

**A GIS EVALUATION OF SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT  
FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE IN EL FAYOUM  
GOVERNORATE, EGYPT**

BY

*B-16918*

**MAHMOUD ALI ABDELFATTAH ABDELRAZEK**

B. Sc., (Soil Science), Cairo University, El Fayoum Branch, (1991)

M. Sc., (Soil Science), ITC, Enschede, The Netherlands, (1998)

***A THESIS***

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**In**

**Agricultural Sciences (Soil Science)**

**Soils and Water Department**

**Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum  
Cairo University**

**2002**

**A GIS EVALUATION OF SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT  
FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE IN EL FAYOUM  
GOVERNORATE, EGYPT**

**By  
MAHMOUD ALI ABDELFATTAH ABDELRAZEK**

**THESIS OF  
Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Sciences  
(Soil Science)**

**Soils and Water Department  
Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum,  
Cairo University**

**Supervised by:**

- 1- Prof. Dr. El Sayed Abd El Hay Khater**  
Prof. of Soil Sci. and Vice Dean, Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum,  
Cairo University.

Signature: E. A. Khater

- 2- Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Shendi**  
Associate Prof. of Soil Sci., Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum,  
Cairo University.

Signature: M. M. Shendi

**2002**

**A GIS EVALUATION OF SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT  
FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE IN EL FAYOUM  
GOVERNORATE, EGYPT**

**By**

**MAHMOUD ALI ABDELFATTAH ABDELRAZEK**

***THESIS***

**Thesis of Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Sciences  
(Soil Science)**

**Soils and Water Department**

**Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum, Cairo University**

**Approved by:**

**1- Prof. Dr. Hassan Hamza Abbas**

Prof. of Soil Sci., Faculty of Agriculture at Moshtohor, Zagazig Univ.

Signature: H. H. Abbas

**2- Prof. Dr. Shawki Ahmed Sadek**

Prof. of Soil Sci., Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University.

Signature: Sh. A. Sadek

**3- Prof. Dr. El Sayed Abd El Hay Khater**

Prof. of Soil Sci. and Vice Dean, Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum,  
Cairo University.

Signature: E. A. Khater

**4- Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Shendi**

Associate Prof. of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture at El Fayoum,  
Cairo University.

Signature: M. M. Shendi

**Date: 27 / 6 / 2002**

## ABSTRACT

The current study was carried out on the soils of Sinnouris District, El Fayoum Governorate, Egypt. The studied area lies between latitudes  $29^{\circ} 5'$  and  $29^{\circ} 35'$  N and longitudes  $30^{\circ} 20'$  and  $31^{\circ} 10'$  E. Over-utilization and inadequate management of the existing resources (i.e., soil, water and land use) are the main causes of unsustainable development in the studied area. Thus, the present study aimed to identify method for assessing land use sustainability index "LUSI" using GIS techniques. This index is a criterion for assessing agricultural sustainability considering the degree of land use suitabilities and the current land use. It is expected that the suggested methodology would be widely used, not just in the studied area, this was performed through some specific objectives, i.e., to conduct a detailed soil survey based on the geopedological approach, in order to determine soil properties and its relevant land qualities; to prepare a comprehensive database for the whole studied area based on field soil survey and the available data and materials; to conduct a land suitability evaluation "physical and economic" using the Automated Land Evaluation System (ALES); and to study the current land use map of the studied area. To fulfill these objectives a pilot study area at Sinnouris District was selected to implement the proposed methodology.

Aerial photo-interpretation was first undertaken for the preparation of geopedological map using stereoscopic analysis. Modified geopedological approach was applied by crossing the base soil map with the slope and texture maps. To minimize the fieldwork, an integration of the previous studies done at Soil and Water Department, Faculty of Agriculture El Fayoum has been considered. Geomorphologically, one landscape was identified which is the plain landscape, containing 12 landform and 34 mapping units. The mapping units were strictly verified in the field, four transect sample areas including 11 soil profiles were selected to represent the different mapping units, besides, minipits and testing augers samples were intensively made. The soil profiles were carefully described in situ, the main physical and chemical characteristics of the different mapping units were determined and stored into ILWIS-GIS databases. The soils were classified up to the family level according to the protocol of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA Soil Taxonomy, 1998). The main soils in the studied area are Vertisols, Entisols and Aridisols.

The Integrated Land and Water Information System (ILWIS), was used as a data processing environment, it has been intensively used in all the processing steps of the present study, all its vector and raster facilities were used for making maps, overlaying, crossing, calculating and classifying purposes. The Automated Land Evaluation System (ALES), was used to perform land suitability evaluation, on the basis of the FAO land evaluation framework, through building up expert system and decision trees. Land use types were mapped based on the existing crop rotation maps and local interviews. Summer and winter land use maps were prepared to fulfil the requirements of the proposed methodology.

Following the FAO land evaluation framework, by means of ALES software, the land physical suitability evaluation was done. Ten land use types were selected based on the former research studies carried out in the studied area and several interviews during the fieldwork from March to May 2000. The selected land use types are: cotton, wheat, maize, sorghum, rice, sugar beet, onion, olive, mango and citrus.

Five land qualities were considered based on the requirements of the selected LUTs, i.e., salinity & alkalinity, nutrient availability, moisture availability, oxygen availability and rooting conditions. The physical evaluation results indicated that the southern and middle parts of the studied area (high and moderately high terraces) are classified as moderately and highly suitable. Whereas, the northern parts "the low terraces", as near as Qarun Lake, are mostly classified as marginally or not suitable due to their salinity and or alkalinity constraints.

A general economic land evaluation was done, Net Present Value (NPV) and Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) were used to give an overview of the economic situation of the current land use types. The results of the economic evaluation indicated that: 1- Mango, onion, olive and cotton are the highest profitable land use types concerning both NPV and BCR; 2- Sugar beet, although, is a newly introduced land use type in the study area, its economic situation is acceptable and promising; and 3- Rice, wheat, sorghum and maize, the main and essential cereal crops for home consumption are economically fall in the middle of the rating concerning both net present value and benefit cost ratio.

Considering the land physical suitability of the ongoing land use types and the current land use types, in ILWIS-GIS environment, the Land Use Sustainability Index "LUSI" was calculated as an index for assessing agricultural sustainability. This index was used as an indicator to appraise the sustainability of the on-going land use types. The results of Land Use Sustainability Index (LUSI) indicate that most of the selected land use types are classified as sustainable land use which are: cotton, wheat, maize, rice, onion, mango and citrus, two of them are classified as highly sustainable land use types: sorghum; and olive and only one land use is classified as somewhat sustainable land use which is sugar beet.

**Key words:**

Sustainable agriculture, Soil & Water management, Land use types, Land Evaluation, El Fayoum soils, GIS, ILWIS and ALES Systems.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First of all, I am full of gratitude and thanks to GOD who provided me with patient, knowledge and strength to complete this research work.

I am grateful to Prof. Dr. El Sayed Abdel Hay Khater, Professor of Soil Science and Vice Dean, Soils and Water Department, Faculty of Agriculture, El Fayoum, Cairo University, Egypt, main supervisor for his invaluable support, guidance and encouragement throughout this research work. My thanks and gratitude are due to Dr. Mahmoud Mohammed Shendi, Associate Professor of Soil Science, Soils and Water Department, Faculty of Agriculture, El Fayoum, Cairo University, Egypt for his kind help, assistance and positive guidance as a second supervisor.

I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Rossiter, Head of Soil Science Division, ITC, Enschede, the Netherlands for his instant response whenever I need help in using ALES software, also to Dr. Farshad and Prof. Zinck, ITC, the Netherlands for their continuous encouragement.

Finally, I would like to remember my family, particularly my wife, for their help, patient, understanding and support, I owe so much for them, thanks all.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page No.</i>
ABSTRACT	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
LIST OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VIII
LIST OF MAPS	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	X
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1. BACKGROUND-----	1
1.2. RESEARCH PROBLEM-----	2
1.3. RESEACH OBJECTIVES-----	3
1.3.1. Main objective-----	3
1.3.2. Specific objectives-----	3
 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	 4
2.1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA-----	4
2.1.1. Location-----	4
2.1.2. Climate-----	4
2.1.3. Geology-----	7
2.1.4. Geomorphology-----	8
2.2. Sustainability-----	12
2.2.1. Definitions of sustainability-----	13
2.2.2. Principles of sustainability-----	15
2.2.3. Types of sustainability-----	16
2.2.4. Disrupting factors in agricultural sustainability-----	16
(1) Soil degradation-----	17
(2) Aridification-----	17
(3) Desertification-----	18
2.2.5. Methodological approaches to assess and analyze sustainability-----	18
2.2.5.1. Conventional approaches-----	19
(1) Land evaluation techniques-----	19
(2) Productive potential estimation-----	20
(a) The productivity performance equation (Lal et al., 1990)-----	20
(b) Productivity indices-----	20
2.2.5.2. Modern approaches-----	21
2.2.6. Validity (aspects) of researches in sustainability-----	21
2.2.7. Sustainability from an Egyptian prospective-----	22
2.3. Land Evaluation-----	22
2.3.1. Land resources survey and land evaluation-----	22
2.3.2. Definitions of land evaluation-----	24
2.3.3. Development of land evaluation as a discipline-----	24
2.3.4. The need for land evaluation-----	25

2.3.5. Objectives and questions that land evaluation should answer-----	25
2.3.6. Main land evaluation methods presently in the world-----	26
2.3.6.1. The Land Capability Classification-----	27
2.3.6.2. FAO Framework for Land Evaluation (FAO, 1976)-----	28
2.3.7. Selection of a land evaluation system-----	29
2.3.8. Description of the FAO Framework for Land Evaluation-----	31
2.3.8.1. Principles-----	31
2.3.9. Automated Land Evaluation System – ALES-----	32
2.3.9.1. Definition and components-----	32
2.3.9.2. ALES components-----	33
2.3.9.3. Kinds of ALES users-----	34
2.3.9.4. Structure of ALES evaluation-----	34
2.4. Geographical Information Systems (GIS)-----	35
<b>3. MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.1. DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING STAGE-----</b>	<b>37</b>
3.1.1. Interpretation of aerial photographs-----	38
3.1.1.1. The geopedological approach-----	38
3.1.2. Collecting and digitizing of different maps into ILWIS-----	40
3.1.3. Collecting and digitizing of land use maps-----	40
3.1.4. Fieldwork-----	41
3.1.4.1. Pre-fieldwork activities-----	42
3.1.4.2. Fieldwork activities-----	42
3.1.4.3. Post-fieldwork activities-----	43
3.1.4.4. Materials used-----	46
3.1.5. Laboratory analyses-----	46
3.1.5.1. Physical analyses-----	46
3.1.5.2. Chemical analyses-----	47
3.1.6. Re-interpretation of mapping units using ILWIS-GISaerial photographs-----	47
3.1.5. Final geopedological map-----	48
<b>3.2. DATA INTERPRETATION AND ASSESSMENT STAGE-----</b>	<b>48</b>
3.2.1. Land suitability evaluation, physical and economic, using ALES system-----	48
3.2.1.1. The FAO framework-----	48
3.2.1.2. The ALES system-----	55
3.2.2. Assessment of agricultural sustainability-----	56
3.2.3. Presentation of final maps and results-----	58
<b>3.3. Application of Geographical Information Systems-----</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>4.1. PHYSIOGRAPHY AND SOILS-----</b>	<b>60</b>
4.1.1. Soils of the Fayoum Depression-----	60
4.1.2. Soils of the study area-----	61
4.1.2.1. Assessment and characterization of present geo-pedomorphic units	61
4.1.2.2. Soils of the higher terraces (Pl 1)-----	62
a. Soils of the nearly level terrace tread (Pl 111)-----	62
b. Gently sloping terrace tread (Pl 121)-----	66
c. Basin (Pl 122)-----	67
4.1.2.3. The soils of the moderately high terraces (Pl 2)-----	68



a. Nearly level terrace tread (Pl 211)-----	68
b. Sloping terrace tread (Pl 212)-----	69
c. Basin (Pl 213)-----	71
4.1.2.4. Soils of the moderately low terraces (Pl 3)-----	71
4.1.2.5. Soils of the low terraces (Pl 4)-----	73
a. Nearly level to gently sloping terrace tread (Pl 411)-----	74
b. Basin covered with sand sheet (Pl 412)-----	75
c. Marches (Pl 413)-----	76
4.1.2.6. Soils of the incisions (Pl 5)-----	77
a. Vales (Pl 511)-----	77
b. Overflow-mantel (Pl 512)-----	78
<b>4.2. Land Evaluation-----</b>	<b>85</b>
4.2.1. Land use types-----	85
4.2.1.1. Selection of land use types-----	85
4.2.1.2. Description of the selected land use types-----	86
(1) LUT1: Semi-mechanized cotton-----	86
(2) LUT2: Semi-mechanized wheat-----	87
(3) LUT3: Semi-mechanized maize-----	87
(4) LUT4: Semi-mechanized sorghum-----	87
(5) LUT5: Semi-mechanized rice-----	87
(6) LUT6: Semi-mechanized sugar beet-----	88
(7) LUT7: Semi mechanized onion-----	88
(8) LUT8: Semi-mechanized olive intercropped with date palm-----	88
(9) LUT9: Semi-mechanized mango intercropped with grape & date palms	89
(10) LUT10: Semi mechanized citrus-----	89
4.2.1.3. Crop calendar of the selected land use types-----	89
4.2.2. Land use requirements-----	90
4.2.3. Economical data-----	97
4.2.4. Physical data (Land Qualities "LQs")-----	100
(1) Salinity and alkalinity-----	100
(2) Nutrient availability-----	101
(3) Moisture availability-----	101
(4) Oxygen availability-----	101
(5) Rooting conditions-----	102
4.2.5. Matching land use requirements and land qualities-----	102
4.2.5.1. Application of the Automated Land Evaluation System (ALES)----	102
4.2.5.2. The decision procedure-----	105
(1) Land use requirement severity level decision tree-----	105
(2) Physical suitability sub-class decision tree-----	106
4.2.6. Land map units-----	108
4.2.7. Physical land evaluation (physical suitability classes)-----	108
4.2.7.1. Discussion and comments-----	114
4.2.8. General economical land evaluation-----	128
4.2.8.1. Discussion and comments-----	130
<b>4.3. ASSESSMENT OF AGRICUTLRUAL SUSTAINABILITY-----</b>	<b>131</b>
4.3.1. Discussion and comments-----	133
 <b>5. SUMMERY AND CONCLUSIONS-----</b>	 <b>137</b>

## List of contents

5.1. TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES-----	137
5.2. PHYSIOGRAPHY AND SOILS-----	138
5.3. LAND EVALUATION-----	138
5.3.1. Physical land evaluation-----	138
5.3.1. Economical land evaluation-----	141
5.4. AGRICULTURAL SUSTAINABILITY-----	141
5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS-----	142
 REFERENCES-----	 142
APPENDICES-----	152
ARABIC SUMMARY-----	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<i>Page No.</i>
Table (1). Mean monthly temperature, rainfall, evaporation and relative humidity in the study area (for the period 1931 - 1989)-----	6
Table (2). Landforms of the Fayoum depression as indicated in the literature----	12
Table (3). Legend of the geopedological units-----	52
Table (4). Suitability ratings-----	57
Table (5). Sustainability classification-----	57
Table (6). Map units specifications "main soil, modal profile and type of map unit" in each mapping unit-----	64
Table (7). Particle size distribution, $\text{CaCO}_3$ , and organic matter content in the studied soil profiles-----	79
Table (8). Analysis of soil paste extracts of the studied soils-----	81
Table (9). Exchangeable cations, cation exchange capacity (cmolc/kg) and exchangeable sodium percent "ESP" in the studied soil profiles-----	83
Table (10). Selected land use types-----	86
Table (11). Crop calendar for the selected land use types in the study area-----	90
Table (12). Land use requirements for LUT 1: (Cotton)-----	91
Table (13). Land use requirements for LUT2: (Wheat)-----	92
Table (14). Land use requirements for LUT3: (Maize)-----	92
Table (15). Land use requirements for LUT4: (Sorghum)-----	93
Table (16). Land use requirements for LUT5: (Rice)-----	93
Table (17). Land use requirements for LUT5: (Rice)-----	94
Table (18). Land use requirements for LUT 7 (Onion)-----	94
Table (19). Land use requirements for LUT 8: (Olive intercropped with date palm)-----	95
Table (20). Land use requirements for LUT 9: (Mango intercropped with date palm and grape)-----	95
Table (21). Land use requirements for LUT 10 (Citrus mostly orange)-----	96
Table (22). Output parameters "mean, optimum, prices and total output" for the selected land use types-----	97
Table (23). General inputs for the permanent LUTs-----	97
Table (24). Detailed inputs per feddan for the selected land use types (Cotton, Rice, Wheat and Onion" (1998-1999)-----	98
Table (25). Land map units characteristics-----	103
Table (26). Land evaluation results (Physical suitability)-----	109
Table (27). The best land use"s" for each map unit, "for planning purposes"-----	111
Table (28). Area coverage per feddan for the degree of suitabilities of each land use type.-----	114
Table (29). Net Present Values and Benefit Cost Ratio for the selected land use types-----	129
Table (30). Rating of the most profitable land use type concerning Net Present Value (NPV) and Benefit Cost Ratio-----	130
Table (31). Calculation of land use sustainability index and agricultural sustainability-----	133

## LIST OF MAPS

	<i>Page No.</i>
Map (1). Location map of the study area (Sinouris District)-----	5
Map (2). Geological map of the Fayoum Depression (cited from Said, 1962)-----	9
Map (3). Geomorphology of the Fayoum Depression (after Abdel-All, 1990)-----	11
Map (4). Layers of the previous soil profiles which covered each map unit-----	44
Map (5). Location of the three transect sample areas and the studied soil profiles superimposed soil map -----	45
Map (6). Soil texture map for Sinuoris District (after Soil, Water and Environment Research Institute, 1998) -----	49
Map (7). Revised new soil texture map for Sinuoris District-----	50
Map (8). Geopedological map "soil map" of the study area-----	51
Map (9). Location of the selected cross-section used to map land use superimposed the villages map of Sinuoris District-----	54
Map (10). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 1 "Cotton"-----	118
Map (11). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 2 "Wheat"-----	119
Map (12). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 3 "Maize"-----	120
Map (13). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 4 "Sorghum"-----	121
Map (14). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 5 "Rice"-----	122
Map (15). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 6 "Sugar beet"-----	123
Map (16). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 7 "Onion"-----	124
Map (17). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 8 "Olive"-----	125
Map (18). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 9 "Mango"-----	126
Map (19). Land suitability evaluation for LUT 10 "Citrus"-----	127
Map (20). Land use map "summer crops" in the selected cross-section of the study area "generalized map"-----	135
Map (21). Land use map "winter crops" in the selected cross-section of the study area "generalized map"-----	136

## LIST OF FIGURES

		<i>Page No.</i>
Figure (1)	Mean monthly temperature, rainfall, evaporation and relative humidity in the study area (for the period 1931 - 1989)-----	8
Figure (2)	The geological time scale of the Fayoum depression-----	8
Figure (3)	The methodological approach applied on the present study-----	39
Figure (5)	Land use sustainability "LUSI" calculation-----	58
Figure (6)	Input, output and profit of the selected land use types-----	99
Figure (7)	Land use suitabilities and their percent -----	113

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. BACKGROUND

In the last few decades, the term sustainability has become a key concept to describe the successful management of the agricultural resources, particularly soil and water, to satisfy changing human needs, while maintaining or improving the quality of the environment and conserving natural resources (TAC, 1988), although methods to assess sustainability are still being developed. The concept of sustainability shows many factors therefore ecologists, environmentalists, agronomists, economists and politicians use it with different conditions. In addition, the sustainability of land management systems varies in space, according to climate, soil, technology and societal conditions. Sustainable farming system varies also in time, as they evolve and may collapse, frequently together with the corresponding socio-systems. Because of its complexity, sustainability is difficult to measure directly and requires the use of appropriate indicators for assessment. A sustainable land management system must satisfy a large variety of requirements, including technological feasibility, economic viability, political desirability, administrative manageability, social acceptability, and environmental soundness. Real world conditions at farm and policy-making levels needs to be substantially improved to achieve sustainable land management.

Worldwide, the increasing population, the problem of deterioration of soil and water, the concern for a safe environment and the conservation of natural resources lead to uncertainties in meeting future needs for food and other production and call for a sustainable use of natural resources (Oskoueï, 1997).

In most developing countries, agriculture remains the engine of the economic development and a more sustainable agriculture is more likely to provide the long-term benefits required to achieve sustainable development and poverty reduction. The foundation for sustainable agriculture is maintenance of biological production potential, particularly maintenance of land and water quality, and genetic diversity (Dumanski, 1996).