

# Selected soil chemical properties and fertility assessment in some traditional irrigation schemes of Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania.

Joachim H.J.R. Makoi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

## ABSTRACT

**Aims:** To find out the status of the major plant nutrients important for plant growth and development in selected areas in Tanzania.

**Place and Duration of Study:** The soil physicochemical properties survey was conducted in Msagali and Chipogolo proposed irrigation schemes, Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, in Tanzania during the dry season of 2003.

**Methodology:** Before sampling, the study areas were divided into twenty two (22) pedogeomorphic units or soil types using pedogeomorphic approach. Thirty soil samples were collected from each pedogeomorphic unit at a depth of 0 – 20 cm in a zigzag manner, bulked, homogeneously mixed, and sub-sampled to obtain a representative composite sample. The composite soil samples were sent to Selian Agricultural Research Institute (SARI), Arusha, Tanzania, for analysis of physicochemical characteristics leading to the determination of the soil fertility status by means of these major mineral elements.

**Results:** The results showed variations in fertility status in the selected sites of each scheme. Based on guidelines of soil mineral elements contents established elsewhere, the results showed the soils in Msagali had high pH (8.1) and excessive  $\text{Na}^+$  ( $6.1 \text{ cmol (+).kg}^{-1}$  soil) in 30.9% of the total surveyed area (263.5 ha). The data showed that crop production in Chipogolo was slightly constrained by sodicity (ESP = 9.6%) in 73.1% of the total area (130.3 ha) surveyed and very strongly (ESP = 27.9%) in 55.8% of the total surveyed area in Msagali. The results also showed that total N and Organic Matter (OM) were low, ranging from 0.2 to  $1.0 \text{ g.kg}^{-1}$  and 2.3 to  $11.7 \text{ g.kg}^{-1}$  respectively. Available P was rated as low to medium and ranged from 1.01 to  $5.13 \text{ mg P.kg}^{-1}$  in all sites (i.e. Msagali and Chipogolo). Mg were rated as low ( $1.0 \text{ to } 3.2 \text{ cmol (+).kg}^{-1}$  soil.) in 26.9% of the area surveyed in Chipogolo and low in 18.4% of the surveyed area in Msagali ranging from 0.6 to  $6.5 \text{ cmol (+).kg}^{-1}$  soil. Results have also indicated that of the total surveyed area, 63.7% in Chipogolo and 18.4% in Msagali have low Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC) with values  $<12 \text{ cmol.kg}^{-1}$ . C:N ratio in 63.2% the total area surveyed in Chipogolo was of good quality (i.e. C:N between 8 – 12) suggesting ideal conditions for plant growth compared with 36.8% of the total study area in Chipogolo and all the studied sites in Msagali. The data have indicated Ca: Mg ratios to be less than the suggested guidelines in 36.8% of the total surveyed area in Chipogolo suggesting that plants would probably respond to the addition of Ca or Mg in such areas.

**Conclusion:** The fertility status and overall information from this study could be used in soil and fertiliser management studies to establish nutrient requirements for different crops grown in these areas.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

Keywords: [calcium, cation exchange capacity, crop production, excessive sodicity, fertility constraints, management practices, soil organic matter, survey]

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In Mpwapwa district, Dodoma Region, Tanzania, farmers have realized that huge profit margins can be achieved through crop diversification including rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) cultivation. The district, one of the five districts in Dodoma Region, is among the potential areas in Tanzania which practise both rainfed and irrigated agriculture. It is estimated that agricultural sector contributes about 48% of the total District Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The district has a total area of 223,000 ha potential for agriculture of which more than 5,991 ha (2.7%) are potential for irrigation development. of which However, but only 2,891 ha (48.3%) are currently irrigated by water from different sources including such as rainwater harvesting, rivers and storage dams. Some of the important crops cultivated in these areas include: Bambara groundnut (*Vigna subterranea* (L.) Verdc.), cassava (*Manihot esculenta*), cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.), groundnuts (*Arachis hypogea* L.), maize (*Zea mays* L.), pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*), onions (*Allium cepa* L.), sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.), sunflowers (*Helianthus annuus*), sweet potatoes (*Ipomoea batatas*) and rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). Due to increasing consumption of rice in the region, majority of farmers are now engaged in intensified irrigated rice cultivation in order to address the food crisis within and outside the region. Just as in other tropical areas, the selected areas for rice cultivation in Mpwapwa district are challenged by negative mineral elements balances, essential for plant growth and development [1; 2]. These challenges include excessive leaching, soil degradation, non-replenishment of the removed plant nutrients and low purchasing power to replenish the depleted mineral elements [3; 1; 4].

Due to complex interactions between soil and crop management, farming systems and soil fertility [5], production of both food and cash crops have declined, thus, threatening food security in these areas. For example, the current rice and maize grain yields in these irrigation schemes is very low, 1.0 – 1.5 t.ha<sup>-1</sup> [1; 6]. As yet no information is available presently, there is no research information to quantify and study the influence of soil fertility factors and their effect on crop yields.

~~the influence of soil fertility factors and how they can affect crop yields.~~ However, studies in similar environments of continuous land cultivation without proper management practises in some areas of Africa have showed shown soil fertility decline [7; 4; 8, 9]. Therefore, the decrease in crop yields and its impact on yields and household food security [10; 11; 12; 13] in many areas of Mpwapwa district forebodes decline in soil fertility.

Key indicators on soil fertility have previously been reported as soil pH, ~~soil organic carbon (OC) or~~ soil organic matter (SOM); cation exchange capacity (CEC); exchangeable bases (EB), salinity (S) and sodicity status (SS) and the amount of extractable N, P, K, Mg, Ca and Na ([14;15] ~~mineral elements~~). These indicators are realistic in predicting plant growth and development. Hence there is a need for regular and systematic evaluation to establish their levels in the soil so as in-order to achieve sustainable crop productivity in cropping systems. If unchecked, their limitation may result in complex mineral elements imbalances, consequent poor soil quality, and decline in soil productivity and crop yields [16; 17].

Thus, assessment and understanding of the soil fertility status based on the aforementioned attributes will not only provide strategies for soil fertility management and land development, but also will provide input into the design and planning of crop nutrition packages in the study areas. To date, studies on soil fertility status ~~survey studies~~ in Tanzania are very scarce in the literature [18; 9; 2]. The objective of this study was to assess the soil fertility status in the selected irrigation schemes of Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: joachimmakoi@yahoo.com; Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

69

## 70 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

71

### 72 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

73

74 The irrigation schemes of Chipogolo and Msagali are located in Mpwapwa District, Dodoma  
75 Region, in the Central part of Tanzania. Specifically, Chipogolo is located at 6°15'S and  
76 35°30' E, 100 km South West of Mpwapwa town at an altitude of 100 m a.m.s.l. Msagali is  
77 located at 6°15'S and 36°25' E, 16 km South West of Mpwapwa town at an altitude of 98.5 m  
78 a.m.s.l. These schemes are generally on a plain or piedmont landscape. The climate of the  
79 two schemes is characterised as hot semi-arid according to Köppen's classification [19]. The  
80 rainfall pattern in the district is characterised by 2 intermediate months and 10 dry months  
81 (see Table 1; Figure 1). The rainfall pattern is unimodal with one rainy season from  
82 November through May. Its distribution is unreliable and there is a risk of drought in January  
83 and March (Table 1; Figure 1). The driest months are between June to October with no rains  
84 at all ~~occur between the months of June and October, where there is completely no rain as~~  
85 ~~shown in Table 1.~~ The annual rainfall is 642 mm.month<sup>-1</sup> while annual evapotranspiration is  
86 2,147 mm.month<sup>-1</sup>. The mean monthly temperature in these schemes is between 21.8 C -  
87 26.7 C while the mean annual temperature is 24.6 C. There is slightly cooler period from  
88 May to July marked by the onset of the winds which continues up to October. Sunshine  
89 hours range between 7.1 - 9.9 hrs. Potential evaporation at Dodoma station as computed by  
90 Penman equation is in the range of 145 mm.month<sup>-1</sup> (February) to 254 mm.month<sup>-1</sup>  
91 (October) or 2,147 mm per annum. Relative humidity (RH) is between 61.1% (November)  
92 and 78.4% (April). Annual RH is 67.8%. The climatic data representatives for Chipogolo and  
93 Msagali schemes are summarized in Table 2.

94

### 95 2.2 SOIL SAMPLING

96

97 Before sampling, the study areas were divided into twenty two (22) pedogeomorphic units or  
98 soil types using pedogeomorphic approach [20]. Thirty soil samples were collected from  
99 each pedogeomorphic unit at a depth of 0 – 20 cm in a zigzag manner. The collected soil  
100 samples were bulked, homogeneously mixed, and sub-sampled to obtain a kg of a  
101 representative composite sample, filled in a plastic bag and labelled. The composite soil  
102 samples were sent to Selian Agricultural Research Institute (SARI), Arusha, Tanzania, air  
103 dried and ground to pass through a 2 mm-sieve after which they were analysed for physical  
104 chemical characteristics leading to the determination of the soil fertility status ~~by means of~~  
105 ~~these major mineral elements.~~

106

### 107 2.3 SOIL PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERISATION

108

109 Particle size analysis was determined by the Bouyoucos hydrometer method [21]. Organic  
110 carbon (OC) was done by Walkley and Black wet acid dichromate digestion method [22].  
111 Soil organic Matter (SOM) was calculated as 1.72 x % OC [23]; pH (water) was determined  
112 by a pH meter using 1:2.5 soil to water ratio as described by [24] whereas total N was done  
113 by semi-micro Kjeldahl digestion [25] followed by ammonium distillation and titrimetric  
114 determinations.

115

116 Exchangeable bases (Ca, Mg, K, Na) and CEC determination depended on soil pH. In soils  
117 with pH < 7.5, subsequent percolation with 1M ammonium acetate (NH<sub>4</sub>OAc) at pH 7,  
118 ethanol and acidified 1MKCl in the first percolate [26]. For soils with pH > 7.5 and high

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: joachimmakoi@yahoo.com; Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

119 carbonates contents, the method recommended by [27] was followed. Determination of K  
120 and Na was done with flame photometer, Ca and Mg by atomic absorption  
121 spectrophotometer [28]. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) was done following the method by  
122 [28]. Electrical conductivity (EC) was measured by a conductivity meter from the soil solution  
123 directly following the procedure described by [29]. Available P was extracted  
124 spectrophotometrically [30] by reacting with ammonium molybdate using ascorbic acid as a  
125 reductant in the presence of antimony, as in [31]. The total exchangeable bases (TEB) were  
126 obtained as the sum of exchangeable Ca, Mg, K and Na. Percent base saturation (%BS)  
127 was obtained by dividing TEB by CEC and then multiplied by 100 [32] Page et al., 1982.  
128 Exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) was obtained by dividing total exchangeable  
129 sodium by CEC, and then multiplied by 100. The K:TEB was obtained by dividing K by TEB.  
130

## 131 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

132

### 133 3.1 SOIL REACTION

134

135 Results from the survey showed that in Chipogolo, pH of the top soils ranged from 6.1 to 7.1.  
136 Of the total surveyed area (130.3 ha); 73.1% (i.e. 95.3 ha) was rated as mildly acidic to as  
137 very slightly acidic acid to slightly acid whereas 35 ha (i.e. 26.9%) was rated as neutral  
138 (Tables 3 and Table 5). In Msagali, soil pH reaction of the top soils ranged from 6.9 to 8.1  
139 and 37.5% of the total surveyed area (263.5 ha) was rated as very slightly acid, 31.7% as  
140 mildly alkaline and 30.9% as moderately alkaline (Tables 3 and 5) [33]. Soil pH is an  
141 important indicator in assessing soil fertility and its environment. For example, the normal pH  
142 range for optimal mineral elements availability for most crops is 6.0 to 7.5 [34; 35]. However,  
143 30.9% of the surveyed area in Msagali (i.e. MSAG-Pa3) had a soil pH of 8.1 rated as  
144 moderately alkaline (Table 3, 5) [33] and mineral elements deficiency such as P, Ca, Fe, Cu,  
145 Zn, Mn and Mo are likely to occur [36; 37; 38]. Furthermore, unfavourable plant growth  
146 conditions such as severe root damage, shallow rooting, poor root development,  
147 susceptibility to drought and poor use of subsoil mineral elements have been reported in  
148 such pH range [39; 40]. Collectively, the constraints associated with alkaline conditions may  
149 threaten the yield potential particularly in Msagali study area.  
150

### 151 3.2 TOTAL SOIL ORGANIC MATTER AND ORGANIC CARBON

152

153 Soil organic matter (SOM) content in the study area ranged from 2.3 to 11.7 g.kg<sup>-1</sup> in topsoil  
154 (Table 3) and was rated as very low (Table 5). Since SOM content was calculated from soil  
155 organic carbon [23], these parameters have had the same trend. It is generally accepted that  
156 a threshold for SOM in most soils is 34 g.kg<sup>-1</sup> below which decline in soil quality is expected  
157 to occur [41]. Soil organic matter was below the proposed threshold values in all the sites  
158 used in this under study, suggesting a decline in soil quality (Tables 3, 5). It is, therefore,  
159 apparent that there is a need to replenish the SOM using resources such as crop residues  
160 and manure for maximum crop yields. Understanding the SOM status before any  
161 development interventions are undertaken is of vital importance because such materials  
162 have been reported extensively it is known extensively to play a key role in the improvement  
163 of soil physical and chemical properties. These properties include structural stability,  
164 porosity, mineral elements availability (i.e. N, P and S); cation exchange capacity [42; 35; 43;  
165 44; 45]; and soil moisture and nutrient holding capacity [14]. SOM has also been reported to  
166 have great impact on improving irrigation efficiency for sustainable land productivity; to  
167 enhance productivity and environmental quality; to reduce the severity and costs of natural

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: joachimmakoi@yahoo.com; Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

phenomena, such as drought, flood, and disease; to reduce atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels that contribute to climate change [46; 47; 48; 49].

### 3.3 TOTAL N

Total nitrogen (Total N) status in the study area ranged from 0.2 to 1.0 g.kg<sup>-1</sup> in Chipogolo and 0.3 to 0.4 g.kg<sup>-1</sup> in Msagali (Table 3) and was rated as very low (Table 5). According to [33] guidelines, the proposed value for most crops in Tanzania is 2 g N.kg<sup>-1</sup> soil. The results show that all the surveyed sites had total N below the threshold value (< 2 g.kg<sup>-1</sup>) and was rated as very low (Tables 3, 5). The observed low N in these areas may be attributed to, amongst others, low SOM content which is greatly influenced by microbial activity in the soil [50] and high soil pH which could lead to N loss through ammonia volatilisation [51]. In our study, soil samples with relatively higher N levels were obtained from the relatively organic enriched soils. So, any activity envisaged to improve the soil pH, SOM and microbial activities can, consequently, lead to an increase in the %N in the soil. Inadequate amounts of N in the soil are the primary factor that limits plant growth and development in many parts of the world [52; 53] suggesting short- and long-term interventions. Practices such as choice of cropping systems involving legumes with N<sub>2</sub> fixation capability, the use of artificial acidified nitrogen fertilisers, animal manure or composts are some of the means by which N input into the soil can be effected.

### 3.4 C:N RATIO

The C:N ratio showed no clear relationship with the soil texture in our study. The C:N ratio ranged from 12 to 20 suggesting that the study area has a moderate to good quality SOM (Tables 3, 5) [33]. It is generally accepted that C:N ratios between 8 and 12 are considered to be the most favourable. In this study, 63.2% of the total area (i.e. 130.3 ha) in Chipogolo (CH-Pi2 and CH-Pa1) have good quality SOM implying a relatively fast mineralisation of N from the organic materials. For example, higher C:N ratios greater than 23 [56] have been shown to favour slow degradation of residues by the associated micro-organisms [57], higher immobilisation effects [56] and limited N in the soil that may lead to reduced crop yields [54; 55; 56]. The observed C:N ratio status in 63.2% of the surveyed area in Chipogolo suggests ideal conditions for plant growth, since in such situations mineralisation in the soil is greater than immobilisation, compared with 36.8% of the total study area in Chipogolo and all the studied sites in Msagali where mineralisation in the soil was lower than immobilisation.

### 3.5 AVAILABLE PHOSPHORUS

In Chipogolo, the data showed that, phosphorus (P) ranged from 2.31 to 5.13 mg P.kg<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3) and was rated as low to medium (Table 5). Of the total study area (130.3 ha), 36.8% was rated as having low P (i.e. 2.31 mg P.kg<sup>-1</sup>) and 63.2% was rated as having moderate P availability (i.e. an average of 4.87 mg P.kg<sup>-1</sup>). In Msagali, the data showed that, P ranged from 1.01 to 2.12 mg P.kg<sup>-1</sup> and was rated as low (Tables 3, 5). Phosphorus is an essential macro-element for plant growth, hence an important soil fertility indicator. Based on the current soil fertility recommendation that uses a critical P concentration of > 7 mg P.kg<sup>-1</sup> to separate P deficient soils [33], P availability was less than critical range. The observed low values of P could partly be attributed to fixation into unavailable forms due to high soil pH especially so in areas such as Msagali (Tables 3, 5). For example, in alkaline soils, calcium phosphates (Ca<sub>3</sub>(PO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>) are less soluble, hence high P retention capacity and consequently low P availability [57].

### 3.6 EXCHANGEABLE BASES (K, Mg, Ca)

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: joachimmakoi@yahoo.com; Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

Results in this study showed that potassium (K) levels in the soil ranged from 0.78 to 7.68 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil in Chipogolo and was rated as medium in 26.9% and high or very high in 73.1% of the total area (i.e. 130.3 ha) surveyed. In Msagali, K ranged from 0.33 to 0.55 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, and was rated as low in 13.3%, medium in 49.3% and high in 37.4% of the total area (i.e. 263.5 ha) surveyed (Tables 3, 5). It is generally accepted that response to K fertilisers is likely when a soil has an exchangeable K value of less than 0.2 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil and unlikely when it is above 0.4 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil [33; 58]. Based on the critical concentrations of exchangeable K values of 0.2 to 0.4 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, the data suggests that K is not a limiting mineral element to crop productivity in the study area [33; 59].

These results also showed that Mg<sup>2+</sup> content was low to high in the topsoil of Chipogolo area ranging from 1.0 to 3.2 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil. In this area, Mg content in 26.9% of the total area surveyed was rated as low, 36.8% as medium and 36.3% as high. Mg was rated as low to very high in the topsoil of Msagali area ranging from 0.6 to 6.5 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil and Mg content in 18.4% of the total area surveyed was rated as low, 13.3% as medium and 68.3% as high or very high (Table 3, 5). The recommended value of Mg<sup>2+</sup> in most crops is 2 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> [60]. The observed low levels of Mg<sup>2+</sup> in 26.9% of the total area surveyed in Chipogolo and 18.4% of the total area surveyed in Msagali suggest that these areas have insufficient Mg<sup>2+</sup> supplies for crop growth. Mg is required by a large number of enzymes involved in energy transfer, particularly those utilizing ATP; a constituent of the chlorophyll molecule; is required for the normal structural development of the chloroplast; as well as other organelles such as the mitochondrion [61; 62; 63; 64]. Thus, it is **to-be** expected that Mg deficiency would have damaging effects on photosynthesis and respiration leading to poor crop yields. As such measures should be undertaken to ameliorate such deficiencies for crop development.

The exchangeable Ca<sup>2+</sup> in the topsoil of the Chipogolo study area ranged from 3.9 to 9.7 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> soil. The data showed that of the total area, 63.2% was rated as medium and 36.8% as high (Tables 3, 5). Likewise in Msagali, 18.4% was rated as medium, 30.9% as high and 50.7% as very high (Tables 3, 5). [65] proposed that in most crops, the recommended threshold level of Ca<sup>2+</sup> is 5 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup>. Calcium deficiency occurs frequently in a range of crops when exchangeable Ca concentration is less than 1 cmol (+).kg<sup>-1</sup> [66; 67]. It is generally acknowledged that field conditions that limit Ca<sup>2+</sup> uptake produce lower crop yields than crops grown with adequate Ca<sup>2+</sup> [68;69;70;71]. The medium to very high levels of Ca<sup>2+</sup> in the study areas indicates lower bondage of Ca<sup>2+</sup> to P at relatively lower soil reactions (Tables 3, 5).

### 3.7 CATION EXCHANGE CAPACITY

The cation exchange capacity (CEC) status in the soil ranged from 3.73 to 36.6 cmol (+) kg<sup>-1</sup> (Table 3) and was rated as very low to high (Table 5) [33]. Cation exchange capacity refers to the exchange phenomenon of positively charged ions at the surface of the negatively charged colloids. The higher the CEC, the more capable the soil can retain mineral elements. Studies have shown that soils with CEC values of between 6 to 12 cmol (+) kg<sup>-1</sup> are poor in exchangeable bases [33]. Of the total surveyed area, 63.7% in Chipogolo and 18.4% in Msagali had CEC values <12 cmol (+) kg<sup>-1</sup>. According to [72], soils with low CEC are typically weathered with a low ability to support plant growth with adequate mineral element such **as** Ca. It is generally accepted that SOM is responsible for 25 - 90% of the total CEC of surface horizons of mineral soils [73; 74]. The very low or low to medium CEC found in some areas in this study could be related to low SOM (Tables 3, 5). The very low or low CEC values in soils have also been implicated with low yield in most agricultural soils [72]. Any intervention such as applying both manure and the required amount of fertiliser

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

with the aim of improving the CEC of the soil is recommended. By doing so, humus content of the soil will increase and, consequently, improve the CEC that may lead to better retention of mineral elements in the soil.

### 3.8 EXCHANGEABLE SODIUM (Na) OR EXCHANGEABLE SODIUM PERCENTAGE (ESP)

The exchangeable sodium ( $\text{Na}^+$ ) in Chipogolo ranged from 0.31 to 4.31 cmol (+)  $\text{kg}^{-1}$  soil. This corresponds to ESP values which range from 5.3 to 9.6%. In Chipogolo Msagali  $\text{Na}^+$  values ranged from 0.43 to 6.1 cmol (+)  $\text{kg}^{-1}$  soil corresponding to ESP values which ranged from 4.2 to 27.9% (Tables 3, 5). The critical values of ESP above which most crops are affected are established at 15 [75]. 26.9% of the total surveyed area in Chipogolo had ESP of 5.3 which was below the recommended threshold levels of  $\text{ESP} < 6$  rated as non-sodic (Tables 3, 5). However, 73.1% of the total surveyed area in Chipogolo was rated as slightly sodic. In Msagali, 37.4% of the total surveyed area had 6.1 cmol  $\text{Na}^+$  ( $\text{kg}^{-1}$  soil and ESP of 27.9 rated as very high and very strongly sodic respectively. However, 44.2% of the total area was rated as non-sodic and 18.4% as moderately sodic (Tables 3, 5). The medium to very high Na or slightly/moderately sodic to very strongly sodic status observed in this study may probably be related to high evaporation, poor management of irrigation water, lack of drainage systems and low  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  due to high  $\text{Na}^+$  concentrations in the exchange complex (Tables 3, 5). Higher  $\text{Na}^+$  levels in the soil is associated with decline in net photosynthesis; energy losses for salt exclusion mechanisms; greater decrease in mineral elements uptake; poor  $\text{NO}_3^-$  assimilation required for plant growth; inhibition of vital enzymes and competition with  $\text{K}^+$  [76; 77; 78; 79]. The excessive  $\text{Na}^+$  in the soil is likely to cause reduced plant growth and development, thus, decreased crop yields [80; 81; 82; 83]. Our results suggest that such sodic soils may require appropriate amendments such as farm yard manure (FYM) and or gypsum to reduce the concentration of  $\text{Na}^+$  on the exchange complex, thereafter followed by leaching to replace the soluble  $\text{Na}^+$  on the soil colloid, through irrigation or rain water [84; 2] and use of acidifying fertilisers such as sulphate of ammonia to lower the soil pH. Successful results on the use of locally available soil ameliorants, such as gypsum ( $\text{CaSO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) as a  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  source and/or organic manure, has been reported in northern Tanzania [2].

### 3.9 CATION RATIOS

In Chipogolo, the Ca:Mg ratios ranged from 2 to 3.9; Mg:K ratio: from 0.4 to 2.2 and K:TEB ratio: from 11.6 to 30.9% (Table 4). But in Msagali, the Ca:Mg ratios ranged from 2.7 to 13.8; Mg:K ratio: from 1.1 to 14.8 and K:TEB ratio: from 1.2 to 12.3%. According to the established guidelines [33; 85], the recommended optimum ratio of Mg:K for most crops is 1 - 4. However, in areas where K was high Mg was low and vice versa suggesting that these mineral elements are antagonistic. These results indicate that almost all sites have optimal K enrichment sufficient to support plant growth. In relation to Ca:Mg, our data suggests less favourable conditions for most crops. The availability of mineral elements for uptake by plants depends not only upon absolute levels but also on relative amounts of individual elements. It has been suggested that the optimal cation ratio for the growth of most crops in the tropical area is assumed to be equal to 12.7:3:1 for Ca: Mg: K respectively [33]. Although the general trend for Ca: Mg: K doesn't indicate a good ratio in relation to the established standards, the individual nutrient ratios are more important i.e. Ca: Mg; Mg: K and K: TEB. Research has indicated that the Ca: Mg ratio of 3 - 5 in the topsoil [33] is optimal for most crops and the K: TEB ratio of less than 2% is sub-optimal and may limit crop production. Our results have indicated Ca: Mg ratios to be less than the suggested guidelines in only 36.8% of the total surveyed area in Chipogolo suggesting that plants would probably respond to the addition of Ca or Mg in such areas (Table 4).

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, with reference to the established guidelines elsewhere, these results provide soil fertility status indicators for major soil elements in the selected irrigation schemes in the Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania. The data also suggest that soil pH and excessive Na<sup>+</sup> in the soil are the major soil fertility constraints to crop production in the area followed by Ca<sup>+</sup>, SOM and CEC. This information from this study could be incorporated in the soil fertility management in Tanzania thus contributing significantly in the efficient utilisation of land resources in the study areas Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by the Participatory Irrigation Development Programme (PIDP), Mpwapwa District, Dodoma Region, Tanzania and the Kilimanjaro Zonal Irrigation and Technical Services Unit (KZITSU), Moshi, Tanzania

Competing interests: None

#### REFERENCES

1. Ngailo JA, Wickama JM, Nyaki AS, Kaswamila AL. Nutrient flow analysis for selected farming systems in the Northern Tanzania: The case of Mbulu, Moshi Rural and Lushoto Districts (pp 49-64). In: Soil and Nutrient management in sub-Saharan Africa in support of the soil fertility initiative. 1999: Pp.376.
2. Makoi JHJR and Ndakidemi PA. Reclamation of sodic soils in northern Tanzania, using locally available organic and inorganic resources. Afr. J. Biotechnol. 2007;16(6):1926 - 1931.
3. Mokwunye AU, de Jager A, Smaling EMA. Restoring and maintaining the productivity of West African soils: Key to sustainable development. Misc. fertilizer stud 14, Int. Dev. Central Africa, Lome, Togo; 1996.
4. Sanchez PA. Soil fertility and hunger in Africa. Sci. 2002;295:2019-2020.
5. Mowo JG, Janssen BH, Oenema O, German LA, Mrema JP, Shemdoe RS. Soil fertility evaluation and management by smallholder farmer communities in northern Tanzania. Agriculture, Ecosyst & Environ. 2006;116 (1-2):47-59.
6. RLDC. Rural Livelihood Development Company, Rice Sector Strategy: Improving rice profitability through increased productivity and better marketing focusing on Tanzania's Central Corridor, November, 2009: Pp 34.
7. Scoones I. Dynamics and Diversity: Soil Fertility and Farming Livelihoods in Africa: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Mali, and Zimbabwe, Earthscan Publications Ltd., London, 2001: pp 244.
8. Hellin J. From soil erosion to soil quality. LEISA Mag. Low External Input Sustain Agric. 2003;19 (4).
9. Ndakidemi PA and Semoka JMR. Soil fertility in Western Usambara Mountains, Northern Tanzania. Pedosphere. 2006;16(2):237-244.
10. Defoer T, Budelman A (Eds.). Managing Soil Fertility in the Tropics. A Resource Guide for Participatory Learning and Action Research. KIT Publishers, Amsterdam; 2000.
11. Lyamchai CJ, Mowo JG, Wickama JM. Managing new working relationships: partnership and networking. In: AHI Regional Conference, Nairobi; 2004.
12. Oue'draogo E. Soil quality improvement for crop production in semi arid West Africa. PhD Thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen; 2004.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

- 378 13. Sai'dou A, Kuyper TW, Kossou DK, Tossou R, Richards P. Sustainable soil fertility  
379 management in Benin: learning from farmers. *NJAS-Wageningen. J Life Sci.*  
380 2004;52: 349-369.
- 381 14. Monreal CM, Dinel H, Schnitzer M, Gamble DS, Biederbeck VO. Impact of carbon  
382 sequestration on functional indicators of soil quality as influenced by management in  
383 sustainable agriculture. P. 435-457. In: Lal R et al. (eds.) *Soil processes and the*  
384 *carbon cycle*, Lewis Publ., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL; 1997.
- 385 15. Brady NC, Weil RR. *Nature and Properties of Soils*. 13<sup>th</sup> Edition. With permission of  
386 Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey; 2002.
- 387 16. Angers DA, Pesant A, Vigneux J. Early cropping - induced changes in soil  
388 aggregation, organic matter and microbial biomass. *SSSAJ*. 1992;56:115-119.
- 389 17. Riffaldi R, Saviozzi A, Levi-Minzi R, Menchetti F. Chemical characteristics of soil  
390 after 40 years of continuous maize cultivation. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*. 1994;49:239-  
391 245.
- 392 18. Muchena FM and Kiome RM The role of soil science in agricultural development in  
393 East Africa. *Geoderma*. 1995;67:141-157.
- 394 19. Köppen, W. *Die Klimate der Erde*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin; 1923.
- 395 20. Makoi JHJR. Soil Fertility assessment for irrigation in the selected schemes of Mbulu  
396 District. In: United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security,  
397 Participatory Irrigation Development Programme. ZITS, Moshi, Kilimanjaro; 2003.
- 398 21. Day PR. Particle fraction and particle size analysis. In: Black CA et al. (Eds).  
399 *Methods of soil analysis*. Part 2. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1965:Pp.  
400 545-567.
- 401 22. Allison E. Organic carbom. In: Black CA et al. (eds). *Methods of soil analysis*. Part 2.  
402 American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1965:Pp.1367-1378.
- 403 23. Walkley A, Black A. Determination of organic matter. *Soil Sci*. 1934;37:29-38.
- 404 24. Peech M. Hydrogen ion activity. In: Black CA et al. (Eds). *Methods of soil analysis*.  
405 Part 2. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1965:Pp.914-926.
- 406 25. Bremner JM. Total nitrogen. In: Black CA et al. (eds). *Methods of soil analysis*. Part  
407 2. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1965: Pp. 1149-1178.
- 408 26. Chapman HD. Cation exchange capacity. In: Black CA et al. (Eds). *Methods of soil*  
409 *analysis*. Part 2. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1965:Pp. 891-901.
- 410 27. Polemio M, Rhoades JD. Determining cation exchange capacity: A new procedure  
411 for calcareous and gypsiferous soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J*. 1977;41:524-528.
- 412 28. Hesse PR. *A Text Book of Soil Chemistry Analysis*. John Murray Ltd. London.  
413 1971:Pp. 120-309.
- 414 29. Piper CS. *Soil and Plant Analysis*. University of Adelaide; 1942.
- 415 30. Rodriguez JB, Self JR and Soltanpour NP. Optimal conditions for phosphorous  
416 analysis by the ascorbic acid-molybdenum blue method. *Soil Sci Soc Am J*.  
417 1994;58:866-870.
- 418 31. Murphy J, and Riley JP. A modified single solution method for determination of  
419 phosphates in natural waters. *Anal Chim Acta*. 1962;27:31-36.
- 420 32. Page AL, Miller RH, Keeney DR. eds. *Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2: Chemical*  
421 *and Microbiological Properties*, 2nd ed.: American Society of Agronomy, Madison,  
422 WI. 1982.
- 423 33. NSS. *Laboratory procedures for routine soil analysis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Ministry of Agriculture  
424 and Livestock Development, National Soil Service (NSS), ARI, Mlingano;1990
- 425 34. Schmidt EL. Nitrification in Soil. In: Stevenson, F.J. (Ed), *Nitrogen in Agricultural*  
426 *Soils*. American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI, 1982:pp. 253-288. ISBN  
427 0891180702.
- 428 35. Sanchez PA, Palm CA, Boul SW. Fertility capability classification: A tool to help  
429 assess soil quality in the tropics. *Geoderma*. 2003;114:157-185.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

- 430 36. Page AL, Chang AC, Adriano DC. Deficiencies and toxicities of trace elements.  
431 Agricultural Salinity Assessment and Management, Chapter 7, ASCE Manuals and  
432 Reports on Eng. Practice No. 71, ASCE, 1990:pp.138-160.
- 433 37. Foy CD. Soil chemical factors limiting plant root growth. *Adv Soil Sci.* 1992;19:97-  
434 131.
- 435 38. Makoi JHJR, Ndakidemi PA. The agronomic potential of vesicular arbuscular  
436 mycorrhiza (VAM) in cereals– legume mixtures in Africa. *Afr. J. Microbiol. Res.*  
437 2009; 3: 664-675.
- 438 39. Kauffman MD. The effect of soil acidity and lime placement on root growth and yield  
439 of winter wheat and alfalfa. Ph.D. Diss. Oregon state Univ., Corvallis. Diss. Abstr.  
440 37B, 7, 1977:pp. 3192-3193.
- 441 40. Adams F. Crop response to lime in the Southern United States. In: Adams, F. (Ed.),  
442 Soil Acidity and Liming, second ed. Agronomy no. 12, ASA, CSSA, SSSA, WI, pp.  
443 1984: 211-265.
- 444 41. Loveland P, Webb J. Is there a critical level of organic matter in the agricultural soils  
445 of temperate regions: a review. *Soil and Tillage Res.* 2003;70(1):1-18.
- 446 42. Roscoe R, Buurman P, Velthorst EJ, Vasconcellos CA. Soil organic matter dynamics  
447 in density and particle size fractions as revealed by the <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C isotopic ratio in a  
448 Cerrado's oxisol. *Geoderma.* 2001;104:185-202.
- 449 43. Kockba M, Ritvo G, Avinimelech Y. The effect municipal solid waste compost (MSW)  
450 on the replacement of sodium in sodic soil models. *Soil Sci.* 2004;169:567-572.
- 451 44. Ferreras L, Gomez E, Toresani S, Firpo I, Rotondo R. Effect of organic  
452 amendments on some physical, chemical and biological properties in a horticultural  
453 soil. *Bioresource Tech.* 2006;97(4):635-640.
- 454 45. Flavel TC, Murphy DV. Carbon and Nitrogen mineralization rates after application of  
455 organic amendments to the soil. *J Environ Quality.* 2006;35:183-193.
- 456 46. Doran, J., 1995. Building soil quality. In: Proceedings of the 1995 Conservation  
457 Workshop on Opportunities and Challenges in Sustainable Agriculture. Red Deer,  
458 Alta., Canada, Alberta Conservation Tillage Society and Alberta Agriculture  
459 Conservation, Development Branch, pp. 151–158.
- 460 47. Drinkwater, L.E., Letourneau, D.K., Workneh, F., van Bruggen, A.H.C., Shennan, C.,  
461 1995. Fundamental differences between conventional and organic tomato  
462 agroecosystems in California. *Ecol. Appl.* 5, 1098–1112.
- 463 48. Shepherd MA, Harrison R, Webb J. 2006: Managing soil organic matter –  
464 implications for soil structure on organic farms, *Soil Use and Management* 18  
465 (s1):284 – 292.
- 466 49. Stamatiadis, S., Werner, M., Buchanan, M., 1999. Field assessment of soil quality  
467 as affected by compost and fertilizer application in a broccoli field (San Benito  
468 County, California). *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 12, 217–225.
- 469 50. Facelli JM, Pickett STA. Plant litter. Its dynamics and effects on plant community  
470 structure. *Bot Rev.* 1991;57:1-32.
- 471 51. Rao DLN and Batra L. Ammonia volatilization from applied nitrogen in alkali soils.  
472 *Plant Soil.* 1983;70(2): 219-228.
- 473 52. Vermeer JG, Berendse F. The relationship between nutrient availability, shoot  
474 biomass and species richness in grassland and wetland communities. *Vegetation.*  
475 1983;53:121-126.
- 476 53. Tilman GD. Plant dominance along an experimental nutrient gradient. *Ecol.* 1984;65:  
477 1445-1453.
- 478 54. Goma HC. Potential for changing traditional soil fertility management systems in the  
479 wet miombo woodlands of Zambia: the chitemene and fundikila systems: In: Gichuru  
480 MP, Bationo A, Bekunda MA, Goma HC, Mafongoya PL, Mugendi DN, Murwira HK,  
481 Nandwa SM, Nyathi P, Swift MJ (eds). 2003. Soil fertility management in Africa: a  
482 regional perspective, 2003:pp 187-218.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

- 483 55. Eiland F, Klamer M, Lind AM, Leth M, Baath E. Influence of initial C/N ratio on  
484 chemical and microbial composition during long term composing of straw. Microbial  
485 Ecol. 2001;41:272-280.
- 486 56. Uriyo AP, Mongi HO, Chowdhury MS, Sing BR and Semoka JMR. Introductory Soil  
487 Science. Tanzania Publishing House, Dar es Salaam. 1979:pp 232.
- 488 57. Hassett JJ and Banwart WL. Soils and their environment. Prentice Hall, Englewood,  
489 New Jersey. 1992:Pp.424.
- 490 58. Anderson GD. Potassium responses of various crops in East Africa. In: Proceedings  
491 of the 10<sup>th</sup> Colloquium of the International Potash Potash Insititute, Abijan, Ivory  
492 Coast. International Potash Insititute, Abijan. 1973:Pp. 413-437.
- 493 59. Gourley CJP. Potassium. In "Soil Analysis: An Interpretation Manual" (K. I. Peverill,  
494 L. A. Sparrow and D. J. Reuter, eds.). CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne; 1999.
- 495 60. Schwartz HF and Coralles MA. Nutritional disorders in beans. In: Schwartz HF,  
496 Coralles MAP (Eds.) Bean production Problems in the tropics. Second edition.  
497 International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Cali. 1989:Pp.75-604.
- 498 61. Thomson WW and Weier TE. The fine structure of chloroplasts from mineral-  
499 deficient leaves of *Phaseolus vulgaris*. Amer J Bot. 1962;49:1047-1055.
- 500 62. Marinos NG. Studies on submicroscopic aspects of mineral deficiencies. II. Nitrogen,  
501 potassium, sulfur, phosphorus and magnesium deficiencies in the shoot apex of  
502 barley. Amer J Bot. 1963;50:998-1005.
- 503 63. Evans HJ and Sorger GJ. Role of mineral elements with emphasis on the univalent  
504 cations. Annu Rev Plant Physiol. 1966;17:47-76.
- 505 64. Hall JD, Barr R, Al-Abbas AH, and Crane FL. The ultra structure of chloroplasts in  
506 mineral deficient maize leaves. Plant Physiol. 1972;50:404-409.
- 507 65. Marx ES, Hart J and Stevens RG. Soil test interpretation guide. Oregon State  
508 University Extension Services. Oregon State University, Corvallis. 1996:7pp.
- 509 66. Cregan DD, Hirth JR, and Conyers MK. Amelioration of soil acidity by liming and  
510 other amendmets. In "Soil Acidity and Plant Growth" (A. D. Robson, Ed.),  
511 1989:pp.205-264. Academic Press, Sydney.
- 512 67. McCray JM and Sumner ME. Assessing and modifying Ca and Al levels in acid  
513 subsoils. Adv Soil Sci. 1990;14:45-75.
- 514 68. Cox FR, Sullivan GA, Martin CK. Effect of calcium and irrigation treatments on  
515 peanut yield, grade and seed quality. Peanut Sci. 1976;3:81-85.
- 516 69. Hadidi NA. The influence of macronutrient deficiency on plant growth and  
517 development, fruit yield, seed yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*  
518 Mill.) and cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.). Ph.D. Diss. (Diss. Abstr. AAT 8426398).  
519 The Ohio State University, Columbus; 1984.
- 520 70. Frost DJ, Kretchman DW. Calcium deficiency reduces cucumber fruit and seed  
521 quality. J Am Soc Hort Sci. 1989;114:552-556.
- 522 71. Smiciklas KD, Mullen RE, Carlson RE, Knapp AD. Drought-induced stress effect on  
523 soybean seed calcium and quality. Crop Sci. 1989;29: 1519-1523.
- 524 72. Sanchez PA, Logan TJ. Properties and management of soils in the tropics. John  
525 Wiley and Sons, New York. 1992: pp 618.
- 526 73. Van Dijk H. Colloid chemical properties of humic matter. In: McLaren AD, Skujins J  
527 (Eds.), Soil Biochemistry, Vol. 2. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1971:pp.16-35.
- 528 74. Oades JM, Gillman GP, Uehara G, Hue NV, van Noordwijk M, Robertson GP, Wada  
529 K. Interactions of soil organic matter and variable-charge clays. In: Coleman DC,  
530 Oades JM, Uehara G (Eds), Dynamics of Soil Organic Matter in Tropical  
531 Ecosystems. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI, 1989:pp.69-95.
- 532 75. Lebron I, Suarez DL, Yoshida T. Gypsum effect on the aggregate size and geometry  
533 of three sodic soils under reclamation. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 2002;66: 92-98.
- 534 76. Aslam M, Hukffker RC, Rains DW. Early effects of salinity on nitrate assimilation in  
535 barley seedlings. Plant Physiol. 1984;76:321-325.

- 536 77. Seeman JR, Sharkley TD. Salinity and nitrogen effects on photosynthesis, ribulose-  
537 1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase and metabolite pool sizes in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L.  
538 Plant Physiol. 1986;82:555-560.
- 539 78. Tarczynski MC, Jensen RG and Bohnert HJ. Stress protection of transgenic tobacco  
540 by production of the osmolyte mannitol. Sci. 1993;259: 508-510.
- 541 79. Munns R. Physiological processes limiting plant growth in saline soils: some dogmas  
542 and hypotheses. Plant Cell Environ. 1993;16:15-24.
- 543 80. Noble CL and Rogers MJE. Response of temperate forage legumes to water logging  
544 and salinity. In: Pessarakli M (ed) handbook of Plant and crops stress. Marcel  
545 Dekker. Inc., New York, NY, 1993:pp.473-496.
- 546 81. Gouia H, Ghorbal MH, Touraine B. Effect of NaCl on flows of N and mineral ions and  
547 on NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reductase rate within whole plants of salt-sensitive bean and salt-tolerant  
548 cotton. Plant Physiol. 1994;105:1409-1418.
- 549 82. Murguia JR, Belles JM and Serrano R. A salt-sensitive 3' (2'), 5'-bisphosphate  
550 nucleotidase involved in sulfate activation. Sci. 1995;267:232-234.
- 551 83. Flowers TJ. Salinisation and horticultural production. Sci Hort. 1999;78: 1-4.
- 552 84. Clark GJ, Dodgshun N, Sale PWG, Tang C. Changes in chemical and biological  
553 properties of a sodic clay subsoil with addition of organic amendments. Soil Biol.  
554 Biochem. 2007;39(11):2806-2817.
- 555 85. Lombin G and Fayemi AA. Magnesium availability in soils from Western Nigeria. Soil  
556 Science. 1976;122: 91-99.

557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254

589 **Table 1: Computations of humidity index (HI) for the selected sites of Mpwapwa District,**  
590 **Dodoma Region, Tanzania.**  
591  
592

| Month     | HI   | Remarks      |
|-----------|------|--------------|
| January   | 0.41 | Dry          |
| February  | 0.74 | Intermediate |
| March     | 0.34 | Dry          |
| April     | 0.61 | Intermediate |
| May       | 0.25 | Dry          |
| June      | 0    | Dry          |
| July      | 0    | Dry          |
| August    | 0    | Dry          |
| September | 0    | Dry          |
| October   | 0    | Dry          |
| November  | 0.1  | Dry          |
| December  | 0.34 | Dry          |
| Annual    | 0.30 | Dry          |

593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture Food and Cooperatives, Directorate of Irrigation, P.O. Box 9192, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;  
email: [joachimmakoi@yahoo.com](mailto:joachimmakoi@yahoo.com); Cell: +255 (0) 762 293 254




**Figure 1: Water balance and the determination of the growing period for the selected schemes.**

**Table 2:** Climatic data representative to Chipogolo and Msagali irrigation schemes.

| Description        | Unit                      | J     | F     | M     | A     | M     | J     | J     | A     | S     | O     | N     | D     |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Temp. Max          | °C                        | 26.0  | 25.9  | 25.6  | 25.1  | 23.9  | 22.1  | 21.8  | 21.9  | 23.8  | 25.3  | 26.7  | 26.5  |
| Rainfall           | (mm.month <sup>-1</sup> ) | 64.0  | 108.0 | 53.0  | 89.0  | 38.0  | 0.0   | 0.0   | 0.0   | 0.0   | 0.0   | 24.0  | 61.0  |
| ET <sub>o</sub>    | (mm.month <sup>-1</sup> ) | 155.0 | 145.0 | 155.0 | 147.0 | 155.0 | 147.0 | 161.0 | 183.0 | 219.0 | 254.0 | 246.0 | 180.0 |
| 0.5ET <sub>o</sub> | (mm.month <sup>-1</sup> ) | 77.5  | 72.5  | 77.5  | 73.5  | 77.5  | 73.5  | 80.5  | 91.5  | 109.5 | 127.0 | 123.0 | 90.0  |
| RH                 | %                         | 72.8  | 78.0  | 77.2  | 78.4  | 66.8  | 64.5  | 64.4  | 62.8  | 62.4  | 58.7  | 61.1  | 66.0  |
| SSR                | l.day <sup>-1</sup>       | 511.0 | 517.0 | 503.0 | 481.0 | 474.0 | 490.0 | 488.0 | 489.0 | 521.0 | 527   | 534.0 | 517.0 |
| SH                 | Hrs                       | 7.1   | 7.2   | 7.1   | 6.8   | 7.8   | 9.0   | 9.3   | 9.6   | 9.6   | 9.9   | 9.6   | 7.6   |

Source: Dodoma station except for rainfall data which were taken from Chinyasungwi station, ET<sub>o</sub> = Potential evapotranspiration, RH = Relative humidity, SSR = Solar Radiation, SH = Sunshine hours

661

662 **Table 3:** Soil fertility data for the selected sites of Mpwapwa District (topsoil samples 0 – 20 cm depth).  
663

| Sample No. | Texture | pH                    | EC   | OM                    | TN                  | C/N | Pav  | CEC   | Exchangeable Bases         |                                |      |      | BS  | ESP  |     |
|------------|---------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----|------|-------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
|            |         | (H <sub>2</sub> O)    |      |                       |                     |     |      |       |                            | Ca                             | Mg   | K    |     |      | Na  |
|            |         | (dS.m <sup>-1</sup> ) |      | (g.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | mg.kg <sup>-1</sup> |     |      |       | cmol.kg <sup>-1</sup> soil | cmol (+).kg <sup>-1</sup> soil |      |      |     |      | (%) |
| Chipogolo  |         |                       |      |                       |                     |     |      |       |                            |                                |      |      |     |      |     |
| CH-Pi1     | CL      | 6.8                   | 0.06 | 2.9                   | 0.2                 | 15  | 2.31 | 9.00  | 4.50                       | 2.20                           | 0.99 | 0.86 | 95  | 9.6  |     |
| CH-Pi2     | SCL     | 7.1                   | 0.10 | 2.3                   | 0.2                 | 12  | 4.61 | 5.82  | 3.90                       | 1.00                           | 0.78 | 0.31 | 100 | 5.3  |     |
| CH-Pa1     | C       | 6.1                   | 1.67 | 11.7                  | 1.0                 | 12  | 5.13 | 36.60 | 9.70                       | 3.20                           | 7.68 | 4.31 | 95  | 9.6  |     |
| Msagali    |         |                       |      |                       |                     |     |      |       |                            |                                |      |      |     |      |     |
| MSAG-Pa1   | SCL     | 6.9                   | 2.42 | 4.7                   | 0.3                 | 16  | 1.48 | 21.84 | 10.40                      | 3.80                           | 1.10 | 6.10 | 98  | 27.9 |     |
| MSAG-Pa2   | C       | 7.4                   | 0.56 | 5.6                   | 0.3                 | 20  | 1.57 | 23.25 | 23.50                      | 1.70                           | 0.33 | 0.97 | 100 | 4.2  |     |
| MSAG-Pa3   | C       | 8.1                   | 0.28 | 7.4                   | 0.4                 | 19  | 1.01 | 19.88 | 19.40                      | 6.50                           | 0.44 | 0.89 | 100 | 4.5  |     |
| MSAG-Pa4   | SCL     | 7.6                   | 0.04 | 5.9                   | 0.3                 | 19  | 2.12 | 3.73  | 2.90                       | 0.60                           | 0.55 | 0.43 | 100 | 11.5 |     |

664 EC = Electrical Conductivity, TN = Total Nitrogen; C/N = Carbon/Nitrogen ration, Pav = Available Phosphorus; K = Potassium; Ca =  
665 Calcium; Mg = Magnesium; Na = Sodium, OM = Organic Matter; CEC = Cation Exchange Capacity; BS = Base Saturation, ESP =  
666 Exchangeable Sodium Percentage; SCL = Sand Clay Loam; CL = Clay Loam; C = Clay

667

668

669

670

671

**Table 4:** Summary of the results of the Cation Ratios and Total Exchangeable bases in the top soil samples (0 – 20 cm)

| Sample No. | Texture | Ca/Mg | Mg/K | K/TEB | TEB                            |
|------------|---------|-------|------|-------|--------------------------------|
|            |         |       |      | (%)   | cmol (+).kg <sup>-1</sup> soil |
| Chipogolo  |         |       |      |       |                                |
| CH-Pi1     | CL      | 2.0   | 2.2  | 11.6  | 8.6                            |
| CH-Pi2     | SCL     | 3.9   | 1.3  | 13.0  | 6.0                            |
| CH-Pa1     | C       | 3.0   | 0.4  | 30.9  | 24.9                           |
| Msagali    |         |       |      |       |                                |
| MSAG-Pa1   | C       | 2.7   | 3.5  | 5.1   | 21.4                           |
| MSAG-Pa2   | C       | 13.8  | 5.2  | 1.2   | 26.5                           |
| MSAG-Pa3   | SCL     | 3.0   | 14.8 | 1.6   | 27.2                           |
| MSAG-Pi1   | SCL     | 4.8   | 1.1  | 12.3  | 4.5                            |

K = Potassium; Ca = Calcium; Mg = Magnesium; Na = Sodium, TEB = Total Exchangeable Bases, BS = Base Saturation; SCL = Sand Clay Loam; CL = Clay Loam; C = Clay

683 **Table 5:** Soil fertility status for the selected schemes of Mpwapwa district

| Soil fertility unit symbol | Texture | S (%) | Soil fertility description |          |        |           |           |           |          |          |                     | Area  |      |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|----------------------------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|---------------------|-------|------|
|                            |         |       | pH                         | TN       | P      | K         | Ca        | Mg        | OM       | CEC      | ESP                 | Ha    | %    |
| Chipogolo                  |         |       |                            |          |        |           |           |           |          |          |                     |       |      |
| CH-Pi1                     | CL      | 3-4   | Very slightly acid         | Very low | Low    | High      | High      | Medium    | Very low | Low      | Slightly sodic      | 48.0  | 36.8 |
| CH-Pi2                     | SCL     | 1-2   | Neutral                    | Very low | Medium | Medium    | Medium    | Low       | Very low | Very low | Non-sodic           | 35.0  | 26.9 |
| CH-Pa1                     | C       | < 1   | Slightly acid              | low      | Medium | Very high | Medium    | High      | Low      | High     | Slightly sodic      | 47.3  | 36.3 |
| Total                      |         |       |                            |          |        |           |           |           |          |          |                     | 130.3 | 100  |
| Msagali                    |         |       |                            |          |        |           |           |           |          |          |                     |       |      |
| MSAG-Pa1                   | SCL     | < 1   | Very slightly acid         | Very low | Low    | High      | Very high | High      | Very low | Medium   | Very strongly sodic | 98.5  | 37.4 |
| MSAG-Pa2                   | C       | < 1   | Mildly alkaline            | Very low | Low    | Low       | Very high | Medium    | Very low | Medium   | Non-sodic           | 35.0  | 13.3 |
| MSAG-Pa3                   | C       | < 1   | Moderately alkaline        | Very low | Low    | Medium    | High      | Very high | Low      | Medium   | Non-sodic           | 81.5  | 30.9 |
| MSAG-Pa4                   | SCL     | <4    | Mildly alkaline            | Very low | Low    | Medium    | Medium    | Low       | Very low | Very low | Moderately sodic    | 48.5  | 18.4 |
| Total                      |         |       |                            |          |        |           |           |           |          |          |                     | 263.5 | 100  |

684

685 Classification: According to NSS (1990) guidelines. CH = Chipogolo; MSAG = Msagali; Pa = Plain; Pi = Piedmont; S (%) = Slope percent;  
686 TN = Total Nitrogen; P = Phosphorus; K = Potassium; Ca = Calcium; Mg = Magnesium; OM = Organic Matter; CEC = Cation Exchange  
687 Capacity; ESP = Exchangeable Sodium Percentage; SCL = Sand Clay Loam; CL = Clay Loam; C = Clay