Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences

∂ OPEN ACCESS

Abbreviated Key Title: Sch J Agric Vet Sci ISSN 2348–8883 (Print) | ISSN 2348–1854 (Online) Journal homepage: <u>https://saspublishers.com</u>

Tank Rehabilitation Index for a Tank Cluster

Kalaiarasi M. S^{1*}, Carolin Arul¹

¹Centre for Water Resources, Department of Civil Engineering, Anna University, Guindy, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600025, India

DOI: <u>10.36347/sjavs.2022.v09i01.001</u>

| Received: 13.12.2021 | Accepted: 18.01.2022 | Published: 20.01.2022

*Corresponding author: Kalaiarasi M. S

Centre for Water Resources, Department of Civil Engineering, Anna University, Guindy, Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600025, India

Abstract

Original Research Article

Restoration and rehabilitation of irrigation tanks is gaining much attention due to the increased temporal variation in the rainfall. This study was carried out in the first four tanks (i.e. Arungunam, Devadur, Mariputhur and Kavadur tanks) of the Madurantakam tank cluster, which lies in the Kiliyar sub basin, Palar basin, Tamil Nadu, India. The study was aimed at assessing the performance of the tanks and deriving a Tank Rehabilitation Index (TRI) for prioritizing the tanks based on 24 indicators reflecting the physical, hydrological and socio technical aspects. The physical performance of the tanks was measured in terms of their storage capacity. Capacity estimation was carried out using Bathymetry survey and Google earth. The results showed that the Kavadur tank performed well with 89.29% storage capacity when compared with the Arungunam, Devadur and Mariputhur tanks having 75%, 57.42% and 42.11% as their storage capacities respectively. A score-based method was adopted in finding out the TRI. It was found that the Kavadur tank tops the priority for rehabilitation with a score of 14.50 followed by the Arungunam and Devadur tank with a score of 14.25. The Mariputhur tank scored the least (13.75). Much variation in the TRI developed could be obtained, if the tanks were selected randomly over different reaches of the cluster.

Keywords: Tank prioritization, Tank capacity, Performance indicators, Tank rehabilitation index, Bathymetry.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tanks are the traditional water harvesting structures, which supplements the monsoon rains to sustain agricultural production and to fulfill the various ecological demands. Around 39,000 tanks are situated in Tamil Nadu (Palanisamy and Ruth, 2001). The climate change has led to frequent flood and drought conditions, which has resulted in water scarcity, crop failure and inundation of tank command area during flash floods, affecting the livelihood of the farmers. It is essential to make productive use of the available water resources in a watershed to face the climatic extremes. Tanks serve as the lifeline of people; hence emphasis must be given to the maintenance and improvement of the irrigation structures.

For making productive use of the available water in a watershed, assessment and rehabilitation of the existing irrigation systems must be carried out (Nagarajan, 2013). The high resolution satellite data could be used for identifying the current status of the tank components, the land use/land cover changes in the tank catchment and its command area, cropping intensity in various seasons, cropping pattern, delineation of the watershed boundary and identifying the current drainage pattern (Hakeem and Raju, 2008; Krishnaveni *et. al.*, 2011). A tank could be taken up for rehabilitation based upon three major factors such as cropping intensity, ratio of catchment area to waterspread area and ratio of command area to waterspread area (Sakthivadivel *et. al.*, 1996). The condition of tank components, water sharing arrangements, water availability in the tank and water distribution contributes for the participation of farmers in tank related activities (Jana and Lise, 2013). The multiple uses of the tank should also be considered for evaluating the tank potential with a view of providing maximum benefits from the tank (Palanisamy and Ruth, 2001). Thus a holistic socio-technical approach is needed for rehabilitating an irrigation system.

2. STUDY AREA

Four tanks (out of 30 tanks) in the upper reach of the Madurantakam tank cluster (with Madurantakam as the head tank) were chosen for the study. The Madurantakam tank cluster lies in the Kiliyar sub basin of the Palar basin, Tamil Nadu. The main sources of supply to the Madurantakam tank are the Kiliyar River (a tributary of river Palar) and Nelvoy Maduvu, a supply channel which connects the Madurantakam and

Citation: Kalaiarasi M. S & Carolin Arul. Tank Rehabilitation Index for a Tank Cluster. Sch J Agric Vet Sci, 2022 Jan 9(1): 1-8.

¹

the Uthiramerur tanks. A supply channel from the left flank feeds the Karunguzhi tank, the surplus of which drains back into the Kiliyar river. A supply channel from the right flank feeds 30 tanks in a chain. Depending on the ratio of catchment area to waterspread area, the first four tanks fed by the high level channel scheme (Arungunam tank, Mariputhur tank, Devadur tank and Kavadur tank) were taken for the study. The waterspread area was delineated from the toposheets 57P14 and 57P15 (1:50,000 scale), using ArcGIS and Google Earth captured during the month of November and December when the tank is at Full Tank Level (F.T.L).

3. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to assess the performance of the tanks in a cluster and to derive the tank rehabilitation index based on the hydrological and physical status of tanks adopting a socio technical approach. To assess the performance of the tanks, a methodology was developed as shown in Figure 1. The sample size for the questionnaire survey is sixty.



Figure 1: Methodology for Prioritization of Tanks in a Cluster

The Cartosat DEM with 2.5 m resolution was used for delineating the watershed by using ArcGIS. The storage capacity of the tanks was taken as an

indicator for measuring its performance and was estimated by two methods as shown in Figure 2.

2



Figure 2: Capacity Estimation of the Tanks

The waterspread area of the tank delineated from Google Earth was used in the formation of grids at 20m x 20m interval using ArcGIS. Bathymetry survey was carried out in the Arungunam tank using Q-liner (Figure 3) and demarcation of the waterspread boundary was carried out using a hand-held GPS (Figure 4). The readings were taken at every 90 seconds interval along a line. Then the next line was taken up which was set out with an offset of 20m from the first line. O-liner could be used to measure depths ranging between 0.35m to 10m. The points where the depth was less than 0.35m were measured by using a scale arrangement Depths were measured at 148 points in the waterspread area during the survey (99 points taken using the Q-liner and 49 points using a scale arrangement. The data stored in the Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) were retrieved using the Q-liner review software. The depth values obtained from the PDA were converted to reduced levels (RL) with respect to the top of weir.



Figure 3: Bathymetry survey using Q-liner



Figure 4: Demarcation of the waterspread boundary using a hand-held GPS

The points surveyed were mapped using ArcGIS and the corresponding depth values were interpolated using Kriging method for the entire waterspread. Contours were generated from the interpolated values at an interval of 0.05 m followed by Triangulated Irregular Networks (TIN) from which the capacity of the tank was estimated using the surface volume tool.

The steps followed in capacity estimation using Google Earth were similar to that of the steps followed in capacity estimation by the Bathymetry survey, except that the elevation points were obtained from the Google Earth. The difference in capacities of the Arungunam tank was obtained from both the methods, which gave a percentage of error in the capacity estimation using Google Earth as 30%. The approximate capacities of Devadur, Kavadur and

3

```
© 2022 Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences | Published by SAS Publishers, India
```

Mariputhur tanks were arrived based on this percentage of error.

3.1 Physical aspects

Rehabilitation will be effective only when the physical components of the tank like the bund, sluices, surplus weir, bed, inflow and outflow channels are in good condition. Rehabilitating a highly degraded tank will be time consuming and requires more financial assistance. The functioning of the tank components was evaluated based on the physical observations, semistructured interview conducted with the Officials and questionnaire survey administered with the farmers.

The tank with a high level of siltation must be given priority, as it reduces the storage levels, which may lead to decline in the command area and may gradually go unused. The adequacy of the tank capacity indicates the inability of the tank to meet out the irrigation demands. If the tank fails to meet the demand, then it needs more attention. In such cases, increasing the storage depth in potential areas could be attempted. Equity in water distribution indicates that there is no water sharing problem and thus the water from the tank could be used efficiently by the farmers and such tanks could be preferred for rehabilitation.

Encroachment in a tank system could be seen more commonly in the bed, feeder channels and bund, which could be witnessed in terms of households and as agricultural fields. The level of encroachment was mapped out using the Google Earth imagery by overlaying the shape file obtained from the toposheet, Survey of India.

The change in landuse was obtained by demarcating the command area of the tanks in the Google Earth using the cadastral map obtained from the Water Resources Department (WRD)/Public Works Department (PWD), Madurantakam. The temporal images in the Google Earth were used to find out the landuse changes in the tank command area. This study aimed at mapping the fallow lands as there is no urban sprawl in the study tanks. History of rehabilitation obtained from WRD/PWD, Madurantakam indicates the way of prioritizing the tanks based on the past rehabilitation activities such that the tank which has not undergone rehabilitation over a long period of time could be given more preference.

Rehabilitation would be effective only if the tank receives sufficient amount of rainfall. Hence, the frequency analysis was done using Weibull's method using 20 years rainfall data (n=20). From the analysis, the 75% dependable rainfall was found to be 789.1 mm with a corresponding return period of one year three months. This was around 65% of the normal annual rainfall (1,214 mm) of the district.

Decrease in the cropping season could be taken as an indicator of the water unavailability in the tank as a result of reduction in the storage capacity. Rehabilitating such tanks proves to regain its original potential. The multiple uses of the tank apart from irrigation such as the ecological services and livelihood activities must be given more importance while taking up the tank for rehabilitation.

Disposal factor takes into account the ease in disposing the silt that is taken up from the tank bed which calls for the involvement of the local people. Disposal of huge quantum of silt is a major hindrance faced in tank bed desilting apart from the financial constraints.

The surplus history indicates whether there is huge potential for increasing the storage capacity of the tank in order to make productive use of the surplus water. The study tanks had surplused seven times in the last 10 years. Also, a proper surplus arrangement is required in order to make sure that the excess water is disposed off safely without causing any damage to the structure. The surplus arrangement in the Arungunam tank was found to be inadequate.

Potential for extension of the ayacut could be considered while taking up a tank for rehabilitation as it aids in improving the overall productivity, which was evaluated based on the presence of more fallow lands within the ayacut and which could be brought under irrigation.

3.2 Socio-technical aspects

A well-managed tank can be evaluated based on the reliability, timeliness and equity in water supply, performance of the tank, accountability of the staff, flexibility in management, operation and maintenance activities in the tank and a good interaction between the Officials and the Water Users' Associations.

The interaction of the farmers with the Officials and coordination among the farmers in the command area are very essential for better management of the available water resources. If there is good contribution from the government side for operation and maintenance activities of the tank, the sustainability of tank rehabilitation could be ensured.

Higher involvement of the beneficiaries in tank management enhances proper functioning of the tank. The level of knowledge on tank management is of great importance, if the farmers are ready to take up the tank for O&M activities. Proper training to both the Officials and beneficiaries are required for an integrated functioning of the system.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

		The j	prime	purpose o	of the t	ank is to	store	the
	runoff	from	the	catchmen	it and	l rainfall	in	its
© 2022 Scholars Journal of Agriculture a	nd Veterinary Sciences Published by SAS Publis	shers. Inc	lia				4	

waterspread area, which can be put to beneficial usage. Hence the performances of the tanks were evaluated based on their present storage capacity as it represents the functioning of the system as a whole. Table 1 represents the storage capacity of the tanks and percentage reduction from the design capacity.

Sl. No	Name of the tank	Design Capacity (MCM)	Present Capacity (MCM)	Reduction in capacity (%)
1	Arungunam	1.72	1.29	25
2	Mariputhur	0.38	0.16	57.89
3	Devadur	0.40	0.23	42.48
4	Kavadur	0.28	0.25	10.71

 Table 1: Performance of tanks in terms of their storage capacity

The reduction in storage capacity was high in Mariputhur and Devadur tank, whereas it was moderate in the Arungunam tank and comparably low in the Kavadur tank. The reduction in storage capacities could be accounted for the siltation in the tanks. The reduction in waterspread area was obtained with the aid of Google Earth and it was found to be moderate in the study tanks with the Kavadur tank showing a maximum of 16.67% reduction in storage area followed by the Devadur tank with 10.46% reduction in storage area, the Mariputhur tank with 9.76% reduction in storage area and the Arungunam tank with 9.09% reduction in storage area.

Encroachments in the tank waterspread area were observed to be 6.43%, 2.10%, 2.66% and 0.13% in the Arungunam, the Mariputhur, the Devadur and the Kavadur tanks respectively. Water distribution system was found to be good and equity in water supply is maintained in all the study tanks. The cropping season has reduced from 2 to 1 over the past 20 years as the tank water is adequate for meeting out the irrigation demands of only one crop season. The farmers with wells go for second crop. Apart from irrigation, the study tanks aid in supply of drinking water for humans, animals and birds, and help to recharge groundwater. Fish rearing was observed only in the Arungunam tank. The landuse change was mapped using Google Earth and it was found to be minimal as there was no urbanization in the study tanks.

The farmers are ready to contribute for the management of tanks in the form of labor and willing to take up the silt for their use depending on its quality, if disposal of the silt could be a problem while desilting the tank. All the study tanks scored least in the sociotechnical aspects. The management followed a top down approach and there was little interaction between the farmers and the Officials. The performance of the tank users' associations was found low, as they do not have a well-defined function. Most of the farmers do not have much knowledge about the Tank Users' Associations' and they do not have adequate training for the management of the tanks even though they are willing to take part.

4.1 Tank Rehabilitation Index (TRI)

The Tank Rehabilitation Index (TRI) was derived by adopting a score-based method. Table 2 represents the classification of scores based on their relevance to rehabilitation aspects. The tank which has obtained the maximum score would be taken up for rehabilitation on priority basis.

Sl. No	Parameter	Class	Score
1	Physical condition of the tank components	Less than 80%	1
	(Based on their performance in an order of good to poor)	80% - 50%	0.75
		50% - 20%	0.5
		Greater than 20%	0.25
2	Adequacy of tank capacity	Less than 50%	1
	(Based on its ability to meet the irrigation demands in an order of low	50% - 70%	0.75
	to high)	70% - 90%	0.5
		Greater than 90 %	0.25
3	Drainage conditions	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
4	Inflow conditions	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
5	Siltation	Greater than 60%	1
	(high to low)	60% - 40%	0.75
		40% - 20%	0.5
		Less than 20%	0.25
0.0000 C 1			
© 2022 Sch	olars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences Published by SAS Publishers, Indi	a	5

 Table 2: Score-based classification on rehabilitation aspects

Kalaiarasi M. S & Carolin Arul., Sch J Agric Vet Sci, Jan, 2022; 9(1): 1-8

6 Surplus arrangements Excellent Good 1 Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 0 7 Encroachments (high to low) Greater than 50% 1 S0% - 30% 0 30% - 10% 0 8 Timeliness (Based on the release of water high to low) Excellent 1 1 9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 0 10 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 0 10 Extension of area under irrigation (Resed on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 0 11 History of relabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 1 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the runn period of 73% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) S- 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 10 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 0 10 - 5 years 0 15) I	Parameter	Class	Score
1 Encroachments Good 0 7 Encroachments Greater than 50% 1 (high to low) 50% - 30% 0 8 Timeliness Greater than 10% 0 8 Timeliness Excellent 1 (Based on the release of water high to low) Good 0 Medium 9 Extension of area under irrigation Greater than 50% 1 (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Good 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 1 (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of some order of the tark had undergone rehabilitation (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of some order of high to low) 10 15 - 10 years 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on the enture period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) 1 - 3 years 0 1 - 3 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall Gased on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the pars 20 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 3 years 0 3 - 5 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 5 years 0 1 - 3 years	S	Surplus arrangements	Excellent	1
Medium Medium 0 7 Encroachments (high to low) Greater than 50% 50% - 30% 30% - 10% 0 1 8 Timeliness (Based on the release of water high to low) Good Medium 0 9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 30-10% 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% Creater than 90% 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Creater than 50% Creater than 50% 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Creater than 15 years Creater than 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Creater than 50% Creater than 50% Creater than 50% 0 14 Reduction in storage area order of high to low) Greater than 50% Creater than		· ·	Good	0.75
Bad 0 7 Encroachments Greater than 50% 1 (high to low) S0% - 30% 0 30% - 10% 0 8 Timcliness Exectlent 1 1 (Based on the release of water high to low) Good 0 0 9 Extension of area under irrigation Good 0 10 10 Equity Greater than 90% 1 0 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Medium</td> <td>0.5</td>			Medium	0.5
7 Encroachments (high to low) 1 8 Timcliness (Based on the release of water high to low) 50% - 30% 0 0 9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) 6 1 10 Fauescont 1 6000 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 0 10 Fauity (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 11 15 - 10 years 10 - 5 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibult's method) 15 - 3 years 0 - 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 15 - 10 years 10 - 5 years 1 0 - 3 years 0 - 1 - 3 years 0 - 1 - 3 years 0 - 1 - 3 years 0 0 - 10 - 5 years 0 - 1 - 3 years 0 - 2 years 0 - 2 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 3 years 0 - 2 years			Bad	0.25
(high to low) 50% - 30% 0 8 Timeliness Excellent 1 (Based on the release of water high to low) Good 0 9 Extension of area under irrigation Greater than 50% 1 (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 15 - 10 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 15 - 10 years 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 0 0 30-10% 0 15 Landuse change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 10 - 5 years 0 10 - 5 years 0 15 Landuse change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0-10% 0	I	Encroachments	Greater than 50%	1
10% 10% 10% 8 Timeliness (Based on the release of water high to low) Excellent 1 9 Extension of area under irrigation Good 0 10 Extension of area under irrigation Greater than 50 % 1 10 Equity Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 0% 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 90% 0 12 Probability of rainfall Greater of high to low) 0 10 12 Probability of rainfall Less than 10% 0 11 13 Surplus history Greater than 50% 0 12 15 - 10 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 0 13 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 15 - 10 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 0	((high to low)	50% - 30%	0.75
Institution Institution Institution 8 Timeliness Excellent 1 9 Extension of area under irrigation Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 90% 0 12 Probability of minfall Greater than 10% 0 12 Probability of minfall Cased on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation 10 - 5 years 0 12 Probability of minfall Classed on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation 10 - 5 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 15 years 1 1 - 3 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 15 years 0 1 15 - 10 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 1 5 - 30% 0 14 Reducti			30% - 10%	0.5
8 Timeliness (Based on the release of water high to low) Excellent Good Medium 1 9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 0.00% 1 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 0 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on use are the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 0 Greater than 15 years 0 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) 1 - 3 years 2 0 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 3 years 1 - 5 years 0 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 3 years 1 - 5 years 0 1 Greater than 15 years 1 - 0 years 0 1 Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area order of high to low) 0 Greater than 90% 0 0 Greater than 90% 0 1 5 - 30% 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 90% 0 0 Greater than 90% 0 0 Greater than 90% 0 0 Greater than 90% 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an ord			Less than 10%	0.25
0 Interview of water high to low) Interview of water wight to low) 9 Extension of area under irrigation Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 50% 0 12 Probability of rainfall Greater than 50% 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 1 year 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 % 1 15 Loy ears 0 10 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 1 15 Loy east 1 10 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 1 15 Landuse change Greater than 50% 1 1 <td< td=""><td>1</td><td>Timeliness</td><td>Excellent</td><td>1</td></td<>	1	Timeliness	Excellent	1
10 Discust of mile relate (o) miles might (o (o) f) Medium 0 9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 1 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation hately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 15 - 10 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 0 0 1 15 Landuse change (Dased on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 1 50-30% 0 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 0 1 1 50-30% 0 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 1 1 17 Decrease in cropping se	(Based on the release of water high to low)	Good	0.75
9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 50 % 30-10% 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 0 Creater than 90% 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 0 Greater than 15 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibult's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 1 So-30% 30-10% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 30-10% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 10 Greater than 50% 30-10% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 10% (Caster than 75% 1 1 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)		Duseu on me release of water high to tow)	Medium	0.75
9 Extension of area under irrigation (New areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 0 Greater than 15 years 1 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) 15 - 10 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 15 - 10 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 15 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the extange in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 15 Surplus history (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent Dependent 0<			Bad	0.25
2 Extension and under inights in an order of high to low 00.30% 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 00.80% 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 00.80% 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation hately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 15 - 10 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Wetbull's method) 1 - 3 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 3 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 0 1 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 0 30-10% 0 15 Landuse change (Iden the alay of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 1 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to ow) 0 15 Landuse change the landuse	T	Extension of area under irrigation	Greater than 50 %	1
low) 00-30% 00 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 10 Equity Greater than 90% 0 11 History of rehabilitation 00% - 70% 0 11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 90% 0 12 Probability of rainfall Greater than 15 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall Greater than 15 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 5 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 50% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 90% 0 <tr< td=""><td></td><td>New groups that could be possibly covered in an order of high to</td><td>50 2004</td><td>0.75</td></tr<>		New groups that could be possibly covered in an order of high to	50 2004	0.75
10 East shan 10% 0 10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 10 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 50% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Exs (than 20% 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19		Inew areas that could be possibly covered in an order of high to	20 100/	0.75
10 Equity (Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 0% - 70% 0% - 50% 0 0 11 History of rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 00% - 70% 15 - 10 years 1 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 15 - 10 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Creater than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 10 50-30% 00 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 75% 175% - 50% 18 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 10 10 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent 10 00% - 25% 0 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent Good 0 1 0	l	<i>OW</i>)	50-10%	0.5
10 Equity of high to low) Creater than 90% 1 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 1 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Creater than 15 years 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 15 years 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 90% 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 10 5 years 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 10 90% - 70% 0 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 90% 0 0 1 16 Disposal factor (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) 10 90% - 70% 0 0 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 0 1 19 Manag			Less than 10%	0.25
(Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order of high to low) 90% - 10% 70% - 50% (Less than 50% 0 0 11 History of rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 0 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 0 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 10 - 5 years 0 1 10 - 5 years 0 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 10 - 5 years 0 0 1 14 Reduction in storage area (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 1 50-30% 30-10% 10 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 1 14 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Greater than 50% 10 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent Good 0 1 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent Good 0	1	Equity	Greater than 90%	1
of high to low) 70% - 50% 0 11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 15 - 10 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 Less than 50% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 1 5% - 50% 0 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Execellent 10 1 1 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 <td< td=""><td>(</td><td>Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order</td><td>90% - 70%</td><td>0.75</td></td<>	(Based on the water distribution from head to tail end in an order	90% - 70%	0.75
11 History of rehabilitation Greater than 15 years 1 (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 10 - 5 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 50% 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options Hisply dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Greater than 10% 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 75% 1 17	0	of high to low)	70% - 50%	0.5
11 History of rehabilitation (Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) Greater than 15 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 % 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 15 Landuse change (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 70% 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of the tank) Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent Dependent 0 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 1			Less than 50%	0.25
(Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 15 - 10 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 10 - 5 years 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 0 Greater than 90% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1	H	History of rehabilitation	Greater than 15 years	1
lately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high) 10 - 5 years 0 12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 0 So-30% 0 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 0 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater of than 75% 0 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 1 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 1	(Based on year the when the tank had undergone rehabilitation	15 - 10 years	0.75
12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Is - 5 years (Greater than 5 years) 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 10 - 5 years 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 1 50-30% 30-10% 0 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high low) Greater than 75% 0 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 0 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Greater than 75% 0 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 0 1 19 Management of tanks Execllent Good Medium 1 1 19 Management of tanks Execllent Good Medium 1 1	l	ately in the past 20 years in an order of low to high)	10 - 5 years	0.5
12 Probability of rainfall (Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) Less than 1 year 1 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 30-10% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 75% 0 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 0 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent 0 1 19 Management of tanks Dependent 0 0 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 1 1 19 Management of tanks Decrease of tanks Dependent 0 0 19 Management of tanks Dependent 0 1 Decrease of the tank) Dependent 0 1 19 Management of tanks Dependent 0 0 0			Less than 5 years	0.25
(Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated using Weibull's method) 1 - 3 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 5 years 0 13 Surplus history Greater than 5 years 0 20 years in an order of high to low) 1 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 5 years 0 15 Landuse change Greater than 5 wears 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 18 Livelihood options Highly dependent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 19 Management of tanks Greater 1	F	Probability of rainfall	Less than 1 year	1
using Weibull's method) 3 - 5 years 0 13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Creater than 15 years 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50% 1 10 - 5 years 0 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 50% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1	(Based on the return period of 75% dependable rainfall calculated	1 - 3 years	0.75
13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 15 - 10 years 10 - 5 years Less than 5 years 0 10 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 50-30% 30-10% Less than 10% 1 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 50-30% 30-10% 1 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 75% 17 Greater than 75% 10% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 175% - 50% 18 1 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent Dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent Good Medium 1	ı	using Weibull's method)	3 - 5 years	0.5
13 Surplus history (Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low) Greater than 15 years 15 - 10 years 0 10 - 5 years 0 Uess than 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 50-30% 0 30-10% Uess than 10% 1 50-30% 0 30-10% 0 Uess than 10% 15 Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 90% 0 30-10% Uess than 10% 1 50-30% 0 Uess than 10% 16 Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) Greater than 75% 0 Uess than 10% 1 90% - 70% 0 Uess than 50% 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 Uess than 25% 1 75% - 50% 0 Uess than 25% 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 0 Uess dependent 1 Dependent 0 Uess dependent 1 Dependent 0 Uess dependent 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Greater than 5 years	0.25
Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past 20 years in an order of high to low)15 - 10 years 10 - 5 years0 10 - 5 years014Reduction in storage areaGreater than 50 % 50-30%1 50-30%1 50-30%0 30-10%0 1515Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low)Greater than 50 % 10-503%1 60-30%16Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low)Greater than 75% 100-25%0 100-25%17Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75% 00 181 175% - 50%1 175% - 50%18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent 00 Less than 25%1 00 00 1919Management of tanksExcellent 1 10001 10001000 100019Management of tanksExcellent 1 1 0001 1000	S	Surplus history	Greater than 15 years	1
20 years in an order of high to low) 10 - 5 years 0 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 1 15 Landuse change Greater than 50 % 1 (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 00 10 - 5 years 00 16 Disposal factor Greater than 50 % 1 00% 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 0 10 - 50% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 75% - 50% 0 0 18 Livelihood options Highly dependent 1 Dependent 0 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 1 1 1		(Based on the number of surplusing years of the tanks in the past	15 - 10 years	0.75
14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 1 50-30% 0 30-10% 0 15 Landuse change Greater than 50 % 1 (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 18 Livelihood options Greater than 25% 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1	2	20 years in an order of high to low)	10 - 5 years	0.5
14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 1 14 Reduction in storage area Greater than 50 % 0 15 Landuse change 0 0 15 Landuse change Greater than 50 % 1 0 Greater than 50 % 1 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1		5 6 7	Less than 5 years	0.25
SolutionSolutio	H	Reduction in storage area	Greater than 50 %	1
30-10% 0 15 Landuse change Greater than 50 % 1 (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) Greater than 50 % 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 0 (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 90% - 70% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options Greater than 25% 0 18 Livelihood options Highly dependent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good Medium 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1			50-30%	0.75
Less than 10%015Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low)Greater than 50 % 50-30% 30-10%116Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low)Greater than 90% 90% - 70%117Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75% 75% - 50% Less than 25%118Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Dependent Management of tanks119Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium 0019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium 0019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium 0019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium 0019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium 00			30-10%	0.5
15Landuse change (Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low)Greater than 50 % 1 50-30%1 50-30%16Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low)Greater than 90% 90% - 70%1 90% - 70%17Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75% 0 Less than 25%1 75% - 50% 0 Less than 25%18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent 0 Less dependent1 0 0 0 1919Management of tanksExcellent 0			Less than 10%	0.25
15 Initials on the change in the landuse in the command area in an order of high to low) 50-30% 0 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 1 16 Disposal factor Greater than 90% 1 10 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 18 Livelihood options Highly dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0	I	anduse change	Greater than 50 %	1
Internation of high to low)Internation in the commune area in an order of high to low)Internation in the commune area in an 30-10%Internation in an 30-10%Internation in an 00 Less than 10%Internation in an 00 Less than 10%Internation in an 00 00 00% - 70%Internation in an order of high to 00% - 70%Internation in an order of high to 00%Internation in an order of high to 00% - 70%Internation in an order of high to 00%Internation in an order of high to 00%Internation in an order of high to 00%Internation in an order of high to 00%<	(Based on the change in the landuse in the command area in an	50-30%	0.75
Index of high to low)Index of high to low		production the change in the landaise in the community area in an	30-10%	0.75
16Disposal factor (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low)Greater than 90% 90% - 70%1 90% - 70%17Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75% (Decrease in cropping season1 75% - 50%0 (Decrease than 75%)1 75% - 50%18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent (Dependent (Decrease than 25%)1 0 (Decrease than 25%)19Management of tanksExcellent (Good (Decrease)1 (Decrease)19Management of tanksExcellent (Decrease)1 (Decrease)19Management of tanks1 (Decrease)19Management of tanks1 (Decrease)19Management of tanks1 (Decrease)10Management of tanks1 (Decrease)11Management of tanks1 (Decrease)12 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Less than 10%</td><td>0.5</td></td<>			Less than 10%	0.5
10 Disposal factor 1 (Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to low) 90% - 70% 0 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 1 17 Decrease in cropping season Greater than 75% 0 18 Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Highly dependent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 10 Bad 0 0	т	Disposal factor	Greater than 00%	1
Image: Composition of the case of alsposation interview of all interv		Depending on the ease of disposal of the silt in an order of high to	90% = 70%	0.75
10w)70% - 30%017Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 50%017Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75%175% - 50%01850% - 25%018Livelihood optionsHighly dependent1(Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Dependent019Management of tanksExcellent1Good0Medium0Bad00		Depending on the ease of disposal of the still in an order of high to	90% - 70% 70% - 50%	0.75
17Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75%117Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75%118Livelihood options1850% - 25%018Livelihood optionsHighly dependent1(Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Dependent019Management of tanksExcellent119Management of tanksExcellent119Management of tanksExcellent019Management of tanksExcellent019Management of tanks0019Management of tanks0019Management of tanks0019Management of tanks0019Management of tanks0019Management of tanks0010100011100012000130014001500160017001800190019001000100011001200130014001500160017001800190 <td>l</td> <td>OW)</td> <td>70% - 30%</td> <td>0.5</td>	l	OW)	70% - 30%	0.5
17Decrease in cropping seasonGreater than 75%175% - 50%018Livelihood options1850% - 25%018Livelihood optionsHighly dependent1(Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Dependent019Management of tanksExcellent119Management of tanksExcellent119Management of tanksExcellent019Management of tanksExcellent119Management of tanksExcellent019Management of tanksExcellent010Medium0011100121010013101001410101510101016101010171010101810101019101			Less than 50%	0.25
18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent Dependent119Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium Bad1		Decrease in cropping season	Greater than 75%	
18 Livelihood options Highly dependent 1 (Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 0 10 Management of tanks Excellent 0 10 Medium 0 0 11 Good 0 0 11 Medium 0 0 11 Medium 0 0 11 Medium 0 0 12 Medium 0 0 13 Medium 0 0 14 Medium 0 0 15 Medium 0 0 16 Medium 0 0 17 Medium 0			/5% - 50%	0.75
18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent Dependent119Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium119Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Good Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Medium019Management of tanksExcellent Medium010Medium Medium0Medium Medium10Medium Medium010Medium Medium011Medium Medium012Medium Medium013Medium Medium014Medium Medium015Medium Medium016Medium Medium0<			1850% - 25%	0.5
18Livelihood options (Considering the multiple uses of the tank)Highly dependent Dependent1 O Medium19Management of tanksExcellent1 Good19Management of tanksExcellent1 Good10Bad0			Less than 25%	0.25
(Considering the multiple uses of the tank) Dependent 0 Medium 0 Less dependent 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 0 0 0	I	Livelihood options	Highly dependent	1
Medium 0 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 0	(Considering the multiple uses of the tank)	Dependent	0.75
Image: Image in the image i			Medium	0.5
19 Management of tanks Excellent 1 Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 0			Less dependent	0.25
Good 0 Medium 0 Bad 0	Ν	Management of tanks	Excellent	1
Medium 0 Bad 0			Good	0.75
Bad 0			Medium	0.5
			Bad	0.25
			· · · · ·	

Kalaiarasi M. S & Carolin Arul., Sch J Agric Vet Sci, Jan, 2022; 9(1): 1-8

Sl. No	Parameter	Class	Score
20	Performance of tank users' associations	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
21	Government contribution to the tank	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
22	Beneficiaries willingness to contribute to the tank	Excellent	1
	(in terms of money or labour)	Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
23	Level of awareness and knowledge on tank management	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25
24	Level of training on tank management	Excellent	1
		Good	0.75
		Medium	0.5
		Bad	0.25

The TRI obtained for the study tanks were tabulated in the Table 3. The score-based approach proves to be beneficial in evaluating the rehabilitation

aspects of the tanks as well as helps in identifying the rehabilitation activities that should be carried out in the selected tanks.

Sl.	Parameter	Score			
No.		Arungunam	Mariputhur	Devadur	Kavadur
		tank	tank	tank	tank
1	Physical condition of the tank components	0.75	0.75	0.75	1
2	Adequacy of tank capacity	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
3	Drainage conditions	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
4	Inflow conditions	1	0.75	0.75	0.75
5	Siltation	0.5	0.75	0.75	0.25
6	Surplus arrangements	0.5	1	1	1
7	Encroachments	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
8	New area to be included	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
9	Equity	1	1	1	1
10	Timeliness	1	1	1	1
11	History of rehabilitation	0.25	0.25	0.25	1
12	Probability of rainfall	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
13	Surplus history	1	1	1	1
14	Reduction in storage area	0.25	0.25	0.5	0.5
15	Landuse change	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
16	Disposal factor	1	0.75	0.75	0.75
17	Decrease in cropping season	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
18	Livelihood options	1	0.75	0.75	0.75
19	Management of tanks	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
20	Performance of tank users' associations	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
21	Government contribution to the tank	0.75	0.5	0.75	0.5
22	Beneficiaries willingness to contribute to the tank	1	0.75	0.75	0.75
23	Level of knowledge on tank management	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
24	Level of training on tank management	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Total	score (out of 24)	14.25	13.75	14.25	14.50

Table 3: Determination of Tank Rehabilitation Index

© 2022 Scholars Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences Published by SAS Publishers, India	7
	/

If two or more tanks have the same index then the tank with higher ratio of command area to waterspread area could be taken up first for rehabilitation. The order of prioritization for the selected tanks for rehabilitation was given in Table 4.

Table 4: Order of prioritizing the tanks for rehabilitation						
Sl. No.	Name of the tank	TRI	Rank			
1	Arungunam	14.25	2			
2	Mariputhur	13.75	4			
3	Devadur	14.25	3			
4	Kavadur	14.50	1			

5. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions derived from this study are:

- i. The performance of the tanks in terms of their storage capacity was found to be good in the Arungunam and the Kavadur tanks whereas the Mariputhur and the Devadur tanks showed reduced performance due to siltation. Efforts must be taken to restore the original capacity of the tanks either by desilting the entire tank bed or by partial desilting with the help of the stakeholders.
- ii. The depth of storage could be increased in the tanks as they show good hydrologic potential ensuring productive use of the surplus water. This helps the farmers to go for another season of cultivation with the tank water and also aids for other livelihood activities like increasing the groundwater recharge and drinking purposes.
- iii. Proper training and awareness programs should be given to both the farmers and the Officials related to tank management thereby strengthening up the institutional aspects. The roles and functions of the tank users' associations must be highlighted.
- iv. Proper communication between the farmers and the Officials must be ensured. A bottom up flexible level of management could be adopted for better performance of the system as a whole.
- v. The Madurantakam high level channel could be desilted and maintained in such a way that the surplus water reaches all the 30 tanks in the cluster. If this channel functions properly, the livelihood of the farmers in the lower reaches improves and this may also prevent the tank from going unused due to water unavailability.
- vi. Most of the people in the tank command area have agriculture as their major occupation. The study tanks are in the verge of exposure to the urban sprawl as the head tank Madurantakam is currently facing this issue. The policy makers

must keep in mind the dependency of people on tanks and make appropriate frame work to protect the water resources from going unbeneficial due to the landuse changes in the command area, which may gradually lead to encroachment along the waterbodies and finally cause disappearance of the tanks.

REFERENCES

- Palanisami, K., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2001). Tank performance and multiple uses in Tamil Nadu, South India. *Irrigation and drainage Systems*, 15(2), 173-195.
- Nagarajan, R. (2013). Tank rehabilitation index for prioritization of lakes in semi arid regions-Geospatial approach. *International Journal of Geomatics and Geosciences*, 3(3), 525-537.
- Krishnaveni, M., Sankari, S., & Rajeswari, A. (2011). Rehbailitation of Irrigation Tank Cascade System Using Remote Sensing GIS and GPS. *International Journal of Engineeering Science and Technology*, *3*(2), 1624-1629.
- Abdul Hakeem, K., & Raju, P. V. (2009). Use of high-resolution satellite data for the structural and agricultural inventory of tank irrigation systems. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, *30*(14), 3613-3623.
- Sakthivadivel, R., Fernando, N., Panabokke, C. R., & Wijayaratna, C. M. (1996). Nature of small tank cascade systems and a framework for rehabilitation of tanks within them. IIMI Country Paper, Srilanka No.13.
- Jana, S. K., & Lise, W. (2013). Participation in Tank Irrigation Management in Dry Zones in India, *European Water Publications*, 42, 35-50.
- Operating Instructions: Mobile River Discharge Measurement System OTT Qliner 2, www.ott.com, accessed on 14th February 2018.

8