

### **Research Paper**



### Water and Soil Quality Analysis of Selected Areas of Sunderban and Mapping Using GIS Technique

\*Mane Ashish Vilas and Ghosal Ashwinova Department of Environmental Science, Fergusson College, Pune 411004, Maharashtra, INDIA

(Received 12<sup>th</sup> July 2015, Accepted 31<sup>st</sup> August 2015)

Abstract: Mangrove ecosystem of Sunderbans is dynamic, fragile and comprised of a complex network of estuaries, tidal inlets, tidal creeks and large number of islands. Due to temporal and spatial variations in water and soil qualities, monitoring programs help to understand quality of natural ecosystems. The present investigation was undertaken to assess seasonal and spatial variations in pH, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, hardness, turbidity, sodium and potassium of water. Similarly, soil samples were also checked for pH, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, water holding capacity, organic carbon, organic matter and calcium carbonate. The results of the various parameters significantly fluctuated over different seasons. The surface water of the study area was brackish to brine. All parameters except turbidity have shown highest concentration in monsoon. Overall, the concentration of water quality parameters were governed by flushing of rainfall, river water flow, seawater intrusion, runoff from agricultural fields and oil from spill. The high percentage of organic matter and calcium carbonate content might beattributed decomposition of plant-animal residues in mangrove area. Mud content in the study area was higher because of high organic matter in the soil while the high water holding capacity directs that soil was clayey in texture. It is advisable that continuous baseline, monitoring studies for water and soil quality analysis is carried out with scientific approach to conserve the mangrove ecosystem. Monitoring programs using remote sensing and GIS can be used to tackle the threats at all levels efficiently.

Keywords:Sunderban, Mangroves, Water Analysis, Soil Quality, GIS Mapping

© 2015 IJRCE. All rights reserved

istry

#### Introduction

Estuarine and coastal areas are complex and dynamic aquatic environment<sup>[1]</sup>. Coastal waters has become a major concern because of its value for socioeconomic development and human health. With the growth of human population and commercial industries, estuarine water has received large amounts of pollution from a variety of sources such as recreation, fish culture and the assimilation and transport of pollution effluents through river <sup>[2]</sup>. These situations have generated great pressure on estuarine ecosystem, resulting in degradation of water quality, soil quality and biodiversity. Overall, these reasons have caused loss of critical natural habitats<sup>[3]</sup>. Other drivers of mangrove destruction are wood extraction, climate change and industrial development, such as harbours and tourism. Oil contamination of mangrove habitat has significant hydrocarbon levels after a spill event <sup>[4,5]</sup>. These impacts are likely to continue and worsen as human population and

other activities expand further. Recognition of these impacts on mangrove ecosystem is likely to develop sustainable approaches. Mangroves represent only 1% (100,000 sq.km) of the area of tropical forests with tree species number showing decline from equatorial region to sub tropical region with increase of latitude. Mangroves grow throughout the tropics and are limited in their subtropical distribution due to lack of temperature resistance <sup>[6]</sup> and are available along almost 75% of the coastline <sup>[7]</sup> between 25° N and 25 °S latitudes. Mangroves vary both in their salinity tolerance and in the degree to which salinity maybe necessary to maintain their growth and competitive dominance<sup>[8]</sup>.

Mangrove ecosystem of Sunderbans is dynamic, fragile with vegetation and environmental factors interconnecting the process of energy fixation, accumulation of biomass, decomposition of dead organic matter and nutrient cycling. Belonging to the class of a tidedominated wetland <sup>[9]</sup> the Sunderban wetland is comprised of a complex network of estuaries, tidal inlets, tidal creeks and a large number of islands which are frequently inundated with salt water. Most of the creeks act as a s pathway for to-and-fro movement of tidal water and downstream flow of river systems. The region is covered solely by quaternary sediments carried and deposited by the rivers Ganges, Matla and Bidyadhari. It is the largest remaining tract of mangrove forest in the world which is an independent biome and has rich biodiversity<sup>[10]</sup>. Sunderban's highly productive ecosystem acts as a natural fish nursery. Over 1186 numbers of known living species

### **Materials and Methods**

**Sample Collection:** Surface water and soil samples were collected thrice over a period of six months in the monsoon (September 2014), post-monsoon (December 2014) and winter (February 2015). Water samples were collected in pre-cleaned polythene bottles during high tide in forenoon hours. The bottles were kept in black polythene bags to avoid direct interference with sunlight. They were transported to the laboratory and preserved for 24 hours in refrigerator after which they were analyzed. Soil samples were collected from adjacent areas in white plastic bottles and kept in black polythene bags to avoid sunlight. They were transported to the lab where the samples were analyzed within 48 hours.

### Water Quality Analysis

The methods of water quality analysis were in consistent with the standard methods mentioned in 'Handbook of Water Analysis' <sup>[22]</sup> and 'Practical Methods in Ecology and Environmental Science' <sup>[23]</sup>.

### pН

pH of the water samples was determined digitally by using Digital pH meter of Hanna Instruments.

### **Electrical Conductivity and Total Dissolved Solids**

Electrical conductivity (EC) and Total dissolved solids (TDS) of the water sample was determined by using Cyberscan Con 11 Conductivity/TDS meter of Eutech Instruments where the electrode was directly dipped into water samples to get a direct digital display of the result.

### Turbidity

Turbidity of the sample was measured by Nephalometric method using the Nephelo-turbidity Meter 132 model of Systronics. The sample was poured into the cell and turbidity was read directly from digital display of the instrument.

### **Total Hardness**

The total hardness of the water samples was determined by **EDTA** titration method where50 ml of the sample was taken in a conical flask and pH of the solution was adjusted to 10 by adding Buffer solution. A pinch of Eriochrome black-T indicator was added and titrated with 0.01M EDTA

dominated wetland <sup>[9]</sup> the Sunderban wetland is comprised of a complex network of estuaries, tidal inlets, tidal creeks and a large number of islands which are frequently inundated with salt water. Most of the creeks act as a s pathway for to-and-fro movement of tidal water and downstream flow of river systems. The region is covered solely by quaternary sediments carried and deposited by the rivers Ganges, Matla and Bidyadhari. It is the largest remaining tract of mangrove forest in the world which is an independent biome and has rich biodiversity<sup>[10]</sup>. Sunderban's highly productive ecosystem acts as a natural fish nursery. Over 1186 numbers of known living species (flora and fauna) are found in the biome<sup>[11]</sup>. Sunderban mangrove reduces the fury of cyclonic storm and prevents erosion due to tidal action. Millions of people depend on Sunderban ecosystem for their livelihood through fishing, fuelwood, timber collection and other materials of importance. Over one million people directly or indirectly depend on the forest for their livelihood and the forest contributes a great amount of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)<sup>[12,13]</sup>. The main concern at present is that, this area is under pressure of urbanization, industrialization and oil from spills, transport and refineries <sup>[14]</sup>. Due to temporal and spatial variations in water and soil qualities, monitoring programs help to understand water and soil quality <sup>[15]</sup>. Quality of water and soil is identified in terms of its physical, chemical and biological parameters <sup>[16]</sup>.

Geographical Information system (GIS) is a computer- based technology for handling geographical data in digital form. It is designed to capture, store, manipulate, analyze, and display diverse sets of spatial or georeferenced data <sup>[17]</sup>. GIS hence, is a powerful and essential tool for mapping, water and soil quality <sup>[18]</sup>. It is very useful and easy to feed data into a GIS environment for integration with other types of data and perform analysis <sup>[19]</sup>. This application is used to obtain informative and userfriendly maps<sup>[20]</sup>. The present investigation was undertaken to assess basic physico-chemical parameters of water and soil of selected areas of Sunderban, West Bengal. The purpose of the study was to examine seasonal and spatial variations in pH, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, total hardness, calcium hardness, magnesium hardness, turbidity, sodium and potassium of water. Soil samples were also checked to find out pH, EC, total dissolved solids, water holding capacity, organic carbon, organic matter and calcium carbonate. We hypothesized that the water and soil quality changes over seasons under the influence of rain, river and seawater.

### **Study Area**

The Sunderban mangrove forest is located between  $21^{0}31$ 'N and  $22^{0}30$ 'N and longitude  $88^{0}10$ 'E and  $89^{0}51$ 'E along the North East coast of Bay of Bengal, India. The climate in the region is characterized by the south-west monsoon (June-September), northeast monsoon or postmonsoon (October-January), and pre-monsoon (Februarytill wine red solution changes to blue. The volume of EDTA consumed was noted and similarly a reagent blank with distilled water was run to calculate the hardness of water samples.

Total Hardness = 
$$\frac{CxDx1000}{mlofsample}$$

Where, C = ml of EDTA required, D = 1M

### Calcium and Magnesium Hardness as CaCO<sub>3</sub>

The Calcium hardness of the water sample was determined by EDTA titration method. 50 ml sample was taken in a conical flask and pH of the solution was adjusted to 10 by adding 1ml NaOH. A pinch of Murexide indicator was added and titrated with 0.01M EDTA till pink color solution changes to purple. The volume of EDTA consumed was noted and similarly a reagent blank with distilled water was run to calculate the hardness of water sample.

Calcium Hardness = 
$$\frac{Cx1000x1.05}{ml. of sample}$$
  
Where, C = volume of Titrant

The Magnesium hardness as  $CaCO_3$  was determined by subtracting the Calcium hardness (as  $CaCO_3$ ) from Total Hardness (as  $CaCO_3$ ).

### Sodium and Potassium

Sodium and potassium content in the water samples were estimated by using a Flame photometer (Systronics-128) where standard concentrations of sodium and potassium were prepared to obtain a standard graph. The air pressure was kept at  $0.5 \text{ kg/cm}^2$  and the gas feeder knob was adjusted so as to obtain a sharp blue flame.

### Soil quality Analysis

### pH, Electrical Conductivity and Total Dissolved Solids

pH of the water sample was determined digitally by using pH meter (Hanna Instruments). Electrical conductivity (EC) and Total dissolved solids (TDS) of the water sample was determined after two days using Cyberscan Con 11 Conductivity/TDS meter of Eutech Instruments where the electrode was directly dipped into water samples to get direct digital display of the result. The soil suspension of 1:5 was prepared in distilled water to obtain these values.

The Organic carbon content of the soil sample was estimated by Walkley and Black (1934) rapid dichromate oxidation method where 0.5 g of oven-dried soil was taken in conical flask and 10 ml 1N potassium dichromate was added. 20 ml concentrated sulphuric acid was poured in a conical flask followed by 200 ml distilled water and 10 ml Ortho-phosphoric acid. 1 ml of Diphenylamine indicator was used to obtain blue-violet to green end point with ferrous ammonium sulphate (FAS) as titrant.

Organic carbon (%) = 
$$\frac{10(B - T) \times 0.003 \times 100}{B \times S}$$

B= Vol. of FAS for blank, T= Vol. of FAS for soil sample, S= Wt. of soil in gm.

The value of organic carbon is multiplied by 1.724 to get the organic matter content of the soil sample.

### Water Holding Capacity

Water holding capacity of the soil sample was estimated byWhatmann filter paper 41 in which 50 g of oven dried soil sample was taken. 50 ml distilled water was poured into it and the filtered water was collected in beaker to obtain volume of water which formed the basis to calculate water holding capacity of the soil.

### **Calcium Carbonate:**

Calcium carbonate content of the soil was estimated by a rapid titration method. 5g soil was taken in 150 ml beaker and 100 ml 1N HCl was added in it. After vigorous stirring for 1 hour, it was allowed to settle and 20 ml of the supernatant was used for titration by using bromothymol blue indicator against 1N NaOH titrant.

Calcium carbonate (%) =  $(B - T) \ge 5$ 

where, B= Volume of 1N NaOH for blank, T= Volume of 1N NaOH for soil

### Data Analysis:

All the data sets have been compiled using Microsoft excel. Each parameter was estimated for two times and the average value was considered as the final result. The Standard deviation was also calculated and presented in tables.

### Mapping:

Google Earth software was used to obtain a base map of the study area. WGS 1984 (Geographic Coordinate System) was selected for spatial reference of the map in ArcCatalogue of ArcGIS 10.1 software. Control points were added to the base map in ArcMap by using the Georeferencing tool. The coordinates of the Google Earth map were considered as reference for creating the shape file. Lastly, Krigging was performed by using ArcGIS 10.1 software in which interpolation in spatial analyst tool from ArcTool Box was used.

## Discussion of Water Quality Analysis: pH:

The pH was recorded in the range of 6.18 to 8.24 over the study period. Highest pH in the month of September 2014 was 7.22 at Chandipur while it was highest for the month of December 2014 and February 2015 by 7.93 at Chandipur and 8.24 at Gosabarespectively. The lowest pH for the month of September 2014 was 6.18 at site Birajmoni while in December 2014 it was 7.82 at Amlamethiand in February 2015 it was 8.06 at Bally.pH in surface estuarine water mostly remained alkaline (pH>7) while it was slightly acidic (pH<7) at few sites during study period, especially in monsoon (Table 1, 2, 3). Generally fluctuations in pH values during different seasons of the year is attributed to factors like removal of  $CO_2$  by photosynthesis through bicarbonate degradation, dilution of

seawater by freshwater influx, reduction of salinity, temperature and decomposition of organic matter [24,35]. The recorded variations in pH value might be due to influence of seawater penetration and high biological activity <sup>[26]</sup>, similar results were also reported by Velsamy*et*  $al^{.[27]}$ .



Figure 1: Overview of Sunderban Mangrove



Figure 2: Roots of Sunderban Mangrove Tree



Figure 3: Bally



Figure 4: Mocumberia



Figure 5: Gosaba



Figure 6: Bijoynagar





Figure 7: Variations in pH of Surface Water





Figure 8: Variations in Electrical Conductivity (mS)of Surface Water

Figure 9: Variations in TDS(ppt)of Surface Water







Figure 11: Variations in Calcium Hardness(mg/l) of Surface Water



Figure 12: Variations in Potassium(mg/l)of Surface Water

pH Range

4.6 - 5 5.1 - 5.3

5.4 - 5.7 5.8 - 6.1 6.2 - 6.4

6.5 - 6.8

6.9 - 7.1

7.2 - 7.5

Reference Scale: 1:250000

2 Kilometers

0 0.5 1

**TITITI** 



![](_page_6_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_5.jpeg)

Figure 15: Variations in Electrical Conductivity (mS)of Soil

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

Reference Scale: 1:250000

### Figure 16: Variations in TDS (ppt)of Soil

![](_page_7_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_6.jpeg)

Reference Scale: 1:250000

![](_page_7_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_9.jpeg)

Figure 18: Variations in Calcium Carbonate (%) of Soil

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

Figure 19: Variations in Water Holding Capacity(%) of Soil

### **Results and Discussion**

Table 1. Water Quality Mary 515 of the Dumples Concercu II on Delected M cas of Dunuer Dan in Dependent, 201	Table 1: Water	Quality Anal	lysis of the Sample	es Collected from	Selected Areas	of Sunderban in S	eptember,	2014
--	----------------	--------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------	-------------------	-----------	------

S. No.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
1.	рН	6.82	6.84	6.82	6.24	6.18	7.15	7.22	7.20
		(±0.03)	(±0.02)	(±0.04)	(±0.03)	(±0.07)	(±0.04)	(±0.06)	(±0.02)
2.	EC (mS)	18.3	25.5	24.8	24.4	25.9	25.7	25.9	25.5
		(±1.2)	(±0.8)	(±0.9)	(±1.3)	(±0.9)	(±0.7)	(±0.8)	(±0.7)
3.	TDS(ppt)	9.1	12.5	12.6	12.3	12.8	12.7	12.9	12.8
		(±0.8)	(±0.5)	(±0.7)	(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±1.1)	(±0.9)	(±0.9)
4.	Total Hardness	9200	8600	8400	8800	9000	7400	8200	7800
	(mg/l)	(±200)	(±200)	(±200)	(±100)	(±100)	(±200)	(±100)	(±200)
5.	Calcium Hardness	3700	3200	3600	3400	4200	3100	3600	3000
	(mg/l)	(±105)	(±105)	(±210)	(±210)	(±105)	(±210)	(±105)	(±105)
6.	Magnesium	5500	5400	4800	4400	4800	3300	4600	4800
	Hardness(mg/l)	5500	5400	4000	++00	+000	5500	4000	4000
7.	Turbidity (NTU)	1.1	1.0	1.2	0.7	1.3	0.9	1.3	1.9
		(±0.2)	(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.1)
8.	Sodium (mg/l)	6750	6900	7500	6450	7600	6900	5900	5700
		(±150)	(±100)	(±150)	(±150)	(±100)	(±100)	(±150)	(±150)
9.	Potassium (mg/l)	375	344	437	356	487	406	392	434
		(±54)	(±64)	(±62)	(±76)	(±68)	(±64)	(±52)	(±56)

### **Electrical Conductivity (EC)**

The electrical conductivity of the samples collected from different sites over study period ranged from 18.1 to 25.9 mS (milli-Siemens).EC was highest at Birajmoni (25.9mS) and lowest at Bally (18.3mS) in September 2014. In the month of December 2014, EC was observed to be highest atBijoynagar andChandipur (18.8mS)and lowest atGosaba(18.1mS). In Ferbuary 2015, EC was found to be highest at Birajmoni (21.6mS) and lowest at Chandipur (19.9mS). Themaximum EC was found in monsoon which might be due to increase in sediment load and influence of high concentration of anions, cations and organic matter. In general, high temperature also favours the conductivity in water bodies.

The TDS of the samples collected ranged from 7.2 to 12.9 ppt (parts per thousand). The Highest value of TDS was observed to be 12.9 ppt at Chandipur in the month of September while in the months of December 2014 and February 2015, highest TDS was found to be 8.8 and 10.6 ppt in Mocumberia and Gosaba areas respectively. The lowest TDS in the month of September was reported to be 9.1 ppt at site Bally while lowest TDS in December 2014 was 7.24 ppt at Gosaba and in February 2015 was 9.2ppt at Godhkhali (Table 1,2,3). Dissolved solids are an important part of water mass which influence the ecology and quality of water <sup>[28]</sup>.TDS had a direct correlation with EC in all the sites. TDS is

generally associated with inorganic salt and there is a close parallelism between TDS and conductivity. Though there is no generally valid exact quantitative relationship

between TDS and conductivity but high conductivity indicates high TDS  $^{\left[29\right]}$ 

<b>S.</b>	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
No.									
1.	pH	7.86	7.84	7.83	7.82	7.84	7.90	7.93	7.88
		(±0.05)	(±0.04)	(±0.04)	(±0.06)	(±0.05)	(±0.03)	(±0.05)	(±0.04)
2.	EC (mS)	18.3	18.6	18.8	18.6	18.2	18.1	18.8	18.6
		(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±0.6)	(±0.8)	(±0.7)	(±0.6)	(±0.9)	(±0.8)
3.	TDS(ppt)	7.97	8.80	8.08	7.93	7.73	7.24	7.38	8.04
		(±0.7)	(±0.6)	(±0.6)	(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±0.7)	(±0.9)	(±0.6)
4.	Total Hardness	2100	2500	2200	2500	2300	1800	2300	2600
	(mg/l)	(±100)	(±200)	(±100)	(±100)	(±100)	(±200)	(±200)	(±100)
5.	Calcium Hardness	945	2100	735	630	630	1040	840	1740
	( <b>mg/l</b> )	(±105)	(±105)	(±210)	(±105)	(±105)	(±105)	(±210)	(±105)
6.	Magnesium Hardness	1155	500	1465	1870	1670	760	1460	860
	( <b>mg/l</b> )								
7.	Turbidity (NTU)	1.0	0.9	3.2	0.9	1.1	3.0	2.2	3.4
		(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.2)	(±0.2)
8.	Sodium (mg/l)	4000	4000	4400	2400	3600	3600	3200	2400
		(±150)	(±100)	(±150)	(±100)	(±100)	(±100)	(±100)	(±150)
9.	Potassium (mg/l)	335	312	395	322	426	388	354	408
		(±58)	(±52)	(±74)	(±64)	(±66)	(±74)	(±54)	(±72)

Table 3: Water Quality	Analysis of the	Samples Collected from	Selected Areas of	Sunderban in	February, 2015
------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-------------------	--------------	----------------

S.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
No.									
1.	pH	8.06	8.14	8.20	8.19	8.19	8.24	8.20	8.23
	•	(±0.06)	(±0.12)	(±0.14)	(±0.08)	(±0.16)	(±0.09)	(±0.12)	(±0.07)
2.	EC (mS)	20.0	20.7	20.9	21.0	21.6	21.5	19.9	20.1
		(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±0.7)	(±0.7)	(±0.8)	(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±0.9)
3.	TDS(ppt)	10.0	10.4	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.6	10.1	9.2
		(±0.9)	(±0.6)	(±0.9)	(±0.8)	(±0.5)	(±0.8)	(±0.9)	(±0.7)
4.	Total Hardness	4800	4100	3000	3000	3200	4600	4000	3400
	( <b>mg/l</b> )	(±100)	(±100)	(±100)	(±200)	(±100)	(±200)	(±200)	(±100)
5.	Calcium Hardness (mg/l)	3045	2415	1890	1995	1995	2835	3045	1995
		(±210)	(±105)	(±210)	(±105)	(±105)	(±210)	(±105)	(±105)
6.	Magnesium Hardness (mg/l)	1755	1685	1110	1005	1205	1765	955	1405
7.	Turbidity (NTU)	3.6	0.9	1.0	2.0	0.8	0.8	1.8	4.2
		(±0.2)	(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.1)	(±0.1)	(±0.2)	(±0.3)
8.	Sodium (mg/l)	5600	6000	5600	4800	4400	3600	3600	2800
		(±150)	(±100)	(±150)	(±150)	(±100)	(±150)	(±150)	(±100)
9.	Potassium (mg/l)	354	338	412	346	442	406	392	438
		(±56)	(±52)	(±64)	(±46)	(±58)	(±62)	(±58)	(±66)

Sr. No.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
1.	рН	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.4	7.4	7.8	7.7	7.8
2.	EC (mS)	18.9	21.6	21.5	21.3	21.9	21.9	21.5	21.4
3.	TDS(ppt)	9.02	10.56	10.26	10.11	10.24	10.18	10.13	10.01
4.	Total Hardness (mg/l)	5367	5066	4533	4766	4833	4600	4833	4600
5.	Calcium Hardness (mg/l)	2563	2571	2075	2008	2275	2325	2495	2245
6.	Magnesium Hardness (mg/l)	2803	2528	2453	2425	2558	1941	2338	2355
7.	Turbidity (NTU)	1.9	0.7	1.8	1.2	1.1	1.5	1.8	3.1
8.	Sodium (mg/l)	5450	5633	5833	4550	5200	4700	4233	3633
9.	Potassium (mg/l)	355	331	415	341	451	400	379	426

Table 4: Average Values of the Water Quality Parameters over Study Period (Used for Mapping)

# Total Hardness, Calcium Hardness & Magnesium Hardness

The noted value of total hardness ranged from 1800 to 9200 mg/l. The maximum total hardness of water was observed in monsoon and minimum in post-monsoon phase. In September 2014, highest total hardness value was 9200 mg/l at Bally and lowest was 7400 mg/l at Gosaba. Highest total hardness in December 2014 and February 2015 were 2600 mg/l and 4800 mg/l at Godhkhali and Bally respectively, while lowest total hardness in December 2014 and February 2015 were 1800 mg/l and 3000 mg/l atGosaba and Bijoynagar, Amlamethirespectively.Calcium hardness ranged across 630 mg/l in December 2014 atAmlamethi and Birajmoni to4200 mg/l at Birajmoni while Mg ranged from 955 mg/l in December 2014 at Mocumberia to 5500 mg/l in September 2014 at Bijoynagar, Birajmoni and Godhkhali. Both calcium and magnesium hardness were maximum in monsoon and minimum in post-monsoon phase (Table 1, 2, 3).Hardness of water is not a specific constituent but it is a variable and complex mixture of cations and anions. It is caused by dissolved polyvalent-metallic ions <sup>[30]</sup>. Hardness in water is mostly due to accumulation of salts/compoundswhich come in contact with soil and various geological formations <sup>[31]</sup> which may enter from direct pollution, anthropogenic activities and agricultural runoff as well. Seasonal variations in Ca and Mg may be attributed due to seawater/freshwater influx <sup>[32]</sup> and fertilizer application on nearby land. High level of hardness may be due to the influx and decay of debris in the area as well as imbalanced level of H<sup>+</sup> ions from surface run-offs during the monsoon [33]

### Turbidity

The recorded values of turbidity range from 0.7 NTU to 3.6 NTU. It was recorded to be highest in February 2015 at Bally and lowest in September 2014 at Amlamethi. Turbidity is a condition resulting from presence of suspended solids in the water, including silts, clays, domestic and industrial sewage and plankton. Turbidity is known to lower oxygen level <sup>[34]</sup>.

### Sodium and Potassium

The range of recorded values forsodium and potassium were 2400 to 7600 mg/l and 322 to 487 mg/l respectively. Highest sodium and potassium concentration in September 2014 were observed to be 7600mg/l and 487mg/l respectively at Birajmoni while the lowest sodium and potassium at concentration in the same month were 5700mg/l and 344mg/l at Godhkhali and Mocumberia respectively. In December 2014, highest sodium and potassium concentrations were noted to be 4400mg/l and 426mg/l at Amlamethi-Godhkhali and Birajmoni respectively whereas lowest sodium and potassium concentration were found to be 2400mg/l and 312mg/lat Bijoynagar and Mocumberia respectively. Highest sodium and potassium concentration in February 2015 were observed to be 6000mg/l and 442mg/l at Mocumberia and Bijoynagar respectively while the lowest sodium and potassium at concentration were reported to be 2800mg/l and 338mg/l at Godhkhali and Mocumberia respectively (Table 1,2,3). High concentration of Na<sup>+</sup> and K<sup>+</sup>ions were mostly due to seawater intrusion in this area. According to surface water standard, the K<sup>+</sup> in fresh water should be 2.3 mg/l<sup>[35]</sup>. Bergman<sup>[36]</sup> found potassium content of seawateras 392 mg/l.

# Discussion of Soil Quality Analysis pH

The pH in soil remained maximum in monsoon and post-monsoon phases.Bally showed acidic condition while soil samples collected from Mocumberia, Bijoynagar and Amlamethiwere weakly acidic. On the other hand,Birajmoni, Gosaba and Chandipur showed neutral to mildly alkaline pH values. Similar findings were recorded by Janakiraman et al.<sup>[37]</sup> in Adyar estuary where it ranged from 7.06 to 7.86. The factors like photosynthesis, respiratory activity, temperature, airconditon, disposal of industrial wastes, bring out changes in pH <sup>[37]</sup>.Hassan and Razzaque<sup>[38]</sup> found that pH value of soil is neutral to slightly alkaline in Sunderban area under field conditions but in some localities, the pH value of dried up subsoil samples drop to 6.5. Mahmood and Saikat<sup>[39]</sup> reported the acidic pH values in the soil of ChakariaSunderban area and mentioned that this area has a rich reserve of pyrite in its soil.

### **Electrical Conductivity (EC)**

The electrical conductivity ranged from 0.09 to 8.7mS. The EC value was maximum in the post-monsoon season and minimum in monsoon, highest being 8.7mS in December 2014 at Chandipur and lowest being 0.2mS in September 2014 at Amlamethi and Godkhali (Table 5, 6, 7). Higher electrical conductivity in the soil suspension of the samples was due to presence of high percentage of soluble salts.

### **Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)**

The TDS ranged from 1.3 to 8.2 pptin the soil suspension (1:5).

Lowest TDS was observed to be 1.3ppt in February 2015 at Birajmoni while the highest TDS was noted to be 8.2ppt at Mocumberia in September 2014. It is clear from the results that maximum TDSoccurred in monsoon and minimum in winter. EC, TDS and soluble salts are interrelated.Generally, salinity acts as a limiting factor in the distribution of living organisms and its variation coursed by dilution and evaporation is most likely to influence the final distribution <sup>[40]</sup>.

### Water Holding Capacity (WHC)

The WHC of soil had been recorded in the range of 28% in September 2014 at Bijoynagar to 44% in December 2014 and February 2015 at Birajmoni and Chandipur respectively (Table 5,6,7). The results of the present investigation indicate that the soil of the study area contains a huge amount of clay.

S.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
No.									
1.	pH	7.2	7.1	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.2
		(±0.09)	(±0.08)	(±0.04)	(±0.12)	(±0.09)	(±0.06)	(±0.08)	$(\pm 0.05)$
2.	EC (mS)	0.9	1.7	0.9	0.2	1.3	0.4	1.3	0.2
		(±0.17)	(±0.15)	(±0.22)	(±0.19)	(±0.16)	(±0.17)	(±0.25)	(±0.19)
3.	TDS(ppt)	4.7	8.2	4.5	7.6	6.5	6.7	7.1	7.2
		(±0.42)	(±0.54)	(±0.36)	(±0.24)	(±0.28)	(±0.32)	(±0.34)	(±0.26)
4.	Organic Carbon (%)	2.4	2.8	2.2	4.0	2.2	4.1	3.2	4.2
		(±0.24)	(±0.36)	(±0.42)	(±0.38)	(±0.32)	(±0.46)	(±0.26)	(±0.34)
5.	<b>Organic Matter (%)</b>	4.1	4.8	3.8	6.9	2.2	7.1	5.5	7.2
6.	Calcium carbonate	7.1	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
	content (%)	(±0.5)	(±1.5)	(±1)	(±2)	(±1.5)	(±0.5)	(±0.5)	(±1)
7.	WHC (%)	32.0	32.0	32.0	36.0	28.0	36.0	28.0	28.0
		(±4)	(±4)	(±2)	(±4)	(±2)	(±2)	(±4)	(±2)

### Table 5: Soil Quality Analysis of the Samples Collected from Selected Areas of Sunderban in September, 2014

Table 6: Soil Quality Analysis of the Samples Collected from Selected Areas of Sunderban in December, 2014

S.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
No.									
1.	pH	2.8	7.7	7.9	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.7	7.2
	_	(±0.11)	(±0.08)	(±0.06)	(±0.08)	(±0.05)	(±0.06)	(±0.08)	(±0.06)
2.	EC (mS)	6.6	3.2	5.5	3.4	6.2	4.6	8.7	4.0
		(±0.35)	(±0.25)	(±0.27)	(±0.22)	(±0.28)	(±0.19)	(±0.34)	(±0.28)
3.	TDS(ppt)	3.2	1.2	2.8	1.7	3.2	2.2	4.3	2.0
		(±0.22)	(±0.18)	(±0.32)	(±0.28)	(±0.26)	(±0.24)	(±0.19)	(±0.25)
4.	Organic Carbon (%)	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.7	2.7	0.8
		(±0.2)	(±0.2)	(±0.4)	(±0.4)	(±0.2)	(±0.3)	(±0.3)	(±0.2)
5.	Organic Matter (%)	1.7	2.6	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.9	4.7	1.3
6.	Calcium carbonate	4.2	3.5	5.2	5.8	5.5	5.4	5.0	5.2
	content (%)	(±0.5)	(±2)	(±1.5)	(±0.5)	(±1.5)	(±0.5)	(±1)	(±0.5)
7.	WHC (%)	40.0	40.0	40.0	46.0	36.0	40.0	44.0	38.0
		(±2)	(±4)	(±4)	(±2)	(±4)	(±6)	(±2)	(±4)

S.	Parameters	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8
No.									
1.	pH	3.6	4.7	4.0	3.1	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.4
	_	(±0.07)	(±0.06)	(±0.09)	(±0.05)	(±0.14)	(±0.06)	(±0.05)	(±0.12)
2.	EC (mS)	3.1	3.0	4.9	1.6	2.6	3.5	3.5	4.2
		(±0.15)	(±0.2)	(±0.23)	(±0.14)	(±0.25)	(±0.18)	(±0.22)	(±0.19)
3.	TDS(ppt)	1.6	1.5	2.6	1.7	1.3	1.8	2.1	1.8
		(±0.2)	(±0.28)	(±0.25)	(±0.2)	(±0.3)	(±0.28)	(±0.3)	(±0.29)
4.	Organic Carbon (%)								0.7
	_	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.5	2.7	1.2	(±0.5)
		(±0.3)	(±0.2)	(±0.2)	(±0.3)	(±0.3)	(±0.5)	(±0.4)	
5.	Organic Matter (%)	5.0	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.3	4.6	2.1	1.2
6.	Calcium carbonate content (%)	3.0	2.1	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0
		(±1)	(±0.5)	(±0.5)	(±1.5)	(±0.5)	(±1.5)	(±0.5)	(±1.5)
7.	WHC (%)	38.0	40.0	34.0	40.0	44.0	36.0	44.0	38.0
		(±4)	(±2)	(±4)	(±4)	(±2)	(±6)	(±4)	(±2)

Table 7: Soil Quality Analysis of the Samples Collected from Selected Areas of Sunderban in February, 2015

Table 8. Average	Values of the Soil	<b>Ouality Parameters</b>	over Study Period	(Used for Manning)
Table 0. Average	values of the boll	Quality I al ameters	over bludy reriou	(Used for mapping)

S.	Parameters	Site1	Site2	Site3	Site4	Site5	Site6	Site7	Site8
No.									
1.	pH	4.6	6.5	6.4	6.0	7.4	7.4	7.5	7.3
2.	EC (mS)	3.3	2.6	3.8	1.7	3.4	2.9	4.5	2.8
3.	TDS(ppt)	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.6	4.5	3.7
4.	Organic Carbon (%)	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.8	2.4	1.9
5.	Organic Matter (%)	5.9	5.6	5.1	6.1	5.7	6.6	5.2	3.3
6.	Calcium carbonate content (%)	4.8	4.2	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.1	5.7	5.4
7.	WHC (%)	36.7	37.3	35.3	40.7	36.0	37.3	38.7	31.3

# Organic Carbon, Organic Matter and Calcium Carbonate Content

Highest organic carbon was found to be 4.2% at Godhkhali in September 2014 and the lowest was noted to be 0.7% at Godhkhali in February 2015. Similarly the high organic matter content was found to be 7.2% in September 2014 at Godkhali whereas the lowest organic matter was found to be 1.2% in the month of February 2015 at the same site (Table 5, 6, 7).Zafar et al.<sup>[41]</sup> reported that organic matter varied between 0.86 to 1.9% in the intertidal muddy beach of Bankhali river estuary of Bangladesh. 5% organic matter is known to be ideal for the proper composition of soil. The organic matter in mangrove soil belongs over 5% <sup>[42]</sup>. The Calcium carbonate content was observed to be in the range of 2.1 to 7.1%. Calcium carbonate was recorded to be highest with 7.1% at Bally in September 2014 while it was lowest with 2.1% in February 2015 at Mocumberia. Organic carbon is related to the mud percentage in the soil <sup>[43-45]</sup>. Therefore, values of organic carbon present in the study reflect the higher mud percentage in the soil than sand. The percentage of organic matter and content of calcium carbonate is higher in Sunderban due to the more decomposition of plant and animal residues in mangrove area <sup>[46]</sup>. In terms of seasonal variations, organic carbon, organic matter and calcium carbonate show similar patterns

56

in concentration levels with maximum in monsoon and minimum in winter.

### Conclusion

The present investigation summarizes various water and soil quality parameters of the samples collected from eight estuarine sites of Sunderban, West Bengal. The results of the parameters significantly fluctuated over different seasons. The surface water of the study area was brackish to brine. All parameters except turbidity have shown highest concentration in monsoon. Sodium concentration remained higher than potassium, calcium and magnesium hardness throughout the study period. EC and TDS have been found to be interrelated. Overall, the concentration of water quality parameters were governed by flushing of rainfall, river water flow, seawater intrusion, runoff from agricultural fields and oil from the spill. The soil quality analysis showed presence of EC and TDS in high concentration. This indicates the influence of seawater in this region. The percentage of organic matter and calcium carbonate content were higher and might be attributed to decomposition of plant-animal residues in mangroves area. This also imparts blackish brown color to soils of Sunderban. Mud content in the study area was higher because of high organic matter in the soil while higher water holding capacity directs that the soil was

clayey in texture. The deterioration of water quality in estuarine regions of Sunderbanmay take place due to insufficiency in water resource protection and lack of environmental planning and management. It is advisable that continuous baseline, monitoring studiesfor water and soil quality analysis are carried out along with scientific approach in order to conserve the pristine mangrove ecosystem of Sunderban. Remote sensing and GIS techniques are the effective, cheaper and valuable tools in monitoring water and soil quality parameter in estuarine areas and various water bodies. The maps can provide guidelines for decision makers and conservationists. Therefore, monitoring programs using remote sensing and GIS are needed to tackle the threats at all levels efficiently.

### Acknowledgement

Authors are thankful to Dr. R. G. Pardeshi, Principal, Fergusson College, Pune and Management of Deccan Education Society for providing necessary facilities and support for completion of present investigation.

### References

1.Morris A.W., Allen J.I., Howland, R.J.M. and Wood R.G., The estuary plume zone: source or sink for land derived nutrient discharges, *Estuary Coast and Shelf Science*, **40**, 387-402 (**1995**)

2.Muduli B.P. and Panda C.R, Physico chemical properties of water collected from Dhamra Estuary, *International Journal of Environmental Science*, **1**, 334-342 (**2010**)

3.Herrera-Silveira J.A., Morales-Ojeda S.M, Evaluation of the health status of a coastal ecosystem in southeast Mexico: assessment of water quality, phytoplankton and submerged aquatic vegetation, *Marine Pollut. Bull.*, **59**, 72-86 (**2009**)

4.Bernard D., Jeremie J.J., Pascal H., First assessment of hydrocarbon pollution in a mangrove, *Marine Pollut. Bull.*, **30**, 146-15, **(1995)** 

5.Bernard D., Pascaline H., Jeremie J.J., Distribution and origin of hydrocarbons in sediments from lagoons with fringing mangrove communities, *Marine. Pollut. Bull.*, **32**, 734-739(**1996**)

6.Dodd R.S., Fromard F., Rafii Z.A. and Blasco F.,Biodiversity among west African Rhizophora: foliar wax chemistry, *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology*, **23**, 859-868(**1995**)

7.Day J.W., Conner W., Ley-Lou F., Day R.H. and Navarro A.M., The productivity and composition of mangrove forests, Laguna de Terminos, Mexico, *Aquatic Botany*, **27**, 267-284 (**1987**)

8.Ellison Aaron M. and Farnsworth E.J., Mangrove communities. In: Marine community ecology (Eds:

Bertness MD, Gaines S and Hay ME) 423-442, Sinauer Press, Sunderland, Massachusetts (2001)

9.Selvam V., Ravichandran K.K., Gnanappazham L., andNavamuniyammal M.,Assessment of community-based restoration of Pichavaram mangrove wetland using remote sensing data, *Current Science*, **85**, 794-798 (**2003**)

10.Gonzalez-Acosta B., Bashan Y. Hernandez-Saavedra N.Y., Ascenaio F.and Cruz-Aguero G., Seasonal seawater temperature as the major determinant for populations of culturable bacteria in the soils of an in-tact mangrove in an arid region, *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, **55**, 311-321. doi:10.1111/j.1574-6941.2005.00019.x(**2006**)

11.Gilman E.L., Ellison J., Duke N.C. and Field C., Threats to mangroves from climate change and adaptation options: A review, *Aquatic Botany*, **89**, 237-250(**2008**)

12.Giri C., Zhu Z., Tieszen L. L., Singh A., Gillette S., and Kelmelis J.A., Mangrove forest distributions and dynamics (1975-2005) of the tsunami-affected region of Asia, *Journal of Biogeography*, **35**, 519-528 (**2008**)

13.Hazra S., Samanta K., Mukhopadhyay A. and Akhand A., Temporal change detection (2001-2008) study of Sunderban, Report submitted to School of Oceanographic Studies, Jadavpur University (**2010**)

14.Mastaller M., Destruction of mangrove wetlands-causes and consequences, *Natural Resources and Development*, 43, 37-57 (**1996**)

15.Dixon W., Chiswell B., Review of aquatic monitoring program design, *Water Res.*, **30**, 1935-1948 (**1996**)

16.Sargaonkar A. and Deshpande V.,Development of an overall index of pollution for surface water waste based on a general classification scheme in Indian context,*Environ Monit. Assess.*, **89**, 43-67 (**2003**)

17.Singh V.P. and Fiorentino M., Geographic information system in hydrology, *Kluwer Academic Publishers*, Dordrecht, (**1996**)

18. Krishna Kumar S., Karthikeyan N., Sashikkumar M.C., Surface water quality monitoring for thamirabarani river basin, Tamil Nadu Using Gis, *International Journal of Remote Sensing & Geoscience (IJRSG)*, 2, (2013)

19.Jha M.K., Chowdhury A., Chowdhary V.M. and Peiffer S, Groundwater management and development by integrated remote sensing and geographic information systems: prospects and constraints, *Water Resour Manage* (2007)

20.Priya K.L., Jebastina N. and Prince Arulraj G., Assessment of Water Quality Indices for Groundwater in

the Singanallur Sub-Basin, Coimbatore, India, *Open Access Scientific Report* (2012)

21.Das S., De M., Ganguly D., Maiti T.K., Mukherjee A., Jana T.K., De T.K., Depth Integrated Microbial Community and Physico-Chemical Properties in Mangrove Soil of Sundarban, *Advances in Microbiology*, **2**, 234-240 (**2012**)

22.Maiti, S.K., Handbook of Methods in Environmental Studies: Water and Wastewater Analysis. ABD. Publishers, Jaipur(Rajasthan) India, **1**, (2004)

23. Trivedy R.K., Goel P.K., Trisal C.L., Practical Methods in Ecology and Environmental Science, Enviro Media Publication, Karad, India (**1998**)

24.Upadhay S., Physico-chemical characteristics of the Mahanadhi estuarine ecosystem, East Coast of India, *Ind. J. Mar. Sci*, **17**, 19-23 (**1988**).

25.Rajasegar M., Physico-chemical characteristics of the Vellar estuary in relation to shrimp farming, *J. Environ. Biol.*, **24**, 95-101 (**2003**)

26.Balasubramanian R. and Kannan L., Physicochemical characteristics of the coral reef environs of the Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve, India. *Int. J. Ecol. Environ. Sci.*, **31**, 265-271 (**2005**)

27. Velsamy G., Manoharan N., Ganesan S., Analysis of physico-chemical variations in sea water samples Uppanar estuary, Cuddalore, Tamilnadu, India, *International Journal of Research in Biological Sciences*, **3**, 80-8 (**2013**) 28. Fan X., Cui B., Zhang K., Zhang Z., & Shao H., Water quality management based on Division of dry and wet seasons in Pearl River Delta, China, *Clean-Soil, Air, Water* DOI: 10.1002/clen.201100123 (**2012**)

29.Behera B.C., Mishra R.R., Patra J.K., Dutta S.K., Thatoi H.N., Pattnaik B., Physico chemical properties of water sample collected from mangrove ecosystem of Mahanadi River Delta, Odisha, India , *American Journal of Marine Science*, **2**, 19-24, DOI:10.12691/marine-2-1-3 (**2014**)

30.Shanmuga Sundaram K. and Nethaji Mariappan V.E., Effect of groundwater contamination on site specific zones of Pondicherry State, *National Journal on Chem. Biosis*, **1** (2010)

31.Ahmad A. and Faizan A.,Qualitative monitoring of underground water quality of Mathura City, *Indian Journal* of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, **4**, 208-211 (**2014**)

32.Bhaware B., Rodríguez M.A., Kurhe A., Study of seasonal variations in physico-chemical parameters and nutrients in water of Bhatye estuary, Ratnagiri central,

West coast of India, *International Journal of Environmental* Sciences, **3**, 1671-1677 (**2013**)

33.Singh K.P., Malik A., Mohan D., Sinha S., Multivariate statistical techniques for the evalution of spatial and temporal variations in water quality of Gomti River (India) – A case study, *Water Res.*, **38**, 3980–3992 (**2004**)

34.Sarkar S. and Bhattacharya B.D., Water quality analysis of the coastal regions of Sunderban Mangrove Wetland, India Using Multivariate Statistical Techniques, Environmental Management, SantoshSarkar (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-307-133-6, InTech, (**2010**)

35.Garrels R.M. and MacKenzie R.T., Evolution of Sedimentary Rocks, New York (**1971**)

36.Bergman J., Is the sodium chloride level in the oceans evidence for Abiogenesis? *Answers Res. J.*, **3**, 159 (**2010**)

37.Janakiraman M.S., Naveed K., Altaff, Impact of domestic sewage pollution on rotifer abundance in Adyar estuary, *Int. Journal of Environ. Sci.*, **3**, 689-696 (**2012**).

38.Hassan M.M. and Razzaque, A Preliminary evolution of the clay mineralogy of the Sunderban soil, Bano *Biggyan Patrika*, **10**, 21-26 (**1981**)

39.Mahmood N. and Saikat S.Q, On acid sulphate soils of the coastal aquaculture ponds of Bangladesh, *Pak. J. Marine Sci*, **4**, 39-43 (**1995**)

40.Kamalkanth S., Muniyan M., Christy ponni A., Seasonal variations in physico-chemical parameters at Tranquebar Coastal Nagapattinam, Tamilnadu, *India, Int. J. of Environ. Bio.*, **2**, 203–207 (**2012**)

41.Zafar M., Wouters K., Belaluzzaman A.M., and Islam I., Occuranceabundance and spawning of *Lingulaanatina* in the inter-tidal muddy beach of Bankhali river estuary, Bangladesh, *Pak. J. Marine Biol.*, **5**, 41-47 (**1999**)

42. Chaudhury A.M., Working plan of the Sunderbans forest division for the period from 1960-61 to 1979-80, *East Pakistan Government Press*, Dhaka, **82** (1968)

43.Estcourt I.N., Distribution and associations of benthic invertebrates in a sheltered water soft bottom environment (Marlborough Sounds, *New Zealand J. Marine Fisheries Res.*, **1**, 352-370 (**1967**)

44.Anderson S.S., The ecology of Morecambe Bay II, Intertidal invertebrates and factors affecting their distribution, *J. Applied Ecol.*, **9**, 161-178 (**1972**)

45.Mayer L.M., Rahim P.T., Gwerin W., Macko S.A., WaltingL. and F.E. Anderson, Biologolical and granulometriccontrols on sedimentary organic matter of an

intertidal mud flat, *Estua. Coast Shelf. Sci.*, **20**, 491-503 (1985)

46.MuhibbullahMd., Nurul Amin S.M. and Chowdhury A.T., Some physico-chemical parameters of soil and water of Sundarban Mangrove Forest, Bangladesh, *Journal of Biological Sciences*, **5**, 354-357 (**2005**).