

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Soil erosion and degradation</b>	<b>3</b>
The Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE)	<b>4</b>
Limitations of the USLE	<b>8</b>
USLE-derived models	<b>12</b>
Soil erosion in the tropics	<b>14</b>
<b>1.2 Remote sensing of environments</b>	<b>15</b>
A brief history of remote sensing	<b>19</b>
ASTER	<b>21</b>
Vegetation indices	<b>24</b>
Image limitations and interpretation	<b>28</b>
<b>1.3 Spectroscopy</b>	<b>31</b>
Sensing soil quality	<b>32</b>
Calibration and prediction using PLS regression	<b>33</b>
Additional applications and benefits	<b>36</b>
<b>1.4 Synthesis</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2. STUDY AREA</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>2.1 Human development in Tanzania</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>2.2 The political economy of agriculture in Tanzania</b>	<b>43</b>
Tanzanian socialism— <i>Ujamaa</i> : 1967 – 1985	<b>44</b>
The Structural Adjustment Programs: 1985 – present	<b>48</b>
<b>2.3 Kambi ya Simba and its environs</b>	<b>49</b>
Regional geology	<b>53</b>
Village geography	<b>53</b>
Soils and the NSS classification system	<b>54</b>
Climate	<b>57</b>
Vegetation ecology	<b>58</b>
<b>2.4 Agriculture and its history in Kambi ya Simba</b>	<b>59</b>
Settlement and agriculture before 1974	<b>61</b>
<i>Villigization</i> : 1974 – 1976	<b>61</b>

In the wake of <i>villigization</i> : 1976 – 1990	62
Marginalization and unaccompanied growth: 1990 – 2004	63
<b>2.5 Soil conservation in Kambi ya Simba</b>	<b>66</b>
Tillage	67
Livestock management	67
Contour ridges	68
Residue management	70
<b>3. METHODS</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>3.1 Farmer surveys</b>	<b>72</b>
Fields and crop productivity	72
Management factors	74
Socioeconomic factors	76
Sample size and distribution bias	77
<b>3.2 Remote sensing</b>	<b>79</b>
ASTER image preprocessing and georeferencing	80
Soil type mapping	83
Land use mapping	85
SLA-NDVI	90
<b>3.3 Soil sampling, spectroscopy, and quality predictions</b>	<b>95</b>
Sampling methods and distribution	95
Soil spectroscopy and calibration to soil quality indicators	96
<b>3.4 Estimating soil loss</b>	<b>105</b>
Erosivity (R)	106
Erodibility (K)	108
Slope length (L)	112
Slope steepness (S)	113
Cropping (C) and protection (P)	113
Applying the soil loss equation	115
<b>4. RESULTS</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>4.1 Farmer surveys</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>4.2 Remote sensing</b>	<b>123</b>
Soil and land use mapping	123
SLA-NDVI	128
<b>4.3 Soil spectra and quality predictions</b>	<b>131</b>
Spectral variation among samples and averages	132
Soil quality indicators derived from spectra	141
Correlation of ground truth management practices to ASTER	143
<b>4.4 Soil loss estimates</b>	<b>144</b>
Correlating soil loss estimates to vegetation density	151
Correlating soil loss estimates to other trends among soil types	153

<b>5. DISCUSSION</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>5.1 Farmer surveys</b>	<b>155</b>
The quality of survey data	155
Crop productivity	156
Management practices, field age and field size	158
Socioeconomics	164
<b>5.2 Remote sensing</b>	<b>170</b>
The quality of ASTER data	170
Soil type and land use mapping	170
The extent of cultivation	172
Residue management	174
SLA-NDVI	176
<b>5.3 Soil spectra and quality predictions</b>	<b>177</b>
The quality of soil spectra and DRS predictions	178
Spectral variation and composition among soil types	179
Spectral variation and composition among land use types	181
Spectral variation and composition within land use types	184
Soil quality of fields among soil types	187
Soil quality of fields by management practices	189
Correlation of ground truth management practices to ASTER	191
<b>5.4 Soil loss estimates</b>	<b>192</b>
Differences in soil loss estimates among/within regions/soil types	193
Validating soil loss estimates	196
Correlations to ground truth observations	200
<b>6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FARMERS</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>6.1 Useful trees and shrubs for Kambi ya Simba</b>	<b>212</b>
<b>6.2 Agricultural recommendations by soil type</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>6.3 Recommendations for livestock management</b>	<b>221</b>
<b>6.4 Target areas</b>	<b>223</b>
Sites 1-5	223
Sites 6-9	224
Sites 10-13	225
Sites 14-20	226
<b>6.5 Taking action</b>	<b>227</b>
<b>7. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>228</b>
<b>8. REFERENCES</b>	<b>231</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>241</b>

<b>A. Soil type descriptions</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>B. Methods and results for 2002 fieldwork</b>	<b>250</b>
1. Methods	250
1.1 Variables	250
1.2 Farmer surveys and walking transects	251
2. Results	258
2.1 Land use	258
2.2 Soil erosion	261
2.3 Crop productivity	262
2.4 Conservation measures	263
3. Questionnaire	266
<b>C. 2003 Farmer surveys</b>	<b>268</b>
1. Additional tables	268
2. Calculating livestock carrying capacity	273
3. Questionnaire form	274
<b>D. Geometric correction by resampling</b>	<b>275</b>
<b>E. Soil sampling, spectra, and quality indicators</b>	<b>276</b>
1. Soil sample descriptions	276
2. Soil spectra	282
2.1 Reflectance measurements	282
2.2 Calibrations	285
2.3 Soil quality predictions	286

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1.1** Original nomograph for estimating the LS (slope-based) factor in the USLE (cf. Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)
- Figure 1.1.2** Original nomograph for estimating the C (cropping canopy cover) factor in the USLE (cf. Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)
- Figure 1.1.3** Original nomograph for estimating the C (cropping surface cover) factor in the USLE (cf. Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)
- Figure 1.1.4** Original nomograph for estimating the K (soil erodibility) factor in the USLE (cf. Wischmeier and Smith, 1978)
- Figure 1.2.1** The electromagnetic spectrum (cf. Kaiser, 2002)
- Figure 1.2.2** Atmospheric transmission and absorption of the Sun's incident electromagnetic energy (cf. Jensen, 2000)
- Figure 1.2.3** Spectral features of healthy vegetation in the VNIR – MIR range (cf. Campbell, 1996)
- Figure 1.2.4** ASTER NIR over red (simple ratio) reflectance for an agricultural landscape
- Figure 1.2.5** Distribution of pixels in NIR/red multispectral space (a) and their migration during the typical agricultural growing season (cf. Jensen, 2000)
- Figure 1.4.1** Flowchart showing the general methodology in GIS-based applications of the USLE
- Figure 2.3.1** Political map of Tanzania (Arusha Region outlined in pink)
- Figure 2.3.2** Map of Arusha Region
- Figure 2.3.3** Kambi ya Simba and its environs
- Figure 2.3.4** 3-D surface view and cross-section of the village topography and regions
- Figure 3.i** Venn diagram of methodology
- Figure 3.ii** Flowchart showing methods employed in generating soil loss estimates, assessing their validity, and using them to assist developmental planning

- Figure 3.2.1** Bad DEM data appear white in original DEM and black in shaded relief
- Figure 3.2.2** Example of four adjacent soil types of differing stoniness based on VNIR land use differences
- Figure 3.2.3** Example of two adjacent soil types of differing slope based on (a) shaded relief, (b) VNIR, (c) slope, and (d) MIR Band 4
- Figure 3.2.4** Spectrum of simple ratio values indicating thresholds for each region's soil types' land use types
- Figure 3.2.5** Broad land use classification using simple ratio thresholds on Central valley subset
- Figure 3.2.6** Field land use classification using simple ratio thresholds on portion of RU1 subset
- Figure 3.2.7** Example of soil line equation derivation
- Figure 3.2.8** Weighted linear equation showing decline in NIR reflectance with altitude for use in SLA-NDVI
- Figure 3.3.1** Georeferenced soil sample locations and samples selected for laboratory analysis
- Figure 3.3.2** Reflectance spectra for soil samples from bush/graze selected for laboratory analysis and used in PLS calibration
- Figure 3.3.3** Reflectance spectra for soil samples from maize fields selected for laboratory analysis and used in PLS calibration
- Figure 3.3.4** Reflectance spectra for soil samples from wheat fields selected for laboratory analysis and used in PLS calibration
- Figure 3.3.5** Fit of soil quality indicators measured in the laboratory with predicted values from calibration to soil spectra
- Figure 3.3.6** Example of using PLS-derived multivariate equation to predict clay content from first derivative values at key wavelengths
- Figure 3.4.1** Altitudinal rainfall gradient for Kambi ya Simba (cf. data in Magoggo, 1997)
- Figure 3.4.2** Average distribution of rainfall intensities during storm events for East Africa (adapted from Edwards et al., 1983)

- Figure 3.4.3** Erosivity (R-factor) by elevation (as a product of average annual rainfall) in Kambi ya Simba village
- Figure 3.4.4** Logarithmic plot of grain size analysis diameter by cumulative bulk weight percentage for the 10 soil samples selected for laboratory analysis
- Figure 3.4.5** Erodibility (K-factor) by clay content and OMC for Kambi ya Simba
- Figure 3.4.6** Slope-derived factors in the USLE
- Figure 3.4.7** Cropping factor values generated by October SLA-NDVI values
- Figure 4.2.1** Soil type map of Kambi ya Simba (October 2002)
- Figure 4.2.2** Land use map of Kambi ya Simba (October 2002)
- Figure 4.2.3** Land use map of Kambi ya Simba (October 2002) with fields distinguished by presence of residues
- Figure 4.2.4** Comparison of two vegetation indices by ability to predict actual land use classification
- Figure 4.2.5** Difference map showing pixels where SLA-NDVI outperforms MSAVI
- Figure 4.3.1** Spectral regions where variation among samples is greatest
- Figure 4.3.2** Spectral variation by soil type
- Figure 4.3.3** Spectral variation by land use type
- Figure 4.3.4** Spectral variation between two different soil samples taken from areas of dense bush
- Figure 4.3.5** Spectral variation among three different soil samples taken from grazing areas
- Figure 4.3.6** Spectral variation among three different soil samples taken from maize fields
- Figure 4.3.7** Spectral variation among three different soil samples taken from wheat fields
- Figure 4.4.1** Map of estimated soil loss risk (non-slope equation)

- Figure 4.4.2** Map of estimated soil loss risk (slope-dependent equation)
- Figure 4.4.3** Map of R-factor (rainfall erosivity)
- Figure 4.4.4** Map of slope values in degrees (for input into the LS factor)
- Figure 4.4.5** Map of DRS predicted clay content (wt %) for input into the K-factor (soil erodibility)
- Figure 4.4.6** Map of DRS predicted soil organic matter content for input into the K-factor (soil erodibility)
- Figure 4.4.7** Histogram showing percentages of each heavily cultivated soil type's fields' estimated soil loss ranking
- Figure 4.4.8** Strength of correlations between soil loss estimates and June SLA-NDVI by soil type
- Figure 4.4.9** Strength of correlations between soil loss estimates and June SLA-NDVI for fields in the heavily cultivated soil types
- Figure 4.4.10** Standardized distribution of important trends in fields for heavily cultivated soil types
- Figure 5.4.1** Map of estimated soil loss risk (non-slope equation) with numbers corresponding to photographs in Figure 5.4.2 – 5.4.17
- Figure 5.4.2** Photograph #1 (2002): Recently cleared wheat fields (some residues and grassy vegetation are present) with Northern Highlands Forest Reserve in background. Soil type RU1; 1800 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.3** Photograph #2 (2002): Recently cleared wheat fields with beans sprouting. Soil type RU2; 1800 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.4** Photograph #3 (2002): Gully formation on valley side. Soil type V; 1720 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.5** Photograph #4 (2003): Wheat fields with recently constructed contour ridges intercropped with *A. tortilis*. Soil type RU1; 1680 m elevation; moderate/high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.6** Photograph #5 (2003): Small-scale irrigation of vegetables and cabbage. Soil type RU1; 1650 m elevation; moderate/low erosion risk.

- Figure 5.4.7** Photograph #6 (2003): Commercial flower farm with vegetated contour ridges. Soil type RU2; 1640 m elevation; moderate erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.8** Photograph #7 (2003): Expanding gully in shallow valley down slope from areas of extensive cultivation. Soil type V; 1560 m elevation; moderate/high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.9** Photograph #8 (2002): Large, expanding gully in heavily grazed area near village center. Soil type V; 1520 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.10** Photograph #9 (2002): Gully surrounded by small sisal hedges near soccer field in village center. Soil type M; 1510 m elevation; moderate/high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.11** Photograph #10 (2002): View of village center, grazing lands and areas of dense bush. Soil type RU3/M; 1520 m elevation; moderate/low erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.12** Photograph #11 (2003): Small sunflower field with residues/greens present (and the Rift Valley escarpment by the horizon). Soil type RL1; 1470 m elevation; moderate/high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.13** Photograph #12 (2002): Small-scale cultivation with contour ridges in valley sides near settlements. Soil type V/RL1; 1450 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.14** Photograph #13 (2002): Recently cleared bean fields with residues/greens present. Soil type RL2; 1430 m elevation; moderate erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.15** Photograph #14 (2002): Family in recently cleared field of maize/pigeon peas with residues present. Soil type L1; 1420 m elevation; moderate/low erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.16** Photograph #15 (2002): Recently cleared, small maize field near settlement with some greens present. Soil type L1; 1400 m elevation; moderate erosion risk.
- Figure 5.4.17** Photograph #16 (2002): Steep Rift Valley scarp with dense bush. Soil type V (E); 1370 m elevation; high erosion risk.
- Figure 6.i** Map of estimated soil loss risk (non-slope equation) with numbers corresponding to areas of greatest need for soil conservation and agroforestry development

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1.1.1</b>	Sample lookup table for the K (soil erodibility) factor in the USLE (cf. Stone and Hilborn, 2003)
<b>Table 1.2.1</b>	ASTER bands at spatial resolution at nadir
<b>Table 2.3.1</b>	Soil type descriptions and physiography (NSS, 1989)
<b>Table 3.1.1</b>	Range of socioeconomic group rating values by group
<b>Table 3.1.2</b>	Survey population (n) by region/soil type and field type
<b>Table 3.1.3</b>	Survey population (n) by field age and management practices
<b>Table 3.2.1</b>	Description of land use types for mapping
<b>Table 3.2.2</b>	Seasonal VNIR difference in subsequently defined land use types
<b>Table 3.2.3</b>	Simple ratio threshold values for fields (residues vs. bare) by soil type
<b>Table 3.2.4</b>	Formulae for vegetation indices used in comparison with SLA-NDVI
<b>Table 3.3.1</b>	Distribution of soil sample populations (n)
<b>Table 3.3.2</b>	Coefficients used to predict soil quality indicators from spectral data
<b>Table 3.4.1</b>	On-site land use categories and their respective remotely defined categories
<b>Table 3.4.2</b>	Weight of variables used in generating soil loss estimates
<b>Table 4.1.1</b>	2003 average crop productivity by region/soil type
<b>Table 4.1.2</b>	Crop productivity for wheat and maize by field age and management practices
<b>Table 4.1.3</b>	Significance of younger field age/positive management practices and higher productivity
<b>Table 4.1.4</b>	Survey demographics (n) by socioeconomic group with percentages relative to socioeconomic group size
<b>Table 4.1.5</b>	Crop surplus income and survey demographics by socioeconomic group
<b>Table 4.1.6</b>	Distribution of land and field types by socioeconomic group

<b>Table 4.1.7</b>	Geographic distribution of land by socioeconomic group
<b>Table 4.1.8</b>	Management practices and field age populations (n) by socioeconomic group
<b>Table 4.1.9</b>	The interrelation of crop productivity, positive management practices rating, and field age by socioeconomic group
<b>Table 4.1.10</b>	Distribution of large and small fields by socioeconomic group, soil type, field age, and positive management practices rating
<b>Table 4.2.1</b>	Extent of bush/graze by region/soil type
<b>Table 4.2.2</b>	Extent of fields and residue management by region/soil type
<b>Table 4.2.3</b>	Percentage of land use types correctly classified in post-harvest (October) image using vegetation indices
<b>Table 4.2.4</b>	Pre-harvest (June) image differences in SLA-NDVI and MSI with residue management by region/soil type
<b>Table 4.2.5</b>	Seasonal SLA-NDVI differences in fields by soil type
<b>Table 4.3.1</b>	Changes in soil quality indicators since 1989 by region/soil type
<b>Table 4.3.2</b>	Averaged soil quality indicators for fields within each soil type
<b>Table 4.3.3</b>	Averaged soil quality indicators by field type
<b>Table 4.3.4</b>	Averaged soil quality indicators by tillage method for each field type
<b>Table 4.3.5</b>	Averaged soil quality indicators by vegetated contour ridges for each field type
<b>Table 4.3.6</b>	Average SLA-NDVI/MSI values for georeferenced fields by management practices
<b>Table 4.4.1</b>	Numerical soil loss estimates (A) in $10^3$ kg/ha/yr and their corresponding rankings, as derived from the non-slope equation
<b>Table 4.4.2</b>	Estimated soil loss risk by soil type (non-slope equation)
<b>Table 4.4.3</b>	Estimated soil loss risk and cover for fields by residue management
<b>Table 4.4.4</b>	Estimated soil loss risk and cover within grazing areas
<b>Table 5.4.1</b>	Slope thresholds for each ranking group to maintain tolerable soil loss

