ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.598

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

INDARGI-3 (4D3A9A1d) MICROWATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk & District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

SUJALA – III

World Bank funded Project

THE WORLD BANK

ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING

ICAR - NBSS & LUP

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GOVT. OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

About ICAR - NBSS&LUP

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

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

Citation: Rajendra Hegde, Ramesh Kumar, S.C., K.V. Niranjana, S. Srinivas, M.Lalitha, B.A. Dhanorkar, R.S. Reddy and S.K. Singh (2019). “Land resource inventory and socio-economic status of farm households for watershed planning and development of Indargi 3 (4D3A9A1b) Microwatershed, Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka”, ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.599, ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. p.141 & 29.

TO OBTAIN COPIES,
Please write to:
Director, ICAR - NBSS & LUP,

Amaravati Road, NAGPUR - 440 033, India

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

Telefax : 0712-2522534

E-Mail : director@nbsslup.ernet.in

Website URL : nbsslup.in

Or

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

Phone : (080) 23412242, 23510350 (O)

Telefax : 080-23510350

E-Mail : nbssrcb@gmail.com

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

INDARGI-3 (4D3A9A1d) MICROWATERSHED

Irakallagada Hobli, Koppal Taluk & 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 Indargi-3 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:27-11-2019

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	Dr. Mahendra kumar M.B
	Dr. Gopali Bardhan
	Smt. Chaitra, S.P.
	Smt. Arpitha G.M
	Sh. Somashekar T.N
	Sh. Tirupati Meti
Field Work	
Sh. C. Bache Gowda	Sh. Bheemaraya Nayak
Sh. Somashekar	Sh. Arun Kumar, S.G.
Sh. M. Jayaramaiah	Sh. Umesh Jadiyappa Madolli
	Sh. Praveen Kumar P. Achalkar
	Sh. Veerabhadraswamy
	Sh. Arun Kumar, S.
	Sh. Sunil Raj
	Sh. Yogesh Kumar, B.
	Sh. Vinay
	Sh. Shankarappa, K.
	Sh. Appanna B. Hattigoudar
	Sh. Maharudra
	Sh. Lankesh, R.S.
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.

Soil & Water Conservation	
Sh. Sunil P. Maske	
Socio-Economic Analysis	
Dr. S.C. Ramesh Kumar	Sh. M. K. Prakashanaik
	Ms. Sowmya K.B
	Sh.Manjunath M
	Sh.Veerabhadraswamy R
	Sh.Lankesh RS
	Sh.Kalaveerachari R Kammar
	Sh.Pradyumma U
	Sh.Yogesha HN
	Sh.Vijay kumar lamani
	Sh.Arun N Kambar
	Sh.Vinay
	Sh.Basavaraj.Biradar
	Sh.Vinod R
	Sh.Praveenkumar P Achalkar
	Sh.Rajendra D
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 Indargi-3 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 636 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 69 per cent is covered by soils, 29 per cent is covered by rock-out crops and 2 per cent is covered by others (Habitation and Settlements). The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below.

- *The soils belong to 11 soil series and 22 soil phases (management units) and 7 Land Management Units.*
- *The length of crop growing period is <90 days and starts from 2nd week of August to 2nd week of November.*
- *From the master soil map, several interpretative and thematic maps like land capability, soil depth, surface soil texture, soil gravelliness, available water capacity, soil slope and soil erosion were generated.*
- *Soil fertility status maps for macro and micronutrients were generated based on the surface soil samples collected at every 320 m grid interval.*
- *Land suitability for growing 31 major agricultural and horticultural crops were assessed and maps showing the degree of suitability along with constraints were generated.*
- *Entire area is suitable for agriculture.*
- *An area of about 21 per cent of the soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), 17 per cent of the soils are moderately deep (75- 100 cm) and 31 per cent is deep to very deep (100 to >150 cm) soils.*
- *About 51 per cent area in the microwatershed has loamy soils and 18 per cent clayey soils at the surface.*
- *An area of about 29 per cent area has non-gravelly (<15% gravel) soils and 39 per cent has gravelly to very gravelly (15-60% gravel) soils.*
- *An area of about 42 per cent area is very low to low (<50-100 mm/m), 12 per cent area is high (151-200 mm/m) and 15 per cent area is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity.*
- *An area of about 5 per cent area of the microwatershed has nearly level (0-1% slope) lands and 63 per cent area of the microwatershed has very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands.*

- *An area of about 23 per cent area is slightly (e1) eroded and 45 per cent area is moderately (e2) eroded.*
- *An area of about 44 per cent soils are neutral (pH 6.5-7.3), 24 per cent soil are slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and less then 1 per cent soils are strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) in soil reaction.*
- *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the soils in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed is <2 dsm^{-1} indicating that the soils are non-saline.*
- *Organic carbon is low (<0.5%) in 2 per cent, medium (0.5-0.75%) in 25 per cent and high (>0.75%) in 42 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available phosphorus is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in 13 per cent and high (>57 kg/ha) in 55 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in 62 per cent and high (>337 kg/ha) in 7 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in 10 per cent, medium (10-20 ppm) in 54 per cent and high (>20 ppm) in 4 per cent area of the soils.*
- *Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in the entire area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available iron is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in 21 per cent and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 47 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- *An area of about 63 per cent is deficient (<0.6 ppm) and 6 per cent is sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in available zinc content.*
- *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in the entire area of the microwatershed.*
- *The land suitability for 31 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	*130(20)*	*155(25)*		*Sapota*	*75(12)*	*117(19)*
Maize	-	*284(45)*		*Pomegranate*	*75(12)*	*193(31)*
Bajra	*75(12)*	*325(51)*		*Guava*	*75(12)*	*117(19)*
Groundnut	-	*220(34)*		*Jackfruit*	*75(12)*	*117(19)*
Sunflower	*130(20)*	*132(21)*		*Jamun*	*75(12)*	*85(14)*
Cotton	*55(9)*	*229(37)*		*Musambi*	*130(20)*	*138(22)*
Redgram	*75(12)*	*187(30)*		*Lime*	*130(20)*	*138(22)*
Bengal gram	*55(9)*	*21(3)*		*Cashew*	*75(12)*	*117(19)*
Chilli	*75(12)*	*210(33)*		*Custard apple*	*130(20)*	*270(42)*
Tomato	*75(12)*	*134(21)*		*Amla*	*75(12)*	*304(48)*
Brinjal	*75(12)*	*134(21)*		*Tamarind*	*75(12)*	*85(14)*
Onion	-	*209(33)*		*Marigold*	*75(12)*	*210(33)*
Bhendi	*75(12)*	*210(33)*		*Chrysanthemum*	*75(12)*	*210(33)*
Drumstick	*75(12)*	*172(28)*		*Jasmine*	*75(12)*	*134(21)*
Mulberry	-	*192(31)*		*Crossandra*	*75(12)*	*134(21)*
Mango	*75(12)*	*30(5)*				

- *Apart from the individual crop suitability, a proposed crop plan has been prepared for the 7 identified LMUs by considering only the highly and moderately suitable lands for different crops and cropping systems with food, fodder, fibre and other horticulture crops.*
- *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 plan has been prepared that would help in identifying the sites to be treated and also the type of structures required.*
- *As part of the greening programme, several tree species have been suggested to be planted in marginal and submarginal lands, field bunds and also in the hillocks, mounds and ridges. That would help in supplementing the farm income, provide fodder and fuel, and generate lot of biomass which in turn would help in maintaining the ecological balance and contribute to mitigating the climate change.*

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Soil is a finite natural resource that is central to sustainable agriculture and food security. Over the years, this precious resource is faced with the problems of erosion, salinity, alkalinity, degradation, depletion of nutrients and even decline in availability of land for agriculture. It is a known fact, that it takes thousands of years to form a few centimetres of soil, thus, soil is a precious gift of nature. The area available for agriculture is about 51 per cent of the total geographical area and more than 60 per cent of the people are still dependant on agriculture for their livelihood. However, the capacity of a soil to produce is limited and the limits to the production are set by its intrinsic characteristics, agro-climatic setting, and use and management. There is, therefore, tremendous pressure on land and water resources, which is causing decline in soil-health and stagnation in productivity. As much as 121 m ha of land is reportedly degraded which leads to impaired soil quality. It is imperative that steps are urgently taken to check and reverse land degradation without any further loss of time. The improvements in productivity will have to come from sustainable intensification measures that make the most effective use of land and water resources. 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.

Added to this, every year there is a significant diversion of farm lands and water resources for non-agricultural purposes. Thus, developing strategies to slow down the degradation process or reclaim the soils to normal condition and ensure sustainability of production system are the major issues today. This demands a systematic appraisal of our soil and land resources with respect to their extent, geographic distribution, characteristics, behaviour and uses potential, which is very important for developing an effective land use and cropping systems for augmenting agricultural production on a sustainable basis. The soil and land resource inventories made so far in Karnataka had limited utility because the surveys were of different types, scales and intensities carried out at different times with specific objectives. Hence, there is an urgent need to generate

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 all the parameters which are critical for productivity *viz.,* soils, site characteristics like slope, erosion, gravelliness and stoniness, climate, water, 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 Indargi-3 microwatershed in Koppal Taluk and District, Karnataka State for the Karnataka Watershed Development Department. The database was generated by using cadastral map of the village as a base along with high resolution IRS LISS IV and Cartosat-1 merged satellite imagery. Later, an attempt will be made to uplink this LRI data generated at 1:7920 scales 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 Indargi-3 Microwatershed is located in the central part of northern Karnataka in Koppal Taluk, Koppal District, Karnataka State (Fig.2.1). It lies between $15^0$26'42'' and $15^0$28'25'' North latitudes and $76^0$17'38'' and $76^0$19'31'' East longitudes and covers an area of about 636 ha. It is about 26 km from Koppal town. It comprises and bounded by Indargi on the north, east, central and south, and Vanabellary village on the north and northwestern side of the microwatershed.



Fig.2.1 Location map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

2.2 Geology

Major rock formation observed in the microwatershed are granite gneiss and alluvium (Figs.2.2 a & 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 Bettageri village. The soil thickness of the alluvium generally is limited to less than a meter, except in river valleys where it is very deep extending to tens of meters. Such soils are transported and represent palaeo black soils originally formed at higher elevation, but now occupying river valleys.

Fig.2.2a Granite and granite gneiss rocks

Fig.2.2b Alluvium

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as Granite gneiss and Alluvial landscapes based on geology. The 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 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 takes place 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 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 and 193 mm in the months 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 Indargi-3 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 bouldery areas have very poor vegetative cover. Major crops grown in the area are sorghum, maize, bajra, cotton, safflower, sunflower, red gram, horse gram, onion, mulberry, pomegranate, sugarcane, Bengalgram, marigold and groundnut (Fig 2.5). While carrying out land resource inventory, the land use/land cover particulars are collected from all the survey numbers and a current land use map of the microwatershed is prepared. The current land use map prepared shows the arable and non-arable lands, other land uses and different types of crops grown in the area. The current land use map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed is presented in Fig.2.6. Simultaneously, enumeration of existing wells (bore wells and open wells) and other soil and water conservation structures in the microwatershed is made and their location in different survey numbers is marked on the cadastral map. Map showing the location of wells in Indargi-3 Microwatershed is given Fig.2.7.

Table 2.2 Land Utilization in Koppal District

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



Fig.2.5 Different crops and cropping systems in Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.2.6 Current Land Use map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.2.7 Location of wells map of Indargi-3 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 Indargi-3 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 636 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 uplands, summits and very gently sloping 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 gently 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 Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.3.2 Satellite Image of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.3.3 Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Indargi-3 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 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 up to 200 cm or to the depth limited by rock or hard substratum and studied in detail for all their morphological and physical characteristics. The soil and site characteristics were recorded for all profile sites on a standard proforma as per the guidelines given in USDA Soil Survey Manual (Soil Survey Staff, 2012). Apart from the transect study, profiles were also studied at random, almost like in a grid pattern, outside the transect areas to validate the soil map unit boundaries.

Based on the soil characteristics, the soils were grouped into different soil series. Soil series is the most homogeneous unit having similar horizons and properties and behaves similarly for a given level of management. Soil depth, texture, colour, kind of horizon and horizon sequence, amount and nature of gravel present, calcareousness, nature of substratum etc, were used as the major differentiating characteristics for identifying soil series occurring in the area. The differentiating characteristics used for identifying the soil series are given in Table 3.1. Based on the above characteristics, 11 soil series were identified in Indargi-3 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	Lakkur (LKR)	50-75	2.5YR 2.5/3, 2.5/4, 3/4, 3/6	gsc	40-60	Ap-Bt-Bc-Cr	-
2	Mukhadahalli (MKH)	50-75	5YR3/3,3/4,4/3,5/4,6/6 2.5YR3/4	gsc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
3	Hooradhahalli (HDH)	75-100	2.5YR2.5/4,3/4, 3/6	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
4	Bidanagere (BDG)	75-100	5YR3/3,3/4,4/3,5/4 2.5YR3/4	gc	35-60	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
5	Balapur (BPR)	100-150	2.5YR2.5/4,3/4	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bt-Cr	-
6	Hallikere (HLK)	>150	5YR3/3,3/4 7.5YR3/3,3/4	c	<15	Ap-Bt	-
7	Niduvalalu (NDL)	>150	2.5YR2.5/3,2.5/4, 3/3,4/6	gsc	>35	Ap-Bt	-
Soils of Alluvial landscape							
8	Kyasalapura (KSP)	50-75	5YR 3/2, 3/3, 3/4	gscl	15-35	Ap-Bt-Ck	e-es
9	Bedwatti (BWT)	75-100	10YR 3/1, 4/1, 4/3	gsc-gc	>35	Ap-Bw-Ck	e-es
10	Gatareddihal (GRH)	100-150	10YR 2/1, 3/1, 2.5Y 4/3, 5/4	c	<15	Ap-Bss-BC-C	es
11	Kadagathur (KDT)	>150	10YR 3/1, 3/2, 3/3 7.5YR3/3,3/4	sc-c	<15	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 minipits and a few auger bores representing different landforms occurring in the microwatershed were studied. In addition to the profile study, spot observations in the form of minipits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map. The soil map shows the geographic distribution and area extent of 22 mapping units representing 11 soil series occurring in the microwatershed. The soil map unit (soil legend) description is presented in Table 3.2. The soil phase map (management units) shows the distribution of 22 phases mapped in the microwatershed. Each mapping unit (soil phase) delineated on the map has similar soil and site characteristics. In other words, all the farms or survey numbers

included in one phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each series were collected from representative master profiles for laboratory characterization by following the methods outlined in the Laboratory Manual (Sarma *et al*, 1987). Surface soil samples collected in the year 2019 from Indargi-3 farmer's fields for fertility status (major and micronutrients) at 320 m grid interval were analyzed in the laboratory (Katyal and Rattan, 2003). By linking the soil fertility data to the survey numbers through GIS, soil fertility maps were generated using Kriging method for the microwatershed.

3.6 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 22 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were regrouped into 7 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan for sustained development of the microwatershed. The database (soil phases) generated under LRI was utilized for identifying Land Management Units (LMU's) based on the management needs. One or more than one soil site characteristic having influence on the management have been choosen for identification and delineation of LMUs. For Indargi-3 Microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely soil depth, soil texture, slope erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LMUs. The land management units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

Table 3.2 Soil map unit description of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite gneiss Landscape				
	LKR	Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown to dark red, red gravelly sandy clay soils occurring on very gently to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation.		**101(15.82)**
43		LKRcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	3(0.44)
452		LKRhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	98(15.38)
	MKH	Mukhadahalli soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark brown to reddish brown, red gravelly sandy clay soils occurring on gently very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation.		**9(1.4)**
77		MKHcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	5(0.85)
85		MKHhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	1(0.08)
90		MKHiB2g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate	3(0.47)

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
			erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	
	HDH	Hooradhahalli soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark red to dark reddish brown, red gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occurring on nearly level to moderately sloping uplands under cultivation.		**58(9.13)**
111		HDHcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	54(8.48)
112		HDHcB2g2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	2(0.32)
126		HDHiB1g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	0.23(0.04)
128		HDHiB2g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	2(0.29)
	BDG	Bidanagere soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown, red gravelly clay soils occurring on nearly level to gently sloping uplands under cultivation.		**28(5.0)**
180		BDGcB1g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	25(3.98)
193		BDGiB1g2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, very gravelly (35-60%)	3(0.51)
	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.		**23(3.64)**
225		BPRcB2g1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	23(3.64)
	HLK	Hallikere soils are very deep (>150 cm), well drained, have dark brown to dark reddish brown, clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation.		**75(11.72)**
270		HLKhB2	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	40(6.27)
272		HLKiA1	Sandy clay surface, slope 0-1%, slight erosion	35(5.45)
	NDL	Niduvalalu soils are very deep (>150 cm), well drained, have red to dark reddish brown red gravelly sandy clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation.		**7(1.13)**
299		NDLiB1g1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	7(1.13)
Soils of Alluvial Landscape				
	KSP	Kyasalapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown, calcareous, gravelly sandy clay loam soils occurring on very gently sloping plains under cultivation.		**22(3.41)**

Soil map unit No*	Soil Series	Soil Phase	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
320		KSPhB2g1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	22(3.41)
	BWT	Bedwatti soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have dark brown to dark gray and very dark gray, black calcareous gravelly sandy clay to clay soils occurring on very gently sloping plains under cultivation.		**21(3.27)**
366		BWThB1	Sandy clay loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	10(1.53)
367		BWTmB1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	11(1.74)
	GRH	Gatareddihal soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have light olive brown to very dark gray, calcareous sodic black cracking clay soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation.		**37(5.9)**
368		GRHiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	36(5.69)
372		GRHmB1g1	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion, gravelly (15-35%)	1(0.21)
	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.		**55(8.7)**
400		KDTcB1	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	40(6.36)
401		KDTiB1	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, slight erosion	15(2.34)
999	Rock outcrops			**186(29.31)**
1000	Others	Habitation and Waterbody		**13(2.08)**

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



Fig 3.5 Soil Phase or Management Units of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

Chapter 4

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Indargi-3 Microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss and alluvial landscapes based on geology. In all, 11 soil series are identified. Soil formation is the result of the combined effect of environmental and terrain factors that are reflected in soil morphology. The soil formation is dominantly influenced by the parent material, climate, time and relief.

A brief description of each of the 11 soil series identified followed by 22 soil phases (management units) mapped (Fig. 3.5) are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Indargi-3 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, 7 soil series are identified and mapped. Of these, LKR series occupies major area of 101 ha (16%) followed by HLK 75 ha (12%), HDH 58 ha (9%), BDG 28 ha (5%), BPR 23 ha (4%), MKH 9 ha (1%) and NDL 7 ha (1%). The brief description of each soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Lakkur (LKR) Series: Lakkur soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have reddish brown to dark red, gravelly sandy clay 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). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Lakkur (LKR) Series

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

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

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Mukhadahalli (MKH) Series

4.1.3 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). Four soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Hooradhahalli (HDH) Series

4.1.4 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). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape Soil Profile Characteristics of Bidanagere (BDG) Series

4.1.5 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). Only one soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Balapur (BPR) Series

4.1.6 Hallikere (HLK) Series: Hallikere soils are very deep (>150 cm), well drained, have dark brown to dark reddish brown, clayey soils. They have developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands. The Hallikere series has been classified as a member of the fine, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Paleustalfs.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 11 to 14 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 4. The texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay loam. The thickness of B horizon is more than 150 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value and chroma 3 to 4. Its texture is clay. The available water capacity is high (150-200 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape Soil Profile Characteristics of Hallikere (HLK) Series

4.1.7 Niduvalalu (NDL) Series: Niduvalalu soils are very deep (>150 cm), well drained, have dark red to dark reddish brown, gravelly sandy clay soils. They have developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Niduvalalu series has been classified as a member of the clayey–skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Rhodic Paleustalfs.

The thickness of the solum is more than 150 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 11 to 15 cm. Its colour is in 5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. The texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay loam with 10 to 30 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 150 to 160 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 2.5 to 4 and chroma 4 to 6. Its texture is sandy clay and ranges from gravelly sandy clay with 20 to 75 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). Only one soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil Profile Characteristics of Niduvalalu (NDL) Series

4.2 Soils of Alluvial landscape

In this landscape, 4 soil series were identified and mapped. Of these, KDT series occupies major area of 55 ha (9%) followed by GRH 37 ha (6%), KSP 22 ha (3%) and BWT 21 ha (3%). The brief description of each soil series along with the soil phases identified and mapped is given below.

4.2.1 Kyasalapura (KSP) Series: Kyasalapura soils are moderately shallow (50-75cm), well drained, have dark reddish brown, calcareous gravelly sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from alluvium and occur on very gently sloping plains under cultivation. The Kyasalapura series has been classified as a member of the fine-loamy, mixed (calc), isohyperthermic family Typic Haplustalfs.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 53 to 75 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 17 to 23 cm. Its colour is in 2.5YR, 5 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 2 to 4. The texture varies from sandy clay loam to sand clay with 15 to 30 per cent gravel. The thickness of B-horizon varies from 33 to 55 cm. Its colour is in 2.5 YR and 5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 4. Texture is sandy clay loam to sandy clay with 15 to 35 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is very low (<50mm/m). Only one soil phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kyasalapura (KSP) Series

4.2.2 Bedwatti (BWT) Series: Bedwatti soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to dark brown, calcareous gravelly sandy clay to clay soils. They have developed from alluvium and occur on very gently sloping plains under cultivation. The Bedwatti series has been classified as a member of the clayey-skeletal, mixed, (calc), isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 75 to 96 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 11 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 3. The texture is sandy clay loam to clay. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 56 to 76 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value and chroma ranging from 3 to 4. Its texture is sandy clay to clay soil with 50 to 60 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is low (51-100 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Bedwatti (BWT) Series

4.2.3 Gatareddihal (GRH) Series: Gatareddihal soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained have black or dark grey to light olive brown, calcareous, sodic clay soils. They are developed from alluvium and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping plains under cultivation. The Gatareddihal soil series has been classified as member of the very fine, smectitic, (calc), isohyperthermic family of Sodic Haplusterts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 102 to 149 cm. The thickness of A-horizon ranges from 12 to 19 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR, 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 1 to 6. The texture is sandy clay loam to clay. The thickness of B-horizon ranges from 86 to 117 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 6. Texture is clay with less than 15 per cent gravel. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Gatareddihal (GRH) Series

4.2.4 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 uplands 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). Two soil phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and soil profile characteristics of Kadagathur (KDT) Series

Table: 4.1 Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Indargi-3 Microwatershed

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

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-21	Ap	74.00	8.34	17.66	9.62	11.57	15.76	23.13	13.92	20	sl	-	-
21-35	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: Mukahadahalli (MKH), **Pedon:** R-11
Location: $15^0$22'05.4"N, $76^0$04'10.3"E, Halageri village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Clayey-skeletal, mixed, isohyperthermic Typic Haplustalfs

Depth (cm)	Horizon	Size class and particle diameter (mm)								Coarse fragments w/w (%)	Texture Class (USDA)	% Moisture	
		Total			Sand								
		Sand (2.0-0.05)	Silt (0.05-0.002)	Clay (<0.002)	Very coarse (2.0-1.0)	Coarse (1.0-0.5)	Medium (0.5-0.25)	Fine (0.25-0.1)	Very fine (0.1-0.05)			1/3 Bar	15 Bar
0-19	Ap	65.71	8.83	25.46	9.27	9.06	14.42	21.52	11.43	70	scl	16.54	8.60
19-32	Bt	55.89	11.13	32.98	6.47	9.18	11.89	19.19	9.18	50	scl	19.24	12.78
32-58	Bt	47.95	10.41	41.63	17.52	3.78	9.13	9.55	7.97	50	sc	24.03	16.02

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base saturation	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-19	7.38	-	-	0.09	0.2	0.00	8.97	4.32	0.26	0.22	13.77	14.84	0.58	93	1.49
19-32	7.5	-	-	0.106	0.41	0.00	15.98	3.27	0.16	0.50	19.91	20.88	0.63	95	2.38
32-58	7.46	-	-	0.173	0.49	0.00	19.71	4.53	0.23	1.32	25.79	25.76	0.62	100	5.11

Contd....

Soil Series: 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: Niduvalalu (NDL), **Pedon:** R-20
Location: $15^0$12'78.8"N, $75^0$57'44.0" E Raghunathanahalli village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **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
0-16	Ap	79.83	7.02	13.15	9.36	11.02	19.54	28.59	11.33	35-40	sl	14.30	5.17
16-31	Bt1	54.75	10.89	34.36	12.81	7.47	12.17	11.95	10.35	55-60	scl	24.67	14.17
31-44	Bt2	44.64	2.31	53.06	17.06	8.48	7.19	8.05	3.86	65-70	c	30.02	17.19
44-79	Bt3	47.28	2.50	50.21	24.17	8.20	6.07	5.96	2.88	65-70	sc	27.19	14.87
79-107	Bt4	47.79	8.17	44.04	13.38	5.72	11.11	11.87	5.72	60-65	sc	25.96	14.23
107-140	Bt5	46.16	3.57	50.27	21.75	7.57	6.40	6.72	3.73	60-65	sc	27.28	15.13
140-180	Bt6	49.47	3.94	46.59	22.49	8.21	6.29	7.78	4.69	65-70	sc	27.56	14.76

Depth (cm)	pH (1:2.5)			E.C. (1:2.5)	O.C.	$CaCO_3$	Exchangeable bases					CEC	CEC/ Clay	Base satura tion	ESP
							Ca	Mg	K	Na	Total				
	Water	$CaCl_2$	M KCl	dS m^{-1}	%	%	cmol kg^{-1}							%	%
0-16	7.46	-	-	0.08	0.76		6.26	4.05	0.12	0.09	10.52	11.45	0.87	91.88	0.32
16-31	7.84	-	-	0.28	1.05	2.86	-	-	0.18	1.41	-	27.36	0.80	100.00	2.06
31-44	7.69	-	-	0.46	0.81	2.99	-	-	0.24	2.63	-	32.59	0.61	100.00	3.23
44-79	7.92	-	-	0.11	0.35	1.69	16.29	3.51	0.14	2.63	22.57	22.56	0.45	100.03	4.66
79-107	7.86	-	-	0.09	0.23	1.43	12.98	2.83	0.10	1.82	17.73	17.88	0.41	99.19	4.07
107-140	8.20	-	-	0.07	0.23	1.17	16.26	3.41	0.13	1.85	21.65	20.82	0.41	104.01	3.56
140-180	8.11	-	-	0.20	0.15	1.82	-	-	0.11	1.29	-	20.71	0.44	100.00	2.49

Contd…

Series Name: Gatareddihal (GRH), **Pedon:** R-7
Location: $15^0$14'20.8"N, $76^0$04'28.4" E Gudlanur village, Koppal Taluk and District
Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore. **Classification:** Very fine, smectitic, (calc), isohyperthermic Sodic 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
0-18	Ap	20.07	19.71	60.23	1.76	3.75	3.64	3.42	7.50	-	c	41.70	29.56
18-51	Bss1	15.11	17.47	67.42	3.16	3.04	2.25	3.38	3.27	-	c	59.43	38.52
51-80	Bss2	13.19	18.74	68.07	1.80	2.93	2.37	3.04	3.04	-	c	60.69	40.91
80-107	Bss3	17.54	19.50	62.96	2.46	4.13	3.24	4.25	3.46	-	c	57.25	37.31
107-131	BC	9.42	17.48	73.10	1.48	1.82	1.36	1.93	2.84	-	c	64.62	43.98

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	9.08	-	-	0.23	0.33	6.89	-	-	0.70	6.36	-	63.21	1.05	100.00	7.11
18-51	9.19	-	-	0.61	0.49	9.10	-	-	0.54	14.20	-	66.05	0.98	100.00	15.98
51-80	9.27	-	-	0.56	0.29	9.36	-	-	0.49	14.75	-	65.63	0.96	100.00	17.07
80-107	9.28	-	-	0.57	0.39	9.62	-	-	0.44	14.64	-	63.95	1.02	100.00	17.49
107-131	9.04	-	-	1.08	0.31	8.32	-	-	0.52	16.40	-	68.36	0.94	100.00	17.30

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 and rock-outcrops.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The land capability subclasses are recognised based on the dominant limitations observed within a given land capability class. The subclasses are designated by adding a lower case letter like 'e', 'w', 's', or 'c' to the class numeral. The subclass "e" indicates that the main hazard is risk of erosion, "w" indicates drainage or wetness as a limitation for plant growth, "s" indicates shallow soil depth, coarse or heavy textures, calcareousness, salinity/alkali 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 identified 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 22 soil map units identified in the Indargi-3 microwatershed are grouped under 3 Land capability classes and 6 land capability subclasses (Fig. 5.1). Entire cultivated area of about 437 ha (69%) is suitable for agriculture. An area of about 186 ha (29%) is under rock outcrops and 13 ha (2%) is under habitation and waterbodies.

Maximum area of about 247 ha (39%) is good lands (Class II) and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed with minor problems of soil and erosion. An area about 152 ha (24%) is moderately good lands (Class III) and distributed in the northern, western, western, central, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of soil and erosion. Fairly good cultivable lands (Class IV) occur in an area of 37 ha (6%) and distributed in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of soil and erosion.



Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

5.2 Soil Depth

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

Moderately shallow (50-75 cm) soils cover an area of about 131 ha (21%) and occur in the northwestern, western, central, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately deep (75-100 cm) soils cover an area of about 107 ha (17%) and distributed in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 61 ha (9%) is under deep (100-150 cm) soils and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed. Very deep (>150 cm) soils occupy a maximum area of 137 ha (22%) and occur in all parts of the microwatershed.

The most productive lands cover about 198 ha (31%) where all climatically adapted long duration crops can be grown. The problem soils cover about 131 ha (21%) area where only short duration crops can be grown and the probability of crop failure is high.



Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

5.3 Surface Soil Texture

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

Maximum area of about 323 ha (51%) is loamy at the surface and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed. An area of 113 ha (18%) has soils that are clayey at the surface and occur in the northern, eastern, western and southern part of the microwatershed.

The clayey soils (18%) 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 soils (51%) which also have high potential for soil-water retention and nutrient availability but have no drainage or other physical problems.



Fig. 5.3 Surface Soil Texture map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

5.4 Soil Gravelliness

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

An area of about 187 ha (29%) has non gravelly (<15%) soils and occur in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 244 ha (38%) has gravelly (15-35%) soils and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 5 ha (1%) has very gravelly (35-60%) soils and occur in the western part of the microwatershed.

Areas of about 29 per cent are most productive lands with respect to non-gravelliness. These are most productive soils and have potential for growing both annual and perennial crops. The problem lands cover about 39 per cent that are gravelly to very gravelly where only medium or short duration crops can be grown.



Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

5.5 Available Water Capacity

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

An area of about 110 ha (17%) has soils that are very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and distributed in the northern, central and southrn part of the microwatershed. Low (51-100 mm/m) in available water capacity cover a maximum area of about 159 ha (25%) and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 75 ha (12%) is high (151-200 mm/m) in available water capacity and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 93 ha (15%) is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity and occur in the northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed.

An area of about 110 ha (17%) 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 93 ha (15%) has soils that have very high potential

(151->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 Indargi-3 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 different slope classes and a slope map was generated showing the area extent and their geographic distribution of different slope classes in the microwatershed (Fig. 5.6).

An area of about 35 ha (5%) falls under nearly level (0-1% slope) lands and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 402 ha (63%) falls under very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed.

Entire cultivated area of the microwatershed has soils that have high potential in respect of soil slopes. In these areas, all climatically adapted annual and perennial crops can be grown without much soil and water conservation and other land development measures.



Fig. 5.6 Soil Slope map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

5.7 Soil Erosion

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

Soils that are slightly eroded (e1 class) cover an area of 148 ha (23%) and distributed in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed. Soils that are moderately eroded (e2 class) cover a major area of 288 ha (45%) and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed.

Maximum area of about 288 ha (45%) in the microwatershed is problematic because of moderate erosion. For these areas, taking up soil and water conservation and other land development measures are needed.



Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

Chapter 6

FERTILITY STATUS

Soil fertility plays an important role in increasing crop yield. The adoption of high yielding varieties that require high amounts of nutrients has resulted in deficiency symptoms in crops and plants due to imbalanced fertilization and poor inherent fertility status, as these areas are characterised by low rainfall and high temperatures. Hence, it is necessary to know the fertility (macro and micro nutrients) status of the soils of the watersheds for assessing the kind and amount of fertilizers required for each of the crop intended to be grown. For this purpose, the surface soil samples collected from the grid points (one soil sample at every 320 m grid interval) all over the microwatershed through land resource inventory in the year 2019 were analysed for pH, EC, organic carbon, available phosphorus and potassium, and for micronutrients like zinc, boron, copper, iron and manganese, and secondary nutrient sulphur.

Soil fertility data generated has been assessed and individual maps for all the nutrients for the microwatershed have been generated using 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 Indargi-3 microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that a major area of about 282 ha (44%) is under neutral (pH 6.5-7.3) reaction and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 152 ha (24%) is under slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) in soil reaction and occur in the northern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.1). Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) soils occur in an area of 2 ha (<1%) and distributed in the eastern part of the microwatershed. Thus, major soils in the microwatershed are neutral and alkaline in reaction

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

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

6.3 Organic Carbon (OC)

The soil organic carbon content (an index of available Nitrogen) of the microwatershed is low (<0.5%) in an area of 10 ha (2%) and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed. Medium (0.5-0.75%) in an area of about 158 ha (25%) and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 269 ha (42%) is high (>0.75%) in organic carbon and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed (Fig.6.3).

6.4 Available Phosphorus

An area of about 85 ha (13%) is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus and distributed in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. High (>57 kg/ha) in a maximum area of about 351 ha (55%) and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed (Fig 6.4).

6.5 Available Potassium

Maximum area of about 394 ha (62%) is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in available potassium and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 43 ha (7%) is high (>337 kg/ha) in available potassium and distributed in the western and eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig.6.5).

6.6 Available Sulphur

An area of about 63 ha (10%) is low (<10 ppm) in available sulpur and distributed in the central, northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 345 ha (54%) is medium (10-20 ppm) in available sulpur and occur all parts of the microwatershed (Fig.6.6). High (>20 ppm) in an area of 28 ha (4%) and distributed in the northern part of the microwatershed.



Fig.6.1 Soil Reaction (pH) map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.3 Soil Organic Carbon (OC) map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.4 Soil Available Phosphorus map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.5 Soil Available Potassium map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.6 Soil Available Sulphur map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

6.7 Available Boron

Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed (Fig 6.9). (Fig.6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in a major area of about 300 ha (47%) and distributed in the major parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 136 ha (21%) is deficient (<4.5 ppm) and distributed in the northern and central part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.8).

6.9 Available Manganese

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

6.10 Available Copper

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



Fig.6.7 Soil Available Boron map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.8 Soil Available Iron map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.9 Soil Available Manganese map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed



Fig.6.10 Soil Available Copper map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in a major area of about 400 ha (63%) and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. An area of about 36 ha (6%) is sufficient (>0.6 ppm) and distributed in the southern and western part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.11).



Fig.6.11 Soil Available Zinc map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

Chapter 7

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Indargi-3 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 (Table 7.1) were matched with the crop requirements (Tables 7.2 to 7.32) to arrive at the crop suitability. The soil and land characteristics table and crop requirements tables are given at the end of the chapter. In FAO land suitability classification, two orders are recognized. Order S-Suitable and Order N- Not suitable. The orders have Classes, subclasses and units. Order-S has three classes, Class S1-Highly Suitable, Class S2-Moderately Suitable and Class S3-Marginally Suitable. Order N has two classes, N1- Currently not Suitable and N2-Permanently not Suitable. There are no subclasses within the Class S1 as they will have very minor or no limitations for crop growth. Classes S2, S3, N1 and N2 are divided into subclasses based on the kinds of limitations encountered. The limitations that affect crop production are 'c' for erratic rainfall and its distribution and length of growing period (LGP), 'e' for erosion hazard, 'r' for rooting condition, 't' for lighter or heavy texture, 'g' for gravelliness or stoniness, 'n' for nutrient availability, 'l' for topography, 'm' for moisture availability, 'z' for calcareousness and 'w' for drainage. These limitations are indicated as lower case letters to the class symbol. For example, moderately suitable lands with the limitations of soil depth and erosion are designated as S2re. For the microwatershed, the soil mapping units were evaluated and classified up to subclass level.

Using the above criteria, the soil map units of the microwatershed were evaluated and land suitability maps for 31 major agricultural and horticultural crops were generated. The detailed information on the kind of suitability of each of the soil phase for the crops assessed are given village/ survey number wise for the microwatershed in Appendix-III

7.1 Land Suitability for Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*)

Sorghum is one of the major food crop grown in Karnataka in an area of 10.47 lakh ha in Bijapur, Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar, Belgaum, Dharwad, Bellary, Chitradurga, Mysore and Chamarajnagar districts. The crop requirements for growing sorghum (Table 7.2) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and land a 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.

An area of about 130 ha (20%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sorghum and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 155 ha (25%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing sorghum and

distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness and calcareousness. An area of about 153 ha (24%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sorghum and occur in the northern, western, central, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of nutrient availability and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.1 Land Suitability map of Sorghum

7.2 Land Suitability for Maize (*Zea mays*)

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing maize in this microwatershed. Maximum area of about 284 ha (45%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing maize and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 153 ha (24%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing maize and occur in the northern, western, central, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of nutrient availability and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.2 Land Suitability map of Maize

7.3 Land Suitability for Bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum)*

Bajra is one of the major food crop grown in an area of 2.34 lakh ha in 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 land suitability map for growing bajra was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.3.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing bajra and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 325 ha (51%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing bajra and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing bajra and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.3 Land Suitability map of Bajra

7.4 Land Suitability for Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*)

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing groundnut in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 220 ha (34%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing groundnut and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 179 ha (28%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing groundnut and distributed in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of texture. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing groundnut and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.4 Land Suitability map of Groundnut

7.5 Land Suitability for Sunflower (*Helianthus annus*)

Sunflower is one of the most important oilseed crop grown in an area of 3.56 lakh ha in the State in all the districts. The crop requirements for growing sunflower (Table 7.6) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sunflower was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.5.

An area of about 130 ha (20%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing sunflower and distributed in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 132 ha (21%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing sunflower and distributed in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and calcareousness. Maximum area of about 137 ha (22%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sunflower and occur in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of gravelliness, calcareousness and rooting depth. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing sunflower and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

7.6 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, Kalaburagi, Bijapur, Bidar, Bellary, Chitradurga and Chamarajnagar districts. The crop requirements for growing cotton (Table 7.7) 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 7.6.

An area of about 55 ha (9%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing cotton and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 229 ha (37%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing cotton and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of gravelliness, texture, calcareousness and rooting depth. An area of about 153 ha (24%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing cotton and occur in the western, northern, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, nutrient availability and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Cotton

7.7 Land Suitability for Red gram (*Cajanus cajana*)

Red gram is one of the major pulse crop grown in an area of 7.28 lakh ha mainly in northern Karnataka in Bijapur, Kalaburagi, Raichur, Bidar, Belgaum, Dharwad and Bellary districts. The crop requirements for growing red gram (Table 7.8) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing red gram was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.7.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing red gram and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 187 ha (30%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing red gram and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 175 ha (27%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing red gram and distributed in the northern, western, central, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness, nutrient availability and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Red gram

7.8 Land Suitability for Bengal gram (*Cicer aerativum*)

Bengal gram is one of the most important pulse crop grown in about 9.39 lakh ha area in Bijapur, Raichur, Kalaburagi, Dharwad, Belgaum and Bellary districts. The crop requirements for growing Bengal gram (Table 7.9) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing Bengal gram was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.8.

An area of about 55 ha (9%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Bengal gram and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 21 ha (3%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Bengal gram and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of calcareousness. Maximum area of about 361 ha (57%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Bengal gram and occur in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, nutrient availability, calcareousness and gravelliness.



Fig. 7.8 Land Suitability map of Bengal gram

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

Chilli is one of the major 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 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Chilli and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 210 ha (33%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Chilli and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 115 ha (18%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Chilli and distributed in the northern, western, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Chilli and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



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 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Tomato and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (21%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Tomato and occur in northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (30%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Tomato and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Tomato and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.10 Land Suitability map of Tomato

7.11 Land Suitability for Brinjal (*Solanum melongena*)

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

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Brinjal and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (21%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Brinjal and occur in northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (30%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Brinjal and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Brinjal and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig 7.11 Land Suitability map of Brinjal

7.12 Land Suitability for Onion (*Allium cepa L.*,)

Onion is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in the state. The crop requirements for growing onion (Table 7.13) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing onion was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.12.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Onion in the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 209 ha (33%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Onion and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 191 ha (30%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Onion and distributed in the northern, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of calcareousness, gravelliness and texture. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Onion and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig 7.12 Land Suitability map of Onion

7.13 Land Suitability for Bhendi (*Abelmoschus esculentus*)

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

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Bhendi and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 210 ha (33%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Bhendi and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 115 ha (18%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Bhendi and distributed in the northern, western, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Bhendi and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig 7.13 Land Suitability map of Bhendi

7.14 Land Suitability for Drumstick (*Moringa oleifera)*

Drumstick is one of the most important vegetable crop grown in 2403 ha area in the state. The crop requirements for growing drumstick (Table 7.15) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing drumstick was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.14.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing drumstick and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 172 ha (28%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing drumstick and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 153 ha (23%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing drumstick and distributed in the northern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing drumstick and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.14 Land Suitability map of Drumstick

7.15 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 7.16) 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 7.15.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Mulberry in the microwatershed. An area of about 192 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Mulberry and distributed in the northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 208 ha (32%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Mulberry and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, gravelliness, calcareousness and texture. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Mulberry and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.15 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

7.16 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 7.17) 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 7.16.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing mango and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 30 ha (5%) and occur in the western and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover in an area of about 162 ha (25%) and occur in the northern, eastern, southern and western part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 170 ha (27%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing mango and occur in all parts of the microwatershed with severe limitations of nutrient availability, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.17 Land Suitability for Sapota (*Manilkara zapota*)

Sapota is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of about 29373 ha in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.18) for growing sapota were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing sapota was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.17.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Sapota and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 117 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Sapota and occur in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 208 ha (32%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Sapota and distributed all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Sapota and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Sapota

7.18 Land Suitability for Pomegranate (*Punica granatum*)

Pomegranate is one of the commercially grown fruit crop in about 18488 ha in Karnataka mainly in Bijapur, Bagalkot, Koppal, Gadag and Chitradurga districts. The crop requirements for growing pomegranate (Table 7.19) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing pomegranate was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.18.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Pomegranate and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 193 ha (31%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Pomegranate and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 132 ha (20%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Pomegranate and distributed in the northern, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Pomegranate and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.18 Land Suitability map of Pomegranate

7.19 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 7.20) 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 7.19.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Guava and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 117 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Guava and occur in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 208 ha (32%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Guava and distributed all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Guava and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.19 Land Suitability map of Guava

7.20 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 7.21) 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 7.20.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Jackfruit and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 117 ha (19%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Jackfruit and occur in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 208 ha (32%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Jackfruit and distributed all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture, calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Jackfruit and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.21 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

Jamun is one of the important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.22) for growing jamun were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jamun was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.21.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Jamun and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 85 ha (14%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Jamun and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 239 ha (37%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Jamun and distributed all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Jamun and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Jamun

7.22 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 7.23) 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 7.22.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing musambi cover an area of about 130 ha (20%) and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 138 ha (22%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing musambi and occur in major parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 132 ha (21%) and occur in the northern, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing musambi and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.22 Land Suitability map of Musambi

7.23 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 (Table 7.24) for growing lime (Table 7.15) 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 7.23.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing Lime cover an area of about 130 ha (20%) and occur in the northern, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 138 ha (22%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Lime and occur in major parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover an area of about 132 ha (21%) and occur in the northern, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Lime and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Lime

7.24 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 (Table 7.25) for growing cashew 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 7.24.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Cashew and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 117 ha (19%) and occur in the northern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover in an area of about 110 ha (17%) and occur in the northern, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 136 ha (21%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Cashew and occur in all parts of the microwatershed with severe limitations of texture, nutrient availability, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.24 Land Suitability map of Cashew

7.25 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 7.26) 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 7.25.

An area of about 130 ha (20%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing custard apple and occur in the northern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Major area of about 270 ha (42%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing custard apple and occur in major parts of the microwatershed with minor limitations of rooting depth, calcareousness and gravelliness. No marginally suitable (Class S3) lands for growing custard apple in the microwatershed. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing custard apple and occur in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.25 Land Suitability map of Custard Apple

7.26 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 for (Table 7.27) 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 7.26.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Amla and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 304 ha (48%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Amla and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 21 ha (3%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Amla and distributed in the southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of calcareousness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Amla and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.27 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 7.28) 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 is given in Figure 7.27.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Tamarind and distributed in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occupy an area of about 85 ha (14%) and occur in the northern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. Marginally suitable (Class S3) lands cover in an area of about 107 ha (17%) and occur in the northern, western and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 170 ha (26%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Tamarind and occur in all parts of the microwatershed with severe limitations of nutrient availability, calcareousness and rooting depth.



Fig. 7.27 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

7.28 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 7.29) for growing marigold were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing marigold was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.28.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Marigold and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 210 ha (33%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Marigold and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 115 ha (18%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Marigold and distributed in the northern, western, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Marigold and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.28 Land Suitability map of Marigold

7.29 Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum indicum*)

Chrysanthemum is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 4978 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.30) 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 7.29.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Chrysanthemum and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Maximum area of about 210 ha (33%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Chrysanthemum and occur in all parts of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, texture, rooting depth and gravelliness. An area of about 115 ha (18%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Chrysanthemum and distributed in the northern, western, eastern, central and southern part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Chrysanthemum and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.29 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

7.30 Land Suitability for Jasmine *(Jasminum sp.)*

Jasmine is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 803 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.31) for growing jasmine were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jasmine was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.30.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Jasmine and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (21%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Jasmine and occur in northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (30%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Jasmine and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Jasmine and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.30 Land Suitability map of Jasmine

7. 31 Land Suitability for Crossandra *(Crossandra infundibuliformis.)*

Crossandra is one of the most important flower crop grown in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements (Table 7.32) for growing crossandra were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing crossandra was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.31.

An area of about 75 ha (12%) is highly suitable (Class S1) for growing Crossandra and occur in the eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 134 ha (21%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing Crossandra and occur in northern, western, eastern and southern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitations of calcareousness, rooting depth and gravelliness. Maximum area of about 191 ha (30%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing Crossandra and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of texture and gravelliness. An area of about 38 ha (6%) is currently not suitable (Class N1) for growing Crossandra and distributed in the northern and western part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of nutrient availability.



Fig. 7.31 Land Suitability map of Crossandra

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drainage Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC	ESP	CEC [Cmol (p+)kg-1]	BS (%)
					Surf-ace	Sub-surface	Sur-face	Sub-surface								
LKRcB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	15-35	40-60	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.18	0.30	4.51	12.19	100
LKRhB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	40-60	51-100	1-3	moderate	8.18	0.30	4.51	12.19	100
MKHcB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	sl	gsc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
MKHhB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	scl	gsc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
MKHiB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	sc	gsc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	7.38	0.09	1.49	14.84	93
HDHcB2g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.07
HDHcB2g2	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gsc-gc	35-60	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.07
HDHiB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sc	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.07
HDHiB2g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sc	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	moderate	6.54	0.07	7.11	5.84	84.07
BDGcB1g1	662	<90	WD	75-100	sl	gc	15-35	35-60	<50	1-3	slight	6.24	0.06	0.35	3.76	52.56
BDGiB1g2	662	<90	WD	75-100	sc	gc	35-60	35-60	<50	1-3	slight	6.24	0.06	0.35	3.76	52.56
BPRcB2g1	662	<90	WD	100-150	sl	gsc-gc	15-35	>35	101-150	1-3	moderate	6.64	0.03	0.51	5.45	63.48
HLKhB2	662	<90	WD	>150	scl	c	<15	<15	151-200	1-3	moderate	-	-	-	-	-
HLKiA1	662	<90	WD	>150	sc	c	<15	<15	151-200	0-1	slight	-	-	-	-	-
NDLiB1g1	662	<90	WD	>150	sc	gsc	15-35	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	7.46	0.08	0.32	11.45	91.88
KSPhB2g1	662	<90	WD	50-75	scl	gscl	15-35	15-35	<50	1-3	moderate	-	-	-	-	-
BWThB1	662	<90	MWD	75-100	scl	gsc-gc	<15	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	-	-	-	-	-
BWTmB1	662	<90	MWD	75-100	c	gsc-gc	<15	>35	51-100	1-3	slight	-	-	-	-	-
GRHiB2	662	<90	MWD	100-150	sc	c	<15	<15	>200	1-3	moderate	9.08	0.23	7.11	63.21	100
GRHmB1g1	662	<90	MWD	100-150	c	c	15-35	<15	>200	1-3	slight	9.08	0.23	7.11	63.21	100
KDTcB1	662	<90	MWD	>150	sl	sc-c	<15	<15	>200	1-3	slight	6.95	0.17	0.65	12.10	100
KDTiB1	662	<90	MWD	>150	sc	sc-c	<15	<15	>200	1-3	slight	6.95	0.17	0.65	12.10	100

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

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 regime	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 Groundnut

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

Table 7.6 Land suitability criteria for Sunflower

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

Table 7.7 Land suitability criteria for 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/Somewhat 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 7.8 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 7.9 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 7.10 Land suitability criteria for Chilli

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

Table 7.11 Land suitability criteria for Tomato

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

Table 7.12 Land suitability criteria for Brinjal

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

Table 7.13 Land suitability criteria for Onion

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	20-30	30-35	35-40	>40
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately /imperfectly	-	Poorly to V poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	sl,scl,cl,sc,c (red)	-	c (Black),ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<1.0	1.0-2.0	2.0-4.0	<4
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.14 Land suitability criteria for Bhendi

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

Table 7.15 Land suitability criteria for Drumstick

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

Table 7.16 Land suitability criteria for 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 7.17 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 7.18 Land suitability criteria for Sapota

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

Table 7.19 Land suitability criteria for Pomegranate

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

Table 7.20 Land suitability criteria for 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 7.21 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 7.22 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 7.23 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 7.24 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 7.25 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 7.26 Land suitability criteria for Custard apple

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

Table 7.27 Land suitability criteria for 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 7.28 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 7.29 Land suitability criteria for Marigold

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

Table 7.30 Land suitability criteria for Chrysanthemum

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

Table 7.31 Land suitability criteria for Jasmine (irrigated)

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

Table 7.32 Land suitability criteria for Crossandra

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

7.32 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 22 soil map units identified in Indargi-3 microwatershed have been grouped into 7 Land Management Units (LMUs) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan. Land Management Units are grouped based on the similarities in respect of the type of soil, the depth of the soil, the surface soil texture, gravel content, AWC, slope, erosion etc. and a Land Management Unit map (Fig.7.32) has been generated. These Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

The map units that have been grouped into 7 Land Management Units along with brief description of soil and site characteristics are given below.

LMUs	Mapping unit	Soil and site characteristics
1	270.HLKhB2 272.HLKiA1	Very deep (>150 cm), red sandy clay loam to sandy clay soils, slope (0-3%), slight to moderate erosion
2	400.KDTcB1 401.KDTiB1	Very deep (>150 cm), black sandy loam to sandy clay soils, slope (1-3%), slight erosion
3	299.NDLiB1g1 225.BPRcB2g1 180.BDGcB1g1 193.BDGiB1g2 111.HDHcB2g1 112.HDHcB2g2 126.HDHiB1g1 128.HDHiB2g1	Moderately deep to very deep (75 to >150 cm), red gravelly sandy loam to sandy clay soils, slope (1-3%), slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%) to very gravelly (35-60%)
4	368.GRHiB2 372.GRHmB1g1	Deep (100-150 cm), black calcareous sodic clay soils, slope (1-3%), slight to moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
5	366.BWThB1 367.BWTmB1	Moderately deep (75-100 cm), black calcareous gravelly sandy clay loam to clay soils, slope (1-3%), slight erosion
6	43.LKRcB2g1 452.LKRhB2g1 77.MKHcB2g1 85.MKHhB2g1 90.MKHiB2g1	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm), red gravelly sandy loam to sand clay loam soils, slope (1-3%), moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)
7	320.KSPhB2g1	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm), red calcareous gravelly sandy clay loam soils, slope (1-3%), moderate erosion, gravelly (15-35%)



Fig 7.32 Land Management Units map of Indargi-3 microwatershed

7.33 Proposed Crop Plan for Indargi-3 Microwatershed

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

Table 7.33 Proposed Crop Plan for Indargi-3 Microwatershed

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
1	270.HLKhB2 272.HLKiA1	**Indragi :**45,46,49,56,57,58,59, 62, 307,315	Maize, Sorghum, Groundnut, Sunflower, Bajra, Mulberry, Cotton, Red gram, Horse gram, Field bean	**Fruit crops** : Mango, Sapota, Guava, Tamarind, Pomegranate, Lime, Musambi, Cashew, Jackfruit, Jamun Custard apple, Amla **Vegetables:** Tomato, Chillies, Drumstick, Onion, Bhendi, Brinjal, Curry leaves **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Jasmine, Crossandra	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
2	400.KDTcB1 401.KDTiB1	**Indragi** :317,44,48,50,51 **Vanabellary:**45,46,47,48	Maize, Sorghum, Sunflower, Bajra, Cotton, Red gram, Bengal gram	**Fruit crops:** Pomegranate, Lime, Musambi, Custard apple, Jamun, Amla, Tamarind **Vegetables:** Chilli ,Bhendi, Drumstick **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Bio fertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
3	299.NDLiB1g1 225.BPRcB2g1 180.BDGcB1g1 193.BDGiB1g2 111.HDHcB2g1 112.HDHcB2g2 126.HDHiB1g1 128.HDHiB2g1	**Indragi**:42,43,47,55,289,304,306, 308,318,319 **Vanabellary**:38,39,40,41,42,43,44 ,52,54,57,59,62,63,65	Maize, Sorghum, Sunflower, Groundnut, Bajra, Cotton, Red gram	**Fruit crops** : Sapota, Pomegranate, Amla, Cashew, Guava, Custard apple, Jack fruit, Jamun, Lime, Musambi **Vegetables:** Tomato, Chilli, Drumstick, Onion, Bhendi, Brinjal, Curry leaves **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Jasmine,	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Field Crops	Horticulture Crops	Suitable Interventions
				Crossandra	
4	368.GRHiB2 372.GRHmB1g1	**Vanabellary :**50,51,53,58	-	**Agri-Silvi-Pasture :** Acacia sp. Dhaincha, Rhodes grass, Para grass ,Bermuda grass	Application of gypsum, iron pyrites and elemental sulphur. Addition of farm yard manures, green manures and providing subsurface drainage
5	366.BWThB1 367.BWTmB1	**Indragi :**313,67,68,71	Maize, Sorghum, Sunflower, Bajra, Chilli, Cotton, Red gram, Bengal gram	**Fruit crops:** Lime, Musambi, Pomegranate, Custard Apple, Amla **Vegetables:** Drumstick, Chilli **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of gypsum, iron pyrites and elemental sulphur. Addition of farm yard manures, green manures and providing subsurface drainage
6	43.LKRcB2g1 452.LKRhB2g1 77.MKHcB2g1 85.MKHhB2g1 90.MKHiB2g1	**Indragi:**314,316,332,333,52,54,60 ,61,63,64,65,66,72 **Vanabellary :**49	Bajra, Groundnut, Horse gram, Castor	**Fruit crops :** Amla, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Curry leaves **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)
7	320.KSPhB2g1	**Indragi :**309,311,312,69,70 **Vanabellary**64,75	Maize, Sorghum, Groundnut, Bajra	**Fruit crops :** Amla, Custard apple **Vegetables:** Brinjal, Onion, Bhendi, Chilli **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum, Crossandra	Drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices (Crescent Bunding with Catch Pit etc)

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 unfavorable conditions occur

Characteristics of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

- The soil phases with sizeable area identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series of LKR 101 ha (16%), HLK 75 ha (12%), HDH 58 ha (9%), KDT 55 ha (9%), GRH 37 ha (6%), BDG 28 ha (5%), BPR 23 ha (4%), KSP 22 ha (3%), BWT 21 ha (3%), MKH 9 ha (1%) and NDL 7 ha (1%).
- As per land capability classification, entire area in the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II, III and IV). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil and erosion.

- On the basis of soil reaction, an area of about 282 ha (44%) are neutral (pH 6.5-7.3), 152 ha (24%) are slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and 2 ha (<1%) are strongly alkaline (pH 8.4-9.0) in soil reaction.

Soil Health Management

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

Neutral soils

Neutral soils occur in an area of about 282 ha (44%) in the microwatershed.

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

Alkaline soils

Slightly alkaline soils cover an area of about 154 ha (24%) in the microwatershed.

1. Regular addition of organic manure, green manuring, green leaf manuring, crop residue incorporation and mulching needs to be taken up to improve the soil organic matter status.
2. Application of Biofertilizers (Azospirullum, Azotobacter, Rhizobium).
3. Application of 25% extra N and P (125 % RDN&P).
4. Application of ZnSO4 – 12.5 kg/ha (once in three years).
5. Application of Boron – 5 kg/ha (once in three years).

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

Soil Degradation

Soil erosion is one of the major factor affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. An area of about 288 ha (45%) is suffering from moderate erosion. These areas need immediate soil and water conservation and, other land development and land husbandry practices for restoring soil health.

Dissemination of Information and Communication of Benefits

Any large scale implementation of soil health management requires that supporting information is made available widely, particularly through channels familiar to farmers and extension workers. Given the very high priority attached to soil health especially by the Central Government on issuing Soil-Health Cards to all the farmers,

media outlets like Regional, State and National Newspapers, Radio and Dooradarshan programs in local languages but also modern information and communication technologies such as Cellular phones and the Internet, which can be much more effective in reaching the younger farmers.

Inputs for Net Planning (Saturation Plan) and Interventions needed

Net planning 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, radish, 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 Indargi-3 Microwatershed.
- **Organic Carbon:** The OC content is low (<0.5%) in an area of 10 ha (2%), medium (0.5-0.75%) in an area of about 158 ha (25%) and high (>0.75%) in an area of 269 ha (42%). The areas that are low and medium in OC needs to be further improved by

applying farmyard manure and rotating crops with cereals and legumes or mixed cropping.

- **Promoting Green Manuring:** Growing of green manuring crops costs Rs. 1250/ha (green manuring seeds) and about Rs. 2000/ha towards cultivation that totals to Rs. 3250/- per ha. On the other hand, application of organic manure @ 10 tons/ha costs Rs. 5000/ha. The practice needs to be continued for 2-3 years or more. Nitrogen fertilizer needs to be supplemented by 25% in addition to the recommended level in 168 ha area where OC is low and medium (<0.5-0.75%). For example, for rainfed maize, recommended level is 50 kg N per ha and an additional 12 kg /ha needs to be applied for all the crops grown in these plots.
- **Available Phosphorus**: An area of about 85 ha (13%) is medium (23-57 kg/ha) and 351 ha (55%) is high (>57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus content. The areas with low and medium phosphorus content, additional 25% phosphorus from the RDF to be applied.
- **Available Potassium:** Available potassium content is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in an area of about 394 ha (62%) and high (>337 kg/ha) in 43 ha (7%) 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 low and medium.
- **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops. Available sulphur content is low (<10 ppm) in 63 ha (10%), medium (10-20ppm) in 345 ha (54%) and high (>20 ppm) in 28 ha (4%) area of the microwatershed. Areas with low and medium in available sulphur need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or Factamphos (p) fertitilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.
- **Available Boron:** Entire cultivated area of the microwatershed is low (<0.5 ppm) in the available boron content. The areas with low and medium in boron content need to be applied with sodium borate @ 10 kg/ha as soil application or 0.2% borax as foliar spray to correct the deficiency.
- **Available Iron:** Available iron content is deficient (<4.5 ppm) in an area of about 136 ha (21%) and sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in 300 ha (47%) area of the microwatershed. Application of iron sulphate @ 25 kg/ha for 2-3 years to correct the deficiency.
- **Available Manganese:** Entire cultivated area of the microwatershed is sufficient (>1.0 ppm) in the available manganese content.
- **Available Copper:** Entire cultivated area of the microwatershed is sufficient (>0.2 ppm) in the available copper content.
- **Available Zinc:** Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in an area of about 400 ha (63%) and sufficient (>0.6 ppm) in 36 ha (6%) area of the microwatershed. Application of zinc sulphate @ 25 kg/ha is to be followed in areas that are deficient in available zinc.

- **Soil Alkalinity:** An area of about 154 ha (24%) in the microwatershed has soils that are slightly 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 Indargi-3 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 needs 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.



FALL: 1.5 - 0.6 = 0.9 m.

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

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

Note: i) The above intervals are maximum.

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

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

Section of the Bund

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

Recommended Bund Section

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

Formation of Trench cum Bund

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

Details of Borrow Pit dimensions are given below



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
m2	m	m3	L(m)	W(m)	D(m)	Quantity (m3)	m	
0.375	6	2.25	5.85	0.85	0.45	2.24	0.15	Shallow
0.45	6	2.7	5.4	1.2	0.43	2.79	0.6	Shallow
0.45	6	2.7	5	0.85	0.65	2.76	1	Moderately Shallow
0.54	5.6	3.02	5.5	0.85	0.7	3.27	0.1	Moderately shallow
0.54	5.5	2.97	5	1.2	0.5	3	0.5	Shallow
0.72	6.2	4.46	6	1.2	0.7	5.04	0.2	Moderately shallow
0.72	5.2	3.74	5.1	0.85	0.9	3.9	0.1	Moderately deep

B. Waterways

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

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

c) The design details are given in the Manual.

C. Farm Ponds

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

D. Diversion Channel

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

9.1.2 Non-Arable Land Treatment

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

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

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

9.2 Recommended Soil and Water Conservation Measures

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

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

A map (Fig. 9.1) showing soil and water conservation plan with different kinds of structures recommended has been prepared which shows the spatial distribution and extent of area. Maximum area of about 288 ha (45%) needs trench cum bunding. An area of about 114 ha (18%) needs graded bunding. Strengthening of existing bunds/bunding occur in an area of about 35 ha (5%).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. 9.1 Soil and Water Conservation Plan map of Indargi-3 Microwatershed

9.3 Greening of Microwatershed

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

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

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

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

References

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

Appendix I

Indargi-3 (9A1b) Microwatershed

Soil Phase Information

Village	Survey Number	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Indragi	40	4.84	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke (Dy)	1 Borewell	RO	RO
Indragi	41	0.02	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	RO	RO
Indragi	42	5.5	BDGcB1g1	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	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	43	6.59	BDGcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	44	6.43	KDTiB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	45	1.99	HLKiA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	46	6.18	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	47	6.55	BDGcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	48	2.01	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	49	6.62	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	2 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	50	1.39	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	51	7.08	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	52	1.66	MKHcB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	53	1.63	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	RO	RO
Indragi	54	0.11	MKHcB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	55	8.19	NDLiB1g1	LMU-3	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Paddy (Mz+Pd)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	56	8.82	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	57	8.41	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Paddy (Mz+Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	58	4.68	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	59	4.44	HLKhB2	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	60	2.38	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	61	8.54	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	2 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Survey Number	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Indragi	62	5.71	HLKiA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	63	9.17	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	64	7.01	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Mango (Mn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	65	8.58	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	1 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	66	8.47	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	67	10.08	BWTmB1	LMU-5	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Mango+Sugarcane (Mn+Sc)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	68	0.63	BWTmB1	LMU-5	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	69	5.82	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	70	2.05	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	71	3.38	BWTmB1	LMU-5	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	72	9.2	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	78	20.33	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke (Dy)	Not Available	RO	RO
Indragi	221	2.13	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	Others	Others
Indragi	288	5.17	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Waterbody	Not Available	Others	Others
Indragi	289	3.66	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	304	0.03	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	306	5.1	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	307	9.87	HLKiA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize+Paddy (Mz+Pd)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	308	4.25	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	2 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	309	5.12	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	2 Borewell	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	311	0.69	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	312	6.34	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	313	4.76	BWThB1	LMU-5	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	314	7.45	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding

Village	Survey Number	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Indragi	315	5.88	HLKiA1	LMU-1	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	High (151-200 mm/m)	Nearly level (0-1%)	Slight	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	316	9.59	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	317	7.32	KDTiB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut+Maize (Gn+Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Indragi	318	2.96	BDGcB1g1	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	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	319	0.95	BDGcB1g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Not Available (NA)	Not Available	IIs	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	321	6.7	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Waterbody	Not Available	Others	Others
Indragi	322	2.37	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Waterbody	Not Available	Others	Others
Indragi	323	0.57	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Waterbody	Not Available	Others	Others
Indragi	332	0.53	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	333	0.72	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Indragi	334	1.72	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke (Dy)	Not Available	RO	RO
Indragi	335	1.75	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke (Dy)	Not Available	RO	RO
Indragi	336	1.77	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Dyke (Dy)	Not Available	RO	RO
Vanabellary	35	55.45	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Current fallow+Maize (Cf+Mz)	1 Borewell	RO	RO
Vanabellary	38	5.63	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	39	7.55	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	40	7.93	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	41	5.76	BPRcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	1 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	42	5.39	BDGcB1g1	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	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	43	6.95	BPRcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	44	6.43	BPRcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	5 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	45	4.99	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	46	3.95	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	47	7.22	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Groundnut (Gn)	1 Borewell	IIs	Graded bunding

Village	Survey Number	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	WELLS	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Vanabellary	48	5.26	KDTcB1	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize+Current fallow (Mz+Cf)	Not Available	IIs	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	49	8.89	LKRhB2g1	LMU-6	Moderately shallow (50-75 cm)	Sandy clay loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Very Low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	50	5.57	GRHiB2	LMU-4	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Redgram (Mz+Rg)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	51	6.4	GRHiB2	LMU-4	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Current fallow (Mz+Cf)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	52	10.68	BPRcB2g1	LMU-3	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize+Groundnut (Mz+Gn)	5 Borewell	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	53	10.69	GRHiB2	LMU-4	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	54	4.78	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	55	1.06	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	RO	RO
Vanabellary	57	2.4	BDGiB1g2	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	58	5.06	GRHiB2	LMU-4	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Vanabellary	59	3.01	BDGiB1g2	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy clay	Very gravelly (35-60%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Slight	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	62	1.46	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	63	4.97	HDHcB2g1	LMU-3	Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	Sandy loam	Gravelly (15-35%)	Low (51-100 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Maize (Mz)	Not Available	IIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	64	6.68	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	65	0.09	BDGcB1g1	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	Trench cum bunding
Vanabellary	75	1.14	KSPhB2g1	LMU-7	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	IIIes	Trench cum bunding

Appendix II

Indargi-3 (9A1b) Microwatershed

Soil Fertility Information

Village	Survey Number	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Indragi	40	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	41	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	42	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	43	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	44	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	45	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	46	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	47	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	48	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	49	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	50	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Indragi	51	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Indragi	52	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Indragi	53	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	54	Strongly alkaline (pH 8.4 – 9.0)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Indragi	55	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Indragi	56	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	57	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)	Medium (10 – 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	58	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Indragi	59	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Indragi	60	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	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)
Indragi	61	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)

Village	Survey Number	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Indragi	62	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	63	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	64	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	65	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	66	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	67	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	68	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	69	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	70	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	71	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	72	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	78	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	221	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	288	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	289	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 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)
Indragi	304	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	306	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	307	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	308	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	309	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	311	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	312	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	313	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	314	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)

Village	Survey Number	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Indragi	315	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Indragi	316	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	317	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	318	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	319	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)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Indragi	321	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	322	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	323	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	332	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Indragi	333	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Indragi	334	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	335	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	336	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	35	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	38	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	39	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	40	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	41	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	42	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	High (> 20 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	43	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	44	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	45	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	46	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	47	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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 Number	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Vanabellary	48	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	49	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Vanabellary	50	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Vanabellary	51	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	52	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	53	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	54	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	55	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	57	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Vanabellary	58	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Vanabellary	59	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	High (> 0.75 %)	High (> 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	62	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	63	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)
Vanabellary	64	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	65	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)
Vanabellary	75	Neutral (pH 6.5 – 7.3)	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)	Sufficient (> 0.6 ppm)

Appendix III

Indargi-3 (9A1b) Microwatershed

Soil Suitability Information

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Indragi	40	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	41	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	42	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	43	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	44	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Indragi	45	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	46	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	47	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	48	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Indragi	49	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	50	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Indragi	51	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Indragi	52	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3gt	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	53	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	54	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3gt	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	55	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S3gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g
Indragi	56	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	57	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	58	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	59	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	60	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	61	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	62	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	63	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Indragi	64	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	65	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	66	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	67	S3rt	S2tz	S3t	S2z	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S2rt	S3z	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S3t	S3z	S3tz	S3tz
Indragi	68	S3rt	S2tz	S3t	S2z	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S2rt	S3z	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S3t	S3z	S3tz	S3tz
Indragi	69	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Indragi	70	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Indragi	71	S3rt	S2tz	S3t	S2z	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S2rt	S3z	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S3t	S3z	S3tz	S3tz
Indragi	72	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	78	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	221	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	288	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	289	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	304	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	306	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	307	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	308	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	309	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Indragi	311	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Indragi	312	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Indragi	313	S3rt	S2tz	S3t	S2z	S3tz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2z	S2rz	S2rt	S3z	S3tz	S2z	N1tz	S3rz	S2rz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S2tz	S2rt	S2tz	S3t	S2tz	S3t	S3t	S3z	S3tz	S3tz
Indragi	314	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	315	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S3t	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t
Indragi	316	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	317	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Indragi	318	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Indragi	319	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Indragi	321	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	322	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	323	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Indragi	332	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	333	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Indragi	334	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	335	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Indragi	336	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	35	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	38	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	39	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	40	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	41	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g
Vanabellary	42	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	43	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g
Vanabellary	44	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g
Vanabellary	45	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Vanabellary	46	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Vanabellary	47	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Vanabellary	48	S3t	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S3t
Vanabellary	49	N1r	S3g	S3rg	S3g	S3rg	S3g	N1r	S3rg	S3gt	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3rg	S3rg	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S2rg	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3rg	S3rg	S3g
Vanabellary	50	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1tn	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Jasmine	Bhendi	Brinjal	Crossandra	Drumstick	Mulberry	Onion
Vanabellary	51	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1tn	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n
Vanabellary	52	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g
Vanabellary	53	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1tn	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n
Vanabellary	54	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	55	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO	RO
Vanabellary	57	S3r	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S3g
Vanabellary	58	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1tn	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	S3n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n	N1n
Vanabellary	59	S3r	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S2rg	S3g	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S3g	S3g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S3g	S2rg	S2rg	S3g
Vanabellary	62	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	63	S3r	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S2gt	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	64	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz
Vanabellary	65	S3r	S2gt	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2rg	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2rg	S3r	S2rg	S3t	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2g	S2rg	S2rg	S2g
Vanabellary	75	N1rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1rz	S3rz	S3tz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	N1z	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S2rz	S3rz	S3rz	S2rz

RO-Rock outcrops

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

FINDINGS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY

- *The survey was conducted in Indargi-3 is located at North latitude 15^0 28' 26.397" and 15^0 26' 40.332" and East longitude 76^0 19' 31.482" and 76^0 17' 40.928" covering an area of about 644.41 ha coming under Indargi and Ballary villages of Koppal taluk.*
- *Socio-economic analysis of Indargi-3 micro watersheds of Indargi sub-watershed, Koppala taluk & District indicated that, out of the total sample of 35 total respondents, 10 (28.57 %) were marginal, 12 (34.29%)were small, 7 (20.00 %) were Semi medium and 1 (2.86 %) were medium farmers.*
- *The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 81 (62.79%) men and 48 (37.21 %) were women.*
- *Majority of the respondents (44.19%) were in the age group of 16-35 years.*
- *Education level of the sample households indicated that, there were 52.71 per cent illiterates, 38.00 per cent pre university education and 7.75 per cent attained graduation.*
- *About, 82.86 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 17.14 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers.*
- *Agriculture was the major occupation for 23.26 per cent of the household members.*
- *In the study area, 31.43 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 5.71 per cent possess pucca house.*
- *The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 57.14 per cent possess TV, 5.71 per cent possess mixer grinder, 71.43 per cent possess mobile phones and 40.00 per cent possess motor cycles.*
- *Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 11.43 per cent of the households possess plough and 14.29 per cent possess bullock cart.*
- *Regarding livestock possession by the households, 8.57 per cent possess local cow.*
- *The average labour availability in the study area showed that, own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.44, women available in the micro watershed was 1.46, hired labour (men) available was 9.2 and hired labour (women) available was 9.43.*
- *Further, 100.00 per cent of the households opined that hired labour was inadequate during the agricultural season.*
- *Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents 68.03 per cent (35.28 ha) of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 31.97 per cent area is irrigated land.*
- *There were 8.00 live bore wells and 8.00 dry bore wells among the sampled households.*
- *Bore/open well was the major source of irrigation for 22.86 per cent of the households.*
- *The major crops grown by sample farmers are Maize, Bajra, Groundnut, Sorghum and Paddy and cropping intensity was recorded as 98.86 per cent.*

- *Out of the sample households 85.71 percent possessed bank account and 85.71 per cent of them have savings in the account.*
- *About 85.71 per cent of the respondents borrowed credit from various sources.*
- *The per hectare cost of cultivation for Maize, Bajra, Groundnut, Sorghum and Paddy was Rs.33562.69, 29547.96, 46106.54, 16192.28 and 24848.95 with benefit cost ratio of 1:1.50, 1: 0.70, 1: 2.20, 1: 1.80 and 1:4.80 respectively.*
- *Further, 8.57 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate.*
- *The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 65914.29 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 53885.71 comes from agriculture.*
- *Sampled households have grown 12 horticulture trees and 74 forestry trees together in the fields and back yards.*
- *Households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 857.14 for land development.*
- *Source of funds for additional investment is concerned, 8.57 per cent depends on bank loan for land development activities.*
- *Regarding marketing channels, 20.00 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants, while, 65.71 per cent have sold in regulated markets.*
- *Further, 85.71 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.*
- *Majority of the farmers (85.71%) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 85.71 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.*
- *Fire was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 100.00 per cent of the households.*
- *Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households.*
- *Electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households.*
- *In the study area, 42.86 per cent of the households possess toilet facility.*
- *Regarding possession of PDS card, 100.00 per cent of the households possessed BPL card.*
- *Households opined that, the requirement of cereals (88.57%), pulses (77.14%) and oilseeds (11.43%) are adequate for consumption.*
- *Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (85.71%) wild animal menace on farm field (71.43%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (65.71%), inadequacy of irrigation water (20.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (34.29%), high rate of interest on credit (28.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (11.43%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (14.29%), inadequate extension services (17.14%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (54.29%), Less rainfall (62.86%) and Source of Agri-technology information (Newspaper/ TV/Mobile) (57.14%).*

Chapter 2

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

Scope and importance of survey

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

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

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

1. Description of the study area

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

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

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

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

The study was conducted in Indargi-3 micro-watershed (Indargi sub-watershed, Koppala taluk & District) is located at North latitude 15^0 28’ 26.397” and 15^0 26’ 40.332” and East longitude 76^0 19’ 31.482" and 76^0 17’ 40.928”covering an area of about 644.41 ha bounded by under Indargi and Ballary Villages.

3. Selection of the respondents for the study

The micro-watershed is marked with 320 square meters grids. One farmer from every alternate grid in the micro-watershed was selected for the study and interviewed for socio-economic data. Totally 35 households were interviewed for the survey.

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

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

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

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

5. Development of interview schedule and data collection

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

6. Tools used to analyze the data

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

Abbreviations used in the report

LL=Landless
MF=Marginal Farmers
SF=Small farmers
SMF=Semi medium farmers
MDF=Medium farmers
LF=Large Farmers

Chapter 4

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

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

Households sampled for socio-economic survey: The data on households sampled for socio economic survey in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 35 farmers were sampled in Indargi-3 micro-watershed among households surveyed 10 (28.57%) were marginal, 12 (34.29%) were small, 7 (20.00 %) were semi medium, 1 (2.86 %) were medium and 0 (0.00 %) were large farmers. 5 landless farmers were also interviewed for the survey.

Table 1. Households sampled for socio economic survey in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	5	14.3	10	28.6	12	34.3	7	20	1	2.86	35	100

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that, there were 81 (62.79%) men and 48 (37.21%) were women.

Table 2. Population characteristics in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (10)		MF (36)		SF (48)		SMF (29)		MDF (6)		All (129)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Men	7	70	20	56	30	63	19	65.5	5	83.3	81	62.8
2	Women	3	30	16	44	18	38	10	34.5	1	16.7	48	37.2
Total		10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100
Average		2.0		3.6		4.0		4.1		6.0		3.7	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 3. The indicated that, 15 (11.63%) of population were 0-15 years of age, 57 (44.19%) were 16-35 years of age, 45(34.88%) were 36-60 years of age and 12 (9.30 %) were above 61 years of age.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (10)		MF (36)		SF (48)		SMF (29)		MDF (6)		All (129)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	0	0	5	13.9	7	14.6	3	10.34	0	0	15	11.63
2	16-35 years of age	2	20	19	52.8	21	43.8	13	44.83	2	33	57	44.19
3	36-60 years of age	6	60	8	22.2	16	33.3	11	37.93	4	67	45	34.88
4	> 61 years	2	20	4	11.1	4	8.33	2	6.9	0	0	12	9.3
Total		10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that, there were 52.71 per cent of illiterates, 20.16 per cent of them had primary school education, 7.75 per cent middle school education, 5.43 per cent high school education, 2.33 per cent of them had PUC education, 0.78 per cent of them had masters education, 7.75 per cent attained graduation, and 3.10 them had other education.

Table 4. Education level of members of the household in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (10)		MF (36)		SF (48)		SMF (29)		MDF (6)		All (129)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	9	90	13	36.1	22	45.8	18	62.1	6	100	68	52.7
2	Primary School	0	0	4	11.1	13	27.1	9	31	0	0	26	20.2
3	Middle School	0	0	6	16.7	3	6.25	1	3.45	0	0	10	7.75
4	High School	0	0	7	19.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.43
5	PUC	0	0	0	0	3	6.25	0	0	0	0	3	2.33
6	Degree	0	0	3	8.33	6	12.5	1	3.45	0	0	10	7.75
7	Masters	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.78
8	Others	0	0	3	8.33	1	2.08	0	0	0	0	4	3.1
Total		10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100

Occupation of head of households: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 82.86 per cent of households heads were practicing agriculture, 17.14 per cent of the household heads were agricultural Labour.

Table 5: Occupation of heads of households in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	0	0	9	90	12	100	7	100	1	100	29	82.86
2	Agricultural Labour	5	100	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17.14
Total		5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Table 6: Occupation of members of the household in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (10)		MF (36)		SF (48)		SMF (29)		MDF (6)		All (129)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	0	0	9	25	12	25	7	24.14	2	33	30	23.3
2	Agricultural Labour	9	90	23	63.9	28	58.33	19	65.52	4	67	83	64.3
3	Private Service	0	0	0	0	1	2.08	1	3.45	0	0	2	1.55
4	Student	1	10	1	2.78	6	12.5	2	6.9	0	0	10	7.75
5	Children	0	0	3	8.33	1	2.08	0	0	0	0	4	3.1
Total		10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100

Occupation of the members of the household: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 6. The results

indicate that, agriculture was the major occupation for 23.26 per cent of the household members, 64.34 per cent were agricultural labour, 1.55 per cent were working in government sector, 7.75 per cent were working in pursuing education and 3.10 per cent were children's.

Institutional Participation of household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 7. The results show that, out of the total family members in the households 100 per cent were not participating in any of the institutions.

Table 7: Institutional Participation of household member in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (10)		MF (36)		SF (48)		SMF (29)		MDF (6)		All (129)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100
Total		10	100	36	100	48	100	29	100	6	100	129	100

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that, 62.86 percent possess thatched house, 31.43 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 5.71 per cent possess pacca house.

Table 8. Type of house owned by households in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	4	80	4	40	9	75	4	57.1	1	100	22	62.86
2	Katcha	1	20	4	40	3	25	3	42.9	0	0	11	31.43
3	Pucca/RCC	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.71
Total		5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Durable assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 9. The result shows that, 57.14 per cent possess TV, 5.71 per cent possess mixer grinder and Bicycle, 40.00 per cent possess motor cycle and 71.43 per cent possess mobile phones.

Table 9. Durable assets owned by households in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	5	100	2	20	9	75	4	57	0	0	20	57.14
2	Mixer/Grinder	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	1	14	0	0	2	5.71
3	Bicycle	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	100	2	5.71
4	Motor Cycle	0	0	7	70	5	41.7	2	29	0	0	14	40
5	Mobile Phone	3	60	8	80	8	66.7	5	71	1	100	25	71.43

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 10. The result shows that, the average value of television was Rs.7650.00, mixer grinder was Rs.1100.00, bicycle was Rs.2750.00, motor cycle was Rs. 32857.00 and mobile phone was Rs.2962.00.

Table 10. Average value of durable assets owned in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Television	5000	7000	5666	15750	0	7650
2	Mixer/Grinder	0	0	200	2000	0	1100
3	Bicycle	0	0	0	3000	2500	2750
4	Motor Cycle	0	27857	36000	42500	0	32857
5	Mobile Phone	2166	2888	3062	3333	3000	2962

Farm implements owned: The data regarding the farm implements owned by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 11. About 14.29 per cent of the households possess Bullock Cart, 11.43 per cent possess plough, 31.43 per cent possess Weeder and 2.86 per cent possess maize huller.

Table 11. Farm implements owned in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock Cart	0	0	1	10	4	33.33	0	0	0	0	5	14.29
2	Plough	0	0	1	10	3	25	0	0	0	0	4	11.43
3	Weeder	0	0	5	50	3	25	3	42.9	0	0	11	31.43
4	Maize Huller	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	2.86

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.6500.00, bullock Cart was Rs.18000.00, weeder was Rs.560.00 and maize huller Rs.3000.

Table 12. Average value of farm implements in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Bullock Cart	0	20000	17500	0	0	18000
2	Plough	0	2000	8000	0	0	6500
3	Weeder	0	119	940	1200	0	560
4	Maize Huller	0	0	0	3000	0	3000

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 13. The results

indicate that, 14.29 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 8.57 per cent possess local cow, 2.86 per cent possess crossbred cow and sheep.

Table 13. Livestock possession by households in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	0	0	1	10	4	33.33	0	0	0	0	5	14.29
2	Local cow	0	0	1	10	1	8.33	1	14	0	0	3	8.57
3	Crossbred cow	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
4	Sheep	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 14. The indicated that, own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.44, women available in the micro watershed was 1.46, hired labour (men) available was 9.2 and hired labour (women) available was 9.43.

Table 14. Average labour availability in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Hired labour Female	0.8	9.1	11.17	13	10	9.43
2	Own Labour Female	0.4	1.4	1.67	2	1	1.46
3	Own labour Male	0.4	1.6	2	1.14	1	1.44
4	Hired labour Male	0.8	8.6	11.33	12.29	10	9.2

Adequacy of hired labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 100.00 per cent of the household opined that hired labour was Inadequate.

Table 15. Adequacy of hired labour in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Inadequate	5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, 24.00 ha (68.03%) of dry land and 11.28 ha (31.97 %) of irrigated land.

Table 16. Distribution of land (ha) in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Dry	0	0	5.54	100	13.61	89.01	4.86	39.06	0	0	24	68.03
2	Irrigated	0	0	0	0	1.68	10.99	7.58	60.94	2.02	100	11.28	31.97
Total		0	100	5.54	100	15.29	100	12.43	100	2.02	100	35.28	100

Average value of land (ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 17. The results show that the average

value of dry land was Rs.362316.72, and the average value of irrigated land was Rs.319052.74.

Table 17. Average value of land (ha) in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Dry	0	775821.8	264485.6	164666.7	0	362316.7
2	Irrigated	0	0	476144.6	303472.2	247000	319052.7

Status of bore wells: The data regarding the status of bore wells in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, there were 8 De-functioning and functioning bore wells among the sampled households in micro watershed.

Table 18. Status of bore wells in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	De-functioning	0	0	3	4	1	8
2	Functioning	0	0	3	4	1	8

Source of irrigation: The data regarding the source of irrigation in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 19. The results that bore well were major source of irrigation for 22.86 per cent of the households.

Table 19. Source of irrigation in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bore Well	0	0	0	0	3	25	4	57.1	1	100	8	22.86

Depth of water (Avg. In meters): The data regarding the depth of water in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 20. The results revealed that, the depth of bore well was 9.27 meter.

Table 20. Depth of water (Avg. In meters) in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Bore Well	0	0	9.53	25.69	30.48	9.27

Irrigated Area (ha): The data regarding the irrigated area (ha) in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 21. The results indicate that, the availability of irrigation water was used for kharif crops was 9.44 ha.

Table 21. Irrigated Area (ha) in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Kharif	0	0	2.89	4.52	2.02	9.44
Total		0	0	2.89	4.52	2.02	9.44

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 22. The results indicate that, farmers have grown maize (24.03 ha), bajra (4.17 ha), groundnut (4.12 ha), sorghum (1.62 ha) and paddy (1.26 ha).

Table 22. Cropping pattern in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	**Particulars**	**LL (5)**	**MF (10)**	**SF (12)**	**SMF (7)**	**MDF (1)**	**All (35)**
1	Kharif - Maize	0	3.4	7.96	10.66	2.02	24.03
2	Kharif - Bajra	0	1.34	2.83	0	0	4.17
3	Kharif - Groundnut	0	0.4	2.02	1.69	0	4.12
4	Kharif - Sorghum	0	0	1.62	0	0	1.62
5	Kharif - Paddy	0	0	1.26	0	0	1.26
Total		0	5.14	15.7	12.34	2.02	35.2

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 23. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity was 98.86 per cent.

Table 23. Cropping intensity (%) in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	**Particulars**	**LL (5)**	**MF (10)**	**SF (12)**	**SMF (7)**	**MDF (1)**	**All (35)**
1	Cropping Intensity	0	92.7	100	100	100	98.86

Possession of bank account and savings: The data regarding the possession of bank account and saving in Indargi-3 micro-watershed is presented in Table 24. The results indicate that, 85.71 cent of the household's posse's bank account and savings.

Table 24. Possession of Bank account and savings in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	**Particulars**	**LL (5)**		**MF (10)**		**SF (12)**		**SMF (7)**		**MDF (1)**		**All (35)**	
		N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
1	Account	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71
2	Savings	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71

Borrowing status: The data regarding the borrowing status in Indargi-3 micro-watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, 85.71 percent of the sample farmers have borrowed credit from different sources.

Table 25. Borrowing status in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	**Particulars**	**LL (5)**		**MF (10)**		**SF (12)**		**SMF (7)**		**MDF (1)**		**All (35)**	
		N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
1	Credit Availed	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71

Cost of Cultivation of Maize: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Maize in Indargi-3 micro watershed is presented in Table 26.a. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Maize was Rs. 33562.69. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 51018.77. The net income from Maize cultivation was Rs.17456.07, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.50.

Table 26(a). Cost of Cultivation of Maize in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	41.05	10025.71	29.87
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	5.21	2867.55	8.54
3	Tractor		Hours	1.71	1283.67	3.82
4	Machinery		Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenence)		Kgs (Rs.)	18.42	2210.51	6.59
7	FYM		Quintal	17.06	1706.37	5.08
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	5	3611.66	10.76
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	2.4	2832.83	8.44
10	Irrigation		Number	3.07	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	106.49	0.32
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1244.5	3.71
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				25889.3	77.14
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				150	0.45
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				26039.3	77.58
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			17.05	4462.74	13.3
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				30502.04	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				9.5	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				30511.54	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3051.15	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				33562.69	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		42.27	49672.71	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1175	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		16.83	1346.05	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			80	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				51018.77	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				17456.07	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				793.92	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.5	

Cost of Cultivation of Bajra: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Bajra in Indargi-3 micro watershed is presented in Table 26.b. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Bajra was Rs. 29547.96. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 22193.19. The net income from Bajra cultivation was Rs.-7354.77, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:0.70.

Table 26(b). Cost of Cultivation of Bajra in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	47.49	11568.63	39.15
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	4.26	2344.72	7.94
3	Tractor		Hours	1.49	1119.22	3.79
4	Machinery		Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	9.36	1122.9	3.8
7	FYM		Quintal	6.18	617.5	2.09
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	4.58	3295.71	11.15
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	2.29	2454.96	8.31
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	17.9	0.06
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				900.13	3.05
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				23441.66	79.33
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.56
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				23608.33	79.9
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			12.14	3243.46	10.98
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				26851.78	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				26861.78	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2686.18	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				29547.96	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		18.03	21180.84	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1175	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		13.5	1012.34	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			75	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				22193.19	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				-7354.77	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1639.16	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:0.7	

Cost of Cultivation of Groundnut: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Groundnut in Indargi-3 micro watershed is presented in Table 26.c. The results indicate, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Groundnut was Rs.46106.54. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 101167.27. The net income from Groundnut cultivation was Rs. 55060.73, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.20.

Table 26(c). Cost of Cultivation of Groundnut in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	21.2	4965.1	10.77
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	11.73	6452.88	14
3	Tractor		Hours	0.91	685.25	1.49
4	Machinery		Hours	1.85	1111.5	2.41
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	120.58	14469.94	31.38
7	FYM		Quintal	0	0	0
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	5.12	3584.46	7.77
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	2.56	2816.36	6.11
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	128.94	0.28
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				2505.69	5.43
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				36720.11	79.64
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.36
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				36886.78	80
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			19.27	5018.26	10.88
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				41905.04	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				41915.04	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				4191.5	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				46106.54	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		21.69	100327.65	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4625	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		16.79	839.62	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			50	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				101167.27	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				55060.73	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2125.46	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.2	

Cost of Cultivation of Sorghum: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Sorghum in Indargi-3 micro watershed is presented in Table 26.d. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Sorghum was Rs. 16192.28. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs.29640.00. The net income from Sorghum cultivation was Rs. 13447.72, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.80.

Table 26(d). Cost of Cultivation of Sorghum in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	21.61	5248.75	32.42
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	2.47	1358.5	8.39
3	Tractor		Hours	0	0	0
4	Machinery		Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	9.88	1185.6	7.32
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	0	0	0
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.47	1729	10.68
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.24	1358.5	8.39
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	0.01	0
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				513.97	3.17
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				11394.33	70.37
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	1.03
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				11561	71.4
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			11.73	3149.25	19.45
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				14710.25	90.85
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10	0.06
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				14720.25	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				1472.03	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				16192.28	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		24.7	29640	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1200	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				29640	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				13447.72	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				655.56	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.8	

Cost of Cultivation of Paddy: The data regarding the cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of Paddy in Indargi-3 micro watershed is presented in Table 26.e. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) for Paddy was Rs.24848.95. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 118750.00. The net income from Paddy cultivation was Rs. 93901.06, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:4.80.

Table 26(e). Cost of Cultivation of Paddy in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	20.58	4433.33	17.84
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	7.92	4354.17	17.52
3	Tractor		Hours	0.79	593.75	2.39
4	Machinery		Hours	0	0	0
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	79.17	3958.33	15.93
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0	0	0
7	FYM		Quintal	0	0	0
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	3.17	2216.67	8.92
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.58	1741.67	7.01
10	Irrigation		Number	0	0	0
11	Repairs			0	0	0
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0	0	0
13	Depreciation charges			0	285	1.15
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0	0	0
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				951.2	3.83
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				18534.12	74.59
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.67
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				18700.78	75.26
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			16.63	3879.17	15.61
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				22579.95	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				22589.95	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2259	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				24848.95	100
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		79.17	118750	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1500	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				118750	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				93901.06	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				313.88	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:4.8	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, 8.57 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate.

Table 27. Adequacy of fodder in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0	0	0	3	25	0	0	0	0	3	8.57

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the annual gross income in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross income of Rs. 65914.29 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 53885.71 is from agriculture itself.

Table 28. Average annual gross income in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Wage	22400	11900	10833.3	8571.43	0	12028.6
2	Agriculture	0	27800	66500	108571	50000	53885.7
	Income(Rs.)	22400	39700	77333.3	117143	50000	65914.3

Average annual Expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 29. The results indicate that, the farmers have annual gross expenditure of Rs. 159944.05 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 30885.71 is from agriculture itself.

Table 29. Average annual Expenditure in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Wage	8800	11333.3	10625	1000	0	3471.43
2	Agriculture	0	14400	42500	59285.7	12000	30885.7
	Total	8800	25733.3	53125	60285.7	12000	159944

Horticulture species grown: The data regarding horticulture species grown in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, the total number of horticultural trees grown (both field and backyard) by the sampled households were coconut (7) and Mango (5).

Table 30. Horticulture species grown in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Coconut	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	7	0
2	Mango	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5	0

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

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicate that, households have planted 4 teak trees, 56 neem trees and 14 tamarind trees together in both field and backyard.

Table 31. Forest species grown in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Teak	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
2	Neem	0	0	17	0	37	0	2	0	0	0	56	0
3	Tamarind	0	0	0	0	10	0	4	0	0	0	14	0

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

Average additional investment capacity: The data regarding average additional investment capacity in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicate that, households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 857.14 for land development.

Table 32. Average additional investment capacity of households in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (10)	SF (12)	SMF (7)	MDF (1)	All (35)
1	Land development	0	0	1666.67	1428.57	0	857.14

Source of funds for additional investment: The data regarding source of funds for additional investment in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicate that, the sources of finance raised from bank as a loan and from own a source for land development was 8.57 per cent.

Table 33. Source of funds for additional investment in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Item	Land development	
		N	%
1	Own funds	3	8.57

Table 34. Marketing of agricultural produce in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Bajra	75	12	63	84	1175
2	Groundnut	77	15	62	81	4625
3	Maize	920	0	920	100	1175
4	Paddy	100	20	80	80	1500
5	Sorghum	40	12	28	70	1200

Marketing of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 34. The results indicated that, 84.00 percent of output of bajra was sold in the market; 80.52 percent of output of groundnut was sold in the market; 100.00 percent of output of Maize was sold in the

market; 80.00 percent of output of paddy was sold in the market and 70.00 percent of output of sorghum was sold in the market.

Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicated that, 20.00 cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants and 65.71 per cent of regulated market.

Table 35. Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Local/village Merchant	0	0	4	40	0	0	3	42.9	0	0	7	20
2	Regulated Market	0	0	6	60	12	100	4	57.1	1	100	23	65.71

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicated that, 85.71 cent of the households have used tractor.

Table 36. Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Tractor	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicate that, 85.71 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 37. Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF(1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.7

Interest towards soil testing: The data regarding Interest shown towards soil testing in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicated that, 85.71 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.

Table 38. Interest regarding soil testing in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data on usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicated that,

firewood was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 100.00 per cent of the households.

Table 39. Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Source of drinking water: The data on source of drinking water in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicated that, piped supply of water was the major source for drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households.

Table 40. Source of drinking water in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	5	100	10	100	12	100	6	85.7	1	100	34	97.14

Source of light: The data on source of light in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicated that, electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households.

Table 41. Source of light in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Existence of sanitary toilet facility: The data on availability of toilet facility in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 42. The results indicated that, 42.86 per cent of the households possess toilets.

Table 42. Existence of sanitary toilet facility in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	5	100	1	10	1	8.33	7	100	1	100	15	42.9

Possession of PDS card: The data regarding possession of PDS card in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicated that, 100.00 per cent of the households possessed BPL card.

Table 43. Possession of PDS card in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	BPL	5	100	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	35	100

Participation in NREGA programme: The data regarding Participation in NREGA programme in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicated that, only 17.14 percent of the participate have participated in NREGA programme.

Table 44. Participation in NREGA programme in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

S. N	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF(1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	3	60	1	10	2	16.7	0	0	0	0	6	17.1

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, the extent of adequacy of food items for cereals, pulses, Oilseeds and vegetables were 88.57, 77.14, 11.43, 22.86 per cent respectively, similarly for Fruits (11.43%), milk (20.00%), Egg (17.14%), and Meat (8.57%).

Table 45. Adequacy of food items in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	4	80	9	90	10	83.33	7	100	1	100	31	88.57
2	Pulses	2	40	8	80	9	75	7	100	1	100	27	77.14
3	Oilseed	0	0	1	10	2	16.67	1	14.3	0	0	4	11.43
4	Vegetables	3	60	3	30	2	16.67	0	0	0	0	8	22.86
5	Fruits	1	20	2	20	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	4	11.43
6	Milk	0	0	4	40	2	16.67	1	14.3	0	0	7	20
7	Egg	2	40	1	10	1	8.33	2	28.6	0	0	6	17.14
8	Meat	1	20	1	10	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	3	8.57

Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding in adequacy of food items in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 46. The results indicated that, the extent of in adequacy of food items for cereals, pulses, Oilseeds and vegetables were 8.57, 20.00, 80.00 and 62.86 per cent respectively, similarly for fruits (54.29%), milk (48.57%), egg (71.43%) and meat (88.57%).

Table 46. Inadequacy of food items in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	1	20	1	10	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	3	8.57
2	Pulses	3	60	2	20	2	16.67	0	0	0	0	7	20
3	Oilseed	3	60	9	90	9	75	6	85.7	1	100	28	80
4	Vegetables	3	60	4	40	8	66.67	6	85.7	1	100	22	62.86
5	Fruits	1	20	6	60	7	58.33	4	57.1	1	100	19	54.29
6	Milk	3	60	4	40	5	41.67	5	71.4	0	0	17	48.57
7	Egg	3	60	8	80	9	75	4	57.1	1	100	25	71.43
8	Meat	4	80	9	90	11	91.67	6	85.7	1	100	31	88.57

Response on market surplus of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Indargi-3 Micro watershed is presented in Table 47. The results indicated that, the extent of adequacy of food items for cereals, pulses, Oilseeds, vegetables, fruits, milk, egg and meat were 2.86 per cent respectively.

Table 47. Response on market surplus of food items in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
2	Pulses	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
3	Oilseed	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
4	Vegetables	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
5	Fruits	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
6	Milk	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
7	Egg	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86
8	Meat	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	1	2.86

Farming constraints: The results (Table 48)indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by (85.71 %) per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (71.43%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (65.71%), inadequacy of irrigation water (20.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (34.29%), high rate of interest on credit (28.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (11.43 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (14.29%), inadequate extension services (17.14 %), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (54.29%), less rainfall (62.86%), source of agri-technology information (Newspaper/Tv/Mobile) (57.14%).

Table 48. Farming constraints experienced in Indargi-3 micro-watershed

SN	Particulars	MF (10)		SF (12)		SMF (7)		MDF (1)		All (35)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	10	100	12	100	7	100	1	100	30	85.71
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	9	90	9	75	6	85.71	1	100	25	71.43
3	Frequent incidence of pest and diseases	8	80	10	83.33	5	71.43	0	0	23	65.71
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	2	20	2	16.67	3	42.86	0	0	7	20
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	4	40	6	50	2	28.57	0	0	12	34.29
6	High rate of interest on credit	2	20	5	41.67	3	42.86	0	0	10	28.57
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	2	20	2	16.67	0	0	0	0	4	11.43
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	2	20	2	16.67	0	0	1	100	5	14.29
9	Inadequate extension services	2	20	3	25	1	14.29	0	0	6	17.14
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	8	80	5	41.67	5	71.43	1	100	19	54.29
11	Less rainfall	8	80	10	83.33	3	42.86	1	100	22	62.86
12	Source of Agri-technology information	9	90	7	58.33	4	57.14	0	0	20	57.14

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed 35 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey. The study was conducted in Indargi-3 micro-watershed (Indargi sub-watershed, Koppala taluk & District) is located at North latitude 15^0 28' 26.397" and 15^0 26' 40.332" and East longitude 76^0 19' 31.482" and 76^0 17' 40.928"covering an area of about 644.41 ha bounded by under Indargi and Ballary Villages.

Socio-economic analysis indicated that, out of the total sample of 35 respondents, 10 (28.57%) were marginal, 12(34.29%) were small and 7 (20.00%) were semi medium, 1 (2.86%) were medium farmers. The population characteristics of households indicated that, there were 81 (62.79%) men and 48 (37.21%) were women. Majority of the respondents (44.19%) were in the age group of 35-60 years. Education level of the sample households indicated that, majority there were 52.71 per cent illiterates and only 7.75 per cent attained graduation. About, 82.86 per cent of household heads practicing agriculture and 17.14 per cent of the household heads were engaged as agricultural labourers. Agriculture was the major occupation for 23.26 per cent of the household members.

In the study area, 31.43 per cent of the households possess katcha house and 5.71 per cent possess pucca house. The durable assets owned by the households showed that, 57.14 per cent possess TV, 5.71 per cent possess mixer grinder and 71.43 per cent possess mobile phones. Farm implements owned by the households indicated that, 11.43 per cent of the households possess plough. Regarding livestock possession by the households, 8.57 per cent possess local cow.

The average labour availability in the study area showed that**,** own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.44, women available in the micro watershed was 1.46, hired labour (men) available was 9.2 and hired labour (women) available was 9.43.

Out of the total land holding of the sample respondents (35.28 ha), 68.03 per cent of the area is under dry condition and the remaining 31.97 per cent area is irrigated land. There were 8.00 bore wells among the sampled households. Bore well was the major source of irrigation for 22.86 per cent of the households. The major crops grown by sample farmers are Maize, Bajra, Groundnut, Sorghum and Paddy and cropping intensity was recorded as 98.86 per cent.

The sample households possessed 85.71 per cent bank account and 85.71 per cent of them have savings in the account. About 85.71 per cent of the respondents borrowed credit from various sources.

The per hectare cost of cultivation for Maize, Bajra, Groundnut, Sorghum and Paddy was Rs.33562.69 , 29547.96, 46106.54, 16192.28 and 24848.95 with benefit cost ratio of 1:1.50, 1: 0.70, 1: 2.20, 1: 1.80 and 1:4.80 respectively.

Further, 8.57 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate.

The average annual gross income of the farmers was Rs. 65914.29 in micro-watershed, of which Rs. 53885.71 comes from agriculture.

The total number of horticultural trees grown (both field and backyard) by the sampled households were coconut (7) and Mango (5) and forest species are grown 4 teak trees, 56 neem trees and 14 tamarind trees together in both field and backyard.

Households have an average investment capacity of Rs. 857.14 for land development. Source of funds raised from bank as a loan and from own sources for land development was 8.57 per cent.

Regarding marketing channels, 20.00 per cent of the households have sold agricultural produce to the local/village merchants, while, 65.71 per cent have sold by Agents/Traders. Further, 85.71 per cent of the households have used tractor for the transport of agriculture commodity.

Majority of the farmers (85.71 %) have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the watershed and 85.71 per cent of the households were interested towards soil testing.

Firewood connection was the major source of fuel for domestic use for 100.00 per cent of the households. Piped supply was the major source for drinking water for 97.14 per cent of the households. Electricity was the major source of light for 100.00 per cent of the households. In the study area, 42.86 per cent of the households possess toilet facility. Regarding possession of PDS card, 100.00 per cent of the households possessed BPL card. Cereals (88.57%), pulses (77.14%), oilseeds (11.43%) were adequate for consumption.

Farming constraints experienced by households in the micro watersheds were lower fertility status of the soil (85.71%) wild animal menace on farm field (71.43%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (65.71%), inadequacy of irrigation water (20.00%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (34.29%), high rate of interest on credit (28.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (11.43%), lack of marketing facilities in the area (14.29%), inadequate extension services (17.14%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (54.29%), Less rainfall (62.86%) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (57.14%).

Implications of the survey

- ✓ Result indicated that, there were 52.71 per cent were illiterate hence; extension methodologies such as demonstration, street play, drama, video shows will be effective in dissemination of the technologies in the micro watershed.
- ✓ The data indicate that, 31.43 per cent of the households possess katcha house. Hence, the development department while implementing the watershed plan should focus on agriculture to enhance the productivity of major crops in the area to increase the income of the farmers.
- ✓ Results indicated that the local institutional participation of the household members in the micro watershed is minimal hence, activities like membership campaign, awareness creation about the benefits of membership in local institutions and strengths of organized groups must be conveyed.
- ✓ Majority of the households in the watershed have experience in use of mobile phones, and television hence, these mass media can be effectively utilized for transfer of technology as well as for information dissemination.
- ✓ The farm machinery/implement possession in the micro watershed was found to be minimum the reasons may lack of knowledge or lack of financial ability which can be addressed through training on use of different farm implements, providing information on different sources of finance for purchase of farm implements.
- ✓ The possession of livestock such as crossbred cow found is less hence, farmers must be made aware of the benefits of crossbred cow in increased milk production.
- ✓ The possession of livestock such as sheep, goat and poultry was found to be low hence, farmers may be informed the role of subsidiary enterprises in enhancing the income and information on financial support for subsidiary activities.
- ✓ The data indicate that, job/work was the reason for all the migrants hence, farmers may be trained on profitable agriculture or self employment such has animal husbandry, plate making, sheep rearing, goat rearing, rabbit rearing with suitable information on sources of financial support.
- ✓ The results indicate that there was a change in quality of life due to migration hence, the developmental departments should take actions to arrest migration and to improve the quality of the life in rural areas.
- ✓ Households possess 24.00ha (68.03 %) of dry land and 11.28ha (31.97 %) of irrigated land hence, the availability of the dry land agricultural technologies such as short duration crops, high yielding drought resistance crop varieties, drip irrigation technology and subsidy information will be helpful for the farmers to enhance the productivity of land and as well as farmers income.
- ✓ Few of the bore well in micro watershed found non functional hence, farmers may be trained on possibility of bore well rejuvenation.
- ✓ Bore well was major source of irrigation for 22.86 per cent of the households. Hence, in order to increase the area under irrigation as well as to increase the water use

efficiency farmers may trained on drip irrigation and provide the information on subsidy for drip irrigation equipment's along with the information on different agencies which provides the financial assistance for drip irrigation.

- ✓ The total number of horticultural trees grown (both field and backyard) by the sampled households were coconut (7) and Mango (5) and forest species are grown 4 teak trees, 56 neem trees and 14 tamarind trees together in both field and backyard. Hence, production technologies related to these crops can be made available to the farmers for better adoption.
- ✓ The cropping intensity in the micro watershed was found to be (98.86 %) hence, care must be taken by the implementing agency to bring uncultivated land into cultivation through suitable measures.
- ✓ Many of the household members have borrowed loan from cooperative banks which has higher rate of interest hence, farmers may be sensitized on the different sources of credit with lesser interest rate such SHGs etc.
- ✓ The results indicated the non availability of both green and dry fodder throughout the year hence, fodder development activities can be taken up in the micro watershed.
- ✓ The average annual gross income of the households Rs.53885.71 from agriculture and Rs. 12028.57 from wages and. Agriculture was found to be the major source of income for households hence; the development activities should focus on productivity enhancement, marketing arrangements and agricultural technology dissemination to have a direct impact on the farmers.
- ✓ The cultivation of forest species is found minimal hence; information and production technology related to agro-forestry and integrated farming system.
- ✓ The data indicated that, 85.71 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems. Hence, those farmers who reported the soil and water erosion problems may be given attention while implementation of the watershed development plan.
- ✓ The data indicated that, 85.71 per cent of the households have interest in soil testing hence, farmers must be provided with the information on various institutions which are involved in soil testing for the benefit of the farmers.
- ✓ Except summer ploughing the adoption of other soil and water conservation structures is minimum hence, the farmers in the micro watershed should be sensitized on the use of different conservation structures for soil water conservation.
- ✓ Cereals and pulses found be adequate for per cent of the households respectively hence, farm households and the farm women must be trained on importance of balanced nutrition and role of vegetable, milk, egg, meat in balanced diet.
- ✓ Lower fertility status of the soil (85.71%), wild animal menace on farm field (71.43%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (65.71%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (34.29%), high rate of interest on credit (28.57%), low price for the agricultural commodities (11.43%), lack of marketing facilities in

the area (14.29%), inadequate extension services (17.14%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agricultural produce to the market (54.29%) were the major farming constraints experienced hence, these constraints must be addressed immediately for the welfare of the farmers. Awareness to be created among the farmers to approach nearest KVKs/RSKs and other developmental departments for technical and for subsidized inputs and utilize the well established regulated markets, approaching the contract firms, direct markets to avoid the involvement of middlemen.