Short Communication Range Mgmt. & Agroforestry 41 (2) : 374-380, 2020 **ISSN 0971-2070**



Soil organic carbon content and nutrient status in temperate agroforestry systems of Kashmir Himalaya

Merajudin Dar*, K.N. Qaisar, A.H. Mughal, P.A. Khan, T.H. Masoodi, J.A. Mugloo and Immad A. Shah

Sher-e Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Srinagar-190025, India *Corresponding author e-mail: mihraj.dar@gmail.com Received: 13th April, 2020 Accepted: 26th July, 2020

Abstract

The study was carried out to assess the soil nutrient status in four prominent agroforestry systems viz., home gardens, horti-agriculture, boundary plantation and hortisilvi-pasture in temperate conditions of Kashmir Himalaya. Home garden was the most prominent system being adopted by farmers (98.43% of the total farmers surveyed). All the four agroforestry systems showed significantly higher values of available N, P, K and OC contents. However, home garden system had maximum nutrient (available N: 337.0, available P: 42.02 and available K: 289.38 kgha⁻¹) and soil organic carbon content (1.57%) due to multi-strata canopy systems. Thus all the studied tree based land use systems at temperate zones were found as sustainable because of efficient nutrient cycling and played an important role in carbon mitigation.

Keywords: Agroforestry systems, Carbon mitigation, Nutrient status, Soil, Temperate zones

The term nutrient cycling, used in most agroforestry systems refer to the continuous transmission of nutrients within a soil-plant system (Nair, 1993; Nair et al., 1995; Buresh and Tian, 1997). Plants absorb and use nutrients from the soil for metabolic processes. In turn, plants naturally return nutrients to the soil as litter falls into the unmanaged systems, deliberately as pruning in some agroforestry systems or through senescence in both managed and unmanaged systems. These plant parts are decomposed by micro-organisms of the soil, which release the nutrients in the soil, thus nutrients become available for plant consumption. In a broader sense, nutrient cycling involves the continuous transfer of nutrients within and between different ecosystem components and includes processes such as mineral weathering, activities of soil biota and other transformations occurring in biosphere, lithosphere and hydrosphere (Jordan, 1985). Nutrients in the component

of the soil contribute to the pool of soil nutrients. Water can remove nutrients from the soil nutrient pool with the nutrient loss level determined by the percolating water flow rate and soil properties. Nutrients such as nitrates, which are readily dissolved in water and weakly held by the soil matrix, are more likely to be leached than other nutrients, such as phosphates, which have very low solubility and mobility in soils. Tree litter fall is one of the main routes in carbon and nutrient cycles that connect above and below the soil (Vitousek and Sanford, 1986). Litter fall has been well studied over the last few decades as an important and uniform source of nutrients and organic matter (Vitousek, 1984; Meier et al., 2005; Carnol and Bazgir, 2013). However, litter fall varies considerably between ecosystems, depending on the climate, the structure of tree species and soil fertility (Vitousek and Sanford, 1986).

Natural forest ecosystems in tropics are self-sufficient with efficient cycling of nutrients. These are closed nutrient cycling systems with relatively low loss or gain of active cycling nutrients and higher rates of nutrients. Most agricultural systems, however, represent open or leaky systems with a relatively high loss of nutrients. Cycling of nutrients in agroforestry falls between these extremes (Nair et al., 1995). However, there is paucity of information on traditional agroforestry systems of Kashmir. Hence, the present study was conducted to assess the soil nutrient status in four different agroforestry systems viz., home gardens, hortiagriculture, boundary plantation and horti-silvi-pasture in the temperate conditions of Kashmir Himalaya.

The study was carried out at Gandebal district of Jammu and Kashmir during the year 2015-2016. It was located between 34° 12' 59" N latitude and 74°46' 18" E longitude at an altitude between 1600 to 3000 m above mean sea level. Its borders is bound with district Baramulla in the West, district Srinagar in the South, newly created district

Dar et al.

Bandipora in the North-West and district Kargil in the East. The soil of district Ganderbal varies from silt clay loam to clay loam. The climate is temperate type with the upper areas receives heavy snowfall during winter. Average annual precipitation was 1753.9 and 991.5 during the year 2015 and 2016, respectively.





Fig 1. False colour composite (FCC) and map of sampled villages of district Ganderbal, Kashmir

The study was based on field survey of four prominent agroforestry systems *viz.*, home gardens, horti-agriculture, boundary plantation and horti-silvi-pasture in selected representative areas of the temperate conditions of Kashmir Himalaya (Table 1). Adoption and

practice of these agroforestry systems depended on the edapho-climatic condition, socioeconomic status and needs of peasants. These attributes lead to variation in the structure and composition of recommended technologies and existing agrarianism. Soil sampling (for available N, P, K and OC content) was carried out during mid-May, mid-July, mid September, and mid November, respectively. Soil samples were collected randomly from six villages (Bakura, Wakura, Hakeem gund, Akhal, Watlar and Gund) at two depths i.e., 0-30 and 30-60 cm in each system. Each sample was then thoroughly mixed, air dried, grinded with pestle and mortar, sieved through a 2 mm mesh screen. The sieved soil samples were stored in paper bags for chemical analysis. Organic carbon was determined by Walkley Black rapid titration method (Jackson, 1958), while available nitrogen by alkaline permanganate method (Subbiah and Asija, 1956) and available phosphorous by Olsen's method (Olsen et al., 1954). But potassium was determined by flame photometry after extraction with neutral normal ammonium acetate (Jackson, 1973). The data was subjected to statistical analysis following the standard methods (Snedecor and Cochran, 1968).

Nitrogen is an important factor in soil fertility, plant strata and therefore, it is necessary to manage the delicate balance between nitrogen (N) supply and crop demand in order to achieve economic profitability and environmental protection objectives (Zebarth et al., 2009). The available nitrogen content was declined with the increase in depth in all the agroforestry systems studied. The maximum available nitrogen content was recorded in home gardens (349.8 kg ha-1) at D, and (295.2 kg ha⁻¹) at D₂, while minimum in boundary plantation (309.0 kga⁻¹) at depth D₁ and (260.3 kg ha⁻¹) at D₂ (Table 2). Further maximum nitrogen content was recorded in autumn, whereas its minimum value was recorded in early spring in the all four land use systems which could be attributed to increased requirement of energy and nutrients by microbes and new root system under the influence of increased moisture regime and temperature of the soil. Higher available nitrogen in home garden and horti-silvi-pastoral system than boundary plantation might be due to the increasing level of soil exploitation, intensive farming, soil erosion, organic matter mineralization in the leaf litter (Haag and Kaupenjoham, 2001). Curtin and Campbell (2008) reported that organic matter, crop residues and organic amendments plus residual soil mineral N from the previous growing season are also important sources of nitrogen supply. Cassman and Munns (1980) indicated that surface soil

Soil nutrient status of temperate agroforestry systems

was responsible for a considerable part of mineral N release, however, deeper soil layers could not be ignored because of their potential contribution to net soil N mineralization.

During the month of May, the concentrations of soil N and other nutrients were lower in prominent agroforestry systems, but the concentration of these nutrients gradually increased in the months of July, September and November. Indeed, microbial population present in the soil, soil temperature and moisture regime played an important role in the temporal increase of soil nutrients (RavIna *et al.*, 1995; Hoskinson *et al.*, 1999). Reynolds *et al.* (2000) reported that the availability of nutrients decreased with decrease in temperature.

The available phosphorus level varied in all the four prominent agroforestry systems. In our findings home gardens recorded higher available phosphorus, while it was lower in boundary plantation (Table 3). This might be due to dense finer root, rapid microbial activity, higher proportion of leaf litter and the effect of plant root on soil and phosphorus availability (Yitbarek *et al.*, 2013). The lower concentration of available phosphorus in higher soil depth D_2 when compared to D_1 in all prominent land use systems could be attributed to surface enrichment due to the litter production and decomposition in treebased production systems (Starr *et al.*, 2005).

The available potassium level also varied in four prominent agroforestry systems. The maximum available potassium (305.2 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in the home garden and the minimum potassium level (256.6 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded in boundary plantation (Table 4). Higher available potassium in home garden or other agroforestry systems was probably due to nutrient rich litters of trees which contributed to substantial amount of potassium returned back to the soil (Puri *et al.*, 1994; Saha *et al.*, 1999; Lin and Kao., 2001) and relatively higher pumping of potassium from the sub-soil by vegetation (Moges *et*

 Table 1. Details of most prominent agroforestry systems selected for the study

| | | | | , | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Agroforestry | No. of farmers | Tree | Fruit | Crop components | | | | | |
| system | adopted* | | | Rabi | Kharif | | | | |
| Home gardens | 189 (98.43%) | Poplar, Salix | Apple, Pear | Turnip, Radish, Kale | Chilli, Beans, Kale | | | | |
| Horti-agriculture | 117 (60.93%) | - | Apple | Turnip, Radish, Kale | Beans, Knol-khol, Kale | | | | |
| Boundary plantation | 67 (34.89%) | Poplar,Salix | - | Oats/ Mustard | Paddy | | | | |
| Horti-silvi-pasture | 46 (23.95%) | Poplar,Salix | Apple | Trifolium repens (white clover), Polygo | | | | | |
| | | | | hydropiper (water pep | per), Trifolium pretense | | | | |
| | | | | (red clover), Aegilops | <i>tauschii</i> (Tausch's goat | | | | |
| | | | | grass), Amaranthus spi | nosus (spiny amaranth), | | | | |
| | | | | Echinochloa crus-galli | (cockspur grass), Lolium | | | | |
| | | | | perenne (rye grass) |), Bromus japonicas | | | | |
| | | | | (Japanese brome), C | linopodium umbrosum | | | | |
| | | | | (shady calamint), Ch | enopodium album (pig | | | | |
| | | | | weed) and Avena sativa | a (wild oats) | | | | |
| *Out of total 192 farme | rs surveyed | | | | | | | | |

Table 2 Status of available nitrogen (kg ha⁻¹) under prominent agro

| Maria Ala | Llaws a mandama | I have the second second second | Devenden verlev fetter | 11 41 11 1 |
|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Table 2. | Status of available nitrogen | (kg ha ⁻) under prominent | agroforestry systems (pooled | data of 2015- 2016) |

| Month | Hor | ne gard | ens | Hort | l-agri sy | stem | Boun | dary plar | ntation | Horti-silv | | IVI- |
|----------------|----------------|---------|-------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|----------------|---------|----------------|----------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | | | ра | storal s | ystem |
| | Soil | depth | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean |
| | D ₁ | D_2 | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D_2 | depth |
| M ₁ | 329.5 | 273.7 | 301.6 | 302.4 | 242.4 | 272.44 | 293.3 | 239.3 | 266.28 | 318.6 | 267.5 | 293.1 |
| M ₂ | 347.3 | 292.2 | 319.8 | 317.0 | 259.8 | 288.38 | 305.0 | 265.2 | 285.10 | 332.0 | 281.5 | 306.3 |
| M ₃ | 358.2 | 305.7 | 332.2 | 323.1 | 267.5 | 295.28 | 317.7 | 275.6 | 296.64 | 341.5 | 288.6 | 315.1 |
| M ₄ | 364.4 | 309.5 | 337.0 | 326.4 | 271.8 | 299.10 | 320.2 | 279.7 | 299.95 | 346.2 | 293.3 | 320.3 |
| Mean | 349.8 | 295.2 | | 317.4 | 260.4 | | 309.0 | 264.3 | | 334.6 | 282.7 | |
| CD(P < 0.05) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Μ | | 30.06 | | | 12.28 | | | 13.88 | | | | 11.16 |
| D | | 21.24 | | | 8.68 | | | 9.82 | | | | 7.88 |
| M×D | | 42.5 | | | 17.36 | | | 19.62 | | | | 15.78 |

Soil depth: $D_1 = 0.30$ cm, $D_2 = 30.60$ cm; Month: $M_1 = May$, $M_2 = July$, $M_3 = September$, $M_4 = November$

Dar et al.

al., 2013), besides variation in cropping pattern (Annapurna *et al.*, 2017). The available potassium followed the same trend as of nitrogen and phosphorus. This was probably due to higher microbial activities with recycling of nutrients through leaf litters and more favou-

-rable physical conditions *viz.*, better soil moisture and temperature under the trees (Qaisar *et al.*, 2007; Vanlalhluba and Sahoo, 2010). Semwal *et al.* (2009) also observed maximum available phosphorus in winter season, which was due to accumulation of minerals that usually takes place in winter season.

Table 3. Status of available phosphorous (P_2O_5 ; kg ha⁻¹) under prominent agroforestry systems (pooled data of 2015-2016)

| Month | Hoi | Home gardens | | | Horti-agri system | | | Boundary plantation | | | Horti-silvi- | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | pastoral system | | | | | | | |
| | Soil | Soil depth Mean | | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean Soil d | | depth | Mean | |
| | D ₁ | D_2 | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D_2 | depth | |
| M ₁ | 28.30 | 18.87 | 23.58 | 23.57 | 15.92 | 19.74 | 19.85 | 13.60 | 16.72 | 25.77 | 16.83 | 21.30 | |
| M ₂ | 37.67 | 26.03 | 31.85 | 29.17 | 23.40 | 26.28 | 26.57 | 19.93 | 23.24 | 33.67 | 25.23 | 29.45 | |
| M ₃ | 43.47 | 34.57 | 39.02 | 36.53 | 29.17 | 32.85 | 32.49 | 24.40 | 28.44 | 39.53 | 30.23 | 34.88 | |
| M ₄ | 45.97 | 38.97 | 42.02 | 38.73 | 32.53 | 35.63 | 34.03 | 27.54 | 30.78 | 41.60 | 33.47 | 37.53 | |
| Mean | 38.85 | 29.38 | | 32.00 | 25.26 | | 28.23 | 21.36 | | 35.14 | 26.44 | | |
| CD (P<0.05) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| М | | 5.66 | | | 4.04 | | | 7.84 | | | 5.54 | | |
| D | | 4.00 | | | 2.86 | | | 5.56 | | | 3.39 | | |
| M×D | | 8.02 | | | 5.72 | | | 11.12 | | | 7.84 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 4. Status of available potassium (K_2O ; kg ha⁻¹) under prominent agroforestry systems (pooled data of 2015-2016)

| Month | Но | me gard | ens | Horti | i-agri sy | stem | Boun | dary pla | ntation | Horti-si | | lvi- |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|------------|----------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|---------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| | | | | | | | | | | ра | astoral s | ystem |
| | Soil | depth | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil depth | | Mean |
| | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth |
| M ₁ | 289.3 | 233.5 | 261.4 | 257.3 | 202.5 | 229.9 | 239.8 | 205.5 | 222.6 | 265.7 | 241.3 | 253.5 |
| M ₂ | 302.4 | 247.2 | 274.7 | 273.4 | 216.3 | 244.9 | 255.1 | 219.1 | 237.1 | 277.1 | 257.4 | 267.2 |
| M ₃ | 312.2 | 256.6 | 284.4 | 281.6 | 222.1 | 251.8 | 263.5 | 223.7 | 243.6 | 285.6 | 266.6 | 275.8 |
| M ₄ | 317.2 | 261.7 | 289.3 | 286.7 | 225.1 | 255.9 | 268.0 | 225.8 | 246.9 | 289.4 | 271.3 | 280.4 |
| Mean | 305.2 | 249.7 | | 274.7 | 216.5 | | 256.6 | 218.0 | | 279.3 | 259.3 | |
| CD (P<0.05) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Μ | | 14.58 | | | 8.72 | | | 17.16 | | | 15.68 | |
| D | | 10.3 | | | 6.18 | | | 12.12 | | | 11.10 | |
| M × D | | 20.62 | | | 12.34 | | | 24.26 | | | 22.18 | |

Table 5. Status of oil organic carbon (OC; %) in prominent agroforestry systems (pooled data of 2015- 2016)MonthHome gardensHorti-agri systemBoundary plantationHorti-silvi-

| WOITUT | nome gardens | | | nonu-agir system | | | Douii | ual y piai | ination | 1010-5111- | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|----------------|---------|------------|----------------|--------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | p | astoral s | system | |
| | Soil depth | | Mean | Soil c | depth | Mean | Soil d | epth | Mean | Soil | depth | Mean | |
| | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D ₁ | D ₂ | depth | D | D ₂ | depth | |
| M ₁ | 1.91 | 0.95 | 1.43 | 1.12 | 0.91 | 1.01 | 1.09 | 0.65 | 0.87 | 1.62 | 1.09 | 1.36 | |
| M ₂ | 1.95 | 1.06 | 1.51 | 1.22 | 1.07 | 1.15 | 1.14 | 0.69 | 0.91 | 1.76 | 1.18 | 1.47 | |
| M ₃ | 1.99 | 1.09 | 1.53 | 1.32 | 1.16 | 1.24 | 1.19 | 0.74 | 0.96 | 1.82 | 1.29 | 1.55 | |
| M ₄ | 2.01 | 1.13 | 1.57 | 1.38 | 1.09 | 1.30 | 1.22 | 0.79 | 1.00 | 1.86 | 1.34 | 1.60 | |
| Mean | 1.96 | 1.05 | | 1.26 | 1.05 | | 1.16 | 0.71 | | 1.76 | 1.22 | | |
| CD (P<0.05) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Μ | | 0.10 | | | 0.12 | | | 0.05 | | | 0.12 | | |
| D | | 0.70 | | | 0.09 | | | 0.04 | | | 0.08 | | |
| M×D | | 0.15 | | | 0.18 | | | 0.08 | | | 0.16 | | |

Soil depth: $D_1 = 0.30$ cm, $D_2 = 30.60$ cm; Month: $M_1 = May$, $M_2 = July$, $M_3 = September$, $M_4 = November$

Soil nutrient status of temperate agroforestry systems

The potential of agroforestry systems to increase both above ground and below ground carbon stock is an important tool for mitigation of climate change (Bangroo et al., 2013; Cardineal et al., 2015; Chaturvedi et al., 2016). Soil organic carbon (SOC) content was significantly influenced due to change in agroforestry systems as well as increase in soil depth (Table 5). Maximum organic carbon (1.96%) was found in home garden and minimum (1.16%) in boundary plantation. The increased organic carbon content in soils under home garden might be ascribed to more leaf litter, root turnover from trees, crops and organic waste deposition (Zegeve, 1999). The enrichment in SOC under tree-based systems could be due to several factors such as addition of litter, annual fine root biomass recycling, root exudates and reduced oxidation of organic matter under tree shade (Singh et al., 1989). Lower organic carbon content in boundary plantation was also reported by Cihacek and Ulmer (1998) and Pal et al. (2013) earlier. The higher organic carbon in home garden and horti-silvi-pastoral system was also attributed to increased accumulation followed by decomposition under tree based land use system.

Further organic carbon in soil under different agroforestry systems was minimum in the month of May. It increased throughout the season and it was maximum in November. The turn-over of carbon in soil is controlled mainly by water regime and temperature. Lower organic carbon content in soil in late spring and early summer might be due to increased requirement of energy and nutrients by microbes and new root systems developing under the influence of increased moisture regime and temperature of the soil. The increase in organic carbon towards the end of the growing season might be attributed to slower rate of decomposition. High rates of decomposition during growth season results in decrease in organic carbon concentration of soil. The present findings corroborated with the earlier findings of Raich (1983), who recorded lowest soil organic carbon in summer, which was ascribed to higher soil temperature. Further in the present study organic carbon showed decreasing trend with respect to depth. Similar findings were also documented in earlier studies (Wells et al., 2013; Sinoga et al., 2012; Lawrence et al., 2015).

It was concluded that all four prominent agroforestry systems *viz.*, home gardens, horti-agriculture, boundary plantation and horti-silvi-pasture system showed significantly higher values of available N, P, K and OC content. Although maximum nitrogen (337.0 kg ha⁻¹), phosphorus (42.02 kg ha⁻¹), potassium (289.3 kg ha⁻¹)

and organic carbon contents (1.57%) were recorded in home garden due to multi-strata canopy systems. Thus the prominent tree based land use systems of temperate zone were found sustainable because of efficient nutrient cycling and these are playing an important role in carbon dioxide mitigation.

References

- Annapurna, M.V.N.T., B.S. Kadam and H.K. Surshi. 2017. Distribution of different forms of potassium of representative soil series of sus-mortance zone of Maharasta, India. *Inernational Journal of Microbial and Applied Sciences* 6: 2648-2653.
- Bangroo, S. A, Ali Tahir, Mahdi S. Sheraz, G.R. Najar and J.A. Sofi. 2013. Carbon and greenhouse gas mitigation through soil carbon sequestration potential of adaptive agriculture and agroforestry systems. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 34: 1-11.
- Buresh, R.I and G. Tian. 1997. Soil improvement by trees in sub-Saharan Africa. *Agroforestry Systems* 38: 51-76.
- Cardinael, R., T. Chevallier, B.G. Barthès, N.P.A. Saby, T. Parent, C. Dupraz, M. Bernoux and C. Chenu. 2015. Impact of alley cropping agroforestry on stocks, forms and spatial distribution of soil organic carbon– a case study in a Mediterranean context. Geoderma 259-260: 288-299.
- Carnol, M. and M. Bazgir. 2013. Nutrient return to the forest floor through litter and through fall under 7 forest species after conversion from Norway spruce. *Forest Ecology Management* 309: 66-75.
- Cassman, K.G. and D.N. Munns. 1980. Nitrogen mineralization as affected by soil moisture, temperature and depth. *Soil Science Society of American Journal* 40: 1233 -1237.
- Chaturvedi, O.P., A.K. Handa, R. Kaushal, A. R. Uthappa, S. Sarvade and P. Panwar.2016. Biomass production and carbon sequestration through agroforestry. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 37: 116-127.
- Cihacek, L.J and M.G. Ulmer. 1998. Effect of tillage on profile soil carbon distribution in the northern Great Plains of the US. In: R. Lal, J. Kimble, R. Follett and B.A. Stewart (eds). Soil Management and Green House Effect. CRC press, Boca Raton, FL, USA. pp. 83-91.
- Curtin, D and C.A. Campbell. 2008. Mineralizable nitrogen. In: M.R. Carter and E.G. Gregorich (eds). *Soil Sampling and Methods of Analysis*. 2nd edn. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FI, USA. pp. 599-606.

- Haag, D and M. Kaupenjohann. 2001. Landscape fate of nitrate fluxes and emissions in Central Europe: critical review of concepts, data, and models for transport and retention. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 86: 121.
- Hoskinson, R.L., J.R. Hess, R.S. Alessi and J.V Stafford. 1999. Temporal changes in the spatial variability of soil nutrients. In: *Proceedings of 2nd European Conference on 'Precision Agriculture' (July 11-15, 1999)*, Odeuse, Denmark. pp. 61-70.
- Jackson, M. L. 1958. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Jackson, M. L.1973. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. 2nd edn. Prentice Hall of India, Private Limited, New Delhi. pp 1-498.
- Jordan, C.F. 1985. *Nutrient Cycling in Tropical Forest Ecosystems*. John Wiley, New York, pp. 1-190.
- Lawrence, C.R., J.W. Harden., X. Xu., M.S. Schul and S.E. Rumbore. 2015. Long term controls and soil organic carbon with depth and time; A case study form the cowlitz river chronosequence, WA, USA. *Geoderma* 247-248: 73-87.
- Lin, C.C and C.H. Kao. 2001. Abscisic acid induced changes in cell wall peroxidase activity and hydrogen peroxide level in roots of rice seedlings. *Plant Science*.160: 323-329.
- Meier, I. C., C. Leuschner and D. Hertel. 2005. Nutrient return with leaf litter fall in *Fagus sylvatica* forests across a soil fertility gradient. *Plant Ecology* 177: 99-112.
- Moges, A., M. Dagnachew and F. Yimer. 2013. Land use effects on soil quality indicators: case study of Abo-Wonsho Southern Ethiopia. *Applied and Environmental Soil Science* 1: 1-9.
- Nair, P.K.R. 1993. An Introduction to Agroforestry, Kluver, Dorddrect. pp. 1-499.
- Nair, P.K.R., B.T. Kang and D.B.L. Kass. 1995. Nutrient cycling and soil erosion control in agroforestry system in agriculture and environment; Bridging food production in developing countries, ASA Special Publication No. 60, *American Society of Agronomy*, Madison, WI.
- Olsen, S.R., C.V. Cole, F. S. Watanabe and L.A. Dean, 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus by extracting with sodium bicarbonate. USDA circular 939. US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Pal, S., P. Pawar and N.D.R. Dhardwaj. 2013. Soil quality under forest compared to other land users in acid soil of north western Himalaya, India. *Annals of Forest Research* 56: 187-198.

- Puri, S., A. Kumar and S. Singh. 1994. Productivity of *Cicer* arietinum (chickpea) under *Prosopis cineraria* agroforestry system in the arid regions of India. *Journal of Arid Environments* 27: 85-98.
- Qaisar, K. N., P.A. Khan, S.N. Zaffar and J.A. Mugloo. 2007. Fodder production in agricultural system under rainfed condition in Kashmir *Indian Journal of Agroforestry* 9: 20-22.
- Raich, J.W. 1983. Effect of forest conversion on the carbon budget of a tropical soil. *Biotropica* 15: 177-184.
- Ravlna, M.D., M. J. Acea and T. Carballas. 1995. Seasonal changes in microbial biomass and nutrient flush in forest soils. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 19: 220-226.
- Reynolds, P.E., N.V, Thevathasau, J.A Simpson and A.M. Gordon. 2000. Alternative conifer release treatments affect microclimate and soil nitrogen mineralization. *Forest Ecology and Management* 133: 115-125.
- Saha, B., J.S. Samra, K. Singh and M.L. Juneja. 1999. Physicochemical properties of soil under different land use systems. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science* 47: 133-140.
- Semwal, D. P., P.L. Uniyal, Y.M. Bahuguna and A.B. Bhatt. 2009. Soil nutrient storage under different forest types in a part of central Himalaya, India. *Annals of Forestry* 17: 43-52.
- Singh, K., H.S. Chauhan, D.K. Rajput and D.V. Singh. 1989. Report of a 60 month study on litter production, changes in soil chemical properties and productivity under poplar (*P. deltoides*) and Eucalyptus (*E. hybrid*) inter-planted with aromatic grasses. *Agroforestry Systems* 9: 37-45.
- Sinoga, J. R., S. Pariente, A.R. Diaz and J.F.M. Murillo. 2012. Variability of relationships between soil organic carbon and some soil properties in Mediterranean rangelands under different climatic conditions (south of Spain). *Catena* 94: 17-25.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran. 1968. *Statistical Methods*. 6th edn. Oxford and IBH pub. Co., India.
- Starr, M., S. Saarsalmi, T. Hokkanen, P. Merila and H.S. Helmisaari. 2005. Models of litter fall production for Scots pine (*Pinus sylventris* L.) in Finland using stand site and climate factors. *Forest, Ecology and Management* 205: 215-225.
- Subbiah, B.V and G.L. Asija, G.L. 1956. A rapid procedure for the determination of available nitrogen in soils. *Current Science* 25: 259-260.
- Vanlalhluba, P.C and U.K. Sahoo. 2010. Tree greater and crop yield hair agroforestry practices in Mizoram, NE India. *Journal Tropical Forestry* 26: 49-54.

Soil nutrient status of temperate agroforestry systems

- Vitousek, P. M and R.L. Sanford. 1986. Nutrient cycling in moist tropical forest. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 17: 137-167.
- Vitousek, P. M. 1984. Litter fall, nutrient cycling, and nutrient limitation in tropical forests. *Ecology* 65: 285-298.
- Wells, M.S., S.C. Reberg-Horton, A.N. Smith and J.M. Grossman. 2013. The reduction of plant-available nitrogen by cover crop mulches and subsequent effects on soybean performance and weed interference. Agronomy Journal 105: 539-545.
- Yitbarek, T., H. Gebrekidan, K. Kibret and S. Beyene. 2013. Impacts of land use on selected physicochemical properties of soils of Abobo area, western Ethiopia. *Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries* 2: 177-183.
- Zebarth, B.J., C.F. Drury, N. Tremblay and A.N. Cambouris. 2009. Opportunities for improved fertilizer nitrogen management in production of arable crops in eastern Canada: a review. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* 89: 113-132.
- Zegeye, M.W. 1999. Tree crop interaction studies in agrihorti-silviculture system. M.Sc. Thesis. Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan (HP), India.