ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.539

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

Agrisearch with a human touch

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

MASLAPUR-2 (4D3A9P2b) MICROWATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk & 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 (2019). “Land resource inventory and socio-economic status of farm households for watershed planning and development of Maslapur-2 (4D3A9P2b) Microwatershed, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka”, ICAR – NBSS & LUP Sujala MWS Publ .539, ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. p.139 & 42.

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

MASLAPUR-2 (4D3A9P2b) MICROWATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk & 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

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 Maslapur-2 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 and socio-economic status of farm households covering thirty per cent farmers randomely selected representing landed and landless class of farmers in the micro-watershed. The project report with the accompanying maps for the microwatershed will provide required detailed database for evolving effective land use plan, alternative land use options and conservation plans for the planners, administrators, 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 **S.K. SINGH**
Date:10-11-2019 Director, ICAR - NBSS&LUP

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	Sh. Venkata Giriyappa
	Dr. Gopali Bardhan
	Smt. Chaitra, S.P.
	Dr. Gayathri, B.
	Dr. Savitha, H.R.
	Sh. Nagendra, B.R.
	Mr. Somashekar T.N
	Ms. Arpitha, G.M.
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. Ramesh Kumar, S.C.	Sh. Prakashanaik, M.K.
	Dr. Shridevi. R.Kanabargi
	Ms. Shraddha Hegde
	Sh. Vinod R
	Sh. Basavaraj
	Ms. Sowmya K.B
	Mrs. Prathibha, D.G
	Sh. Rajendra,D
Soil & Water Conservation	
Sh. Sunil P. Maske	
Watershed Development Department, GOK, Bangalore	
Sh. Prabhash Chandra Ray, IFS Project Director & Commissioner, WDD	Dr. A. Natarajan NRM Consultant, Sujala-III Project
Sh. A. Padmaya Naik, Director (In-Charge) Executive Director, KWDP-II, Sujala-III, WDD	

PART-A

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY

Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The land resource inventory of Maslapur-2 microwatershed was conducted using village cadastral maps and IRS satellite imagery on 1:7920 scale. The false colour composites of IRS imagery were interpreted for physiography and 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 510 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 92 per cent is covered by soils and 8 per cent by rock outcrops, habitation and water bodies, settlements and others. The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below.

- *The soils belong to 11 soil series and 20 soil phases (management units) and 7 land management units.*
- *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 320 m grid interval.*
- *Land suitability for growing 31 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 8 per cent of the soils are shallow (25-50 cm), 61 per cent of the soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), 14 per cent of the soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), 7 per cent area has deep (100-150 cm) and 2 per cent has very deep (>150 cm) soils.*
- *About 10 per cent has sandy soils at the surface, 78 per cent has loamy soils at the surface and 4 per cent has clayey soils at the surface.*
- *About 6 per cent of the area has non-gravelly (<15%), 78 per cent gravelly (15-35% gravel) and 8 per cent has very gravelly (35-60%) soils.*

- *About 33 per cent are very low (<50 mm/m), 53 per cent low (51-100 mm/m), 4 per cent medium (101-150 mm/m) and 2 per cent very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity.*
- *An area of about 6 per cent has nearly level (0-1%) and 86 per cent area has very gently sloping (1-3%) lands.*
- *An area of about 22 per cent has soils that are slightly eroded (e1) and 70 per cent moderately eroded (e2) lands.*
- *An area of about 35 per cent are slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) and 56 per cent are very neutral (pH pH 6.5-7.3) in soil reaction.*
- *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the soils is <2 dS m^{-1} and as such the soils are non-saline.*
- *Organic carbon is medium (0.5-0.75%) in 60 per cent and high (>0.75%) in 31 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available phosphorus is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in the entire area of the microwatershed.*
- *An area of about 34 per cent are low (<145 kg/ha), 58 per cent soils are medium (145-337 kg/ha) and <1 per cent soils are high (>337 kg/ha) in available potassium content.*
- *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in about 69 per cent and medium (10-20 ppm) in 22 per cent soils.*
- *Available boron is low (0.5 ppm) in about 54 per cent and medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in 37 per cent area.*
- *Available iron is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in entire area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available zinc is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in 42 per cent and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 50 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in all the soils.*
- *The land suitability for 31 major agricultural and horticultural crops grown in the microwatershed were assessed and the areas that are highly suitable (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) are given below. It is however to be noted that a given soil may be suitable for various crops but what specific crop to be grown may be decided by the farmer looking to his capacity to invest on various inputs, marketing infrastructure, market price and finally the demand and supply position.*

Land suitability for various crops in the microwatershed

Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)		Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)	
	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)		Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)
Sorghum	-	*336 (66)*	*Sapota*	*18 (4)*	*70 (14)*
Maize	-	*336 (66)*	*Pomegranate*	*18 (4)*	*79 (15)*
Bajra	*26 (5)*	*383 (75)*	*Musambi*	*18 (4)*	*79 (15)*
Groundnut	*26 (5)*	*377 (74)*	*Lime*	*18 (4)*	*79 (15)*
Sunflower	-	*53 (10)*	*Amla*	*44 (9)*	*382 (75)*
Red gram	-	*53 (10)*	*Cashew*	-	*88 (17)*
Bengalgram	*9 (2)*	*257 (50)*	*Jackfruit*	*18 (4)*	*70 (14)*
Cotton	-	*336 (66)*	*Jamun*	-	*97 (19)*
Chilli	-	*327 (64)*	*Custard apple*	*44 (9)*	*382 (75)*
Tomato	-	*327 (64)*	*Tamarind*	-	*27 (5)*
Brinjal	*26 (5)*	*284 (56)*	*Mulberry*	*18 (4)*	*95 (19)*
Onion	*26 (5)*	*284 (56)*	*Marigold*	-	*336 (66)*
Bhendi	-	*284 (56)*	*Chrysanthemum*	-	*336 (66)*
Drumstick	*18 (4)*	*51 (10)*	*Jasmine*	-	*327 (64)*
Mango	-	*18 (4)*	*Crossandra*	-	*327 (64)*
Guava	-	*88 (17)*			

Apart from the individual crop suitability, a proposed crop plan has been prepared for the 7 identified LMUs by considering only the highly and moderately suitable lands for different crops and cropping systems with food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops that helps in maintaining productivity and ecological balance in the microwatershed.

- *Maintaining soil-health is vital for crop production and conserve soil and land resource base for maintaining ecological balance and to mitigate climate change. For this, several ameliorative measures have been suggested for these problematic soils like saline/alkali, highly eroded, sandy soils etc.*
- *Soil and water conservation treatment plan has been prepared that would help in identifying the sites to be treated and also the type of structures required.*
- *As part of the greening programme, several tree species have been suggested to be planted in marginal and submarginal lands, field bunds and also in the hillocks, mounds and ridges. 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed in Koppal Taluk and 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed is located in the central part of northern Karnataka in Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka State (Fig. 2.1). It comprises parts of Ganganahala, Musalapura, Hasagala and Guddalakammapura Villages. It lies between $15^0$30' – $15^0$32' North latitudes and $76^0$18– $76^0$19 East longitudes and covers an area of 510 ha. It is about 33 km from Koppal town. It is surrounded by Ganganahala taluk on the north, Hasagala on the west, Musalapura on the south and Guddalakammapura on the eastern side.



Fig. 2.1 Location map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

2.2 Geology

Major rock formations observed in the microwatershed are granite gneiss (Figs. 2.2). 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 the village.

Fig. 2.2 Granite and granite gneiss rocks

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as granite gneiss landscapes based on geology. The microwatershed area has been further divided into summits, very gently sloping uplands and nearly level plains based on slope and its relief features. The elevation ranges from 571 to 594 m in the gently sloping uplands.

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 an average annual rainfall of 662 mm (Table 2.1). Maximum of 424 mm precipitation takes place during the 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 takes place 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 and 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

2.7 Land Utilization

About 91 per cent area (Table 2.2) in Koppal district is cultivated at present and about 16 per cent of the area is sown more than once. The cropping intensity is 118 per cent. 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 bouldery 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed is presented in Fig. 2.6. Simultaneously, enumeration of existing wells (bore wells and open wells) and other soil and water conservation structures in the microwatershed is made and their location in different survey numbers is marked on the cadastral map. Map showing the location of wells and other water bodies in Maslapur-2 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed



Fig. 2.5 (b) Different crops and cropping systems in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed



Fig. 2.6 Current Land Use – Maslapur-2 Microwatershed



Fig. 2.7 Location of wells-Maslapur-2 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 for a given level of management. This was achieved in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed by the detailed study of all the soil characteristics (depth, texture, colour, structure, consistence, coarse fragments, porosity, soil reaction, soil horizons etc.) and site characteristics (slope, 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 510 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 and satellite imagery as base supplied by the KSRSAC. 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 landscape 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)



Fig. 3.1 Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed



Fig. 3.2 Satellite Image of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed



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

3.3 Field Investigation

The field boundaries and survey numbers given on the cadastral sheet were located on the ground by following permanent features like roads, cart tracks, *nallas*, streams, tanks etc., and wherever changes were noticed, they were incorporated on the microwatershed cadastral map. Preliminary traverse of the microwatershed was carried out with the help of cadastral map, imagery and toposheets. While traversing, landforms and physiographic units identified were checked and preliminary soil legend was prepared by studying soils at few selected places. Then, intensive traversing of each physiographic unit like hills, ridges, uplands and 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, soil profiles (vertical cut showing the soil layers from surface to the rock) were opened upto 200 cm or to the depth limited by rock or hard substratum and studied in detail for all their morphological and physical characteristics. The soil and site characteristics were recorded for all profile sites on a standard proforma as per the guidelines given in USDA Soil Survey Manual (Soil Survey Staff, 2012). Apart from the transect study, profiles were also studied at random, almost like in a grid pattern, outside the transect areas 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, 11 soil series were identified in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed.

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

Soils of Granite gneiss Landscape							
Sl. No.	**Soil Series**	**Depth (cm)**	**Colour (moist)**	**Texture**	**Gravel (%)**	**Horizon sequence**	**Calcareo-usness**
1	Kanchanahalli (KNH)	25-50	2.5YR3/4,3/6	sc	<15	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
2	Harve (HRV)	25-50	2.5YR3/4,3/6 5YR3/3,4/4,3/4	gscl	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr-	-
3	Kethanapura (KTP)	50-75	2.5YR3/4, 3/6	gsc	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
4	Kutegoudanahundi (KGH)	50-75	7.5YR3/2,3/3,3/4	gscl	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
5	Mukhadahalli (MKH)	50-75	5YR3/3,3/4,4/3, 5/4,6/6 2.5YR3/4	gsc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
6	Lakkur (LKR)	50-75	2.5YR 2.5/3, 2.5/4, 3/4, 3/6	gsc	40-60	Ap-Bt-Bc-Cr	50-75
7	Gollarahatti (GHT)	75-100	2.5YR3/4,3/6, 4/4,4/6	gscl	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
8	Hooradhahalli (HDH)	75-100	2.5YR3/4,3/6, 4/4,4/6	gscl	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
9	Balapur (BPR)	100-150	2.5YR2.5/4,3/4	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
10	Jedigere (JDG)	100-150	5YR 4/6, 3/4, 7.5YR 3/4, 4/6	sc-c	<15	Ap-Bt-BC-Cr	-
11	Thimmasandra (TSD)	>150	10YR2/12/2,3/1, 3/2,4/1, 4/2,4/3	c	-	Ap-Bw	-

3.4 Soil Mapping

The area under each soil series was further separated into 20 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 soil map (Fig. 3.5) in the form of symbols. During the survey many soil profile pits, few minipits and a few auger bores representing different landforms occurring in the microwatershed were studied. In addition to the profile study, spot observations in the form of minipits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map. The soil map shows the geographic distribution of 20 mapping units representing 11 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 11 soil phases mapped in the microwatershed. Each mapping unit (soil phase) delineated on the map has similar soil and site characteristics. In other words, all the farms or survey numbers included in one phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each soil series were collected from representative master profiles for laboratory characterization by following the methods outlined in the Laboratory Manual (Sarma *et al*, 1987). Surface soil samples collected in the year 2018 from Maslapur-2 farmer's fields for fertility status (major and micronutrients) at 320 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase Symbol	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite and Granite gneiss landscape				
	KNH	Kanchanahalli soils are shallow (25 -50 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown sandy clay soils occuring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**11 (2.18)**
467		KNHiB1g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	11 (2.18)
	HRV	Harve soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay loam soils occuring on very gently to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation		**32 (6.2)**
465		HRVcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	12 (2.25)
26		HRVhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	20 (3.95)
	KTP	Kethanapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown, gravelly sandy clay soils occuring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**99 (19.33)**
71		KTPcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	70 (13.72)
72		KTPhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	29 (5.61)
	KGH	Kaggalipura soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have brown to dark reddish brown gravelly sandy clay soils occuring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**131 (25.68)**
63		KGHcA1	Sandy loam surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion	22 (4.31)
65		KGHcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	109 (21.37)

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase Symbol	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
	MKH	Mukhadahalli soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark brown to reddish brown, gravelly sandy clay soils occuring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**67 (12.96)**
77		MKHcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	53 (10.29)
78		MKHcB2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%),	14 (2.66)
82		MKHhB1g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	0 (0.1)
	LKR	Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay red soils occuring on nearly level to very gently and gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**16 (3.06)**
452		LKRhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	16 (3.06)
	GHT	Gollarahatti soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay loam soils occuring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**25 (5.03)**
134		GHTbB2g1	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	18 (3.57)
142		GHThB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	7 (1.46)
	HDH	Hooradhahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have red to dark red and reddish brown gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occuring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**45 (8.7)**
105		HDHbB2g1	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	15 (2.97)
111		HDHcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	20 (3.86)
112		HDHcB2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%),	10 (1.87)
122		HDHhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	0 (0.0)
	BPR	Balapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occuring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**16 (3.15)**
219		BPRbB2g2	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%),	16 (3.15)
	JDG	Jedigere soils are deep (100-150 cm) well drained, have		**18 (3.51)**

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase Symbol	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
		yellowish red to strong brown sandy clay to clay soils occuring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		
457		JDGcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	18 (3.51)
	TSD	Thimmasandra soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark brown to very dark grayish brown clay soils occuring on nearly level to very gently sloping lowlands under cultivation		**9 (1.71)**
446		TSDmA1	Clay surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion,	9 (1.71)
999		Rock outcrops	Rock lands, both massive and bouldery with little or no soil	**41 (7.99)**
1000	Others	waterbody		**2 (0.42)**

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

3.6 Land Management Units (LMU's)

The 20 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were regrouped into 7 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan for sustained development of the microwatershed. The database (soil phases) generated under LRI was utilized for identifying Land Management Units (LMU's) based on the management needs. One or more than one soil site characteristic having influence on the management have been choosen for identification and delineation of LMUs. For Maslapur-2 Microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely soil depth, soil texture, slope, erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LMUs. The Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.



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

Chapter 4

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss landscape based on geology. In all, 11 soil series are 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 11 soil series identified followed by 20 soil phases (management units) mapped (Fig. 3.4) are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Maslapur-2 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, 11 soil series are identified and mapped. Of these, Kutegoudanahundi (KGH) series occupies maximum area of 131 ha (26%), Kethanapura (KTP) 99 ha (19), Mukhadahalli (MKH) 67 ha (13%), Hooradhahalli (HDH) 45 ha (9%), Harve (HRV) 32 ha (6%), Gollarahatti (GHT) 25 ha (5%), Jedigere (JDG) 18 ha (4%), Lakkur (LKR) 16 ha (3%), Balapur (BPR) 16 ha (3%), Kanchanahalli (KNH) 11 ha (2%) and Thimmasandra (TSD) occupy minor area of about 9 ha (2%) in the microwatershed. The brief description of each soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Kanchanahalli (KNH) Series: Kanchanahalli soils are shallow (25 -50 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown sandy clay soils. They have developed from granite gneiss and occur on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Kanchanahalli series has been tentatively classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Paralithic Rhodustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 28 to 50 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 and chroma 4 to 6. The texture varies from sandy clay loam to sandy clay with 10 to 15 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 16 to 38 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Its texture is sandy clay with gravel content of < 15 per

cent. The available water capacity is low (50-100 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kanchanahalli (KNH) Series

4.1.2 Harve (HRV) Series: Harve soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay loam soils. They have developed from granite gneiss and occur on very gently to moderately sloping uplands. The Harve series has been classified as a member of the loamy-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic, family of (Paralithic) Rhodustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 28 to 48 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 12 to 17 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 loam with 20 to 60 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 16 to 32 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Its texture is sandy clay loam with gravel content of more than 35 per cent. The available water capacity is very low (<50 mm/m). Two phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Harve (HRV) Series

4.1.3 Kethanapura (KTP) Series: Kethanapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown, gravelly sandy clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The Kethanapura series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Rhodic Paleustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 53 to 72 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 11 to 16 cm. Its colour is in 5YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. The texture varies from loamy sand to sandy clay loam with 15 to 40 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon varies from 41 to 56 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture is dominantly sandy clay loam with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is medium (101-150 mm/m). Two phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kethanapura (KTP) Series

4.1.4 Kutegoudanahundi (KGH) Series: Kutegoudanahundi soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have brown to dark brown gravelly sandy clay loam soils. They have developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The Kutegoudanahundi series has been classified as a member of the fine-loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 50 to 74 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 12 to 22 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. The texture varies from loamy sand to sandy loam with 15 to 30 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 40 to 62 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. Its texture is sandy clay loam with gravel content of 15 to 35 per cent. The available water capacity is medium (100-150 mm/m). Two phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kutegoudanahundi (KGH) Series

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

The thickness of the solum ranges from 51 to 72 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 12 to 17 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 4. The texture varies from loamy sand to sandy loam with 20 to 45 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 40 to 68 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 6. Texture is sandy clay loam to sandy clay with 35 to 50 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (50-100 mm/m). Three phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Mukhadahalli (MKH) Series

4.1.6 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 weathered 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). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Lakkur (LKR) Series

4.1.7 Gollarahatti (GHT) Series: Gollarahatti soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The Gollarahatti series has been classified as a member of the fine loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Rhodustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 78 to 98 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 12 to 18cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture varies from gravelly sandy clay loam with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 66 to 81cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture is sandy clay loam with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is medium (100-150 mm/m). Two phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Gollarahatti (GHT) Series

4.1.8 Hooradhahalli (HDH) Series: Hooradhahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have red to dark red and reddish brown gravelly sandy clay to clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The Hooradhahalli series has been classified as a member of the clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Rhodic Paleustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 76 to 100 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 11 to 19 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. The texture varies from loamy sand to sandy clay with 15 to 50 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon varies from 65 to 83 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 2.5 to 3 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture is sandy clay to clay with 35 to 50 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (50-100 mm/m). Four phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Hooradhahalli (HDH) Series

4.1.9 Balapur (BPR) Series: Balapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils. These soils are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The Balapur series has been classified as a member of the clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Rhodustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 102 to 147 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 12 to 17 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 2.5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. The texture ranges from loamy sand to sandy clay with 15 to 50 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 90 to 132 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 2.5 to 3 and chroma 4 to 6. Texture is sandy clay to clay with 35 to 50 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is medium (100-150 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Balapur (BPR) Series

4.1.10 Jedigere (JDG) Series: Jedigere soils are deep (100-150 cm) well drained, have yellowish red to strong brown sandy clay to clay soils. They have developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Jedigere series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 117 to 145 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 13 to 21 cm. Its colour is in hue 5 YR and 7.5 YR with value 2 to 4 and chroma 2 to 6. Its texture is dominantly sandy clay and sand clay loam. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 104 to 124 cm. Its colour is in hue 5 YR and 7.5 YR with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. Its texture is dominantly clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile Characteristics of Jedigere (JDG) Series

4.1.11 Thimmasandra (TSD) Series: Thimmasandra soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark brown to very dark grayish brown clay soils. They have developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping lowlands under cultivation. The Thimmasandra series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 11 to 17 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 3. The texture is sandy clay. The thickness of B horizon is more than 150 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 2 to 4 and chroma 1 to 3. Its texture is sandy clay to clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Thimmasandra (TSD) Series

Table: 4.1 Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

Series Name: Harve (HRV)**, Pedon:** R-10
Location: $15^0$25'11.63"N, $76^0$22'03.65"E Jabbaragudda village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Loamy-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic (Paralithic) 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
0-15	Ap	65.64	9.07	25.28	29.04	12.99	9.00	3.48	11.15	50	scl	12.87	4.81
15-29	Bt1	56.13	7.75	36.12	27.81	11.43	7.21	1.44	8.24	60	sc	15.69	6.24
29-47	Bt2	63.42	6.53	30.05	32.38	13.93	7.48	5.74	3.89	60	scl	15.41	9.29

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}							%	%
0-15	6.05	-	-	0.21	0.93	-	8.89	1.96	0.50	0.08	11.43	11.24	0.44	100.00	0.73
15-29	5.99	-	-	0.15	0.29	-	9.72	2.75	0.51	0.09	13.07	12.71	0.35	100.00	0.74
29-47	6.07	-	-	0.11	0.38	-	9.35	2.47	0.49	0.06	12.36	12.71	0.42	97.29	0.44

Contd...

Series Name: Kethanapura (KTP) **Pedon:** R-9
Location: $15^0$25'28.81"N, $76^0$22'00.76" E Jabbaragudda village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Rhodic Paleustalfs

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
0-18	Ap	83.64	10.52	5.84	25.61	22.36	15.24	13.52	6.91	10	ls	7.92	2.58
18-38	Bt1	46.06	5.63	48.31	21.58	9.54	3.53	4.15	7.26	30	sc	19.62	14.48
38-73	Bt2	52.31	6.91	40.78	24.56	12.74	5.96	5.55	3.49	30	sc	17.73	11.95

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}							%	%
0-18	6.42	-		0.07	1.24	-	2.95	0.93	0.57	0.02	4.48	4.41	0.75	100.00	0.05
18-38	6.63	-	-	0.09	0.70	-	11.71	3.53	0.98	0.08	16.31	16.59	0.34	98.30	0.50
38-73	6.88	-	-	0.15	0.48	-	11.36	3.30	0.72	0.13	15.50	15.75	0.39	98.42	0.80

Contd...

Series Name: Kutegoudanahundi (KGH) **Pedon:** R1
Location: Lambani tanda village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine-loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustalfs

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
0-12	Ap	79.84	7.93	12.23	30.70	15.50	14.08	12.26	7.29	20	sl	10.46	4.79
12-35	Bt1	64.49	9.69	25.82	33.88	10.92	8.06	7.45	4.18	25	scl	16.40	9.12
35-58	Bt2	62.27	9.51	28.22	35.38	8.90	7.06	3.27	7.67	30	scl	19.13	11.05
58-72	Bc	62.77	7.40	29.83	32.76	11.50	7.63	6.82	4.07	40	scl	19.86	10.16

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}							%	%
0-12	6.66			0.089	0.83		6.39	1.56	0.21	0.08	8.23	8.22	0.67	100	0.93
12-35	7.39			0.061	0.73				0.25	0.07		14.95	0.58	100	0.49
35-58	7.56			0.064	0.69				0.27	0.08		16.34	0.58	100	0.52
58-72	7.92			0.146	0.47				0.36	0.12		17.72	0.59	100	0.69

Contd...

Series Name: Mukahadahalli (MKH), **Pedon:** R-11
Location: $15^0$22'05.4"N, $76^0$04'10.3"E, Halageri village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustalfs

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
0-19	Ap	65.71	8.83	25.46	9.27	9.06	14.42	21.52	11.43	70	scl	16.54	8.60
19-32	Bt	55.89	11.13	32.98	6.47	9.18	11.89	19.19	9.18	50	scl	19.24	12.78
32-58	Bt	47.95	10.41	41.63	17.52	3.78	9.13	9.55	7.97	50	sc	24.03	16.02

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}							%	%
0-19	7.38	-	-	0.09	0.2	0.00	8.97	4.32	0.26	0.22	13.77	14.84	0.58	93	1.49
19-32	7.5	-	-	0.106	0.41	0.00	15.98	3.27	0.16	0.50	19.91	20.88	0.63	95	2.38
32-58	7.46	-	-	0.173	0.49	0.00	19.71	4.53	0.23	1.32	25.79	25.76	0.62	100	5.11

Contd...

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	Bt	54.37	10.48	35.14	16.33	8.64	9.69	11.59	8.11	40	sc	-	-
35-56	Bc	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...

Soil Series: Gollarahatti (GHT), **Pedon:** RM-2
Location: $50^0$04'88.8"N, $75^0$37'65.2"E, (4D4A3I1f), Belhatti village, Shirahatti taluk, Gadag district.
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine loamy, 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
0-26	Ap	83.22	5.74	11.05	9.71	11.73	16.68	27.10	16.58	30	ls	-	-
26-63	Bt1	55.91	13.36	30.73	13.05	9.66	11.10	14.29	7.81	20	scl	-	-
63-84	Bt2	57.17	11.38	31.45	10.53	10.11	12.28	13.83	10.42	20	scl	-	-

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}							%	%
0-26	5.70	-	-	0.06	0.20	0.00	1.50	0.60	0.09	0.13	2.32	3.17	0.29	73.00	4.10
26-63	6.26	-	-	0.04	0.24	0.00	7.35	1.55	0.09	0.17	9.15	9.89	0.32	93.00	1.72
63-84	6.50	-	-	0.05	0.20	0.47	-	-	0.09	0.21	0.30	10.18	0.32	100.00	2.06

Contd...

Soil Series: Hooradhahalli (HDH), **Pedon:** RM-69
Location: $13^0$24'31"N, $76^0$33'41"E, (4D3D8G2d), Hesarahalli village, Chikkanayakanahalli taluk, Tumukura district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Clayey-skeletal mixed, isohyperthermic Rhodic Paleustalfs

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
0-18	Ap	72.56	15.17	12.27	4.57	8.33	17.38	23.88	18.39	35	sl	-	-
18-33	Bt1	56.29	10.75	32.96	7.88	10.24	13.41	14.43	10.34	55	scl	-	-
33-58	Bt2	46.66	10.79	42.55	10.79	9.87	8.43	9.04	8.53	55	sc	-	-
58-90	Bt3	43.09	13.63	43.27	9.90	8.25	7.32	8.76	8.87	45	c	-	-

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}							%	%
0-18	6.54	-	-	0.07	0.60	0.00	2.68	1.38	0.44	0.42	4.91	5.84	0.48	84.07	7.11
18-33	5.90	-	-	0.07	0.52	0.00	3.99	1.27	0.09	0.37	5.71	8.61	0.26	66.32	4.29
33-58	6.16	-	-	0.07	0.44	0.00	4.92	1.67	0.08	0.55	7.22	10.00	0.24	72.23	5.50
58-90	6.39	-	-	0.06	0.40	0.00	4.30	2.02	0.08	0.46	6.87	9.21	0.21	74.61	5.05

Contd...

Soil Series: Balapur (BPR), **Pedon**: RM-78
Location: $13^0$26'39"N, $76^0$35'03"E, (4D3D8G2c), Kasaba, Chikkanayakanahalli taluk, Tumakuru district
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
0-12	Ap	65.66	18.66	15.68	4.14	6.16	13.33	21.82	20.20	-	sl	-	-
12-34	Bt1	61.91	11.52	26.57	2.36	6.78	12.53	21.36	18.89	-	scl	-	-
34-60	Bt2	51.81	11.24	36.94	4.66	5.70	12.23	15.96	13.26	30	sc	-	-
60-84	Bt3	46.61	9.02	44.37	14.70	6.88	7.51	8.97	8.55	55	sc	-	-
84-112	Bt4	48.75	12.92	38.33	15.73	8.13	6.87	8.23	9.79	60	sc	-	-
112-127	Bc	50.98	24.74	24.28	5.25	4.63	5.15	10.92	25.03	50	scl	-	-

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}							%	%
0-12	6.64	-	-	0.03	0.56	0.00	1.90	1.32	0.21	0.03	3.46	5.45	0.35	63.48	0.51
12-34	6.99	-	-	0.02	0.48	0.00	3.66	1.90	0.07	0.08	5.70	7.82	0.29	72.93	0.96
34-60	7.29	-	-	0.02	0.40	0.00	5.13	2.08	0.11	0.20	7.52	11.19	0.30	67.18	1.75
60-84	7.50	-	-	0.02	0.32	0.00	5.83	6.36	0.13	0.23	12.55	12.38	0.28	101.43	1.83
84-112	7.54	-	-	0.02	0.24	0.00	6.02	6.59	0.11	0.25	12.96	12.77	0.33	101.49	1.97
112-127	7.90	-	-	0.02	0.20	0.00	8.04	3.62	0.07	0.32	12.04	12.47	0.51	96.56	2.55

Contd...

Series Name: Jedigere (JDG), **Pedon:** R5
Location: Chennahalu village, Yelburga Taluk and Koppal District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustalfs

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
0-14	Ap	70.63	8.33	21.04	16.26	23.58	13.41	11.59	5.79	-	scl	13.46	6.17
14-39	Bt1	49.95	11.56	38.49	10.61	17.40	10.30	7.42	4.22	-	sc	23.07	13.70
39-62	Bt2	45.88	11.44	42.68	10.72	16.70	9.28	6.80	2.37	-	sc	25.24	15.20
62-94	Bt3	42.89	8.51	48.61	9.48	14.54	8.35	6.80	3.71	-	c	25.30	14.07
94-118	Bt4	45.24	11.90	42.86	10.66	15.53	8.59	6.63	3.83	-	sc	23.52	13.58

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}							%	%
0-14	6.11			0.078	0.83		5.58	2.49	0.18	0.19	8.45	9.41	0.45	90	2.06
14-39	6.87			0.123	0.67		12.01	5.62	0.32	0.29	18.24	18.22	0.47	100	1.59
39-62	7.65			0.121	0.50				0.42	0.43		21.68	0.51	-	1.99
62-94	8.21			0.188	0.28				0.34	0.41		21.09	0.43	-	1.93
94-118	8.23			0.189	0.24				0.33	0.36		17.62	0.41	-	2.02

Contd...

Soil Series: Thimmasandra (TSD), **Pedon:** R-14
Location: 11°55'64.2"N, 76°51'82.9" E, (4B3A5K3b), Somanapura village, Chamarajanagara taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification**: Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustepts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		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
0-19	Ap	12.27	25.92	61.81	0.98	0.98	1.52	3.91	4.89	-	c	-	-
19-33	Bw1	32.98	26.29	40.72	2.75	4.44	4.97	8.35	12.47	-	c	-	-
33-58	Bw2	10.21	27.99	61.81	0.98	1.30	1.19	2.17	4.56	-	c	-	-
58-83	Bw3	9.83	27.40	62.77	1.09	0.98	0.98	1.86	4.91	-	c	-	-
83-95	Bw4	6.17	26.07	67.76	0.99	0.77	0.55	0.99	2.86	-	c	-	-
95-116	Bw5	7.52	28.87	63.61	0.77	1.00	1.11	1.88	2.77	-	c	-	-

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}							%	%
0-19	8.46	-	-	0.175	1.01	4.45	-	-	1.91	0.18		36.61	0.59	100	0.19
19-33	8.65	-	-	0.16	0.81	6.41	-	-	0.77	0.39		23.98	0.59	100	0.64
33-58	8.94	-	-	0.26	0.56	6.90	-	-	0.82	2.24		33.59	0.54	100	2.67
58-83	9.13	-	-	0.335	0.4	8.01	-	-	0.30	1.01		36.72	0.58	100	1.10
83-95	9.05	-	-	0.412	0.36	4.58	-	-	0.76	4.17		38.88	0.57	100	4.30
95-116	8.96	-	-	0.4	0.28	4.21	-	-	0.96	4.02		43.63	0.69	100	3.68

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 20 soil map units identified in the Maslapur-2 Microwatershed are grouped under two land capability classes and five land capability subclasses (Fig. 5.1).



Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

Entire area of the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture. Maximum area of 327 ha (64%) are good lands (Class II) that have minor limitations and require moderate conservation practices and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Moderately good lands (Class III) cover an area of 141 ha (28%) and are distributed in the southern, northern and northwestern part of the microwatershed with moderate problems of soil that require special conservation practices. The other miscellaneous areas cover about 8 per cent is rock outcrops, habitations and water bodies.

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).

An area of 43 ha (8%) is shallow (25-50 cm) and are distributed in the southern and western part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 312 ha (61%) is moderately shallow (50-75 cm) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Moderately deep soils (75-100 cm) occupy an area of 70 ha (14%) and occur in the northern, western and eastern part of the microwatershed. Deep (100-150 cm) to very deep (>150 cm) soils occupy an area of 43 ha (8%) and are distributed in the northeastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed.

The most problem lands with an area of about 43 ha (8%) having shallow (25-50 cm) rooting depth. They are suitable for growing short duration agricultural crops but well suited for pasture, forestry or other recreational purposes. The most productive lands cover an area about 43 ha (8%) where all climatically adapted long duration crops be grown.



Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

5.3 Surface Soil Texture

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

An area of 49 ha (10%) is sandy soils at the surface and are distributed in the eastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 398 ha (78%) has loamy soils at the surface and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of 20 ha (4%) has clayey soils at the surface and are distributed in the western and northeastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 5.3).

The most productive lands 20 ha (4%) with respect to surface soil texture are the clayey soils that have high potential for soil-water retention and availability, and nutrient retention and availability, but have more problems of drainage, infiltration, workability and other physical problems. The other most productive lands 398 ha (78%) are loamy soils which also have high potential for AWC, nutrient availability but have no drainage or other physical problems compared to loamy soils. The problem soils cover 10 per cent area which

have problem of moisture and nutrient availability and require frequent irrigation and nutrient management. They are better suited for root and tuber crops.



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

5.4 Soil Gravelliness

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

The soils that are non-gravelly (<15% gravel) cover an area of 31 ha (6%) and are distributed in the central and northeastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 397 ha (78%) is covered by gravelly (15-35% gravel) soils and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 39 ha (8%) is very gravelly (35-60%) and are distributed in the western and northwestern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 5.4).

The most productive lands with respect to gravelliness are found to be 6%. 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 gravelly (15-35%) to very gravelly (35-60%) cover 436 ha (86%) where only short or medium duration crops can be grown.



Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

5.5 Available Water Capacity

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

An area of about 169 ha (33%) are very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the northern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 271 ha (53%) is low (51-100 mm/m) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Soils with medium available water capacity (101-150 mm/m) occupy an area of 18 ha (4%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 9 ha (2%) is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the western and northeastern part of the microwatershed.

An area of about 169 ha (33%) 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. The potential soils with respect to AWC cover about 9 ha (2%) that have very high AWC, where all climatically adapted long duration crops can be grown.



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

5.6 Soil Slope

Soil slope refers to the inclination of the surface of the land. It is defined by gradient, shape and length, and is an integral feature of any soil as a natural body. Slope is considered important in soil genesis, land use and land development. The length and gradient of slope influences the rate of runoff, infiltration, erosion and deposition. The soil map units were grouped into four 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).

An area of 31 ha (6%) is nearly level (0-1%) and are distributed in the central and northeastern part of the microwatershed. Major area of about 437 ha (86%) falls under very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands and are distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. In all these lands, 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

5.7 Soil Erosion

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

Soils that are slightly eroded (e1 Class) occupy an area of about 112 ha (22%) and are distributed in the central, northeastern, northern and western part of the microwatershed. Moderately eroded (e2 Class) soils cover a maximum area of 355 ha (70%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed.

An area of about 355 ha (70%) in the microwatershed is problematic because of moderate erosion. These areas need soil and water conservation and other land development measures for restoring the soil health.



Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Maslapur-2 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 characterised by low rainfall and high temperatures. Hence, it is necessary to know the fertility (macro and micro nutrients) status of the soils of the watersheds for assessing the kind and amount of fertilizers required for each of the crop intended to be grown. For this purpose, the surface soil samples collected from the grid points (one soil sample at every 320 m grid interval) all over the microwatershed through land resource inventory in the year 2018 were analysed for pH, EC, organic carbon, available phosphorus and potassium and for micronutrients like zinc, boron, copper, iron and manganese, and secondary nutrient sulphur.

Soil fertility data generated has been assessed and individual maps for all the nutrients for the microwatershed have been generated 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that an area of 180 ha (35%) is slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) and is distributed in the southern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 287 ha (56%) is neutral (pH 6.58-7.3) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Thus, entire soils in the microwatershed are alkaline covering 467 ha.

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

The Electrical Conductivity of the soils is <2 dS m^{-1} in the entire microwatershed (Fig. 6.2) area and as such the soils are nonsaline.

6.3 Organic Carbon

The soil organic carbon content (an index of available Nitrogen) in the soils of the microwatershed is medium (0.5-0.75%) covering maximum area of 308 ha (60%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of 160 ha (31%) is high (>0.75%) and is distributed in the northern and southwestern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.3).



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



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



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



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

6.4 Available Phosphorus

Entire area of about 467 ha (92%) is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.4).

6.5 Available Potassium

Available potassium content in the soils of the microwatershed is low in an area of 173 ha (34%) and is distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 294 ha (58%) is medium (145-337 kg/ha) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. A minor area of about <1 ha (<1%) is high (>337 kg/ha) and is distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.5).

6.6 Available Sulphur

Soils that are low (>10 ppm) in available sulphur content occupy a maximum area of 353 ha (69%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of 114 ha (22%) is medium (10-20 ppm) and is distributed in the southern and central part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.6).

6.7 Available Boron

Available boron content is low (<0.5 ppm) in a maximum area of 277 ha (54%) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 191 ha (37%) is medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in available boron and is distributed in the northern and eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of about 467 ha (92%) and is distributed in all parts of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.8).

6.9 Available Manganese

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

6.10 Available Copper

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



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



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



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



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



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



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

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of 213 ha (42%) and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 254 ha (50%) is sufficient (>0.6 ppm) and is distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.11).



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

Chapter 7

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed were assessed for their suitability for growing food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops by following the procedure as outlined in FAO, 1976 and 1983. Crop requirements were developed for each of the crop from the available research data and also by referring to Naidu *et. al.* (2006) and Natarajan *et. al* (2015). The crop requirements (Table 7.2 to 7.33) were matched with the soil and land characteristics (Table 7.1) to arrive at the crop suitability. The criteria tables are given at the end of the Chapter. In FAO land suitability classification, two orders are recognized. Order S-Suitable and Order N- Not suitable. The orders have classes, subclasses and units. Order-S has three classes, Class S1-Highly Suitable, Class S2-Moderately Suitable and Class S3-Marginally Suitable. Order N has two Classes, N1-Currently not Suitable and N2-Permanently not Suitable. There are no subclasses within the Class S1 as they will have very minor or no limitations for crop growth. Classes S2, S3, N1 and N2 are divided into subclasses based on the kinds of limitations encountered. The limitations that affect crop production are 'c' for erratic rainfall and its distribution and length of growing period (LGP), 'e' for erosion hazard, 'r' for rooting condition, 't' for lighter or heavy texture, 'g' for gravelliness or stoniness, 'n' for nutrient availability, 'l' for topography, 'm' for moisture availability, 'z' for calcareousness 's' for sodium 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 31 major agricultural and horticultural crops were generated. The detailed information on the kind of suitability of each of the soil phase for the crops assessed are given village/ survey number wise for the microwatershed in Appendix-III.

7.1 Land Suitability for Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*)

Sorghum is one of the major food crop 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.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sorghum in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 336 ha (66%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, drainage, texture and rooting condition. An area of 132 ha (26%) is

marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.1 Land Suitability map of Sorghum

7.2 Land Suitability for Maize (*Zea mays*)

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

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing maize in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 336 ha (66%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness and texture. An area of 132 ha (26%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.2 Land Suitability map of Maize

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 the northern districts of the Karnataka State. The crop requirements for growing bajra (Table 7.4) 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.

An area of 26 ha (5%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing bajra and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 383 ha (75%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, rooting condition and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of 59 ha (12%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.3 Land Suitability map of Bajra

7.4 Land Suitability for Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*)

Groundnut is one of the major oilseed crop grown in an area of 6.54 lakh ha in Karnataka in most of the districts either as rainfed or irrigated crop. The crop requirements for growing groundnut (Table 7.5) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing groundnut was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.4.

An area of 26 ha (5%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing groundnut and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 377 ha (74%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, texture and rooting condition. Maximum area of 65 ha (13%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the northeastern, northwestern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness, texture and drainage.



Fig. 7.4 Land Suitability map of Groundnut

7.5 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 7.6) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sunflower was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.5.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sunflower in the microwatershed. An area of 53 ha (10%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the southern, western, northeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, drainage and rooting condition. Maximum area of 373 ha (73%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sunflower and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands cover an area of 43 ha (8%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

7.6 Land Suitability for Red gram (*Cajanus cajan)*

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

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing red gram in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of 53 ha (10%) and are distributed in the southern, eastern and northeastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, rooting condition and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of 372 ha (73%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands cover an area of 43 ha (8%) for growing red gram and are distributed in the southern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Redgram

7.7 Land Suitability for Bengalgram (*Cicer arietinum*)

Bengalgram 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 Bengalgram (Table 7.8) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing Bengalgram was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.7.

An area of 9 ha (2%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing bengalgram and are distributed in the western and northeastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable lands (Class S2) occupy a maximum area of 257 ha (50%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of gravelliness, texture and rooting condition. An area of 202 ha (40%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) lands for growing bengalgram in the microwatershed. An area of 9 ha (3%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) and are distributed in the eastern, central, northern, southern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of gravelliness, texture and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Bengalgram

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.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing cotton in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy a maximum area of 336 ha (66%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness and drainage. An area of 133 ha (26%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the western, southern, eastern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness and texture.



Fig. 7.8 Land Suitability map of Cotton

7.9 Land Suitability for Chilli (*Capsicum annuum L*)

Chilli is one of the most important commercial spice crop grown in an area of 0.89 lakh ha in all the districts of 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.

There are no highly (Class S1) lands for growing chilli in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in a maximum area of 327 ha (64%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 141 ha (28%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, drainage, rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.9 Land Suitability map of Chilli

7.10 Land Suitability for Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*)

Tomato is one of the most important vegetable 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 7.11) 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.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing tomato in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in a maximum area of 327 ha (64%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy an area of 141 ha (28%) and are distributed in the northern, northwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, drainage, rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.10 Land Suitability map of Tomato

7.11 Land Suitability for Brinjal (*Solanum melongena*)

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

An area of 26 ha (5%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing brinjal and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 284 ha (56%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, drainage, gravelliness and rooting condition. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occur in an area of 159 ha (31%) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.11 Land Suitability map of Brinjal

7.12 Land Suitability for Onion (*Allium cepa*)

Onion is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in Raichur, Dharwad, Belgaum, Gulbarga, Bijapur, Bidar, Bellary, Chitradurga and Tumakuru districts. The crop requirements for growing onion (Table 7.13) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing Onion was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.12.

An area of 26 ha (5%) is highly (Class S1) for growing onion and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 284 ha (56%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness, texture and drainage. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occupy an area of 159 ha (31%) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.12 Land Suitability map of Onion

7.13 Land Suitability for Bhendi (*Abelmoschus esculentus*)

Bhendi is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in all the districts. The crop requirements for growing bhendi (Table 7.14) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing bhendi was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.13.

An area of 26 ha (5%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing bhendi and are distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 284 ha (56%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, rooting condition, drainage and gravelliness. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occur in an area of 159 ha (31%) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.13 Land Suitability map of Bhendi

7.14 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 7.15) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing drumstick was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.14.

An area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing drumstick and are distributed in the southern part of the microwaterhsed. An area of 51 ha (10%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the northeastern, eastern, southwestern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, drainage and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of 356 ha (70%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands cover an area of 43 ha (8%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.14 Land Suitability map of Drumstick

7.15 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 7.16) 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 7.15.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing mango in the microwaterhsed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of 18 ha (4%) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitation of rooting condition. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of 95 ha (19%) and are distributed in the eastern, northern, southwestern and western part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition, texture, drainage and gravelliness. An area of 354 ha (69%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing mango and occur in the major part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.15 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.16 Land suitability for Guava (*Psidium guajava*)

Guava is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of about 0.64 lakh 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.

There are no highly (Class S1) lands for growing guava in the microwatershed. An area of 88 ha (17%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the western, southern, northern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting condition and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 337 ha (66%) area is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing guava and occur in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition, drainage, gravelliness and texture. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Guava

7.17 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 7.18) 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 7.17.

An area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sapota and area distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 70 ha (14%) and are distributed in the northern, western and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. Major area of 337 ha (66%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sapota and occur in the all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness, texture and drainage. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing sapota and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Sapota

7.18 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 7.19) 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 7.18.

An area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing pomegranate and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of 79 ha (15%) and are distributed in the northern, western and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting condition, drainage and gravelliness. Maximum area of 328 ha (64%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing pomegranate and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.18 Land Suitability map of Pomegranate

7.19 Land Suitability for Musambi (*Citrus limetta*)

Musambi is one of the most important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing musambi (Table 7.20) 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 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing musambi and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of 79 ha (15%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the northern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, drainage and rooting condition. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occur in a maximum area of 328 ha (64%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing musambi and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



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 0.11 lakh 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.

Maximum area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing lime and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. An area of 79 ha (15%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the eastern, northern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, drainage and rooting condition. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occur in a maximum area of 328 ha (64%) for growing lime and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing lime and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Lime

7.21 Land Suitability for Amla (*Phyllanthus emblica*)

Amla is one of the most important medicinal crop grown in 151 ha area and distributed in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing amla (Table 7.22) 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 7.21.

An area of 44 ha (9%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing amla and are distributed in the southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 382 ha (75%) has soils that are moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, texture, gravelliness and drainage. The marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of 43 ha (8%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.22 Land Suitability for Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale)*

Cashew is one of the most important nut crop grown in an area of 1.24 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing cashew (Table 7.23) 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 7.22.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing cashew in the microwatershed. Modeately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 88 ha (17%) and are distributed in the eastern, northern, southern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition, texture and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 328 ha (64%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing cashew and are distributed in all parts of the microwaterhsed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 52 ha (10%) and are distributed in the western, northeastern and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation s of gravelliness, rooting condition and drainage.



Fig. 7.22 Land Suitability map of Cashew

7.23 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 for growing jackfruit (Table 7.24) 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 7.23.

An area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately (Class S2) suitable lands occur in an area of 70 ha (14%) and are distributed in the western, northern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of 337 ha (66%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition, texture, gravelliness and drainage. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing jackfruit and occur in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.24 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

Jamun is an important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing jamun (Table 7.25) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jamun was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.24.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing jamun in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 97 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, texture, gravelliness and drainage. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy a maximum area of 328 ha (64%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing jamun and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.24 Land Suitability map of Jamun

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

Custard apple is one of the most important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing custard apple (Table 7.26) 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 7.25.

An area of 44 ha (9%) is highly (Class S1) suitable for growing custard apple and are distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of 382 ha (75%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness and drainage. An area of 43 ha (8%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing custard apple and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.25 Land Suitability map of Custard Apple

7.26 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 for growing tamarind (Table 7.27) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tamarind was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.26.

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing tamarind in the microwatershed. An area of 27 ha (5%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the southern, northeastern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, texture and drainage. An area of 86 ha (17%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and occur in northern, eastern, western and southwestern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition. Maximum area of 354 ha (69%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

7.27 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 7.28) 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 7.27.

An area of 18 ha (4%) is highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing mulberry and are distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of 95 ha (19%) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, western and southwestern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting condition, drainage and texture. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of 312 ha (61%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness. An area of 43 ha (8%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting condition and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.27 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

7.28 Land Suitability for Marigold (*Tagetes erecta*)

Marigold is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 1858 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing marigold (Table 7.29) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing marigold was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.28.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing marigold in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 336 ha (66%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, gravelliness, rooting condition and drainage. An area of 132 ha (26%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing marigold in the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.28 Land Suitability map of Marigold

7.29 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 for growing chrysanthemum (Table 7.30) 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 7.29.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing chrysanthemum in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 336 ha (66%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing chrysanthemum and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of drainage, rooting condition, gravelliness and texture. An area of 132 ha (26%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing chrysanthemum and occur in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting condition.



Fig. 7.29 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

7. 30 Land Suitability for Jasmine *(Jasminum sp.)*

Jasmine is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 6146 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.31) 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 7.30.

There are no highly suitable lands (Class S1) for growing jasmine in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 327 ha (64%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing jasmine and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, texture and gravelliness. An area of 141 ha (28%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing jasmine and are distributed in the northern, eastern, northwestern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, rooting condition, drainage and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.30 Land Suitability map of Jasmine

7. 31 Land Suitability for Crossandra *(Crossandra in fundibuliformis)*

Crossandra is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 6146 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.32) 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 7.31.

There are no highly suitable lands (Class S1) for growing crossandra in the microwatershed. Maximum area of 327 ha (64%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing crossandra and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting condition, gravelliness and texture. An area of 141 ha (28%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) and are distributed in the northern, eastern, northwestern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, rooting condition, drainage and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.31 Land Suitability map of Crossandra

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drainage Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m)	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC	ESP	CEC [Cmol (p^+) kg^{-1}]	BS (%)
					Surface	Sub-surface	Surface	Sub-surface								
KNHiB1g1	662	90	WD	25-50	sc	sc	15-35	<15	50-100	1-3	Slight	-	-	-	-	-
HRVcB2g1	662	90	WD	25-50	sl	gscl	15-35	>35	<50	1-3	Moderate	6.05	0.21	0.73	11.24	100
HRVhB2g1	662	90	WD	25-50	scl	gscl	15-35	>35	<50	1-3	Moderate	6.05	0.21	0.73	11.24	100
KTPcB1g1	662	90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	15-35	15-35	101-150	1-3	Slight	6.42	0.07	0.05	4.41	100
KTPhB2g1	662	90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	15-35	101-150	1-3	Moderate	6.42	0.07	0.05	4.41	100
KGHcA1	662	90	WD	50-75	sl	gscl	-	15-35	100-150	0-1	Slight	6.66	0.08	0.93	8.22	100
KGHcB2g1	662	90	WD	50-75	sl	gscl	15-35	15-35	100-150	1-3	Moderate	6.66	0.08	0.93	8.22	100
MKHcB2g1	662	90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	15-35	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
MKHcB2g2	662	90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	35-60	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
MKHhB1g1	662	90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	>35	50-100	1-3	Slight	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
LKRhB2g1	662	90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	40-60	50-100	1-3	Moderate	8.18	0.30	4.51	12.19	100
GHTbB2g1	662	90	WD	75-100	ls	gscl	15-35	15-35	100-150	1-3	Moderate	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
GHThB2g1	662	90	WD	75-100	scl	gscl	15-35	15-35	100-150	1-3	Moderate	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
HDHbB2g1	662	90	WD	75-100	ls	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHcB2g1	662	90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHcB2g2	662	90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHhB2	662	90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc-gc	-	>35	50-100	1-3	Moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
BPRbB2g2	662	90	WD	100-150	ls	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	1-3	Moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
JDGcB2g1	662	90	WD	100-150	sl	sc-c	15-35	<15	>200	1-3	Moderate	6.11	0.07	2.06	9.41	90
TSDmA1	662	90	MWD	>150	c	c	-	-	>200	0-1	Slight	8.46	0.17	0.19	36.61	100

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

Table 7.2 Land suitability criteria for Sorghum

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime1	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	26–30	30–34; 24–26	34–40; 20–24	>40; <20
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristics					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, c (red), c (black)	scl, cl	ls, sl	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.8	5.0-5.5 7.8-9.0	>9.0	-
	CEC	C mol (p+)/K g				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	10-15
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.3 Land suitability criteria for Maize

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	30-34	35-38 26-30	38-40 26-20	
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	Very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc	c (red), c (black)	ls, sl	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.8	5.0-5.5 7.8-9.0	>9.0	-
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	-
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.4 Land suitability criteria for Bajra

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	33-38 24-27	39-40 20-23	<20
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm	500-750	400-500	200-400	<200
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	Very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl, scl, cl,sc,c (red)	C (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.0-5.5 7.8-9.0	5.5-6.0 >9.0	
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	15-35	35-60	>60	
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	1-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.5 Land suitability criteria for Groundnut

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	24–33	22–24; 33–35	20–22; 35–40	<20; >40
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. Well drained	Poorly drained	Very Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl	sl,cl, sc	c (red), c (black), ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.5-6.0 7.8-8.4	5.0-5.5 8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<35	35-60	>60	
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.6 Land suitability criteria for Sunflower

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	24–30	30–34; 20–24	34–38; 16–20	>38; <16
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	mod. Well drained	-	Poorly to very drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	cl, sc,c (red), c (black)	scl	ls, sl	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.5-7.8	7.8-8.4 5.5-6.5	8.4-9.0; 5.0-5.5	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.7 Land suitability criteria for Red gram

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	30-35(G) 20-25(AV) 15-18 (F&PS) 35-40(M)	25-30(G) 20-25 (AV) 12-15 (F&PS) 30-35(M)	20-25(G) 15-20(AV) 10-12 (F&PS) 25-30(M)	< 20 <15 <10 <25
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. Well drained	Poorly drained	Very Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, c (red)	c (black),sl, scl, cl	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.5-6.0 7.8-9.0	5.0-5.5 >9.0	-
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-50	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.8 Land suitability criteria for Bengal gram

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	20–25	25–30; 15–20	30–35; 10–15	>35; <10
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. Well drained	Poorly drained	Very Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	C (black)	-	c (red), scl, cl, sc	ls, sl
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.0-6.0 7.8-9.0	>9.0	-
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	-
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.9 Land suitability criteria for Cotton

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	22-32	>32	<19	-
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well to moderately well	Poorly drained/Some what excessively drained	-	very poorly/excessively drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, c (red,black)	cl	scl	ls, sl
	pH	1:2.5	6.5-7.8	7.8-8.4	5.5-6.5 8.4->9.0	<5.5
	CEC	C mol (p+)Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	50-100	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-10	10-15	>15	
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	-	>5

Table 7.10 Land suitability criteria for Chilli

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	25-32	33-35 20-25	35-38 <20	>38
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	Very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc	c (black), sl	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.11 Land suitability criteria for Tomato

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	25-28	29-32 20-24	15-19 33-36	<15 >36
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl, scl, cl, sc, c (red)	-	ls, c(black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.12 Land suitability criteria for Brinjal

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class				
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl, scl, cl, sc c (red)	-	ls, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	7.3-8.4 5.0-6.0	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.13 Land suitability criteria for Onion

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	20-30	30-35	35-40	>40
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately /imperfectly	-	Poorly to V poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl,scl,cl,sc,c (red)	-	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
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<1.0	1.0-2.0	2.0-4.0	<4
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.14 Land suitability criteria for Bhendi

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	25-28	29-32 20-24	15-19 33-36	<15 >36
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly to very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl,sc, c (red)	c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.15 Land suitability criteria for Drumstick

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, scl, cl, c (red)	sl, c (black)	ls	s
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-5.5 7.3-7.8	5.5-6.0 7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<35	35-60	60-80	>80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m				
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-10	-	>10

Table 7.16 Land suitability criteria for Mango

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	24-27 33-35	36-40	20-24
	Min temp. before flowering	^{0}C	10-15	15-22	>22	-
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration	Days				
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	-	ls, sl, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	75-100	<75
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.17 Land suitability criteria for Guava

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	33-36 24-27	37-42 20-23	
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.18 Land suitability criteria for Sapota

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	33-36 24-27	37-42 20-23	>42 <18
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	-	Poorly to very drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	sl	ls, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.19 Land suitability criteria for Pomegranate

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N1)
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	30-34	35-38 25-29	39-40 15-24	
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl,cl, sc, c (red)	c (black),sl	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.8	7.8-8.4	5.0-5.5 8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.20 Land suitability criteria for Musambi

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-30	31-35 24-27	36-40 20-23	>40 <20
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately drained	poorly	Very poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c	sl	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.5-6.0 7.8-8.4	5.0-5.5 8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.21 Land suitability criteria for Lime

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-30	31-35 24-27	36-40 20-23	>40 <20
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately drained	poorly	Very poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c	sl	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.5-6.0 7.8-8.4	5.0-5.5 8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.22 Land suitability criteria for Amla

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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 7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15-35	35-60	60-80	-
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.23 Land suitability criteria for Cashew

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	32 to 34	28 to 32; 34 to 38	24 to 28; 38 to 40	<20; >40
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	moderately well drained	Poorly drained	Very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	-	sl, ls	c (black)
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-6.5	5.0-5.5 6.5-7.3	7.3-7.8	>7.8
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-10	>10	-

Table 7.24 Land suitability criteria for Jackfruit

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well	Poorly	V. Poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10-

Table 7.25 Land suitability criteria for Jamun

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N1)
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well	Mod. well	Poorly	V.Poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.26 Land suitability criteria for Custard apple

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N1)
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	Scl, cl, sc, c (red), c (black)	-	Sl, ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.5-6.0 7.3-8.4	5.0-5.5 8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15-35	35-60	60-80	-
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	>5	-

Table 7.27 Land suitability criteria for Tamarind

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod.well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	75-100	<75
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.28 Land suitability criteria for Mulberry

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	24–28	22–24; 28–32	32–38; 22–18	>38; <18
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sc, cl, scl	c (red)	c (black), sl, ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5 7.8-8.4	7.3-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	0-35	35-60	60-80	>80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

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

Table 7.29 Land suitability criteria for Marigold

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	18-23	17-15 24-35	35-40 10-14	>40 <10
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl,scl, cl, sc, c (red)	c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%				
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.30 Land suitability criteria for Chrysanthemum

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N1)
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	18-23	17-15 24-35	35-40 10-14	>40 <10
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl,scl, cl, sc, c (red)	c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%				
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.31 Land suitability criteria for Jasmine (irrigated)

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	18-23	17-15 24-35	35-40 10-14	-
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	sl	ls, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%				
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

7.32 Land suitability criteria for Crossandra

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		Unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N1)
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	-	Poorly to very poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
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 7.3-8.4	8.4-9.0	>9.0
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	dS/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%				
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

7.32 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 20 soil map units identified in Maslapur-2 Microwatershed have been grouped into 7 Land Management Units (LMUs) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan. Land Management Units are grouped based on the similarities in respect of the type of soil, the depth of the soil, the surface soil texture, gravel content, AWC, slope, erosion etc. and a Land Management Units map (Fig. 7.32) has been generated. These Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

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

LMU	Soil map unit number	Mapping unit	Soil and site characteristics
1	446	TSDmA1	Very deep, lowland clay soils
2	219, 105, 111, 112, 122	BPRbB2g2, HDHbB2g1, HDHcB2g1, HDHcB2g2, HDHhB2	Moderately deep to deep, red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils
3	457, 134, 142	JDGcB2g1, GHTbB2g1, GHThB2g1	Moderately deep to deep, red sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils
4	452, 77, 78, 82	LKRhB2g1, MKHcB2g1, MKHcB2g2, MKHhB1g1	Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils
5	63, 65, 71,72	KGHcA1, KGHcB2g1, KTPcB1g1, KTPhB2g1	Moderately shallow, red sandy clay loam soils
6	465, 26	HRVcB2g1, HRVhB2g1	Shallow, red gravelly loamy soils
7	467	KNHiB1g1	Shallow, red sandy clay soils



Fig 7.32 Land Management Units map of Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

7.33 Proposed Crop Plan for Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

After assessing the land suitability for the 31 crops, the proposed crop plan has been prepared for the 7 identified LMUs by considering only the highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands for each of the 31 crops. The resultant proposed crop plan is presented in Table 7.33.

Table 7.33 Proposed Crop Plan for Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Soil characters	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
LMU 1 9 ha (2%)	446.TSDmA1	**Guddalakamapura:** 26/1 **Muslapur:**19,20/1,20/2,20/3,20/4,20/5,20/6	Very deep, lowland clay soils	Lowland Paddy, Maize, Cotton	**Fruit crops:** Custard Apple, Amla **Vegetable crops:** Brinjal, Tomato, Chillies, Drumstick, Coriander **Flower crops:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Jasmine	Providing proper drainage, addition of organic manures, green leaf manuring, suitable conservation practices
LMU 2 60 ha (12%)	219.BPRbB2g2 105.HDHbB2g1 111.HDHcB2g1 112.HDHcB2g2 122.HDHhB2	**Guddalakamapura:**4/1, 4/2,4/3, 21/4, **Hasagala:**57,60,61,68,69,70,74 **Muslapur :** 46,47,48,49	Moderately deep to deep, red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils	Groundnut, Bajra, Horse gram, Castor, Mulberry	**Fruit crops:** Musambi, Lime, Jamun, Jackfruit Amla, Custard apple, Tamarind **Vegetable crops:** Drumstick, Curry leaves	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
LMU 3 44 ha (9%)	457.JDGcB2g1 134.GHTbB2g1 142.GHThB2g1	**Guddalakamapura:**4/4, 4/5,40,6,7/1,7/2,7/3,7/4,7/5,20/2,20/3,20/4,21/1,21/2,21/3 **Muslapur:**26,34/1,36,37,38	Moderately deep to deep, red sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils	Maize, Sorghum, Sunflower, Bajra, Finger millet, Groundnut, Red gram, Cowpea, Field bean, Castor, Mulberry	**Fruit crops:** Pomegranate, Guava, Sapota, Jackfruit, Jamun, Tamarind, Lime, Musambi, Amla, Custard apple, Cashew **Vegetable crops:** Drumstick, Tomato, Bhendi, Chilli, Brinjal, Onion, Curry leaves **Flower crops:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Jasmine, Crossandra	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Soil characters	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
LMU 4 82 ha (16%)	452.LKRhB2g1 77.MKHcB2g1 78.MKHcB2g2 82.MKHhB1g1	**Ganganahala:**54,61,62,63,64,67,68, 69 **Muslapur:**31,33,34/2,50, 51,52,53,54,55	Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay to sandy clay loam soils	Sorghum, Groundnut, Bajra, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Lime, Musambi, Amla, Cashew, Custard apple,	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
LMU 5 230 ha (45%)	63.KGHcA1 65.KGHcB2g1 71.KTPcB1g1 72.KTPhB2g1	**Guddalakamapura:**2,22,23,26/2 **Hasagala:**43,44,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,59,62,63,64, 65, 66,67 **Muslapur:**15,16,17,18/1, 18/2,21/1,21/2,22/1,22/2, 23,24,25/1,25/2,28,29,30, 32,39,40/1,40/2,41,42,43, 45,62,63	Moderately shallow, red sandy clay loam soils	Sorghum, Groundnut, Bajra, Green gram, Black gram, Cowpea, Horse gram, Castor,	**Fruit crops:** Lime, Musambi, Amla, Custard apple, Cashew **Flower crops:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Crossandra, Jasmine	Drip irrigation, Mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
LMU 6 32 ha (6%)	465.HRVcB2g1 26.HRVhB2g1	**Hasagala :** 36,39,40,41,42	Shallow, red gravelly loamy soils	Green gram, Black gram, Horse gram	**Agri-Silvi-Pasture:** Custard apple, , Hybrid Napier, *Styloxanthes hamata*, Glyricidia, *Styloxanthes scabra*	Use of short duration varieties, sowing across the slope and split application of nitrogen fertilizers
LMU 7 11 ha (8%)	467.KNHiB1g1	**Hasagala:**35,37,38,45,46	Shallow, red sandy clay soils	Green gram, Black gram, Horse gram	**Agri-Silvi-Pasture:** Custard apple, Amla, Hybrid Napier, *Styloxanthes hamata*, Glyricidia, *Styloxanthes scabra*	Use of short duration varieties, sowing across the slope and split application of nitrogen fertilizers

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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

- The soil phases with sizeable area identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series of Kutegoudanahundi (KGH) 131 ha (26%), Kethanapura (KTP) 99 ha (19), Mukhadahalli (MKH) 67 ha (13%), Hooradhahalli (HDH) 45 ha (9%), Harve (HRV) 32 ha (6%), Gollarahatti (GHT) 25 ha (5%), Jedigere (JDG) 18 ha (4%), Lakkur (LKR) 16 ha (3%), Balapur (BPR) 16 ha (3%), Kanchanahalli (KNH) 11 ha (2%) and Thimmasandra (TSD) occupy minor area of about 9 ha (2%) in the microwatershed.

- As per land capability classification, entire area in the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II & III). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil, drainage and erosion.
- On the basis of soil reaction, an area of 180 ha (35%) is slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) and 287 ha (56%) is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3) in the microwatershed. Entire area in the microwatershed is acid to neutral 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.

Acid soils

Slightly acid soils cover an area of 180 ha.

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

Liming materials:

1. $CaCO_3$ (Calcium Carbonate). More than 90% use in India.
2. Dolomite [Ca Mg $(Co_3)_2$]
3. Quick lime (Cao)
4. Slaked lime [Ca $(OH)_2$]

For normal pH and pH-4.8 (35 t/ha) and pH 6 .0-7.0 (4 t/ha) lime is required.

Neutral soils

Neutral soils cover about 287 ha area in the microwatershed.

1. Regular addition of organic manure, green manuring, green leaf manuring, crop residue incorporation and mulching needs to be taken up to improve the soil organic matter status.
2. Application of biofertilizers (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 factor affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. Out of total 510 ha area in the microwatershed, an area of about 112 ha (22%) is suffering from slight erosion and 355 ha (70%) is suffering from moderate erosion. The areas suffering from 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 (Saturation plan) 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed.

- **Organic Carbon:** The OC content (an index of available Nitrogen) is medium (0.5-0.75%) in 308 ha (60%). 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. It is high (>0.75%) in 160 ha (31%).
- **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 the area where OC is medium. 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:** Entire area of about 467 ha (92%) is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus. Hence for all the crops, 25% additional P-needs to be applied where it is medium.
- **Available Potassium:** Available potassium is low (<145 kg/ha) in 173 ha (34%), medium (145-337 kg/ha) in 294 ha (58%) and high (>337 kg/ha) in 0.44 (<1%) in the microwatershed. Additional 25% potassium needs to be applied in areas where it is low and medium.
- **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops. Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in 353 ha (69%) and medium (10-20 ppm) in 114 ha (22%) in the microwatershed. These areas 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 277 ha (54%) is low (<0.5 ppm) and 191 ha (37%) is medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in available boron content. The areas that are low and medium need to be applied with sodium borate @ 10 kg/ha as soil application or 0.2% borax as foliar spray to correct the deficiency.
- **Available Iron:** Entire area of 467 ha (92) is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in available iron in the microwatershed. To manage iron deficiency, iron sulphate@25 kg/ha needs to be applied for 2-3 years in the deficient areas.
- **Available Manganese:** Entire area in the microwatershed is sufficient (>1.0 ppm) in available manganese.
- **Available Copper:** Entire area is sufficient (>0.2 ppm) in available copper in the microwatershed.
- **Available Zinc:** An area of about 213 ha (42%) is deficient (<0.6 ppm) and 254 ha (50%) is sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in available zinc in the microwatershed.

- **Soil Acidity:** The microwatershed has 180 ha (35%) area with soils that are slightly acid. These areas need application of lime (Calcium Carbonate).
- **Land suitability for various crops:** Areas that are highly, moderately and marginally suitable and not suitable for growing various crops are indicated. Along with the suitability, various constraints that are limiting the productivity are also indicated. For example, in case of cotton, gravel content, rooting depth and salinity/alkalinity are the major constraints in various plots. With suitable management interventions, the productivity can be enhanced. In order to increase 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed, the land resource inventory database generated under Sujala-III project has been transformed as information through series of interpretative (thematic) maps using soil phase map as a base. The various thematic maps (1:7920 scale) generated were

- Soil depth
- Surface soil texture
- Available water capacity
- Soil slope
- Soil gravelliness
- Land capability
- Present land use and land cover
- Crop suitability 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 to be collected.

Steps for Survey and Preparation of Treatment Plan

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

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

9.1 Treatment Plan

The treatment plan recommended for arable lands is briefly described below.

9.1.1 Arable Land Treatment

A. BUNDING

Steps for Survey and Preparation of Treatment Plan		USER GROUP-1
Cadastral map (1:7920 scale) is enlarged to a scale of 1:2500 scale Existing network of waterways, pothissa boundaries, grass belts, natural drainage lines/ watercourse, cut ups/ terraces are marked on the cadastral map to the scale Drainage lines are demarcated into		
Small gullies	(up to 5 ha catchment)	
Medium gullies	(5-15 ha catchment)	
Ravines	(15-25 ha catchment) and	
Halla/Nala	(more than 25ha catchment)	



Measurement of Land Slope

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





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

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

Note: i) The above intervals are maximum.

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

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

Section of the Bund

Bund section is decided considering the soil texture class and gravelliness class (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 black clayey soils	
0.45	2	0.75	01:01	0.92		
0.45	2.4	0.75	1.3:1	1.07	Shallow black clayey soils	
0.6	3.1	0.7	1.78:1	1.29	Medium black clayey soils	
0.5	3	0.85	1.47:1	1.49		

Formation of Trench cum Bund

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

Details of Borrow Pit dimensions are given below



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.

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

a) The cadastral map has to be updated as regards the network of drainage lines (gullies/ *nalas/hallas*) and existing structures are marked to the scale and storage capacity of the existing water bodies are documented.
b) The drainage line will be demarcated into Upper Reach, Middle Reach and Lower Reach.
c) Considering the Catchment, *Nala* bed and bank conditions, suitable structures are decided.
d) Number of storage structures (Check dam/ *Nala* bund/ Percolation tank) will be decided considering the commitments and available runoff 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. Maximum area of about 437 ha (86%) requires Trench cum Bunding and 31 ha (61%) requires Strengthening of existing bunds in the microwatershed. The conservation plan prepared may be presented to all the stakeholders including farmers and after including 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 Maslapur-2 Microwatershed

9.3 Greening of Microwatershed

As part of the greening programme in the watersheds, it is envisaged to plant a variety of horticultural and other tree plants that are edible, economical and produce lot of biomass which helps to restore the ecological balance in the watersheds. The lands that are suitable for greening programme are non-arable lands (land capability classes V, VI VII and VIII) and also the lands that are not suitable or marginally suitable 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 dug out soil on the lower side of the slope in order to harness the flowing water and facilitate weathering of soil in the pit. Exposure of soil in the pit also prevents spread of pests and diseases due to scorching sun rays. The pits should be filled with mixture of soil and organic manure during the second week of April and keep ready with sufficiently tall seedlings produced either in poly bags or in root trainer nurseries so that planting can be done during the 2nd or 3rd week of April depending on the rainfall.

The tree species suitable for the area considering rainfall, temperature and adaptability is listed below; waterlogged areas are recommended to be planted with species like 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; Research Gap and future needs. Fert. News 48 (4); 9-20.
5. Naidu, L.G.K., Ramamurthy, V., Challa, O., Hegde, R. and Krishnan, P. (2006) Manual Soil Site Suitability Criteria for Major Crops, NBSS Publ. No. 129, NBSS &LUP, Nagpur, 118 pp.
6. Natarajan, A. and Dipak Sarkar (2010) Field Guide for Soil Survey, National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning (ICAR), Nagpur, India.
7. Natarajan, A., Rajendra Hegde, Raj, J.N. and Shivananda Murthy, H.G. (2015) Implementation Manual for Sujala-III Project, Watershed Development Department, Bengaluru, Karnataka.
8. Sarma, V.A.K., Krishnan, P. and Budihal, S.L. (1987) Laboratory Manual, Tech. Bull. 23, NBSS &LUP, Nagpur.
9. Sehgal, J.L. (1990) Soil Resource Mapping of Different States of India; Why and How?, National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Nagpur, 49 pp.
10. Shivaprasad, C.R., R.S. Reddy, J. Sehgal and M. Velayuthum (1998) Soils of Karnataka for Optimizing Land Use, NBSS Publ. No. 47b, NBSS & LUP, Nagpur, India.
11. Soil Survey Staff (2006) Keys to Soil Taxonomy, Tenth edition, U.S. Department of Agriculture/ NRCS, Washington DC, U.S.A.
12. Soil Survey Staff (2012) Soil Survey Manual, Handbook No. 18, USDA, Washington DC, USA.

Appendix I

Maslapur-2 (9P2b) Microwatershed

Soil Phase Information

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Ganganahalla	61	3.47	MKHcB2g2	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Currentfallow+Redgram (Cf+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	62	7.81	LKRhB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	63	9.91	LKRhB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow+Fallow land+Redgram (Cf+Fl+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	64	2.03	MKHcB2g2	LMU-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+Fallow land+Redgram (Cf+Fl+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	67	1.95	MKHcB2g2	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Redgram (Gn+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	68	3.83	MKHcB2g2	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Mango (Rg+Mn)	1 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Ganganahalla	69	1.1	MKHcB2g2	LMU-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+Fallow land+Redgram (Cf+Fl+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	1	0.76	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Habitation	Not Available	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	2	0.52	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/1	1.96	HDHbB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/2	2.73	HDHbB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/3	2.96	HDHbB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/4	0.57	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/5	0.06	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	4/6	2.25	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Habitation	Not Available	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	6	0.09	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	7/1	0.56	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	7/2	2.71	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	7/3	2.55	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	7/4	2.22	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	7/5	0.68	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Guddalakamapura	20/1	0.61	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	20/2	4.52	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	20/3	1.6	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	20/4	0.21	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	20/5	0.02	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	21/1	2.85	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	21/2	1.75	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	21/3	0.76	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	21/4	4.1	HDHbB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	22	2.97	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	23	4.95	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	26/1	0.1	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Guddalakamapura	26/2	2.38	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	40	0.005	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Guddalakamapura	42	0.34	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	RO	RO
Hasagala	35	0.07	KNHiB1g1	LMU-7	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	36	0.22	HRVhB2g1	LMU-6	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	37	0.78	KNHiB1g1	LMU-7	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Current fallow (Rg+Cf)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	38	5.69	KNHiB1g1	LMU-7	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	39	4.41	HRVhB2g1	LMU-6	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	40	3.77	HRVhB2g1	LMU-6	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	41	4.74	HRVhB2g1	LMU-6	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+RO (Rg+Ro)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	42	5.14	HRVhB2g1	LMU-6	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	43	5.03	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Hasagala	44	9.12	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Groundnut (Rg+Gn)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	45	5.89	KNHiB1g1	LMU-7	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	46	0.84	KNHiB1g1	LMU-7	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	48	2.33	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	49	2.14	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	50	6.56	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Eucalyptus (Rg+Eu)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	51	4.55	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	52	7.45	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	53	5.81	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	54	3.45	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	57	1.47	HDHcB2g2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Current fallow (Rg+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	59	2.57	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Jowar (Rg+Jw)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	60	3.4	HDHcB2g2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow(Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	61	3.95	HDHcB2g2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	62	7.98	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	63	4.96	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	64	5.54	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	65	5.6	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	66	5.45	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	67	4.41	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	68	6.64	BPRbB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Bajra+Redgram (Bj+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	69	3.99	BPRbB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	70	0.67	BPRbB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Horsegram (Rg+Hg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Hasagala	74	0.01	BPRbB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Horsegram (Hg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Hasagala	75	0.22	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	RO	RO
Hasagala	76	14.15	`	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Redgram+Horsegram+RO (Rg+Hg+Ro)	Not Available	RO	RO
Musalapura	15	0.07	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	16	2.2	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	17	2.44	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	18/1	1.72	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	18/2	1.44	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	19	1.22	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Jowar (Jw)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/1	0.62	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/2	0.89	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/3	1.07	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/4	0.9	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/5	0.98	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	20/6	0.26	TSDmA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIw	Graded bunding
Musalapura	21/1	2.54	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	21/2	1.66	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	22/1	0.27	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	22/2	11.42	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	23	2.57	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	24	6.16	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	25/1	0.41	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	25/2	7.55	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Groundnut+Current fallow (Mz+Gn+Cf)	2 Borewell	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	26	9.93	GHThB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Current fallow (Jw+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	27	4.15	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Jowar+Current fallow (Jw+Cf)	Not Available	RO	RO

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Musalapura	28	6.35	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	29	13.34	KTPhB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	3 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	30	8.34	KTPhB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	31	5.12	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar (Jw)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	32	10.43	KTPhB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	33	8.65	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	34/1	7.12	JDGcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Nilagiri (Jw+Ni)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	34/2	8.47	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	35	11.88	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke+Maize (Dy+Mz)	Not Available	RO	RO
Musalapura	36	10.05	JDGcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Nilagiri (Jw+Ni)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	37	14.33	JDGcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Jowar+Nilagiri (Jw+Ni)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	38	10.75	JDGcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Nilagiri (Mz+Ni)	2 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	39	12.61	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	40/1	7.34	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	40/2	4.4	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	41	5.64	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	1 Borewell	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	42	8.3	KTPcB1g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	43	7.43	KGHcA1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Musalapura	44/1	0.68	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/2	0.8	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Papaya (Ppy)	Not Available	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/3	0.74	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	Others	Others
Musalapura	45	2.93	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Papaya (Ppy)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	46	2.81	HDHcB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 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
Musalapura	47	4.26	HDHcB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 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

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Musalapura	48	5.8	HDHcB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	49	3.8	HDHcB2g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	50	2.43	MKHcB2g1	LMU-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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	51	6.73	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	52	5.68	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Jowar (Mz+Jw)	2 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	53	9.26	MKHcB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Pomegranate (Mz+Pg)	1 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	54	5.74	MKHcB2g1	LMU-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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	55	7.27	MKHcB2g1	LMU-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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	62	2.48	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Musalapura	63	0.49	KGHcB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding

Appendix II

Maslapur-2 (9P2b) Microwatershed

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
Ganganahala	61	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	62	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	63	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	64	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	67	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	68	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Ganganahala	69	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	1	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Guddalakam apura	2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/2	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/3	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/4	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/5	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	4/6	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Guddalakam apura	6	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	7/1	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	7/2	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	7/3	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	7/4	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	7/5	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	20/1	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Guddalakam apura	20/2	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	20/3	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	20/4	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	20/5	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	21/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	21/2	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	21/3	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	21/4	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	22	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	23	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	26/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	26/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	40	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Guddalakam apura	42	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Hasagala	35	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	36	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	37	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	38	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	39	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	40	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	41	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	42	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	43	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	44	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 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
Hasagala	45	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	46	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	48	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	49	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	50	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	51	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	52	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	53	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	54	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	57	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	59	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	60	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	61	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	62	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	63	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	64	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	65	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	66	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	67	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	68	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	69	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	70	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	74	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hasagala	75	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Hasagala	76	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Musalapura	15	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	16	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	17	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	18/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	18/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	19	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/3	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/4	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/5	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	20/6	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	21/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	21/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	22/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	22/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	23	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	24	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	25/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	25/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	26	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	27	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Musalapura	28	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	29	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	30	Neutral (pH 6.5	Non saline	Medium (0.5	Medium (23 –	Medium (145 –	Medium (10 –	Low (< 0.5	Sufficient	Sufficient (>	Sufficient (>	Sufficient (>

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
		– 7.3)	(<2 dsm)	– 0.75 %)	57 kg/ha)	337 kg/ha)	20 ppm)	ppm)	(>4.5 ppm)	1.0 ppm)	0.2 ppm)	0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	31	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	32	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	33	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	34/1	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	34/2	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	35	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Musalapura	36	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	37	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	38	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	39	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Low (<145 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	40/1	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	40/2	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	41	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	42	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	43	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	44/1	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/2	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/3	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	45	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	46	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	47	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	48	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	49	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	50	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 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
Musalapura	51	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	52	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	53	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	54	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	55	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	62	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Musalapura	63	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	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 (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)

Appendix III

Maslapur-2 (9P2b) Microwatershed

Soil Suitability Information

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Ganganahala	61	N1r	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	62	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	63	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	64	N1r	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	67	N1r	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	68	N1r	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Ganganahala	69	N1r	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Guddalakamapura	1	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Guddalakamapura	4/1	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Guddalakamapura	4/2	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Guddalakamapura	4/3	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Guddalakamapura	4/4	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	4/5	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	4/6	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	6	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	7/1	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	7/2	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	7/3	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	7/4	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakama	7/5	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
pura																																
Guddalakamapura	20/1	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Guddalakamapura	20/2	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	20/3	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	20/4	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	20/5	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Guddalakamapura	21/1	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	21/2	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	21/3	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	21/4	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Guddalakamapura	22	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Guddalakamapura	23	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Guddalakamapura	26/1	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Guddalakamapura	26/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Guddalakamapura	40	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Guddalakamapura	42	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Hasagala	35	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S2w	S2w	S3r	N1r	N1r	S2w
Hasagala	36	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg
Hasagala	37	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S2w	S2w	S3r	N1r	N1r	S2w
Hasagala	38	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S2w	S2w	S3r	N1r	N1r	S2w
Hasagala	39	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg
Hasagala	40	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg
Hasagala	41	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Hasagala	42	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rt	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	N1rg	N1rg	S3rg
Hasagala	43	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	44	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	45	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S2w	S2w	S3r	N1r	N1r	S2w
Hasagala	46	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3r	N1r	N1r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S3r	N1r	S3r	S3r	S2w	S2w	S3r	N1r	N1r	S2w
Hasagala	48	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	49	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	50	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	51	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	52	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	53	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	54	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	57	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Hasagala	59	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	60	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Hasagala	61	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Hasagala	62	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	63	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	64	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	65	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	66	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	67	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Hasagala	68	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2gt	S2g
Hasagala	69	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2gt	S2g
Hasagala	70	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2gt	S2g
Hasagala	74	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2gt	S2g
Hasagala	75	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Hasagala	76	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Musalapura	15	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	16	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	17	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	18/1	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	18/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	19	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/1	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/2	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/3	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/4	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/5	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	20/6	S3tw	S2t	S3tw	S2w	S3tw	S2w	S2tw	S2w	S1	S2w	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2w	N1tw	S2tw	S2w	S3tw	S3tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2t	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S3tw	S2tw	S2tw	S2tw
Musalapura	21/1	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	21/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	22/1	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	22/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	23	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	24	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	25/1	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	25/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	26	S3r	S2g	S2r	S2g	S2r	S2rg	S3r	S2r	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2r	S2r	S1	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2r	S1	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2rg	S2r	S1
Musalapura	27	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Musalapura	28	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	29	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	30	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	31	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	32	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	33	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	34/1	S2r	S2tg	S1	S2tg	S2t	S2g	S2r	S1	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2r	S1	S2t	S2g	S2g	S2tg	S2tg	S1	S2g	S2tg	S2t	S2t	S2gt	S1	S1	S2t
Musalapura	34/2	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	35	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Musalapura	36	S2r	S2tg	S1	S2tg	S2t	S2g	S2r	S1	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2r	S1	S2t	S2g	S2g	S2tg	S2tg	S1	S2g	S2tg	S2t	S2t	S2gt	S1	S1	S2t
Musalapura	37	S2r	S2tg	S1	S2tg	S2t	S2g	S2r	S1	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2r	S1	S2t	S2g	S2g	S2tg	S2tg	S1	S2g	S2tg	S2t	S2t	S2gt	S1	S1	S2t
Musalapura	38	S2r	S2tg	S1	S2tg	S2t	S2g	S2r	S1	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2r	S1	S2t	S2g	S2g	S2tg	S2tg	S1	S2g	S2tg	S2t	S2t	S2gt	S1	S1	S2t
Musalapura	39	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	40/1	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	40/2	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	41	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	42	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S3t	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	43	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	44/1	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	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/2	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	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	44/3	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	Others	Others	Others
Musalapura	45	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	46	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Musalapura	47	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Musalapura	48	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Musalapura	49	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g
Musalapura	50	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	51	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	52	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	53	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	54	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	55	N1r	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	N1r	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Musalapura	62	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r
Musalapura	63	N1r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	N1r	S3r	S2rt	S3r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S2r	S3r	S3r	S2r

RO- Rock outcrops

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

SALIENT FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

- *The result indicated that 35 farmers were sampled in Maslapur-2 micro watershed among them 5(14.29%) were landless, 4 (11.43%) were marginal farmers, 16 (45.71%) were small farmers and 10 (28.57%) were semi medium farmers.*
- *The data indicated that there were 98 (58.68%) men and 69 (41.32%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 5, marginal farmers' was 3.75, small farmers' was 4.56 and semi medium farmers' was 5.40.*
- *The data indicated that, 27 (16.17%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.31%) were in 16-35 years of age, 50 (29.94%) were in 36-60 years of age and 16(9.58%) were above 61 years of age.*
- *The results indicated that Maslapur-2 had 30.54 per cent illiterates, 49.70 per cent of them had primary school education, 1.80 per cent of them had middle school education, 8.38 per cent of them had high school education, 4.79 per cent of them had PUC, 0.60 per cent of them had diploma and ITI education, 2.99 per cent of them had degree education and 0.60 per cent of them did other education.*
- *The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of households were practicing agriculture and 17.14 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers.*
- *The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 20.96 per cent of the household members, 56.29 per cent were agricultural laborers, 1.80 per cent was in private sector, 20.36 per cent were students and 0.60 per cent was children. In case of landless farmers, 8 per cent were agriculturist, 60 per cent were general labourers and 32 per cent were students. In case of marginal farmers 20 per cent of them were practicing agriculture, 40 per cent were agricultural labourers, 6.67 per cent were in private service and 33.33 per cent were students. In case of small farmers, 21.92 per cent were agriculturists, 58.90 per cent were agricultural labourers and 19.18 per cent were students. In case of semi medium farmers 25.93 per cent were agriculturist, 55.56 per cent were agriculture labourers, 3.70 per cent were in private service, 12.96 per cent were students and 1.85 per cent was housewives.*
- *The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions.*
- *The results indicate that 51.43 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 40 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 8.57 per cent of them possess Pucca house.*
- *The results showed that 91.43 per cent of the households possess TV, 80 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 28.57 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 34.29 per cent of the households possess motor cycle and 91.43 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.*

- *The results show that the average value of television was Rs.4906, mixer grinder was Rs.1332, bicycle was Rs. 1650, motor cycle was Rs.33583 and mobile phone was Rs.1707.*
- *Data showed 22.86 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 31.43 per cent of them possess plough, 2.86 per cent of them possess both power tiller and tractor, 28.57 per cent of them possess sprayer, 94.29 per cent of them possess weeder and 2.86per cent of them possess chaff cutter.*
- *The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.18500, plough was Rs.2029, the average value of power tiller was Rs.30000, the average value was tractor was Rs.300000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.3368, the average value of chaff cutter was Rs.3000, and the average value of weeder was Rs.17.*
- *The results indicate that, 31.43 per cent of the households possess both bullocks and local cow, 2.86 per cent of the households possess both crossbreed cow and sheep respectively.*
- *In case of marginal households, 25 per cent of them possess bullocks, local cow and sheep respectively. 43.75 per cent of the small farmers possess bullock and local cow correspondingly, 6.25 per cent of the small farmers possess crossbred cow. In case of semi medium farmers, 30 per cent of households possess bullock and local cow respectively.*
- *The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.80, average own labour (women) available was 1.63, average hired labour (men) available was 6.80 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.09.*
- *In case of marginal farmers, average own labour men available was 1.50, average own labour (women) was 1.25, average hired labour (men) was 7.75 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.50. In case of small farmers, average own labour men available was 1.88, average own labour (women) was 1.63, average hired labour (men) was 8.94 and average hired labour (women) available was 9.25. In case of semi medium farmers, average own labour men available was 2, average own labour (women) was 1.90, average hired labour (men) was 5.20 and average hired labour (women) available was 5.30.*
- *The results indicate that, 97.14 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that, households of the Maslapur-2 micro watershed possess 23.43 ha (61.01%) of dry land and 14.97 ha (38.99%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 2.59 ha (100%) of dry land. Small farmers possess 18.81 ha (88.74%) of dry land and 2.39 ha (11.26%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 2.03 ha (13.90%) of dry land and 12.58 ha (86.10%) of irrigated land.*
- *The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 243,202.62 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 460,746.14. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 579,812.21 for dry land. In case of small famers, the*

average land value was Rs. 207,250.43 for dry land and Rs. 753,559.31for irrigated land. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 147,609.56 for dry land and Rs. 405,178.51 for irrigated land.

- *The results indicate that, there were 15 functioning and 14 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed.*
- *The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 42.86 per cent of the farmers in micro watershed.*
- *The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 29.52 meters.*
- *The results indicate that, marginal, small and semi medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40ha, 3.48 ha and 11.05 ha of irrigated land respectively.*
- *The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (14.71 ha), groundnut (8.40 ha), bajra (1.88 ha), Sunflower (1.62 ha), Bengal gram (1.21 ha), Red gram (1.21 ha), Sorghum (1.21 ha), castor (0.81 ha), Tomato (0.81 ha), water melon (0.81 ha) and Banana (0.49 ha) in kharif season and also grown maize (1.62 ha) and groundnut (1.21 ha) in Rabi season. Marginal farmers have grown maize, bajra, sunflower and Bengal gram. Small farmers had grown maize, groundnut, bajra, Bengal gram, paddy, red gram, sorghum, castor and banana. Semi medium farmers had grown maize, groundnut, sunflower, tomato and watermelon.*
- *The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed was found to be 92.65 per cent. In case of marginal farmers it was 100 per cent, small farmers it was 92.25 per cent and in case of semi medium it was 92.18 per cent.*
- *The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of the households have bank account and 85.71 per cent of the households have savings.*
- *The results indicate that, 60 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 27663.19. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 28612.58. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 949.39, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.03.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 53510.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 54452.62. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 942.56. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.02.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 30927.98. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 74100. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 43172.02. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.4.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for water melon was Rs. 37280.33. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 69160. The net income from water melon cultivation was Rs. 31879.67. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86.*

- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for banana was Rs. 95816.55. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 679249.97. The net income from banana cultivation was Rs. 583433.42. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:7.09.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 58817.01. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 156227.50. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 97410.49. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.66.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 45612.07. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45960.53. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 348.45. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.01.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Sunflower was Rs. 27395.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 50931.76. The net income from Sunflower cultivation was Rs. 23535.83. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 21266.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 20729.50. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -537.29. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.97.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 14285.38. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31369. The net income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. 17083.62. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.2.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for redgram was Rs. 13687.64. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31122.00. The net income from redgram cultivation was Rs. 17434.36. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.27.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Castor was Rs. 32673.72. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 29640. The net income from Castor cultivation was Rs. -3033.72. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.91.*
- *The results indicate that, 25.71 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 11.43 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that, in landless farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs. 43000, in marginal farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.27500, wage was Rs.23750, agriculture was Rs.28025 and goat farming was Rs.10000. In small farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.5312.50, wage was Rs.24187.50, agriculture was Rs.64390.63 and dairy farming was Rs.3937.50. In semi medium farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs.13500, agriculture was Rs.69100 and dairy farming was Rs.800.*

- *The results indicate that, in case of landless the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs. 17000. In marginal farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.5000, wage was Rs.8333.33, agriculture was Rs.14750 and goat farming was Rs.15000. In small farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.20000, wage was Rs.7133.33, agriculture was Rs.31875 and dairy farming was Rs.5800. In semi medium farmers, the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs.10000, agriculture was Rs.29000 and dairy farming was Rs.1333.33.*
- *The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 24 coconut, 2 lemon trees and 13 mango trees in their fields.*
- *The results indicate that, households have planted 55 neem trees and 5 tamarind trees in their field and also planted 1 neem tree in their back yard.*
- *The results indicate that, the average additional investment capacity with the households for land development was Rs. 7342.86, for irrigation facility Rs. 1057.14 and for improved crop production Rs. 285.71.*
- *The results indicate that, government subsidy was the source of additional investment capacity for 85.71 per cent of the households for land development, 22.86 per cent of the households for irrigation facility and 5.71 per cent of the households for improved crop production .*
- *The results indicated that, banana, Bengal gram, castor, red gram, sorghum, tomato and water melon crops were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Bajra, groundnut, maize, paddy and sunflower crops were sold to an extent of 92.05 per cent, 92.02 per cent, 98.89 per cent, 88.89 per cent and 28 per cent respectively.*
- *The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets.*
- *The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.*
- *The results indicated that, 80 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 100 per cent of the marginal farmers, 87.50 per cent of the small farmers and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems.*
- *The results indicated that, 82.86 per cent have shown interest in soil test.*
- *The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households used fire wood.*
- *The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households and 2.86 per cent of the households were using bore well for drinking water in the micro watershed.*
- *The results indicated that, Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed.*

- *The results indicated that, 57.14 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 6.25 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers.*
- *The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card.*
- *The results indicated that, 40 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.*
- *The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 60 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 40 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 54.29 per cent, fruits were adequate for 82.86 per cent, milk was adequate for 45.71 per cent, eggs were adequate for 60 per cent and meat was adequate for 60 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 40 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate for 54.29 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 42.86 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 20 per cent, milk were inadequate for 17.14 per cent and egg was inadequate for 31.43 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 85.71 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (74.29%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (28.57%), inadequacy of irrigation water (8.57%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (51.43%), high rate of interest on credit (8.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (8.57%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (25.71%), inadequate extension services (8.57%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (20%), less rainfall (62.86%) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (14.29%).*

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, labour 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.

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.3 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%.

Description of the micro watershed

Maslapur-2 micro-watershed (Maslapur sub-watershed, Koppal Taluk and District) is located at North latitude $15^0$32’22.694’’ to 15^0 30’55.505” and East longitude 76^0 18’40.09’’ to $76^0$18’9.647’’ covering an area of 536.06 ha and spread across Ganganahala and Hasagala villages.

Methodology followed in assessing socio-economic status of households

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed a comprehensive questionnaire was prepared. Major components such as demographic conditions, migration details, food consumption and family expenditure pattern, material possession, land holding, land use management, cropping pattern, cost of cultivation of crops, livestock management. The statistical components such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze the data. About 35 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey.

Chapter 4

SALIENT FEATURES OF THE SURVEY

Households sampled for socio-economic survey: The data on households sampled for socio economic survey in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 35 farmers were sampled in Maslapur-2 micro watershed among them 5(14.29%) were landless, 4 (11.43%) were marginal farmers, 16 (45.71%) were small farmers and 10 (28.57%) were semi medium farmers.

Table 1: Households sampled for socio economic survey in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	5	14.29	4	11.43	16	45.71	10	28.57	35	100.00

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that there were 98 (58.68%) men and 69 (41.32%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 5, marginal farmers' was 3.75, small farmers' was 4.56 and semi medium farmers' was 5.40.

Table 2: Population characteristics of Maslapur-2 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (25)		MF (15)		SF (73)		SMF (54)		All (167)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Male	17	68.00	12	80.00	40	54.79	29	53.70	98	58.68
2	Female	8	32.00	3	20.00	33	45.21	25	46.30	69	41.32
Total		25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00
Average		5.00		3.75		4.56		5.40		4.77	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 3. The data indicated that, 27 (16.17%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.31%) were in 16-35 years of age, 50 (29.94%) were in 36-60 years of age and 16 (9.58%) were above 61 years of age.

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

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (25)		MF (15)		SF (73)		SMF (54)		All (167)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	8	32.00	3	20.00	13	17.81	3	5.56	27	16.17
2	16-35 years of age	13	52.00	5	33.33	28	38.36	28	51.85	74	44.31
3	36-60 years of age	4	16.00	5	33.33	24	32.88	17	31.48	50	29.94
4	> 61 years	0	0.00	2	13.33	8	10.96	6	11.11	16	9.58
Total		25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that Maslapur-2 had 30.54 per cent illiterates, 49.70 per cent of them had primary school education, 1.80 per cent of them had middle school education, 8.38 per cent of them had high school education, 4.79 per cent of them had PUC, 0.60 per cent of them had diploma and ITI

education, 2.99 per cent of them had degree education and 0.60 per cent of them did other education.

Table 4: Education level of household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (25)		MF (15)		SF (73)		SMF (54)		All (167)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	4	16.00	4	26.67	23	31.51	20	37.04	51	30.54
2	Primary School	17	68.00	7	46.67	37	50.68	22	40.74	83	49.70
3	Middle School	1	4.00	1	6.67	1	1.37	0	0.00	3	1.80
4	High School	2	8.00	1	6.67	7	9.59	4	7.41	14	8.38
5	PUC	1	4.00	0	0.00	2	2.74	5	9.26	8	4.79
6	Diploma	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.85	1	0.60
7	ITI	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.85	1	0.60
8	Degree	0	0.00	2	13.33	2	2.74	1	1.85	5	2.99
9	Others	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.37	0	0.00	1	0.60
Total		25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00

Occupation of household heads: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of households were practicing agriculture and 17.14 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers.

Table 5: Occupation of household heads in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	2	40.00	3	75.00	15	93.75	9	90.00	29	82.86
2	Agricultural Labour	3	60.00	1	25.00	1	6.25	1	10.00	6	17.14
Total		5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	35	100.00

Table 6: Occupation of family members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (25)		MF (15)		SF (73)		SMF (54)		All (167)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	2	8.00	3	20.00	16	21.92	14	25.93	35	20.96
2	Agricultural Labour	15	60.00	6	40.00	43	58.90	30	55.56	94	56.29
3	Private Service	0	0.00	1	6.67	0	0.00	2	3.70	3	1.80
4	Student	8	32.00	5	33.33	14	19.18	7	12.96	34	20.36
5	Housewife	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.85	1	0.60
Total		25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00

Occupation of the household members: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 6. The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 20.96 per cent of the household members, 56.29 per cent were agricultural laborers, 1.80 per cent was in private sector, 20.36 per cent were students and 0.60 per cent was children. In case of landless farmers, 8 per cent were agriculturist, 60 per cent were general labourers and 32 per cent were students. In case of marginal farmers 20 per cent of them were practicing agriculture, 40 per cent were agricultural labourers, 6.67 per cent were in private service and 33.33 per cent were students. In case of small farmers, 21.92 per cent were agriculturists, 58.90 per cent were agricultural labourers and 19.18 per cent were students. In case of semi medium

farmers 25.93 per cent were agriculturist, 55.56 per cent were agriculture labourers, 3.70 per cent were in private service, 12.96 per cent were students and 1.85 per cent was housewives.

Institutional participation of the household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 7. The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions.

Table 7: Institutional Participation of household members in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (25)		MF (15)		SF (73)		SMF (54)		All (167)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00
Total		25	100.00	15	100.00	73	100.00	54	100.00	167	100.00

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that 51.43 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 40 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 8.57 per cent of them possess Pucca house.

Table 8: Type of house owned by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	4	80.00	1	25.00	6	37.50	7	70.00	18	51.43
2	Katcha	1	20.00	3	75.00	9	56.25	1	10.00	14	40.00
3	Pucca/RCC	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	2	20.00	3	8.57
Total		5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	35	100.00

Durable Assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 9. The results show that 91.43 per cent of the households possess TV, 80 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 28.57 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 34.29 per cent of the households possess motor cycle and 91.43 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.

Table 9: Durable Assets owned by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	4	80.00	3	75.00	15	93.75	10	100.00	32	91.43
2	Mixer/Grinder	3	60.00	3	75.00	12	75.00	10	100.00	28	80.00
3	Bicycle	0	0.00	3	75.00	6	37.50	1	10.00	10	28.57
4	Motor Cycle	1	20.00	1	25.00	6	37.50	4	40.00	12	34.29
5	Mobile Phone	4	80.00	4	100.00	15	93.75	9	90.00	32	91.43

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 10. The results show that the average value of television was Rs.4906, mixer grinder was

Rs.1332, bicycle was Rs. 1650, motor cycle was Rs.33583 and mobile phone was Rs.1707.

Table 10: Average value (Rs) of durable assets owned by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Television	5,000.00	4,000.00	4,333.00	6,000.00	4,906.00
2	Mixer/Grinder	1,500.00	866.00	1,216.00	1,560.00	1,332.00
3	Bicycle	0.00	2,000.00	1,250.00	3,000.00	1,650.00
4	Motor Cycle	25,000.00	40,000.00	33,000.00	35,000.00	33,583.00
5	Mobile Phone	1,833.00	1,014.00	1,516.00	2,250.00	1,707.00

Farm Implements owned: The data regarding the farm implements owned by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 11. About 22.86 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 31.43 per cent of them possess plough, 2.86 per cent of them possess both power tiller and tractor, 28.57 per cent of them possess sprayer, 94.29 per cent of them possess weeder and 2.86 per cent of them possess chaff cutter.

Table 11: Farm Implements owned by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock Cart	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	31.25	3	30.00	8	22.86
2	Plough	0	0.00	1	25.00	7	43.75	3	30.00	11	31.43
3	Power Tiller	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	0	0.00	1	2.86
4	Tractor	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	0	0.00	1	2.86
5	Sprayer	0	0.00	1	25.00	6	37.50	3	30.00	10	28.57
6	Weeder	4	80.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	9	90.00	33	94.29
7	Chaff Cutter	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	0	0.00	1	2.86

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.18500, plough was Rs.2029, the average value of power tiller was Rs.30000, the average value of tractor was Rs.300000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.3368, the average value of chaff cutter was Rs.3000, and the average value of weeder was Rs.17.

Table 12: Average value (Rs) of farm implements owned by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Bullock Cart	0.00	0.00	18,800.00	18,000.00	18,500.00
2	Plough	0.00	1,000.00	2,333.00	1,500.00	2,029.00
3	Power Tiller	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.00	30,000.00
4	Tractor	0.00	0.00	300,000.00	0.00	300,000.00
5	Sprayer	0.00	3,000.00	3,007.00	4,333.00	3,368.00
6	Weeder	18.00	23.00	17.00	16.00	17.00
7	Chaff Cutter	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 13. The results

indicate that, 31.43 per cent of the households possess both bullocks and local cow, 2.86 per cent of the households possess both crossbreed cow and sheep respectively.

In case of marginal households, 25 per cent of them possess bullocks, local cow and sheep respectively. 43.75 per cent of the small farmers possess bullock and local cow correspondingly and 6.25 per cent of the small farmers possess crossbred cow. In case of semi medium farmers, 30 per cent of households possess bullock and local cow respectively.

Table 13: Livestock possession by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	1	25.00	7	43.75	3	30.00	11	31.43
2	Local cow	1	25.00	7	43.75	3	30.00	11	31.43
3	Crossbred cow	0	0.00	1	6.25	0	0.00	1	2.86
4	Sheep	1	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.86

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 14. The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.80, average own labour (women) available was 1.63, average hired labour (men) available was 6.80 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.09.

In case of marginal farmers, average own labour men available was 1.50, average own labour (women) was 1.25, average hired labour (men) was 7.75 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.50. In case of small farmers, average own labour men available was 1.88, average own labour (women) was 1.63, average hired labour (men) was 8.94 and average hired labour (women) available was 9.25. In case of semi medium farmers, average own labour men available was 2, average own labour (women) was 1.90, average hired labour (men) was 5.20 and average hired labour (women) available was 5.30.

Table 14: Average Labour availability in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
		N	N	N	N
1	Own labour Male	1.50	1.88	2.00	1.80
2	Own Labour Female	1.25	1.63	1.90	1.63
3	Hired labour Male	7.75	8.94	5.20	6.80
4	Hired labour Female	8.50	9.25	5.30	7.09

Table 15: Adequacy of Hired Labour in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Inadequate	4	80.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	34	97.14

Adequacy of Hired Labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 97.14 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, households of the Maslapur-2 micro watershed possess 23.43 ha (61.01%) of dry land and 14.97 ha (38.99%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 2.59 ha (100%) of dry land. Small farmers possess 18.81 ha (88.74%) of dry land and 2.39 ha (11.26%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 2.03 ha (13.90%) of dry land and 12.58 ha (86.10%) of irrigated land.

Table 16: Distribution of land (Ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%
1	Dry	2.59	100.00	18.81	88.74	2.03	13.90	23.43	61.01
2	Irrigated	0.00	0.00	2.39	11.26	12.58	86.10	14.97	38.99
Total		2.59	100.00	21.20	100.00	14.61	100.00	38.40	100.00

Average land value (Rs./ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 17. The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 243,202.62 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 460,746.14. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 579,812.21 for dry land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 207,250.43 for dry land and Rs. 753,559.31for irrigated land. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 147,609.56 for dry land and Rs. 405,178.51 for irrigated land.

Table 17: Average land value (Rs./ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
		N	N	N	N
1	Dry	579,812.21	207,250.43	147,609.56	243,202.62
2	Irrigated	0.00	753,559.31	405,178.51	460,746.14

Status of bore wells: The data regarding the status of bore wells in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, there were 15 functioning and 14 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed.

Table 18: Status of bore wells in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
		N	N	N	N	N
1	De-functioning	0	1	4	9	14
2	Functioning	0	1	5	9	15

Source of irrigation: The data regarding the source of irrigation in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 19. The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 42.86 per cent of the farmers in micro watershed.

Table 19: Source of irrigation in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bore Well	0	0.00	1	25.00	5	31.25	9	90.00	15	42.86

Depth of water (Avg in meters): The data regarding the depth of water in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 20. The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 29.52 meters.

Table 20: Depth of water (Avg in meters) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
		N	N	N	N	N
1	Bore Well	0.00	19.05	19.62	64.31	29.52

Irrigated Area (ha): The data regarding the irrigated area (ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 21. The results indicate that, marginal, small and semi medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40 ha, 3.48 ha and 11.05 ha of irrigated land respectively.

Table 21: Irrigated Area (ha) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Kharif	0.00	0.40	3.48	11.05	14.94
Total		0.00	0.40	3.48	11.05	14.94

Table 22: Cropping pattern in Maslapur-2 micro watershed (Area in ha)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Kharif - Maize	0	0.4	7.43	6.88	14.71
2	Kharif - Groundnut	0	0	1.78	6.62	8.4
3	Kharif - Bajra	0	0.81	5.7	0	6.51
4	Kharif - Sunflower	0	0.56	0	1.32	1.88
5	Kharif - Bengal gram	0	0.81	0.81	0	1.62
6	Kharif - Paddy	0	0	1.21	0	1.21
7	Kharif - Red gram (togari)	0	0	1.21	0	1.21
8	Kharif - Sorghum	0	0	1.21	0	1.21
9	Kharif - Castor	0	0	0.81	0	0.81
10	Kharif - Tomato	0	0	0	0.81	0.81
11	Kharif - Water melon	0	0	0	0.81	0.81
12	Kharif - Banana	0	0	0.49	0	0.49
13	Rabi - Maize	0	0	0	1.62	1.62
14	Rabi - Groundnut	0	0	0	1.21	1.21
Total		0	2.59	20.66	19.27	42.51

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 22. The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (14.71 ha), groundnut (8.40 ha), bajra (1.88 ha), Sunflower (1.62 ha), Bengal gram (1.21 ha), Red gram (1.21 ha), Sorghum (1.21 ha), castor (0.81 ha), Tomato (0.81 ha), water melon (0.81 ha) and Banana (0.49 ha) in kharif season and also grown maize (1.62 ha) and groundnut (1.21 ha) in Rabi season. Marginal farmers have grown maize, bajra, sunflower and Bengal gram. Small farmers had grown maize, groundnut, bajra, Bengal

gram, paddy, red gram, sorghum, castor and banana. Semi medium farmers had grown maize, groundnut, sunflower, tomato and watermelon.

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 23. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed was found to be 92.65 per cent. In case of marginal farmers it was 100 per cent, small farmers it was 92.25 per cent and in case of semi medium it was 92.18 per cent.

Table 23: Cropping intensity (%) in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Cropping Intensity	0.00	100.00	92.25	92.18	92.65

Possession of Bank account and savings: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 24. The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of the households have bank account and 85.71 per cent of the households have savings.

Table 24: Possession of Bank account and savings in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Account	0	0.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	9	90.00	29	82.86
2	Savings	0	0.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	30	85.71

Borrowing status: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, 60 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.

Table 25: Borrowing status in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Credit Availed	0	0.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	1	10.00	21	60.00

Cost of Cultivation of Maize: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of maize in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 26. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 27663.19. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 28612.58. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 949.39, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.03.

Table 26: Cost of Cultivation of maize in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	32.95	7075.28	25.58
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.55	303.15	1.10
3	Tractor		Hours	2.79	2089.90	7.55
4	Machinery		Hours	0.70	419.81	1.52
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	14.14	1696.54	6.13
7	FYM		Quintal	13.38	2675.09	9.67
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.99	2714.94	9.81
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs/liters	1.32	2207.42	7.98
10	Irrigation		Number	5.97	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	70.79	0.26
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1116.48	4.04
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				20369.41	73.63
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				183.33	0.66
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				20552.75	74.30
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			17.63	4585.61	16.58
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				25138.36	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				25148.36	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2514.84	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				27663.19	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		19.36	26819.80	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1385.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		29.88	1792.78	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			60.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				28612.58	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				949.39	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1428.55	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.03	

Cost of cultivation of Groundnut: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of groundnut in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 53510.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 54452.62. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 942.56. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.02.

Table 27: Cost of Cultivation of groundnut in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	38.46	8266.99	15.45
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.79	436.16	0.82
3	Tractor		Hours	3.06	2293.15	4.29
4	Machinery		Hours	0.96	578.61	1.08
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	158.16	22664.03	42.35
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	11.64	2327.50	4.35
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.93	2700.18	5.05
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.00	1198.67	2.24
10	Irrigation		Number	4.28	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	107.38	0.20
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				3468.04	6.48
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				44040.71	82.30
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				250.00	0.47
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				44290.71	82.77
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			16.81	4344.80	8.12
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				48635.51	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				48645.51	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				4864.55	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				53510.06	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		19.12	52818.25	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2762.50	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		31.13	1634.37	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			52.50	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				54452.62	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				942.56	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2798.68	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.02	

Cost of Cultivation of Tomato: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of tomato in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 30927.98. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 74100. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 43172.02. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.4.

Table 28: Cost of Cultivation of Tomato in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	41.99	9262.50	29.95
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	3.71	2778.75	8.98
4	Machinery		Hours	1.24	741.00	2.40
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	4.94	3705.00	11.98
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	12.35	2470.00	7.99
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.47	3458.00	11.18
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Irrigation		Number	6.18	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	1.61	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1157.16	3.74
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				23574.02	76.22
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				333.33	1.08
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				23907.35	77.30
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			16.06	4199.00	13.58
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				28106.35	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				28116.35	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2811.63	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				30927.98	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		74.10	74100.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				74100.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				43172.02	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				417.38	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.4	

Cost of Cultivation of Water melon: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of water melon in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 29. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for water melon was Rs. 37280.33. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 69160. The net income from water melon cultivation was Rs. 31879.67. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86.

Table 29: Cost of Cultivation of water melon in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	60.52	13091.00	35.12
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	3.71	2778.75	7.45
4	Machinery		Hours	2.47	1482.00	3.98
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	3.71	3519.75	9.44
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	24.70	4940.00	13.25
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.24	2470.00	6.63
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Irrigation		Number	2.47	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	1.61	0.00
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1312.77	3.52
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				29595.88	79.39
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				333.33	0.89
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				29929.21	80.28
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			14.82	3952.00	10.60
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				33881.21	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				33891.21	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3389.12	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				37280.33	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		9.88	69160.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			7000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				69160.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				31879.67	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				3773.31	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.86	

Cost of Cultivation of Banana: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of banana in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for banana was Rs. 95816.55. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 679249.97. The net income from banana cultivation was Rs. 583433.42. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:7.09.

Table 30: Cost of Cultivation of Banana in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	82.33	22230.00	23.20
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	2.06	1543.75	1.61
4	Machinery		Hours	2.06	1235.00	1.29
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	2675.83	26758.33	27.93
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	20.58	4116.67	4.30
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.06	4116.67	4.30
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	2.06	1543.75	1.61
10	Irrigation		Number	10.29	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	13423.01	14.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				4385.45	4.58
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				79352.62	82.82
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				333.33	0.35
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				79685.96	83.17
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			28.82	7410.00	7.73
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				87095.96	90.90
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.01
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				87105.96	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				8710.60	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				95816.55	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		339.62	679249.97	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				679249.97	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				583433.42	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				282.12	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:7.09	

Cost of cultivation of Paddy: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of paddy in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 58817.01. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 156227.50. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 97410.49. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.66.

Table 31: Cost of Cultivation of paddy in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	167.14	33509.67	56.97
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	2.47	1852.50	3.15
4	Machinery		Hours	0.82	494.00	0.84
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	90.57	4528.33	7.70
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	8.23	1646.67	2.80
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.65	2305.33	3.92
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.82	617.50	1.05
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	1.07	0.00
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1092.94	1.86
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				46048.01	78.29
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.28
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				46214.68	78.57
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			25.52	7245.33	12.32
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				53460.01	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				53470.01	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				5347.00	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				58817.01	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		111.15	155610.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1400.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		20.58	617.50	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			30.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				156227.50	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				97410.49	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				529.17	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.66	

Cost of cultivation of bengalgram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of bengalgram in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 45612.07. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45960.53. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 348.45. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.01.

Table 32: Cost of Cultivation of Bengalgram in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	40.14	8830.25	19.36
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.85	1018.88	2.23
3	Tractor		Hours	3.09	2315.63	5.08
4	Machinery		Hours	1.24	741.00	1.62
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	117.33	12905.75	28.29
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	12.35	2470.00	5.42
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.47	3458.00	7.58
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.24	926.25	2.03
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	137.46	0.30
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				2372.40	5.20
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				35175.61	77.12
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.37
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				35342.27	77.48
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			23.47	6113.25	13.40
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				41455.52	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				41465.52	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				4146.55	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				45612.07	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		9.26	45849.38	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4950.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		3.71	111.15	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			30.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				45960.53	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				348.45	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				4924.38	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.01	

Cost of cultivation of Sunflower: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of Sunflower in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Sunflower was Rs. 27395.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 50931.76. The net income from Sunflower cultivation was Rs. 23535.83. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86.

Table 33: Cost of Cultivation of Sunflower in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	34.74	7772.50	28.37
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	2.41	1324.67	4.84
3	Tractor		Hours	2.54	1902.73	6.95
4	Machinery		Hours	1.27	761.09	2.78
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	8.37	1087.51	3.97
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	7.60	1520.00	5.55
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.54	3551.77	12.96
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.27	951.37	3.47
10	Irrigation		Number	2.28	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	149.85	0.55
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				854.48	3.12
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				19875.97	72.55
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				250.00	0.91
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				20125.97	73.46
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			18.65	4769.41	17.41
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				24895.38	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				24905.38	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2490.54	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				27395.92	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		13.06	50931.76	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			3900.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				50931.76	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				23535.83	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2097.79	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.86	

Cost of cultivation bajra: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of bajra in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 34. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 21266.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 20729.50. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -537.29. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.97.

Table 34: Cost of Cultivation of Bajra in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	22.94	4937.46	23.22
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.31	718.68	3.38
3	Tractor		Hours	2.46	1845.01	8.68
4	Machinery		Hours	0.75	449.90	2.12
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	10.19	1253.79	5.90
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	10.37	3135.40	14.74
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.09	1768.92	8.32
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.81	606.22	2.85
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	328.41	1.54
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				812.92	3.82
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				15856.70	74.56
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				125.00	0.59
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				15981.70	75.15
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			12.74	3341.74	15.71
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				19323.45	90.86
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.05
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				19333.45	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				1933.34	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				21266.79	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		15.52	19781.86	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1275.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		21.06	947.65	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			45.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				20729.50	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				-537.29	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1370.71	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:0.97	

Cost of cultivation of sorghum: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of sorghum in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 14285.38. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31369. The net income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. 17083.62. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.2.

Table 35: Cost of Cultivation of Sorghum in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	12.35	2634.67	18.44
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.82	452.83	3.17
3	Tractor		Hours	2.47	1852.50	12.97
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	8.23	823.33	5.76
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.65	2305.33	16.14
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	1.07	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				376.64	2.64
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				8446.38	59.13
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	1.17
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				8613.04	60.29
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			17.29	4363.67	30.55
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				12976.71	90.84
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.07
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				12986.71	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				1298.67	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				14285.38	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		14.00	29393.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2100.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		32.93	1976.00	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			60.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				31369.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				17083.62	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1020.63	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.2	

Cost of cultivation of red gram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of redgram in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for redgram was Rs. 13687.64. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31122.00. The net income from redgram cultivation was Rs. 17434.36. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.27.

Table 36: Cost of Cultivation of redgram in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	14.82	3211.00	23.46
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	3.29	2470.00	18.05
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	8.23	823.33	6.02
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.65	2305.33	16.84
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.82	617.50	4.51
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	1.07	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				450.74	3.29
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				9878.98	72.17
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	1.22
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				10045.64	73.39
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			9.06	2387.67	17.44
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				12433.31	90.84
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.07
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				12443.31	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				1244.33	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				13687.64	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		7.41	31122.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4200.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				31122.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				17434.36	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1847.19	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.27	

Cost of cultivation of Castor: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of Castor in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Castor was Rs. 32673.72. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 29640. The net income from Castor cultivation was Rs. -3033.72. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.91.

Table 37: Cost of Cultivation of Castor in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	35.82	7904.00	24.19
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	2.47	1358.50	4.16
3	Tractor	Hours	2.47	1852.50	5.67
4	Machinery	Hours	1.24	741.00	2.27
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	6.18	1543.75	4.72
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM	Quintal	12.35	2470.00	7.56
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	2.47	3458.00	10.58
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs / liters	1.24	926.25	2.83
10	Irrigation	Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs		0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)		0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges		0.00	606.76	1.86
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**				
16	Interest on working capital			1008.96	3.09
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**			21869.72	66.93
III	**Cost B2**				
18	Rental Value of Land			166.67	0.51
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**			22036.38	67.44
IV	**Cost C1**				
20	Family Human Labour		29.64	7657.00	23.43
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**			29693.38	90.88
V	**Cost C2**				
22	Risk Premium			10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**			29703.38	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**				
24	Managerial Cost			2970.34	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**			32673.72	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**				
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)	4.94	29640.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)		6000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)			29640.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)			-3033.72	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)			6614.11	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)			1:0.91	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicate that, 25.71 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 11.43 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate.

Table 38: Adequacy of fodder in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0.00	1	25.00	6	37.50	2	20.00	9	25.71
2	Inadequate-Dry Fodder	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	18.75	1	10.00	4	11.43

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the average annual gross income in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicate that, in landless farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs. 43000, in marginal farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.27500, wage was Rs.23750, agriculture was Rs.28025 and goat farming was Rs.10000. In small farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.5312.50, wage was Rs.24187.50, agriculture was Rs.64390.63 and dairy farming was Rs.3937.50. In semi medium farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs.13500, agriculture was Rs.69100 and dairy farming was Rs.800.

Table 39: Average annual gross income in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Service/salary	0.00	27,500.00	5,312.50	0.00	5,571.43
2	Wage	43,000.00	23,750.00	24,187.50	13,500.00	23,771.43
3	Agriculture	0.00	28,025.00	64,390.63	69,100.00	52,381.43
4	Dairy Farm	0.00	0.00	3,937.50	800.00	2,028.57
5	Goat Farming	0.00	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,142.86
Income(Rs.)		43,000.00	89,275.00	97,828.13	83,400.00	84,895.71

Table 40: Average annual expenditure in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
1	Service/salary	0.00	5,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	714.29
2	Wage	17,000.00	8,333.33	7,133.33	10,000.00	8,485.71
3	Agriculture	0.00	14,750.00	31,875.00	29,000.00	24,542.86
4	Dairy Farm	0.00	0.00	5,800.00	1,333.33	942.86
5	Goat Farming	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	428.57
Total		17,000.00	43,083.33	64,808.33	40,333.33	165,225.00
Average		3,400.00	10,770.83	4,050.52	4,033.33	4,720.71

Average annual expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicate that, in case of landless the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs. 17000. In marginal farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.5000, wage was Rs.8333.33, agriculture was Rs.14750 and goat farming was Rs.15000. In small farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.20000, wage was Rs.7133.33, agriculture

was Rs.31875 and dairy farming was Rs.5800. In semi medium farmers, the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs.10000, agriculture was Rs.29000 and dairy farming was Rs.1333.33.

Horticulture species grown: The data regarding horticulture species grown in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 24 coconut, 2 lemon trees and 13 mango trees in their fields.

Table 41: Horticulture species grown in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Coconut	0	0	0	0	11	0	13	0	24	0
2	Lemon	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
3	Mango	0	0	0	0	7	0	6	0	13	0

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

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 42. The results indicate that, households have planted 55 neem trees and 5 tamarind trees in their field and also planted 1 neem tree in their back yard.

Table 42: Forest species grown in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Neem	0	0	6	0	25	1	24	0	55	1
2	Tamarind	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	0

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

Average Additional investment capacity: The data regarding average additional investment capacity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicate that, the average additional investment capacity with the households for land development was Rs. 7342.86, for irrigation facility Rs. 1057.14 and for improved crop production Rs. 285.71.

Table 43: Average Additional investment capacity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (4)	SF (16)	SMF (10)	All (35)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Land development	0.00	10,500.00	9,375.00	6,500.00	7,342.86
2	Irrigation facility	0.00	2,500.00	937.50	1,200.00	1,057.14
3	Improved crop production	0.00	1,250.00	0.00	500.00	285.71

Table 44: Source of additional investment in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No	Item	Land development		Irrigation facility		Improved crop production	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Government subsidy	30	85.71	8	22.86	2	5.71

Source of additional investment: The data regarding Source of additional investment in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicate that, government subsidy was the source of additional investment capacity for 85.71 per cent

of the households for land development, 22.86 per cent of the households for irrigation facility and 5.71 per cent of the households for improved crop production .

Marketing of the agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, banana, Bengal gram, castor, red gram, sorghum, tomato and water melon crops were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Bajra, groundnut, maize, paddy and sunflower crops were sold to an extent of 92.05 per cent, 92.02 per cent, 98.89 per cent, 88.89 per cent and 28 per cent respectively.

Table 45: Marketing of the agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Bajra	88.0	7.0	81.0	92.05	1275.0
2	Banana	165.0	0.0	165.0	100.0	2000.0
3	Bengalgram	15.0	0.0	15.0	100.0	4950.0
4	Castor	4.0	0.0	4.0	100.0	6000.0
5	Groundnut	188.0	15.0	173.0	92.02	2762.5
6	Maize	237.0	5.0	232.0	97.89	1385.0
7	Paddy	135.0	15.0	120.0	88.89	1400.0
8	Redgram	9.0	0.0	9.0	100.0	4200.0
9	Sorghum	17.0	0.0	17.0	100.0	2100.0
10	Sunflower	25.0	18.0	7.0	28.0	3900.0
11	Tomato	60.0	0.0	60.0	100.0	1000.0
12	Water Melon	8.0	0.0	8.0	100.0	7000.0

Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 46. The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets.

Table 46: Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Regulated Market	0	0.00	4	100.00	17	106.25	12	120.00	33	94.29

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 47. The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.

Table 47: Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Tractor	0	0.00	4	100.00	17	106.25	12	120.00	33	94.29

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 48. The

results indicated that, 80 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 100 per cent of the marginal farmers, 87.50 per cent of the small farmers and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 48: Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0.00	4	100.00	14	87.50	10	100.00	28	80.00

Interest shown towards soil testing: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 49. The results indicated that, 82.86 per cent have shown interest in soil test.

Table 49: Interest shown towards soil testing in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0.00	4	100.00	15	93.75	10	100.00	29	82.86

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data regarding usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 50. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households used fire wood.

Table 50: Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	35	100

Source of drinking water: The data regarding source of drinking water in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 51. The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households and 2.86 per cent of the households were using bore well for drinking water in the micro watershed.

Table 51: Source of drinking water in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	9	90.00	34	97.14
2	Bore Well	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	1	2.86

Source of light: The data regarding source of light in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 52. The results indicated that, Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed.

Table 52: Source of light in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	35	100.00

Existence of Sanitary toilet facility: The data regarding existence of sanitary toilet facility in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 53. The results indicated that, 57.14 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 6.25 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers.

Table 53: Existence of Sanitary toilet facility in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	5	100.00	4	100.00	1	6.25	10	100.00	20	57.14

Possession of PDS card: The data regarding possession of PDS card in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 54. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card.

Table 54: Possession of PDS card in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	BPL	5	100.00	4	100.00	16	100.00	10	100.00	35	100.00

Participation in NREGA program: The data regarding participation in NREGA programme in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 55. The results indicated that, 40 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.

Table 55: Participation in NREGA programme in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF(10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	5	100	2	50	6	37.50	1	10	14	40

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 56. The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 60 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 40 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 54.29 per cent, fruits were adequate for 82.86 per cent, milk was adequate for 45.71 per cent, eggs were adequate for 60 per cent and meat was adequate for 60 per cent of the households.

Table 56: Adequacy of food items in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	5	100.00	4	75.00	16	100.00	10	120.00	35	100
2	Pulses	4	80.00	5	125.00	9	56.25	3	30.00	21	60.00
3	Oilseed	1	20.00	1	25.00	7	43.75	5	50.00	14	40.00
4	Vegetables	2	40.00	3	75.00	10	62.50	4	40.00	19	54.29
5	Fruits	4	80.00	3	75.00	10	62.50	12	120.00	29	82.86
6	Milk	2	40.00	3	75.00	7	43.75	4	40.00	16	45.71
7	Egg	4	80.00	2	50.00	7	43.75	8	80.00	21	60.00
8	Meat	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	0	0.00	1	2.86

Response on Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding inadequacy of food items in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 57. The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 40 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate for 54.29 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 42.86 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 20 per cent, milk were inadequate for 17.14 per cent and egg was inadequate for 31.43 per cent of the households.

Table 57: Response on Inadequacy of food items in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Pulses	1	20.00	0	0.00	6	37.50	7	70.00	14	40.00
2	Oilseed	3	60.00	2	50.00	10	62.50	4	40.00	19	54.29
3	Vegetables	3	60.00	1	25.00	7	43.75	4	40.00	15	42.86
4	Fruits	1	20.00	1	25.00	4	25.00	1	10.00	7	20.00
5	Milk	1	20.00	0	0.00	3	18.75	2	20.00	6	17.14
6	Egg	1	20.00	1	25.00	8	50.00	1	10.00	11	31.43

Farming constraints: The data regarding farming constraints experienced by households in Maslapur-2 micro watershed is presented in Table 58. The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 85.71 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (74.29%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (28.57%), inadequacy of irrigation water (8.57%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (51.43%), high rate of interest on credit (8.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (8.57%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (25.71%), inadequate extension services (8.57%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (20%), less rainfall (62.86%) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (14.29%).

Table 58: Farming constraints Experienced in Maslapur-2 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	MF (4)		SF (16)		SMF (10)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	4	100	15	93.75	10	100	30	85.71
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	4	100	15	93.75	7	70	26	74.29
3	Frequent incidence of pest and diseases	1	25	4	25.00	5	50	10	28.57
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	0	0	1	6.25	2	20	3	8.57
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	4	100	9	56.25	5	50	18	51.43
6	High rate of interest on credit	0	0	2	12.50	1	10	3	8.57
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	0	0	2	12.50	1	10	3	8.57
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	1	25	6	37.50	2	20	9	25.71
9	Inadequate extension services	1	25	1	6.25	1	10	3	8.57
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	0	0	4	25.00	3	30	7	20.00
11	Less rainfall	3	75	12	75.00	7	70	22	62.86
12	Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile)	0	0	3	18.75	2	20	5	14.29

Chapter 5

SUMMARY

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed a comprehensive questionnaire was prepared. Major components such as demographic conditions, migration details, food consumption and family expenditure pattern, material possession, land holding, land use management, cropping pattern, cost of cultivation of crops, livestock management. The statistical components such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze the data. About 35 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey.

The result indicated that 35 farmers were sampled in Maslapur-2 micro watershed among them 5(14.29%) were landless, 4 (11.43%) were marginal farmers, 16 (45.71%) were small farmers and 10 (28.57%) were semi medium farmers. The data indicated that there were 98 (58.68%) men and 69 (41.32%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 5, marginal farmers' was 3.75, small farmers' was 4.56 and semi medium farmers' was 5.40. The data indicated that, 27 (16.17%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.31%) were in 16-35 years of age, 50 (29.94%) were in 36-60 years of age and 16(9.58%) were above 61 years of age.

The results indicated that Maslapur-2 had 30.54 per cent illiterates, 49.70 per cent of them had primary school education, 1.80 per cent of them had middle school education, 8.38 per cent of them had high school education, 4.79 per cent of them had PUC, 0.60 per cent of them had diploma and ITI education, 2.99 per cent of them had degree education and 0.60 per cent of them did other education. The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of households were practicing agriculture and 17.14 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers.

The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 20.96 per cent of the household members, 56.29 per cent were agricultural laborers, 1.80 per cent was in private sector, 20.36 per cent were students and 0.60 per cent was children. In case of landless farmers, 8 per cent were agriculturist, 60 per cent were general labourers and 32 per cent were students. In case of marginal farmers 20 per cent of them were practicing agriculture, 40 per cent were agricultural labourers, 6.67 per cent were in private service and 33.33 per cent were students. In case of small farmers, 21.92 per cent were agriculturists, 58.90 per cent were agricultural labourers and 19.18 per cent were students. In case of semi medium farmers 25.93 per cent were agriculturist, 55.56 per cent were agriculture labourers, 3.70 per cent were in private service, 12.96 per cent were students and 1.85 per cent was housewives.

The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions. The results indicate that 51.43 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 40 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 8.57 per cent of them possess Pucca house. The results showed that 91.43 per cent of

the households possess TV, 80 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 28.57 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 34.29 per cent of the households possess motor cycle and 91.43 per cent of the households possess mobile phones. The results show that the average value of television was Rs.4906, mixer grinder was Rs.1332, bicycle was Rs. 1650, motor cycle was Rs.33583 and mobile phone was Rs.1707.

Data showed 22.86 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 31.43 per cent of them possess plough, 2.86 per cent of them possess both power tiller and tractor, 28.57 per cent of them possess sprayer, 94.29 per cent of them possess weeder and 2.86per cent of them possess chaff cutter. The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.18500, plough was Rs.2029, the average value of power tiller was Rs.30000, the average value of tractor was Rs.300000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.3368, the average value of chaff cutter was Rs.3000, and the average value of weeder was Rs.17. The results indicate that, 31.43 per cent of the households possess both bullocks and local cow, 2.86 per cent of the households possess both crossbreed cow and sheep respectively. In case of marginal households, 25 per cent of them possess bullocks, local cow and sheep respectively. 43.75 per cent of the small farmers possess bullock and local cow correspondingly, 6.25 per cent of the small farmers possess crossbred cow. In case of semi medium farmers, 30 per cent of households possess bullock and local cow respectively.

The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.80, average own labour (women) available was 1.63, average hired labour (men) available was 6.80 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.09. In case of marginal farmers, average own labour men available was 1.50, average own labour (women) was 1.25, average hired labour (men) was 7.75 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.50. In case of small farmers, average own labour men available was 1.88, average own labour (women) was 1.63, average hired labour (men) was 8.94 and average hired labour (women) available was 9.25. In case of semi medium farmers, average own labour men available was 2, average own labour (women) was 1.90, average hired labour (men) was 5.20 and average hired labour (women) available was 5.30. The results indicate that, 97.14 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

The results indicate that, households of the Maslapur-2 micro watershed possess 23.43 ha (61.01%) of dry land and 14.97 ha (38.99%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 2.59 ha (100%) of dry land. Small farmers possess 18.81 ha (88.74%) of dry land and 2.39 ha (11.26%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 2.03 ha (13.90%) of dry land and 12.58 ha (86.10%) of irrigated land. The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 243,202.62 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 460,746.14. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 579,812.21 for dry land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 207,250.43 for dry land

and Rs. 753,559.31for irrigated land. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 147,609.56 for dry land and Rs. 405,178.51 for irrigated land.

The results indicate that, there were 15 functioning and 14 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed. The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 42.86 per cent of the farmers in micro watershed. The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 29.52 meters. The results indicate that, marginal, small and semi medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40ha, 3.48 ha and 11.05 ha of irrigated land respectively.

The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (14.71 ha), groundnut (8.40 ha), bajra (1.88 ha), Sunflower (1.62 ha), Bengal gram (1.21 ha), Red gram (1.21 ha), Sorghum (1.21 ha), castor (0.81 ha), Tomato (0.81 ha), water melon (0.81 ha) and Banana (0.49 ha) in kharif season and also grown maize (1.62 ha) and groundnut (1.21 ha) in Rabi season. Marginal farmers have grown maize, bajra, sunflower and Bengal gram. Small farmers had grown maize, groundnut, bajra, Bengal gram, paddy, red gram, sorghum, castor and banana. Semi medium farmers had grown maize, groundnut, sunflower, tomato and watermelon. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Maslapur-2 micro watershed was found to be 92.65 per cent. In case of marginal farmers it was 100 per cent, small farmers it was 92.25 per cent and in case of semi medium it was 92.18 per cent.

The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of the households have bank account and 85.71 per cent of the households have savings. The results indicate that, 60 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.

The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 27663.19. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 28612.58. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 949.39, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.03. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 53510.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 54452.62. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 942.56. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.02. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 30927.98. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 74100. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 43172.02. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.4. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for water melon was Rs. 37280.33. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 69160. The net income from water melon cultivation was Rs. 31879.67. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86.

The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for banana was Rs. 95816.55. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 679249.97. The net income from banana cultivation was Rs. 583433.42. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:7.09. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 58817.01. The

gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 156227.50. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 97410.49. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.66. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 45612.07. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45960.53. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 348.45. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.01.

The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Sunflower was Rs. 27395.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 50931.76. The net income from Sunflower cultivation was Rs. 23535.83. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.86. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 21266.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 20729.50. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -537.29. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.97. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 14285.38. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31369. The net income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. 17083.62. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.2. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for redgram was Rs. 13687.64. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 31122.00. The net income from redgram cultivation was Rs. 17434.36. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.27. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for Castor was Rs. 32673.72. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 29640. The net income from Castor cultivation was Rs. -3033.72. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.91.

The results indicate that, 25.71 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 11.43 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate. The results indicate that, in landless farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs. 43000, in marginal farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.27500, wage was Rs.23750, agriculture was Rs.28025 and goat farming was Rs.10000. In small farmers, the average annual gross income from service/salary was Rs.5312.50, wage was Rs.24187.50, agriculture was Rs.64390.63 and dairy farming was Rs.3937.50. In semi medium farmers, the average annual gross income from wage was Rs.13500, agriculture was Rs.69100 and dairy farming was Rs.800.

The results indicate that, in case of landless the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs. 17000. In marginal farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.5000, wage was Rs.8333.33, agriculture was Rs.14750 and goat farming was Rs.15000. In small farmers, the average annual expenditure from service/salary was Rs.20000, wage was Rs.7133.33, agriculture was Rs.31875 and dairy farming was Rs.5800. In semi medium farmers, the average annual expenditure from wage was Rs.10000, agriculture was Rs.29000 and dairy farming was Rs.1333.33.

The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 24 coconut, 2 lemon trees and 13 mango trees in their fields. The results indicate that, households have planted 55 neem trees and 5 tamarind trees in their field and also planted 1 neem tree in

their back yard. The results indicate that, the average additional investment capacity with the households for land development was Rs. 7342.86, for irrigation facility Rs. 1057.14 and for improved crop production Rs. 285.71. The results indicate that, government subsidy was the source of additional investment capacity for 85.71 per cent of the households for land development, 22.86 per cent of the households for irrigation facility and 5.71 per cent of the households for improved crop production . The results indicated that, banana, Bengal gram, castor, red gram, sorghum, tomato and water melon crops were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Bajra, groundnut, maize, paddy and sunflower crops were sold to an extent of 92.05 per cent, 92.02 per cent, 98.89 per cent, 88.89 per cent and 28 per cent respectively. The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets. The results indicated that, 94.29 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.

The results indicated that, 80 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 100 per cent of the marginal farmers, 87.50 per cent of the small farmers and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems. The results indicated that, 82.86 per cent have shown interest in soil test. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households used fire wood. The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households and 2.86 per cent of the households were using bore well for drinking water in the micro watershed. The results indicated that, Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed. The results indicated that, 57.14 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 6.25 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card. The results indicated that, 40 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.

The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 60 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 40 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 54.29 per cent, fruits were adequate for 82.86 per cent, milk was adequate for 45.71 per cent, eggs were adequate for 60 per cent and meat was adequate for 60 per cent of the households. The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 40 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate for 54.29 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 42.86 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 20 per cent, milk were inadequate for 17.14 per cent and egg was inadequate for 31.43 per cent of the households.

The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 85.71 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (74.29%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (28.57%), inadequacy of irrigation

water (8.57%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (51.43%), high rate of interest on credit (8.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (8.57%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (25.71%), inadequate extension services (8.57%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (20%), less rainfall (62.86%) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (14.29%).