## Watershed Report

## **Upper White (05120201)**

							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
Boone	74,129	42,422	2.41	5,116	0.29	363	0.02	20,645	1.17	5,159	0.29	53	0.00
Brown	5,368	90	0.01	3,590	0.20	87	0.00	1,493	0.08	96	0.01	0	0.00
Clinton	1,565	1,355	0.08	21	0.00	7	0.00	170	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
Delaware	176,720	106,097	6.02	9,994	0.57	1,544	0.09	43,330	2.46	13,799	0.78	298	0.02
Hamilton	257,347	124,826	7.09	10,152	0.58	5,125	0.29	77,038	4.37	37,831	2.15	924	0.05
Hancock	25,287	16,886	0.96	401	0.02	15	0.00	5,934	0.34	1,549	0.09	113	0.01
Hendricks	140,920	58,333	3.31	10,296	0.58	1,269	0.07	50,111	2.85	19,510	1.11	161	0.01
Henry	65,205	43,636	2.48	4,708	0.27	73	0.00	14,995	0.85	865	0.05	55	0.00
<u>Johnson</u>	82,863	32,361	1.84	8,291	0.47	883	0.05	31,232	1.77	9,332	0.53	133	0.01
Madison	274,927	181,091	10.28	11,376	0.65	515	0.03	59,651	3.39	19,368	1.10	673	0.04
Marion	230,361	10,975	0.62	9,588	0.54	6,655	0.38	75,985	4.31	125,988	7.15	431	0.02
Monroe	11,388	614	0.03	7,511	0.43	84	0.00	2,974	0.17	186	0.01	0	0.00
Morgan	219,478	57,484	3.26	69,345	3.94	5,052	0.29	69,695	3.96	16,097	0.91	217	0.01
Owen	11,547	5,537	0.31	2,362	0.13	102	0.01	3,120	0.18	311	0.02	1	0.00
Randolph	106,067	75,698	4.30	3,341	0.19	48	0.00	25,441	1.44	1,129	0.06	22	0.00
Tipton	78,188	65,675	3.73	1,248	0.07	46	0.00	10,054	0.57	785	0.04	81	0.00
Totals	1,761,362	823,082	46.73	157,342	8.93	21,867	1.24	491,868	27.93	252,006	14.31	3,162	0.18

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

% 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
<u>Boone</u>	61	0.00
<u>Brown</u>	1,416	0.08
<u>Clinton</u>	0	0.00
<u>Delaware</u>	40	0.00
Hamilton	381	0.02
Hancock	0	0.00
Hendricks	143	0.01
<u>Henry</u>	312	0.02
<u>Johnson</u>	0	0.00
Madison	548	0.03
Marion	13,025	0.74
<u>Monroe</u>	6,448	0.37
<u>Morgan</u>	9,259	0.53
<u>Owen</u>	0	0.00
Randolph	0	0.00
<u>Tipton</u>	37	0.00
Totals	31,670	1.80

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)

% Public = Sum of the acres of federal, state, and local government land divided by the total acres in the watershed.

(data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	Cropland Types													
	Crop (Ac.) % of Total Corn (Ac.) % of Total Wheat (Ac.) % of Total Soybeans(Ac.) % of Total Other (A													
<u>Boone</u>	42,422	2.41	19,970	1.13	828	0.05	19,381	1.10	823	0.05				
Brown	90	0.01	19	0.00	9	0.00	20	0.00	20	0.00				
<u>Clinton</u>	1,355	0.08	711	0.04	3	0.00	637	0.04	2	0.00				
Delaware	106,097	6.02	44,311	2.52	1,481	0.08	59,708	3.39	511	0.03				
<u>Hamilton</u>	124,826	7.09	57,884	3.29	3,276	0.19	57,991	3.29	2,916	0.17				
Hancock	16,886	0.96	6,815	0.39	793	0.05	9,199	0.52	65	0.00				
Hendricks	58,333	3.31	27,287	1.55	2,066	0.12	24,151	1.37	1,978	0.11				
<u>Henry</u>	43,636	2.48	17,621	1.00	1,109	0.06	24,447	1.39	411	0.02				
<u>Johnson</u>	32,361	1.84	15,759	0.89	859	0.05	14,219	0.81	769	0.04				
Madison	181,091	10.28	76,767	4.36	4,938	0.28	98,151	5.57	1,095	0.06				
Marion	10,975	0.62	4,293	0.24	1,396	0.08	4,324	0.25	428	0.02				
Monroe	614	0.03	162	0.01	24	0.00	205	0.01	105	0.01				
Morgan	57,484	3.26	31,165	1.77	1,648	0.09	18,711	1.06	2,801	0.16				
Owen	5,537	0.31	2,995	0.17	195	0.01	1,915	0.11	111	0.01				
Randolph	75,698	4.30	32,185	1.83	1,639	0.09	41,481	2.36	391	0.02				
<u>Tipton</u>	65,675	3.73	34,092	1.94	974	0.06	29,948	1.70	286	0.02				
Totals	823,082	46.73	372,035	21.12	21,236	1.21	404,489	22.96	12,713	0.72				

**Data Source** = National Ag Statistics Service, 2006, <u>http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/SARS1a.htm</u> % **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)

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

	Beef and Swine Processing											
	Beef Plants	Beef Animals	Swine Plants	Swine Animals								
<u>Boone</u>	0	0	0	0								
<u>Brown</u>	0	0	0	0								
<u>Clinton</u>	0	0	0	0								
<u>Delaware</u>	0	0	0	0								
Hamilton	1	275	1	318								
Hancock	0	0	0	0								
Hendricks	0	0	0	0								
<u>Henry</u>	1	315	1	372								
<u>Johnson</u>	1	282	1	631								
Madison	0	0	0	0								
Marion	0	0	0	0								
Monroe	0	0	0	0								
Morgan	1	452	1	340								
<u>Owen</u>	0	0	0	0								
Randolph	2	1,087	2	1,183								
<u>Tipton</u>	0	0	0	0								
Totals	6	2,411	6	2,844								
Data Gaussi	Tediana Decedar	And investigation of the second	DOC (Claushhan	Due								

**Data Source** = Indiana Board of Animal Health, 2006 (Slaughter Processing), <u>http://www.in.gov/boah/food\_safety/inspection/meat\_poulty.html</u>

	Confined Livestock 2006													
	CAFO/CFO*	Da Farms	airy Animals	B. Farms	eef Animals	Sv Farms	vine Animals	Por Farms	ultry Animals	She Farms	ep Animals			
Boone	5	0	0	1	15	4	6.377	1	18,000	0	0			
Brown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Clinton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Delaware	7	0	0	0	0	7	10,794	0	0	0	0			
Hamilton	13	0	0	1	50	12	22,931	0	0	0	0			
Hancock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Hendricks	2	0	0	0	0	2	6,307	0	0	0	0			
Henry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Johnson	1	0	0	0	0	1	646	0	0	0	0			
Madison	13	2	6,616	3	1,205	9	22,747	0	0	0	0			
Marion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Morgan	2	0	0	0	0	2	2.203	0	0	0	0			
Owen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Randolph	12	2	1,800	0	0	10	83.758	0	0	0	0			
<u>Tipton</u>	11	0	0	2	800	10	28,891	1	480,254	0	0			
Totals	66	4	8.416	7	2.070	57	184.654	2	498.254	Ő	Ő			

\*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, <u>http://www.state.in.us/idem/agriculture/livestock/cfo/index.html</u> (data is viewable on the corresponding watershed man)

Data Source = Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Orice of Land Quality, 2007, <a href="https://www.state.in.us/idem/agriculture/livestock/doi/index.ntml">https://www.state.in.us/idem/agriculture/livestock/doi/index.ntml</a> (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 wine 55 pounds or more; 3000 wine under 55 pounds; 150 horses; 3000 sheep or lambs; 16,500 turkes; 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 sheep; or 30,000 poultry.

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

	Biofuel Pla	nts		Surface and Groundwater Resource Concern Areas									
	Ethanol	Biodiesel		Impaired Streams (Mi.)	Impaired Lakes (Ac.)	Wellhead Protection (Ac.)	Karst (Ac.)	% Karst					
<u>soone</u>	0	0	Boone	86.15	0	2.813	0	0.00					
Slinton	0	0	Brown	0.00	0	0	0	0.00					
Jelaware	0	0	Clinton	1.51	0	0	0	0.00					
Jamilton	0	0	Delaware	125.36	0	10.331	0	0.00					
Hancock	0	0	Hamilton	144.81	2.291	28,142	0	0.00					
Hendricks	Ő	Ő	Hancock	0.00	0	270	0	0.00					
lenry	0	0	Hendricks	76.52	0	8,278	0	0.00					
lohnson	0	0	Henry	64.66	0	1,419	0	0.00					
<u>Madison</u>	0	0	Johnson	21.57	0	6.003	0	0.00					
<u>Marion</u>	0	0	Madison	148.26	0	16.328	0	0.00					
<u> 1onroe</u>	0	0	Marion	79 76	2 157	24 954	0	0.00					
<u>Morgan</u>	0	0	Monroe	0.00	2,107	221	2 336	0.00					
Owen	0	0	Morgan	38.92	0	6 164	2,000	0.10					
Randolph	1	0	Owen	0.00	0	264	4 379	0.00					
<u>Fipton</u>	1	0	Randolph	71.03	0	3 645	4,373	0.25					
Totals	2	0	Tinton	54.82	0	1 774	0	0.00					
Data Sou	rce = Indiana Depa	artment of	Totals	913.38	4.449	110.609	6.715	0.00					
Transporta	ation 2006 (Biofuel	c			.,	,							

Transportati Processing), http://www.in.gov/isda/biofuels/

Boone Brown Clinton Delaware Hamilton Hancock Hendricks <u>Henry</u> Johnson Madison Marion Monroe Morgan Owen Randolph Tipton Totals

> Data Source (Impaired Water Bodies) = 2006 Indiana Department of Environmental Management 303(d) List, 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)

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

	Soils-Based Resource Concerns and Analyses																	
	Hydric (Ac.)	%	Leaching Index >= 10 (Ac.)	%	Subsurface Drainage= H/VH (Ac.)	%	Soil Erosion (Wind) >500 (Ac.)	%	Potential for Frequent Flooding (Ac.)	%	Surface Runoff Class =H/VH (Ac.)	%	Soil Erosion (Water) >37 (Ac.)	%	Sheet/Rill Erosion Potential Between 1T & 2T (Ac.)	%	Sheet/Rill Erosion Potential >=2 (Ac.)	%
<u>Boone</u>	24,526	1.39	31,717	1.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	777	0.04	13,128	0.75	3,954	0.22	1,166	0.07	662	0.04
<u>Brown</u>	0	0.00	1,861	0.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	29	0.00	3,842	0.22	5,033	0.29	540	0.03	3,167	0.18
<u>Clinton</u>	1,079	0.06	0	0.00	1,529	0.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	20	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
<u>Delaware</u>	55,405	3.15	201	0.01	3,151	0.18	863	0.05	7,207	0.41	29,422	1.67	6,231	0.35	2,858	0.16	201	0.01
<u>Hamilton</u>	82,455	4.68	4,391	0.25	183,182	10.40	367	0.02	12,739	0.72	42,059	2.39	13,026	0.74	2,394	0.14	2,114	0.12
<u>Hancock</u>	12,191	0.69	12,293	0.70	23,146	1.31	149	0.01	271	0.02	249	0.01	285	0.02	33	0.00	0	0.00
<u>Hendricks</u>	37,666	2.14	54,629	3.10	102,204	5.80	0	0.00	12,937	0.73	30,067	1.71	17,142	0.97	1,744	0.10	3,270	0.19
<u>Henry</u>	19,556	1.11	22,430	1.27	38,690	2.20	576	0.03	0	0.00	20,443	1.16	6,281	0.36	4,848	0.28	1,113	0.06
<u>Johnson</u>	10,659	0.61	29,706	1.69	41,880	2.38	0	0.00	8,865	0.50	24,552	1.39	17,032	0.97	4,127	0.23	4,561	0.26
<u>Madison</u>	104,736	5.95	1,329	0.08	210,738	11.96	1,640	0.09	7,204	0.41	37,362	2.12	13,823	0.78	4,358	0.25	1,313	0.07
<u>Marion</u>	32,458	1.84	84,887	4.82	112,184	6.37	0	0.00	23,231	1.32	50,484	2.87	16,720	0.95	4,728	0.27	1,868	0.11
<u>Monroe</u>	62	0.00	4,184	0.24	0	0.00	0	0.00	724	0.04	6,957	0.39	9,956	0.57	4	0.00	6,707	0.38
<u>Morgan</u>	7,402	0.42	136,814	7.77	52,907	3.00	0	0.00	44,092	2.50	64,568	3.67	111,095	6.31	25,842	1.47	36,449	2.07
<u>Owen</u>	272	0.02	8,275	0.47	0	0.00	0	0.00	1,197	0.07	2,005	0.11	8,057	0.46	486	0.03	1,825	0.10
Randolph	33,893	1.92	4,216	0.24	58,691	3.33	321	0.02	6,288	0.36	36,775	2.09	6.326	0.36	3,153	0.18	462	0.03
<u>Tipton</u>	46,218	2.62	0	0.00	71,387	4.05	164	0.01	0	0.00	2,751	0.16	171	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
Totals	468,578	26.60	396,933	22.54	899,689	51.08	4,080	0.23	125,561	7.13	364,684	20.70	235,132	13.35	56,281	3.20	63,712	3.62

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 greater than 2 times of tolerable limits may be ineligible for certain USDA benefits. Management systems that leave more residue on the surface, those with lower-residue crops 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.

**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.)				
Boone	101	104.20	70.09	8.47	14.05	7.54	0.00	0.00	4.04				
Brown	21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
<u>Clinton</u>	0	2.54	2.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Delaware	1,470	153.68	84.98	34.79	4.31	29.60	0.00	0.00	0.00				
<u>Hamilton</u>	2,626	317.52	177.68	64.75	31.18	24.00	9.22	0.00	10.70				
Hancock	4	12.48	12.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Hendricks	241	135.80	71.19	45.85	18.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Henry	59	64.66	49.06	11.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.84				
Johnson	371	92.58	73.34	12.24	0.00	0.00	5.27	0.00	1.73				
Madison	361	217.64	112.91	79.33	0.70	22.14	0.00	0.00	2.54				
Marion	3,997	229.49	102.50	43.09	19.77	19.10	31.26	0.00	13.77				
Monroe	9	6.90	5.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00				
Morgan	1,317	253.66	132.60	64.20	15.86	0.29	39.30	0.00	1.43				
Owen	0	12.45	9.18	1.26	0.00	0.00	2.01	0.00	0.00				
Randolph	116	113.65	67.69	20.63	24.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.44				
Tipton	0	89.98	63.65	14.15	11.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59				
Totals	10,695	1,807.22	1,035.76	400.52	141.12	102.66	88.09	0.00	39.09				

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)

## **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 Watershed in Permanent Easement
196,037.29	11.13	1,673.30	89.90	0.01

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 = ¼ - ½ 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 + ¼ 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			
Boone	181	31	57	34	23	18	18	1	27	81			
<u>Brown</u>	5	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	2			
<u>Clinton</u>	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2			
<u>Delaware</u>	474	56	174	101	79	31	33	2	64	199			
Hamilton	726	140	277	137	98	43	31	17	88	336			
Hancock	78	13	27	16	10	5	6	2	11	36			
Hendricks	384	49	161	82	41	23	26	1	60	170			
<u>Henry</u>	189	20	69	51	24	15	10	2	28	77			
<u>Johnson</u>	228	29	93	45	29	18	14	3	33	96			
Madison	761	101	243	176	95	77	68	7	130	300			
Marion	265	93	105	40	18	4	4	4	36	103			
Monroe	23	2	7	10	3	1	0	0	4	10			
Morgan	572	71	255	155	47	21	22	8	74	290			
Owen	25	1	7	11	4	1	1	0	2	12			
Randolph	273	23	72	63	57	35	23	3	47	120			
Tipton	174	15	34	39	39	25	22	3	24	69			
Totals	4,362	645	1,585	963	568	318	279	53	630	1,903			

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

Ft.: Feet %: Percent Mi.: Miles <: Less Than All data are the measure of that parameter within the Indiana portion of the watershed.

Page 6 of 7

	Watershed	
Boone	4.21	
Brown	0.00	
Clinton	0.00	
Delaware	10.03	
<u>Hamilton</u>	14.61	
<u>Hancock</u>	9.71	
<u>Hendricks</u>	8.00	
Henry	0.00	
Johnson	4.70	
Madison	15.60	
Marion	13.07	
Monroe	0.00	
<u>Morgan</u>	12.45	
<u>Owen</u>	0.00	
Randolph	0.00	
<u>Tipton</u>	0.00	
Totals	92.37	
Data Source = Enviro	nmental Protection Age	ency, 2006,
data no longor publich	od .	

Air Resource Concern Areas

(data are viewable on the corresponding watershed map)

	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	406	5,559	5,531	15,069	87	221	4,230	4,084	0	2	69	3	1,287	115	0	6
2006	75	868	16	3,646	59	183	3,265	3,272	Ō	ō	11	- Ā	580	91	1	92
2005	115	1,245	3,030	6,488	44	231	1,808	2,943	0	24	34	4	206	32	0	1
2004	43	1,667	2,033	11	18	62	0	0	0	n/a	22	3	22	151	0	0
2003	n/a	1,664	862	958,633	291	114	3,681	3,780	0	0	n/a	n/a	1,002	68	1	45
2002	n/a	2,787	3,857	85,832	404	18	6,857	5,355	0	1	n/a	n/a	718	161	1	0
Totals (2002-2007):	639	13,790	15,329	1,069,679	903	829	19,841	19,434	0	27	136	33	3,815	618	3	144

Data Source = NRCS Performance Results System Reports, 2007, http://ias.sc.eqov.usda.gov/prshome/index.aspx. 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. 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, Microinitation (441) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442) + Irrigation 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.

practices installed in the given inscal 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) + Composting 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 (657) + wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + Wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + Wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + Wetland Creation (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (657) + Wetland Enhancement (658) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (658) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (659) practices installed in the given (658) + Wetland Enhancement (658) + Wetl