Watershed Report

Upper East Fork White (05120206)

	Land Use														
	Total (Ac.)	Crops (Ac.)	% of Total	Forest (Ac.)	% of Total	Water/Wetland (Ac.)	% of Total	Pasture/Hay (Ac.)	% of Total	Urban (Ac.)	% of Total	No Data (Ac.)	% of Total		
Bartholomew	151,233	74,504	14.36	29,361	5.66	1,372	0.26	37,891	7.30	3,248	0.63	850	0.16		
Brown	2,431	25	0.00	2,157	0.42	5	0.00	234	0.05	10	0.00	0	0.00		
Decatur	182,145	112,677	21.72	16,961	3.27	193	0.04	32,895	6.34	1,634	0.32	13,877	2.68		
Jackson	116,822	55,064	10.62	24,408	4.71	1,718	0.33	27,371	5.28	2,780	0.54	115	0.02		
Jennings	45,582	17,791	3.43	15,221	2.93	30	0.01	10,553	2.03	353	0.07	19	0.00		
Rush	14,753	12,874	2.48	274	0.05	1	0.00	1,459	0.28	14	0.00	20	0.00		
Shelby	5,755	4,904	0.95	155	0.03	0	0.00	602	0.12	0	0.00	22	0.00		
Totals	518,721	277,840	53.56	88,536	17.07	3,319	0.64	111,006	21.40	8,039	1.55	14,903	2.87		

Land Llea

Data Source = National Ag Statistics Service, 2006, http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/SARS1a.htm

% Crop = Sum of the acres of corn, soybeans, wheat, other small grains, etc. divided by the total acres in the watershed.

% **Pasture/Hay** = Sum of the acres of pasture, hay, and idle land divided by the total acres in the watershed.

% Forest = Sum of the acres of forest land divided by the total acres in the watershed.

% Urban = Sum of the acres of residential and urban land divided by the total acres in the watershed.

% Water/Wetland = Sum of the acres of streams, lakes, ponds, etc. divided by the total acres in the watershed.

% Data Not Available = Sum of the acres of clouds on arial photographs divided by the total acres in the watershed.

(data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	Pu	blic Lands
	Public Lands (Ac.)	% of Total
Bartholomew	314	0.06
Brown	1,705	0.33
Decatur	146	0.03
<u>Jackson</u>	4,427	0.85
<u>Jennings</u>	0	0.00
<u>Rush</u>	0	0.00
Shelby	0	0.00
Totals	6,592	1.27

Data Source = Indiana Department of Natural Resources (State-Managed Lands), 2004; Hoosier National Forest - U.S. Forest Service, 2004 and Patoka River USFWS, 2003 (Federal-Managed Lands)

(constrained by the constrained by the constrained by the total acres in the watershed.

(data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	Cropland Types													
	Crop (Ac.)	Other (Ac.)	% of Total											
Bartholomew	74,504	14.36	22,910	4.42	3,645	0.70	42,934	8.28	3,480	0.67				
Brown	25	0.00	15	0.00	0	0.00	9	0.00	0	0.00				
Decatur	112,677	21.72	43,100	8.31	3,290	0.63	62,085	11.97	4,160	0.80				
<u>Jackson</u>	55,064	10.62	14,710	2.84	5,824	1.12	31,246	6.02	2,982	0.57				
<u>Jennings</u>	17,791	3.43	4,116	0.79	1,895	0.37	10,450	2.01	1,029	0.20				
<u>Rush</u>	12,874	2.48	5,479	1.06	304	0.06	6,943	1.34	165	0.03				
<u>Shelby</u>	4,904	0.95	2,314	0.45	71	0.01	2,465	0.48	69	0.01				
Totals	277,840	53.56	92,643	17.86	15,030	2.90	156,132	30.10	11,885	2.29				

Data Source = National Ag Statistics Service, 2006, http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/SAR51a.htm

% Corn = Acres of corn divided by the acres in the watershed.

% Beans = Acres of soybeans + double-crop soybeans/wheat divided by the acres in the watershed.

% Wheat = Acres of wheat divided by the acres in the watershed.

% Other Row Crop = Difference of the sum of the acres of corn, soybeans, and wheat minus total cropland acres in the watershed divided by the acres in the watershed. (data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	Beef and Swine Processing											
	Beef Plants	Beef Animals	Swine Plants	Swine Animals								
Bartholomew	0	0	1	507								
Brown	0	0	0	0								
Decatur	2	1,624	2	1,521								
<u>Jackson</u>	0	0	0	0								
<u>Jennings</u>	0	0	0	0								
<u>Rush</u>	0	0	0	0								
Shelby	0	0	0	0								
Totals	2	1,624	3	2,028								

http://www.in.gov/boah/food_safety/inspection/meat_poulty.html

					Co	nfined Liv	estock 20	06				
	CAFO/CFO*	D. Farms	airy Animals	B Farms	eef Animals	s Farms	Swine Animals	Po Farms	ultry Animals	She Farms	eep Animals	
<u>Bartholomew</u>	4	0	0	2	550	2	2,257	0	0	0	0	
Brown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Decatur	67	2	2,412	7	830	64	157,818	0	0	0	0	
Jackson	16	0	0	2	350	9	36,037	6	5,157,842	0	0	
Jennings	2	0	0	0	0	2	6,970	0	0	0	0	
Rush	5	0	0	0	0	5	20,995	0	0	0	0	
Shelby	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Totals	94	2	2,412	11	1,730	82	224,077	6	5,157,842	0	0	

*Because a CAFO/CFO permit may include multiple types of animals, the total number of permits in the county might be less than the sum of the farms with each animal type. Data Source = Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Office of Land Quality, 2007, http://www.state.in.us/idem/agriculture/livestock/cfo/index.html

(data is viewable on the corresponding watershed map) Confined Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) = (U. S. Environmental Protection Agency definition) Operations with at least one of the following: 200 dairy cows; 300 veal calves; 300 beef cattle; 750 swine 55 pounds or more; 3000 swine under 55 pounds; 150 horses; 3000 sheep or lambs; 16,500 turkeys; 9000 chickens (liquid manure); 25,000 chickens -laying hens (not liquid manure); 37,500 chickens - not laying hens (not liquid manure); 1,500 ducks (liquid manure); or 10,000 ducks (not liquid manure). Confined Feeding Operation (CFO) = (Indiana Department of Environmental Management definition) = Operations with at least one of the following: 300 cattle; 600 swine or character 30,000 anulter; sheep; or 30,000 poultry.

						-	-
ofuel Pla	nts		Surfac	ce and Grou	undwater Reso	ource Con	icern Are
Ethanol	Biodiesel		Impaired Streams (Mi.)	Impaired Lakes (Ac.)	Wellhead Protection (Ac.)	Karst (Ac.)	% Karst
0	0	Bartholomew	44.21	0	2,578	796	0.15
0	0	Brown	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
0	0	Decatur	48.01	0	795	25,163	4.85
0	0	Jackson	60.31	0	3,550	468	0.09
0	0 0	Jennings	0.00	0	0	32,609	6.29
0	0	Rush	7.64	0	0	0	0.00
0	0	Shelby	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
		Totals	160.17	0	6,922	59,036	11.38
= Indiana Depa 2006 (Biofuel	artment of s	Data Source (I	Impaired Water Bodies te.in.us/idem/program	s) = 2006 Indiana s/water/303d/ind	Department of Environ ex.html (data is viewat	mental Manage	ment 303(d) L sponding water
	Ethanol 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Ethanol Biodiesel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Ethanol Biodiesel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 <tr< td=""><td>Surfact Surfact Impaired Streams (Mi.) Ethanol Biodiesel Impaired Streams (Mi.) 0 0 Brown 44.21 Brown 0.00 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 Jackson 60.31 Jennings 0.00 0 0 Brown 0.00 Shelby 0.00 Totals 160.17 Data Source (Impaired Water Bodies http://www.state.in.us/idem/program Data Source (Impaired Water Bodies</td><td>Surface and Grou Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Ethanol Biodiesel Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 0</td><td>Surface and Groundwater Rest Impaired streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Wellhead 0<</td><td>Surface and Groundwater Resource Cor Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Protection (Ac.) Karst 0</td></tr<>	Surfact Surfact Impaired Streams (Mi.) Ethanol Biodiesel Impaired Streams (Mi.) 0 0 Brown 44.21 Brown 0.00 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 0 0 Decatur 48.01 Jackson 60.31 Jennings 0.00 0 0 Brown 0.00 Shelby 0.00 Totals 160.17 Data Source (Impaired Water Bodies http://www.state.in.us/idem/program Data Source (Impaired Water Bodies	Surface and Grou Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Ethanol Biodiesel Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 0	Surface and Groundwater Rest Impaired streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Wellhead 0<	Surface and Groundwater Resource Cor Impaired Streams (Mi.) Impaired Lakes (Ac.) Protection (Ac.) Karst 0

http://www.state.in.us/idem/programs/water/303d/index.html (data is viewable on the corresponding watershed map) 303(d)-listed streams = impaired waterbodies that have been identified by IDEM as exceeding threshold limits of specific contaminants.

Data Source (Wellhead Protection Areas) = Indiana Department of Environmental Management, 2007, http://www.in.gov/idem/programs/water/swp/whpp/ (data is not available for viewing)

Data Source (Karst) = Karst Data, 2002, Indiana NRCS, data unpublished (data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

						Soi	ls-Based	Reso	ource Conce	erns a	nd Analy	ses						
	Leaching Subsurface Soil Erosion Potential for Surface Soil Erosion Subsurface Soil Erosion Potential for Surface Soil Erosion Subsurface Soil Erosion Potential for Surface Soil Erosion Potential for Surface Soil Erosion Potential Potential													Sheet/Rill Erosion Potential >=2 (Ac.)	%			
Bartholomew	19,603	3.78	72,362	13.95	376	0.07	0	0.00	20,481	3.95	39,496	7.61	51,813	9.99	8,054	1.55	15,695	3.03
Brown	0	0.00	154	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.00	1,996	0.38	2,269	0.44	721	0.14	1,092	0.21
<u>Decatur</u>	33,999	6.55	84,364	16.26	94,046	18.13	0	0.00	16,816	3.24	42,646	8.22	44,667	8.61	19,199	3.70	7,660	1.48
Jackson	15,149	2.92	78,162	15.07	751	0.14	11,731	2.26	41,032	7.91	20,620	3.98	28,461	5.49	5,869	1.13	12,492	2.41
<u>Jennings</u>	9,526	1.84	17,843	3.44	0	0.00	0	0.00	5,424	1.05	14,024	2.70	24,632	4.75	8,426	1.62	5,523	1.06
Rush	3,136	0.60	11,797	2.27	7,611	1.47	0	0.00	826	0.16	2,945	0.57	1,342	0.26	102	0.02	0	0.00
<u>Shelby</u>	1,332	0.26	166	0.03	4,551	0.88	0	0.00	122	0.02	1,085	0.21	601	0.12	75	0.01	21	0.00
Totals	82,745	15.95	264,848	51.06	107,335	20.69	11,731	2.26	84,702	16.33	122,812	23.68	153,785	29.65	42,446	8.18	42,483	8.19

Data Source (Hydric Soils) = NRCS Soil Data Mart (2007) - http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/. A soil mapunit was considered hydric if a majority of its component soils is hydric.

Data Source (Sheet/Rill Erosion Potential) = NRCS Soil Data Mart, 2007, http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/ and the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation, Version 2 (RUSLE2). Erosion potential is based on the RUSLE2 calculation for the soil with a "C" Factor equal to that of a typical cropland management system used in Indiana (no-till soybeans, followed by chisel-plowed corn with an injected anhydrous application). Soils (if used to produce annual crops) under this management system between 1 and 2 times of tolerable limits are eroding above sustainable levels; soils (if used to produce annual crops) under this management system stat leave more residue on the surface, those with less soil disturbance, crop rotations with higher-residue crops, etc. will decrease soil erosion compared to those under the typical cropland system. Management systems that leave less residue, disturb the soil more, and those with crop rotations with lower-residue crops may increase soil erosion above the typical cropland system.

Data Source (Leach Index, Wind Erosion, Water Erosion, Flood Potential, and Surface and Subsurface Drainage) = NRCS Soil Data Mart, 2007, <u>http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/</u> and the NRCS Indiana Offsite Risk Index (ORI) (Section II of the Indiana Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG)). <u>http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov/efotg_locator.aspx?map=IN</u>. NOTE: Because climatic and other data elements may be county-based, threshold values may differ among adjacent counties and result in abrupt data thresholds.

Hydric soils = Characterized by, relating to, or requiring an abundance of water. Hydric soils may be indicators of wetlands, which represent unique management considerations including groundwater impacts, crop production limitations, wildlife considerations, etc. A soil mapunit was considered hydric if a majority of its component soils is hydric.

Leach Index = soils with a relatively high risk of water percolating below the crop root zone; developed using annual precipitation, rainfall distribution data and hydrologic soil groups.

Subsurface Drainage = soils with a relatively high risk of having subsurface drainage; determined from a matrix based on soil drainage class and depth to seasonal high water, and the presence of artificial subsurface drainage and surface tile inlets. Soil Erosion (Wind) = soils with a relatively high risk of eroding by wind; determined from a location's C (Climate) Factor and a soil's Soil Erodibility Index (I).

Flooding Potential = soils with a relatively frequent risk of being covered by flowing water from any source; determined from the NRCS soil survey.

Surface Runoff Class = soils with a relatively high risk of soil solution movement from the surface of a management unit; determined using soil permeability and percent slope.

Soil Erosion (Water) = soils with a relatively high risk of eroding by water; determined from a location's R (Rainfall-Runoff Erosivity) Factor, and a soil's K (Soil Erodibility) and LS (Length-Slope) factors.

(All data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	Water Resources														
	Standing Water (Ac.)	Streams (Mi.)	1st Order (Mi.)	2nd Order (Mi.)	3rd Order (Mi.)	4th Order (Mi.)	5th Order (Mi.)	6th+ Order (Mi.)	Stream Order Unavailable (Mi.)						
Bartholomew	787	170.99	94.85	35.21	25.35	1.02	14.56	0.00	0.00						
Brown	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
<u>Decatur</u>	225	198.62	124.71	38.31	24.73	10.88	0.00	0.00	0.00						
<u>Jackson</u>	502	173.08	99.50	14.51	11.48	2.69	42.61	0.00	2.29						
<u>Jennings</u>	34	72.82	35.94	10.00	0.20	26.69	0.00	0.00	0.00						
<u>Rush</u>	0	12.67	6.65	6.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
Shelby	0	4.63	4.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00						
Totals	1,548	632.81	366.28	104.05	61.76	41.28	57.16	0.00	2.29						

Data Source = National Hydrography Data - U.S. Geological Survey, 2006, http://www.horizon-systems.com/nhdplus/

Stream Order = A hierarchal stream classification system. The confluence of two first order streams forms a second order stream; the confluence of two second order streams forms a third order stream; etc. Generally, larger order streams (such as the Ohio or Mississippi Rivers) have more volume, depth and channel width. They also are located in the lower reaches of watersheds. First order streams (unforked or unbranched streams) are in the upper reaches of watersheds. (data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

Air Reso	ource Concern Areas
	% of
	Watershed
Bartholomew	0.00
<u>Brown</u>	0.00
Decatur	0.00
Jackson	22.50
Jennings	0.00
Rush	0.00
Shelby	1.11
Totals	23.61
Data Source = Env data no longer publis (data are viewable o	ronmental Protection Agency, 2006, shed. n the corresponding watershed map)

Ac.: Acres #: Number >: Greater Than Ft.: Feet %: Percent

Mi.: Miles <: Less Than

All data are the measure of that parameter within the Indiana portion of the watershed.

Page 3 of 4

Unique Habitat Areas

Ac. Within Range of Known T & E Species	% of Watershed Within Range of Known T & E Species	Natural Communities (Ac.)	Permanent Easement (Ac.)	% of Watershee in Permanent Easement
26,315.40	5.07	832.00	187.20	0.04

Data Source (Threatened & Endangered (T & E) Species and Natural Communities) = Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves; Analysis by NRCS, 2007, data source is not public. Habitat ranges indicate the likely life-history range surrounding known locations of threatened & endangered species (state and federal listed) that have the potential to be used by the species (ranges for plants = point - 0 miles; amphibians/reptiles/insects/aquatic species = 1/4 - 1/2 mile; mammals/birds = 1 mile).

Data Source (Natural Communities) = Areas identified and classified by the IDNR as unique/rare (data include the Natural Community acreage + 1/4 mile buffer), data not published.

Data Source (Permanent Easements) = Indiana NRCS (Wetlands Reserve Program), 2008 data not published

	Farm Census Data													
	Farms	Farms <10 Ac.	Farms <50 Ac.	Farms <180 Ac.	Farms <500 Ac.	Farms <1000 Ac.	Farms >1000 Ac.	Minority Farmers	Full Time Farmers	Part Time Farmers				
Bartholomew	357	41	111	91	61	26	28	5	69	158				
Brown	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1				
Decatur	510	35	114	136	131	56	38	8	94	198				
Jackson	285	19	86	78	54	33	15	2	42	117				
<u>Jennings</u>	132	8	52	43	16	8	5	1	17	60				
<u>Rush</u>	31	2	6	7	7	5	3	0	6	11				
Shelby	13	1	4	3	2	1	1	0	2	5				
Totals	1,331	106	374	359	271	129	90	16	231	550				

Data Source = National Ag Statistics Service 2002 Census of Agriculture (http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/census/2/volume1/in/index2.htm). Estimates for each watershed were derived from county values based on the percentage of each county in the watershed.

	NRCS Practices															
Year:	Vegetative Agronomic Practices (Ac.)	No Till (Ac.)	Mulch Till (Ac.)	Upland Buffers (Ft.)	Aquatic Buffers (Ac.)	Grazing Practices (Ac.)	Nutrient Mgt. (Ac.)	Pest Mgt. (Ac.)	Irrigation (Ac.)	CNMPs (#)	Gully Control Grassed Waterway (Ac.)	Gully Control Other (#)	Wildlife Habitat (Ac.)	Forestry Practices (Ac.)	Confined Livestock Waste Storage (#)	Wetland Practices (Ac.)
2007	383	7,429	6,284	10,085	233	566	15,111	12,148	154	1	42	15	1,617	128	1	0
2006	280	2,706	1,690	12,155	87	193	6,204	4,284	0	6	23	11	2,471	62	1	8
2005	443	14,849	7,602	25,370	230	339	13,479	11,841	0	3	170	43	1,068	391	0	13
2004	564	12,353	6,079	0	232	460	14,077	0	0	n/a	186	60	277	269	0	0
2003	n/a	7,001	417	2,000	202	138	3,960	3,105	0	5	n/a	n/a	239	237	0	5
2002	n/a	4,764	348	10,455	207	26	4,384	2,460	0	1	n/a	n/a	351	110	0	0
Totals (2002-2007):	1,670	49,102	22,420	60,065	1,191	1,722	57,215	33,838	154	16	421	255	6,023	1,197	2	26

Data Source = NRCS Performance Results System Reports, 2007, <u>http://ias.sc.egov.usda.gov/prshome/index.aspx</u>. Vegetative Agronomic Practices = Acres of Conservation Cover (327) + 342 (Critical Area Planting) + 340 (Cover Crops) practices installed in the given fiscal year. No-Till = Acres of Residue & Tillage Management, No-Till/Strip Till/Direct Seed (329) + Residue Management, No-Till/Strip Till (329A) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Mulch-Till = Acres of Residue & Tillage Management, Mulch Till (345) + Residue Management, Mulch Till (329B) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Upland Buffers = Feet of Field Border (386) + Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380) + Hedgerow Planting (422) + Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation (650) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Aquatic Buffers = Acres of Filter Strips (393) + Riparian Forest Buffers (391) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Grazing Practices = Acres of Prescribed Grazing (528 and 528A) + Pasture and Hayland Planting (512) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Nutrient Mgmt = Acres of Nutrient Management (590) + Waste Utilization (633) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Pest Mgmt = Acres of Pest Management (595) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Irrigation = Acres of Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442) + Irrigation System, System, Surface and Subsurface (443) + Irrigation Water Management (449) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

CNMPs = Number of Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans written in the given fiscal year. Gully Control - grassed waterways = Acres of Grassed Waterway (412) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Gully Control - other = Acres of Grade Stabilization Structure (410) + Water and Sediment Control Basin (638) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Wildlife habitat = Acres of Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645) + Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644) + Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (653) + Early Successional Habitat Development/Management (647) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Forestry Practices = Acres of Tree/Shrub Establishment (612) + Forest Stand Improvement (666) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Confined Livestock Waste Storage Facilities = Number of Waste Storage Facility (313) + Compositing Facility (317) + Waste Treatment Lagoon (359) practices installed in the given fiscal year.

Wetland Practices = Acres of Wetland Restoration (657) + Wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given fiscal year.