total		24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that, there were 29.84 per cent of illiterates, 0.52 per cent of functional literate, 18.85 per cent of them had primary school education, 2.62 per cent middle school education, and 18.32 per cent high school education, 9.42 per cent of them had PUC education, 0.52 per cent of them had Diploma, 11.52 per cent attained graduation and 6.81 them had other education.

Table 4. Education level of members of the household in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (24)		MF (43)		SF (59)		SMF (34)		MDF (31)		All (191)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	5	20.8	18	41.9	20	33.9	7	20.6	7	22.58	57	29.8
2	Functional Literate	0	0	0	0	1	1.69	0	0	0	0	1	0.52
3	Primary School	5	20.8	7	16.3	9	15.3	10	29.4	5	16.13	36	18.9
4	Middle School	0	0	1	2.33	2	3.39	1	2.94	1	3.23	5	2.62
5	High School	4	16.7	2	4.65	15	25.4	8	23.5	6	19.35	35	18.3
6	PUC	1	4.17	7	16.3	4	6.78	1	2.94	5	16.13	18	9.42
7	Diploma	1	4.17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.52
8	ITI	0	0	0	0	1	1.69	1	2.94	1	3.23	3	1.57
9	Degree	3	12.5	6	14	3	5.08	6	17.7	4	12.9	22	11.5
10	Others	5	20.8	2	4.65	4	6.78	0	0	2	6.45	13	6.81
Total		24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100

Occupation of head of households: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 20.00 per cent of households heads were practicing agriculture, 77.50 per cent of the household heads were agricultural Labour.

Table 5: Occupation of heads of households in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	1	20	2	29	2	14.29	1	17	2	25	8	20
2	Agricultural Labour	3	60	5	71	12	85.71	5	83	6	75	31	77.5
3	Private Service	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
Total		5	100	7	100	14	100	6	100	8	100	40	100

Occupation of the members of the household: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 6. The results indicate that, agriculture was the major occupation for 10.47 per cent of the household members, 65.97 per cent were agricultural labour, 13.09 per cent were working in pursuing education, 1.05 per cent were involved as housewife and 6.81 per cent were childrens.

Institutional Participation of household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in

Table 7. The results show that, were not found of households member are participating in any of the institutions.

Table 6: Occupation of members of the household in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (24)		MF (43)		SF (59)		SMF (34)		MDF (31)		All (191)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	1	4.17	12	27.9	4	6.78	1	2.94	2	6.5	20	10.5
2	Agricultural Labour	7	29.2	24	55.8	47	79.66	25	73.53	23	74	126	66
3	Private Service	1	4.17	0	0	0	0	2	5.88	0	0	3	1.57
4	Trade & Business	2	8.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.05
5	Student	6	25	5	11.6	4	6.78	6	17.65	4	13	25	13.1
6	Housewife	2	8.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.05
7	Children	5	20.8	2	4.65	4	6.78	0	0	2	6.5	13	6.81
Total		24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100

Table 7: Institutional Participation of household member in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (24)		MF (43)		SF (59)		SMF (34)		MDF (31)		All (191)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100
Total		24	100	43	100	59	100	34	100	31	100	191	100

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that, 17.50 percent possess thatched house, 80.00 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 2.50 per cent possess pacca house.

Table 8. Type of house owned by households in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	3	60	1	14	3	21.43	0	0	0	0	7	17.5
2	Katcha	2	40	6	86	11	78.57	5	83.3	8	100	32	80
3	Pucca/RCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	2.5
Total		5	100	7	100	14	100	6	100	8	100	40	100

Durable assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 9. The results shows that, 70.00 per cent possess TV, 17.50 per cent possess mixer grinder, 7.50 per cent possess Bicycle, 37.50 per cent possess motor cycle, 85.00 per cent possess mobile phones and 2.50 per cent possess Computer/Laptop.

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 10. The result shows that, the average value of television was Rs.8142.00, mixer grinder was Rs.1314.00, bicycle was Rs.1566.00, motor cycle was Rs. 40000.00, mobile phone was Rs.2716.00 and Computer/ Laptop was Rs 35000.00.

Table 9. Durable assets owned by households in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	1	20	4	57	10	71.4	6	100	7	87.5	28	70
2	Mixer/Grinder	0	0	1	14	3	21.4	2	33	1	12.5	7	17.5
3	Bicycle	0	0	1	14	1	7.14	1	17	0	0	3	7.5
4	Motor Cycle	1	20	1	14	4	28.6	4	67	5	62.5	15	37.5
5	Mobile Phone	2	40	7	100	12	85.7	6	100	7	87.5	34	85
6	Computer/Laptop	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	1	2.5
7	Blank	3	60	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	1	12.5	5	12.5

Table 10. Average value of durable assets owned in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
1	Television	9000	8500	8700	8000	7142	8142
2	Mixer/Grinder	0	1000	1533	1450	700	1314
3	Bicycle	0	2000	2000	700	0	1566
4	Motor Cycle	45000	30000	36250	32500	50000	40000
5	Mobile Phone	3000	2083	3178	2416	3177	2716
6	Computer/Laptop	0	0	0	35000	0	35000

Farm implements owned: The data regarding the farm implements owned by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 11. About 5.00 per cent of the households possess Bullock Cart, 2.50 per cent possess plough and 2.50 per cent possess Seed/Fertilizer Drill and Sprinkler, 2.50 per cent possess Sprayer, 25.00 per cent possess Weeder and 7.50 per cent possess tractor.

Table 11. Farm implements owned in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock Cart	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	1	12.5	2	5
2	Plough	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	2.5
4	Tractor	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	1	16.7	1	12.5	3	7.5
5	Sprayer	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	2.5
6	Weeder	1	20	2	28.6	3	21.43	2	33.3	2	25	10	25
7	Earth remover/Duster	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	1	2.5
8	Blank	4	80	5	71.4	9	64.29	4	66.7	5	62.5	27	67.5

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.1500.00, bullock Cart was Rs.27500.00, seed/fertilizer drill was Rs.35000.00, sprayer was Rs 2000, weeder was Rs.44.00, tractor was Rs. 333333 and Earth remover/Duster was Rs 12000.

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 13. The indicate that,

5.00 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 5.00 per cent possess local cow, 2.50 per cent possess buffalo, 2.50 per cent possess sheep and 2.50 per cent possess goat.

Table 12. Average value of farm implements in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
1	Bullock Cart	0	0	25000	0	30000	27500
2	Plough	0	0	1500	0	0	1500
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0	0	0	35000	0	35000
4	Tractor	0	0	400000	300000	300000	333333
5	Sprayer	0	0	0	2000	0	2000
6	Weeder	50	50	41	42	42	44
7	Earth remover/Duster	0	0	0	12000	0	12000

Table 13. Livestock possession by households in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	1	12.5	2	5
2	Local cow	0	0	0	0	2	14.29	0	0	0	0	2	5
3	Buffalo	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
4	Sheep	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
5	Goat	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
6	blank	5	100	6	86	10	71.43	6	100	7	87.5	34	85

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 14. The indicated that, own labour men available in the micro watershed was 9.89, women available in the micro watershed was 1.17, hired labour (men) available was 2.11 and hired labour (women) available was 11.20.

Table 14. Average labour availability in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Hired labour Female	0	7.43	10.29	7.5	13.1	9.89
2	Own Labour Female	0	1.57	1.07	1.17	1	1.17
3	Own labour Male	0	2.57	2	2.5	1.63	2.11
4	Hired labour Male	0	9	12.07	9.17	13.1	11.2

Adequacy of hired labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 75.00 per cent of the household opined that hired labour was adequate, 12.50 per cent of the household opined that hired labour was Inadequate.

Table 15. Adequacy of hired labour in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate	0	0	6	85.7	13	92.9	5	83.3	6	75	30	75
2	Inadequate	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, 77.12 ha (96.29%) of dry land and 2.03 ha (2.54 %) of irrigated land.

Table 16. Distribution of land (ha) in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Dry	0	0	4.95	100	19.6	98.34	15.92	97.35	36.65	94.3	77.12	96.29
2	Irrigated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.03	5.23	2.03	2.54
3	Permanent Fallow	0	0	0	0	0.33	1.66	0.43	2.65	0.18	0.46	0.94	1.18
Total		0	100	4.95	100	19.94	100	16.35	100	38.86	100	80.09	100

Average value of land (ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 17. The results show that the average value of dry land was Rs.189900.29 and the average value of irrigated land was Rs.295219.12.

Table 17. Average value of land (ha) in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Dry	0	414361.7	275351	200966.2	109098.9	189900.3
2	Irrigated	0	0	0	0	295219.1	295219.1
3	Permanent Fallow	0	0	286158.5	92336.45	392954.5	217317.6

Status of bore wells: The data regarding the status of bore wells in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, there were 1 functioning bore wells among the sampled households in micro watershed.

Table 18. Status of bore wells in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Functioning	0	0	0	0	1	1

Source of irrigation: The data regarding the source of irrigation in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 19. The results that bore well were major source of irrigation for 2.50 per cent of the households.

Table 19. Source of irrigation in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bore Well	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	1	2.5

Depth of water (Avg. In meters): The data regarding the depth of water in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 02. The results revealed that, the depth of bore well was 3.05 meter.

Table 20. Depth of water (Avg. In meters) in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Bore Well	0	0	0	0	15.24	3.05

Irrigated Area (ha): The data regarding the irrigated area (ha) in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 21. The results indicate that, the availability of irrigation water was used for kharif crops was 2.03 ha.

Table 21. Irrigated Area (ha) in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
1	Kharif	0	0	0	0	2.03	2.03
Total		0	0	0	0	2.03	2.03

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 22. The results indicate that, farmers have grown Sunflower (23.96 ha), Bengal gram (5.49 ha), Sorghum (33.12 ha), Red gram (0.85 ha), Cotton (1.21 ha) and maize (3.79 ha).

Table 22. Cropping pattern in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
1	Kharif - Sorghum	0	1.32	7	0.81	19.43	28.57
2	Kharif - Sunflower	0	2.71	6.54	9.44	5.26	23.96
3	Kharif - Bengal gram	0	0	2.66	2.83	0	5.49
4	Rabi - Jowar	0	0	0	0	4.55	4.55
5	Rabi - Bengal gram	0	0	0	3.65	0	3.65
6	Kharif - Maize	0	0.06	0	0	2.03	2.09
7	Rabi - Maize	0	0	1.7	0	0	1.7
8	Kharif - Cotton	0	0	1.21	0	0	1.21
9	Rabi - Red gram (togari)	0	0.85	0	0	0	0.85
Total		0	4.95	19.12	16.73	31.28	72.08

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 23. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity was 81.55 per cent.

Table 23. Cropping intensity (%) in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
1	Cropping Intensity	0	100	78.05	89.21	77.84	81.55

Cost of Cultivation of Maize: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Maize in Adavalli-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24.a. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Maize was Rs. 143546.48. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 307260.42. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs.163713.94, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.10.

Table 24(a). Cost of Cultivation of Maize in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	31.92	5811.21	4.05
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0	0	0
3	Tractor		Hours	1.08	810.1	0.56
4	Machinery		Hours	0.16	98.41	0.07
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	10.3	1530.22	1.07
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	12.48	2496.4	1.74
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	24.96	23658.14	16.48
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	6.24	6150.98	4.29
10	Irrigation		Number	2.46	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	0.51	0
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	1.1	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				4061.13	2.83
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				44618.19	31.08
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				277.78	0.19
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				44895.97	31.28
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			474.5	85593.83	59.63
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				130489.8	90.9
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				7	0
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				130496.8	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				13049.68	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				143546.48	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		42.24	247797.46	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			5866.67	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		137.22	59462.96	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			433.33	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				307260.42	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				163713.94	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				3398.5	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.1	

Cost of Cultivation of Sunflower: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Sunflower in Adavalli-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24.b. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Sunflower was Rs. 30428.73. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 46623.51. The net income from Sunflower cultivation was Rs.16194.78, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.50.

Table 24(b). Cost of Cultivation of Sunflower in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	35.15	5963.08	19.6
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.87	535.41	1.76
3	Tractor		Hours	4.1	3248.8	10.68
4	Machinery		Hours	0.32	252.49	0.83
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	7.9	3596.04	11.82
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	1.78	460.56	1.51
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	7.59	6296.24	20.69
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs/liters	0.74	743.01	2.44
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	58.94	0.19
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	3.29	0.01
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1331.62	4.38
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				22489.48	73.91
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				375	1.23
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				22864.48	75.14
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			21.23	4796.99	15.76
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				27661.48	90.91
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				1	0
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				27662.48	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2766.25	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				30428.73	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		16.69	45614.88	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2733.33	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		7.96	1008.63	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			126.67	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				46623.51	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				16194.78	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1823.35	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.5	

Cost of Cultivation of Bengal gram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Bengal gram in Adavalli-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24.c. The results indicate, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Bengal gram was Rs.32954.11. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 52620.38. The net income from Bengal gram cultivation was Rs. 19666.27, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.60.

Table 24(c). Cost of Cultivation of Bengal gram in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	47.55	7592.92	23.04
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.82	490.77	1.49
3	Tractor		Hours	4.77	3813.56	11.57
4	Machinery		Hours	1.42	1128.54	3.42
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	27	2950.52	8.95
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	2.57	513.79	1.56
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	6.82	6183.12	18.76
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.04	1030.28	3.13
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	273.46	0.83
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	2.82	0.01
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1281.6	3.89
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				25261.38	76.66
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				309.52	0.94
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				25570.9	77.6
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			21.32	4385.1	13.31
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				29956	90.9
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				2.29	0.01
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				29958.28	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2995.83	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				32954.11	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		19.37	50635.56	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2614.29	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		11.58	1984.82	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			171.43	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				52620.38	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				19666.27	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1701.4	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.6	

Cost of Cultivation of Red gram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Red gram in Adavalli-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24.d. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Red gram was Rs. 33744.81. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs.47409.95. The net income from Red gram cultivation was Rs. 13665.14, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.40.

Table 24(d). Cost of Cultivation of Red gram in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	57.36	9423.46	27.93
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.17	643.84	1.91
3	Tractor		Hours	3.51	2633.89	7.81
4	Machinery		Hours	1.17	702.37	2.08
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	5.85	1463.27	4.34
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	2.34	468.25	1.39
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	3.51	6438.39	19.08
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.17	1404.74	4.16
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	2.34	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1174.16	3.48
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				24354.7	72.17
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.49
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				24521.37	72.67
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			24.58	6145.73	18.21
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				30667.1	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				30677.1	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3067.71	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				33744.81	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		10.54	47409.95	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4500	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				47409.95	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				13665.14	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				3202.95	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.4	

Cost of Cultivation of Cotton: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Cotton in Adavalli-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24.e. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Cotton was Rs.30837.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 59280.00. The net income from Cotton cultivation was Rs. 28442.94, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.90.

Table 24(e). Cost of Cultivation of Cotton in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	33.76	5145.83	16.69
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.82	494	1.6
3	Tractor		Hours	4.94	3952	12.82
4	Machinery		Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	4.94	4693	15.22
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	1.65	329.33	1.07
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	7.41	6125.6	19.86
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.82	823.33	2.67
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	3.29	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	3.29	0.01
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1436.67	4.66
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				23006.36	74.61
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				333.33	1.08
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				23339.69	75.69
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			21.41	4693	15.22
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				28032.69	90.91
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				1	0
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				28033.69	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2803.37	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				30837.06	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		12.35	49400	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4000	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		24.7	9880	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			400	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				59280	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				28442.94	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2496.93	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.9	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, 10.00 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate. With respect to green fodder availability, 10.00 percent of them opined it was sufficient.

Table 25. Adequacy of fodder in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	1	14.29	3	21.43	0	0	0	0	4	10
2	Adequate-Green Fodder	0	0	1	14.29	3	21.43	0	0	0	0	4	10

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the annual gross income in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 26. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross income of Rs. 74242.50 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 56842.50 is from agriculture itself.

Table 26. Average annual gross income in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Service/salary	0	0	0	6666.67	0	1000
2	Business	0	21428.6	0	25000	0	7500
3	Wage	19000	14285.7	5785.71	5833.33	2500	8275
4	Agriculture	0	31928.6	52307.1	95900	92812.5	56842.5
5	Non Farm income	0	0	1071.43	0	0	375
6	Dairy Farm	0	0	714.29	0	0	250
Income(Rs.)		19000	67642.9	59878.6	133400	95312.5	74242.5

Average annual Expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross expenditure of Rs. 416592.86 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 32975.00 is from agriculture itself.

Table 27. Average annual Expenditure in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Service/salary	0	0	0	20000	0	500
2	Business	0	80000	0	85000	0	4125
3	Wage	11000	27500	7200	9000	10000	4350
4	Agriculture	0	17857.1	28285.7	60000	54750	32975
5	Dairy Farm	0	0	6000	0	0	150
Total		11000	125357	41485.7	174000	64750	416593

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, households have planted, 1 teak tree, 2 neem trees, 2 acacia trees and 2 banyan trees together in both field and backyard.

Table 28. Forest species grown in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Teak	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2	Neem	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
3	Acacia	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
4	Banyan	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0

***F= Field B=Back Yard**

Average additional investment capacity: The data regarding average additional investment capacity in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 29. The results indicate that, households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 3425.00 for land development, Rs. 100.00 for creation of irrigation facility, Rs.2225 for adoption of improved livestock breeds and Rs.1125 for adoption of improved crop production activities.

Table 29. Average additional investment capacity of households in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (7)	SF (14)	SMF (6)	MDF (8)	All (40)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Land development	0	2142.86	3785.71	4833.33	5000	3425
2	Irrigation facility	0	0	285.71	0	0	100
3	Improved crop production	0	1142.86	2357.14	3166.67	3625	2225
4	Improved livestock management	0	428.57	1357.14	1333.33	1875	1125

Source of funds for additional investment: The data regarding source of funds for additional investment in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, the sources of finance raised from bank as a loan and from own sources for land development was 40.00 and 17.50 per cent, for irrigation facility was 2.50, for improved crop production was 32.5 and 12.5 per cent and for improved livestock adoption was 20 and 2.5 per cent.

Table 30. Source of funds for additional investment in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl. No	Item	Land development		Irrigation facility		Improved crop production		Improved livestock management	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Loan from bank	16	40	1	2.5	13	32.5	8	20
2	Own funds	7	17.5	0	0	5	12.5	1	2.5

Marketing of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicated that, 92.96 percent of output of Bengal gram was sold in the market with average price of Rs. 2614.29; 100.00 percent of output of Cotton was sold in the market with average price of Rs. 4000.00; 60.00 percent of output of jowar was sold in the market with average price of

Rs. 1850.00; 98.70 percent of output of Maize was sold in the market with average price of Rs. 5866.67 and 66.67 percent of output of Red gram was sold in the market with average price of Rs. 4500.00.

Table 31. Marketing of agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Bengalgram	142	10	132	93	2614
2	Cotton	15	0	15	100	4000
3	Jowar	50	20	30	60	1850
4	Maize	77	1	76	99	5867
5	Redgram	9	3	6	67	4500
6	Sorghum	553	36	517	93	1547
7	Sunflower	337	0	337	100	2563

Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicated that, 97.50 cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants, 2.50 per cent of regulated market and 10.00 per cent of cooperative marketing society.

Table 32. Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Local/village Merchant	0	0	6	86	17	121	8	133	8	100	39	97.5
2	Regulated Market	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
3	Cooperative marketing Society	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	4	10

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicated that, 110.00 cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.

Table 33. Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Tractor	0	0	7	100	18	129	9	150	10	125	44	110

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 34. The results indicate that, 50.00 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 34. Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0	4	57	8	57.1	3	50	5	62.5	20	50

Interest towards soil testing: The data regarding Interest shown towards soil testing in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicated that, 75.00 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.

Table 35. Interest regarding soil testing in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0	6	86	13	92.9	5	83	6	75	30	75

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data on usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicated that, firewood was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 80.00 per cent of the households followed by LPG (20.00 %).

Table 36. Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	4	80	5	71.4	12	85.7	6	100	5	62.5	32	80
2	LPG	1	20	2	28.6	2	14.3	0	0	3	37.5	8	20

Source of drinking water: The data on source of drinking water in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicated that, piped tank supply of water was the major source for drinking water for 87.50 per cent of the households followed by bore well water (12.50%).

Table 37. Source of drinking water in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	5	100	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	35	87.5
2	Bore Well	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5

Source of light: The data on source of light in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicated that, electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households.

Table 38. Source of light in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	5	100	7	100	14	100	6	100	8	100	40	100

Existence of sanitary toilet facility: The data on availability of toilet facility in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicated that, 62.50 per cent of the households possess toilets.

Table 39. Existence of sanitary toilet facility in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	4	80	5	71	9	64.29	2	33	5	62.5	25	62.5

Possession of PDS card: The data regarding possession of PDS card in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicated that, 2.50 per cent of the households possessed BPL card, 92.50 per cent possessed APL card and 5.00 per cent do not possess PDS card.

Table 40. Possession of PDS card in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	APL	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
2	BPL	4	80	6	85.7	14	100	5	83	8	100	37	92.5
3	Not Possessed	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	2	5

Participation in NREGA programme: The data regarding Participation in NREGA programme in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicated that, only 67.50 percent of the participate have participated in NREGA programme.

Table 41. Participation in NREGA programme in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	3	60	6	85.7	8	57.1	5	83.3	5	63	27	67.5

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 42. The results indicated that, the extent of adequacy of food items for cereals, pulses and vegetables were 100.00, 87.50 and 82.50 per cent respectively, similarly for Fruits (0.00%), milk (87.50%), Egg (90.00%), and Meat (87.50%).

Table 42. Adequacy of food items in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	5	100	7	100	14	100	6	100	8	100	40	100
2	Pulses	5	100	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	35	87.5
3	Vegetables	4	80	6	85.7	12	85.71	5	83.3	6	75	33	82.5
4	Milk	5	100	6	85.7	12	85.71	6	100	6	75	35	87.5
5	Egg	6	120	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	36	90
6	Meat	5	100	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	35	87.5

Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding in adequacy of food items in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicated that, the extent of in adequacy of food items for pulses, Oilseeds and vegetables were 12.50, 87.50 and 2.50 per cent respectively, similarly for fruits (87.50%), milk (12.50%) and egg (10.00%).

Table 43. Inadequacy of food items in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Pulses	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5
2	Oilseed	5	100	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	35	87.5
3	Vegetables	0	0	0	0	1	7.14	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
4	Fruits	5	100	6	85.7	13	92.86	5	83.3	6	75	35	87.5
5	Milk	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5
6	Egg	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	0	0	2	25	4	10

Response on market surplus of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicated that, the extent of adequacy of food items for Oilseeds and vegetables were 12.50 and 12.50 per cent respectively

Table 44. Response on market surplus of food items in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Oilseed	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5
2	Vegetables	0	0	1	14.3	1	7.14	1	16.7	2	25	5	12.5

Farming constraints: The data regarding farming constraints experienced by households in Adavalli-1 Micro watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by (77.50 %) per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (37.50%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (50.00%), inadequacy of irrigation water (5.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (75.00%), high rate of interest on credit (62.50%), low price for the agricultural commodities (62.50 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (57.50%), inadequate extension services (5.00 %), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (12.50%), less rainfall (12.50%), source of agri-technology information (Newspaper/Tv/Mobile) (12.50%).

Table 45. Farming constraints experienced in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed

SN	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (7)		SF (14)		SMF (6)		MDF (8)		All (40)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	0	0	7	100	13	92.86	5	83.33	6	75	31	77.5
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	0	0	4	57.14	5	35.71	3	50	3	37.5	15	37.5
3	Frequent incidence of pest and disease	0	0	3	42.86	9	64.29	3	50	5	62.5	20	50
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	0	0	1	14.29	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	2	5
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	0	0	6	85.71	13	92.86	5	83.33	6	75	30	75
6	High rate of interest on credit	0	0	3	42.86	11	78.57	4	66.67	7	87.5	25	62.5
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	0	0	4	57.14	11	78.57	5	83.33	5	62.5	25	62.5
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	0	0	4	57.14	9	64.29	4	66.67	6	75	23	57.5
9	Inadequate extension services	0	0	1	14.29	0	0	1	16.67	0	0	2	5
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	0	0	1	14.29	1	7.14	1	16.67	2	25	5	12.5
11	Less rainfall	0	0	1	14.29	1	7.14	1	16.67	2	25	5	12.5
12	Source of Agri-technology information	0	0	1	14.29	1	7.14	1	16.67	2	25	5	12.5

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed 40 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey. The study was conducted in Adavalli-1 micro-watershed (Bannikoppa sub-watershed, Koppal taluk & District) is located at North latitude 15^0 18' 20.293" and 15^0 17' 21.033" and East longitude 75^0 59' 25.404" and 75^0 57' 22.576"covering an area of about 427.04 ha bounded by under Kavalura Villages.

Socio-economic analysis indicated that, out of the total sample of 40 respondents, 7 (17.50%) were marginal, 14(35.00%) were small and 6 (15.00%) were semi medium and 8 (20.00%) were medium farmers. The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 112 (58.64%) men and 79 (41.36%) were women. Majority of the respondents (46.07%) were in the age group of 35-60 years. Education level of the sample households indicated that, majority there were 29.84 per cent illiterates, 0.52 per cent were functional literates and only 11.52 per cent attained graduation. About, 20.00 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 77.50 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers. Agriculture was the major occupation for 10.47 per cent of the household members.

In the study area, 80.00 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 2.50 per cent possess pucca house. The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 70.00 per cent possess TV, 17.50 per cent possess mixer grinder and 85.00 per cent possess mobile phones. Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 2.50 per cent of the households possess plough and only 2.50 per cent sprayer. Regarding livestock possession by the households, 5.00 per cent possess local cow and 2.50 per cent possess buffalo respectively.

The average labour availability in the study area showed that**,** own men and women labour availability in the micro watershed was 11.06 each, while the hired labour (men) availability was 2.11. Further, 12.50 per cent of the households opined that hired labour was inadequate during the agricultural season

Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents (80.09 ha), 96.29 per cent of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 2.54 per cent area is irrigated land. There were 1.00 bore wells among the sampled households. Bore well was the major source of irrigation for 2.50 per cent of the households. The major crops grown by sample farmers are Maize, Sunflower, Bengal gram, Red gram and Cotton and cropping intensity was recorded as 81.55 per cent.

The per hectare cost of cultivation for Maize, Sunflower, Bengal gram, Redg gram and Cotton was Rs.143546.48 , 30428.73, 32954.11, 33744.81, and 30837.06 with benefit cost ratio of 1:2.10, 1: 1.50, 1: 1.60, 1: 1.40, and 1:1.90 , respectively.

Further, 10.00 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 10.00 per cent of the households have opined that the green fodder was adequate.

The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 74242.50 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 56842.50 comes from agriculture.

Households have an average investment capacity of Rs 40.00 for land development. Source of funds for additional investment is concerned, 17.50 per cent depends on own funds and 40.00 per cent depends on bank loan for land development activities.

Regarding marketing channels, 97.50 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants, while, 2.50 per cent have sold by Agents/Traders. Further, 110.00 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.

Majority of the farmers (50.00 %) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 75.00 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.

Firewood connection was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 80.00 per cent of the households and 20.00 per cent households has LPG. Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 87.50 per cent of the households. Electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households. In the study area, 62.50 per cent of the households possess toilet facility. Regarding possession of PDS card, 92.50 per cent of the households possessed BPL card and 5.00 per cent do not possess PDS card. Cereals (100.00%) and pulses (87.50%) were adequate for consumption.

Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (77.50%) wild animal menace on farm field (37.50%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (50.00%), inadequacy of irrigation water (5.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (75.00%), high rate of interest on credit (62.50%), low price for the agricultural commodities (62.50%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (57.50%), inadequate extension services (5.00%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (12.50%), Less rainfall (12.50%) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (12.50%).

Implications of the survey

- ✓ Result indicated that, there were 29.84 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, 80.00 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 has 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 77.12 ha (96.29 %) of dry land and 2.03ha (2.54 %) 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 2.5 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 trained on drip irrigation and provide the information on subsidy for drip irrigation equipment's along with the information on different agencies which provides the financial assistance for drip irrigation.
- ✓ Hence, production technologies related to these crops can be made available to the farmers for better adoption.
- ✓ The cropping intensity in the micro watershed was found to be (81.55 %) 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.56842.50 from agriculture, Rs.7500.00 from business and Rs. 8275.00 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, 50.00 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, 75.00 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 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 (77.50%), wild animal menace on farm field (37.50%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (50.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (75.00%), high rate of interest on credit (62.50%), low price for the agricultural commodities (62.50%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (57.50%), inadequate extension services (5.00%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (12.50%) 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.