ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.290

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

KANAKAPUR-1 (4D4A1S1c) MICRO WATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

SUJALA – III

World Bank funded Project

ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING

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 Kanakapur-1 (4D4A1S1c) Microwatershed, Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka”, ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ. 290 ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. p.145 &38.

TO OBTAIN COPIES,

Please write to:
Director, ICAR - NBSS & LUP,

Amaravati Road, NAGPUR - 440 033, India

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

Telefax : 0712-2522534

E-Mail : director@nbsslup.ernet.in

Website URL : nbsslup.in

Or

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

Phone : (080) 23412242, 23510350 (O)

Telefax : 080-23510350

E-Mail : nbssrcb@gmail.com

ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.290

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

KANAKAPUR-1 (4D4A1S1c) MICRO WATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

Sujala-III

World Bank funded Project

ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, GOVT. OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

ICAR-NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore has taken up a project sponsored by the Karnataka Watershed Development Project-II, (Sujala-III), Government of Karnataka funded by the World Bank under Component -1 Land Resource Inventry. This study was taken up to demonstrate the utility of such a database in reviewing, monitoring and evaluating all the land based watershed development programs on a scientific footing. To meet the requirements of various land use planners at grassroots level, the present study on "Land Resource Inventory and Socio-Economic Status of Farm Households for Watershed Planning and Development of for Kanakapur-1 microwatershed in Koppal Taluk, and District, Karnataka" for integrated development was taken up in collaboration with the State Agricutural Universities, IISC, KSRSAC, KSNDMC as Consortia partners. The project provides detailed land resource information at cadastral level (1:7920 scale) for all the plots and socio-economic status of farm households covering thirty per cent farmers randomely selected representing landed and landless class of farmers in the 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
Date: 01-08-2019

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

Contributors

Dr. Rajendra Hegde Principal Scientist, Head & Project Leader, Sujala-III Project ICAR-NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore	**Dr. S.K.Singh** Director, ICAR-NBSS&LUP Coordinator, Sujala-III Project Nagpur
Soil Survey, Mapping & Report Preparation	
Dr. K.V. Niranjana	Sh. R.S. Reddy
Dr. B.A. Dhanorkar	Smt. Chaitra, S.P.
	Dr. Gopali Bardhan
	Mr. Somashekar T.N
	Ms. Arpitha G.M
	Dr. Mahendra kumar M.B
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	Smt. Shyla, B.
Smt. K.V.Archana	Smt. Swetha ,K.
Sh. N.Maddileti	Ms. Vidya, P.C.
	Sh. Deepak, M.J.
	Smt. K.Karunya Lakshmi
	Ms. Seema, K.V.

Laboratory Analysis	
Dr. M. Lalitha	Sh. Vindhya, N.G.
Smt. Arti Koyal	Ms. P. Pavanakumari, P.
Smt. Parvathy, S.	Ms. Rashmi, N.
	Ms. Leelavathy, K.U.
	Smt. Usha Kiran, G.
Socio-Economic Analysis	
Dr. S.C. Ramesh Kumar	Sh. M.K. Prakashanaik
	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. Rajeev Ranjan IFS Project Director & Commissioner, WDD	Dr. A. Natarajan NRM Consultant, Sujala-III Project
Dr. S.D. Pathak IFS Executive Director & Chief Conservator of Forests, WDD	

PART-A

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY

Contents

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The land resource inventory of Kanakapur-1 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 433 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 98 per cent is covered by soil, one per cent by rock out crops and one per cent by water bodies, settlements and others and <less than one per cent by railways. The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below

- *The soils belong to 14 soil series and 38 soil phases (management units) and 6 land use classes.*
- *The length of crop growing period is <90 days and starts from 2nd week of August to 2nd week of November.*
- *From the master soil map, several interpretative and thematic maps like land capability, soil depth, surface soil texture, soil gravelliness, available water capacity, soil slope and soil erosion were generated.*
- *Soil fertility status maps for macro and micronutrients were generated based on the surface soil samples collected at every 320 m grid interval.*
- *Land suitability for growing 28 major agricultural and horticultural crops were assessed and maps showing the degree of suitability along with constraints were generated.*
- *Entire area is suitable for agriculture.*
- *About 11 per cent of the soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), 31 per cent moderately deep (75- 100 cm) and 56 per cent is deep to very deep (100->150cm) soils.*
- *About 10 per cent is sandy (loamy sand), 62 per cent loamy (sandy loam and sandy clay loam) and 27 per cent has clayey (sandy clay) soils at the surface.*
- *About 55 per cent of the area has non-gravelly (<15%) soils, 30 per cent has gravelly soils (15-35 % gravel) and 13 per cent very gravelly (35-60 %) soils.*
- *With respect to available water capacity 25 per cent of the area has very low (<50mm/m), 59 per cent of the area has low (51-100 mm/m), <1 per cent medium*

(101-150 mm/m) and 13 per cent area has very high (>200mm/m) in available water capacity.

- *An area of about 4 per cent has nearly level (0-1%), 90 per cent has very gently sloping (1-3%) lands and 4 per cent has gently sloping lands (3-5%).*
- *An area of about 51 per cent is slightly eroded (e1), 44 per cent is moderately eroded (e2) and 3 per cent is severely eroded.*
- *An area of about 47 per cent is slightly acid (pH6.0-6.5) 41 per cent has neutral (pH 6.5 to 7.3) soils, 10 per cent slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 to 7.8) and <1 per cent moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 to 8.4)*
- *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the soils are dominantly <2 dsm^{-1} indicating that soils are non saline.*
- *Organic carbon is medium (0.5-0.75%) in 97 per cent and high (>0.75%) in 2 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available phosphorus is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in 76 per cent and high (>57 kg/ha) in 23 per cent of the soils.*
- *Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in an entire area of the soils.*
- *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in 73 per cent and medium (10-20 ppm) in 25 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in entire area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available iron is deficient in 50 per cent and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 49 per cent of the area.*
- *Available zinc is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in 90 per cent and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 9 per cent of the microwatershed.*
- *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in the entire area.*
- *The land suitability for 28 major agricultural and horticultural crops grown in the microwatershed was assessed and the areas that are highly suitable (class S1) and moderately suitable (class 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	*95(22)*	*82 (19)*		*Pomegranate*	*32(7)*	*187(20)*
Maize	*42 (10)*	*135 (31)*		*Guava*	*1(<1)*	*163(38)*
Bajra	*77(18)*	*190(44)*		*Jackfruit*	*32(7)*	*131(30)*
Redgram	*30(7)*	*103 (24)*		*Jamun*	*29(7)*	*167(39)*
Bengal gram	*53(12)*	*112(26)*		*Musambi*	*85(20)*	*134(31)*
Groundnut	*19(4)*	*316 (73)*		*Lime*	*85(20)*	*134(31)*
Sunflower	*83 (19)*	*61 (14)*		*Cashew*	*13(3)*	*153(35)*
Cotton	*82(19)*	*84(19)*		*Custard apple*	*130(30)*	*296(68)*
Chilli	*56(13)*	*47(11)*		*Amla*	*77(18)*	*349 (81)*
Tomato	*56(13)*	*47(11)*		*Tamarind*	*29(7)*	*59(14)*
Drumstick	*32(7)*	*268(62)*		*Marigold*	*41(9)*	*136(32)*
Mulberry	*32(7)*	*347(80)*		*Chrysanthemum*	*41(9)*	*136 (32)*
Mango	*29(7)*	*6(2)*		*Jasmine*	*41(9)*	*80(19)*
Sapota	*32(7)*	*131(30)*		*Crossandra*	*41(9)*	*104(24)*

Apart from the individual crop suitability, a proposed crop plan has been prepared for the 6 identified LUCs by considering only the highly and moderately suitable lands for different crops and cropping systems with food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops.

- *Maintaining soil-health is vital for crop production and conserve soil and land resource base for maintaining ecological balance and to mitigate climate change. For this, several ameliorative measures have been suggested to these problematic soils like saline/alkali, highly eroded, sandy soils etc.,*
- *Soil and water conservation and drainage line treatment plans have 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 Kanakapur-1 microwatershed in Koppal Taluk, Koppal District, Karnataka State for the Karnataka Watershed Development Department. The database was generated by using cadastral map of the village as a base along with high resolution IRS LISS IV and Cartosat-1 merged satellite imagery. Later, an attempt will be made to uplink this LRI data generated at 1:7920 scale under Sujala-III Project to the proposed Landscape Ecological Units (LEUs) map.

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

Chapter 2

GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

2.1 Location and Extent

The Kanakapur-1 micro-watershed is located in the central part of Karnataka in Koppal taluk and district (Fig2.1). It lies between $15^0$26'and $15^0$28' North latitudes and $76^0$10' and $76^0$12' East longitudes and covers an area of about 433 ha. It comprises parts of Hanamanahalli, Vaddarahatti, Thalakanapura, Budashettynala and Irakallagada villages. It is about 48 km from Koppal town and is bounded by Thalakanapura on the east, Vaddarahatti on the north and Budashettynala and Hanamanahalli on the western side of the microwatershed.



Fig.2.1 Location map of Kanakapur-1Microwatershed

2.2 Geology

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

medium grained. They consist primarily of quartz, feldspar, biotite and hornblende. The gray granite gneisses are highly weathered, fractured and fissured upto a depth of about 10 m. Dolerite dykes and quartz veins are common with variable width and found to occur in Kanakapur-1 village. The thickness of the alluvium generally is limited to less than a meter, except in river valleys where it is very deep extending to tens of meters. Such soils are transported and represent paleo black soils originally formed at higher elevation, but now occupying river valleys.

Fig.2.2 a Granite and granite gneiss rocks

Fig.2.2 b Alluvium

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as Granite gneiss and Alluvial landscapes based on geology. The microwatershed area has been further divided into

mounds/ridges, summits, side slopes and very gently sloping uplands and nearly level plains based on slope and its relief features. The elevation ranges from 489 to 550 m in the gently sloping uplands. The mounds and ridges are mostly covered by rock outcrops.

2.4 Drainage

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

2.5 Climate

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

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

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



Fig. 2.3 Rainfall distribution in Koppal Taluk and District

2.6 Natural Vegetation

The natural vegetation is sparse comprising few tree species, shrubs and herbs. The mounds, ridges and boulders occupy sizeable areas which are under thin to moderately thick forest vegetation. Still, there are some remnants of the past forest cover which can be seen in patches in some ridges and hillocks in the microwatershed (Fig 2.4).

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

Fig 2.4 Natural vegetation of Kanakapur-1 microwatershed

2.7 Land Utilization

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

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



Fig.2.6 Current Land Use – Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed



Fig.2.7 Location of wells– Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 3

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The purpose of land resource inventory is to delineate similar areas (soil series and phases), which respond or expected to respond similarly for a given level of management. This was achieved in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed by the detailed study of all the soil characteristics (depth, texture, colour, structure, consistence, coarse fragments, porosity, soil reaction, soil horizons etc.) and site 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 433 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 and alluvial landscapes and is divided into landforms such as ridges, mounds and uplands based on slope. They were further subdivided into physiographic/ image interpretation units based on image characteristics. The image interpretation legend for physiography is given below.

Image Interpretation Legend for Physiography

G- Granite gneiss landscape

G1 Hills/ Ridges/ Mounds

G11 Summits

G12 Side slopes

G121 Side slopes with dark grey tones

G2 Uplands

G21 Summits

G22 Gently sloping uplands

G221 Gently sloping uplands, yellowish green (eroded)

G222 Gently sloping uplands, yellowish white (severely eroded)

G23 Very gently sloping uplands

G231 Very gently sloping uplands, yellowish green

G232 Very gently sloping uplands, medium green and pink

G233 Very gently sloping uplands, pink and green (scrub land)

G234 Very gently sloping uplands, medium greenish grey

G235 Very gently sloping uplands, yellowish white (eroded)

G236 Very gently sloping uplands, dark green

G237 Very gently sloping uplands, medium pink (coconut garden)

G238 Very gently sloping uplands, pink and bluish white (eroded)

DSe -Alluvial landscape

DSe 1 Summit

DSe 11 Nearly level Summit with dark grey tone

DSe 12 Nearly level Summit with medium grey tone

DSe 13 Nearly level Summit with whitish grey tone

DSe 14 Nearly level Summit with whitish tone (Calcareousness)

DSe 15 Nearly level Summit with pinkish grey tone

DSe 16 Nearly level Summit with medium pink tone

DSe 17 Nearly level Summit with bluish white tone

DSe 18 Nearly level Summit with greenish grey tone

DSe 2 Very genetly sloping

DSe 21 Very gently sloping, whitish tone

DSe 22 Very gently sloping, greyish pink tone

DSe 23 Very gently sloping, whitish grey tone

DSe 24 Very gently sloping, medium grey tone

DSe 25 Very gently sloping, medium pink tone

DSe 26 Very gently sloping, dark grey tone

DSe 27 Very gently sloping, bluish grey tone

DSe 28 Very gently sloping, greenish grey tone

DSe 29 Very gently sloping, Pinkish grey



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



Fig.3.2 Satellite Image of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed



Fig.3.3 Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

3.3 Field Investigation

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



Fig: 3.4. Location of profiles in a transect

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

Based on the soil characteristics, the soils were grouped into different soil series. Soil series is the most homogeneous unit having similar horizons and properties and behaves similarly for a given level of management. Soil depth, texture, colour, kind of horizon and horizon sequence, amount and nature of gravel present, calcareousness, nature of substratum etc, were used as the major differentiating characteristics for identifying soil series occurring in the area. The differentiating characteristics used for identifying the soil series are given in Table 3.1. Based on the above characteristics, 14 soil series were identified in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed.

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

Soils of Granite Gneiss Landscape							
Sl. No	**Soil Series**	**Depth (cm)**	**Colour (moist)**	**Texture**	**Gravel (%)**	**Horizon sequence**	**Calcareo-usness**
1	**Kethanapura (KTP)**	50-75	2.5YR3/4, 3/6	gsc	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	
2	**Lakkur (LKR)**	50-75	2.5YR 2.5/3, 2.5/4, 3/4, 3/6	gsc	40-60	Ap-Bt-Bc-Cr	
3	**Bisarahalli (BSR)**	75-100	5 YR 3/3, 3/4	gsc	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	
4	**Gollarahatti**	75-100	2.5YR3/4,3/6, 4/4,4/6	gscl	15-35	Ap-Bt-Cr	

	(GHT)						
5	**Hooradhahalli (HDH)**	75-100	2.5YR2.5/4,3/4, 3/6	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	
6	**Bidanagere (BDG)**	75-100	5YR3/3,3/4,4/3,5/4 2.5YR3/4	gc	35-60	Ap-Bt-Cr	
7	**Balapur (BPR)**	100-150	2.5YR2.5/4,3/4	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	
8	**Jedigere (JDG)**	100-150	5YR 4/6, 3/4, 7.5YR 3/4, 4/6	sc-c	<15	Ap-Bt-BC-Cr	-
9	**Kumchahalli (KMH)**	100-150	2.5YR3/4, 3/6	sc	<15	Bt-Cr	
10	**Nagalapur (NGP)**	100-150	5YR2.5/2,3/2, 2.5YR3/6,4/6	gsc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
11	**Giddadapalya (GDP)**	100-150	2.5YR3/4, 3/6	gsc-gc	30-60	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
Soils of Alluvial Landscape							
12	**Ravanaki (RNK)**	50-75	7.5YR3/2,3/3,5/2,5/3 10YR3/1,3/2,4/1, 4/2, 5/1,6/1	c	<15	Ap-Bw-Cr	e-ev
13	**Kavalur (KVR)**	100-150	10 YR 2/2, 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 4/4	c		Ap-Bss-Bck-Cr	es-ev
14	**Kadagathur (KDT)**	>150	10 YR 3/1, 3/2, 3/3, 7.5YR 3/3, 3/4	sc-c	-	Ap-Bw	-

3.4 Soil Mapping

The area under each soil series was further separated into soil phases and their boundaries delineated on the cadastral map based on the variations observed in the texture of the surface soil, slope, erosion, presence of gravel, stoniness etc. A soil phase is a subdivision of soil series based mostly on surface features that affect its use and management. The soil mapping units are shown on the map (Fig.3.5) in the form of symbols. During the survey many soil profile pits, few mini pits and a few auger bores representing different landforms occurring in the microwatershed were studied. In addition to the profile study, spot observations in the form of mini pits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map.

The soil map shows the geographic distribution of 38 mapping units representing 14 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 38 phases mapped in the microwatershed. Each mapping unit (soil phase) delineated on the map has similar soil and site characteristics. In other words, all the farms or survey numbers included in one soil phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Land Management Units

The 38 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were regrouped into six Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan for sustained development of the microwatershed. The database (soil phases) generated under LRI was utilized for identifying Land Management Units (LMU's) based

on the management needs. One or more than one soil site characteristic having influence on the management have been chosen for identification and delineation of LMUs. For Kanakapur-1 microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely the soil depth, soil texture, slope, erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LMUs. The land management units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

3.5 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each soil series soil were collected from representative master profiles for laboratory characterization by following the methods outlined in the Laboratory Manual (Sarma *et al*, 1987). Surface soil samples collected in the year 2017 from farmer's fields in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed (43 samples) 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 Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase Symbol	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite and Granite gneiss landscape				
	KTP	Kethanapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown gravelly red sandy clay soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**15 (3.57)**
72		KTPhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	15 (3.57)
	LKR	Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red, gravelly red sandy clay soils occurring on very gently to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation		**14 (3.3)**
54		LKRiB2g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	14 (3.3)
	BSR	Bisarahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown gravelly red sandy clay soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**26 (5.94)**
160		BSRhB1g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	14 (3.16)
161		BSRhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	1 (0.3)
164		BSRiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	11 (2.48)
	GHT	Gollarahatti soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark gravelly red sandy clay loam soils occurring on nearly level very		**30 (7.01)**

		gently sloping uplands under cultivation		
134		GHTbB2g1	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	15 (3.49)
135		GHTcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	3 (0.63)
136		GHTcB1g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	11 (2.62)
142		GHThB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	1 (0.27)
	HDH	Hooradhahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, dark red to dark reddish brown, gravelly red sandy clay to clay soils occurring on nearly level to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation		**76 (17.43)**
108		HDHcB1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	8 (1.9)
109		HDHcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	9 (2.18)
114		HDHcC2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 3-5%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	0.00019 (0.00004)
119		HDHhB1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	14 (3.13)
120		HDHhB1g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	11 (2.48)
122		HDHhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	15 (3.44)
125		HDHiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	19 (4.3)
	BDG	Bidanagere soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown gravelly red clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**3 (0.61)**
180		BDGcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	3 (0.61)
	BPR	Balapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**156 (35.65)**
216		BPRbB2	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	12 (2.83)
217		BPRbB2g1	Loamy sand surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	16 (3.59)
220		BPRcA1	Sandy loam surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion	11 (2.49)
222		BPRcB1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	23 (5.25)

223		BPRcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	7 (1.6)
225		BPRcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	13 (3.06)
226		BPRcB2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	13 (2.9)
227		BPRcC2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 3-5%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	6 (1.38)
228		BPRhB1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	15 (3.39)
232		BPRhB2g2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	15 (3.45)
233		BPRhC3g2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 3-5%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	12 (2.78)
236		BPRiA1g2	Sandy clay surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	7 (1.64)
239		BPRiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	6 (1.29)
	JDG	Jedigere soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark brown to dark reddish brown red sandy clay to clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**2 (0.48)**
211		JDGhB1g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	2 (0.48)
	KMH	Kumchahalli soils are deep (100-150cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red sandy clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**1 (0.26)**
200		KMHiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	1 (0.26)
	NGP	Nagalapur soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark gravelly red sandy clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**2 (0.43)**
262		NGPiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	2 (0.43)
	GDP	Giddadapalya soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark gravelly red sandy clay to clay soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**29 (6.67)**
268		GDPhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	29 (6.67)
Soils of Alluvial landscape				
	RNK	Ravanaki soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown and dark gray, calcareous cracking sodic clay black soils occurring on nearly level to very gently		**18 (4.11)**

		sloping plains under cultivation		
328		RNKhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	18 (4.11)
	KVR	Kavalur soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark yellowish brown to very dark grayish brown, calcareous cracking black clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**3 (0.68)**
384		KVRiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	3 (0.68)
	KDT	Kadagathur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown, sandy clay to clay black soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation		**53 (12.23)**
401		KDTiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	53 (12.23)
999		Rock outcrops	Rock lands, both massive and bouldery with little or no soil	3 (0.68)
1000		Others	Habitation	4 (0.95)

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



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

Chapter 4

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscapes based on geology. In all, 14 soil series were identified. Soil formation is the result of the combined effect of environmental and terrain factors that are reflected in soil morphology. The soil formation is dominantly influenced by the parent material, climate, time and relief.

A brief description of each of the 14 soil series identified followed by 38 soil phases (management units) mapped (Fig. 3.5) are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed are given in Table 4.1 along with soil classification. The soils in any one map unit differ from place to place in their depth, texture, slope, gravelliness, erosion or any other site characteristic that affect management. The soil phase map can be used for identifying the suitability of areas for growing specific crops or for other alternative uses and also for deciding the type of conservation structures needed. The detailed information on soil and site-characteristics like soil depth, surface soil texture, slope, erosion, gravelliness, AWC, LCC etc, with respect to each of the soil phase identified is given village/survey number wise for the microwatershed in Appendix-I.

4.1 Soils of Granite gneiss Landscape

In this landscape, 10 soil series were identified and mapped. Of these series, Balapur (BPR) series occupies maximum area of 156 ha (36 %) followed by Hooradhahalli (HDH) 76 ha (17 %) and others occupy minor area. The brief description of the soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Kethanapura (KTP) Series: Kethanapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown 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 with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is medium (101-150 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kethanapura (KTP) Series

4.1.2 Lakkur (LKR) Series: Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red gravelly sandy clay 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). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Lakkur (LKR) Series

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

The thickness of the solum ranges from 75 to 98 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 17 to 25 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. The texture ranges from sandy clay loam to sandy clay with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 61 to 79 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 3 to 4. Its texture is gravelly sandy clay with gravel content of 15-35 per cent. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). Three soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Bisarahalli (BSR) Series

4.1.4 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 loamy sand to sandy clay 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 (51-100 mm/m). Four soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Gollarahatti (GHT) Series

4.1.5 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 (50-100mm/m). Seven soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Hooradhahalli (HDH) Series

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

The thickness of the solum ranges from 78 to 99 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 12 to 19 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 2 to 3 and chroma 3 to 4. The texture varies from sandy clay loam to sandy clay with 10 to 20 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 68 to 85 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 3 to 4. Its texture is gravelly clay with gravel content of 35-60 per cent. The available water capacity is very low (<50 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape Soil Profile Characteristics of Bidanagere (BDG) Series

4.1.7 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 17cm. 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). Thirteen soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Balapur (BPR) Series

4.1.8 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 10 YR and 7.5 YR with value 2 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. Its texture is dominantly clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile Characteristics of Jedigere (JDG) Series

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

The thickness of the solum ranges from 102 to 150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 11 to 23 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR and 2.5 YR hue with value 2.5 to 3 and chroma 3 to 6. The texture is dominantly sandy clay. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 95 to 132 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 4 to 6. Its texture is dominantly sandy clay loam to sandy clay. The available water capacity is high (150-200 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kumchahalli (KMH) Series

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

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

Landscape Soil Profile Characteristics of Nagalapur (NGP) Series

4.1.11 Giddadapalya (GDP) Series: Giddadapalya soils are deep (100-150 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red, gravelly sandy clay to clay soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Giddadapalya soil series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Rhodic Paleustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 106 to 145 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 12 to 13 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. The texture ranges from sandy loam with 10 to 15 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 106 to 123 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 6. Texture is sandy clay to clay with 35 to 75 per cent gravel after 60 cm depth. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Giddadapalya (GDP) Series

4.2 Soils of Alluvial Landscape

In this landscape, 3 soil series were identified and mapped. Of these series, Kadagathur (KDT) series occupies maximum area of 53 ha (12%) followed by Ravanaki (RNK) 18 ha (4%) and others occupy minor area. The brief description of the soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

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

The thickness of the solum ranges from 50 to 75 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 15 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value 2 to 3 and chroma 2.5 to 4. The texture varies from sandy clay to clay with 10 to 15 per cent gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 35 to 60 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 2 to 6 and chroma 2 to 4. Its texture is sandy clay to clay with gravel content of 10 to 20 per cent. The available water capacity is medium (101-150 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile Characteristics of Ravanaki (RNK) Series

4.2.2 Kavalur (KVR) series: Kavalur soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark yellowish brown to very dark brown and very dark gray, calcareous black cracking clay soils They have developed from alluvium and occur on very gently sloping plains. Kavalur series has been classified as a member of the fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) family of Typic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum is 113 to 143 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 9 to 24 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1. The texture is clay

with no gravel. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 89 to 134 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1. Its texture is clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). One soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kavalur (KVR) series

4.2.3 Kadagathur (KDT) Series: Kadagathur soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to very dark grayish brown sandy clay to clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation. The Kadagathur series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Fluventic Haplustepts.

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



Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kadagathur (KDT) Series

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

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…

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…

Series Name: Bisarahalli (BSR) **Pedon:** R-9
Location: $15^0$25'21.0"N, $76^0$11'42.0"E Hatti village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore**.** **Classification:** Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic 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
0-14	Ap	70.11	9.29	20.60	22.31	15.97	11.98	9.83	10.03	20	scl	13.22	7.81
14-57	Bt1	47.27	7.52	45.20	27.04	8.28	4.61	2.10	5.24	25	sc	16.39	13.31
57-80	Bt2	41.93	8.67	49.40	21.95	6.83	4.76	4.66	3.73	30	c	21.41	15.41
80-99	Bt3	49.02	9.87	41.11	19.90	10.78	6.84	6.42	5.08	40	sc	21.82	14.24

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	6.59	-	-	0.12	0.73	-	4.47	1.77	0.06	0.53	6.82	8.80	0.43	77.55	6.00
14-57	7.02	-	-	0.04	0.48	-	5.85	2.31	0.06	0.20	8.43	14.70	0.33	57.32	1.36
57-80	7.00	-	-	0.05	0.28	-	11.74	2.26	0.08	0.22	14.31	15.60	0.32	91.73	1.44
80-99	6.90	-	-	0.06	0.18	-	13.70	2.16	0.08	0.14	16.08	16.50	0.40	97.44	0.83

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…

Series: Bidanagere (BDG), **Pedon**: RM-3
Location: $13^0$22'11"N, $76^0$38'03"E, (4D3D8G1a), Tharabenahalli village, Chikkanayakanahalli taluk, Tumakuru 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
0-20	Ap	81.19	11.25	7.56	12.54	15.07	17.90	21.94	13.75	50	ls	-	-
20-35	Bt1	57.45	11.45	31.10	12.76	11.02	10.92	12.45	10.31	50	scl	-	-
35-92	Bt2	44.63	7.85	47.52	12.40	9.61	8.37	7.75	6.51	60	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}							%	%
0-20	6.24	-	-	0.06	0.60	0.00	1.61	0.26	0.10	0.01	1.98	3.76	0.50	52.56	0.35
20-35	5.99	-	-	0.02	0.40	0.00	4.25	0.46	0.08	0.28	5.07	8.02	0.26	63.18	3.46
35-92	6.70	-	-	0.03	0.20	0.00	5.45	0.31	0.10	0.22	6.09	9.90	0.21	61.48	2.24

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: $15^0$29'06"N, $76^0$10'38" E 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…

S**eries Name:** Kumchahalli (KMH), **Pedon:** RM-9
Location: $15^0$20'05"N, $76^0$13'21"E, Basapura village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine, 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
0-13	Ap	51.76	9.05	39.19	7.99	8.84	13.42	14.38	7.14	-	sc	20.08	13.69
13-27	A21	53.50	8.12	38.38	7.00	11.05	15.21	14.33	5.91	-	sc	17.05	12.32
27-43	A22	63.60	5.01	31.40	3.85	11.56	24.52	18.52	5.14	-	scl	11.76	9.09
43-64	Bt1	48.74	5.91	45.35	8.87	9.31	12.49	12.27	5.81	10	sc	16.68	13.35
64-84	Bt2	45.13	8.90	45.97	9.86	7.12	10.95	10.62	6.57	20	sc	17.45	13.42
84-114	BC	65.04	6.94	28.02	10.49	16.21	17.80	13.88	6.67	40	scl	13.20	9.75

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}							%	%
0-13	7.2	-	-	0.193	0.81	3.00	9.69	3.93	1.41	0.08	15.10	15.07	0.38	100	0.54
13-27	7.13	-	-	0.161	0.7	3.00	8.69	3.57	1.29	0.16	13.70	13.75	0.36	100	1.14
27-43	7.31	-	-	0.096	0.89	2.64	5.19	2.36	1.07	0.24	8.86	9.46	0.30	94	2.51
43-64	7.65	-	-	0.089	1.16	2.52	8.25	2.88	0.72	0.35	12.20	12.65	0.28	96	2.79
64-84	7.98	-	-	0.1	0.38	3.12	10.49	2.88	0.26	0.41	14.04	14.63	0.32	96	2.78
84-114	8.23	-	-	0.121	0.58	2.88	8.02	1.87	0.09	0.43	10.41	10.67	0.38	98	4.02

Contd…

Series Name: Nagalapur (NGP) **Pedon :** R-10
Location: $15^0$26'38.0"N, $76^0$10'27.0" E Budashettynala village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Clayey- skeletal, mixed isohyperthermic Typic 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
0-16	Ap	78.43	6.36	15.21	25.23	18.82	14.04	13.22	7.12	30	sl	9.32	5.56
16-38	Bt1	46.97	8.53	44.51	14.33	12.34	7.43	6.80	6.07	30	sc	18.70	13.79
38-58	Bt2	51.92	7.48	40.60	20.98	10.07	7.37	7.48	6.02	40	sc	17.93	13.75
58-81	Bt3	54.05	7.18	38.77	27.07	10.58	5.91	5.81	4.67	50	sc	17.92	11.87
81-104	Bt4	59.03	8.93	32.04	21.88	13.11	8.88	8.05	7.12	50	scl	16.63	10.55
104-126	BC	62.35	9.26	28.40	21.19	14.51	9.88	8.13	8.64	60	scl	15.03	10.06

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}							%	%
0-16	6.77	-	-	0.09	0.82	-	3.52	2.14	0.18	0.03	5.87	7.10	0.47	82.70	0.46
16-38	6.89	-	-	0.06	0.57	-	9.35	3.85	0.10	0.21	13.50	14.70	0.33	91.87	1.40
38-58	6.80	-	-	0.06	0.52	-	8.76	3.42	0.10	0.26	12.55	14.20	0.35	88.35	1.85
58-81	6.84	-	-	0.06	0.32	-	7.67	2.77	0.10	0.58	11.12	12.90	0.33	86.18	4.48
81-104	6.86	-	-	0.05	0.20	-	6.97	2.07	0.09	0.95	10.07	11.90	0.37	84.59	7.95
104-126	6.70	-	-	0.07	0.10	-	5.53	1.77	0.07	0.73	8.09	9.40	0.33	86.09	7.77

Contd…

Series Name: Giddadapalya (GDP), **Pedon:** R-8
Location: $15^0$25'26"N, $76^0$10'59"E, Kalakeri 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
0-16	Ap	74.95	9.24	15.81	18.43	18.94	13.85	14.97	8.76	-	sl	11.88	5.09
16-43	Bt1	41.69	13.89	44.42	9.84	10.90	7.41	7.62	5.93	-	c	23.13	14.53
43-61	Bt2	47.67	6.13	46.19	21.14	10.15	5.29	6.45	4.65	-	sc	21.60	11.87
61-83	Bt3	52.52	7.10	40.38	24.42	10.59	5.66	7.55	4.30	40	sc	19.51	11.35
83-119	Bt4	43.76	11.59	44.65	20.15	7.56	5.77	5.46	4.83	60	c	20.80	12.06
119-139	Bt5	54.93	9.84	35.23	29.70	10.49	5.50	5.92	3.32	50	sc	15.24	11.97

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}							%	%
0-16	7.88	-	-	0.103	0.79	-	5.98	1.35	0.05	0.22	7.60	7.8	0.49	97	2.87
16-43	7.81	-	-	0.117	0.66	-	13.99	1.97	0.08	0.46	16.50	16.9	0.38	98	2.74
43-61	7.74	-	-	0.132	0.51	-	12.70	2.18	0.08	0.69	15.64	15.9	0.34	98	4.36
61-83	7.72	-	-	0.142	0.39	-	11.46	2.22	0.08	0.66	14.41	14.6	0.36	99	4.53
83-119	7.58	-	-	0.115	0.22	-	11.30	2.70	0.09	0.73	14.82	15.3	0.34	97	4.79
119-139	7.50	-	-	0.113	0.22	-	10.03	2.19	0.07	0.65	12.95	13.2	0.37	98	4.89

Contd…

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

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-28	Ap	24.43	17.76	57.81	5.30	3.89	3.78	7.14	4.32	20	c	41.40	29.60
28-55	Bw	18.77	15.59	65.64	2.74	3.73	2.85	4.83	4.61	10	c	46.71	35.18

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-28	8.86	-	-	0.483	0.63	15.48	-	-	0.86	6.27	-	37.00	0.64	-	6.78
28-55	8.61	-	-	1.4	0.23	13.68	-	-	0.68	12.27	-	53.20	0.81	-	9.22

Contd…

Series Name: Kavalura (KVR), **Pedon:** A2/RM-9
Location: $15^0$18'86.8"N, $75^0$56'56.3"E, Kavalura village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine, smectitic, isohyperthermic (calc) Typic Haplusterts

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-24	Ap	36.18	17.80	46.02	7.04	7.47	6.62	9.28	5.76	10	c	28.20	18.75
24-50	Bss1	38.79	15.36	45.85	6.25	6.25	9.70	10.67	5.93	05	c	27.16	18.81
50-85	Bss2	36.80	14.66	48.54	9.63	8.23	7.03	7.58	4.33	<5	c	30.16	22.17
85-124	Bss3	22.66	17.24	60.09	4.18	3.85	5.28	5.06	4.29	<5	c	40.34	31.42

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}							%	%
0-24	8.4	-	-	0.265	0.2	8.04	-	-	0.97	0.65		43.25	0.94		0.60
24-50	9.27	-	-	0.23	0.37	8.04	-	-	0.31	3.21		41.66	0.91		3.08
50-85	9.44	-	-	0.297	0.41	8.64	-	-	0.35	6.43		43.99	0.91		5.85
85-124	9.37	-	-	0.46	0.41	11.40	-	-	0.42	7.99		51.09	0.85		6.26

Contd…

Series Name: Kadagathur (KDT**)** **Pedon :** R-7
Location: $15^0$26'48"N, $76^0$09'51" E Budashettynala village, Koppal taluk and district
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Fine, mixed, isohyperthermic Fluventic 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
0-12	Ap	75.90	8.77	15.33	17.33	18.36	14.36	15.90	9.95	-	sl	10.66	5.33
12-37	A2	62.54	11.35	26.11	8.46	20.54	13.31	12.07	8.15	-	scl	15.61	8.22
37-71	Bw1	52.73	10.51	36.77	6.08	18.24	12.47	9.01	6.92	-	sc	19.66	11.21
71-93	Bw2	33.26	22.65	44.09	3.13	12.53	7.78	5.18	4.64	-	c	30.08	17.34
93-118	Bw3	31.01	24.57	44.42	2.04	10.41	8.26	6.01	4.29	-	c	34.92	18.16
118-170	Bw4	38.31	18.73	42.96	2.99	14.62	10.35	6.30	4.06	-	c	46.06	19.59

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	6.95	-	-	0.17	1.28	0.39	9.17	2.76	0.10	0.08	12.11	12.10	0.79	100.09	0.65
12-37	7.55	-	-	0.17	0.40	0.40	8.36	4.51	0.08	0.40	13.35	13.30	0.51	100.37	3.02
37-71	7.60	-	-	0.21	0.44	0.39	10.67	8.19	0.10	0.74	19.70	19.10	0.52	103.12	3.88
71-93	8.26	-	-	0.28	0.72	1.56	14.97	12.13	0.12	3.07	30.29	29.40	0.67	103.01	10.45
93-118	8.44	-	-	0.58	0.68	1.17	13.32	10.77	0.13	4.76	28.98	28.50	0.64	101.68	12.40
118-170	9.06	-	-	0.64	0.44	1.17	8.92	8.14	0.23	12.32	29.61	28.60	0.67	103.53	37.27

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 recognized 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 32 soil map units identified in the Kanakapur-1 microwatershed are grouped under two land capability classes and five land capability subclasses (Fig. 5.1).



Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Entire area in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture. Good lands (Class II) cover an area of about 235 ha (54%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor problems of soil and erosion. Moderately good lands (Class III) occupy an area of about 191 ha (44%) and distributed in the southern and northern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of soil and erosion. An area of about 3 ha (<1%) is under rockout crops and 4 ha (<1 %) is covered by habitation and water body.

5.2 Soil Depth

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



Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Moderately shallow (50-75 cm) soils cover an area of about 48 ha (11%) and distributed in the western and northern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134

ha (31%) is moderately deep soils (75-100 cm) and distributed in the eastern and northern part of the microwatershed. Deep to very deep (100- >150 cm) soils occupy a maximum area of about 244 ha (56%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed.

The most productive lands cover about 244 ha (56%) where all climatically adopted long duration crops be grown..

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 behavior, microbial activity and crop suitability. The textural classes used for LRI were used to classify and a surface soil texture map was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution in the microwatershed is shown in Fig 5.3.

An area of about 43 ha (10%) is sandy (loamy sand) at the surface and distributed in the northern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 267 ha (62%) is loamy (sandy loam) at the surface and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Clayey (sandy clay) soils cover about 115 ha (27%) and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed.

The most productive lands with respect to surface soil texture are clayey soils that (27 %) 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 productive lands are loamy (62%) soils which also have high potential for soil- water retention and nutrient availability but have no drainage or other physical problems. The problem soils are sandy covering 10 per cent area that has moisture and nutrient constraints.



Fig. 5.3 Surface Soil Texture map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

5.4 Soil Gravelliness

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

The soils that are non-gravelly (<15% gravel) cover a maximum area of about 239 ha (55 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 129 ha (30 %) is covered by gravelly (15-35% gravel) soils and are distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. Very gravelly (35-60%) soils cover an area of about 58 ha (13%) and distributed in the southern and northern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 5.4).

The most productive lands with respect to gravelliness are found to be 55 per cent. They are non-gravelly with less than 15 per cent gravel and have potential for growing both annual and perennial crops. The problem soils that are very gravelly (35-60%) cover about 13 per cent where only short duration crops can be grown.



Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

5.5 Available Water Capacity

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

An area of about 110 ha (25 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the eastern, central and western part of the microwatershed. An area of about 256 ha (59%) has soils that are low (51 to 100 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 3 ha (<1%) has soils that are medium (101-150 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the southwestern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 56 ha (13%) is very high (>200 mm/min) in available water capacity and distributed in the central part of the microwatershed.

An area of about 366 ha (84%) in the microwatershed has soils that are problematic with regard to available water capacity. Here, only short duration crops can be grown and the probability of crop failure is very high. These areas are best put to other

alternative uses. An area of about 56 ha (13%) has soils that have high potential (>200 mm/m) with regard to available water capacity where all climatically adapted long duration crops can be grown successfully.



Fig. 5.5 Soil Available Water Capacity map of Kanakapur-1 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 two slope classes and a slope map was generated showing the area extent and their geographic distribution of different slope classes in the microwatershed (Fig. 5.6).

Nearly level (0-1%) lands cover an area of about 18 ha (4%) and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Very gently sloping (1-3%) lands cover a maximum area of about 390 ha (90%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Gently sloping (3-5%) lands cover about 18 ha (4%) and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. In all these areas, all climatically adapted annual and perennial crops can be grown without much soil and water conservation and other land development measures, except an area of 18 ha that require soil and water conservation measures.



Fig. 5.6 Soil Slope map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

5.7 Soil Erosion

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

Slightly eroded lands cover an area of about 222 ha (51 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 192 ha (44 %) is moderately eroded (e2 class) and distributed in the southern, northwestern and northern part of the microwatershed. Severely eroded lands cover about 12 ha (3%) and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately and severely eroded lands are problematic and need appropriate soil and water conservation and other land development measures.



Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Chapter 6

FERTILITY STATUS

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

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

6.1 Soil Reaction (pH)

The soil analysis of the Kanakapur-1 microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) soil cover about 203 ha (47%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. Neutral soils (pH 6.5-7.3) cover an area of about 178 ha (41 %) and distributed in the central, western and southwestern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 45 ha (10%) is slightly to moderately alkaline (pH 7.3-8.4) and is distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. (Fig.6.1). Acid soils cover about 203 ha (47%), neutral soils 178 ha (41%) and alkaline soils 45 ha (10%) area in the microwatershed.

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

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

6.3 Organic Carbon

Maximum area of about 417 ha (97%) in the microwatershed is medium (0.5-0.75%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 8 ha (2%) is high (>0.75%) in organic carbon content and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.3).

6.4 Available Phosphorus

Maximum area of about 327 ha (76 %) is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 99 ha (23%) is high (>57 kg/ha) and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed.

The areas with high phosphorus content reduce 25 per cent from the recommended dose to avoid the excess application of fertilizer and apply additional 25% phosphorus in areas where it is medium (Fig 6.4).



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



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



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

6.5 Available Potassium

Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in entire area of the microwatershed. Apply additional 25% potassium in areas where it is medium (Fig 6.5).

6.6 Available Sulphur

Soil analysis of available sulphur content in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed showed that an area of about 318 ha (73%) is low and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 108 ha (25%) is medium (10-20 ppm) in available sulphur content and distributed in the northwestern part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.6). The areas that are low and medium in available sulphur need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or factomphos (p) fertilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.

6.7 Available Boron

Entire area of the microwatershed is low (< 0.5ppm) in available boron content (Fig.6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content in the soils of the Kanakapur-1 microwatershed is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in an area of about 215 ha (50%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. An area of about 211 ha (49%) showed sufficiency (>4.5 ppm) with

respect to iron content and distributed in the southern and central part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.8).

6.9 Available Manganese

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

6.10 Available Copper

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



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



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



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



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



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



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



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

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of about 388 ha (90 %) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.11). An area of about 37 ha (9%) is sufficient and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed.



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

Chapter 7

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Kanakapur-1 microwatershed were assessed for their suitability for growing food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops by following the procedure as outlined in FAO, 1976 and 1983. Crop requirements were developed for each of the crop from the available research data and also by referring to Naidu *et. al.* (2006) and Natarajan *et. al* (2015). The soil and land characteristics were matched with the crop requirements to arrive at the crop suitability. The soil and land characteristics table (Table 7.1) were matched with the crop requirements (Tables 7.2-7.29) to arrive at the crop suitability and the crop requirement 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 and N1 are divided into subclasses based on the kinds of limitations encountered. The limitations that affect crop production are 'c' for erratic rainfall and its distribution and length of growing period (LGP), 'e' for erosion hazard, 'r' for rooting condition, 't' for lighter or heavy texture, 'g' for gravelliness or stoniness, 'n' for nutrient availability, 'l' for topography, 'm' for moisture availability, 's' for sodium 'z' for calcareousness and 'w' for drainage. These limitations are indicated as lower case letters to the class symbol. For example, moderately suitable lands with the limitations of soil depth and erosion are designated as S2re. For the microwatershed, the soil mapping units were evaluated and classified up to subclass level.

Using the above criteria, the soil map units of the microwatershed were evaluated and land suitability maps for 28 major 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.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands occupy an area of about 95 ha (22%) for growing sorghum and occur in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 82 ha

(19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing sorghum and distributed in the western part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth, texture and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 248 ha (57%) is marginally suitable for growing sorghum and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.1 Land Suitability map of Sorghum

7.2 Land Suitability for Maize (*Zea mays*)

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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands occupy an area of about 42 ha (10%) for growing maize and distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 135 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and distributed in the central and northern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth, and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 248 ha (57%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting depth.



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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands occupy an area of about 77 ha (18%) for growing bajra and occur in the northern and central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 190 ha (44%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing bajra and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 159 ha (37 %) and occur in the southwestern, southern and northern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitation of gravelliness.



Fig. 7.3 Land Suitability map of Bajra

7.4 Land Suitability for Redgram (*Cajanus cajan*)

Redgram is one of the most important pulse crop grown in an area of 7.28 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing redgram (Table 7.5) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing redgram was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.4.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands occupy an area of about 30 ha (7%) for growing redgram and occur in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 103 ha (24%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing redgram and distributed in the northern and central part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occupy a maximum area of about 292 ha (68%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.4 Land Suitability map of Redgram

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

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

An area of about 53 ha (12%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Bengal gram and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 112 ha (26%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing bengalgram and are distributed in the western, central and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 260 ha (60%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Bengal gram

7.6 Land Suitability for Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*)

Groundnut is one of the major oilseed crop grown in an area of 6.54 lakh ha in Karnataka in most of the districts either as rainfed or irrigated crop. The crop requirements for growing groundnut (Table 7.7) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing groundnut was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.6.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands occupy an area of about 19 ha (4 %) for growing groundnut and occur in the northern part of the microwatershed. A maximum area of about 316 ha (73%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing groundnut and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and texture. An area of about 91 ha (21%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing groundnut and are distributed in the central and northern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture, rooting depth and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Groundnut

7.7 Land Suitability for Sunflower (*Helianthus annus*)

Sunflower is one of the most important oilseed crop grown in an area of 3.56 lakh ha in the State in all the districts. The crop requirements for growing sunflower (Table 7.8) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sunflower was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.7.

An area of about 83 ha (19%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sunflower and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 61 ha (14%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy an area of about 282 ha (65%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

7.8 Land Suitability for Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*)

Cotton is one of the most important fibre crop grown in the State in about 8.75 lakh ha area in Raichur, Dharwad, Belgaum, Gulbarga, Bijapur, Bidar, Bellary, Chitradurga and Chamarajnagar districts. The crop requirements for growing cotton (Table 7.9) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing cotton was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.8.

An area of about 82 ha (19 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing cotton and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 84 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and are distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, calcareousness and texture. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands occupy an area of about 259 ha (60%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.8 Land Suitability map of Cotton

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

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

An area of about 56 ha (13 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing chilli and are distributed in the central and northern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 47 ha (11%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing chilli and are distributed in the western and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness and rooting depth. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 322 ha (74%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture and calcareousness.



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 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tomato was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.10.

An area of about 56 ha (13 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing tomato and are distributed in the central and northern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 47 ha (11%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing tomato and are distributed in the western and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness and rooting depth. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 322 ha (74%) and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.10 Land Suitability map of Tomato

7.11 Land Suitability for Drumstick (*Moringa oleifera)*

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

An area of about 32 ha (7 %) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing drumstick and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands cover a maximum area of about 268 ha (62%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 125 ha (29%) and occur in the western and central part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.11 Land Suitability map of Drumstick

7.12 Land Suitability for Mulberry (*Morus nigra*)

Mulberry is the most important leaf crop grown for rearing silkworms in about 1.66 lakh ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing mulberry (Table 7.13) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mulberry was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.12.

An area of about 32 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing mulberry and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 347 ha (80%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing mulberry and distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 47 ha (11%) and occur in the western and western and northern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.12 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

7.13 Land Suitability for Mango (*Mangifera indica*)

Mango is one of the most important fruit crop grown in about 1.73 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.14) for growing mango were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mango was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.13.

An area of about 29 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing mango and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (S2) lands cover an area of about 6 ha (2%) and distributed in the western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 344 ha (79 %) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, texture and calcareousness. Area currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing mango cover about 47 ha (11%) and distributed in the northeastern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.13 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.14 Land Suitability for Sapota (*Manilkara zapota*)

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

An area of about 32 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sapota and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (S2) lands cover an area of about 131 ha (30%) and are distributed in the eastern and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 262 ha (61%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.14 Land Suitability map of Sapota

7.15 Land Suitability for Pomegranate (*Punica granatum*)

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

An area of about 32 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing pomegranate and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 187 ha (20%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands for growing pomegranate occupy an area of about 206 ha (48%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.15 Land Suitability map of Pomegranate

7.16 Land Suitability for Guava (*Psidium guajava*)

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

An area of about 1 ha (<1%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing guava and are distributed in the western part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 163 ha (38%) and are distributed in the central and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and texture. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands for growing guava occupy a maximum area of about 262 ha (61%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, calcareousness and texture.

.



Fig. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Guava

7.17 Land Suitability for Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*)

Jackfruit is one of the most important fruit crop grown in 5368 ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table.7.18) for growing jackfruit were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jackfruit was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in figure 7.17.

An area of about 32 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing jackfruit and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands cover an area of about 131 ha (30%) and are distributed in the eastern and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 262 ha (61%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.18 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

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

An area of about 29 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are highly suitable (Class S1) for growing jamun and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 167 ha (39%) and distributed in the southern, central and western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, texture, calcareousness and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover a maximum area of about 229 ha (53%) and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, calcareousness and texture.



Fig. 7.18 Land Suitability map of Jamun

7.19 Land Suitability for Musambi (*Citrus limetta*)

Musambi is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 5446 ha in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.20) for growing musambi were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing musambi was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.19.

An area of about 85 ha (20%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing musambi and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 206 ha (37%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing musambi and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.19 Land Suitability map of Musambi

7.20 Land Suitability for Lime (*Citrus sp*)

Lime is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 11752 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing lime (Table 7.21) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing lime was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.20.

An area of about 85 ha (20%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing lime and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 206 ha (47%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing lime and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Lime

7.21 Land Suitability for Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale)*

Cashew is one of the most important nut crop grown in an area of 7052 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing cashew (Table 7.22) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing cashew was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.21.

An area of about 13 ha (3%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing cashew and are distributed in the northeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 153 ha (35%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the central and northeastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, gravelliness and rooting depth. Maximum area of about 185 ha (43%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing cashew and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness and rooting depth. An area of about 74 ha (17%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing cashew and distributed in the western part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Cashew

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

Custard apple is one of the most important fruit crop grown in 1426 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements(Table 7.23) for growing custard apple were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing custard apple was generated .The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.22.

An area of about 130 ha (30%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing custard apple and are distributed in the northern and central part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands cover a maximum area of about 296 ha (68%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.22 Land Suitability map of Custard Apple

7.23 Land Suitability for Amla (*Phyllanthus emblica*)

Amla is one of the most important fruit and medicinal crop grown in an area of 151 ha and distributed in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.24) for growing amla were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing amla was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.23.

An area of about 77 ha (18%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing amla and are distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands cover a maximum area of about 349 ha (81%) and occur in the major part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.24 Land Suitability for Tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*)

Tamarind is one of the most important spice crop grown in 14897 ha in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.25) for growing tamarind were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tamarind was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.24.

An area of about 29 ha (7%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing tamarind and are distributed in the central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 59 ha (14%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the western part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, texture and calcareousness Maximum area of about 291 ha (67%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing tamarind and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 47 ha (11%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing tamarind and distributed in the western and northeastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

7.25 Land Suitability for Marigold (*Tagetes erecta*)

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

An area of about 41 ha (9 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing marigold and are distributed in the central and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 136 ha (32%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern, western and central part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 248 ha (57%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing marigold and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness.



Fig. 7.25 Land Suitability map of Marigold

7.26 Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum indicum*)

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

An area of about 41 ha (9 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing chrysanthemum and are distributed in the central and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 136 ha (32%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the northern, western and central part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 248 ha (57%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing chrysanthemum and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness.



Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

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

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

An area of about 41 ha (9 %) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing jasmine and are distributed in the central and northeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 80 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the western and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, calcareousness and texture. Maximum area of about 304 ha (70%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing jasmine and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, texture and calcareousness.



Fig. 7.27 Land Suitability map of Jasmine

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

Crossandra is one of the most important flower crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. Land suitability map for growing crossandra was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.28.

An area of about 41 ha (9%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing crossandra and are distributed in the northeastern and central part of the microwatershed. An area of about 104 ha (24%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) and occur in the central and northern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, texture and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 281 ha (65%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing crossandra and are distributed in the major part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth, calcareousness and texture.



Fig. 7.28 Land Suitability map of Crossandra

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drainage Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m)	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC (dSm^{-1})	ESP	CEC [Cmol $(p^{+})kg^{-1}$]	BS (%)
					Surf-ace	Sub-surface	Sur-face	Sub-surface								
KTPhB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	15-35	<50	1-3	moderate	6.42	0.07	0.05	4.41	100
LKRiB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	sc	gsc	15-35	40-60	<50	1-3	moderate	8.18	0.30	4.51	12.19	100
BSRhB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.59	0.12	6.00	8.80	77.55
BSRhB2	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc	-	15-35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.59	0.12	6.00	8.80	77.55
BSRiB1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sc	gsc	-	15-35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.59	0.12	6.00	8.80	77.55
GHTbB2g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	ls	gscl	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	moderate	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
GHTcB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gscl	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	slight	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
GHTcB1g2	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gscl	35-60	15-35	51-100	1-3	slight	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
GHThB2g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gscl	15-35	15-35	51-100	1-3	moderate	5.70	0.06	4.10	3.17	73
HDHcB1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHcB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHcC2g2	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	3-5	moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHhB1	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHhB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHhB2	662	<90	WD	75-100	scl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
HDHiB1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sc	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.7
BDGcB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gc	15-35	35-60	51-100	1-3	slight	6.24	0.06	0.35	3.76	52.56
BPRbB2	662	<90	WD	100-150	ls	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRbB2g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	ls	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRcA1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	0-1	slight	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRcB1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drainage Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m)	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC (dSm^{-1})	ESP	CEC [Cmol (p^{+})kg^{-1}]	BS (%)
					Surf-ace	Sub-surface	Sur-face	Sub-surface								
BPRcB1g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRcB2g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRcB2g2	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRcC2g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	3-5	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRhB1	662	<90	WD	100-150	scl	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRhB2g2	662	<90	WD	100-150	scl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRhC3g2	662	<90	WD	100-150	scl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	3-5	severe	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRiA1g2	662	<90	WD	100-150	sc	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	0-1	slight	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
BPRiB2	662	<90	WD	100-150	sc	gsc-gc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
JDGhB1g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	scl	sc-c	15-35	<15	101-150	1-3	slight	6.11	0.07	2.06	9.41	90
KMHiB1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sc	sc	-	<15	101-150	1-3	slight	7.2	0.19	0.54	15.07	100
NGPiB1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sc	gsc	-	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.67	0.09	0.46	7.10	82.70
GDPhB2	662	<90	WD	100-150	scl	gsc-gc	-	30-60	51-100	1-3	moderate	7.88	0.10	2.87	7.8	97
RNKhB2	662	<90	MWD	50-75	scl	c	-	<15	101-150	1-3	moderate	8.86	0.48	16.94	37.0	-
KVRiB2	662	<90	MWD	100-150	sc	c	-	-	>200	1-3	moderate	8.4	0.26	0.60	43.25	-
KDTiB1	662	<90	MWD	>150	sc	sc-c	-	-	>200	1-3	slight	6.95	0.17	0.65	12.10	100

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+)/Kg				
	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 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 7.6 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 7.7 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 7.8 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 7.9 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 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 7.13 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 7.14 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 7.15 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 7.16 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 7.17Land 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 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 7.19 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 7.20 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 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 7.23 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 7.24 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 7.25 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 7.26 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 7.27 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 7.28 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

7.29 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

7.29 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 38 soil map units identified in Kanakapur-1 microwatershed have been grouped into six 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.7.29) 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 six Land Management Units along with brief description of soil and site characteristics are given below.

LMU	Mapping unit	Soil and site characteristics
1	401.KDTiB1 384.KVRiB2 (Deep to very deep, black calcareous sandy clay to clay soils)	Moderately deep to very deep, black calcareous to non calcareous clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
2	BPRbB2, BPRbB2g1, BPRcA1, BPRcB1, BPRcB1g1, BPRcB2g1, BPRcB2g2, BPRcC2g1, BPRhB1, BPRhB2g2, BPRhC3g2, BPRiA1g2 , BPRiB2 ,GDPhB2, NGPiB1, HDHcB1, HDHcB1g1, HDHcC2g2, HDHhB1, HDHhB1g1, HDHhB2, HDHiB1, BDGcB1g1	Moderately deep to deep, gravelly red sandy clay to clay soils with slopes of 0-5%, slight to severe erosion, gravelly to very gravelly (15-60%)
3	JDGhB1g1, KMHiB1, BSRhB1g1, BSRhB2, BSRiB1, GHTbB2g1, GHTcB1g1, GHTcB1g2, GHThB2g1	Moderately deep to deep red sandy clay to clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-60%)
4	KTPhB2g1	Moderately shallow, red loamy soils with slopes of 1-3 %, moderate erosion, gravelly(15-35%
5	LKRiB2g1	Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
6	RNKhB2	Moderately shallow, black calcareous clay soils with slopes of 1-3%, moderate erosion



Fig 7.29 Land Management Units map of Kanakapur-1 microwatershed

7.30 Proposed Crop Plan for Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

After assessing the land suitability for the 28 crops, the proposed crop plan has been prepared for the six identified LMUs by considering only the highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands for each of the 28 crops. The resultant proposed crop plan is presented in Table 7.30.

Table 7.30 Proposed Crop Plan for Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
1	401.KDTiB1 384.KVRiB2 (Deep to very deep, black calcareous sandy clay to clay soils)	**Budashettynala:**21,22,23 **Thalakanapura:**2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11	Sorghum, Sunflower, Cotton, Bengal gram, Safflower, Linseed, Bajra	**Fruit crops:** Pomegranate, Jamun, Lime, Musambi, Tamarind, Amla, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Drumstick, Chilli, Coriander **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practises
2	216.BPRbB2 217.BPRbB2g1 220.BPRcA1 222.BPRcB1 223.BPRcB1g1 225.BPRcB2g1 226.BPRcB2g2 227.BPRcC2g1 228.BPRhB1 232.BPRhB2g2 233.BPRhC3g2 236.BPRiA1g2 239.BPRiB2 268.GDPhB2 262.NGPiB1 108.HDHcB1 109.HDHcB1g1 114.HDHcC2g2 119.HDHhB1 120.HDHhB1g1 122.HDHhB2 125.HDHiB1 180.BDGcB1g1	**Budashettynala:**24,25,26,27,28,30,36, 37,38 **Hanamanahalli:**18,20,21,24,48,51,52 **Irakallagada:**205,206,215,216 **Thalakanapura:**1,8,9,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,26,56,57,65,66,67,68,72,73,74,75,76,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,88, 92,93,94,95,96 **Vaddarahatti:**6,7,10,11,14,15,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,28,29, 30,31	Groundnut, Red gram, Bajra, Horse gram, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Lime, Musambi**,** Jackfruit, Jamun, Amla, Cashew, Custard apple **Vegetable crops:** Drumstick	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)

	(Moderately deep to deep, gravelly red sandy clay to clay soils)				
3	211.JDGhB1g1 200.KMHiB1 160.BSRhB1g1 161.BSRhB2 164.BSRiB1 134.GHTbB2g1 135.GHTcB1g1 136.GHTcB1g2 142.GHThB2g1 (Moderately deep to deep red sandy clay to clay soils)	**Hanamanahalli :**10,12,19 **Thalakanapura :** 89 **Vaddarahatti:**5,8,12,13,16,17,32,33, 34,35,36	Maize, Sorghum, Bajra, Groundnut, Redgram, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Pomegranate, Guava, Sapota, Jackfruit, Tamarind, Lime, Musambi, Amla, Custard apple **Vegetable crops:** Drumstick, Tomato, Chilli, Brinjal **Flower crops:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Jasmine	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
4	72.KTPhB2g1 Moderately shallow, red loamy soils)	**Hanamanahalli :** 22,23,25	Maize, Sorghum, Groundnut, Bajra, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Amla, Custard apple **Flower crops:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum **Vegetable crops:** Drumstick	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
5	54.LKRiB2g1 (Moderately shallow, red gravelly sandy clay soils)	**Irakallagada :**214,217,218 **Thalakanapura :**27	Sorghum, Groundnut, Bajra, Castor	**Fruit crops:** Amla, Cashew, Custard apple	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
6	328.RNKhB2 (Moderately shallow, black calcareous clay soils)	**Hanamanahalli :**26 **Vaddarahatti :**27	Sorghum, Bajra, Bengal gram, linseed, Safflower, Coriander	**Fruit crops:** Amla, Custard apple **Flower crops:** Marigold, Jasmine, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices

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 Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

- The soil phases with sizeable area identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series of BPR(156 ha), HDH(76 ha), KDT(53 ha), GHT (30 ha), GDP(29 ha), BSR(26 ha), RNK (18 ha), KTP(15 ha), LKR(14 ha),BDG (3 ha), KVR(3 ha), NGP(2 ha), JDG(2 ha) and KMH(1 ha).
- As per land capability classification, entire area in the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II and III). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil and erosion.

- On the basis of soil reaction, an area of about 203 ha (47 %) is slightly acid (pH 6.0-6.5) 178 ha (41%) is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3), 41 ha (10%) is slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and 4 ha (<1 %) is moderately alkaline (pH 7.8-8.4) alkaline in reaction.

Soil Health Management

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

Acid soils

Acid soils occupy an area of about 203 ha (47%) in the microwatershed. The following measures are recommended for reclaiming acid soils.

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

Alkaline soils

An area of about 45 ha (10 %) is under alkaline soils. The following actions are recommended.

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

Neutral soils

Neutral soils cover about 178 ha (41 %) and the following actions are recommended.

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

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

Soil Degradation

Soil erosion is one of the major factors affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. An area of about 192 ha (44%) is under moderate and 12 ha (3%) is severe erosion. The areas with moderate and severe erosion need immediate soil and water conservation and, other land development and land husbandry practices for restoring soil health.

Dissemination of Information and Communication of Benefits

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

Inputs for Net Planning (Saturation Plan) and Interventions needed

Net planning in IWMP is focusing on preparation of

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

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

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

- **Gravelliness:** More gravel content is favorable for run-off harvesting but poor in soil moisture storage and nutrient availability. It is a significant parameter that decides the kind of crop to be raised.
- **Land Capability Classification:** The land capability map shows the areas suitable and not suitable for agriculture and the major constraints in each of the plot/survey number. Hence, one can decide what kind of enterprise is possible in each of these units. In general, erosion and soil are the major constraints in Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed.
- **Organic Carbon:** An area of about 417 ha (97%) is medium (0.5-0.75%) in OC and high(>0.75%) in 8 ha (2%) OC content. The areas that are medium in OC needs to be further improved by applying farmyard manure and rotating crops with cereals and legumes or mixed cropping.
- **Promoting green manuring:** Growing of green manuring crops costs Rs. 1250/ha (green manuring seeds) and about Rs. 2000/ha towards cultivation that totals to Rs. 3250/- per ha. On the other hand, application of organic manure @ 10 tons/ha costs Rs. 5000/ha. The practice needs to be continued for 2-3 years or more. Nitrogen fertilizer needs to be supplemented by 25% in addition to the recommended level in 417 ha area where OC is less than 0.75 per cent. For example, for rainfed maize, recommended level is 50 kg N per ha and an additional 12 kg /ha needs to be applied for all the crops grown in these plots.
- **Available Phosphorus**: Available phosphorus is medium in 327 ha (76%) and high (>57 kg/ha) in 99 ha (23%) of the soils. The areas with high phosphorus content reduce 25% from the RDF to avoid the excess application of fertilizer and apply additional 25% phosphorus in areas where it is medium.
- **Available Potassium:** Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in entire area of the microwatershed. The areas with high potassium content reduce 25% from the RDF to avoid the excess application of fertilizer and apply additional 25% potassium in areas where it is medium.
- **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops. Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in 318 ha (73%) and medium in 108 ha (25%) area of the microwatershed. Areas with low and medium in available sulphur need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or Factamphos (p) fertitilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.
- **Available iron:** It is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in 215 ha (50 %) and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 211 ha (49 %) area of the microwatershed. To manage iron deficiency iron sulphate @ 25 kg/ha needs to be applied for 2-3 years.
- **Available Zinc:** It is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in the 388 ha (90 %) and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 37 ha (9 %) area of the microwatershed. Application of zinc sulphate @ 25kg/ha is to be followed in areas that are deficient in available zinc.
- **Available Boron:** Available boron is low in (<0.5ppm) entire area in the microwatershed. The areas with low in boron content need to be applied with sodium borate @ 10kg/ha as soil application or 0.2% borax as foliar spray to correct the deficiency.
- **Available manganese**: It is sufficient in the entire area of the microwatershed**.**

- **Available copper:** It is sufficient in the entire area of the microwatershed**.**
- **Soil acidity:** The microwatershed has 203 ha (47 %) area with soils that are slightly acid. These areas need application of lime (Calcium Carbonate).
- **Soil alkalinity:** An area of about 45 ha (10%) in the microwatershed has soils that are slightly to moderately alkaline. These areas need application of gypsum and wherever calcium is in excess, iron pyrites and element sulphur can be recommended. Management practices like treating repeatedly with good quality water to drain out the excess salts and provision of subsurface drainage and growing of salt tolerant crops like Casuarina, Acasia, Neem, Ber etc, are recommended.

  Land Suitability for various crops: Areas that are highly, moderately and marginally suitable 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 Kanakapur-1 microwatershed, the land resource inventory database generated under Sujala-III project has been transformed as information through series of interpretative (thematic) maps using soil phase map as a base. The various thematic maps (1:7920 scale) generated were

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



Apart from these, Hand Level/ Hydro Marker/ Dumpy Level/ Total Station and Kathedars' List 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 clayey black soils	
0.45	2	0.75	01:01	0.92		
0.45	2.4	0.75	1.3:1	1.07	Shallow clayey black soils	
0.6	3.1	0.7	1.78:1	1.29	Medium clayey black soils	
0.5	3	0.85	1.47:1	1.49		

Formation of Trench cum Bund

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

Details of Borrow Pit dimensions are given below



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

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

B. Waterways

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

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

c) The design details are given in the Manual.

C. Farm Ponds

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

D. Diversion Channel

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

9.1.2 Non-Arable Land Treatment

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

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

a) The cadastral map has to be updated as regards the network of drainge lines (gullies/ *nalas/ hallas*) and existing structures are marked to the scale and storage capacity of the existing water bodies are documented (Fig.9.1).

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 Levelling 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 earthern checks in the natural water course. Location and design details are given in the Manual.



Fig. 9.1 Drainage line treatment map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

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. 9.2) showing soil and water conservation plan with different kinds of structures recommended has been prepared which shows the spatial distribution and extent of area. A maximum area of about 352 ha (81 %) needs trench cum bunding, an area of about 56 ha (13 %) needs graded bunding and 18 ha (4%) requires strengthening of existing bunds/ bunding. The conservation plan prepared may be presented to all the stakeholders including farmers and after considering their suggestions, the conservation plan for the microwatershed may be finalized in a participatory approach.



Fig. 9.2 Soil and Water Conservation Plan map of Kanakapur-1 Microwatershed

9.3 Greening of Microwatershed

As part of the greening programme in the watersheds, it is envisaged to plant a variety of horticultural and other tree plants that are edible, economical and produce lot of biomass which helps to restore the ecological balance in the watersheds. The lands

that are suitable for greening programme are non-arable lands (land capability classes V, VI VII and VIII) and also the lands that are not suitable or marginally suitable for growing annual and perennial crops. The method of planting these trees is given below.

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

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

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

References

1. FAO (1976) Framework for Land Evaluation, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.72 pp.
2. FAO (1983) Guidelines for Land Evaluation for Rainfed Agriculture, FAO, Rome, 237 pp.
3. IARI (1971) Soil Survey Manual, All India Soil and Land Use Survey Organization, IARI, New Delhi, 121 pp.
4. Katyal, J.C. and Rattan, R.K. (2003) Secondary and Micronutrients; 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

Kanakapur-1(4D4A1S1C) Microwatershed

Soil Phase Information

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	L M U	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Budashettynala	21	0.03	KVRiB2	LMU-1	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIe	Graded bunding
Budashettynala	22	0.4	KVRiB2	LMU-1	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Sugarcane (Sc)	Not Available	IIIe	Graded bunding
Budashettynala	23	0.55	KVRiB2	LMU-1	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIe	Graded bunding
Budashettynala	24	1.21	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Budashettynala	25	1.6	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Budashettynala	26	1.67	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Budashettynala	27	8.16	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram+Fallow land(Mz+Rg+Fl)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Budashettynala	28	1.14	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Budashettynala	30	0.79	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Budashettynala	36	0.9	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Budashettynala	37	0.47	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current Fallow Land (CFL)	1 Borewell	IIIes	TCB
Budashettynala	38	0.2	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	10	0	GHTcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Hanamanahalli	12	0.03	GHTcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Hanamanahalli	18	3.02	BPRhB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Chilli+Redgram (Ch+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	19	4.58	GHTcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Chilli+Maize+Redgram (Ch+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Hanamanahalli	20	7.34	BPRhB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Castor+Maize+Redgram (Ca+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	21	8.48	BPRhB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Pearl millet (Pm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	22	7.06	KTPhB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	23	6.13	KTPhB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	24	7.33	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Pearl millet (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	25	3.68	KTPhB2g1	LMU-4	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	2 Borewell	IIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	26	7.16	RNKhB2	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	TCB

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	L M U	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Hanamanahalli	48	0.01	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Fallowland+Maize+Redgram (Fl+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	51	0.31	BPRiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram+Tomato(Mz+Rg+Tm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Hanamanahalli	52	0.55	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Watermelon (Rg+Wm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Irakallagada	205	0.1	BDGcB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram+Vegetables (Mz+Rg+Veg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Irakallagada	206	0.5	BDGcB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Vegetables (Rg+Veg)	1 Borewell	IIIs	TCB
Irakallagada	212	2.41	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Granite Outcrop	Not Available	RO	RO
Irakallagada	214	3.93	LKRiB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Vegetables (Rg+Veg)	2 Borewell	IIes	TCB
Irakallagada	215	0.39	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Irakallagada	216	0.06	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Irakallagada	217	7.56	LKRiB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Paddy (Rg+Pd)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Irakallagada	218	6.23	LKRiB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Paddy (Rg+Pd)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	1	9.47	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Cotton+Redgram+Tomato (Cf+Ct+Rg+Tm)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	2	13.67	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Pearlmillet+Redgram (Pm+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	3	8.1	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Pearlmillet+Redgram (Mz+Pm+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	4	5.27	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Fallowland+Maize(Cf+Fl+Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	5	2.55	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	6	2.27	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Chilli+Maize+Pearl millet (Ch+Mz+Pm)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	7	7.02	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	8	3.27	HDHhB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	9	4.66	HDHhB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	10	0.28	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	11	0.7	KDTiB1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	12	4.54	HDHhB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Chilly+Maize+Pearl millet (Ch+Mz+Pm)	1 Borewell	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	13	6.7	HDHiB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	14	6.95	HDHhB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	L M U	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Thalakanapura	15	3.41	HDHhB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Pearl millet (Mz+Pm)	1 Borewell	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	16	3.7	BPRhB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	1 Borewell	IIIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	17	0.23	BPRhB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	18	4.24	BPRhB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	19	2.72	BPRhB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Pearlmillet+Redgram (Pm+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	20	2.13	HDHcB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram+Tomato (Gn+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	21	1.96	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut+Redgram (Gn+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	22	1.18	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Maize+Pearlmillet+Redgram+Tomato(Cf+Mz+Pm+Rg+Tm)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	23	0.59	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	26	0.69	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	27	0.18	LKRiB2g1	LMU-5	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Castor+Pearlmillet+Redgram(Ca+Pm+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	56	0.03	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	57	0.16	BPRcB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	65	0.97	BPRiA1g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Redgram (Cf+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	66	2.74	BPRiA1g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	67	5.26	BPRiA1g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Mesta+Redgram(Cf+Mst+Rg)	1 Borewell	IIIes	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	68	7.51	BPRbB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize+Redgram(Gn+Mz+Rg)	1 Borewell	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	72	5.31	BPRbB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Pearl millet (Mz+Pm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	73	1.86	BPRhC3g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Severe	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	74	5.72	BPRhC3g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Severe	Fallowland+Maize+Redgram(Fl+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	75	3.73	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	76	1.98	BPRhC3g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Severe	Horsegram+Redgram (Hg+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	80	1.74	BPRcC2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Moderate	Currentfallow+Maize+Redgram (Cf+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	81	7.11	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Castor+Maize+Redgram (Ca+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	82	4.55	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	L M U	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Thalakanapura	83	1.17	BPRcC2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize+Seasamum (Gn+Mz+Sm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	84	1.1	BPRcC2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Gently sloping (3-5%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	85	3.59	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Tomato (Rg+Tm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	86	2.2	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	87	1.11	BPRcB2g2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Thalakanapura	88	1.11	BPRcA1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	89	0.1	JDGhB1g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Medium (101-150 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Currentfallow+Maize+Redgram (Cf+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Thalakanapura	92	1.4	BPRcA1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	93	2.78	BPRcA1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Castor (Ca)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	94	5.21	BPRcA1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Castor+Pearlmillet+Redgram(Ca+Pm+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	95	2.09	BPRcA1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Fallow land+Maize (Fl+Mz)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Thalakanapura	96	4.98	BPRcB1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Cotton+Maize+Redgram (Ct+Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	5	5.33	BSRiB1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	6	6.1	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	7	3.67	HDHhB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Current fallow (Rg+Cf)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	8	4.74	BSRiB1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	10	0.25	HDHcB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Fallow land (Rg+Fl)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	11	7.25	HDHcB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Maize+Fallow land(Rg+Mz+Fl)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	12	4.52	BSRhB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Tomato+Crossandra (Tm+Crd)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	13	5.1	BSRhB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Tomato+Watermelon(Rg+Tm+Wm)	2 Borewell	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	14	5.21	HDHcB1g1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Maize (Rg+Mz)	5 Borewell	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	15	6.62	HDHhB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Maize+Currentfallow(Rg+Mz+Cf)	1 Borewell	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	16	9.72	BSRhB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Watermelon+Tomato+Redgram+Pearlmillet+Maize(Wm+Tm+Rg+Pm+Mz)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	17	2.57	BSRhB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	18	3.89	HDHiB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIs	TCB

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	L M U	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Vaddarahatti	19	5.14	HDHiB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Tomato (Tm)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	20	1.37	BPRcB1g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Pearl millet (Rg+Pm)	Not Available	IIIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	21	4.04	HDHiB1	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Pearl millet (Rg+Pm)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	22	7.17	HDHhB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Pearl millet (Rg+Pm)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	23	6.53	GDPhB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	1 Borewell	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	24	4.24	HDHhB2	LMU-2	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	25	8.53	GDPhB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Pearlmillet++Tomato+ Water melon (Pm+Tm+Wm)	1 Borewell	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	26	8.93	GDPhB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	27	4.31	RNKhB2	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Current fallow (Cf)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	28	8.08	GDPhB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Groundnut (Rg+Gn)	1 Borewell	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	29	7.3	BPRbB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Pearl millet (Rg+Pm)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	30	5.15	BPRbB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	31	5.35	BPRbB2g1	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	32	5.75	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Currentfallow+Redgram+Pearl millet (Cf+Rg+Pm)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	33	6.71	GHTcB1g2	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram+Pearlmillet+ Maize (Rg+Pm+Mz)	Not Available	IIs	TCB
Vaddarahatti	34	5.03	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Current fallow (Rg+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	35	1.45	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Current fallow (Rg+Cf)	Not Available	IIes	TCB
Vaddarahatti	36	1.23	GHTbB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Loamy sand	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Neiger (Rg+Ng)	Not Available	IIes	TCB

Appendix II

Kanakapur-1(4D4A1S1C) 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
Budashettynala	21	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Budashettynala	22	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Budashettynala	23	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Budashettynala	24	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Budashettynala	25	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)
Budashettynala	26	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)
Budashettynala	27	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)
Budashettynala	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Budashettynala	30	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)
Budashettynala	36	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)
Budashettynala	37	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)
Budashettynala	38	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)
Hanamanahalli	10	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	12	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	18	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	19	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	20	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	21	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	22	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	23	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	24	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	25	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	26	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 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
Hanamanahalli	48	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	51	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Hanamanahalli	52	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	205	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	206	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	212	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Irakallagada	214	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	215	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	216	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	217	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Irakallagada	218	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Thalakanapura	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)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Thalakanapura	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)
Thalakanapura	3	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	4	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	5	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	6	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	7	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	8	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)
Thalakanapura	9	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)
Thalakanapura	10	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	11	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Thalakanapura	12	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)
Thalakanapura	13	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)
Thalakanapura	14	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
Thalakanapura	15	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)
Thalakanapura	16	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)
Thalakanapura	17	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)
Thalakanapura	18	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)
Thalakanapura	19	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)
Thalakanapura	20	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)
Thalakanapura	21	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)
Thalakanapura	22	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)
Thalakanapura	23	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)
Thalakanapura	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Thalakanapura	27	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)
Thalakanapura	56	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)
Thalakanapura	57	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)
Thalakanapura	65	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)
Thalakanapura	66	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)
Thalakanapura	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)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Thalakanapura	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)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Thalakanapura	72	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)
Thalakanapura	73	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)
Thalakanapura	74	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)
Thalakanapura	75	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)
Thalakanapura	76	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)
Thalakanapura	80	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)
Thalakanapura	81	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)
Thalakanapura	82	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)

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Thalakanapura	83	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)
Thalakanapura	84	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)
Thalakanapura	85	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)
Thalakanapura	86	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)
Thalakanapura	87	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)
Thalakanapura	88	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)
Thalakanapura	89	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)
Thalakanapura	92	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)
Thalakanapura	93	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)
Thalakanapura	94	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)
Thalakanapura	95	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)
Thalakanapura	96	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)
Vaddarahatti	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	7	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	8	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	10	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	11	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	12	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	13	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	14	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	15	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	16	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	17	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	18	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)	Deficient (< 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
Vaddarahatti	19	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	20	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	21	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	23	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	25	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)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	26	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	27	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)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	28	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	29	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	30	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	31	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	32	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	33	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	34	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	35	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vaddarahatti	36	Slightly acid (pH 6.0 – 6.5)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)

Appendix III

Kanakapur-1(4D4A1S1C) Microwatershed

Soil Suitability Information

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Redgram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry
Budashettynala	21	S2rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2zg	S2rz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2rz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz
Budashettynala	22	S2rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2zg	S2rz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2rz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz
Budashettynala	23	S2rz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	S3tz	S2zg	S2rz	S2z	S2z	S2z	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S2rz	S2z	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S2tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2tz	S2tz
Budashettynala	24	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	25	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	26	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	27	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	28	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	30	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	36	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	37	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Budashettynala	38	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	10	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Hanamanahalli	12	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Hanamanahalli	18	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	19	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Hanamanahalli	20	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	21	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	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	S3r	S3r
Hanamanahalli	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	S3r	S3r
Hanamanahalli	24	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	25	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	S3r	S3r
Hanamanahalli	26	N1rz	S2tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Hanamanahalli	48	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Hanamanahalli	51	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Redgram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry
Hanamanahalli	52	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Irakallagada	205	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g
Irakallagada	206	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g
Irakallagada	212	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
Irakallagada	214	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Irakallagada	215	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Irakallagada	216	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Irakallagada	217	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Irakallagada	218	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Thalakanapura	1	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	2	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	3	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	4	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	5	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	6	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	7	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	8	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	9	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	10	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	11	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t
Thalakanapura	12	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	13	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	14	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	15	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	16	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	17	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	18	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	S3g	S2g	S2g

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Redgram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry
Thalakanapura	19	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	20	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	21	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	22	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	23	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	26	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	S2g
Thalakanapura	27	N1rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	N1rg	S3rg	S2rt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg
Thalakanapura	56	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	57	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	65	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	66	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	67	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2gt	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	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	S3g	S2g	S2gt
Thalakanapura	72	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	S3g	S2g	S2gt
Thalakanapura	73	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	75	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	76	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	80	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	81	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	82	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	83	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	84	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	85	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	86	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	87	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	88	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	S3g	S2g	S2g

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Redgram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry
Thalakanapura	89	S2r	S2tg	S1	S2tg	S2t	S2g	S2r	S1	S2tg	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2r	S1	S2t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S1	S1	S2g	S2g	S1	S1
Thalakanapura	92	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	93	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	94	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	95	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Thalakanapura	96	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Vaddarahatti	5	S3r	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2rt	S3r	S2r	S2t	S2r	S2r	S1	S2r	S1	S1	S3r	S2r	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2r	S1	S1	S1	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	6	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	7	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	8	S3r	S1	S2r	S1	S2r	S2rt	S3r	S2r	S2t	S2r	S2r	S1	S2r	S1	S1	S3r	S2r	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2r	S1	S1	S1	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	10	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	11	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	12	S3r	S2tg	S2rg	S2g	S2rt	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2r	S2gt	S1	S2rg	S1	S2rt	S2rg	S2rg	S2t	S1	S1	S2tg	S2tg	S2rg	S1	S2tg	S2gt	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	13	S3r	S2tg	S2rg	S2g	S2rt	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2r	S2gt	S1	S2rg	S1	S2rt	S2rg	S2rg	S2t	S1	S1	S2tg	S2tg	S2rg	S1	S2tg	S2gt	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	14	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	15	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	16	S3r	S2tg	S2rg	S2g	S2rt	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2r	S2gt	S1	S2rg	S1	S2rt	S2rg	S2rg	S2t	S1	S1	S2tg	S2tg	S2rg	S1	S2tg	S2gt	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	17	S3r	S2tg	S2rg	S2g	S2rt	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2r	S2gt	S1	S2rg	S1	S2rt	S2rg	S2rg	S2t	S1	S1	S2tg	S2tg	S2rg	S1	S2tg	S2gt	S2r	S2r
Vaddarahatti	18	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	19	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	20	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	S3g	S2g	S2g
Vaddarahatti	21	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	22	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	23	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1
Vaddarahatti	24	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	S2g
Vaddarahatti	25	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1
Vaddarahatti	26	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1

Village	Survey No	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengalgram	Sunflower	Redgram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry
Vaddarahatti	27	N1rz	S2tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3tz	S2rz	N1tz	S3tz	S3rz	S3tz	S3tz	S3tz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2tz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S3rz
Vaddarahatti	28	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1
Vaddarahatti	29	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	S3g	S2g	S2gt
Vaddarahatti	30	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	S3g	S2g	S2gt
Vaddarahatti	31	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	S3g	S2g	S2gt
Vaddarahatti	32	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Vaddarahatti	33	S3rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S3g	S2rg	S2g
Vaddarahatti	34	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Vaddarahatti	35	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r
Vaddarahatti	36	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	S2g	S2rg	S2r

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

SALIENT FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

- *The data indicated that there were 91 (55.15%) men and 74 (44.85%) women among the sampled households.*
- *The average family size of landless farmers' was 6.5, marginal farmers' was 4.2, small farmers' was 5.45, semi medium farmers' was 6.29 and medium farmers' was 6.*
- *The data indicated that, 28 (16.97%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 72 (43.64%) were in 16-35 years of age, 47 (28.48%) were in 36-60 years of age and 18 (10.91 %) were above 61 years of age.*
- *The results indicated that Kanakapur-1 had 30.30 per cent illiterates, 35.15 per cent of them had primary school education, 2.42 per cent of them had middle school education, 10.30 per cent of them had high school education, 11.52 per cent of them had PUC education, 1.21 per cent of them did ITI, 4.85 per cent of them had degree education and 2 persons were doing masters.*
- *The results indicate that, 87.10 per cent of households practicing agriculture, 9.68 per cent of the households were agricultural laborers and 3.23 per cent were in government service.*
- *The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 18.18 per cent of the household members, 46.67 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.61 per cent were in government service, 1.82 per cent were in private service, 27.88 per cent were students, 3.03 per cent were housewives and 1.82 per cent were children.*
- *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 38.71 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 48.39 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 16.13 per cent of them possess pucca house.*
- *The results shows that 96.77 per cent of the households possess TV, 83.87 per cent of the households possess mixer grinder, 25.81 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 38.71 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 3.23 per cent of the households possess refrigerator and 97.14 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.*
- *The results shows that the average value of television was Rs.4300, mixer grinder was Rs.1800, motor cycle was Rs.28214, mobile phone was Rs.1435, bicycle was Rs.1222 and refrigerator was Rs.15000.*
- *About 22.58 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 29.03 per cent of them possess plough, 6.45 per cent of them possess tractor, 38.71 per cent of them posses sprayer, 93.55 per cent of them possess weeder, 3.23 per cent of them possess harvester and 3.23 per cent of them possess thresher.*

- *The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.15400, plough was Rs.1900, the average value of tractor was Rs. 250000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.1064, the average value of harvester was Rs.3500, thresher was Rs.50000 and the average value of weeder Rs.40.*
- *The results indicate that, 29.03 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 12.90 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.23 per cent of the households possess buffalo.*
- *The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.71, average own labour (women) available was 1.65, average hired labour (men) available was 6.74 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.39.*
- *The results indicate that, 96.77 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that, households of the Kanakapur-1 micro watershed possess 22.29 ha (38.40%) of dry land and 35.76 ha (61.60%) of irrigated land.*
- *The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 273633 and average value of irrigated was Rs. 392264.*
- *The results indicate that, there were 9 functioning and 11 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 29.03 per cent of the farmers.*
- *The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 22.71 meters.*
- *The results indicate that, semi medium and medium farmers had irrigated area of 7.50 ha and 2.02 ha respectively.*
- *The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (16.5 ha), bajra (9.5 ha), cotton (2.63 ha), groundnut (4.63 ha), navane (0.81 ha), sesamum (0.81 ha), sorghum (0.81 ha), sunflower (0.88 ha), tomato (2.11 ha) and Bengal gram (0.73 ha).*
- *The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed was found to be 86.25 per cent.*
- *The results indicate that, 93.55 per cent of the households have bank account and 38.71 per cent of the households have savings.*
- *The results indicate that, 90.32 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 23916. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 26575.54. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 2659.54, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.11.*

- *The total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 24282.12. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 23280.87. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -1001.25. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.96.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 36079.54. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 35197.50. The net income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. -882.04. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.98.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 24352.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 70110. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 45757.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.88.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 36632.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45304.12. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 8671.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.24.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35183.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 67306.06. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 32122.69. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.91.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 36338.34. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 111921.87. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 75583.53. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:3.08.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for navane was Rs. 18748.01. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 36309. The net income from navane cultivation was Rs. 17560.99. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.94.*
- *The total cost of cultivation for sesamum was Rs. 27478.47. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 24700. The net income from sesamum cultivation was Rs. -2778.47. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.9.*
- *The results indicate that, 6.45 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 9.68 per cent of the households opined that green fodder was adequate. Around 12.90 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs.30000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs.60810, for small farmers it was Rs.100354, for semi medium farmers it was Rs.98328, and for medium farmers it was Rs.105000.*
- *The results indicate that the average annual expenditure is Rs. 7730. For landless households it was Rs.7500, for marginal farmers it was Rs 2405, for small farmers it was Rs. 8834, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 7632, and for medium farmers it was Rs. 50000.*
- *The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 18 coconut and 3 mango trees in their field.*
- *The results indicate that, households have planted 3 teak trees, 71 neem trees and 3 tamarind trees in their field and 3 neem trees in their backyard.*

- *The results indicated that, bajra, chilly, groundnut, ladies finger, mango, paddy, tomato were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Maize was sold to the extent of 93.38 per cent.*
- *The results indicated that, about 100 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets. But some farmers also sold their produce in cooperative marketing society.*
- *The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce, but 12.90 per cent have also used cart.*
- *The results indicated that, 51.61 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm.*
- *The results indicated that, 90.32 per cent have shown interest in soil test.*
- *The results indicated that, 16.13 per cent of the households adopted field bunding and 3.23 per cent have adopted summer ploughing.*
- *The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households who have adopted field bunding opined that they require full replacement of the structure.*
- *The results indicated that, government was the main agency that was involved in constructing soil conservation structures in the micro watershed.*
- *The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 38.71 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 61.29 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent used fire wood and 12.90 per cent of the households used LPG.*
- *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, 32.26 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 30 per cent of the marginal, 18.18 per cent of the small, 28.57 per cent of the semi medium and 100 per cent of the medium farmers.*
- *The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card, 3.23 per cent of the households possessed APL card and 9.68 per cent did not possess PDS card.*
- *The results indicated that, 51.43 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 38.71 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 6.45 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 12.90 per cent, fruits were adequate for 22.58 per cent, milk was adequate for 16.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 16.13 per cent and meat was adequate for 9.68 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicated that, cereals were inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households, pulses were inadequate for 54.84 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate*

for 77.42 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 58.06 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 35.48 per cent, milk was inadequate for 35.48 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 61.29 per cent and meat was inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households.

- *The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 83.87 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (48.39%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (41.94%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.90%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (25.81%), high rate of interest on credit (3.23%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25.81%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (22.58%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (45.16%), less rainfall (29.03%) inadequate extension services (16.13%) and source of agri technology information (12.90).*

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

Kanakapur-1 micro-watershed (Kalakeri sub-watershed, Koppal Taluk and District) is located at North latitude 15^0 25’ 30.219’’ to 15^0 23’ 29.99 and East longitude 76^0 12’ 42.124’’ to 76^0 10’ 50.564’’ covering an area of 432.70 ha and spread across Hanumanahalli, Vaddarahatti, Irakallaguda, Thalakanapura and Budashettynala 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 31 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 Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 31 farmers were sampled in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed among them 2 (6.45%) were landless, 10 (32.26%) were marginal farmers, 11 (35.48%) were small farmers, 7 (22.58%) were semi medium farmers, and 1 (3.23%) was medium farmers.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	2	6.45	10	32.26	11	35.48	7	22.58	1	3.23	31	100.00

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that there were 91 (55.15%) men and 74 (44.85%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 6.5, marginal farmers' was 4.2, small farmers' was 5.45, semi medium farmers' was 6.29 and medium farmers' was 6.

Table 2: Population characteristics of Kanakapur-1 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (13)		MF (42)		SF (60)		SMF (44)		MDF (6)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Male	6	46.15	26	61.90	33	55.00	24	54.55	2	33.33	91	55.15
2	Female	7	53.85	16	38.10	27	45.00	20	45.45	4	66.67	74	44.85
Total		13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00
Average		6.50		4.20		5.45		6.29		6.00		5.32	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 3. The data indicated that, 28 (16.97%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 72 (43.64%) were in 16-35 years of age, 47 (28.48%) were in 36-60 years of age and 18 (10.91 %) were above 61 years of age.

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

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (13)		MF (42)		SF (60)		SMF (44)		MDF (6)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	4	30.77	4	9.52	12	20.00	4	9.09	4	66.67	28	16.97
2	16-35 years of age	6	46.15	18	42.86	27	45.00	21	47.73	0	0.00	72	43.64
3	36-60 years of age	2	15.38	14	33.33	13	21.67	16	36.36	2	33.33	47	28.48
4	> 61 years	1	7.69	6	14.29	8	13.33	3	6.82	0	0.00	18	10.91
Total		13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that

Kanakapur-1 had 30.30 per cent illiterates, 35.15 per cent of them had primary school education, 2.42 per cent of them had middle school education, 10.30 per cent of them had high school education, 11.52 per cent of them had PUC education, 1.21 per cent of them did ITI, 4.85 per cent of them had degree education and 2 persons were doing masters.

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

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (13)		MF (42)		SF (60)		SMF (44)		MDF (6)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	4	30.77	13	30.95	19	31.67	14	31.82	0	0.00	50	30.30
2	Primary School	5	38.46	19	45.24	21	35.00	7	15.91	6	100.00	58	35.15
3	Middle School	1	7.69	1	2.38	2	3.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	2.42
4	High School	0	0.00	1	2.38	7	11.67	9	20.45	0	0.00	17	10.30
5	PUC	2	15.38	5	11.90	5	8.33	7	15.91	0	0.00	19	11.52
6	ITI	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	4.55	0	0.00	2	1.21
7	Degree	0	0.00	2	4.76	2	3.33	4	9.09	0	0.00	8	4.85
8	Masters	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.21
9	Others	1	7.69	1	2.38	2	3.33	1	2.27	0	0.00	5	3.03
Total		13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00

Occupation of household heads: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 87.10 per cent of households practicing agriculture, 9.68 per cent of the households were agricultural laborers and 3.23 per cent were in government service.

Table 5: Occupation of household heads in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	0	0.00	10	100.00	10	90.91	6	85.71	1	100.00	27	87.10
2	Agricultural Labour	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	3	9.68
3	Government Service	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
Total		2	100.00	10	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	31	100.00

Occupation of the household members: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 6. The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 18.18 per cent of the household members, 46.67 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.61 per cent were in government service, 1.82 per cent were in private service, 27.88 per cent were students, 3.03 per cent were housewives and 1.82 per cent were children. In case of landless farmers, 61.54 per cent were agricultural laborers, and 30.77 per cent were students. In case of marginal farmers 26.19 per cent were agriculturists, 52.38 per cent were agricultural laborers and 21.43 per cent were students. In case of small farmers, 16.67 per cent were agriculturists, 41.67 per cent were agricultural laborers, 1.67 per cent were in government service, 31.67 per cent were students and 3.33 per cent were children. In case of semi medium farmers, 18.18 per cent were agriculturists, 47.73 per cent were agricultural laborer, 6.82 per cent were in private service and 22.73 per cent were students. In case of medium farmers,

16.67 per cent were agriculturists, another 16.67 per cent were agricultural laborers and 66.67 per cent were students.

Table 6: Occupation of family members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (13)		MF (42)		SF (60)		SMF (44)		MDF (6)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	0	0.00	11	26.19	10	16.67	8	18.18	1	16.67	30	18.18
2	Agricultural Labour	8	61.54	22	52.38	25	41.67	21	47.73	1	16.67	77	46.67
3	Government Service	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.61
4	Private Service	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	6.82	0	0.00	3	1.82
5	Student	4	30.77	9	21.43	19	31.67	10	22.73	4	66.67	46	27.88
6	Housewife	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	5.00	2	4.55	0	0.00	5	3.03
7	Children	1	7.69	0	0.00	2	3.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1.82
Total		13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00

Institutional participation of the household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 7. The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed have not participated in any local institutions.

Table 7. Institutional Participation of household members in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (13)		MF (42)		SF (60)		SMF (44)		MDF (6)		All (165)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00
Total		13	100.00	42	100.00	60	100.00	44	100.00	6	100.00	165	100.00

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that 38.71 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 48.39 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 16.13 per cent of them possess pucca house. In case of marginal farmers, 20 per cent of the households possess thatched house and 80 per cent of the households possess katcha house. 100 per cent of the landless farmers possess. In case of small farmers, 45.45 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 45.45 per cent of them possess katcha and 18.18 per cent of them possess pucca house. In case of semi medium farmers, 28.57 per cent of them possess thatched house, 28.57 per cent of the households possess katcha house, and 42.86 per cent of them possess pucca house. 100 per cent of the medium farm households possess thatched house.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	2	100.00	2	20.00	5	45.45	2	28.57	1	100.00	12	38.71
2	Katcha	0	0.00	8	80.00	5	45.45	2	28.57	0	0.00	15	48.39
3	Pucca/RCC	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	18.18	3	42.86	0	0.00	5	16.13
Total		2	100.00	10	100.00	12	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00

Durable Assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 9. The results shows that 96.77 per cent of the households possess TV, 83.87 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 25.81 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 38.71 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 3.23 per cent of the households possess refrigerator and 97.14 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.

Table 9. Durable Assets owned by households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	2	100.00	9	90.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	30	96.77
2	Mixer/Grinder	2	100.00	6	60.00	10	90.91	7	100.00	1	100.00	26	83.87
3	Refrigerator	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
4	Bicycle	0	0.00	3	30.00	4	36.36	1	14.29	0	0.00	8	25.81
5	Motor Cycle	1	50.00	4	40.00	4	36.36	3	42.86	0	0.00	12	38.71
6	Mobile Phone	2	100.00	10	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	31	100.00

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 10. The results shows that the average value of television was Rs.4300, mixer grinder was Rs.1800, motor cycle was Rs.28214, mobile phone was Rs.1435, bicycle was Rs.1222 and refrigerator was Rs.15000.

Table 10. Average value of durable assets owned by households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Average value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Television	5,500.00	3,000.00	4,636.00	4,857.00	6,000.00	4,300.00
2	Mixer/Grinder	1,500.00	1,166.00	2,750.00	1,200.00	1,500.00	1,800.00
3	Refrigerator	0.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	15,000.00
4	Bicycle	0.00	1,000.00	1,400.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,222.00
5	Motor Cycle	25,000.00	33,000.00	28,600.00	23,750.00	0.00	28,214.00
6	Mobile Phone	2,000.00	911.00	1,833.00	1,368.00	2,000.00	1,435.00

Table 11. Farm Implements owned by households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		LF (0)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock Cart	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	1	100.00	0	0.00	7	22.58
2	Plough	0	0.00	2	20.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	1	100.00	0	0.00	9	29.03
3	Tractor	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.45
4	Sprayer	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	54.55	5	71.43	1	100.00	0	0.00	12	38.71
5	Weeder	1	50.00	10	100.00	12	109.09	5	71.43	1	100.00	0	0.00	29	93.55
6	Harvester	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
7	Thresher	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
8	Blank	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23

Farm Implements owned: The data regarding the farm implements owned by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 11. About 22.58 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 29.03 per cent of them possess plough, 6.45

per cent of them possess tractor, 38.71 per cent of them posses sprayer, 93.55 per cent of them possess weeder, 3.23 per cent of them possess harvester and 3.23 per cent of them possess thresher.

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.15400, plough was Rs.1900, the average value of tractor was Rs. 250000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.1064, the average value of harvester was Rs.3500, thresher was Rs.50000 and the average value of weeder Rs.40.

Table 12. Average value of farm implements owned by households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Bullock Cart	0.00	0.00	18,250.00	9,900.00	15,000.00	15,400.00
2	Plough	0.00	666.00	1,083.00	8,250.00	1,500.00	1,900.00
3	Tractor	0.00	300,000.00	0.00	200,000.00	0.00	250,000.00
4	Sprayer	0.00	0.00	2,207.00	2700.00	1480.00	1064.50
5	Weeder	16.00	28.00	43.00	64.00	16.00	40.00
6	Harvester	0.00	3,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,500.00
7	Thresher	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	0.00	50,000.00

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 13. The results indicate that, 29.03 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 12.90 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.23 per cent of the households possess buffalo.

In case of marginal households, 20 per cent possess bullocks. Among small farmers, 36.36 per cent of the households possess bullock and 27.27 per cent possess local cow. In case of semi medium farmers, 28.57 per cent of households possess bullock and 14.29 per cent of households possess local cow. Medium farmers possess bullock and buffalo.

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

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	0	0.00	2	20.00	4	36.36	2	28.57	1	100.00	9	29.03
2	Local cow	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	27.27	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	12.90
3	Buffalo	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1	3.23
4	blank	2	100.00	8	80.00	6	54.55	5	71.43	0	0.00	21	67.74

Table 14. Average Labour availability in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Own labour Male	2.00	1.70	1.55	2.00	1.00	1.71
2	Own Labour Female	2.00	1.40	1.64	1.86	2.00	1.65
3	Hired labour Male	1.00	7.10	7.27	7.00	7.00	6.74
4	Hired labour Female	2.50	7.20	8.09	7.86	8.00	7.39

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 14. The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.71, average own labour (women) available was 1.65, average hired labour (men) available was 6.74 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.39.

Adequacy of Hired Labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 96.77 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

Table 15. Adequacy of Hired Labour in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Inadequate	2	100.00	10	100.00	10	90.91	7	100.00	1	100.00	30	96.77

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, households of the Kanakapur-1 micro watershed possess 22.29 ha (38.40%) of dry land and 35.76 ha (61.60%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 4.37 ha (100%) of dry land. Small farmers possess 8.20 ha (76.02%) of dry land and 2.59 ha (23.98%) of irrigated land. Semi medium possess 6.07 ha (38.95%) of dry land and 9.51 ha (61.05%) of irrigated land. Medium farmers possess 19.21 ha (100%) of irrigated land, large farmers possess 3.64 ha 45%) of dry land and 4.45 ha (55%) of irrigated land.

Table 16. Distribution of land (Ha) in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%
1	Dry	0	0	8.16	100	14.76	100	9.95	62.87	0	0	32.88	80.63
2	Irrigated	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.88	37.13	2.02	100	7.90	19.37
Total		0	100	8.16	100	14.76	100	15.83	100	2.02	100	40.78	100

Average land value (Rs./ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 17. The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 273633 and average value of irrigated was Rs. 392264. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 404115 for dry land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 257291 for dry land. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 190849 for dry land and Rs. 391253 for irrigated land. In case of medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 395200 for irrigated land.

Table 17. Average land value (Rs./ha) in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Dry	0.00	404,115.02	257,291.67	190,849.94	0.00	273,633.68
2	Irrigated	0.00	0.00	0.00	391,253.44	395,200.00	392,264.34

Status of bore wells: The data regarding the status of bore wells in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, there were 9 functioning and 11 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	De-functioning	0	2	2	5	2	11
2	Functioning	0	1	2	5	1	9

Source of irrigation: The data regarding the source of irrigation in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 19. The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 29.03 per cent of the farmers.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bore Well	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	18.18	5	71.43	1	100.00	9	29.03

Depth of water (Avg in meters): The data regarding the depth of water in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 20. The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 22.71 meters.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Bore Well	0.00	7.62	8.31	61.40	106.68	22.71

Irrigated Area (ha): The results (Table 21) indicate that, semi medium and medium farmers had irrigated area of 7.50 ha and 2.02 ha respectively.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Kharif	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	2.02	7.90
2	Rabi	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.62	0.00	1.62
Total		0.00	0.00	0.00	7.50	2.02	9.52

Table 22. Cropping pattern in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed (Area in ha)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Kharif - Maize	0	2.43	7.51	5.34	1.21	16.5
2	Kharif - Bajra	0	2.83	3.43	3.24	0	9.5
3	Kharif - Cotton	0	0.49	0	1.34	0.81	2.63
4	Kharif - Groundnut	0	0	2.52	2.11	0	4.63
5	Kharif - Navane (Fox Millet)	0	0.81	0	0	0	0.81
6	Kharif - Sesamum (yellu)	0	0	0	0.81	0	0.81
7	Kharif - Sorghum	0	0.81	0	0	0	0.81
8	Kharif - Sunflower	0	0.88	0	0	0	0.88
9	Kharif - Tomato	0	0	1.3	0.81	0	2.11
10	Rabi - Bengal gram	0	0.73	0	0	0	0.73
Total		0	8.98	14.75	13.65	2.02	39.4

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 22. The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (16.5 ha), bajra (9.5 ha), cotton (2.63 ha), groundnut (4.63 ha), navane (0.81 ha), sesamum (0.81 ha), sorghum (0.81 ha), sunflower (0.88 ha), tomato (2.11 ha) and Bengal gram (0.73 ha). Marginal farmers have grown maize, bajra, cotton, navane, sorghum, sunflower and bengalgram. Small farmers have grown maize, bajra, groundnut and tomato. Semi medium farmers have grown maize, bajra, cotton, groundnut, sesamum and tomato. Medium farmers have grown maize and cotton.

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 23. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed was found to be 86.25 per cent. In case of marginal farmers it was 94.87 per cent, for small farmers it was 91.67 per cent, in case of semi medium farmers it was 84.89 per cent, and medium farmers had cropping intensity of 50 per cent.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Cropping Intensity	0.00	94.87	91.67	84.89	50.00	86.25

Possession of Bank account and savings: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 24. The results indicate that, 93.55 per cent of the households have bank account and 38.71 per cent of the households have savings.

Table 24. Possession of Bank account and savings in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Account	2	100.00	9	90.00	10	90.91	7	100.00	1	100.00	29	93.55
2	Savings	2	100.00	5	50.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	1	100.00	12	38.71

Borrowing status: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, 90.32 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.

Table 25. Borrowing status in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Credit Availed	2	100.00	8	80.00	10	90.91	7	100.00	1	100.00	28	90.32

Cost of Cultivation of Maize: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of maize in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 26. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 23916. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 26575.54. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 2659.54, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.11.

Table 26. Cost of Cultivation of maize in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	27.83	6139.92	25.67
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.61	886.16	3.71
3	Tractor		Hours	2.21	1653.91	6.92
4	Machinery		Hours	0.68	406.25	1.70
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	13.96	1675.04	7.00
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	8.67	1734.52	7.25
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.38	3568.23	14.92
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / ltrs	0.90	925.66	3.87
10	Irrigation		Number	3.60	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	173.83	0.73
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				949.57	3.97
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				18113.10	75.74
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				190.48	0.80
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				18303.58	76.53
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			12.99	3428.60	14.34
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				21732.18	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				9.64	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				21741.82	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2174.18	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				23916.00	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		17.64	21670.35	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1228.57	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		6.67	4905.19	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			735.71	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				26575.54	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				2659.54	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1355.89	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.11	

Cost of cultivation of Bajra: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of bajra in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 24282.12. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 23280.87. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -1001.25. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.96.

Table 27. Cost of Cultivation of bajra in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	29.75	6710.73	27.64
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.88	395.42	1.63
3	Tractor		Hours	2.74	2058.33	8.48
4	Machinery		Hours	0.83	500.72	2.06
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	12.74	1215.96	5.01
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	11.75	1800.22	7.41
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.54	3555.46	14.64
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / ltrs	0.97	833.13	3.43
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	185.34	0.76
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				889.77	3.66
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				18145.09	74.73
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				214.29	0.88
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				18359.38	75.61
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			13.92	3705.28	15.26
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				22064.66	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				22074.66	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2207.47	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				24282.12	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		13.69	22590.84	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1650.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		1.51	690.03	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			457.14	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				23280.87	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				-1001.25	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1773.53	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:0.96	

Cost of cultivation of sorghum: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of sorghum in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 36079.54. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 35197.50. The net income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. -882.04. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.98.

Table 28. Cost of Cultivation of sorghum in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	29.64	6916.00	19.17
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.24	679.25	1.88
3	Tractor		Hours	3.71	2778.75	7.70
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	12.35	1605.50	4.45
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	12.35	2470.00	6.85
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	4.94	6916.00	19.17
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs /liters	1.24	1852.50	5.13
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	1.61	0.00
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1542.48	4.28
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				24762.09	68.63
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				0.00	0.00
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				24762.09	68.63
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			30.88	8027.50	22.25
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				32789.59	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				32799.59	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3279.96	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				36079.54	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		18.53	27787.50	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1500.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		37.05	7410.00	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			200.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				35197.50	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				-882.04	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1947.61	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:0.98	

Cost of Cultivation of Bengal gram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of bengalgram in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 29. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 24352.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 70110. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 45757.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.88.

Table 29. Cost of Cultivation of Bengal gram in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	24.70	5130.00	21.07
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.95	522.50	2.15
3	Tractor		Hours	1.90	1425.00	5.85
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	14.25	1567.50	6.44
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.90	2660.00	10.92
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	0.95	950.00	3.90
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	5806.40	23.84
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				622.50	2.56
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				18683.90	76.72
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				500.00	2.05
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				19183.90	78.77
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			11.40	2945.00	12.09
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				22128.90	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				22138.90	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2213.89	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				24352.79	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		17.10	70110.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4100.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				70110.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				45757.21	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1424.14	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.88	

Cost of Cultivation of groundnut: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of groundnut in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 36632.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45304.12. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 8671.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.24.

Table 30. Cost of Cultivation of groundnut in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	35.44	7620.82	20.80
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.40	769.25	2.10
3	Tractor		Hours	2.69	2020.78	5.52
4	Machinery		Hours	1.00	600.62	1.64
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	88.08	8808.00	24.04
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	9.23	1846.11	5.04
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.80	4146.33	11.32
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	309.26	383.54	1.05
10	Irrigation		Number	3.62	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	199.98	0.55
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1823.28	4.98
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				28218.72	77.03
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				416.67	1.14
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				28635.38	78.17
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			18.00	4657.27	12.71
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				33292.65	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				33302.65	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3330.27	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				36632.92	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		13.09	44173.06	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			3375.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		1.89	1131.06	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			600.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				45304.12	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				8671.21	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2798.90	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.24	

Cost of Cultivation of Cotton: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of cotton in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35183.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 67306.06. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 32122.69. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.91.

Table 31. Cost of Cultivation of Cotton in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	35.02	7673.89	21.81
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.24	679.25	1.93
3	Tractor		Hours	2.87	2149.73	6.11
4	Machinery		Hours	3.04	1821.70	5.18
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	10.30	2575.80	7.32
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	13.89	2778.99	7.90
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.78	4189.98	11.91
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.23	1148.16	3.26
10	Irrigation		Number	4.85	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	3338.57	9.49
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1284.35	3.65
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				27640.42	78.56
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				277.78	0.79
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				27918.19	79.35
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			15.79	4056.69	11.53
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				31974.89	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				31984.89	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3198.49	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				35183.37	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		16.03	67306.06	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4200.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				67306.06	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				32122.69	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2195.50	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.91	

Cost of cultivation of Tomato: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of tomato in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 36338.34. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 111921.87. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 75583.53. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:3.08.

Table 32. Cost of Cultivation of tomato in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**				
1	Hired Human Labour	Man days	38.59	8104.69	22.30
2	Bullock	Pairs/day	1.24	679.25	1.87
3	Tractor	Hours	3.40	2547.19	7.01
4	Machinery	Hours	0.62	370.50	1.02
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)	Kgs (Rs.)	2316.24	3550.62	9.77
6	Seed Inter Crop	Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM	Quintal	12.35	2470.00	6.80
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients	Quintal	4.01	5619.25	15.46
9	Pesticides (PPC)	Kgs / liters	927.02	1543.75	4.25
10	Irrigation	Number	1.24	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	108.22	0.30
14	Land revenue and Taxes		0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**				
16	Interest on working capital			1583.23	4.36
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**			26576.70	73.14
III	**Cost B2**				
18	Rental Value of Land			250.00	0.69
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**			26826.70	73.82
IV	**Cost C1**				
20	Family Human Labour		24.39	6198.16	17.06
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**			33024.86	90.88
V	**Cost C2**				
22	Risk Premium			10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**			33034.86	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**				
24	Managerial Cost			3303.49	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**			36338.34	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**				
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)	111.92	111921.87	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)		1000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)			111921.87	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)			75583.53	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)			324.68	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)			1:3.08	

Cost of cultivation of Navane: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of navane in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for navane was Rs. 18748.01. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 36309. The net income from navane cultivation was Rs. 17560.99. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.94.

Table 33. Cost of Cultivation of navane in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	19.76	4693.00	25.03
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	2.47	1852.50	9.88
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	6.18	197.60	1.05
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.47	3458.00	18.44
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.24	926.25	4.94
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	1.61	0.01
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				551.02	2.94
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				11679.98	62.30
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.89
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				11846.64	63.19
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			18.53	5187.00	27.67
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				17033.64	90.86
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.05
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				17043.64	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				1704.36	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				18748.01	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		17.29	36309.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			2100.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				36309.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				17560.99	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1084.33	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.94	

Cost of cultivation of Sesamum: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of sesamum in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 34. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for sesamum was Rs. 27478.47. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 24700. The net income from sesamum cultivation was Rs. -2778.47. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.9.

Table 34. Cost of Cultivation of Sesamum in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	40.75	9262.50	33.71
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Tractor		Hours	3.71	2778.75	10.11
4	Machinery		Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	6.18	926.25	3.37
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	1.24	2470.00	8.99
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.47	2964.00	10.79
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.24	1852.50	6.74
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	24.70	0.09
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				986.73	3.59
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				21265.43	77.39
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				0.00	0.00
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				21265.43	77.39
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			13.58	3705.00	13.48
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				24970.43	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				24980.43	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2498.04	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				27478.47	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		4.94	24700.00	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			5000.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				24700.00	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				-2778.47	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				5562.44	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:0.9	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicate that, 6.45 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 9.68 per cent of the households opined that green fodder was adequate. Around 12.90 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate.

Table 35. Adequacy of fodder in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	0	0	2	18.18	0	0	0	0	2	6.45
2	Inadequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	2	20	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0	4	12.90
3	Adequate-Green Fodder	0	0	0	0	2	18.18	1	14.29	0	0	3	9.68
4	Inadequate-Green Fodder	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the average annual gross income in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs.30000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs.60810, for small farmers it was Rs.100354, for semi medium farmers it was Rs.98328, and for medium farmers it was Rs.105000.

Table 36. Average annual gross income in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Service/salary	0	0	13,636.36	22,857.14	0	10,000
2	Business	0	0	22,727.27	0	0	8,064.52
3	Wage	30,000	30,050	11,181.82	16,571.43	15,000	19,822.58
4	Agriculture	0	30,760.25	52,809.09	58,900	90,000	44,864.60
Income(Rs.)		30,000	60,810.25	100,354.55	98,328.57	105,000	82,751.69

Average annual expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicate that the average annual expenditure is Rs. 7730. For landless households it was Rs.7500, for marginal farmers it was Rs 2405, for small farmers it was Rs. 8834, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 7632, and for medium farmers it was Rs. 50000.

Table 37. Average annual expenditure in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)	MF (10)	SF (11)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (31)
1	Service/salary	0	0	50,000	22,500	0	3,064.52
2	Business	0	0	16,000	0	0	516.13
3	Wage	15,000	10,750	8,000	5,500	10,000	6,935.48
4	Agriculture	0	13,300	23,181.82	25,428.57	40,000	19,548.39
Total		15,000	24,050	97,181.82	53,428.57	50,000	239,660.39
Average		7,500	2,405	8,834.71	7,632.65	50,000	7,730.98

Horticulture species grown: The data regarding horticulture species grown in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 18 coconut and 3 mango trees in their field.

Table 38. Horticulture species grown in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Coconut	0	0	0	0	6	0	11	0	1	0	18	0
2	Mango	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0

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

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicate that, households have planted 3 teak trees, 71 neem trees and 3 tamarind trees in their field and 3 neem trees in their backyard.

Table 39: Forest species grown in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Teak	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2	Neem	0	0	19	0	22	1	29	2	1	0	71	3
3	Tamarind	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0

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

Source of additional investment: The data regarding Source of additional investment in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicate that, government subsidy is the source of investment for 29.03 per cent of the households for land development and irrigation facility 16.13 per cent of the households for improved crop production and 3.23 per cent of the households for improved livestock management. Households opined that pawn broking is the source of investment for irrigation for 3.23 per cent of the households and soft loan was the source of investment for another 3.23 per cent of the households.

Table 40: Source of additional investment in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No	Item	Land development		Irrigation facility		Improved crop production		Improved livestock management	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Government subsidy	9	29.03	9	29.03	5	16.13	1	3.23
2	Pawn broking	0	0.0	1	3.23	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	Soft loan	1	3.23	0	0.0	1	3.23	0	0.0

Marketing of the agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicated that, bajra, chilly, groundnut, ladies finger, mango, paddy, tomato were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Maize was sold to the extent of 93.38 per cent.

Table 41. Marketing of the agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Bajra	113.0	0.0	113.0	100.0	1650.0
2	Bengalgram	18.0	0.0	18.0	100.0	4100.0
3	Cotton	48.0	0.0	48.0	100.0	4200.0
4	Groundnut	58.0	0.0	58.0	100.0	3375.0
5	Maize	327.0	0.0	327.0	100.0	1228.57
6	Navane	14.0	0.0	14.0	100.0	2100.0
7	Sesamum	4.0	1.0	3.0	75.0	5000.0
8	Sorghum	15.0	0.0	15.0	100.0	1500.0
9	Sunflower	15.0	0.0	15.0	100.0	3000.0
10	Tomato	260.0	0.0	260.0	100.0	1000.0

Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 42. The results indicated that, about 100 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets. But some farmers also sold their produce in cooperative marketing society.

Table 42. Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Regulated Market	0	0.00	9	90.00	11	100.00	7	100.0	1	100.00	31	100.00
2	Cooperative marketing Society	0	0.00	2	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.45

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce, but 12.90 per cent have also used cart.

Table 43. Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cart	0	0.00	2	20.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	12.90
2	Tractor	0	0.00	9	90.00	10	90.91	10	142.86	2	200.00	31	100.00

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicated that, 51.61 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 30 per cent of marginal farmers, 63.64 per cent of small farmers, 71.43 per cent of semi medium farmers and 100 per cent of medium farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 44. Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0	3	30	7	63.64	5	71.43	1	100	16	51.61

Interest shown towards soil testing: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, 90.32 per cent have shown interest in soil test.

Table 45. Interest shown towards soil testing in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0.00	9	90.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	28	90.32

Soil and water conservation practices and structures adopted: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 46. The results indicated that, 16.13 per cent of the households adopted field bunding and 3.23 per cent have adopted summer ploughing.

Table 46. Interest shown towards soil testing in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Field Bunding	0	0.00	2	20.00	1	9.09	2	28.57	0	0.00	5	16.13
2	Summer Ploughing	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23

Status of soil and water conservation structures: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 47. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households who have adopted field bunding opined that they require full replacement of the structure.

Table 47. Status of soil and water conservation structures in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No	Item	Good		Severely Damaged		Full Replacement Required	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Field Bunding	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	100.0

Agencies involved in soil conservation structures: The data regarding Agencies involved in soil conservation structures in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 48. The results indicated that, government was the main agency that was involved in constructing soil conservation structures in the micro watershed.

Table 48. Agencies involved in soil conservation structures in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Govt.	0	0.00	2	20.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	0	0.00	6	19.35

Source of drinking water: The data regarding source of drinking water in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 49. The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 38.71 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 61.29 per cent of the households.

Table 49. Source of drinking water in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	2	100.00	6	60.00	3	27.27	1	14.29	0	0.00	12	38.71
2	Bore Well	0	0.00	4	40.00	8	72.73	6	85.71	1	100.00	19	61.29

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data regarding usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 50. The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent used fire wood and 12.90 per cent of the households used LPG.

Table 50. Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	0	0.00	10	100.00	10	90.91	6	85.71	1	100.00	27	87.10
2	LPG	2	100.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	12.90

Source of light: The data regarding source of light in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 51. The results indicated that, Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed.

Table 51. Source of light in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	2	100.00	10	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	31	100.00

Existence of Sanitary toilet facility: The data regarding existence of sanitary toilet facility in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 52. The results indicated that, 32.26 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 30 per cent of the marginal, 18.18 per cent of the small, 28.57 per cent of the semi medium and 100 per cent of the medium farmers.

Table 52. Existence of Sanitary toilet facility in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	2	100.00	3	30.00	2	18.18	2	28.57	1	100.00	10	32.26

Possession of PDS card: The data regarding possession of PDS card in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 53. The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent of the sampled households' possessed BPL card, 3.23 per cent of the households possessed APL card and 9.68 per cent did not possess PDS card.

Table 53. Possession of PDS card in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	APL	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
2	BPL	2	100.00	9	90.00	8	72.73	7	100.00	1	100.00	27	87.10
3	Not Possessed	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	9.68

Participation in NREGA program: The data regarding participation in NREGA programme in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 54. The results indicated that, 51.43 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.

Table 54. Participation in NREGA programme in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	2	100	5	50	4	36.36	2	28.57	1	100	14	45.16

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 55. The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 38.71 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 6.45 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 12.90 per cent, fruits were adequate for 22.58 per cent, milk was adequate for 16.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 16.13 per cent and meat was adequate for 9.68 per cent of the households.

Table 55. Adequacy of food items in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	2	100.00	10	100.00	11	100.00	7	100.00	1	100.00	31	100.00
2	Pulses	0	0.00	4	40.00	6	54.55	1	14.29	1	100.00	12	38.71
3	Oilseed	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	2	6.45
4	Vegetables	1	50.00	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	12.90
5	Fruits	1	50.00	3	30.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	0	0.00	7	22.58
6	Milk	1	50.00	2	20.00	1	9.09	1	14.29	0	0.00	5	16.13
7	Egg	1	50.00	2	20.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	16.13
8	Meat	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	9.68

Response on Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding inadequacy of food items in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 56. The results indicated that, cereals were inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households, pulses were inadequate for 54.84 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate for 77.42 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 58.06 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 35.48 per cent, milk was inadequate for 35.48 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 61.29 per cent and meat was inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households.

Table 56. Response on Inadequacy of food items in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
2	Pulses	2	100.00	6	60.00	3	27.27	6	85.71	0	0.00	17	54.84
3	Oilseed	2	100.00	8	80.00	8	72.73	5	71.43	1	100.00	24	77.42
4	Vegetables	1	50.00	8	80.00	5	45.45	3	42.86	1	100.00	18	58.06
5	Fruits	1	50.00	2	20.00	2	18.18	6	85.71	0	0.00	11	35.48
6	Milk	1	50.00	5	50.00	3	27.27	1	14.29	1	100.00	11	35.48
7	Egg	1	50.00	4	40.00	7	63.64	6	85.71	1	100.00	19	61.29
8	Meat	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23

Farming constraints: The data regarding farming constraints experienced by households in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed is presented in Table 57. The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 83.87 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (48.39%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (41.94%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.90%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (25.81%), high rate of interest on credit (3.23%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25.81%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (22.58%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (45.16%), less rainfall (29.03%) inadequate extension services (16.13%) and source of agri technology information (12.90).

Table 57. Farming constraints Experienced in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (2)		MF (10)		SF (11)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (31)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	0	0.00	9	90.00	10	90.91	6	85.71	1	100.00	26	83.87
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	0	0.00	8	80.00	5	45.45	2	28.57	0	0.00	15	48.39
3	Frequent incidence of pest and diseases	0	0.00	5	50.00	5	45.45	3	42.86	0	0.00	13	41.94
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	0	0.00	2	20.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	100.00	4	12.90
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	0	0.00	3	30.00	2	18.18	3	42.86	0	0.00	8	25.81
6	High rate of interest on credit	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.23
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	0	0.00	2	20.00	3	27.27	2	28.57	1	100.00	8	25.81
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	0	0.00	1	10.00	6	54.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	22.58
9	Inadequate extension services	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	36.36	1	14.29	0	0.00	5	16.13
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	0	0.00	6	60.00	4	36.36	3	42.86	1	100.00	14	45.16
11	Less rainfall	0	0.00	2	20.00	4	36.36	3	42.86	0	0.00	9	29.03
12	Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile)	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	18.18	1	14.29	0	0.00	4	12.90

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 31 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey.

The data indicated that there were 91 (55.15%) men and 74 (44.85%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 6.5, marginal farmers' was 4.2, small farmers' was 5.45, semi medium farmers' was 6.29 and medium farmers' was 6. The data indicated that, 28 (16.97%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 72 (43.64%) were in 16-35 years of age, 47 (28.48%) were in 36-60 years of age and 18 (10.91 %) were above 61 years of age.

The results indicated that Kanakapur-1 had 30.30 per cent illiterates, 35.15 per cent of them had primary school education, 2.42 per cent of them had middle school education, 10.30 per cent of them had high school education, 11.52 per cent of them had PUC education, 1.21 per cent of them did ITI, 4.85 per cent of them had degree education and 2 persons were doing masters. The results indicate that, 87.10 per cent of households practicing agriculture, 9.68 per cent of the households were agricultural laborers and 3.23 per cent were in government service.

The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 18.18 per cent of the household members, 46.67 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.61 per cent were in government service, 1.82 per cent were in private service, 27.88 per cent were students, 3.03 per cent were housewives and 1.82 per cent were children.

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 38.71 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 48.39 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 16.13 per cent of them possess pucca house.

The results shows that 96.77 per cent of the households possess TV, 83.87 per cent of the households possess mixer grinder, 25.81 per cent of the households possess bicycle, 38.71 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 3.23 per cent of the households possess refrigerator and 97.14 per cent of the households possess mobile phones. The results shows that the average value of television was Rs.4300, mixer grinder was Rs.1800, motor cycle was Rs.28214, mobile phone was Rs.1435, bicycle was Rs.1222 and refrigerator was Rs.15000.

About 22.58 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 29.03 per cent of them possess plough, 6.45 per cent of them possess tractor, 38.71 per cent of them posses sprayer, 93.55 per cent of them possess weeder, 3.23 per cent of them possess harvester and 3.23 per cent of them possess thresher. The results show that the average value of bullock cart was Rs.15400, plough was Rs.1900, the average value of tractor was Rs. 250000, the average value of sprayer was Rs.1064, the average value of harvester was Rs.3500, thresher was Rs.50000 and the average value of weeder Rs.40.

The results indicate that, 29.03 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 12.90 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.23 per cent of the households possess buffalo.

The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.71, average own labour (women) available was 1.65, average hired labour (men) available was 6.74 and average hired labour (women) available was 7.39. The results indicate that, 96.77 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

The results indicate that, 93.55 per cent of the households have bank account and 38.71 per cent of the households have savings.The results indicate that, 90.32 per cent of the households have availed credit from different sources.

The results indicate that, households of the Kanakapur-1 micro watershed possess 22.29 ha (38.40%) of dry land and 35.76 ha (61.60%) of irrigated land. The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 273633 and average value of irrigated was Rs. 392264.

The results indicate that, there were 9 functioning and 11 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed. Bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 29.03 per cent of the farmers. The depth of bore well was found to be 22.71 meters.

The results indicate that, semi medium and medium farmers had irrigated area of 7.50 ha and 2.02 ha respectively. Farmers have grown maize (16.5 ha), bajra (9.5 ha), cotton (2.63 ha), groundnut (4.63 ha), navane (0.81 ha), sesamum (0.81 ha), sorghum (0.81 ha), sunflower (0.88 ha), tomato (2.11 ha) and Bengal gram (0.73 ha). The cropping intensity in Kanakapur-1 micro watershed was found to be 86.25 per cent.

The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for maize was Rs. 23916. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 26575.54. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs. 2659.54, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.11. The total cost of cultivation for bajra was Rs. 24282.12. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 23280.87. The net income from bajra cultivation was Rs. -1001.25. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.96. The total cost of cultivation for sorghum was Rs. 36079.54. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 35197.50. The net

income from sorghum cultivation was Rs. -882.04. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.98. The total cost of cultivation for bengalgram was Rs. 24352.79. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 70110. The net income from bengalgram cultivation was Rs. 45757.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.88. The total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 36632.92. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 45304.12. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 8671.21. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.24. The total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35183.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 67306.06. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 32122.69. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.91. The total cost of cultivation for tomato was Rs. 36338.34. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 111921.87. The net income from tomato cultivation was Rs. 75583.53. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:3.08. The total cost of cultivation for navane was Rs. 18748.01. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 36309. The net income from navane cultivation was Rs. 17560.99. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.94. The total cost of cultivation for sesamum was Rs. 27478.47. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 24700. The net income from sesamum cultivation was Rs. -2778.47. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.9.

The results indicate that, 6.45 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and 9.68 per cent of the households opined that green fodder was adequate. Around 12.90 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was inadequate.

The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs.30000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs.60810, for small farmers it was Rs.100354, for semi medium farmers it was Rs.98328, and for medium farmers it was Rs.105000. The average annual expenditure is Rs. 7730. For landless households it was Rs.7500, for marginal farmers it was Rs 2405, for small farmers it was Rs. 8834, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 7632, and for medium farmers it was Rs. 50000.

The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 18 coconut and 3 mango trees in their field. The results indicate that, households have planted 3 teak trees, 71 neem trees and 3 tamarind trees in their field and 3 neem trees in their backyard.

The results indicated that, bajra, chilly, groundnut, ladies finger, mango, paddy, tomato were sold to the extent of 100 per cent. Maize was sold to the extent of 93.38 per cent. The results indicated that, about 100 per cent of the famers have sold their produce in regulated markets. But some farmers also sold their produce in cooperative marketing society. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households have used tractor as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce, but 12.90 per cent have also used cart.

The results indicated that, 51.61 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm. The results indicated that, 90.32 per cent have

shown interest in soil test. The results indicated that, 16.13 per cent of the households adopted field bunding and 3.23 per cent have adopted summer ploughing. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households who have adopted field bunding opined that they require full replacement of the structure. The results indicated that, government was the main agency that was involved in constructing soil conservation structures in the micro watershed.

The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 38.71 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 61.29 per cent of the households. The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent used fire wood and 12.90 per cent of the households used LPG. 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, 32.26 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 30 per cent of the marginal, 18.18 per cent of the small, 28.57 per cent of the semi medium and 100 per cent of the medium farmers.

The results indicated that, 87.10 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card, 3.23 per cent of the households possessed APL card and 9.68 per cent did not possess PDS card. The results indicated that, 51.43 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 38.71 per cent, oilseeds were adequate for 6.45 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 12.90 per cent, fruits were adequate for 22.58 per cent, milk was adequate for 16.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 16.13 per cent and meat was adequate for 9.68 per cent of the households.

The results indicated that, cereals were inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households, pulses were inadequate for 54.84 per cent, oilseeds were inadequate for 77.42 per cent, vegetables were inadequate for 58.06 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 35.48 per cent, milk was inadequate for 35.48 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 61.29 per cent and meat was inadequate for 3.23 per cent of the households.

The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 83.87 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (48.39%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (41.94%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.90%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (25.81%), high rate of interest on credit (3.23%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25.81%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (22.58%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (45.16%), less rainfall (29.03%) inadequate extension services (16.13%) and source of agri technology information (12.90).