International Journal of Physical and Human Geography
Vol.3, No.1, pp.16-30, March 2015
Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

AN **ASSESSMENT OF SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF EROSION RISK IN SHAFE WATERSHED, WESTERN HILLS OF L. ABAYA, SOUTH WESTERN ETHIOPIA**

Teshome Yirgu Bayu, PhD
Department of Geography and Environmental Study, Arba Minch University, Ethiopia. P.O.B 21

ABSTRACT: *The study area is among the most affected parts of Ethiopian highlands that suffered from soil degradation of varying categories, over grazing and siltation resulted from inappropriate land use practices, and historic settlement. This paper tried to quantified rate of soil loss and regionalized erosion risk areas in intensive farming mountainous environment of Shafe watershed. In so doing, Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLM) and Geographic Information Techniques (GIS) are used to map and estimate mean annual soil loss in the area. Laboratory analysis of soil revealed except in the homestead plots, total nitrogen and organic matter content of the soil was low and progressively decreasing away from the homestead. Mean annual soil loss in the study area ranged between 0.04 t and 70 t* ha^{-1} y^{-1}*. In the area low to moderate erosion hazardous areas are found in south and central part, while high to severe erosion risk areas are concentrated in the intensively cultivated hilly northern localities. More than a third of the study watershed (32.8 %) is categorized under high to severe erosion risk area with soil loss rate ranged between 30 t and 70 t* ha^{-1} y^{-1}*.*

KEYWORDS*:* Watershed, sustainable management, Soil erosion, Universal Soil Loss Equation, and Geographic Information System.

INTRODUCTION

Soil plays an important role in the ability of ecosystems to provide diverse services necessary for human wellbeing. However, as a response to mismanagement by human being, there has been a continuous deterioration of soil and depletion of land resources. Soil erosion refers to detachment and transport of soil and soil material by water, wind, ice or gravity, where water and wind being the major factors. No substantial erosion is possible unless both detachment and transport processes are operative. In soil erosion by water, these processes are largely the result of raindrop splash, turbulence of moving water caused by raindrops and flowing water. Thus, soils that most readily detached by raindrop splash erosion are fine sands and silt. Due to its greater weight and volume coarser soil particles are less susceptible to erosion. As mentioned by Haile and Fetene (2012), fine textured soils such as clays and clay-loams are highly susceptible to detachment by erosive act of rainwater because of the strong forces of cohesion that keeps them aggregate.

The underlying cause for the excessive rate of soil loss in Ethiopia is unsustainable exploitation of land resource (forest cutting, overgrazing, expansion of cultivation into hilly and fragile environment, unwise land use practices, etc) and became the main cause for low agricultural production and thereby structural food insecurity problem (Bewket, 2002 and Amsalu et al., 2007). According to Bedadi (2004) in Ethiopia out of 60 million hectares of agriculturally productive lands, 45 percent are significantly eroded, 23.2 percent hectares are seriously eroded

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

and 3.3 percent hectares have reached the point of no return, with an estimated soil loss of 2 billion m^2 top soil per annum. The same source further stated that the average soil loss in the Ethiopian highlands as being 70 ha^{-1} y^{-1}. But the experiments conducted by Soil Conservation and Research Project in six fields in different agro-ecologies of Ethiopia (namely, Maybar, Hunde lafto, Andit Tid, Anjeleni and Dezi) reported the average annual soil loss of 42 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} from cultivated land (Hurni, 1990). It is observed that 42 tons of annual soil loss from cultivated farmland is in excess of 11 tons ha^{-1} y^{-1}, from the permissible rate of annual soil loss (Montgomery, 2007). In the same scenario, empirical studies conducted by Belay (2002) in the neighboring locality of the study area (Gununo area) revealed the rate of soil loss from cultivated land as 64 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}**.**

Literatures shown that topographic characteristics of a given area such as slope gradient length, and aspects determine the amount of run-off; it's potential to cause erosion and loss of nutrients in the soil (Lal, 1994). A climatic factor such as rainfall amount is also an important factor that affect, rainfall erosivity**.** Soil factors such as texture, structure, organic matter content, and permeability and land-use management systems are also important in deciding soil erodibility (Wischmeier and Smith 1978). In addition, cover and management factors are also important to estimate soil loss rate and regionalize erosion risk areas in a given watershed. To undertake effective soil and water conservation schemes in severely degraded and hilly terrain like the study area, the availability of spatial erosion risk map is highly beneficial. However, such types of spatial data are unavailable for the study area. Hence, this situation has initiated the researcher to undertake the study. The objective of the research is to examine spatial variation in erosion intensity and map various categories of erosion vulnerable areas in Shafe watershed.

STUDY AREA AND METHODOLOGY

Description of the study area:
The study was conducted at Shafe watershed, Eastern Gamo highland, south western Ethiopia. It lies between 6° 15"N to 6° 20' 00"N latitude and 37° 39'E to 370 50' E longitude (Fig. 1). It is dominated by rugged terrain (in the upstream) and volcanic Graben (in the downstream). Mean annual rainfall varies significantly throughout the watershed (840 mm to 1320 mm), similarly mean annual temperature also shows a great variation (between 14.6 ^{0}c and 24.6 ^{0}c). Remnant trees such as Arundinaria Alpina, Eucalyptus Globulus and Juniperus Procera in upland, Carissa Spinarum, Hagenia Abyssinica, and Syzygium Guineense in the midlands, and Carissa Spinarum, Dodonaea Viscosa, Entada Abyssinica, Acacia Albida, Albizia Malocophylla and Aloe Vera along the shores of Lake Abaya are the dominant tree species grown.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Fig. 1 Location of Shafe Watershed

Cambisols and Nitosols in the upstream, and Fluvisols in the downstream are the principal soil types. Sample soil analysis revealed at watershed level pH reaction significant variation (4.87 and 10.08 in upland and lowland respectively). Similarly due to soil clay nature and high organic matter content of soil, the coation exchange capacity (CEC) in the soil was found to be high in all land use types, which ranged between 34.57 meq /100g and 46.99 meq/100g (Table 1). According to Kjeldah method (used for nitrogen determination in soil) of rating total nitrogen content in the study area is classified as low. But organic matter content in Enset and Banana fields was found to be high as compared to other land use types. The analysis showed available phosphorus in barley and enset fields were 27.22 ppm and 235.6 ppm respectively. A study by Morgan (2005) suggested that when available phosphorus in the soil is less than 7 ppm, it should be supplemented with phosphorus fertilizer. Based on Morgans' findings, all land use types have sufficient amount of available phosphorus in the soil.

Table 1: Laboratory Result of soil sample, Shafe watershed

	Upland			Midland			Rift valley Basin		
Soil property	A	B	C	A	B	C	D	E	C
pH (H_2o)	4.87	5.74	5.36	6.92	6.38	6.9	7.47	7.78	10.08
Texture class	clay	clay	clay	Clay loam	Clay loam	Sandy loam	Silt loam	Silt loam	Silt loam
OM	2.26	3.17	0.78	0.94	3.84	1.16	1.05	2.19	1.1
Total N (%)	0.07	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.06
Av. K	48.08	110.9	161.7	235.4	425.5	144.4	227.36	190.82	443.6
Av. P	27.22	47.84	40.7	52.3	235.6	41.8	46.8	65.23	94.16
CEC	42	46.99	44	38.61	38.15	38.15	34.57	37.22	38.89

Note: *Code of the land use types: A= Barley; B= Enset (ensete ventricosum); C= Grazing; D= Maize, and E= Banana*

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

The population of Shafe watershed is about 52,441, with 2.7 % current growth rate it is expected to be doubled by 2048. Per capita landholding in the upstream is less than 0.25 hectare, without alternative source of income one can imagine the impact of growing population on fragile land resource after 36 years. In the study area livelihood of the people is basically agricultural (farming mixed with livestock rearing) but off farm activities are also carried out during the off farming seasons. Perennial trees covered a significant portion (23.7 %) of cultivated land. Thus, of perennial crops, Ensete Ventricosum in the upland, and Musa Mesta and Mangifera Indica in the lowland are an important source of food and cash income. But due to climatic variability, farmland exhaustion, and absence of supplementary means of income 35.3 % of the total population are food insecure.

Data sources and Methods of Acquisition:

In the study, both primary and secondary data were utilized. The primary data was generated through four main tools such as satellite imageries and topographic maps, Soil samples, and focus group discussion. In addition, secondary sources such as climatic and demographic data are also used. Data on slope angle, and length are derived from topographic map (1:50,000) and contour lines of various heights are digitized and computerized in GIS environment for preparing terrain elevation model (TEM), which is used to determine slope length (L) and slope steepness (S) factors. While satellite imagery (Landsat ETMA acquired in February 2006 with path 168 and row 054) was used to develop land use/cover map and to determine crop management (C factor), and conservation practices (P factor). In addition, field visit was undertaken to identify the obscured features, crop management practices and final output verification of the land use. Composite soil samples were collected from varying land use/cover types of three agro-ecologies. Sample soils were collected from 30 cm depth of each auger points by using auger and Geographic Position System (GPS). In this case, 120 samples were collected and dried and grinded for laboratory analysis for its physical and chemical properties (Table 1 and 3). Rainfall data (1998-2012) of two stations (Chencha and Mirab Abaya) were collected from the respective meteorological station for computation of rainfall erosivity (R factor) in the USLE.

METHODOLOGY

To assess annual mean soil loss and delineate erosion hazardous areas in Shafe watershed, Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) together with Remote Sensing and Geographic Information System (GIS) was utilized. Literature has confirmed the importance of Universal Soil Loss Equation, USLE to estimate mean annual soil loss rate in original or modified form (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978). But the application of GIS has further enabled its application satisfactorily to predict soil loss rate for large areas and map erosion risk areas in the watershed (Mellerowcz et al., 1994 and Bewket and Tereri, 2009). USLE model was computed using the formula, A = R*K*L*S*C*P (tons per hectare per year) Where,

A is calculated annual soil loss (tonne/ha/year),

R is rainfall erosivity, K is soil erodibility factor, S is slope steepness factor, L is slope length factor, C is cropping and management factor, and P is conservation practice factor.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

Factors used in USLE prediction

Rainfall Erosivity (R) Factor:

It is defined as detachment and transportation of soil due to raindrop impact and runoff, primarily depends on the intensity and the amount of rainfall. The term 'rain erosivity index' was used in the universal soil loss equation to describe the influence of rainfall in rain erosion. In order to calculate R-value the researcher used formula modified and adapted to the Ethiopian conditions (Hurni, 1985a). Accordingly, R= -8.12+ (0.562 * P) where; R is rainfall erosivity factor and P is mean annual precipitation (mm). Thus, the estimated value of erosivity for the upland and low land was 54.04 and 29.31, respectively (Table 2). Then this data was converted to a surface grid of 30 m cell size using ArcGIS taking R-factor as the value for cell as presented in Figure 2.

Table 2 mean annual rainfall and rainfall erosivity factor

Name of the station	Mean annual rainfall (mm)	R-factor
Chencha	110.6	54.04
Mirab Abaya	66.6	29.31



Fig.2. R-factor map of Shafe watershed

Soil Erodibility (K) Factor:

Soil erodibility factor, K is a quantitative description of the inherent resistance to particle detachment (degradation) and transport by rainfall and runoff (erosion). Erodibility strongly depended on the structural stability of the soil and its ability to absorb rainfall. Thus, it is largely dependent upon texture, structure, and organic matter, permeability and land-use management

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

systems, and erodibility ranged between 0.02 and 0.69 (Goldman et al., 1986). Soil erodibility factor for different mapping units was calculated using the formula by Wischmeier and Smith (1978) and fed into Arc GIS for regionalizing it on the map. Accordingly, K factor = (27.66/ $m^{1.14}$ * 10-8 (12-a)) + (0.0043 * (b-2)) + (0.0033 * (c-3)), in which K = soil erodibility factor ($t\_ha^{-1}\_MJ^{-1}\_mm^{-1}$); m = (silt (%) + very fine sand (%)) (100-clay (%)); a = organic matter (%); b = structure code: (1) very structured or particulate, (2) fairly structured, (3) slightly structured and (4) solid (Adapted from and c = profile permeability code: (1) rapid, (2) moderate to rapid, (3) moderate, (4) moderate to slow, (5) slow and (6) very slow. The mean K factor value in the study area was 0.118. It is high in the north and central parts as compared to the southern margin of the study area (Table 3). Thus, according to Wismeir and Smith K factor class in the study area is considered to be very high erodibility index, which is greater than 0.066 t*ha/MJ*mm. After assigning K factors for different mapping units in the watershed, the constructed map was converted to a grid map of 30 m cell size taking K factors as values for the cells (Figure 3).

Table 3 soil properties and their respective mean erodibility factor values

Soil characteristics	Upland (summit)	midland	lowland
Silt (%)	26.4	43.7	64.9
Very Fine sand (%)	12.5	26	21.2
Clay (%)	61.2	30.3	13.8
Organic matter	2.1	0.94	1.1
Structure	4	4	3
Permeability	5	4	2
K value	0.145	0.126	0.081

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Fig. 3 K-factor map of Shafe watershed

Topographic Factor (LS):

Within the USLE, the LS factor reflects the effect of topography on erosion, the slope length factor (L) represents the effect of slope length on erosion, and the slope steepness factor (S) reflects the influence of slope gradient on erosion (Lu et al. 2004). L and S factors were generated from Digital Terrain Model (Fig. 4) developed from topo sheets of the study area. Topo sheets with the scale 1:50,000 were digitized to develop elevation information drainage network and boundary of the study watershed. In determining slope length (L) factor the researcher used the formula after Moore and Wilson (1992).

$$L = (\lambda/22.13)^m$$

Where λ is the projected horizontal distance in meters between the onset of runoff and the point where the runoff enters the channel larger than a rill or deposition occurs, m is an exponent that depends on slope steepness.

The exponent being 0.5 for slope greater than 5 %, 0.4 for slopes 3-5 %, 0.3 for slopes 1-3 %and 0.2 for slopes less than 1 %. Then slope length (L- factor) was obtained from digital terrain model using ArcGIS as presented in figure 5.



Figure 4. Digital Terrain Model of Shafe Watershed

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Figure 5. Slope length (L) factor map of Shafe Watershed

It can be a he steep terrain, due to the effect of gravity water moves more rapidly and little time to infiltrate and got much more force to erode the soil particles. In computing the S-factor the researcher used the formula: $S= (0.065 + 0.045 + 0.0065x^2)$ by Moore and Wilson (1992). Where, S is steepness factor and x represents the slope in percent.

Table 4. Slope gradient of Shafe watershed

Slope Class	Slope (in percent)	S-factor
1	5	0.4
2	10	1.0
3	15	1.6
4	20	2.2
5	> 30	3.0 and above

In Arc GIS system, slope gradient map of 30 m grid cell size was developed from DTM of the study area. Then S- factor values after Wischmeier and Smith, (1978) that was modified to the Ethiopian situation were assigned to each slope gradient classes (Table 4) and S-factor map prepared as presented in Figure 6.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Figure 6. S gradient (S) factor map of Shafe watershed

Land cover (C) factor:

In presentation of land-use and land-Cover map, Remote Sensing and Geographic Information System have been efficient and powerful tools in providing reliable information on natural resource classification and mapping of land-cover changes over space and time. Using Arc GIS software different land-use/cover classes of the study area were identified based on image characteristics like tone, texture, size, shape, pattern, location. In addition, Field check was conducted with the help of Topo sheet and GPS to identify the ground truth. Then image elements were corrected Based on the ground checks.

Table 5. C-factor for varying land use/ cover classe

Land use/ cover	C-factor value
Enset/Banana land	0.01
Bush/ Shrub land	0.01
Degraded land	0.05
Open woodland	0.06
Maize land	0.10
Cereals	0.15
Dense settlement	0.15
Bare land	0.6

Accordingly, the identified land use/ cover classes were Bush land, Enset land (ensete ventricosum) and Banana land (Musa Mesta), degraded grass, open woodland, cereal fields, dense settlement and bare land. These land use/ cover classes were assigned with its corresponding C-factor value (Hurni, 1985 a) to develop C-factor map as shown in Table 5 and Figure 7.

Conservation practice (P) factor: in the study area, people use conservation measures for two main reasons: first, to control soil erosion and second, to maintain soil fertility. The improvement measures of soil erosion have strongly been taken up and widely spread over the densely populated upstream areas, while in the downstream the practices are comparatively less pronounced as the people have access to potentially productive agricultural land.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Figure 7: Cover (C) factor map of Shafe watershed

The techniques that are practiced to control soil erosion in the study area are among others include contour ridging, check dams, earth terraces, and agro forestry. In determining P-factor two land use classes namely agricultural and others and their slopes were used (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978). Based on slope gradients of land use types P-factor map was prepared (Table 6 and figure 8).

Table 6. Conservation practice (P) factor

Land use type	Slope (%)	P- factor
Cultivated land	0– 5	0.1
	5– 10	0.12
	10 – 20	0.14
	20 – 30	0.19
	30 – 50	0.25
	50 - 100	0.33
Other land covers	All	1.00

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Figure 8. Conservation (P) factor map of Shafe watershed

In regionalizing soil erosion risk map of shafe watershed, each layers of USLE parameter were converted into a grid 30 X 30 m grid cell size. Then annual soil loss rate was computed by multiplying values of USLE variables (soil erosivity, erodibility, slope length and gradients, land use and management practices) in GIS system on a pixel by pixel basis using USLE equation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Regionalization of Erosion Hazards area:
In the study area mean annual soil loss rate ranged between 0.04 t and 70 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} (Table 7 and Fig. 9). Our finding is in comparable with the study conducted in the immediate localities of Shafe watershed (Belay, 2002). Belay in Gununo locality identified annual mean soil loss rate between 48 t and 80 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)



Fig. 9. Mean annual soil loss rate, Shafe watershed

Spatially, almost a quarter (26.2 %) of the study watershed was exposed to minimum erosion risk with an annual mean soil loss ranged between 0.04 t -10 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}. Our estimate was in line with Morgan's (2005) findings. Morgan regarded annual soil loss of less than 11 t ha -1 y-1 as tolerable for tropical soils; however according to Hudson (1981), it may be as low as 2 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} in sensitive areas. Due to fruit cultivation and vegetation cover southern part of the study area classified under minimum erosion risk category. But in some localities a significant portion of Banana farms (more than 150 hectares) were inundated by gravels and sediments brought by River Shafe (Fig. 10). Thus, upstream degradation due to improper farming practices and riverine deforestation exacerbated siltation, increased turbidity of water and disturbed shore ecology by affecting aquatic life at the shore of Lake Abaya.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

Fig.10. Inundation of Sediments on Banana farm, Ankober PA, Shafe watershed

Hence to rehabilitate the degraded environment Soil and water conservation measures such as gully treatment and reforestation programs in the upstream, and flood control measures like construction of stone dykes and limiting shoreline farming practices are recommended interventions. In central and north-western part of the study area mean annual soil loss was estimated to be moderate i.e., between 20 t and 30 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}.

Table 7: soil erosion in erosion categories of Shafe watershed.

Erosion Category	numeric range ($t/h^{-1}/y^{-1}$)	Area (ha)	Area (%)	loss rate (x 10^4 t/y^{-1})	soil loss (%)
Minimal	0 - 5	7213	26.2	1.8	0.4
Low	5 – 20	4434	16.0	5.9	1.3
Moderate	20 – 30	6875	25.0	17.2	3.9
High	30 – 50	2913	10.6	51.6	11.7
Extreme	> 50	6107	22.2	366	82.7
Total		27,542	100	442.5	100

On the other hand, as seen in Table 7 high to severe erosion risk (30-70 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}) was found in the upstream areas. This part shared a significant portion (94.4 %) of the total soil loss. This may be related to the hilly nature and erodible volcanic soil of the area. High to severe erosion risk area which is found in northern and central part covered a significant part of the study area (42.2 %) but it contributes less than 2 % of the total soil loss in the watershed.

As revealed in Table 8, the estimated mean annual soil loss for each of four land-use/covers at 30^0 slopes was ranged between 0.04 and 52.9 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} (on enset and barley fields respectively). The result compares well with the studies of Hurni (1985b) for example, Hurni's study in

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

northern highlands of Ethiopia estimated annual soil loss rate of 1 t and 42 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} on perennial and cereal fields respectively.

Table 8: Rate of soil loss in varying land use/ covers

Land use/cover type	slope gradient in percent	Erosion rate (tone/ha/y)
Enset field	30	0.04
Barley field	53	52.9
Barley field	30	26.6
Grazing land	50	49.5
Banana field	6.7	0.06
Maize field	8.3	2.4
Bush/ticket land	25	7.0

Our plot level data in Enset and Banana plots showed minimum rate (0.04 and 0.06 t ha-1 y-1 respectively) compared to Hurni's estimate. On cereal farm the model estimated high level of soil-loss rate than the mean soil generation rate (6 t ha^{-1} y^{-1}) as estimated by Hurni, (1983) for the Ethiopian highland. Further analysis of soil data at varying slopes (53 % and 30 % gradients) of barley fields revealed variable soil loss rate, which is 52.9 t and 26.6 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} respectively. According to Tolcha (1999) an area with soil loss rate more than 30 t ha^{-1} y^{-1} needs conservation measure, in this regard barley field and grazing land with slope gradient exceeding 30^0 requires further management practices.

CONCLUSION

Inappropriate farming practice, over grazing and soil erosion in the upstream, and siltation in the downstream would put the potentials of fertile soil of the study area at risk. Though, some inaccuracies are expected in the quantitative predictions using USLE model and GIS techniques, the model would be helpful in assessing erosion hazardous areas in a small watershed like the study area for rehabilitation planning and sustainable land management interventions. Thus, in further studies, attention should be given to plot level sediment load measurement to reach into more meaningful soil loss prediction. In general, gully treatment and reforestation schemes in the upland and flood control measures in the down streams needs immediate intervention.

REFERENCE

Amsalu A, Stroosnijder L., de Graaf J. 2007. Long term dynamics in land resource use and the driving forces in the Beressa watershed, highlands of Ethiopia. Journal of Environmental Management 83: 448-459.

Bedadi B. 2004. Evaluation of soil erosion in the Harerge region of Ethiopia using soil loss Models, rainfall simulation and field trials. Research report. University of Pretoria: Pretoria.

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)

BelayTegene 2002. Farmers Perceptions of Erosion Hazards and Attitudes Towards Soil Conservation in Gunino Area, Wolayta, Southern Ethiopia, Ethiopian Journals of Development Research, 14(2), 31-35.

Bewket W. 2002. Land covers dynamics since the 1950s in Chemago catchment, Blue Nile basin, Ethiopia. Mountain Research and Development. 22: 263-269.

Bewket W. and Teferi E. 2009. Assessment of Soil Erosion Hazard and Prioritization for Treatment at the watershed Level. Case Study in the Chemago Watershed, Blue Nile Basin, Ethiopia. Land Degrad. Develop. Wiley Inter Science (www.interscience.wiley.com.

Goldman, S.J, Jackson, K., and Bursztynsky, T.A. 1986. Erosion and sediment control handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haile G. and Fetene M. 2012. Assessment of soil erosion hazard in Kilie catchment, East Shoa, Ethiopia. Wiley online Liberary. Land degradation & Development 23: 293-306.

Hurni H. 1983. Soil Conservation Research Project. Vol.4, 3rd progress report 1983, Bern. University of Berne and the United Nation.

_____1985a. Soil Conservation Manual for Ethiopia. Ministry of Agriculture: Addis Ababa.

_____1985b. Erosion Productivity conservation systems in Ethiopia. Paper presented at the 4th international conference on soil conservation, 3-9 November 1985, Maracacy, Venezula.

_____1990. Degradation and conservation of soil resources in the Ethiopian highlands. In: B. Messerli and H. Hurni (eds.), African mountains and highlands. Problems and prospectives. African mountain Association, Marceline, Missouri.

Lal R. and Stewart B. 1990. Soil Degradation. Newyork: Springer Verlag. United Nations Development Program/Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia. 1984 Data book, land-use and agriculture in Ethiopia, vol. 1, Addis Ababa.

Mellerowicz KT, RessHW, Chow TL, Ghanem I. 1994. Soil conservation planning at the watershed level using the Universal Soil Loss Equation with GIS and microcomputer technologies: A case study. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 49: 194–200.

Montgomery DR. 2007. Soil erosion and agricultural sustainability. Proceeding of national academy of science. 104. 13268-13272**.**

Moore and Wilson JP 1992. Length slope factors for the revised universal soil equation. Simplified method of estimation. Journal of soil and water conservation 47: 423-428. Morgan RPC. 2005. Soil Erosio and Conservation (3rd edn). Black Well Science: Oxford.

Tolcha Thomas 1999. Aspects of soil degradation and conservation measure in Angucho catchment, western Harerghe. Research report 19, soil conservation research project by University of Berne, Swezerland.

Wischmeier WH, and Smith DD. 1978. Predicting Rainfall Erosion Loss. USDA Agricultural Research Service Handbook 537.

Acknowledgement

I extend my heartfelt thanks to the Office of Research Directorate, AMU for their financial support and above all I would be grateful to the households and development agents of Shafe catchment**.**

ISSN: 2052-6377(Print), ISSN: 2052-6385(Online)