ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.313

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

YADGIR RF (4D2D6A1a) MICROWATERSHED

Gurumitkal Hobli, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

SUJALA – III

World Bank funded Project

The World Bank

ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING

ICAR - NBSS & LUP

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GOVT. OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

About ICAR - NBSS&LUP

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

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

Citation: Rajendra Hegde, Ramesh kumar, S.C., B.A. Dhanorkar, S. Srinivas, M.Lalitha, K.V. Niranjana, R.S. Reddy and S.K. Singh (2019). "Land Resource Inventory and Socio-Economic Status of Farm Households for Watershed Planning and Development of Yadgir Rf (4D2D6A1a) Microwatershed, Gurumitkal Hobli, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.313, ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore. p.119 & 35.

TO OBTAIN COPIES,

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

Amaravati Road, NAGPUR - 440 033, India

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

Telefax : 0712-2522534

E-Mail : director@nbsslup.ernet.in

Website URL : nbsslup.in

Or

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

Phone : (080) 23412242, 23510350 (O)

Telefax : 080-23510350

E-Mail : nbssrcb@gmail.com

ICAR-NBSS&LUP Sujala MWS Publ.313

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

YADGIR RF (4D2D6A1a) MICROWATERSHED

Gurumitkal Hobli, Yadgir Taluk and District, Karnataka

Karnataka Watershed Development Project – II

Sujala-III

World Bank funded Project

ICAR – NATIONAL BUREAU OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND USE PLANNING

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, GOVT. OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

ICAR-NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bangalore has taken up a project sponsored by the Karnataka Watershed Development Project-II, (Sujala-III), Government of Karnataka funded by the World Bank under Component-1 Land Resource 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 Yadgir RF Microwatershed, Yadgir 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:16-08-2019

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

Contributors

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

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

PART-A

LAND RESOURCE INVENTORY

Contents

Preface		
Contributors		
Executive Summary		
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Geographical Setting	3
2.1	Location and Extent	3
2.2	Geology	3
2.3	Physiography	4
2.4	Drainage	4
2.5	Climate	4
2.6	Natural Vegetation	6
2.7	Land Utilization	6
Chapter 3	Survey Methodology	9
3.1	Base maps	9
3.2	Image Interpretation for Physiography	9
3.3	Field Investigation	12
3.4	Soil Mapping	14
3.5	Land Management Units	14
3.5	Laboratory Characterization	15
Chapter 4	The Soils	19
4.1	Soils of granite gneiss landscape	19
Chapter 5	Interpretation for Land Resource Management	25
5.1	Land Capability Classification	25
5.2	Soil Depth	27
5.3	Surface Soil Texture	28
5.4	Soil Gravelliness	29
5.5	Available Water Capacity	30
5.6	Soil Slope	31
5.7	Soil Erosion	32
Chapter 6	Fertility Status	35
6.1	Soil Reaction (pH)	35
6.2	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	35
6.3	Organic Carbon (OC)	35
6.4	Available Phosphorus	35
6.5	Available Potassium	37
6.6	Available Sulphur	37
6.7	Available Boron	37
6.8	Available Iron	38
6.9	Available Manganese	38
6.10	Available Copper	38
6.11	Available Zinc	42

Chapter 7	Land Suitability for Major Crops	43
7.1	Land suitability for Sorghum	43
7.2	Land suitability for Maize	44
7.3	Land suitability for Bajra	45
7.4	Land suitability for Groundnut	46
7.5	Land suitability for Sunflower	47
7.6	Land suitability for Redgram	48
7.7	Land suitability for Bengal gram	49
7.8	Land suitability for Cotton	50
7.9	Land suitability for Chilli	51
7.10	Land suitability for Tomato	52
7.11	Land suitability for Brinjal	53
7.12	Land suitability for Onion	54
7.13	Land suitability for Bhendi	55
7.14	Land suitability for Drumstick	56
7.15	Land suitability for Mango	57
7.16	Land suitability for Guava	58
7.17	Land suitability for Sapota	59
7.18	Land Suitability for Pomegranate	60
7.19	Land Suitability for Musambi	61
7.20	Land Suitability for Lime	62
7.21	Land Suitability for Amla	63
7.22	Land Suitability for Cashew	64
7.23	Land Suitability for Jackfruit	65
7.24	Land Suitability for Jamun	66
7.25	Land Suitability for Custard apple	67
7.26	Land Suitability for Tamarind	68
7.27	Land Suitability for Mulberry	69
7.28	Land Suitability for Marigold	70
7.29	Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum	71
7.30	Land management units	103
7.31	Proposed Crop Plan	103
Chapter 8	Soil Health Management	105
Chapter 9	Soil and Water conservation Treatment Plan	111
9.1	Treatment Plan	112
9.2	Recommended Soil and Water Conservation measures	115
9.3	Greening of Microwatershed	116
	References	119
	Appendix I	I-III
	Appendix II	V-VII
	Appendix III	IX-XI

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Mean Monthly Rainfall, PET, 1/2 PET at Yadgir Taluk & District	5
2.2	Land Utilization in Yadgir district	7
3.1	Differentiating Characteristics used for Identifying Soil Series	14
3.2	Soil map unit description of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	15
4.1	Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Yadgir RF microwatershed	22
7.1	Soil-Site Characteristics of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	73
7.2	Land suitability criteria for Sorghum	74
7.3	Land suitability criteria for Maize	75
7.4	Land suitability criteria for Bajra	76
7.5	Land suitability criteria for Groundnut	77
7.6	Land suitability criteria for Sunflower	78
7.7	Land suitability criteria for Redgram	79
7.8	Land suitability criteria for Bengal gram	80
7.9	Land suitability criteria for Cotton	81
7.10	Land suitability criteria for Chilli	82
7.11	Land suitability criteria for Tomato	83
7.12	Land suitability criteria for Brinjal	84
7.13	Land suitability criteria for Onion	85
7.14	Land suitability criteria for Bhendi	86
7.15	Land suitability criteria for Drumstick	87
7.16	Land suitability criteria for Mango	88
7.17	Land suitability criteria for Guava	89
7.18	Land suitability criteria for Sapota	90
7.19	Land suitability criteria for Pomegranate	91
7.20	Land suitability criteria for Musambi	92
7.21	Land suitability criteria for Lime	93
7.22	Land suitability criteria for Amla	94
7.23	Land suitability criteria for Cashew	95
7.24	Land suitability criteria for Jackfruit	96
7.25	Land suitability criteria for Jamun	97
7.26	Land suitability criteria for Custard apple	98

7.27	Land suitability criteria for Tamarind	99
7.28	Land suitability criteria for Mulberry	100
7.29	Land suitability criteria for Marigold	101
7.30	Land suitability criteria for Chrysanthemum	102
7.31	Proposed Crop Plan for Yadgir RF Microwatershed	104

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Location map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	3
2.2 a	Granite and granite gneiss rock formation	4
2.3	Rainfall distribution in Yadgir Taluk & District	5
2.4	Natural vegetation of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	6
2.5	Current Land use map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	7
2.6	Different crops and cropping systems in Yadgir RF Microwatershed	8
3.1	Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	11
3.2	Satellite image of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	11
3.3	Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	12
3.4	Location of profiles in a transect	13
3.5	Soil phase or management units of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	17
5.1	Land Capability Classification map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	27
5.2	Soil Depth map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	28
5.3	Surface Soil Texture map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	29
5.4	Soil Gravelliness map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	30
5.5	Soil Available Water Capacity map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	31
5.6	Soil Slope map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	32
5.7	Soil Erosion map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	33
6.1	Soil Reaction (pH) map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	36
6.2	Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	36
6.3	Soil Organic Carbon (OC) map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	37
6.4	Soil Available Phosphorus map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	38
6.5	Soil Available Potassium map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	39
6.6	Soil Available Sulphur map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	39
6.7	Soil Available Boron map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	40
6.8	Soil Available Iron map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	40
6.9	Soil Available Manganese map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	41
6.10	Soil Available Copper map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	41
6.11	Soil Available Zinc map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	42
7.1	Land suitability for Sorghum	44

7.2	Land suitability for Maize	45
7.3	Land suitability for Bajra	46
7.4	Land suitability for Groundnut	47
7.5	Land suitability for Sunflower	48
7.6	Land suitability for Redgram	49
7.7	Land suitability for Bengal gram	50
7.8	Land suitability for Cotton	51
7.9	Land suitability for Chilli	52
7.10	Land suitability for Tomato	53
7.11	Land suitability for Brinjal	54
7.12	Land suitability for Onion	55
7.13	Land suitability for Bhendi	56
7.14	Land suitable for Drumstick	57
7.15	Land suitability for Mango	58
7.16	Land suitability for Guava	59
7.17	Land suitability for Sapota	60
7.18	Land suitability for Pomegranate	61
7.19	Land suitability for Musambi	62
7.20	Land suitability for Lime	63
7.21	Land suitability for Amla	64
7.22	Land suitability for Cashew	65
7.23	Land suitability for Jackfruit	66
7.24	Land suitability for Jamun	67
7.25	Land suitability for Custard apple	68
7.26	Land suitability for Tamarind	69
7.27	Land suitability for Mulberry	70
7.28	Land suitability for Marigold	71
7.29	Land suitability for Chrysanthemum	72
7.30	Land management unit map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	103
9.1	Soil and water conservation map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed	116

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

The present study covers an area of 438 ha in Yadgir taluk & district, Karnataka. The climate is semiarid and categorized as drought-prone with an average annual rainfall of 866 mm, of which about 652 mm is received during south-west monsoon, 138 mm during north-east and the remaining 76 mm during the rest of the year. An area of 157 ha in the microwatershed is covered by soils, 278 ha by forest and 3 ha by others (habitation and water body). The salient findings from the land resource inventory are summarized briefly below.

- *The soils belong to 3 soil series and 5 soil phases (management units) and 2 land management units.*
- *The length of crop growing period is about 120-150 days starting from 1st week of June to 4th week of October.*
- *From the master soil map, several interpretative and thematic maps like land capability, soil depth, surface soil texture, soil gravelliness, available water capacity, soil slope and soil erosion were generated.*
- *Soil fertility status maps for macro and micronutrients were generated based on the surface soil samples collected at every 320 m grid interval.*
- *Land suitability for growing 29 major agricultural and horticultural crops was assessed and maps showing the degree of suitability along with constraints were generated.*
- *About 36 per cent area in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture.*
- *About 7 per cent area is shallow (25-50 cm), 2 per cent area is deep (100 -150 cm) and 27 per cent area of the microwatershed has soils that are deep (>150 cm).*
- *About 2 per cent area in the microwatershed has loamy soils and 33 per cent clayey soils at the surface.*
- *Entire cultivated area in the microwatershed is non gravelly (<15%).*
- *About 7 per cent is very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and 29 per cent is very high (>200 mm/m).*
- *Entire cultivated area in the microwatershed has very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands.*

- *An area of about 29 per cent is moderately (e2) eroded and 7 per cent area is severely (e3) eroded.*
- *Very small area of about 0.1 per cent area is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3) in soil reaction, 21 per cent area is slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and 15 per cent area is moderately alkaline (pH 7.8-8.4).*
- *The Electrical Conductivity (EC) of the entire cultivated soils of the microwatershed is dominantly <2 dsm^{-1} indicating that the soils are non-saline.*
- *About 3 per cent of the soils are low (<0.5%) in organic carbon content and 33 per cent area is medium (0.5-0.75%) in the microwatershed.*
- *An area of about 9 per cent is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in available phosphorus and 26 per cent area is low (<23 kg/ha) in the microwatershed.*
- *About 5 per cent is high (>337 kg/ha) in available potassium and 30 per cent is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in the microwatershed.*
- *Available sulphur is low (<10 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available boron is low (<0.5 ppm) in an area of about 26 per cent and medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in 10 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available iron is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in an area of about 27 per cent and deficient (<4.5 ppm) in 9 per cent area of the microwatershed.*
- *Available manganese and copper are sufficient in all the cultivated soils of the microwatershed.*
- *Available zinc is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in* the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed.
- *The land suitability for 29 major crops grown in the microwatershed were assessed and the areas that are highly suitable (S1) and moderately suitable (S2) are given below. It is however to be noted that a given soil may be suitable for various crops but what specific crop to be grown may be decided by the farmer looking to his capacity to invest on various inputs, marketing infrastructure, market price and finally the demand and supply position.*

Land suitability for various crops in the Microwatershed

Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)		Crop	Suitability Area in ha (%)	
	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)		Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)
Sorghum	*52 (12)*	*73 (17)*	*Guava*	-	-
Maize	-	*126 (29)*	*Sapota*	-	-
Bajra	-	*126 (29)*	*Pomegranate*	-	*126 (29)*
Groundnut	-	-	*Musambi*	*81 (18)*	*45 (10)*
Sunflower	*8 (2)*	*118 (27)*	*Lime*	*81 (18)*	*45 (10)*
Redgram	-	*126 (29)*	*Amla*	-	*126 (29)*
Bengal gram	*126 (29)*	-	*Cashew*	-	-
Cotton	*8 (2)*	*118 (27)*	*Jackfruit*	-	-
Chilli	-	*126 (29)*	*Jamun*	-	*126 (29)*
Tomato	-	*81 (18)*	*Custard apple*	*126 (29)*	-
Brinjal	*52 (12)*	*73 (17)*	*Tamarind*	-	*126 (29)*
Onion	*45 (10)*	*73 (17)*	*Mulberry*	-	-
Bhendi	*126 (29)*	-	*Marigold*	-	*126 (29)*
Drumstick	-	*126 (29)*	*Chrysanthemum*	-	*126 (29)*
Mango	-	*8 (2)*			

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

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Soil being a vital natural resource on whose proper use depends the life supporting systems of a country and the socioeconomic development of its people. Soils provide food, fodder, fibre and fuel for meeting the basic human and animal needs. With the ever increasing growth in human and animal population, the demand on soil for more food and fodder production is on the increase. 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. The soils have been degrading at an estimated rate of one million hectares per year and ground water levels have been receding at an alarming rate resulting in decline in the ground water resource. Further, land degradation has emerged as a serious problem which has already affected about 38 lakh ha of cultivated area in the State. Soil erosion alone has degraded about 35 lakh ha. Almost all the uncultivated areas are facing various degrees of degradation, particularly soil erosion; salinity and alkalinity has emerged as a major problem in more than 3.5 lakh ha in the irrigated areas of the State. Nutrient depletion and declining factor productivity is common in both rainfed and irrigated areas. The degradation is continuing at an alarming rate and there appears to be no systematic effort among the stakeholders to contain this process. In recent times, an aberration of weather due to climate change phenomenon has added another dimension leading to unpredictable situation 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 use 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 has already been made to upscale the soil resource information from 1:250000 and 1:50000 scale to the LEU map in Goa and in some other states.

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

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

Chapter 2

GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

2.1 Location and Extent

The Yadgir RF microwatershed is located in the northern part of Karnataka in Yadgir Taluk & District, Karnataka State (Fig.2.1). It comprises part of Chinthanapalli village. It lies between 16^0 48' and 16^0 50' North latitudes and 77^0 18' and 77^0 20' East longitudes covering an area of about 438 ha. It is about 20 km southwest of Yadgir town and is surrounded by Chinthanapalli on all sides.



Fig.2.1 Location map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

2.2 Geology

Major rock formations observed in the microwatershed are granite gneiss (Figs.2.2). They 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 Yadgir RF microwatershed.

Fig.2.2 Granite and granite gneiss rocks

2.3 Physiography

Physiographically, the area has been identified as granite gneiss landscape based on geology. The area has been further subdivided into five landforms, *viz;* mounds/ridges, summits, side slopes and very gently sloping uplands, plains and valleys based on slope and its relief features. The elevation ranges from 455-509 m above MSL. The mounds and ridges are mostly covered by rock outcrops.

2.4 Drainage

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

2.5 Climate

The Yadgir district lies in the northern plains of Karnataka and falls under semiarid tract of the state and is categorized as drought- prone with total annual rainfall of 866 mm (Table 2.1). Of the total rainfall, maximum of 652 mm is received during the south–west monsoon period from June to September, the north-east monsoon from October to early December contributes about 138 mm and the remaining 76 mm during

the rest of the year. The summer season starts during the middle of February and continues up to the first week of June. The period from December to the middle of February is the coldest season. December is the coldest month with mean daily maximum and minimum temperatures being 29.5^{0}C and 10^{0}C respectively. During peak summer, temperature shoots up to 45^{0}C. Relative humidity varies from 26% in summer to 62% in winter. Rainfall distribution is shown in Figure 2.3. The average Potential Evapo-Transpiration (PET) is 141 mm and varies from a low of 81 mm in December to 199 mm in the month of May. The PET is always higher than precipitation in all the months except July, August and September. Generally, the Length of crop Growing Period (LGP) is 120-150 days and starts from 1st week of June to 4th week of October.

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

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



Fig 2.3 Rainfall distribution in Yadgir Taluk, Yadgir District

2.6 Natural Vegetation

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

Fig 2.4 Natural vegetation of Yadgir RF microwatershed

2.7 Land Utilization

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

Fig.2.5. The different crops and cropping systems adopted in the microwatershed is presented in the Figures 2.6.

Table 2.2 Land Utilization in Yadgir District

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



Fig.2.5 Current Land Use map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

Fig 2.6 Different Crops and Cropping Systems in Yadgir RF 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 Yadgir RF microwatershed by the detailed study of all the soil characteristics (depth, texture, colour, structure, consistence, coarse fragments, porosity, soil reaction, soil horizons etc.) and site characteristics (slope of the land, erosion, drainage, occurrence of rock fragments etc.) followed by grouping of similar areas based on soil-site characteristics into homogeneous (management units) units, and showing the area extent and their geographic distribution on the microwatershed cadastral map. The detailed survey at 1:7920 scale was carried out in an area of 438 ha. The methodology followed for carrying out land resource inventory was as per the guidelines given in Soil Survey Manual (IARI, 1971; Soil Survey Staff, 2006; Natarajan *et al.,* 2015) which is briefly described below.

3.1 Base Maps

The detailed survey of the land resources occurring in the microwatershed was carried out by using digitized cadastral map and satellite imagery as base supplied by 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 landscapes, landforms and other surface features. The imagery helped in the identification and delineation of boundaries between hills, uplands and lowlands, water bodies, forest and vegetated areas, roads, habitations and other cultural features of the area (Fig. 3.2). The cadastral map was overlaid on the satellite imagery (Fig. 3.3) that helps to identify the parcel boundaries and other permanent features. Apart from cadastral maps and images, toposheets of the area (1:50,000 scale) were also used for initial traversing, identification of geology and landforms, drainage features, present land use and also for selection of transects in the microwatershed.

3.2 Image Interpretation for Physiography

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

subdivided into physiographic/image interpretation units based on image characteristics. The image interpretation legend for physiography is given below.

Image Interpretation Legend for Physiography

G- Granite Gneiss Landscape

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



Fig 3.1 Scanned and Digitized Cadastral map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.3.2 Satellite Image of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.3.3 Cadastral map overlaid on IRS PAN+LISS IV merged imagery of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

3.3 Field Investigation

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



Fig: 3.4. Location of profiles in a transect

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

Based on the soil characteristics, the soils were grouped into different soil series. Soil series is the most homogeneous unit having similar horizons and properties and behaves similarly for a given level of management. Soil depth, texture, colour, kind of horizon and horizon sequence, calcareousness, amount and nature of gravel present, nature of substratum etc, were used as the major differentiating characteristics for identifying soil series occurring in the area. The differentiating characteristics used for identifying the soil series are given in Table 3.1. Based on the above characteristics, 3 soil series were identified in the Yadgir RF 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**	**Calcare-ousness**
1	MDG (Mundargi)	100-150	10YR 4/4,3/3 7.5YR 4/4	scl	<15	Ap-Bw	-
2	MDR (Madhwara)	>150	10YR 3/1,3/2,2/1,2/2	scl	-	Ap-Bw	e
3	BDL (Badiyala)	25-50	7.5 YR 2.5/3,2.5/2,3/3 10YR 3/4,4/3	sl	<15	Ap-Bw	e

3.84 Soil Mapping

The area under each soil series was further separated into soil phases and their boundaries delineated on the cadastral map based on the variations observed in the texture of the surface soil, slope, erosion, presence of gravel, stoniness etc. A soil phase is a subdivision of soil series based mostly on surface features that affect its use and management. The soil mapping units are shown on the map (Fig.3.5) in the form of symbols. During the survey many soil profile pits, few minipits and a few auger bores representing different landforms occurring in the microwatershed were studied. In addition to the profile study, spot observations in the form of minipits, road cuts, terrace cuts etc., were studied to validate the soil boundaries on the soil map. The soil map shows the geographic distribution of 5 mapping units representing 3 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 5 soil phases mapped in the microwatershed. Each mapping unit (soil phase) delineated on the map has similar soil and site characteristics. In other words, all the farms or survey numbers included in one soil phase will have similar management needs and have to be treated accordingly.

3.5 Land Management Units (LMU's)

The 5 soil phases identified and mapped in the microwatershed were grouped into 2 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan for sustained development of the microwatershed. The database (soil phases) generated under LRI was utilized for identifying Land Management Units (LMU's) based on the management needs. One or more than one soil site characteristic having influence on the management have been chosen for identification and delineation of LMUs. For Yadgir RF microwatershed, five soil and site characteristics, namely soil depth, soil texture, slope, erosion and gravel content have been considered for defining LMUs. The Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

3.6 Laboratory Characterization

Soil samples for each soil series were collected from representative master profiles for laboratory characterization by following the methods outlined in the Laboratory Manual (Sarma *et al*, 1987). Surface soil samples collected from farmer's fields (43samples) for fertility status (major and micronutrients) at 320 m grid interval in the year 2018 were analyzed in the laboratory (Katyal and Rattan, 2003). By linking the soil fertility data to the survey numbers through GIS, soil fertility maps were generated by using Kriging method for the microwatershed.

Table 3.2 Soil map unit description of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

**Soil map unit No.	Soil Series	Soil Phase	Mapping Unit Description	Area in ha (%)
Soils of Granite and Granite Gneiss Landscape				
	BDL	Badiyala soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have dark brown to very dark brown and dark yellowish brown, slightly calcareous sandy loam soils occurring on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**31 (7.11)**
6		BDLiB3	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, severe erosion	31 (7.11)
	MDG	Mundargi soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, have brown to dark yellowish brown, sandy clay loam soils occurring on very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**8 (1.74)**
58		MDGiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	8 (1.74)
	MDR	Madhwara soils are very deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to very dark brown, slightly calcareous sandy clay loam soils occurring on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation		**118 (26.93)**
59		MDRcB2	Sandy loam surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	10 (2.3)
133		MDRiB2	Sandy clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	45 (10.18)
61		MDRmB2	Clay surface, slope 1-3%, moderate erosion	63 (14.45)
900	Forest			**278 (63.5)**
1000	Others	Water body		**3 (0.73)**



Fig 3.5 Soil Phase or Management Units - Yadgir RF Microwatershed

Chapter 4

THE SOILS

Detailed information pertaining to the nature, extent and their distribution of different kinds of soils occurring in Yadgir RF microwatershed is provided in this chapter. The microwatershed area has been identified as granite gneiss landscape based on geology. In all, 3 soil series are identified. Soil formation is the result of the combined effect of environmental and terrain factors that are reflected in soil morphology. In the granite gneiss landscape, it is by parent material, relief and climate.

A brief description of each of the 3 soil series identified followed by 5 soil phases (management units) mapped are furnished below. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil series identified in Yadgir RF 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, 3 soil series are identified and mapped. Of these, MDR series occupying a maximum area of 118 ha (27%) followed by BDL 31 ha (7%) and MDG 8 ha (2%). Brief description of each series identified and number of soil phases mapped is given below.

4.1.1 Badiyala (BDL) Series: Badiyala soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have very dark brown to dark yellow brown and dark brown, slightly calcareous sandy loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Badiyala series has been classified as a member of the coarse-loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Fluventic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 28 to 50 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 4 to 12 cm. Its colour is in 10YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3 to 4. The texture is loamy sand, sandy clay loam and sandy clay. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 27 to 45 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 2 to 4 and chroma 3 to 4. Its texture is sandy loam to sandy clay loam and is slightly calacreous. The available water capacity is very low (<50mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Badiyala (BDL) Series

4.1.2 Mundargi (MDG) Series: Mundargi soils are deep (100-150 cm), moderately well drained, dark brown to dark yellowish brown, sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Mundargi series has been classified as a member of the fine-loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Fluventic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum ranges from 100 to 149 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 8 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1 to 4. The texture ranges from sandy loam to sandy clay loam and sandy clay. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 105 to 140 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 4. The texture varies from sandy loam to sandy clay loam and sandy clay. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Only one phase was identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Mundargi (MDG) Series

4.1.3 Madhwara (MDR) Series: Madhwara soils are very deep (>150 cm), well drained, have black to very dark brown and very dark gray to very dark grayish brown, slightly calcareous sandy clay loam soils. They are developed from weathered granite gneiss and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands under cultivation. The Madhwara series has been classified as a member of the fine-Loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Fluventic Haplustepts.

The thickness of the solum is more than150 cm. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 10 to 16 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 2 to 3. Texture varies from sandy clay and clay. The thickness of B horizon is >150 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 1 to 3. Texture varies from sandy clay loam to sandy clay and is slightly calcareous. The available water capacity is very high (>200 mm/m). Three phases were identified and mapped.

Landscape and Soil Profile characteristics of Madhwara (MDR) Series

Table: 4.1 Physical and Chemical Characteristics of Soil Series identified in Yadgir RF microwatershed

Soil Series: Badiyala **(**BDL) **Pedon:** R-5

Location: $16^0$37'10.0"N $77^0$20'21.5", Gudalagunta village, Balichakra hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Coarse-loamy, 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	87.13	7.04	5.83	10.03	24.32	23.61	23.51	5.67	<15	ls	6.27	2.44
12-28	Bw1	64.63	13.30	22.07	6.74	13.07	22.30	17.01	5.50	<15	scl	16.34	7.83
28-52	BC	73.11	12.02	14.87	3.93	16.03	26.89	18.41	7.86	<15	sl	12.94	5.47

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	6.20	-	-	0.074	1.00	0.00	2.80	0.98	0.14	0.01	3.92	4.20	0.72	93	0.20
12-28	9.04	-	-	0.253	0.80	3.20	-	-	0.16	0.69	-	16.90	0.77	100	4.09
28-52	9.41	-	-	0.364	1.10	3.60	-	-	0.16	1.39	-	11.10	0.75	100	12.52

Contd…

Soil Series: Mundargi **(**MDG) **Pedon:** R-2

Location: $16^0$46'82.4"N $77^0$04'85.2"E, Thumakura village, Yadgir hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine-Loamy, 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
0-9	Ap	81.23	12.97	5.80	4.84	10.19	14.83	37.94	13.42	<15	ls	11.75	3.31
9-20	A2	76.82	16.19	6.98	4.96	10.12	20.75	27.53	13.46	-	ls	14.52	3.99
20-46	Bw1	42.43	17.43	40.15	2.26	5.59	11.49	14.93	8.16	-	c	34.90	21.14
46-90	Bw2	54.51	16.56	28.93	4.72	5.03	19.92	16.67	8.18	-	scl	36.73	18.88
90-110	Bw3	53.69	11.00	35.30	9.57	9.89	16.23	13.01	4.99	-	sc	38.72	20.53

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}							%	%
0-9	8.2	-	-	0.399	0.44	0.78	-	-	0.16	0.38	-	4.90	0.84	100	3.08
9-20	8.44	-	-	0.075	0.29	1.82	-	-	0.05	0.35	-	4.90	0.70	100	2.88
20-46	9.39	-	-	0.451	0.32	2.73	-	-	0.12	5.22	-	20.77	0.52	100	10.06
46-90	9.75	-	-	0.616	0.24	3.25	-	-	0.12	5.72	-	16.56	0.57	100	13.82
90-110	9.72	-	-	0.725	0.24	3.64	-	-	0.14	6.84	-	19.76	0.56	100	13.836

Contd…

Soil Series: Madhawara (MDR) **Pedon:** T_2 P_2

Location: $16^0$43'48.9"N $77^0$18'38.3"E, Yaleri village, Balichakra hobli, Yadgir taluk and district

Analysis at: NBSS&LUP, Regional Centre, Bengaluru **Classification:** Fine-loamy, 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
0-11	Ap	58.94	20.74	20.32	5.41	7.28	13.31	20.89	12.06	-	scl	16.47	8.85
11-30	Bw1	55.52	19.32	25.16	5.00	7.19	13.12	19.69	10.52	-	scl	18.25	10.18
30-58	Bw2	53.95	19.15	26.90	4.68	7.48	12.58	19.65	9.56	-	scl	26.99	14.02
58-117	Bw3	52.68	19.51	27.81	2.84	5.47	14.72	20.82	8.83	-	scl	37.86	17.40
117-160	Bw4	49.95	17.27	32.79	2.11	5.07	14.15	20.49	8.13	-	scl	44.15	20.38

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}							%	%
0-11	8.31	-	-	0.33	0.46	2.76	-	-	0.45	0.47	-	20.57	1.01	100	0.90
11-30	9.25	-	-	0.20	0.31	4.20	-	-	0.19	1.40	-	23.98	0.95	100	2.34
30-58	9.78	-	-	0.40	0.19	5.76	-	-	0.16	1.53	-	24.53	0.91	100	2.49
58-117	9.94	-	-	0.88	0.23	4.80	-	-	0.18	9.09	-	24.31	0.87	100	14.96
117-160	9.98	-	-	0.93	0.15	3.00	-	-	0.24	11.09	-	28.27	0.86	100	15.69

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 interpretative and thematic maps generated are described below.

5.1 Land Capability Classification

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

Soil Characteristics: Depth, texture, gravelliness, calcareousness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The 5 soil map units identified in Yadgir RF microwatershed are grouped under 2 land capability classes and 3 land capability subclasses. An area of 157 ha (36%) in the microwatershed is suitable for agriculture. About 278 ha (64%) area is having forest and 3 ha (<1%) is covered by others (water body & habitation) (Fig. 5.1).

Good lands (Class II) cover an area of about 29 per cent and are distributed in the southern, southwestern, southeastern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed with minor problems of soil and erosion. Fairly good lands (Class IV) cover an area of about 7 per cent and are distributed in the southern and western part of the microwatershed and have very severe problems of soil and erosion.



Fig. 5.1 Land Capability map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.2 Soil Depth

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

Shallow (25-50 cm) soils occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. Deep (100-150 cm) soils occur in an area of 8 ha (2%) and are distributed in the southern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Very deep (>150 cm) soils occur in an area of 118 ha (27%) and are distributed in the southern, southwestern, southeastern, eastern and western part of the microwatershed.

The problem soils occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) area where only short duration crops can be grown occasionally and the probability of crop failure is very high.



Fig. 5.2 Soil Depth map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.3 Surface Soil Texture

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

An area of 10 ha (2%) of the microwatershed has soils that are loamy and are distributed in the southern, eastern and southeastern part. An area of 146 ha (33%) of the microwatershed has soils that are clayey and are distributed in the western, southern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Both clayey and loamy soils have high potential for soil-water retention and availability, and nutrient retention and availability, but clay soils have more problems of drainage, infiltration, workability and other physical problems.



Fig. 5.3 Surface Soil Texture map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.4 Soil Gravelliness

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

Non gravelly (<15%) soils cover an area of 157 ha (36%) and are distributed in the southern, southwestern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. These are the most productive soils, where all climatically adapted short and long duration crops can be grown.



Fig. 5.4 Soil Gravelliness map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.5 Available Water Capacity

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

An area of about 31 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are very low (<50 mm/m) in available water capacity and is distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 126 ha (29%) is very high (>200 mm/m) in available water capacity and are distributed in the southern, southwestern, southeastern, western and eastern part of the microwatershed.

An area of about 31 ha (7%) in the microwatershed has soils that are problematic with regard to available water capacity. Here, only short duration crops can be grown and probability of the crop failure is very high. These areas are best put to other alternative uses.



Fig. 5.5 Soil Available Water Capacity map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.6 Soil Slope

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

An area of about 157 ha (36%) of the microwatershed falls under very gently sloping (1-3% slope) lands and are distributed in entire cultivated area of the microwatershed. Thus these areas 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 Yadgir RF Microwatershed

5.7 Soil Erosion

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

Soils that are moderately eroded soils (e2 class) cover an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the southern, southwestern, southeastern, western and eastern part of the microwatershed. Severely eroded soils (e3 class) cover an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western and southern part of the microwatershed.

Entire cultivated area of about 157 ha (36%) in the microwatershed is problematic because of moderate and severe erosion. For these areas, taking up of soil and water conservation and other land development measures are needed.



Fig. 5.7 Soil Erosion map of Yadgir RF 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 interval) all over the microwatershed through land resource inventory in the year 2018 were analysed for pH, EC, organic carbon, available phosphorus and potassium, and for micronutrients like zinc, boron, copper, iron and manganese, and secondary nutrient sulphur.

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

6.1 Soil Reaction (pH)

The soil analysis of the Yadgir RF microwatershed for soil reaction (pH) showed that an area of 0.1 ha (<1%) is neutral (pH 6.5-7.3) and are distributed in the southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of 92 ha (21%) is slightly alkaline (pH 7.3-7.8) and are distributed in the southeastern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of 65 ha (15%) is moderately alkaline (pH 7.8-8.4) and are distributed in the southwestern and western part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.1).

6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC)

The Electrical Conductivity in entire area of the microwatershed is non saline (<2 dS/m) (Fig. 6.2)

6.3 Organic Carbon

The soil organic carbon content (an index of available Nitrogen) in the soils of the microwatershed is low (<0.5 %) in the area of 11 ha (3%) and are distributed in the southern part. An area of about 146 ha (33%) is medium (0.5-0.75%) and are distributed in the western, eastern, southwestern, southeastern and southern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.3)



Fig.6.1 Soil Reaction (pH) map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.2 Electrical Conductivity (EC) map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.3 Soil Organic Carbon map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

6.4 Available Phosphorus

Available phosphorus content is low (<23 kg/ha) in an area of about 116 ha (26%) and occur in the western, southern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Medium (23-57 kg/ha) in an area of 38 ha (9%) and occur in the eastern, southeastern and southern part of the microwatershed. Very small area of about 3 ha (<1%) is high (>57 kg/ha) and occur in the eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.4).

6.5 Available Potassium

Available potassium content is high (>337 kg/ha) in an area of 24 ha (5%) and are distributed in the western, southern, southwestern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Medium (145-337 kg/ha) in an area of about 133 ha (30%) and are distributed in the western, central and eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.5).

6.6 Available Sulphur

Available sulphur content is low (<10 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.6).

6.7 Available Boron

Available boron content is low (<0.5 ppm) in 115 ha (26%) and are distributed in th southern, southwestern and western part of the microwatershed. Medium (0.5-1.0ppm) in an area of 42 ha (10%) and are distributed in the western, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6.7).

6.8 Available Iron

Available iron content is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in an area of about 118 ha (27%) and are distributed in the southern, western, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of 39 ha (9%) is deficient (<4.5 ppm) and are distributed in the western and southwestern part of the microwatershed (Fig 6.8).

6.9 Available Manganese

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

6.10 Available Copper

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



Fig.6.4 Soil Available Phosphorus map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.5 Soil Available Potassium map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.6 Soil Available Sulphur map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.7 Soil Available Boron map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.8 Soil Available Iron map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.9 Soil Available Manganese map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed



Fig.6.10 Soil Available Copper map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

6.11 Available Zinc

Available zinc content is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed (Fig 6.11).



Fig.6.11 Soil Available Zinc map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

Chapter 7

LAND SUITABILITY FOR MAJOR CROPS

The soil and land resource units (soil phases) of Yadgir RF 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 requirement (Tables 7.2 to 7.30) to arrive at the crop suitability. The soil and land characteristics table and crop requirement tables are given at the end of the chapter. In FAO land suitability classification, two orders are recognized. Order S-Suitable and Order N-Not suitable. The orders have classes, subclasses and units. Order-S has three classes, Class S1-Highly Suitable, Class S2-Moderately Suitable and Class S3- Marginally Suitable. Order N has two classes, N1-Currently not Suitable and N2- Permanently not Suitable. There are no subclasses within the Class S1 as they will have very minor or no limitations for crop growth. Classes S2, S3, N1 and N2 are divided into subclasses based on the kinds of limitations encountered. The limitations that affect crop production are 'c' for erratic rainfall and its distribution and length of growing period (LGP), 'e' for erosion hazard, 'r' for rooting condition, 't' for lighter or heavy texture, 'g' for gravelliness or stoniness, 'n' for nutrient availability, 'l' for topography, 'm' for moisture availability, 'w' for drainage, 's' for sodium and 'z' for calcareousness. These limitations are indicated as lower case letters to the Class symbol. For example, moderately suitable lands with the limitations of soil depth and erosion are designated as S2re. For the microwatershed, the soil mapping units were evaluated and classified up to subclass level.

Using the above criteria, the soil map units of the microwatershed were evaluated and land suitability maps for 29 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 Tumakuru districts. The crop requirements for growing sorghum (Table 7.2) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) of the soils of the microwatershed and a land suitability map for growing sorghum was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.1.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sorghum occur in an area of 52 ha (12%) and are distributed in the southern, southwestern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 73 ha (17%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for

growing sorghum and are distributed in the western, southern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitation of texture. An area of about 31 ha (7%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing sorghum and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.1 Land Suitability map of Sorghum

7.2 Land Suitability for Maize (*Zea mays*)

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing maize in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing maize occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.2 Land Suitability map of Maize

7.3 Land Suitability for Bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum)*

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing bajra in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing bajra occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



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.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing groundnut in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing groundnut occupy an area of about 157 ha (36%) with moderate limitations of texture and rooting depth and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southeastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed.



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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing sunflower occur in an area of 8 ha (2%) and are distributed in the southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 118 ha (27%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.5 Land Suitability map of Sunflower

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

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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing red gram are not available in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing red gram occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.6 Land Suitability map of Redgram

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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing bengal gram occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, western, southeastern, southwestern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 31 ha (7%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing bengal gram and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.7 Land Suitability map of Bengal gram

7.8 Land Suitability for Cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*)

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

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing cotton occur in an area of 8 ha (2%) and are distributed in the southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 118 ha (27%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitations of texture and calcareousness. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing cotton occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.8 Land Suitability map of Cotton

7.9 Land Suitability for Chilli (*Capsicum annuum)*

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing chilli in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing chilli occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig 7.9 Land Suitability map of Chilli

7.10 Land Suitability for Tomato *(Lycopersicon esculentum)*

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing tomato in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 81 ha (18%) and are distributed in the southeastern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) occupy an area of about 76 ha (17%) and are distributed in the western, southern, central and southwestern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



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.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing brinjal occur in an area of 52 ha (12%) and are distributed in the southern, southwestern and southeastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 73 ha (17%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing brinjal and are distributed in the western, southern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. They have minor limitation of texture. An area of about 31 ha (7%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing brinjal and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of rooting depth.



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.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing onion occur in an area of 45 ha (10%) and are distributed in the central, southern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 73 ha (17%) is moderately suitable (Class S2) for growing onion and are distributed in the western, southern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatersh ed. They have minor limitation of texture. An area of about 39 ha (9%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing onion and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



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.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing bhendi occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, western, southeastern, southwestern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 31 ha (7%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing bhendi and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of rooting depth.



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 about 2403 ha 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.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing drumstick in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig 7.14 Land Suitability map of Drumstick

7.15 Land suitability for Mango (*Mangifera indica*)

Mango is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 1.73 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.16) for growing mango were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mango was generated. The area extent and their geographic distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.15.

Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 8 ha (2%) and are distributed in the southern and southeastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of rooting depth. An area of about 118 ha (27%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing mango and is distributed in the western, southern, eastern, southeastern, southwestern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitations of rooting depth and calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.15 Land Suitability map of Mango

7.16 Land Suitability for Guava (*Psidium guajava*)

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

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing guava in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing guava occupy an area of about 126 ha (29%) with moderate limitation of texture and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southeastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.16 Land Suitability map of Guava

7.17 Land Suitability for Sapota (*Manilkara zapota*)

Sapota is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 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 geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.17.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing sapota in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing sapota occupy an area of about 126 ha (29%) with moderate limitation of texture and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southeastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.17 Land Suitability map of Sapota

7.18 Land Suitability for Pomegranate (*Punica granatum*)

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

There are no highly (Class S1) suitable lands available for growing pomegranate in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig 7.18 Land Suitability map of Pomegranate

7.19 Land Suitability for Musambi (*Citrus limetta*)

Musambi is one of the important fruit crop grown in an area of 3446 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing musambi (Table 7.20) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing musambi was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.19.

Highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing musambi occupy an area of 81 ha (18%) and are distributed in the western, southern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 45 ha (10%) and are distributed in the southwestern and southern, part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.19 Land Suitability map of Musambi

7.20 Land Suitability for Lime (*Citrus sp*)

Lime is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 0.11 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing lime (Table 7.21) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing lime was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7. 20.

Highly (Class S1) suitable lands for growing lime occupy an area of 81 ha (18%) and are distributed in the western, southern, southeastern and eastern part of the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 45 ha (10%) and are distributed in the southwestern and southern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of calcareousness. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.20 Land Suitability map of Lime

7.21 Land Suitability for Amla (*Phyllanthus emblica*)

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

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing amla in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing amla occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.21 Land Suitability map of Amla

7.22 Land Suitability for Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale)*

Cashew is one of the most important plantation nut crop grown in an area of 0.7 lakh ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing cashew (Table 7.23) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing cashew was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.22.

Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in the area of 157 ha (36%) and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southwestern and southeastern part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth, texture.



Fig. 7.22 Land Suitability map of Cashew

7. 23 Land Suitability for Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*)

Jackfruit is one of the most important fruit crop grown in an area of 5368 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing jackfruit (Table 7.24) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jackfruit was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.23.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing jackfruit in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing jackfruit occupy an area of about 126 ha (29%) with moderate limitation of texture and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southeastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.23 Land Suitability map of Jackfruit

7.24 Land Suitability for Jamun (*Syzygium cumini*)

Jamun is an important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing jamun (Table 25) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing jamun was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.24.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing jamun in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, southeastern, southwestern, western, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.24 Land Suitability map of Jamun

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

Custard apple is one of the most important fruit crop grown in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements for growing custard apple (Table7.26) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing custard apple was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.25.

Highly suitable (Class S1) lands for growing custard apple occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the central, western, southeastern, southwestern, southern and eastern part of the microwatershed. An area of about 31 ha (7%) is marginally suitable (Class S3) for growing custard apple and is distributed in the western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with moderate limitation of rooting depth.



Fig. 7.25 Land Suitability map of Custard Apple

7.26 Land Suitability for Tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*)

Tamarind is one of the most important spice crop grown in almost all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing tamarind (Table 7.27) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing tamarind was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.26.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing tamarind in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.26 Land Suitability map of Tamarind

7.27 Land Suitability for Mulberry (*Morus nigra*)

Mulberry is one of the important leaf crop grown for rearing silk worms in about 1.6 lakh ha area in all the districts of the state. The crop requirements for growing mulberry (Table 7.28) were matched with the soil-site characteristics (Table 7.1) and a land suitability map for growing mulberry was generated. The area extent and their geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed is given in Figure 7.27.

There are no highly suitable (Class S1) and moderately suitable (Class S2) lands available for growing mulberry in the microwatershed. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing mulberry occupy an area of about 126 ha (29%) with moderate limitation of texture and are distributed in the western, eastern, southern, southeastern and southwestern part of the microwatershed. Currently not suitable (Class N1) lands occur in an area of 31 ha (7%) and are distributed in western, southern and central part of the microwatershed with severe limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig 7.27 Land Suitability map of Mulberry

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

Marigold is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 9108 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.29) 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 are given in Figure 7.28.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing marigold in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing marigold occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.28 Land Suitability map of Marigold

7.29 Land Suitability for Chrysanthemum (*Dendranthema grandiflora*)

Chrysanthemum is one of the most important flower crop grown in an area of 4978 ha in almost all the districts of the State. The crop requirements (Table 7.30) 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 geographical distribution of different suitability subclasses in the microwatershed are given in Figure 7.29.

No highly suitable (Class S1) lands available for growing chrysanthemum in the microwatershed. Moderately suitable (Class S2) lands occur in an area of 126 ha (29%) and are distributed in the western, central, southeastern, southwestern and eastern part of the microwatershed with minor limitation of texture. Marginally suitable lands (Class S3) for growing chrysanthemum occupy an area of 31 ha (7%) and occur in the western, central and southern part of the microwatershed. They have moderate limitations of rooting depth and texture.



Fig. 7.29 Land Suitability map of Chrysanthemum

Table 7.1 Soil-Site Characteristics of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

Soil Map Units	Climate (P) (mm)	Growing period (Days)	Drain-age Class	Soil depth (cm)	Soil texture		Gravelliness		AWC (mm/m)	Slope (%)	Erosion	pH	EC (dSm^{-1})	ESP (%)	CEC [Cmol $(p^{+})kg^{-1}$]	BS (%)
					Sur-face	Sub-surface	Surface (%)	Sub-surface (%)								
BDLiB3	866	150	WD	25-50	sc	sl	<15	<15	<50	1-3	severe	6.20	0.074	0.20	4.20	93
MDGiB2	866	150	WD	100-150	sc	scl	<15	<15	>200	1-3	moderate	8.2	0.39	3.08	4.90	100
MDRcB2	866	150	WD	>150	sl	scl	<15	<15	>200	1-3	moderate	8.31	0.33	0.90	20.57	100
MDRiB2	866	150	WD	>150	sc	scl	<15	<15	>200	1-3	moderate	8.31	0.33	0.90	20.57	100
MDRmB2	866	150	WD	>150	c	scl	<15	<15	>200	1-3	moderate	8.31	0.33	0.90	20.57	100

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

Table 7.2 Land suitability criteria for Sorghum

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic 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 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, 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 Redgram

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

Table 7.8 Land suitability criteria for Bengal gram

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

Table 7.9 Land suitability criteria for Cotton

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

Table 7.10 Land suitability criteria for Chilli

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

Table 7.11 Land suitability criteria for Tomato

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

Table 7.12 Land suitability criteria for Brinjal

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

Table 7.13 Land suitability criteria for Onion

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

Table 7.14 Land suitability criteria for Bhendi

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

Table 7.15 Land suitability criteria for Drumstick

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

Table 7.16 Land suitability criteria for Mango

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

Table 7.17 Land suitability criteria for Guava

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C	28-32	33-36 24-27	37-42 20-23	
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Moderately well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	sl	c (black), ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.0-6.0	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.18 Land suitability criteria for Sapota

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

Table 7.19 Land suitability criteria for Pomegranate

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

Table 7.20 Land suitability criteria for Musambi

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

Table 7.21 Land suitability criteria for Lime

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

Table 7.22 Land suitability criteria for Amla

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well drained	Poorly drained	V. Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	c (black)	ls, sl	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5 7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>75	50-75	25-50	<25
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15-35	35-60	60-80	-
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.23 Land suitability criteria for Cashew

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

Table 7.24 Land suitability criteria for Jackfruit

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod. well	Poorly	V. Poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c (red)	-	sl, ls, c (black)	-
	pH	1:2.5	5.5-7.3	5.0-5.5 7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>100	75-100	50-75	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10-

Table 7.25 Land suitability criteria for Jamun

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well	Mod. well	Poorly	V.Poorly
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl, sc, c(red)	sl, c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.8	5.0-6.0	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	50-100	<50
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	>60
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2.0	2-4	4-8	>8.0
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.26 Land suitability criteria for Custard apple

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

Table 7.27 Land suitability criteria for Tamarind

Land use requirement			Rating			
Soil –site characteristics		**Unit**	**Highly suitable (S1)**	**Moderately suitable (S2)**	**Marginally suitable (S3)**	**Not suitable (N1)**
Climatic regime	Mean temperature in growing season	°C				
	Mean max. temp. in growing season	°C				
	Mean min. tempt. in growing season	°C				
	Mean RH in growing season	%				
	Total rainfall	mm				
	Rainfall in growing season	mm				
Land quality	Soil-site characteristic					
Moisture availability	Length of growing period for short duration	Days				
	Length of growing period for long duration					
	AWC	mm/m				
Oxygen availability to roots	Soil drainage	Class	Well drained	Mod.well drained	Poorly drained	V.Poorly drained
	Water logging in growing season	Days				
Nutrient availability	Texture	Class	scl, cl,sc, c (red)	sl, c (black)	ls	-
	pH	1:2.5	6.0-7.3	5.0-6.0 7.3-7.8	7.8-8.4	>8.4
	CEC	C mol (p+)/ Kg				
	BS	%				
	CaCO3 in root zone	%		<5	5-10	>10
	OC	%				
Rooting conditions	Effective soil depth	cm	>150	100-150	75-100	<75
	Stoniness	%				
	Coarse fragments	Vol %	<15	15-35	35-60	60-80
Soil toxicity	Salinity (EC saturation extract)	ds/m	<2	2-4	4-8	>8
	Sodicity (ESP)	%	<5	5-10	10-15	>15
Erosion hazard	Slope	%	0-3	3-5	5-10	>10

Table 7.28 Land suitability criteria for Mulberry

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

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

7.30 Land Management Units (LMUs)

The 5 soil map units identified in Yadgir RF microwatershed have been grouped into 2 Land Management Units (LMU's) for the purpose of preparing a Proposed Crop Plan. Land Management Units are grouped based on the similarities in respect of the type of soil, the depth of the soil, the surface soil texture, gravel content, AWC, slope, erosion etc. and a Land Management Units map (Fig. 7.30) has been generated. These Land Management Units are expected to behave similarly for a given level of management.

The 5 map units that have been grouped into 2 Land Management Units along with brief description of soil and site characteristics are given below.

LMU	Soil map units	Soil and site characteristics
1	58.MDGiB2 59.MDRcB2 133.MDRiB2 61.MDRmB2	Deep to very deep (100->150 cm), sandy clay loam soils, 1-3% slopes, non gravelly (<15%), moderate erosion.
2	6.BDLiB3	Shallow (25 to 50 cm), sandy loam soils, 1-3% slopes, non gravelly (<15), severe erosion.



Fig. 7.30 Land Management Units Map- Yadgir RF Microwatershed

7.31 Proposed Crop Plan for Yadgir RF Microwatershed

After assessing the land suitability for the 29 crops, the Proposed Crop Plan has been prepared for the 2 identified LMUs by considering only the highly (Class S1) and moderately (Class S2) suitable lands for each of the 29 crops. The resultant proposed crop plan is presented below in Table 7.31.

Table 7.31 Proposed Crop Plan for Yadgir RF Microwatershed

LMU	Soil Map Units	Survey Number	Field Crops /Commercial crops	Horticulture Crops (Rainfed/Irrigated)	Suitable Interventions
1	58.MDGiB2 59.MDRcB2 133.MDRiB2 61.MDRmB2 (Deep to very deep, sandy clay loam soils)	**Chinthanapalli:** 227,228,241,242, 243/1,243/2	Sunflower, Sorghum, Maize, Groundnut, Red gram, Bajra	**Fruit crops:** Mango, Musambi, Sapota, Tamarind, Pomegranate, Amla, Custard apple, Guava, Jackfruit, Jamun, Lime **Vegetables:** Tomato, Onion**,** Bhendi, Chilli, Brinjal, Drumstick, Coriander **Flowers:** Marigold, Chrysanthemum	Application of FYM, Biofertilizers and micronutrients, drip irrigation, mulching, suitable soil and water conservation practices
2	6.BDLiB3 (Shallow, sandy loam soils)	**Chinthanapalli :** 224,225,229,231,232, 233,234,235,236,237, 238,239,240,244,246, 247,248,249,250,251, 252,253,254,255,256, 257,261,262,263,264, 265,266,267,273,274, 279,280,281,282,283, 284,286/1,286/2,288	-	**Agri-Silvi-Pasture:** Hybrid Napier, *Styloxanthes hamata*, *Styloxanthes scabra*	Use of short duration varieties, sowing across the slope, drip irrigation and mulching is recommended

Chapter 8

SOIL HEALTH MANAGEMENT

8.1 Soil Health

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

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

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

The most important characteristics of a healthy soil are

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

Characteristics of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

- The soil phases identified in the microwatershed belonged to the soil series MDR series occupying a maximum area of 118 ha (27%) followed by BDL 31 ha (7%) and MDG 8 ha (2%).
- As per land capability classification entire area of the microwatershed falls under arable land category (Class II & IV). The major limitations identified in the arable lands were soil and erosion.
- On the basis of soil reaction, about 92 ha (21%) is slightly alkaline, 65 ha (15%) is moderately alkaline and very small area of 0.1 ha (<1%) is neutral in soil reaction.

❖ **Soil Health Management**

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

Acid soils

Acid soils are not occuring in the microwatershed.

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

Liming materials:

1. $CaCO_3$ (Calcium Carbonate).
2. Dolomite [Ca Mg $(Co_3)_2$]
3. Quick lime (Cao)
4. Slaked lime [Ca $(OH)_2$]

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

Alkaline soils

Alkaline soils occur in 157 ha of 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, Azatobacter, Rhizobium).
3. Application of 25% extra N and P (125 % RDN&P).
4. Application of $ZnSO_4$ – 12.5 kg/ha (once in three years).
5. Application of Boron – 5kg/ha (once in three years).

Neutral soils

Neutral soils occur in a very small area of 0.1 ha in the microwatershed.

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

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

Soil Degradation

Soil erosion is one of the major factor affecting the soil health in the microwatershed. Out of total 438 ha area in the microwatershed, about 31 ha (7%) is suffering from severe erosion and 126 ha (29%) is suffering from moderate erosion. In

areas of moderate and severe erosion immediate soil and water conservation and, other land development and land husbandry practices are required for restoring soil health.

Dissemination of Information and Communication of Benefits

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

Inputs for Net Planning (Saturation Plan) and Interventions needed

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

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

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

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

- **Gravelliness:** More gravel content is favorable for run-off harvesting but poor in soil moisture storage and nutrient availability. It is a significant parameter that decides the kind of crop to be raised.
- **Land Capability Classification:** The land capability map shows the areas suitable and not suitable for agriculture and the major constraints in each of the plot/survey number. Hence, one can decide what kind of enterprise is possible in each of these units. In general, erosion and soil are the major constraints in Yadgir RF microwatershed.
- **Organic Carbon:** The OC content (an index of available Nitrogen) is low (<0.5%) in an area of 11 ha (3%) and medium (0.5-0.75%) in an area of 146 ha (33%) of the microwatershed. The areas that are medium and low in OC needs to be further improved by applying farmyard manure and crop rotation with cereals and legumes or mixed cropping.
- **Promoting green manuring:** Growing of green manuring crops costs Rs. 1250/ha (green manuring seeds) and about Rs. 2000/ha towards cultivation that totals to Rs. 3250/- per ha. On the other hand, application of organic manure @ 10 tons/ha costs Rs. 5000/ha. The practice needs to be continued for 2-3 years or more. Nitrogen fertilizer needs to be supplemented by 25% in addition to the recommended level. Where OC is medium and low (<0.5 - 0.75%). For example, for rainfed maize, recommended level is 50 kg N per ha and an additional 12 kg /ha needs to be applied for all the crops grown in these plots.
- **Available Phosphorus**: Available Phosphorus is medium (23-57 kg/ha) in an area 38 ha (9%), low (<23 kg/ha) in an area of 116 ha (26%) and high (>57 kg/ha) in an area of 3 ha (<1%) of the microwatershed. In medium and low areas, for all the crops 25% additional P needs to be applied.
- **Available Potassium:** Available potassium is medium (145-337 kg/ha) in an area of 133 ha (30%) and high (>337 kg/ha) in an area 24 ha (5%) of the microwatershed. All the plots, where available potassium is low and medium, for all the crops, additional 25% potassium may be applied.
- **Available Sulphur:** Available sulphur is a very critical nutrient for oilseed crops. It is low (< 10 ppm) in the entire cultivated area of the microwatershed. Low content sulphur areas need to be applied with magnesium sulphate or gypsum or Factamphos (p) fertilizer (13% sulphur) for 2-3 years for the deficiency to be corrected.
- **Available Boron:** An area of 115 ha (26%) is low (<0.5 ppm) and 42 ha (10%) is medium (0.5-1.0 ppm) in available boron content. Application of sodium tetra borate @ 10 kg/ha as soil application or 0.2 % borax as foliar spray is recommended for low and medium areas.
- **Available Iron:** An area of about 39 ha (9%) is deficient (<4.5 ppm) and 118 ha (27%) area of the microwatershed is sufficient (>4.5 ppm) in available iron content.

- **Available Manganese:** All the soils in the microwatershed are sufficient (>1.0 ppm) in available manganese.
- **Available Copper:** All the soils in the microwatershed are sufficient (>0.2 ppm) in available copper.

- **Available Zinc:** Entire cultivated area of the microwatershed is deficient (<0.6 ppm) in available zinc content. Application of zinc sulphate @25 kg/ha is recommended for deficient areas.
- **Soil Alkalinity**: An area of 157 ha in the microwatershed has soils that are slightly to moderately alkaline. These areas need application of gypsum and wherever calcium is in excess, iron pyrites and element sulphur can be recommended. Management practices like treating repeatedly with good quality water to drain out the excess salts and provision of subsurface drainage and growing of salt tolerant crops like Casuarina, Acacia, Neem, Ber etc, are recommended.

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

Chapter 9

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION TREATMENT PLAN

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

- Soil depth
- Surface soil texture
- Available water capacity
- Soil slope
- Soil gravelliness
- Land capability
- Present land use and land cover
- Crop suitability
- Rainfall
- Hydrology
- Water Resources
- Socio-economic data



- Contour plan with existing features- network of waterways, pothissa boundaries, cut up/ minor terraces etc.
- Cadastral map (1:7920 scale)
- Satellite imagery (1:7920 scale)

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

Steps for Survey and Preparation of Treatment Plan

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

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

9.1 Treatment Plan

The treatment plan recommended for arable lands is briefly described below

9.1.1 Arable Land Treatment

A. BUNDING

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

Measurement of Land Slope

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



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 ($bg_{0...}$ b=loamy sand, g_0 = <15% gravel). The recommended Sections for different soils are given below.

Recommended Bund Section

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

Formation of Trench cum Bund

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

Details of Borrow Pit dimensions are given below:



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

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

B. Water Ways

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

C. Farm Ponds

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

D. Diversion Channel

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

9.1.2 Non-Arable Land Treatment

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

9.1.3 Treatment of Natural Water Course/ Drainage Lines

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

9.2 Recommended Soil and Water Conservation Measures

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

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

A map (Fig. 9.1) showing soil and water conservation plan with different kinds of structures recommended has been prepared which shows the spatial distribution and extent of area. Entire cultivated area of about 157 ha (36%) needs Graded Bunding.

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



Fig. 9.1 Soil and Water Conservation Plan map of Yadgir RF Microwatershed

9.3 Greening of Microwatershed

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

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

The tree species suitable for the area considering rainfall, temperature and adaptability is listed below; waterlogged areas are recommended to be planted with species like Nerale (*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

Yadgir Rf (6A1a) Microwatershed

Soil Phase Information

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Chinthanapalli	55	180.04	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Not Available	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	192	0.09	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	215	95.95	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Not Available	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	224	0.09	MDRcB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	225	1.29	MDRcB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	226	1.28	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Not Available	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	227	5.13	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	228	8.58	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	229	0.42	MDRcB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	231	1.52	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	232	4.28	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	233	5.74	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	234	4.79	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	235	6.28	MDRcB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy loam	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	236	2.41	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	237	4.55	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Scrub land (Ct+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	238	4.44	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton+Scrub land (Ct+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	239	1.56	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Scrub land (Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	240	6.16	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	241	4.59	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Cotton+Scrub land (Ct+Sl)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	242	3.47	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Scrub land (Sl)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	243/1	0.51	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Chinthanapalli	243/2	1.63	BDLiB3	LMU-1	Shallow (25-50 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very low (<50 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Severe	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IVes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	244	5.44	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	245	4.86	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Cotton+Scrub land (Ct+Sl)	Not Available	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	246	8.14	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	247	6.77	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	248	3.03	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut (Gn)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	249	5.85	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	250	7.95	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Redgram (Gn+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	251	8.27	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Redgram (Gn+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	252	0.99	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	253	6.17	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	254	1.11	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram+Scrub land (Rg+Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	255	2.05	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	256	0.88	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Scrub land (Sl)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	257	1.06	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	258	0.02	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Groundnut+Paddy (Gn+Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	259	0.13	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	260	0.75	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	261	0.76	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	262	0.46	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	263	0.46	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	264	1.87	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	265	2.24	MDRiB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Redgram (Rg)	Not Available	IIe	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	266	1.3	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding

Village	Survey No	Area (ha)	Soil Phase	LMU	Soil Depth	Surface Soil Texture	Soil Gravelliness	Available Water Capacity	Slope	Soil Erosion	Current Land Use	Wells	Land Capability	Conservation Plan
Chinthanapalli	267	0.74	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	268	0.55	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	272	0.42	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	273	0.85	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	274	0.75	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	275	0.31	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	278	0.24	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	279	0.74	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	280	0.28	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	281	1.41	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	282	0.02	MDGiB2	LMU-2	Deep (100-150 cm)	Sandy clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	283	1.88	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	284	5.87	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Groundnut+Cotton (Gn+Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	285	1.61	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	286/1	1.51	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	286/2	0.4	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Cotton (Ct)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	288	0.04	MDRmB2	LMU-2	Very deep (>150 cm)	Clay	Non gravelly (<15%)	Very high (>200 mm/m)	Very gently sloping (1-3%)	Moderate	Paddy+Cotton+Redgram (Pd+Ct+Rg)	Not Available	IIes	Graded bunding
Chinthanapalli	325	0.14	Waterbody	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Paddy (Pd)	Not Available	Others	Others

Appendix II

Yadgir Rf (6A1a) Microwatershed

Soil Fertility Information

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Chinthanapalli	55	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	192	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	215	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	224	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	225	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	226	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	227	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	228	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	229	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	231	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	232	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	233	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	234	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	235	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	236	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Deficient (< 4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	237	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Chinthanapalli	238	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 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)
Chinthanapalli	239	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	240	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	241	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	242	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	243/1	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	243/2	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Chinthanapalli	244	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	245	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	246	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	247	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	248	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	249	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	250	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	251	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	252	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	253	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	254	Moderately alkaline (pH 7.8 – 8.4)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	255	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	256	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	257	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	258	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	259	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	260	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	261	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	262	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	263	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Low (< 0.5 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	264	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	265	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Low (< 23 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)
Chinthanapalli	266	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	267	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	268	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others

Village	Survey No	Soil Reaction	Salinity	Organic Carbon	Available Phosphorus	Available Potassium	Available Sulphur	Available Boron	Available Iron	Available Manganese	Available Copper	Available Zinc
Chinthanapalli	272	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	273	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	274	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	275	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	278	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others
Chinthanapalli	279	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	280	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	281	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	282	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	283	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Low (< 0.5 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	284	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	Medium (145 – 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	285	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	286/1	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)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	286/2	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)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	288	Slightly alkaline (pH 7.3 – 7.8)	Non saline (<2 dsm)	Medium (0.5 – 0.75 %)	Medium (23 – 57 kg/ha)	High (> 337 kg/ha)	Low (<10 ppm)	Medium (0.5 – 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (>4.5 ppm)	Sufficient (> 1.0 ppm)	Sufficient (> 0.2 ppm)	Deficient (< 0.6 ppm)
Chinthanapalli	325	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others	Others

Appendix III

Yadgir Rf (6A1a) 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	Onion	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Brinjal	Bhendi	Drumstick	Mulberry
Chinthanapalli	55	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	192	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
Chinthanapalli	215	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	224	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	225	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	226	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	227	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	228	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	229	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	231	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	232	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	233	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	234	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	235	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	236	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	237	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	238	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	239	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	240	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	241	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	242	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	243/1	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	243/2	N1r	S3rt	N1r	S3r	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1r	S3r	N1r	S3rt	S3rt	N1rt	S3r	N1rt	N1rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	S3rt	N1r	S3rt	S3r	S3r	N1rt	N1rt
Chinthanapalli	244	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Onion	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Brinjal	Bhendi	Drumstick	Mulberry
Chinthanapalli	245	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	246	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	247	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	248	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	249	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	250	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	251	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	252	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	253	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	254	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	255	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	256	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	257	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	258	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
Chinthanapalli	259	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
Chinthanapalli	260	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
Chinthanapalli	261	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	262	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	263	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	264	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	265	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S2z	S2t	S2z	S1	S2z	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S2z	S3t	S1	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	266	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	267	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	268	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
Chinthanapalli	272	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
Chinthanapalli	273	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	274	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t

Village	Survey Number	Mango	Maize	Sapota	Sorghum	Guava	Cotton	Tamarind	Lime	Bengal gram	Sunflower	Red gram	Amla	Jackfruit	Custard-apple	Cashew	Jamun	Musambi	Groundnut	Onion	Chilly	Tomato	Marigold	Chrysanthemum	Pomegranate	Bajra	Brinjal	Bhendi	Drumstick	Mulberry
Chinthanapalli	275	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
Chinthanapalli	278	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
Chinthanapalli	279	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	280	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	281	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	282	S2r	S2t	S3t	S1	S3t	S1	S2t	S1	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	283	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	284	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	285	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest	Forest
Chinthanapalli	286/1	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	286/2	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	288	S3tz	S2t	S3t	S2t	S3t	S2t	S2t	S1	S1	S2t	S2t	S2t	S3t	S1	N1t	S2t	S1	S3t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2t	S2tz	S2t	S1	S2t	S3t
Chinthanapalli	325	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

PART-B

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARM HOUSEHOLDS

CONTENTS

1.	Salient findings of the survey	1-5
2.	Introduction	7
3	Methodology	9
4	Salient features of the survey	11-29
5	Summary	31-35

LIST OF TABLES

1	Households sampled for socio economic survey	11
2	Population characteristics	11
3	Age wise classification of household members	11
4	Education level of household members	12
5	Occupation of household heads	12
6	Occupation of family members	12
7	Institutional participation of household members	13
8	Type of house owned by households	13
9	Durable assets owned by households	13
10	Average value of durable assets owned by households	13
11	Farm implements owned by households	14
12	Average value of farm implements owned by households	14
13	Livestock possession by households	15
14	Average labour availability	15
15	Adequacy of hired labour	15
16	Distribution of land (ha)	15
17	Average land value (Rs./ha)	16
18	Status of bore wells	16
19	Source of irrigation	16
20	Depth of water	16
21	Irrigated area (ha)	16
22	Cropping pattern	17
23	Cropping intensity	17
24	Possession of Bank account and savings	17
25	Borrowing status	17
26	Cost of cultivation of Red gram	18
27	Cost of cultivation of Jowar	19
28	Cost of cultivation of Groundnut	20
29	Cost of cultivation of Cotton	21
30	Cost of cultivation of Paddy	22
31	Cost of cultivation of Green gram	23

32	Adequacy of fodder	24
33	Average annual gross income	24
34	Average annual expenditure	24
35	Horticulture species grown	25
36	Forest species grown	25
37	Average Additional investment capacity	25
38	Source of funds for additional investment capacity	25
39	Marketing of the agricultural produce	26
40	Marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce	26
41	Mode of transport of agricultural produce	26
42	Incidence of soil and water erosion problems	26
43	Interest towards soil testing	27
44	Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use	27
45	Source of drinking water	27
46	Source of light	27
47	Existence of sanitary toilet facility	27
48	Possession of public distribution system(PDS) card	28
49	Participation in NREGA programme	28
50	Adequacy of food items	28
51	Response on inadequacy of food items	28
52	Farming constraints experienced	29

Chapter 1

SALIENT FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

- *The data indicated that there were 89 (53.61%) men and 77 (46.39%) women among the sampled households.*
- *The average family size of landless farmers' was 3.2, marginal farmers' was 5.27, small farmers' was 5.77, semi medium farmers' was 6.5, semi-medium farmers' was 6.50 and medium farmers' was 4.*
- *The data indicated that, 33 (19.88%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.58%) were in 16-35 years of age, 43 (25.90 %) were in 36-60 years of age and 16 (9.64%) were above 61 years of age.*
- *The results indicated that Yadgir Rf had 54.82 per cent illiterates, 23.49 per cent of them had primary school education, 4.82 per cent of them had middle school education, 4.22 per cent of them had high school education, 4.82 per cent of them had PUC education, 5.42 per cent of them did degree, and 2.41 per cent did other education.*
- *The results indicate that, 71.88 per cent of households were practicing agriculture, and 25 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers.*
- *The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 14.46 per cent of the household members, 60.84 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.60 per cent were general labourers, 0.60 per cent were in private service, 18.07 per cent were students, 1.81 per cent were housewives and 3.61 per cent were children.*
- *The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions.*
- *The results indicate that 9.38 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 71.88 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 18.75 per cent of them possess pucca house.*
- *The results show that 62.50 per cent of the households possess TV, 3.13 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 15.63 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 6.25 per cent of the households possess bicycle and 59.38 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.*
- *The results show that the average value of television was Rs. 8900, mixer grinder was Rs.2000, motor cycle was Rs.42600, bicycle was Rs. 1000 and mobile phone was Rs. 2477.*
- *About 21.88 per cent of them possess plough, 12.50 per cent of the bullock cart, 6.25 per cent of the households possess seed/fertilizer drill, 3.13 per cent of them power tiller, 21.88 per cent of them sprayer, 3.13 per cent of them sprinkler and 46.88 per cent of them possess weeder.*

- *The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.3571, bullock cart was Rs. 20000, seed/fertilizer drill was Rs. 2200, power tiller was Rs. 25000, Sprayer was Rs. 2971, Sprinkler was Rs. 12000 and the average value of weeder was Rs.234.*
- *The results indicate that, 21.88 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 31.25 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.13 per cent of the households possess goat.*
- *The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.63, average own labour (women) available was 1.50, average hired labour (men) available was 7.43 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.17.*
- *The results indicate that, 93.75 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that, households of the Yadgir Rf micro-watershed possess 26.56 ha (82.81%) of dry land and 5.52 ha (17.19%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 6.43 ha (93.69%) of dry land and 0.43 ha (6.31%). Small farmers possess 16.90 ha (93.09%) of dry land and 1.25 ha (6.91%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 3.24 ha (71.05%) of dry land and 1.30 ha (28.95 %) of irrigated land. Medium farmers possess 2.51 ha (100%) of irrigated land.*
- *The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 349,954.30 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 507,410.13. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 622,166.26 for dry land and Rs. 923,364.44 for irrigated land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 289,822.80 for dry land and Rs. 956,129.06. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 123,500.00 for dry land and Rs 454,601.23 for irrigated land. In case of medium farmers, the average land value was Rs 239,032.27 for irrigated land.*
- *The results indicate that, there were 6 functioning and 6 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed.*
- *The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 18.75 per cent of the farmers.*
- *The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 11.43 meters.*
- *The results indicate that, marginal, small farmers, semi-medium farmers and medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40 ha, 2.47 ha, 1.36 ha and 2.51 ha respectively.*
- *The results indicate that, farmers have grown cotton (5.52 ha), greengram (2.87 ha), groundnut (1.36 ha), paddy (1.21 ha), red gram (19.79 ha), paddy (1.21 ha) and jowar (0.41 ha). Marginal farmers have grown red gram, cotton greengram, paddy and jowar. Small farmers have grown red gram, cotton and paddy. Semi medium farmers have grown red gram, green gram and groundnut. Medium farmers have grown cotton and paddy.*
- *The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was found to be 80.22 per cent.*

- *The results indicate that, the possession of bank account in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was represented to be 84.38 per cent and bank saving account was 84.38 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicate that, borrowing status was 84.38 per cent of the households in Yadgir Rf Micro-watershed*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for redgram was Rs. 29861.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 46398.39. The net income from Redgram cultivation was Rs. 16537.02, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.55.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for jowar was Rs. 46247.26. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 110423.53. The net income from Jowar cultivation was Rs. 64176.27. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.39.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 39915.62. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 104386.91. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 64471.28. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.62.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35939.71. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 96214.57. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 60274.85. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.68.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 59670.85. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 97702.22. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 38031.37. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.64.*
- *The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for greengram was Rs. 27738.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 49264.05. The net income from greengram cultivation was Rs. 21525.98. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.78.*
- *The results indicate that, 31.25 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and another 12.50 per cent opined that dry fodder was inadequate.*
- *The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs. 60,000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 153,728.18, for small farmers it was Rs. 142,161.54, for semi-medium farmers it was Rs. 219,000 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 341,600.*
- *The results indicate that the average annual expenditure is Rs. 16,653.27. For landless households it was Rs. 4,000, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 17,454.46, for small farmers it was Rs. 5,454.28, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 52,500 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 85,555.56.*
- *The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 84 custard apple and 11 mango trees in their field and 2 mango trees in their back yard.*

- *The results indicate that, households have planted 84 neem trees, 14 tamarind tree, 3 teak tree and 5 acacia in their field and 3 neem trees in their backyard.*
- *The results indicate that, households have average addition investment capacity was Rs 12062. In Yadgir Rf micro-watershed.*
- *The results indicate that, households of the share of government subsidy were 12.5 per cent and 15.63 per cent of soft loan.*
- *The results indicated that, cotton was sold to the extent of 100 per cent, greengram was sold to the extent of 71.4 per cent, groundnut was 64.3 per cent, jowar was 37.5 per cent, paddy was 53.8 per cent and red gram was sold to be extent of 73.8 per cent.*
- *The results indicated that, about 96.88 per cent of the farmers sold their produce to regulated markets and 3.13 per cent sold in agent/traders.*
- *The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the households have used tractor and 3.13 per cent of track as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.*
- *The results indicated that, 18.75 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 18.18 per cent of the marginal farmers, and 30.77 per cent of the small farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems.*
- *The results indicated that, 81.25 per cent have shown interest in soil test which accounts for 100 per cent of marginal farmers, 100 per cent small farmers and 100 per cent of semi medium farmers.*
- *The results indicated that, 93.75 per cent of the households used firewood and 6.25 per cent used LPG as a source of fuel.*
- *The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 50 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 20 per cent of the households in the micro watershed.*
- *Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed.*
- *The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 100 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers and 100 per cent of the medium farmers.*
- *The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the sampled household's possessed BPL card and 3.12 per cent of the households not possessed.*
- *The results indicated that, 37.50 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.*
- *The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 96.88 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 53.13 per*

cent, fruits were adequate for 53.13 per cent, milk was adequate for 28.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 31.25 per cent and oil seeds were adequate for 25 per cent.

- *The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 31.13 per cent, oil seeds were inadequate for 68.75 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 28.13 per cent, milk was inadequate for 31.25 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 68.75 per cent of the households and vegetables were inadequate for 43.75 per cent of the households.*
- *The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 93.75 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (78.13%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (53.13%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.50%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (37.50%), high rate of interest on credit (15.63%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (6.25%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agril produce to the market (40.63 %), Less rainfall (71.88 %) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (6.25 %).*

Chapter 2

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

Scope and importance of survey

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

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

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

Description of the study area

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

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

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

Description of the micro watershed

Yadgir Rf micro-watershed in Mokadampur sub-watershed (Yadgir taluk and district) is located in between $16^0$55’46.306’’ to 16^0 53’21.504” North latitudes and 77^0 6’20.706’’ to $77^0$5’5.764’’ East longitudes, covering an area of about 438.27 ha, bounded by Himalapura, and Chinthanapalli villages.

Methodology followed in assessing socio-economic status of households

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed a comprehensive questionnaire was prepared. Major components such as demographic conditions, migration details, food consumption and family expenditure pattern, material possession, land holding, land use management, cropping pattern, cost of cultivation of crops, livestock management. The statistical components such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze the data. About 32 households located in the micro-watershed were interviewed for the survey.

Chapter 4

SALIENT FEATURES OF THE SURVEY

Households sampled for socio-economic survey: The data on households sampled for socio economic survey in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 1 and it indicated that 32 farmers were sampled in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed among them 5 (15.63%) were landless, 11 (34.38%) were marginal farmers, 13 (40.63%) were small farmers, 2 (6.25%) were semi medium farmers and 1 (3.13 %) were medium farmers.

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

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Farmers	5	15.63	11	34.38	13	40.63	2	6.25	1	3.13	32	100.00

Population characteristics: The population characteristics of households sampled for socio-economic survey in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 2. The data indicated that there were 89 (53.61%) men and 77 (46.39%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 3.2, marginal farmers' was 5.27, small farmers' was 5.77, semi medium farmers' was 6.5, semi-medium farmers' was 6.50 and medium farmers' was 4.

Table 2: Population characteristics of Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Men	8	50.00	33	56.90	38	50.67	8	61.54	2	50.00	89	53.61
2	Women	8	50.00	25	43.10	37	49.33	5	38.46	2	50.00	77	46.39
Total		16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00
Average		3.20		5.27		5.77		6.50		4.00		5.19	

Age wise classification of population: The age wise classification of household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 3. The data indicated that, 33 (19.88%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.58%) were in 16-35 years of age, 43 (25.90 %) were in 36-60 years of age and 16 (9.64%) were above 61 years of age.

Table 3: Age wise classification of household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (16)		MF (58)		SF (75)		SMF (13)		MDF (4)		All (166)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0-15 years of age	2	12.50	9	15.52	22	29.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	33	19.88
2	16-35 years of age	7	43.75	28	48.28	31	41.33	6	46.15	2	50.00	74	44.58
3	36-60 years of age	6	37.50	14	24.14	19	25.33	3	23.08	1	25.00	43	25.90
4	> 61 years	1	6.25	7	12.07	3	4.00	4	30.77	1	25.00	16	9.64
Total		16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00

Education level of household members: Education level of household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 4. The results indicated that Yadgir Rf had 54.82 per cent illiterates, 23.49 per cent of them had primary school education, 4.82 per cent of them had middle school education, 4.22 per cent of them had high school

education, 4.82 per cent of them had PUC education, 5.42 per cent of them did degree, and 2.41 per cent did other education.

Table 4. Education level of household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (16)		MF (58)		SF (75)		SMF (13)		MDF (4)		All (166)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Illiterate	9	56.25	32	55.17	39	52.00	10	76.92	1	25.00	91	54.82
2	Primary School	3	18.75	15	25.86	19	25.33	1	7.69	1	25.00	39	23.49
3	Middle School	2	12.50	0	0.00	6	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	4.82
4	High School	2	12.50	2	3.45	3	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	4.22
5	PUC	0	0.00	4	6.90	3	4.00	1	7.69	0	0.00	8	4.82
6	Degree	0	0.00	3	5.17	3	4.00	1	7.69	2	50.00	9	5.42
7	Others	0	0.00	2	3.45	2	2.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	2.41
Total		16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00

Occupation of household heads: The data regarding the occupation of the household heads in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 5. The results indicate that, 71.88 per cent of households were practicing agriculture, and 25 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers.

Table 5: Occupation of household heads in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	1	20.00	10	90.91	10	76.92	1	50.00	1	100.00	23	71.88
2	Agricultural Labour	4	80.00	1	9.09	2	15.38	1	50.00	0	0.00	8	25.00
Total		5	100.00	11	100.00	12	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	31	100.00

Occupation of the household members: The data regarding the occupation of the household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 6. The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 14.46 per cent of the household members, 60.84 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.60 per cent were general labourers, 0.60 per cent were in private service, 18.07 per cent were students, 1.81 per cent were housewives and 3.61 per cent were children.

Table 6: Occupation of family members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (16)		MF (58)		SF (75)		SMF (13)		MDF (4)		All (166)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agriculture	1	6.25	10	17.24	11	14.67	1	7.69	1	25.00	24	14.46
2	Agricultural Labour	12	75.00	37	63.79	40	53.33	11	84.62	1	25.00	101	60.84
3	General Labour	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.60
4	Private Service	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	0.60
5	Student	3	18.75	9	15.52	17	22.67	1	7.69	0	0.00	30	18.07
6	Housewife	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	2.67	0	0.00	1	25.00	3	1.81
7	Children	0	0.00	2	3.45	4	5.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	3.61
Total		16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00

Institutional participation of the household members: The data regarding the institutional participation of the household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is

presented in Table 7. The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions.

Table 7. Institutional Participation of household members in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (16)		MF (58)		SF (75)		SMF (13)		MDF (4)		All (166)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	No Participation	16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00
Total		16	100.00	58	100.00	75	100.00	13	100.00	4	100.00	166	100.00

Type of house owned: The data regarding the type of house owned by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 8. The results indicate that 9.38 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 71.88 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 18.75 per cent of them possess pucca house.

Table 8. Type of house owned by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Thatched	0	0.00	1	9.09	1	7.69	1	50.00	0	0.00	3	9.38
2	Katcha	4	80.00	8	72.73	9	69.23	1	50.00	1	100.00	23	71.88
3	Pucca/RCC	1	20.00	2	18.18	3	23.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	18.75
Total		5	100.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00

Durable Assets owned by the households: The data regarding the Durable Assets owned by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 9. The results show that 62.50 per cent of the households possess TV, 3.13 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 15.63 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 6.25 per cent of the households possess bicycle and 59.38 per cent of the households possess mobile phones.

Table 9. Durable Assets owned by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Television	2	40.00	6	54.55	9	69.23	2	100.00	1	100.00	20	62.50
2	Mixer/Grinder	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	7.69	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.13
3	Bicycle	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2	6.25
4	Motor Cycle	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	7.69	1	50.00	1	100.00	5	15.63
5	Mobile Phone	3	60.00	5	45.45	9	69.23	2	100.00	0	0.00	19	59.38
6	Blank	1	20.00	3	27.27	1	7.69	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	15.63

Table 10. Average value of durable assets owned by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Average value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Television	7,000.00	8,000.00	10,444.00	6,000.00	10,000.00	8,900.00
2	Mixer/Grinder	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,000.00
3	Bicycle	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
4	Motor Cycle	0.00	45,000.00	30,000.00	58,000.00	35,000.00	42,600.00
5	Mobile Phone	3,166.00	1,750.00	2,850.00	2,000.00	0.00	2,477.00

Average value of durable assets: The data regarding the average value of durable assets owned by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 10. The results show that the average value of television was Rs. 8900, mixer grinder was Rs.2000, motor cycle was Rs.42600, bicycle was Rs. 1000 and mobile phone was Rs. 2477.

Farm Assets owned by the households: The data regarding the farm Assets owned by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 11. The results show that 12.50 per cent of the households possess bullock cart, 21.88 per cent of the households possess plough, 6.25 per cent of the households possess seed/fertilizer drill, 3.13 per cent of the households possess power tiller, 21.88 per cent of the households possess sprayer, 3.13 per cent of the households possess sprinkler and 46.88 per cent of the households possess weeder.

Table 11. Farm Implements owned by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

		LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
Sl.No.	**Particulars**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
1	Bullock Cart	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	23.08	1	50.00	0	0.00	4	12.50
2	Plough	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	46.15	1	50.00	0	0.00	7	21.88
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.25
4	Power Tiller	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	1	3.13
5	Sprayer	0	0.00	2	18.18	4	30.77	0	0.00	1	100.00	7	21.88
6	Sprinkler	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1	3.13
7	Weeder	1	20.00	5	45.45	7	53.85	2	100.00	0	0.00	15	46.88
8	Blank	4	80.00	5	45.45	4	30.77	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	40.63

Average value of farm implements: The data regarding the average value of farm Implements owned by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 12. The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.3571, bullock cart was Rs. 20000, seed/fertilizer drill was Rs. 2200, power tiller was Rs. 25000, Sprayer was Rs. 2971, Sprinkler was Rs. 12000 and the average value of weeder was Rs.234.

Table 12. Average value of farm implements owned by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Average Value (Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Bullock Cart	0.00	0.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	20,000.00
2	Plough	0.00	0.00	2,833.00	8,000.00	0.00	3,571.00
3	Seed/Fertilizer Drill	0.00	0.00	2,200.00	0.00	0.00	2,200.00
4	Power Tiller	0.00	0.00	0.00	25,000.00	0.00	25,000.00
5	Sprayer	0.00	2,500.00	2,950.00	0.00	4,000.00	2,971.00
6	Sprinkler	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
7	Weeder	32.00	41.00	332.00	344.00	0.00	234.00

Livestock possession by the households: The data regarding the Livestock possession by the households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 13. The results indicate that, 21.88 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 31.25 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.13 per cent of the households possess goat.

Table 13. Livestock possession by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bullock	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	38.46	2	100.00	0	0.00	7	21.88
2	Local cow	0	0.00	3	27.27	5	38.46	2	100.00	0	0.00	10	31.25
3	Goat	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.13
4	blank	5	100.00	7	63.64	5	38.46	0	0.00	1	100.00	18	56.25

Average Labour availability: The data regarding the average labour availability in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 14. The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.63, average own labour (women) available was 1.50, average hired labour (men) available was 7.43 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.17.

Table 14. Average Labour availability in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Hired labour Female	0.00	7.45	9.46	17.50	5.00	8.17
2	Own Labour Female	0.67	1.45	1.62	2.50	1.00	1.50
3	Own labour Male	1.67	1.36	1.62	3.00	2.00	1.63
4	Hired labour Male	0.00	6.91	8.23	17.50	5.00	7.43

Adequacy of Hired Labour: The data regarding the adequacy of hired labour in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 15. The results indicate that, 93.75 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

Table 15. Adequacy of Hired Labour in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Inadequate	3	60.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	30	93.75

Distribution of land (ha): The data regarding the distribution of land (ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 16. The results indicate that, households of the Yadgir Rf micro-watershed possess 26.56 ha (82.81%) of dry land and 5.52 ha (17.19%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 6.43 ha (93.69%) of dry land and 0.43 ha (6.31%). Small farmers possess 16.90 ha (93.09%) of dry land and 1.25 ha (6.91%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 3.24 ha (71.05%) of dry land and 1.30 ha (28.95 %) of irrigated land. Medium farmers possess 2.51 ha (100%) of irrigated land.

Table 16. Distribution of land (Ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%
1	Dry	6.43	93.69	16.90	93.09	3.24	71.05	0.00	0.00	26.56	82.81
2	Irrigated	0.43	6.31	1.25	6.91	1.32	28.95	2.51	100.00	5.52	17.19
Total		6.86	100.00	18.15	100.00	4.56	100.00	2.51	100.00	32.08	100.00

Average land value (Rs./ha): The data regarding the average land value (Rs./ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 17. The results indicate that, the average

value of dry land was Rs. 349,954.30 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 507,410.13. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 622,166.26 for dry land and Rs. 923,364.44 for irrigated land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 289,822.80 for dry land and Rs. 956,129.06. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 123,500.00 for dry land and Rs 454,601.23 for irrigated land. In case of medium farmers, the average land value was Rs 239,032.27 for irrigated land.

Table 17. Average land value (Rs./ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Dry	0.00	622,166.26	289,822.80	123,500.00	0.00	349,954.30
2	Irrigated	0.00	923,364.44	956,129.06	454,601.23	239,032.27	507,410.13

Status of bore wells: The data regarding the status of bore wells in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 18. The results indicate that, there were 6 functioning and 6 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed.

Table 18. Status of bore wells in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	De-functioning	0	1	3	1	1	6
2	Functioning	0	1	3	1	1	6

Source of irrigation: The data regarding the source of irrigation in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 19. The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 18.75 per cent of the farmers.

Table 19. Source of irrigation in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Bore Well	0	0.00	1	9.09	3	23.08	1	50.00	1	100.00	6	18.75

Depth of water (Avg in meters): The data regarding the depth of water in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 20. The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 11.43 meters.

Table 20. Depth of water (Avg in meters) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
		N	N	N	N	N	N
1	Bore Well	0.00	6.93	14.07	15.24	76.20	11.43

Irrigated Area (ha): The data regarding the irrigated area (ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 21. The results indicate that, marginal, small farmers, semi-medium farmers and medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40 ha, 2.47 ha, 1.36 ha and 2.51 ha respectively.

Table 21. Irrigated Area (ha) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Kharif	0.00	0.40	2.47	1.36	2.51	6.74

Cropping pattern: The data regarding the cropping pattern in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 22. The results indicate that, farmers have grown cotton (5.52 ha), greengram (2.87 ha), groundnut (1.36 ha), paddy (1.21 ha), red gram (19.79 ha), paddy (1.21 ha) and jowar (0.41 ha). Marginal farmers have grown red gram, cotton greengram, paddy and jowar. Small farmers have grown red gram, cotton and paddy. Semi medium farmers have grown red gram, green gram and groundnut. Medium farmers have grown cotton and paddy.

Table 22. Cropping pattern in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed (Area in ha)

Sl.No.	Particulars	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Kharif - Red gram (togari)	3.77	14.39	1.62	0	19.79
2	Kharif - Cotton	0.91	2.51	0	2.11	5.52
3	Kharif - Greengram	1.25	0	1.62	0	2.87
4	Kharif - Groundnut	0	0	1.36	0	1.36
5	Kharif - Paddy	0.4	0.4	0	0.4	1.21
6	Kharif - Jowar	0.41	0	0	0	0.41
7	Summer - Cotton	0.4	0	0	0	0.4
Total		7.15	17.31	4.6	2.51	31.57

Cropping intensity: The data regarding the cropping intensity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 23. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was found to be 80.22 per cent.

Table 23. Cropping intensity (%) in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Cropping Intensity	0.00	94.64	91.40	58.68	50.00	80.22

Possession of Bank account and savings: The data regarding the possession of bank account and saving in yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 24. The results indicate that, the possession of bank account in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was represented to be 84.38 per cent and bank saving account was 84.38 per cent of the households.

Table 24. Possession of Bank account and savings in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Account	0	0.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	27	84.38
2	Savings	0	0.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	27	84.38

Borrowing status: The data regarding the borrowing status in yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 25. The results indicate that, borrowing status was 84.38 per cent of the households in Yadgir Rf Micro-watershed.

Table 25. Borrowing status in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Credit Availed	0	0.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	27	84.38

Cost of Cultivation of Redgram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of red gram in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 26. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for red gram was Rs. 29861.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 46398.39. The net income from Red gram cultivation was Rs. 16537.02, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.55.

Table 26. Cost of Cultivation of red gram in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	35.80	7949.43	26.62
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	3.67	2016.74	6.75
3	Tractor		Hours	3.36	2518.15	8.43
4	Machinery		Hours	1.68	1007.95	3.38
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	11.42	1141.99	3.82
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	10.95	2190.90	7.34
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	1.99	2023.46	6.78
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.49	1514.92	5.07
10	Irrigation		Number	9.26	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	94.31	0.32
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				825.75	2.77
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				21283.59	71.27
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				225.00	0.75
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				21508.59	72.03
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			22.17	5628.11	18.85
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				27136.70	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				27146.70	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2714.67	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				29861.37	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		9.81	44500.26	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4536.84	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		18.03	1898.13	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			105.26	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				46398.39	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				16537.02	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				3044.39	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.55	

Cost of cultivation of Jowar: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of Jowar in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 27. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for jowar was Rs. 46247.26. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 110423.53. The net income from Jowar cultivation was Rs. 64176.27. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.39.

Table 27. Cost of Cultivation of Jowar in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	9.69	2421.57	5.24
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	7.26	3995.59	8.64
3	Tractor		Hours	4.84	3632.35	7.85
4	Machinery		Hours	2.42	1452.94	3.14
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	19.37	1743.53	3.77
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	24.22	4843.14	10.47
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.42	2663.73	5.76
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	4.84	7264.71	15.71
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	0.05	0.00
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1983.01	4.29
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				30000.61	64.87
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.36
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				30167.28	65.23
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			43.59	11865.69	25.66
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				42032.96	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				42042.96	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				4204.30	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				46247.26	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		19.37	100737.26	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			5200.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		48.43	9686.27	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			200.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				110423.53	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				64176.27	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2387.26	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.39	

Cost of Cultivation of Groundnut: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of groundnut in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 28. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 39915.62. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 104386.91. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 64471.28. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.62.

Table 28. Cost of Cultivation of Groundnut in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	21.32	4998.81	12.52
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	3.68	2021.58	5.06
3	Tractor		Hours	2.21	1654.02	4.14
4	Machinery		Hours	0.74	441.07	1.11
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	147.02	13232.14	33.15
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	7.35	1470.24	3.68
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	0.74	808.63	2.03
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.47	2205.36	5.53
10	Irrigation		Number	3.68	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	368.52	0.92
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				2127.16	5.33
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				29327.53	73.47
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				333.33	0.84
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				29660.86	74.31
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			25.73	6616.07	16.58
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				36276.93	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				36286.93	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3628.69	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				39915.62	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		20.58	102916.67	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			5000.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		14.70	1470.24	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			100.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				104386.91	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				64471.28	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1939.22	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.62	

Cost of Cultivation of Cotton: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of cotton in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 29. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35939.71. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 96214.57. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 60274.85. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.68.

Table 29. Cost of Cultivation of cotton in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	50.46	11089.99	30.86
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	2.19	1205.23	3.35
3	Tractor		Hours	3.62	2716.98	7.56
4	Machinery		Hours	1.39	831.83	2.31
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	7.96	1591.36	4.43
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	22.31	4461.94	12.42
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.24	2470.59	6.87
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.56	1709.61	4.76
10	Irrigation		Number	2.38	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	105.29	0.29
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				1229.22	3.42
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				27412.04	76.27
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				166.67	0.46
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				27578.71	76.74
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			20.30	5083.76	14.15
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				32662.47	90.88
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.03
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				32672.47	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				3267.25	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				35939.71	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		20.91	96182.69	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4600.00	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		0.80	31.87	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			40.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				96214.57	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				60274.85	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1718.84	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:2.68	

Cost of Cultivation of Paddy: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of paddy in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 30. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 59670.85. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 97702.22. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 38031.37. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.64.

Table 30. Cost of Cultivation of Paddy in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	60.10	13420.33	22.49
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	1.65	905.67	1.52
3	Tractor		Hours	4.94	3705.00	6.21
4	Machinery		Hours	2.47	1482.00	2.48
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	78.22	3952.00	6.62
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	24.70	4940.00	8.28
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	4.94	4693.00	7.86
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	10.70	4734.17	7.93
10	Irrigation		Number	9.06	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	397.34	0.67
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				2199.50	3.69
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				40429.01	67.75
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				222.22	0.37
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				40651.23	68.13
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			53.52	13585.00	22.77
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				54236.23	90.89
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.02
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				54246.23	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				5424.62	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				59670.85	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		53.52	92762.22	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			1733.33	
	By Product	e) Main Product (q)		49.40	4940.00	
		f) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			100.00	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				97702.22	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				38031.37	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				1115.00	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.64	

Cost of Cultivation of Greengram: The data regarding the cost of cultivation of green gram in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 31. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for green gram was Rs. 27738.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 49264.05. The net income from green gram cultivation was Rs. 21525.98. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.78.

Table 31. Cost of Cultivation of Green gram in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Particulars		Units	Phy Units	Value(Rs.)	% to C3
I	**Cost A1**					
1	Hired Human Labour		Man days	20.75	4755.51	17.14
2	Bullock		Pairs/day	3.67	2016.79	7.27
3	Tractor		Hours	5.52	4139.54	14.92
4	Machinery		Hours	1.03	617.50	2.23
5	Seed Main Crop (Establishment and Maintenance)		Kgs (Rs.)	9.16	824.71	2.97
6	Seed Inter Crop		Kgs.	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	FYM		Quintal	6.18	1235.00	4.45
8	Fertilizer + micronutrients		Quintal	2.35	2582.83	9.31
9	Pesticides (PPC)		Kgs / liters	1.59	1498.01	5.40
10	Irrigation		Number	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Repairs			0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Msc. Charges (Marketing costs etc)			0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Depreciation charges			0.00	124.05	0.45
14	Land revenue and Taxes			0.00	0.00	0.00
II	**Cost B1**					
16	Interest on working capital				738.07	2.66
17	**Cost B1 = (Cost A1 + sum of 15 and 16)**				18531.99	66.81
III	**Cost B2**					
18	Rental Value of Land				388.89	1.40
19	**Cost B2 = (Cost B1 + Rental value)**				18920.88	68.21
IV	**Cost C1**					
20	Family Human Labour			23.46	6285.54	22.66
21	**Cost C1 = (Cost B2 + Family Labour)**				25206.42	90.87
V	**Cost C2**					
22	Risk Premium				10.00	0.04
23	**Cost C2 = (Cost C1 + Risk Premium)**				25216.42	90.91
VI	**Cost C3**					
24	Managerial Cost				2521.64	9.09
25	**Cost C3 = (Cost C2 + Managerial Cost)**				27738.06	100.00
VII	**Economics of the Crop**					
a.	Main Product	a) Main Product (q)		10.19	49264.05	
		b) Main Crop Sales Price (Rs.)			4833.33	
b.	Gross Income (Rs.)				49264.05	
c.	Net Income (Rs.)				21525.98	
d.	Cost per Quintal (Rs./q.)				2721.40	
e.	Benefit Cost Ratio (BC Ratio)				1:1.78	

Adequacy of fodder: The data regarding the adequacy of fodder in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 32. The results indicate that, 31.25 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and another 12.50 per cent opined that dry fodder was inadequate.

Table 32. Adequacy of fodder in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Adequate-Dry Fodder	0	0.00	5	45.45	3	23.08	2	100.00	0	0.00	10	31.25
2	Inadequate-Dry Fodder	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	30.77	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	12.50

Average annual gross income: The data regarding the average annual gross income in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 33. The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs. 60,000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 153,728.18, for small farmers it was Rs. 142,161.54, for semi-medium farmers it was Rs. 219,000 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 341,600.

Table 33. Average annual gross income in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Service/salary	0.00	21,818.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,500.00
2	Wage	60,000.00	94,090.91	59,230.77	75,000.00	30,000.00	71,406.25
3	Agriculture	0.00	33,913.64	82,930.77	133,000.00	311,600.00	63,398.44
4	Dairy Farm	0.00	3,905.45	0.00	11,000.00	0.00	2,030.00
Income(Rs.)		60,000.00	153,728.18	142,161.54	219,000.00	341,600.00	144,334.69

Average annual expenditure: The data regarding the average annual expenditure in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 34. The results indicate that the average annual expenditure is Rs. 16,653.27. For landless households it was Rs. 4,000, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 17,454.46, for small farmers it was Rs. 5,454.28, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 52,500 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 85,555.56.

Table 34. Average annual expenditure in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

(Avg value in Rs.)

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	All (32)
1	Service/salary	0.00	100,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,125.00
2	Wage	20,000.00	44,590.00	28,636.36	22,500.00	20,000.00	28,934.38
3	Agriculture	0.00	17,409.09	42,269.23	72,500.00	125,000.00	31,593.75
4	Dairy Farm	0.00	30,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	0.00	2,187.50
Total		20,000.00	191,999.09	70,905.59	105,000.00	145,000.00	532,904.69
Average		4,000.00	17,454.46	5,454.28	52,500.00	145,000.00	16,653.27

Horticulture species grown: The data regarding horticulture species grown in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 35. The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 84 custard apple and 11 mango trees in their field and 2 mango trees in their back yard.

Table 35. Horticulture species grown in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Custard apple	0	0	12	2	72	0	0	0	0	0	84	2
2	Mango	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	11	0

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

Forest species grown: The data regarding forest species grown in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 36. The results indicate that, households have planted 84 neem trees, 14 tamarind tree, 3 teak tree and 5 acacia in their field and 3 neem tree in their backyard.

Table 36: Forest species grown in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B	F	B
1	Teak	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2	Neem	0	0	24	0	49	1	6	2	5	0	84	3
3	Tamarind	0	0	2	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	14	0
4	Acacia	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0

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

Average Additional investment capacity: The data regarding Average Additional investment capacity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 37. The results indicate that, households have average addition investment capacity was Rs 12062. In Yadgir Rf micro-watershed.

Table 37: Average Additional investment capacity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)	MF (11)	SF (13)	SMF (2)	MDF (1)	LF (0)	All (32)
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Land development	0.00	14,090.91	17,384.62	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	12,062.50

Source of additional investment: The data regarding Source of additional investment in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 38. The results indicate that, households of the share of government subsidy were 12.5 per cent and 15.63 per cent of soft loan.

Table 38: Source of additional investment in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Item	Land development	
		N	%
1	Government subsidy	4	12.5
2	Soft loan	5	15.63

Marketing of the agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing of the agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 39. The results indicated that, cotton was sold to the extent of 100 per cent, greengram was sold to the extent of 71.4 per cent, groundnut was 64.3 per cent, jowar was 37.5 per cent, paddy was 53.8 per cent and red gram was sold to be extent of 73.8 per cent.

Table 39. Marketing of the agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No	Crops	Output obtained (q)	Output retained (q)	Output sold (q)	Output sold (%)	Avg. Price obtained (Rs/q)
1	Cotton	125.0	0.0	125.0	100.0	4600.0
2	Greengram	28.0	8.0	20.0	71.4	4833.33
3	Groundnut	28.0	10.0	18.0	64.3	5000.0
4	Jowar	8.0	5.0	3.0	37.5	5200.0
5	Paddy	65.0	30.0	35.0	53.8	1733.33
6	Redgram	191.0	50.0	141.0	73.8	4536.84

Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce: The data regarding marketing channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 40. The results indicated that, about 96.88 per cent of the farmers sold their produce to regulated markets and 3.13 per cent sold in agent/traders.

Table 40. Marketing Channels used for sale of agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Agent/Traders	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1	3.13
2	Regulated Market	0	0.00	12	109.09	15	115.38	3	150.00	1	100.00	31	96.88

Mode of transport of agricultural produce: The data regarding mode of transport of agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 41. The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the households have used tractor and 3.13 per cent of track as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.

Table 41. Mode of transport of agricultural produce in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Tractor	0	0.00	12	109.09	15	115.38	3	150.00	1	100.00	31	96.88
2	Truck	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1	3.13

Incidence of soil and water erosion problems: The data regarding incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 42. The results indicated that, 18.75 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 18.18 per cent of the marginal farmers, and 30.77 per cent of the small farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems.

Table 42. Incidence of soil and water erosion problems in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Soil and water erosion problems in the farm	0	0.00	2	18.18	4	30.77	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	18.75

Interest shown towards soil testing: The data regarding Interest shown towards soil testing in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 43. The results indicated that,

81.25 per cent have shown interest in soil test which accounts for 100 per cent of marginal farmers, 100 per cent small farmers and 100 per cent of semi medium farmers.

Table 43. Interest shown towards soil testing in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Interest in soil test	0	0.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	26	81.25

Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use: The data regarding usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 44. The results indicated that, 93.75 per cent of the households used firewood and 6.25 per cent used LPG as a source of fuel.

Table 44. Usage pattern of fuel for domestic use in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Fire Wood	5	100.00	9	81.82	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	30	93.75
2	LPG	0	0.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.25

Source of drinking water: The data regarding source of drinking water in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 45. The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 50 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 20 per cent of the households in the micro watershed.

Table 45. Source of drinking water in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Piped supply	2	40.00	5	45.45	7	53.85	1	50.00	1	100.00	16	50.00
2	Bore Well	3	60.00	6	54.55	6	46.15	1	50.00	0	0.00	16	50.00

Source of light; The data regarding source of light in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 46. The results indicated that, Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed.

Table 46. Source of light in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Electricity	5	100.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00

Existence of Sanitary toilet facility: The data regarding existence of sanitary toilet facilit**y** in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 47. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 100 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers and 100 per cent of the medium farmers.

Table 47. Existence of Sanitary toilet facility in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sanitary toilet facility	5	100.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00

Possession of PDS card : The data regarding possession of PDS card in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 48. The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the sampled households possessed BPL card and 3.12 per cent of the households not possessed.

Table 48. Possession of PDS card in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	APL	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	BPL	5	100.00	10	90.91	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	31	96.88
3	Not Possessed	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Participation in NREGA program: The data regarding participation in NREGA programme in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 49. The results indicated that, 37.50 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.

Table 49. Participation in NREGA programme in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Participation in NREGA programme	5	100.00	2	18.18	3	23.08	1	50.00	1	100.00	12	37.50

Adequacy of food items: The data regarding adequacy of food items in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 50. The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 96.88 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 53.13 per cent, fruits were adequate for 53.13 per cent, milk was adequate for 28.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 31.25 per cent and oil seeds were adequate for 25 per cent.

Table 50. Adequacy of food items in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Cereals	5	100.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00
2	Pulses	5	100.00	11	100.00	12	92.31	2	100.00	1	100.00	31	96.88
3	Oilseed	2	40.00	3	27.27	3	23.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	25.00
4	Vegetables	3	60.00	3	27.27	9	69.23	2	100.00	0	0.00	17	53.13
5	Fruits	1	20.00	6	54.55	8	61.54	2	100.00	0	0.00	17	53.13
6	Milk	3	60.00	3	27.27	3	23.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	28.13
7	Egg	2	40.00	2	18.18	5	38.46	1	50.00	0	0.00	10	31.25

Table 52. Response on Inadequacy of food items in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl.No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Pulses	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	7.69	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	3.13
2	Oilseed	3	60.00	7	63.64	9	69.23	2	100.00	1	100.00	22	68.75
3	Vegetables	2	40.00	7	63.64	4	30.77	0	0.00	1	100.00	14	43.75
4	Fruits	3	60.00	1	9.09	4	30.77	0	0.00	1	100.00	9	28.13
5	Milk	1	20.00	6	54.55	3	23.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	31.25
6	Egg	3	60.00	9	81.82	8	61.54	1	50.00	1	100.00	22	68.75

Response on Inadequacy of food items: The data regarding inadequacy of food items in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 52. The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 31.13 per cent, oil seeds were inadequate for 68.75 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 28.13 per cent, milk was inadequate for 31.25 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 68.75 per cent of the households and vegetables were inadequate for 43.75 per cent of the households.

Farming constraints: The data regarding farming constraints experienced by households in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed is presented in Table 53. The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 93.75 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (78.13%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (53.13%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.50%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (37.50%), high rate of interest on credit (15.63%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (6.25%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agril produce to the market (40.63 %), Less rainfall (71.88 %) and Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile) (6.25 %).

Table 53. Farming constraints Experienced in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed

Sl. No.	Particulars	LL (5)		MF (11)		SF (13)		SMF (2)		MDF (1)		All (32)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Lower fertility status of the soil	3	60.00	11	100.00	13	100.00	2	100.00	1	100.00	30	93.75
2	Wild animal menace on farm field	1	20.00	9	81.82	12	92.31	2	100.00	1	100.00	25	78.13
3	Frequent incidence of pest and diseases	1	20.00	6	54.55	10	76.92	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	53.13
4	Inadequacy of irrigation water	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	23.08	1	50.00	0	0.00	4	12.50
5	High cost of Fertilizers and plant protection chemicals	2	40.00	6	54.55	3	23.08	1	50.00	0	0.00	12	37.50
6	High rate of interest on credit	0	0.00	1	9.09	4	30.77	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	15.63
7	Low price for the agricultural commodities	0	0.00	5	45.45	2	15.38	1	50.00	0	0.00	8	25.00
8	Lack of marketing facilities in the area	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.25
9	Inadequate extension services	1	20.00	2	18.18	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	15.63
10	Lack of transport for safe transport of the Agril produce to the market.	0	0.00	4	36.36	9	69.23	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	40.63
11	Less rainfall	2	40.00	9	81.82	9	69.23	2	100.00	1	100.00	23	71.88
12	Source of Agri-technology information(Newspaper/TV/Mobile)	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	6.25

Chapter 5

SUMMARY

In order to assess the socio-economic condition of the farmers in the watershed a comprehensive questionnaire was prepared. Major components such as demographic conditions, migration details, food consumption and family expenditure pattern, material possession, land holding, land use management, cropping pattern, cost of cultivation of crops, livestock management. The statistical components such as frequency and percentage were used to analyze the data. About 32 households located in the micro watershed were interviewed for the survey.

The data indicated that there were 89 (53.61%) men and 77 (46.39%) women among the sampled households. The average family size of landless farmers' was 3.2, marginal farmers' was 5.27, small farmers' was 5.77, semi medium farmers' was 6.5, semi-medium farmers' was 6.50 and medium farmers' was 4.

The data indicated that, 33 (19.88%) people were in 0-15 years of age, 74 (44.58%) were in 16-35 years of age, 43 (25.90 %) were in 36-60 years of age and 16 (9.64%) were above 61 years of age. The results indicated that Yadgir Rf had 54.82 per cent illiterates, 23.49 per cent of them had primary school education, 4.82 per cent of them had middle school education, 4.22 per cent of them had high school education, 4.82 per cent of them had PUC education, 5.42 per cent of them did degree, and 2.41 per cent did other education.

The results indicate that, 71.88 per cent of households were practicing agriculture, and 25 per cent of the households were agricultural labourers. The results indicate that agriculture was the major occupation for 14.46 per cent of the household members, 60.84 per cent were agricultural laborers, 0.60 per cent were general labourers, 0.60 per cent were in private service, 18.07 per cent were students, 1.81 per cent were housewives and 3.61 per cent were children. The results show that 100 per cent of the population in the micro watershed has not participated in any local institutions.

The results indicate that 9.38 per cent of the households possess thatched house, 71.88 per cent of the households possess Katcha house and 18.75 per cent of them possess pucca house.

The results show that 62.50 per cent of the households possess TV, 3.13 per cent of the households possess Mixer grinder, 15.63 per cent of the households possess motor cycle, 6.25 per cent of the households possess bicycle and 59.38 per cent of the households possess mobile phones. The results show that the average value of television was Rs. 8900, mixer grinder was Rs.2000, motor cycle was Rs.42600, bicycle was Rs. 1000 and mobile phone was Rs. 2477.

About 21.88 per cent of them possess plough, 12.50 per cent of the bullock cart, 6.25 per cent of the households possess seed/fertilizer drill, 3.13 per cent of them power tiller, 21.88 per cent of them sprayer, 3.13 per cent of them sprinkler and 46.88 per cent of them possess weeder. The results show that the average value of plough was Rs.3571, bullock cart was Rs. 20000, seed/fertilizer drill was Rs. 2200, power tiller was Rs. 25000, Sprayer was Rs. 2971, Sprinkler was Rs. 12000 and the average value of weeder was Rs.234.

The results indicate that, 21.88 per cent of the households possess bullocks, 31.25 per cent of the households possess local cow and 3.13 per cent of the households possess goat.

The results indicate that, average own labour men available in the micro watershed was 1.63, average own labour (women) available was 1.50, average hired labour (men) available was 7.43 and average hired labour (women) available was 8.17. The results indicate that, 93.75 per cent of the households opined that the hired labour was inadequate.

The results indicate that, households of the Yadgir Rf micro-watershed possess 26.56 ha (82.81%) of dry land and 5.52 ha (17.19%) of irrigated land. Marginal farmers possess 6.43 ha (93.69%) of dry land and 0.43 ha (6.31%). Small farmers possess 16.90 ha (93.09%) of dry land and 1.25 ha (6.91%) of irrigated land. Semi medium farmers possess 3.24 ha (71.05%) of dry land and 1.30 ha (28.95 %) of irrigated land. Medium farmers possess 2.51 ha (100%) of irrigated land.

The results indicate that, the average value of dry land was Rs. 349,954.30 and average value of irrigated land was Rs. 507,410.13. In case of marginal famers, the average land value was Rs. 622,166.26 for dry land and Rs. 923,364.44 for irrigated land. In case of small famers, the average land value was Rs. 289,822.80 for dry land and Rs. 956,129.06. In case of semi medium famers, the average land value was Rs. 123,500.00 for dry land and Rs 454,601.23 for irrigated land. In case of medium farmers, the average land value was Rs 239,032.27 for irrigated land.

The results indicate that, there were 6 functioning and 6 de-functioning bore wells in the micro watershed. The results indicate that, bore well was the major irrigation source in the micro water shed for 18.75 per cent of the farmers. The results indicate that, the depth of bore well was found to be 11.43 meters. The results indicate that, marginal, small farmers, semi-medium farmers and medium farmers had irrigated area of 0.40 ha, 2.47 ha, 1.36 ha and 2.51 ha respectively.

The results indicate that, farmers have grown cotton (5.52 ha), greengram (2.87 ha), groundnut (1.36 ha), paddy (1.21 ha), red gram (19.79 ha), paddy (1.21 ha) and jowar (0.41 ha). Marginal farmers have grown red gram, cotton greengram, paddy and jowar.

Small farmers have grown red gram, cotton and paddy. Semi medium farmers have grown red gram, green gram and groundnut. Medium farmers have grown cotton and paddy. The results indicate that, the cropping intensity in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was found to be 80.22 per cent.

The results indicate that, the possession of bank account in Yadgir Rf micro-watershed was represented to be 84.38 per cent and bank saving account was 84.38 per cent of the households. The results indicate that, borrowing status was 84.38 per cent of the households in Yadgir Rf Micro-watershed

The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for redgram was Rs. 29861.37. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 46398.39. The net income from Redgram cultivation was Rs. 16537.02, thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.55. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for jowar was Rs. 46247.26. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 110423.53. The net income from Jowar cultivation was Rs. 64176.27. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.39. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for groundnut was Rs. 39915.62. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 104386.91. The net income from groundnut cultivation was Rs. 64471.28. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.62. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for cotton was Rs. 35939.71. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 96214.57. The net income from cotton cultivation was Rs. 60274.85. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:2.68. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for paddy was Rs. 59670.85. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 97702.22. The net income from paddy cultivation was Rs. 38031.37. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.64. The results indicate that, the total cost of cultivation for greengram was Rs. 27738.06. The gross income realized by the farmers was Rs. 49264.05. The net income from greengram cultivation was Rs. 21525.98. Thus the benefit cost ratio was found to be 1:1.78.

The results indicate that, 31.25 per cent of the households opined that dry fodder was adequate and another 12.50 per cent opined that dry fodder was inadequate.

The results indicate that the average annual gross income was Rs. 60,000 for landless farmers, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 153,728.18, for small farmers it was Rs. 142,161.54, for semi-medium farmers it was Rs. 219,000 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 341,600. The results indicate that the average annual expenditure is Rs. 16,653.27. For landless households it was Rs. 4,000, for marginal farmers it was Rs. 17,454.46, for small farmers it was Rs. 5,454.28, for semi medium farmers it was Rs. 52,500 and for medium farmers it was Rs. 85,555.56.

The results indicate that, sampled households have grown 84 custard apple and 11 mango trees in their field and 2 mango trees in their back yard. The results indicate that,

households have planted 84 neem trees, 14 tamarind tree, 3 teak tree and 5 acacia in their field and 3 neem trees in their backyard.

The results indicate that, households have average addition investment capacity was Rs 12062. In Yadgir Rf micro-watershed. The results indicate that, households of the share of government subsidy were 12.5 per cent and 15.63 per cent of soft loan.

The results indicated that, cotton was sold to the extent of 100 per cent, greengram was sold to the extent of 71.4 per cent, groundnut was 64.3 per cent, jowar was 37.5 per cent, paddy was 53.8 per cent and red gram was sold to be extent of 73.8 per cent. The results indicated that, about 96.88 per cent of the farmers sold their produce to regulated markets and 3.13 per cent sold in agent/traders. The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the households have used tractor and 3.13 per cent of track as a mode of transportation for their agricultural produce.

The results indicated that, 18.75 per cent of the households have experienced soil and water erosion problems in the farm i.e., 18.18 per cent of the marginal farmers, and 30.77 per cent of the small farmers have experienced soil and water erosion problems. The results indicated that, 81.25 per cent have shown interest in soil test which accounts for 100 per cent of marginal farmers, 100 per cent small farmers and 100 per cent of semi medium farmers.

The results indicated that, 93.75 per cent of the households used firewood and 6.25 per cent used LPG as a source of fuel. The results indicated that, piped supply was the major source of drinking water for 50 per cent of the households and bore well was the source of drinking water for 20 per cent of the households in the micro watershed. Electricity was the major source of light for 100 per cent of the households in micro watershed. The results indicated that, 100 per cent of the households possess sanitary toilet i.e. 100 per cent of the landless, 100 per cent of the marginal, 100 per cent of the small and 100 per cent of the semi medium farmers and 100 per cent of the medium farmers. The results indicated that, 96.88 per cent of the sampled household's possessed BPL card and 3.12 per cent of the households not possessed. The results indicated that, 37.50 per cent of the households participated in NREGA programme.

The results indicated that, cereals were adequate for 100 per cent of the households, pulses were adequate for 96.88 per cent, vegetables were adequate for 53.13 per cent, fruits were adequate for 53.13 per cent, milk was adequate for 28.13 per cent, eggs were adequate for 31.25 per cent and oil seeds were adequate for 25 per cent.

The results indicated that, pulses were inadequate for 31.13 per cent, oil seeds were inadequate for 68.75 per cent, fruits were inadequate for 28.13 per cent, milk was inadequate for 31.25 per cent, eggs were inadequate for 68.75 per cent of the households and vegetables were inadequate for 43.75 per cent of the households.

The results indicated that, lower fertility status of the soil was the constraint experienced by 93.75 per cent of the households, wild animal menace on farm field (78.13%), frequent incidence of pest and diseases (53.13%), inadequacy of irrigation water (12.50%), high cost of fertilizers and plant protection chemicals (37.50%), high rate of interest on credit (15.63%), low price for the agricultural commodities (25 %), lack of marketing facilities in the area (6.25%), lack of transport for safe transport of the agril produce to the market (40.63 %), Less rainfall (71.88 %) and Source of Agri-technology information (Newspaper / TV / Mobile) (6.25 %).