

1 **Case study**
2 **Land evaluation for site specific pigeon pea (*Cajanus***
3 ***cajan*) - sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) management - A**
4 **case Study of Mormanchi Microwatershed, Gulbarga**
5 **District, Karnataka, India.**

6
7
8
9
10
11

ABSTRACT (ARIAL, BOLD, 11 FONT, LEFT ALIGNED, CAPS)

Aims: Integration of land resource inventory with land suitability to derive optimal land use at farm level

Study design: land resource inventory for farm level planning using transect approach for soil profile studies and then classified soils as per USDA soil taxonomy. The soil series information was used to derive soil map and used GIS to derive crop suitability maps.

Place and Duration of Study: Mormanchi microwatershed in Gulbarga tehsil

Methodology: Detailed soil survey at 1:10000scale using remotesensing data sets and cadastral maps with transect method of soil profile studies . Identification of soil series and defining soil phases as mapping units to derive soil map for land evaluation for sorghum and pigeon pea using GIS.

Results: The land resource information obtained from detailed soil survey shows that this micro watershed has six soil series belongs to the subgroups of vertisols and vertic integrades having low available sulphur and boron with wide spread phosphorus, Zn deficiency. The soil map with fifteen mapping units was used in land evaluation for sorghum and pigeon pea. The results showed that 35 % of total is evaluated as suitable with limitations of soil depth, graveliness and slope. To enhance productivity, it is suggested to go for early sowing of pigeon pea with supplementary irrigation in times of dry spells but for sorghum, soil-water conservation measures must be integrated with nutrient management

Conclusion: The fifteen shrink- swell soil mapping units in Mormanchi Microwatershed were evaluated for sorghum and pigeon pea in northern dry zone having short length of growing period. The results showed that 35% of area is suitable as against the current land use of 85% of total cultivated area.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

1. INTRODUCTION

Land evaluation constitutes a valuable resource inventory that is linked with the survival of life on the earth and involves the process of evaluation of a particular tract of land for specific purposes involving the execution and interpretation of data of natural resources and other related aspects of land in order to identify and make a comparison of promising

20 kinds of land uses. Information on soil and related properties obtained from land evaluation
21 can help in better delineation of land suitability for irrigation and efficient irrigation water
22 management. Hence, depending on the suitability of the mapped land units for a set of
23 crops, optimum cropping patterns could be suggested by taking into consideration the
24 present cropping system and the socio-economic conditions of the farming community [26].

25 In India, the land resources available for agriculture are shrinking. Most of the soils
26 in rainfed regions are at the verge of degradation having low cropping intensity, relatively low
27 organic matter status, poor soil physical health and low fertility [13].

28 Appraisal of land is essential for its optimal use for agricultural development on
29 sustainable basis. Accordingly, Soil survey and land evaluation helps better land use
30 planning and management with realization of inherent potentials and constraints of
31 biophysical factors in the region [6]. The land resource inventory provides adequate
32 information in terms of landforms, vegetation as well as characteristics of soils (*viz.*, texture,
33 depth, structure, stoniness, drainage, acidity, salinity etc.), which can be utilized for land use
34 planning and development [8].

35 In the twenty-first century, to steer the agricultural achievements towards the path of
36 an 'evergreen revolution' there is a need to blend the traditional knowledge with frontier
37 technologies. Information and communication technology; space technology; geographical
38 information systems (GIS) are the tools of such frontier technologies which would help in
39 creating agricultural management systems; making plans for sustainable agriculture; and
40 bringing new areas (through development of wastelands) into productive agriculture. The
41 role of remote sensing and GIS in agricultural applications can be broadly categorized into
42 two groups- inventorying/mapping and management. Suggesting sustainable agricultural
43 land use plan based on integration of land capability, land productivity; soil suitability; terrain
44 characteristics and socio-economic etc. information using GIS [35]. In the dry ecosystem,
45 climatic variability in terms of mean annual rainfall (MAR) and mean annual temperature
46 (MAT) results in affect crop performance and often leads to low crop yield [29]. The large
47 scale mapping using IRS-P6-LISS-IV merged with cartosat were used in generation of land
48 resource data at village level [32, 37, 2, 3]. The watershed management programs are
49 aimed at designing suitable soil and water conservation measures, productivity
50 enhancement of existing crops, crop diversification with horticultural species, greening the
51 wastelands with forestry species of multiple uses and improving the livelihood opportunities
52 for landless people. The objectives can be met to a great extent when an appropriate Natural
53 Resources Management (NRM) plan is prepared and implemented. It is essential to have
54 site specific Land Resources Inventory (LRI) indicating the potentials and constraints for

developing such a site specific plan [24]. The district economy is mainly dry land agriculture with an irrigated area of 18.8% of the net area sown (below the state average of 25 per cent). The district is a drought prone with an occurrence of drought once in three years [21]. The agricultural landscapes in rural sectors of drought prone Gulberga district and provide an opportunity to look into the reflective realities of drought and difficulties faced by farmers to enhance farm productivity with rudimentary farming systems. Hence present study was aimed at integrating soil-land information with land evaluation for crop planning at landscape level. The objectives of present study are: (i) to characterize and classify soils and then mapping for land evaluation and (ii) to integrate soil-land information in GIS environment for assessing their suitability to locally adopted crops for crop development in the watershed level.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Description of the study area

Mormanchi microwatershed in Gulburga tehsil ($17^{\circ}36'-17^{\circ}38'$ N and $77^{\circ}4'-77^{\circ}6'$ E) covers 597 hectare (Fig. 1). This area comes under the agroclimatic zone of north eastern transition zone with mean annual rainfall of 740 mm with 46 rainy days and also comes under Semi arid Deccan Plateau, hot arid ecosubregion [36]. Of the total rainfall, seventy three per cent of rainfall (540 mm) is received during the southwest monsoon (June to September), seventeen per cent during the north-east monsoon (October to early December) and the remaining ten per cent (74 mm) during the remaining period. December is the coldest with mean daily minimum temperature of 10° C but in summer (May) the temperature rises to 45° C with a relative humidity of 26%. The soil water balance diagram [34] shows that this area has average potential evapo-transpiration (PET) of 159 mm with a variation of 115 mm in December to 232 mm in May exceeding precipitation in all the months except August and September (fig. 2). The length of crop growing period (LGP) is 120-150 days and starts from 3rd week of May to first week of October. The agroclimate is characterized as ustic soil moisture regime and soil temperature regime [7] at an elevation of 300-450 m above mean sea level. The cropping pattern is dominated by food crops, which accounts for 78.6% of the net area sown. Sorghum, pigeon pea and sunflower are the major crops, occupying 20.7 per cent 24.8 and 11.3 per cent of the net area sown. The district is called 'Tur' bowl of the state as the area under Pigeon pea occupies 65.7 per cent. The system of farming and the cropping pattern reveals low levels of living of the people in rural areas. This crop assumes a great importance in Karnataka agricultural economy, which ranks second in area (0.51 m ha) and fifth in terms of production (0.25 mt) in the country. But ironically the yield of this crop is

below all India average. It is grown both as a sole crop and intercrop with pearl millet, groundnut, chickpea, green gram and cowpea. It is largely grown in the northern parts of the state especially in Gulbarga, Raichur, Bidar and Bellary districts of Karnataka predominantly under rainfed cropping system [27]. The productivity of pigeon pea in Karnataka is 581 kg ha⁻¹, which is much below the national average of 671 kg ha⁻¹ [14].




Fig.1 Location map of Mormanchi Microwatershed




Fig.2. Rainfall distribution in Gulbarga Taluk, Gulbarga District

2.2 Field survey

Land resource inventory on 1:10000 scale using false colour composites of Cartosat-1 and LISS-IV merged satellite data was carried out with the preparation of

landform form map as prerequisite for field survey as per standard guidelines given in Soil Survey Manual [16, 30]. The intensive field traverse was made to check field boundaries and to acquaint with landscape patterns. The soil transects were selected at respective landscape elements and dug out 16 soil profiles and recorded latitude/longitude and elevation of each site with the help of Global Positioning System (GPS). Morphological descriptions of each pedon were recorded [25] and classified upto family level as per [31]. The soil map was generated with six soil series identified and derived 15 soil mapping units defined as phases of series in GIS environment with ARCinfo ver.10.2.

111

112 **2.3 Laboratory analysis**

Horizon wise soil samples were collected and sieved air dry samples through 2 mm sieve for fine earth fraction. The routine and standard procedures were used for bulk density by clod method, pH, Electrical conductivity (1:2.5 soil water ratio) by [17] in the supernatant suspension of 1:2.5 (soil: water ratio). The method described by [4] was used for cation exchange capacity (CEC) estimation. Soil organic carbon (OC) was estimated using the method [38] and expressed in percentage. 1N ammonium acetate (NH₄OAc) solution at pH extractable potassium (K⁺) was determined by Flame photometer [17]. DTPA-extractable micronutrients Fe, Mn, Zn and Cu were extracted by 0.005 M DTPA at pH 7.3 according to the method of [18] and the concentration of the micronutrients were estimated using atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Agilent Technologies, 200 series AA model). Available phosphorus determined by Olsen method [23] and available S by CaCl₂ extraction method [40]. The available Boron estimated by the Azomethine-H method by using LabIndia (analytical) UV/VIS spectrophotometer [15]. Fertility status of N, P, K and S were interpreted as low, medium and high and that of DTPA extractable zinc, iron, copper and manganese interpreted as deficient, sufficient and excess by following the criteria [1].


128 **2.4 Land evaluation for crops**

Land evaluation classification was undertaken according to the [8, 9, 10, 12] system to assess the suitability of the studied area soils for agriculture and development. The FAO-SYS system had divisions of suitability classes that indicate degree of suitability. These classes are: 'S1' = suitable, 'S2' = moderately suitable, 'S3' = marginally suitable, 'N1' = unsuitable for economic reasons but otherwise marginally suitable, 'N2' = unsuitable for physical reasons. The steps followed in land evaluation for crops and in deriving thematic map of suitability zones were as follows (fig. 3):

Step 1. Soil map with limiting biophysical parameters was used to define limitations of each series.

Step 2. Development of land capability of soil units as per the guidelines of [16].

139 Step 3. Suitability for crops as per the frame work of FAO [8, 11].
 140 Step 4. Development land management units considering biophysical and
 141 homogeneity of soil units in terms of properties and land use for making decisions on crop
 142 plans for a defined priority areas suitable for crops under GIS environment.
 143



144
 145 **Fig. 3. Flow diagram of site specific land evaluation for crop management of**
 146 **Mormanchi Microwatershed**
 147

148 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

149 Brief description of basaltic soil resources occurring in the microwatershed is given
 150 given below in table 1. The six soil series identified and classified upto family in the
 151 subgroups level as (i) Margutti: clayey, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Ustorthents;
 152 (ii) Dinsi: Very fine, smectitic isohyperthermic, family of Leptic Haplusterts; (iii) Novinihala:
 153 loamy, mixed, isohyperthermic family of Typic Ustorthents; (iv) Matki; clayey, mixed,
 154 isohyperthermic paralithic Ustorthents; Nirgudi; (v)Very fine, smectitic, calcareous,
 155 isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplusterts; (vi) Mannur: Very fine, smectic, calcareous,
 156 isohyperthermic family of Typic Haplusterts. [31].

157 3.1 Soil map

158 In the present study, fifteen mapping units defined as phases of soil series was used
 159 to derive soil map of mormanchi microwatershed (Fig. 4). The map shows that Margutti
 160 (MGT) series with seven phases identified with variations in gravelliness, slope and severity
 161 of erosion. This series cover 311.43 ha (52.15% of total area). The mapping unit
 162 (MGTmB2g2 as in soil map) covers 19.68 per cent with severe limitation of rooting depth
 163 and very low available water holding capacity. These land units are concentrated in the
 164

middle and foot slopes of microwatershed indicating high degree of sheet erosion. Matki soil series covering 57.84 ha (9.68%) has two phases viz., (i) MAThD3g3 having very shallow (<25cm) clayey soils, on 5 to 10% slopes and (ii) MATmB1g1 covering 14 ha (2.4% of total area) has clayey texture, occurring on 1-3% slopes, slightly eroded and gravelly (15 to 35%). These land units are mostly concentrated in north western fringes with horizontal bend towards south western part of microwatershed as depicted in whitish patch (Fig. 4). The Novinihala soils series (NHA, 87.33 ha, 14.62% of total area) are shallow with two phases viz., (i) NHAmB1 covering 79 ha i.e. 89.7% of this entire unit under watershed, but (ii) NHAmB2g1 has 9 ha with limitations of gravelly and moderate erosion. This unit is mostly located in northern parts of the watershed and 61.43 ha (10.29%). The Dinsi soil series (DSI) are moderately shallow with two phases (i) DSImB1 (58 ha, 9.77%) and DSImB2g1 (southern and northeastern zone) identified with limitations of moderate erosion and gravelliness. The consociations of Nirgudi (NIR) and Mannur (MAR) soils are clayey and moderately to very deep with NIRmB1 (19.7 ha, 3.3%) and MARmB1 (36.67 ha, 6.14%) with 1-3 per cent slopes and slightly eroded. These land units are concentrated in all along the depositional zones of stream floors and northern fringes of microwatershed.

181

182

183

184

185 **Table. 1. Description of soil series under basaltic soil resources in Mormanchi**
186 **Microwatershed**

	Margutti (MGT) Series: Marguti soils are very shallow (<25cm), well drained, have very dark grayish brown to dark brown clay soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on very gently sloping to moderately sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 7 to 18 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 3. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 18 to 24 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 5 and chroma 3 to 4.
	Novinihala (NHA) Series: Novinihala soils are shallow (25-50 cm), well drained, have very dark grayish brown to dark brown clay soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on very gently to gently sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 12 to 20 cm. Its colour is in 7.5 YR and 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 4. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 32 to 45 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 4.

	Dinsi (DSI) Series: Dinsi soils are moderately shallow (50-75 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark gray to brown clay soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on very gently sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 9 to 24 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1 to 3. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 40 to 62 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 4.
	Matki (MAT) Series: Matki soils are very shallow (<25cm), well drained, have very dark reddish brown to dark reddish gray clayey soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on very gently sloping to moderately sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 7 to 18 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR and 7.5 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 2 to 3. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 18 to 24 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 to 4 and chroma 3.
	Nirgudi (NIR) Series: Nirgudi soils are moderately deep (75-100 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark grayish brown to very dark gray calcareous clayey soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on nearly level to very gently sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 10 to 22 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 1 to 2. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 63 to 79 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 1.
	Mannur (MAR) Series: Mannur soils are deep (>150 cm), moderately well drained, have very dark grayish brown to gray clayey soils. They have developed from basalt and occur on very gently sloping to moderately sloping uplands. The thickness of A horizon ranges from 18 to 25 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 1. The thickness of B horizon ranges from 45 to 78 cm. Its colour is in 10 YR hue with value 3 and chroma 2 to 1.

187

188

189

3.2 Climate analysis

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

Karnataka is located on the western coast of peninsular India, enclosed between 11.50° N to 18.50° N and 74° E to 78.5° E. The study area Gulbarga belongs to semi arid climatic conditions. The south western monsoon rainfall occurs mainly in June to September and constitutes over 75% of the total rainfall. Normal rainfall of the Gulbarga district is 777 mm and actual rainfall is 881.10 mm. December is the coldest month but in summer, maximum temperature goes upto 45° C. Relative humidity varies from 26% in summer and 62% in winter.

197

198

199

200

201

It is reported that, low rainfall epochs return at a periodicity of 17 years at Bijapur and at 13 years at Dharward. The results further said that the return of such events co-existed at both places during the present episode. Similar analysis at other stations may also indicate the wide spread nature of the last epoch of low rainfall at all places [19]. It is deduced from the report of Centre for sustainable technologies [5], Gulbarga, has very low

values of water resource vulnerability index (WRVI) and therefore belong to the category of very high vulnerability (cluster 4) due to : low availability of surface water, high crop water stress, and exposure to flood and drought. The water balance diagram shows that the length of growing period is 120 to 150 days with erratic rainfall and prolonged dry spells during crop season and made to choose locally adopted dryland sorghum and pigeon pea.




Fig. 4. Soil phase units map of the study area Mormanchi Microwatershed

3.4 Current land use

Major crops grown in the mormanchi microwatershed revealed that pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) and sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) are the principal crops. The current land use of Mormanchi microwatershed (Fig. 5) with respect to fifteen soil mapping units shows that about 80% area under cultivation of pigeon pea, out of that pigeon pea with sorghum multicropping cultivation was adapted mostly in five mapping units viz., MGTmB2g2 (5), NHAmB1 (10), DSImB1 (12), NIRmB1 (14) and MARmB1 (15) with the area of 312 ha (52%), whereas mapping unit MGThD3g3 and MATHD3g3 of 89 ha (15%) were under grassland area.



Fig. 5. Current landuse map of the study area Mormanchi Microwatershed

3.5 Biophysical constraints

The seven biophysical constraints for pigeon pea and sorghum are considered under this study and reported area under each constraints of each soil mapping unit in table 2. The microwatershed under study has 62% of total under very shallow; 75% area under very gently slopes and 50% under moderate to severe erosion (50%). About 21% area has extremely gravelly with 74.6% of area under clay texture. About 61.83% soils are affected by very low (<50 mm/m) available water capacity (Table 2). The soil pH measured in soils varied from neutral (9.68%) to moderately alkaline (41%) and strongly alkaline (2%).

3.6 Fertility status of soils

The chemical properties of six soil series is given in table 3. Soil pH is slightly alkaline in MGT and MAT to moderately alkaline for NHA, NIR and MAR soil series. All these soils have low salt concentration with EC less than 0.2dS m^{-1} . Margutti series (MGT) have high organic carbon with mean of 0.78 ± 0.1 with a variation of 13.25 per cent (least variable).

235 **Table 2. Soil depth, soil slope and soil erosion of the study area**

Class	Soil mapping units	Cultivation area in ha (%)
Soil depth		
Very shallow (<25cm)	1-MGThD3g3, 2-MGTiB3g3, 3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 6-MGTmB3g1, 7-MGTmC2g1, 8-MATHD3g3, 9- MATmB1g1	369 (61.83)
Shallow (25-50 cm)	10-NHAmB1, 11-NHAmB2g1	87 (14.62)
Moderately Shallow (50-75 cm)	12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1	61 (10.29)
Moderately deep (75-100 cm)	14-NIRmB1	20 (3.3)
Very deep (<150 cm)	15- MARmB1	37 (6.14)
Soil gravelliness		
Non-gravelly (<15%)	3-MGTmB1, 10-NHAmB1, 12-DSImB1, 14-NIRmB1, 15- MARmB1	242 (40.52)
Gravelly (15-35%)	4-MGTmB1g1, 6-MGTmB3g1, 7-MGTmC2g1, 9- MATmB1g1, 11-NHAmB2g1, 13-DSImB2g1	86 (14.4)
Very gravelly (35-60%)	5-MGTmB2g2	118 (19.68)
Extremely gravelly (60-80%)	1-MGThD3g3, 2-MGTiB3g3, 8-MATHD3g3,	129 (21.58)
Soil erosion		
Slight	3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 9- MATmB1g1, 10-NHAmB1, 12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1, 14-NIRmB1, 15- MARmB1	276 (46.29)
Moderate	5-MGTmB2g2, 7-MGTmC2g1, 11-NHAmB2g1	165 (27.62)
Severe	1-MGThD3g3, 2-MGTiB3g3, 6-MGTmB3g1, 8-MATHD3g3	133 (22.28)
Soil slope		
Very gently sloping (1-3%)	2-MGTiB3g3, 3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 6-MGTmB3g1, 9- MATmB1g1, 10-NHAmB1, 11-NHAmB2g1, 12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1, 14-NIRmB1, 15- MARmB1	451 (75.44)
Gently sloping (3-5%)	7-MGTmC2g1	36 (5.96)
Moderately sloping (5-10%)	1-MGThD3g3, 8-MATHD3g3	88 (14.76)
Surface soil texture		
Sandy clay loam	1-MGThD3g3, 8-MATHD3g3	88 (14.76)
Sandy clay	2-MGTiB3g3	41 (6.82)
Clay	3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 6-MGTmB3g1, 7-MGTmC2g1, 9- MATmB1g1, 10-NHAmB1, 11-NHAmB2g1, 12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1, 14-NIRmB1, 15-MARmB1	445 (74.6)
Available water capacity		
Very low (<50 mm/m)	1-MGThD3g3, 2-MGTiB3g3, 3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 6-MGTmB3g1, 7-MGTmC2g1, 8-MATHD3g3, 9- MATmB1g1	369 (61.83)
Low (51-100 mm/m)	10-NHAmB1, 11-NHAmB2g1	87 (14.62)
Medium (101-150 mm/m)	12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1, 14-NIRmB1	81 (13.58)
Very high (>200 mm/m)	15- MARmB1	37 (6.14)
Soil pH		
Neutral (pH 6.5-7.3)	3-MGTmB1, 8-MATHD3g3, 11-NHAmB2g1,	58 (9.68)
Slightly Alkaline (7.3-7.8)	1-MGThD3g3, 3-MGTmB1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 6-MGTmB3g1, 7-MGTmC2g1, 8-MATHD3g3, 9- MATmB1g1, 12-DSImB1, 13-DSImB2g1	255 (42.69)
Moderately Alkaline (7.8-8.4)	2-MGTiB3g3, 3-MGTmB1, 4-MGTmB1g1, 5-MGTmB2g2, 10-NHAmB1, 12-DSImB1, 14-NIRmB1, 15- MARmB1	248 (41.51)
Strongly Alkaline (8.4-9.0)	10-NHAmB1	14 (2.30)

236 Similar kind of least variability of soil organic carbon is recorded in Nirgudi and Mannur
 237 series whereas moderate variation of organic carbon with CV of 21 to 23% in case of Matki,
 238 Novinihala and Dinsi series. Available phosphorous was low and potassium was medium
 239 with high per cent of variability CV > 35%, [39] (Wilding, 1985) in all soil series under study.
 240 Similar trends of low status of available sulphur and Boron (B) are recorded all soil series
 241 with moderate CV% (<35%) in NHA, NIR and MAR soil series but for boron 32% and 33%
 242 under Dinsi and Mannur series. The mean values of micronutrients (Cu, Fe, Mn and Zn) are

sufficient to high [18] with higher CV%, except in Fe and Mn under DSI and NIR soil series respectively.

245

246 **Table 3. Soil properties of different soil series of the study area**

Soil series		pH	EC dS m ⁻¹	OC (%)	P ₂ O ₅ kg ha ⁻¹	K ₂ O kg ha ⁻¹	S ppm	B ppm	Cu ppm	Fe ppm	Mn ppm	Zn ppm
Margutti (MGT)	Mean	7.8	0.13	0.78	6.62	225.60	7.56	0.34	3.99	12.41	26.24	0.74
	Std	0.53	0.06	0.10	7.27	116.38	6.57	0.17	1.69	5.68	21.72	0.63
	CV%	6.77	44.61	13.2	109.9	51.59	86.88	51.09	42.29	45.79	82.78	85.8
Matki (MAT)	Mean	7.6	0.11	0.66	8.31	168.58	11.50	0.42	4.52	13.04	26.52	0.65
	Std	0.61	0.05	0.15	4.34	82.42	7.30	0.19	2.08	6.87	19.09	0.29
	CV%	8.0	40.7	23.3	52.2	48.9	63.5	46.1	46.1	52.7	72.0	43.8
Novinihala (NHA)	Mean	7.9	0.14	0.77	6.87	188.88	14.69	0.40	4.19	10.77	12.74	0.52
	Std	0.54	0.07	0.16	4.24	133.19	3.42	0.16	2.68	4.32	6.24	0.20
	CV%	6.8	46.9	21.1	61.7	70.5	23.3	41.3	63.9	40.1	49.0	38.7
Dinsi (DSI)	Mean	7.9	0.15	0.75	7.85	274.26	5.61	0.44	4.07	9.81	19.78	0.69
	Std	0.44	0.10	0.16	8.40	166.51	4.86	0.14	2.11	3.08	15.36	0.53
	CV%	5.6	65.6	21.1	107.1	60.7	86.7	31.9	51.8	31.4	77.6	77.3
Nirgudi (NIR)	Mean	7.5	0.09	0.86	1.15	145.20	2.08	0.25	4.96	14.05	25.63	0.63
	Std	0.13	0.05	0.08	1.62	58.79	0.59	0.18	0.34	3.27	7.76	0.24
	CV%	1.7	53.3	9.9	141.4	40.5	28.6	72.2	6.8	23.3	30.3	38.2
Mannur (MAR)	Mean	8.1	0.12	0.72	5.15	224.53	13.89	0.32	3.81	11.38	11.46	0.48
	Std	0.50	0.05	0.13	3.67	151.38	2.82	0.11	1.63	4.43	5.74	0.21
	CV%	6.2	46.1	17.6	71.3	67.4	20.3	33.3	42.7	38.9	50.1	42.8

247

248 3.7 Crop suitability maps with area

249 Using the criteria in table 4, the soil map units of the microwatershed are evaluated
 250 and land suitability maps for 2 major crops are generated. The crop requirements for
 251 growing pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) (table 4) were matched with the soil-site characteristics
 252 of the soils of the microwatershed and land suitability map for growing pigeon pea was
 253 generated. An area of about 117 ha (20%) is moderately suitable (S2) for pigeon pea and is
 254 distributed dominantly in the southwestern, central and northern part of the microwatershed.
 255 (Table 5) They have moderate limitations of texture, depth of rooting and erosion. An area of
 256 about 87 ha (15%) is marginally suitable (S3) and distributed in the southeastern,
 257 northeastern and northwestern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6a). They have major
 258 limitations of depth of rooting and texture. Majority of area of about 369 ha (62%) is not
 259 suitable (N) for growing pigeon pea and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. They
 260 have severe limitations of gravelliness, rooting depth and texture. In case of pigeon pea, it is
 261 suggested to sow early to obtain higher yields and also give one or two protective irrigations
 262 in the event of dry spells during crop season. The length of growing period is in support of
 263 pigeon pea cultivation in the areas rainfall exceeds half PET from the mid week of July and

264

265

266 **Table 4. Crop suitability criteria for two major crops in Mormanchi microwatershed**

Crop requirement		Rating			
		Pigeon pea			
Soil –site characteristics	unit	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately Suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)	Not suitable (N)
Slope	%	<3	3-5	5-10	>10
LGP	Days	>210	180-210	150-180	<150
Soil drainage	class	Well drained	Mod. to well drained	Imperfectly drained	Poorly drained
Soil reaction	pH	6.5-7.5	5.0-6.5 7.6-8.0	8.0-9.0	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	I, scl, sil, cl, sl	sicl, sic, c(m)	Is	S, fragmental
Soil depth	Cm	>100	85-100	40-85	<40
Gravel content	% vol.	<20	20-35	35-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dS m ⁻¹	<1.0	1.0-2.0	>2.0	-
Sodicity (ESP)	%	<10	10-15	>15	-
Sorghum					
Slope	%	2-3	3-8	8-15	>15
LGP	Days	120-150	120-90	<90	
Soil drainage	class	Well to mod. drained	imperfect	Poorly/excess ively	V. poorly
Soil reaction	pH	6.0-8.0	5.5-5.9 8.1-8.5	<5.5 8.6-9.0	>9.0
Surface soil texture	Class	C, cl, sicil, sc	I, sil, sic	Sl, Is	S, fragmental skeletal
Soil depth	Cm	100-75	50-75	30-50	<30
Gravel content	% vol.	5-15	15-30	30-60	>60
Salinity (EC)	dS m ⁻¹	2-4	4-8	8-10	>10
Sodicity (ESP)	%	5-8	8-10	10-15	>15

Source: [22]

268 **Table 5. Land suitability for various crops of the study area (Mormanchi**
269 **Microwatershed)**

Crops	Highly suitable (S1)	Moderately suitable (S2)	Marginally suitable (S3)
Mapping units	15-MARmB1, 14-NIRmB1	15-MARmB1, 14-NIRmB1	3-MGTmB1, 9-MATmB1g1, 10-NHAmB1, 12-DSImB1
Suitability Area in ha (%)			
Pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>)	-	117 (19.73%)	87 (14.62%)
Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>)	56 (9.4%)	61 (10.29%)	87 (14.62%)




Fig. 6(a). Land suitability map of Pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) and (b) sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*)

then extends upto mid week of October. The popular pigeon pea grown in the areas are CP-8863, BSMR-736, ICPL-87119, Guyul local, TS-3R (New), WRP1, GC11-39 and normally sown in 2nd fortnight of June [28]. The land evaluation exercise clearly brought out that only 35% of total area is suitable for pigeon pea as against current area of 80% of total area in the watershed. Approximately 50% of area can be used for other crops such as sunflower wherever supplementary irrigation facilities are available.

The crop requirements for growing sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) (Table 4) are matched with the soil-site suitability. About 56 ha (9%) areas are highly suitable (S1) for growing sorghum with no limitations and distributed mainly in the central, northern and northeastern part of the microwatershed (Fig. 6b). Whereas 61 ha (10%) is moderately suitable (S2) distributed in the southwestern and central part with moderate limitations of erosion and rooting depth and 87 ha (15%) marginally suitable lands (S3) concentrated in southeastern, central and northern part with severe limitations of rooting depth (Table 5). About 369 ha (62%) is not suitable (N) for growing sorghum and distributed in all parts of the microwatershed. They have severe limitations of gravelliness, topography, erosion and rooting depth. They are grown under limited irrigation sorghum usually grown in dryland areas with soils less than 15 cm deep, using farmyard manures and household produced biofertilisers [20]. Short duration varieties are grown with duration of 65 days. They are mainly grown by small and marginal farmers (i.e. those with farm size less than 5 hectares) [33]. It is hereby suggested to modify the depth criteria in land evaluation exercises for

sorghum to bring marginal areas under cultivation in the watershed. This is possible with the crop interventions suggested to enhance productivity of sorghum by organizing on farm demonstration trials with the integration of package of practices involving moisture conservation, integrated nutrient management, and improved varieties and by popularizing the “seed village” programme through gram panchayats.

4. CONCLUSION

The land resource information obtained from detailed soil survey shows that this micro watershed has six soil series belongs to the subgroups of vertisols and vertic integrades having low available sulphur and boron with wide spread phosphorus, Zn deficiency. The soil map with fifteen mapping units was used in land evaluation for sorghum and pigeon pea. The results showed that 35 % of total is evaluated as suitable with limitations of soil depth, graveliness and slope. To enhance productivity, it is suggested to go for early sowing of pigeon pea with supplementary irrigation in times of dry spells but for sorghum, soil-water conservation measures must be integrated with nutrient management.

REFERENCES

1. Arora VK. 2002. The use of the aridity index to assess climate change effect on annual runoff. *Jour. Hydrology*, 265: 164-177.
2. Bhaskar BP, Sunil Maske, Gaikwad SS, Chaturvedi A, Jagdish Prasad, Anantwar SG, Singh SK. Soil-Land resource evaluation for rural agricultural land use planning: A case study from hot semiarid ecosystem of Western India. *Archives of Agriculture and Environmental Science*. 2017; 2(3): 206-218.
3. Bhaskar BP., Dipak Sarkar, Bobade SV, Gaikwad MS, Gaikwad SS, Nimkar AM, Anantwar, SG, Patil, SV, Tapas Bhattacharyya. Land resource evaluation for optimal land use plans in cotton growing Yavatmal district, Maharashtra. *The Ecoscan*. 2011; 1: 251-259.
4. Bower CA, Reitemeyer RF, Fireman M. Exchangeable cation analysis of saline and alkaline soils. *Soil Science*, 1952; 73: 251-261.
5. Centre for sustainable technologies. Transitioning towards Climate Resilient Development in Karnataka. Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore; 2014.
6. Dent D, Yong A. Soil survey and land evaluation: Allen & Unwin, London: 1981.
7. Eswaran H, Mosi D, Manickam TS. Soil moisture and temperature regimes of Southern India. Soil management support services. Washington, DC. USA; 1990.
8. FAO. A framework for land evaluation. Soil Bulletin No.32, Food and Agriculture Organization, Geneva; 1976.
9. FAO. Guidelines: land evaluation for rainfed agriculture. Soils Bulletin 52. FAO, Rome, Italy; 1983.
10. FAO. Guidelines: Land evaluation for irrigated agriculture. FAO Soils Bulletin 55, Rome; 1985.
11. FAO. 1986. A Forester's guide for community involvement in upland conservation with special reference to the Asia and Pacific region, FAO, Rome.
12. FAO. A framework for land evaluation. FAO Soil Bulletin No. 6, Rome, Italy; 2007.

- 339 13. GOI. Union Budget and Economic Survey. Ministry of Finance, Government of India,
340 New Delhi; 2009.
- 341 14. Government of India. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance, Directorate of economics and
342 Statistics, Ministry of Agricultural, New Delhi-01; 2010.
- 343 15. Gupta UC. A simplified method for determining hot-water-soluble boron in podzol soils.
344 Soil Sci. 1967; 103: 424-8.
- 345 16. IARI. Soil Survey Manual, All India Soil and Land Use Survey Organization, IARI, New
346 Delhi; 1971: 121.
- 347 17. Jackson ML. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi; 1973.
- 348 18. Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. Development of a DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and
349 copper. Soil Sci. Sot. Am. J. 1978; 42: 421-428.
- 350 19. Mallappa J, Madolli PS, Kanannavar yaligar Ravindra. Spatial and temporal analysis of
351 precipitation for the state of Karnataka, india, International journal of agricultural science.
352 2015; 5: 93-98.
- 353 20. Millet Network of India (MNI), Deccan Development Society and FIAN (Food First
354 Information and Action Network), India. Millets: future of food and farming; 2009.
- 355 21. Ministry of Minority Affairs Government of India and Indian Council of Social Science
356 Research. A baseline survey of minority concentration districts of India Gulberga
357 (Karnataka). Institute for Human Development. Mahatma Gandhi Marg, New Delhi;
358 2008.
- 359 22. Naidu LGK, Ramamurthy O, Rajendra Hegde, Krishnan P. Manual soil-site suitability
360 criteria for major crops. NBSS&LUP. 2006; 129: 66-67.
- 361 23. Olsen GW. Yield correlation. Soil and Environmental. A down and Guller Books,
362 Chapman and Hall, NY. London. 1981; 119-129.
- 363 24. Rajendra Hegde, Niranjana KV, Srinivas S, Nair KM, Dhanorkar BA, Reddy RS, Singh
364 SK. "Land Resource Inventory of Chikasavanur-1 Micro-watershed for Watershed
365 Planning and Development, Shirahatti Taluk, Gadag District, Karnataka", NBSS Publ.
366 No., ICAR – NBSS & LUP, RC, Bangalore; 2016: 36.
- 367 25. Schoeneberger M, Bentrup G, Gooijer H de, Soolanayakanahally R, Sauer T, Brandle J,
368 Zhou X, Current D. Branching out: Agroforestry as a climate change mitigation and
369 adaptation tool for agriculture. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. 2012; 67(5):
370 128A-136A. doi:10.2489/jswc.67.5.128A.
- 371 26. Sehgal JL, Saxena RK, Vadivelu S. Field Manual –Soil resource mapping of different
372 States. 2nd edition, Technical Bulletin 13, NBSS&LUP, Publication, Nagpur, India. 1989.
- 373 27. Shambulingappa KG, Rajana. Pigeonpeas ICPL-8863 and ICPL-87 in Karnataka. Ed.
374 Bantilan, M.C.S. and Joshi, P.K. Integrating Research Evaluation Efforts, ICRISAT.
375 1997; 138 -139.
- 376 28. Siddayya, Anil Kumar Dandekar, Shivanad K Kammar. Adoption pattern of improved
377 pigeonpea varieties in Gulbarga district, Karnataka, India.Agric. Sci. Digest. 2016; 36
378 (4): 255-260.
- 379 29. Singh RP, Subba Reddy, G. In Drought Research Priorities for the Dryland Tropics (eds
380 Bidinger, F. R. and Johansen, C.), ICRISAT, Patancheru; 1988.
- 381 30. Soil Survey Staff. Keys to Soil Taxonomy, Tenth edition, U.S. Department of Agriculture/
382 NRCS, Washington DC, U. S. A. Survey and Land Use Planning (ICAR), Nagpur, India;
383 2006.
- 384 31. Soil Survey Staff. Keys to Soil Taxonomy. 12th edition. USDA/NRSC, Washington, DC;
385 2014.
- 386 32. Srivastava R, Saxena RK. Technique of large scale soil mapping in basaltic terrain using
387 satellite remote sensing data. International journal of Remote Sensing. 2004; 25 (4):
388 679-688.
- 389 33. Swaminaidu N, Ghosh SK, Mallikarjuna K. "Millets: the miracle grains." International
390 Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences. 2015; 6 (4): 440-446.

- 391 34. Thronthwaite CW, Mathur JR. The water balance: Centerton, NJ, Laboratory of
392 Climatology. Publications in Climatology. 1955; 8 (1): 1-104.
- 393 35. V Madhava Rao, Om Prakash, Anand Sharma, R R Hermon, P Kesava Rao, NSR
394 Prasad , T Phanidra Kumar, SSRS Srinivas Kumar. Agro-climatic planning and
395 information bank (APIB) for uttarakhand state, India. The International Archives of the
396 Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences. Vol. XXXVII. Part
397 B7. 2008; 1451-1456.
- 398 36. Velayutham M, Mandal DK, Mandal C, Sehgal J. Agroecological subregions of India for
399 planning and development. NBSS&LUP, 1999; 35: 372.
- 400 37. Wadodkar M, Ravishankar T. Soil resource database at village level for developmental
401 planning. Journal of the Indian Society of Remote sensing. 2011; 31(1): 43-57.
- 402 38. Walkley A, Black IA. An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil
403 organic matter, and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. Soil
404 Science, 1934; 37: 29-38.
- 405 39. Wilding LP. Spatial variability: its documentation, accommodation and implication to soil
406 surveys. In: Nielsen DR, Bouma J (eds) Soil spatial variability. Proceedings of a
407 Workshop of ISSS and the SSSA, Las Vegas USA; 1985.
- 408 40. Williams CH, Steinberg A. Soil sulphur fractions as chemical indices of available sulphur
409 in some Australian soils. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research. 1959; 10: 340-
410 352.