Watershed Report

Whitewater (05080003)

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
Dearborn	29,270	5,676	0.66	8,196	0.96	105	0.01	9,688	1.13	971	0.11	4,275	0.50
Decatur	22,667	10,464	1.23	3,506	0.41	208	0.02	5,791	0.68	253	0.03	2,072	0.24
<u>Fayette</u>	125,806	62,300	7.30	25,828	3.02	95	0.01	32,757	3.84	4,329	0.51	10	0.00
Franklin	233,395	60,348	7.07	88,914	10.41	2,970	0.35	68,780	8.05	8,626	1.01	2,012	0.24
Henry	28,516	21,028	2.46	1,608	0.19	3	0.00	5,456	0.64	257	0.03	5	0.00
Randolph	51,263	36,915	4.32	2,243	0.26	12	0.00	11,211	1.31	538	0.06	4	0.00
Ripley	13,897	5,133	0.60	2,958	0.35	53	0.01	4,610	0.54	228	0.03	570	0.07
Rush	10,850	9,011	1.06	434	0.05	5	0.00	1,339	0.16	26	0.00	4	0.00
<u>Union</u>	80,076	43,865	5.14	15,953	1.87	2,030	0.24	16,072	1.88	1,826	0.21	19	0.00
Wayne	258,160	133,438	15.63	34,918	4.09	528	0.06	76,699	8.98	9,369	1.10	37	0.00
Totals	853,898	388,177	45.46	184,558	21.61	6,009	0.70	232,403	27.22	26,422	3.09	9,008	1.05

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
<u>Dearborn</u>	0	0.00
<u>Decatur</u>	0	0.00
<u>Fayette</u>	103	0.01
<u>Franklin</u>	11,294	1.32
<u>Henry</u>	0	0.00
<u>Randolph</u>	0	0.00
Ripley	0	0.00
Rush	0	0.00
<u>Union</u>	10,407	1.22
<u>Wayne</u>	353	0.04
Totals	22,157	2.59

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 (Ac.) % of Total													
<u>Dearborn</u>	5,676	0.66	1,623	0.19	1,102	0.13	2,243	0.26	394	0.05				
Decatur	10,464	1.23	3,656	0.43	438	0.05	6,039	0.71	353	0.04				
<u>Fayette</u>	62,300	7.30	28,009	3.28	2,004	0.23	31,101	3.64	1,237	0.14				
<u>Franklin</u>	60,348	7.07	25,396	2.97	4,220	0.49	28,782	3.37	1,958	0.23				
<u>Henry</u>	21,028	2.46	9,520	1.11	588	0.07	10,750	1.26	153	0.02				
<u>Randolph</u>	36,915	4.32	14,017	1.64	1,110	0.13	21,568	2.53	220	0.03				
Ripley	5,133	0.60	1,497	0.18	511	0.06	2,539	0.30	501	0.06				
Rush	9,011	1.06	3,806	0.45	218	0.03	4,840	0.57	104	0.01				
<u>Union</u>	43,865	5.14	21,367	2.50	837	0.10	21,096	2.47	566	0.07				
<u>Wayne</u>	133,438	15.63	58,235	6.82	4,260	0.50	67,682	7.93	3,909	0.46				
Totals	388,177	45.46	167,125	19.57	15,288	1.79	196,641	23.03	9,395	1.10				

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

Ac.: Acres #: Number

Ft.: Feet %: Percent Mi.: Miles <: Less Than >: Greater Than

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

	В	Beef and S	wine Proc	essing	
	Beef Plants	Beef Animals	Swine Plants	Swine Animals	
<u>Dearborn</u>	0	0	0	0	
<u>Decatur</u>	0	0	0	0	
<u>Fayette</u>	0	0	0	0	
Franklin	2	930	2	535	
Henry	1	302	1	424	
Randolph	0	0	0	0	
Ripley	0	0	0	0	
Rush	0	0	0	0	
<u>Union</u>	0	0	0	0	
<u>Wayne</u>	0	0	0	0	
Totals	3	1,232	3	959	

Data Source = Indiana Board of Animal Health, 2006 (Slaughter Processing), http://www.in.gov/boah/food_safety/inspection/meat_poulty.html

	Confined Livestock 2006												
	CAFO/CFO*		airy Animals		eef Animals	Sv Farms	wine Animals	Poi Farms	ultry Animals	She Farms	ep Animals		
<u>Dearborn</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
<u>Decatur</u>	10	0	0	1	80	10	23,632	0	0	0	0		
<u>Fayette</u>	9	0	0	1	100	9	25,050	0	0	0	0		
<u>Franklin</u>	15	1	100	4	693	13	17,699	0	0	0	0		
Henry	2	2	400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Randolph	4	0	0	0	0	4	27,084	0	0	0	0		
Ripley	1	0	0	0	0	1	1,034	0	0	0	0		
Rush	5	0	0	0	0	5	9,524	0	0	0	0		
<u>Union</u>	4	0	0	1	74	4	6,093	0	0	0	0		
Wayne	9	0	0	1	200	9	36,076	0	0	0	0		
Totals	59	3	500	8	1,147	55	146,192	0	0	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

sheep; or 30,000 poultry.

E	Biofuel Pla	nts
	Ethanol	Biodiesel
<u>Dearborn</u>	0	0
<u>Decatur</u>	0	0
<u>Fayette</u>	0	0
<u>Franklin</u>	0	0
<u>Henry</u>	0	0
Randolph Randolph	0	0
Ripley	0	0
<u>Rush</u>	0	0
<u>Union</u>	0	0
<u>Wayne</u>	0	0
Totals	0	0

Data Source = Indiana Department of Transportation, 2006 (Biofuels Processing), http://www.in.gov/isda/biofuels/

Surface and Groundwater Resource Concern Areas

	Impaired	Impaired	Wellhead	Karst	
	Streams (Mi.)	Lakes (Ac.)	Protection (Ac.)	(Ac.)	% Karst
Dearborn	5.27	0	199	3,268	0.38
<u>Decatur</u>	0.00	0	0	1,531	0.18
<u>Fayette</u>	14.88	0	2,211	0	0.00
<u>Franklin</u>	42.75	0	4,361	14,830	1.74
<u>Henry</u>	0.00	0	647	0	0.00
Randolph	17.92	0	1,106	0	0.00
Ripley	0.00	0	181	6,266	0.73
Rush	1.51	0	0	0	0.00
<u>Union</u>	36.98	0	2,954	0	0.00
<u>Wayne</u>	157.39	194	8,852	0	0.00
Totals	276.70	194	20,509	25,894	3.03

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

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)

Ft.: Feet %: Percent Mi.: Miles <: Less Than

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.)	%
Dearborn	1,843	0.22	4,032	0.47	1,954	0.23	0	0.00	3,320	0.39	16,904	1.98	18,889	2.21	4,164	0.49	10,350	1.21
Decatur	1,443	0.17	5,774	0.68	8,264	0.97	0	0.00	2,397	0.28	10,331	1.21	11,247	1.32	3,805	0.45	3,351	0.39
<u>Fayette</u>	5,155	0.60	77,815	9.11	7,514	0.88	0	0.00	16,091	1.88	33,034	3.87	81,781	9.58	17,427	2.04	16,309	1.91
<u>Franklin</u>	11,020	1.29	46,060	5.39	250	0.03	0	0.00	4,571	0.54	124,737	14.61	153,312	17.95	54,823	6.42	52,968	6.20
Henry	8,616	1.01	9,259	1.08	14,280	1.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	12,848	1.50	2,035	0.24	1,870	0.22	169	0.02
Randolph	17,685	2.07	0	0.00	26,892	3.15	51	0.01	3,212	0.38	20,826	2.44	4,272	0.50	3,837	0.45	437	0.05
Ripley	2,288	0.27	3,688	0.43	16	0.00	0	0.00	942	0.11	2,673	0.31	7,317	0.86	3,029	0.35	823	0.10
Rush	1,724	0.20	7,572	0.89	4,523	0.53	0	0.00	365	0.04	3,251	0.38	2,112	0.25	382	0.04	0	0.00
<u>Union</u>	4,923	0.58	40,751	4.77	8,084	0.95	0	0.00	7,814	0.92	18,449	2.16	44,311	5.19	9,580	1.12	9,769	1.14
Wayne	26,860	3.15	70,206	8.22	109,795	12.86	89	0.01	20,223	2.37	67,043	7.85	65,099	7.62	35,026	4.10	10,341	1.21
Totals	81,557	9.55	265,157	31.05	181,572	21.26	140	0.02	58,935	6.90	310,096	36.32	390,375	45.72	133,943	15.69	104,517	12.24

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 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, http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/ and the NRCS Indiana Offsite Risk Index (ORI) (Section II of the Indiana Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG)). http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov/efotg_locator.aspx?map=IN. 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 Streams 1st Order 2nd Order 3rd Order 4th Order 5th Order 6th + Order Stream Order Water (Ac.) (Mi.) (Mi.) (Mi.) (Mi.) (Mi.) (Mi.) Unavailable (Mi.)													
<u>Dearborn</u>	153	59.72	38.68	4.43	6.79	0.23	8.45	0.00	1.14					
<u>Decatur</u>	259	19.68	14.56	5.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
<u>Fayette</u>	88	133.17	87.68	26.26	2.12	17.12	0.00	0.00	0.00					
<u>Franklin</u>	3,240	363.59	215.33	77.10	15.04	29.93	13.77	0.00	12.43					
Henry	5	31.28	26.01	5.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
<u>Randolph</u>	57	76.47	58.12	14.55	3.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
Ripley	61	7.00	6.06	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
Rush	14	6.25	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00					
<u>Union</u>	2,285	161.25	103.10	21.73	17.64	16.19	0.00	0.00	2.59					
<u>Wayne</u>	483	481.58	284.09	72.53	89.03	27.67	0.00	0.00	8.26					
Totals	6,645	1,339.99	839.86	227.93	134.42	91.14	22.21	0.00	24.42					

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 Resou	rce Concern Areas
	% of
	Watershed
<u>Dearborn</u>	3.41
Decatur	0.00
<u>Fayette</u>	0.00
<u>Franklin</u>	0.00
Henry	0.00
Randolph	0.00
Ripley	0.00
Rush	0.00
<u>Union</u>	0.00
Wayne	0.00
Totals	3.41

Data Source = Environmental Protection Agency, 2006, data no longer published.

(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								
40,911.89	4.79	771.00	0.00	0.00								

.........

 $\label{eq:Data Source} \begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Data Source} \end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Communities} = \\ \textbf{Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves; Analysis by NRCS, 2007, data source is not public. Habitat ranges indicate the likely life-history range surrounding known locations of threatened & endangered species (state and federal listed) that have the potential to be used by the species (ranges for plants = point - 0 miles; amphibians/reptiles/insects/aquatic species = <math>\frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{16} = \frac$

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 Farms Farms Farms Minority Full Time Part Time Farms <10 Ac. <50 Ac. <180 Ac. <500 Ac. <1000 Ac. >1000 Ac. Farmers Farmers Farmers												
<u>Dearborn</u>	93	4	27	50	10	2	0	2	12	39			
<u>Decatur</u>	60	4	13	16	15	7	4	1	11	23			
<u>Fayette</u>	388	17	123	112	79	32	26	1	67	168			
Franklin	763	42	199	303	165	44	10	5	116	361			
<u>Henry</u>	81	8	29	22	10	7	4	1	12	33			
<u>Randolph</u>	146	12	39	34	30	19	12	1	25	64			
Ripley	44	3	13	16	8	3	1	1	7	20			
Rush	22	1	4	5	5	4	2	0	5	8			
<u>Union</u>	199	13	31	59	45	37	13	1	29	77			
<u>Wayne</u>	847	49	277	303	119	64	36	11	134	376			
Totals	2,643	153	755	920	486	219	108	24	418	1,169			

Data Source = National Ag Statistics Service 2002 Census of Agriculture (http://www.nass.usda.gov/census/census02/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 Gully Confined Vegetative Control Gully Livestock Wetland Agronomic Aquatic Grazing Control Wildlife Forestry Grassed Waste Buffers Practices Nutrient CNMPs Habitat **Practices** Upland Other Practices Practices No Till Mulch Till Pest Mat. Waterway Storage Irrigation Year: (Ac.) (Ac.) Mgt. (Ac.) (#) (Ac.) (Ac.) (Ac.) Buffers (Ft.) (Ac.) (Ac.) (Ac.) (Ac.) (Ac.) (#) (#) (Ac.) 2007 81 12.754 6.754 9.241 26 927 8.297 6,617 941 3.437 29 15 75 0 7,817 10,654 2006 469 3,749 631 82 290 7,806 84 3,060 181 0 3 78 6,233 5,264 54 2005 79 8.210 3.260 96 0 238 148 160 80 0 n 38 37,185 114 2 2004 1,302 6,252 5,177 332 4,486 0 0 n/a 124 468 279 21 n/a 2003 4.630 63 287 95 297 1 759 1.225 0 n/a 1.018 343 1 n/a 1.324 0 n 2002 n/a 4.408 1.946 26.555 234 283 4.413 3.925 n/a n/a 552 173 0 0 0 0 Totals (2002-2007): 1,931 40,003 19.092 144,085 647 2,207 35,842 24,837 1,297 222 25 240 8.695 1.131 4

Data Source = NRCS Performance Results System Reports, 2007, http://ias.sc.egov.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.

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, Microirrigation (441) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (443) + Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (443) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (443) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (443) + Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (443) + Irrigation System, Sprinkler (4 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 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) + 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 fiscal year.