

# Watershed Report

## Middle Wabash-Little Vermilion (05120108)

### 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
Benton	127,927	111,854	8.42	1,661	0.12	115	0.01	12,141	0.91	1,461	0.11	0	0.00
Boone	21,404	17,215	1.30	546	0.04	20	0.00	3,422	0.26	108	0.01	20	0.00
Fountain	226,746	152,264	11.46	33,931	2.55	1,806	0.14	34,193	2.57	2,519	0.19	0	0.00
Hendricks	2,998	2,439	0.18	59	0.00	0	0.00	482	0.04	2	0.00	0	0.00
Montgomery	123,219	100,639	7.57	5,481	0.41	318	0.02	14,592	1.10	1,644	0.12	22	0.00
Parke	212,018	93,459	7.03	70,868	5.33	4,023	0.30	37,791	2.84	3,134	0.24	1	0.00
Putnam	59,995	36,431	2.74	11,379	0.86	204	0.02	10,591	0.80	590	0.04	16	0.00
Tippecanoe	236,287	148,548	11.18	20,124	1.51	1,972	0.15	49,918	3.76	13,278	1.00	1	0.00
Vermillion	110,791	58,411	4.40	21,484	1.62	2,415	0.18	21,790	1.64	6,209	0.47	0	0.00
Vigo	1,436	617	0.05	338	0.03	36	0.00	366	0.03	20	0.00	0	0.00
Warren	186,477	119,849	9.02	26,538	2.00	1,358	0.10	31,569	2.38	6,324	0.48	0	0.00
White	19,604	18,127	1.36	75	0.01	20	0.00	1,340	0.10	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,328,903</b>	<b>859,854</b>	<b>64.70</b>	<b>192,483</b>	<b>14.48</b>	<b>12,289</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>218,194</b>	<b>16.42</b>	<b>35,289</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**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)

### Public Lands

	Public Lands (Ac.)	% of Total
Benton	945	0.07
Boone	0	0.00
Fountain	534	0.04
Hendricks	0	0.00
Montgomery	0	0.00
Parke	4,341	0.33
Putnam	0	0.00
Tippecanoe	2,168	0.16
Vermillion	8,793	0.66
Vigo	0	0.00
Warren	246	0.02
White	0	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17,027</b>	<b>1.28</b>

**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
Benton	111,854	8.42	59,059	4.44	178	0.01	49,972	3.76	2,608	0.20
Boone	17,215	1.30	9,207	0.69	700	0.05	6,715	0.51	212	0.02
Fountain	152,264	11.46	76,255	5.74	2,249	0.17	67,221	5.06	2,816	0.21
Hendricks	2,439	0.18	1,264	0.10	5	0.00	1,117	0.08	19	0.00
Montgomery	100,639	7.57	49,175	3.70	768	0.06	48,453	3.65	1,369	0.10
Parke	93,459	7.03	49,636	3.74	3,006	0.23	34,700	2.61	2,650	0.20
Putnam	36,431	2.74	18,250	1.37	863	0.06	15,490	1.17	874	0.07
Tippecanoe	148,548	11.18	72,382	5.45	2,814	0.21	65,860	4.96	3,434	0.26
Vermillion	58,411	4.40	30,483	2.29	602	0.05	25,348	1.91	1,823	0.14
Vigo	617	0.05	363	0.03	29	0.00	142	0.01	32	0.00
Warren	119,849	9.02	60,394	4.54	855	0.06	55,188	4.15	3,308	0.25
White	18,127	1.36	8,941	0.67	67	0.01	8,995	0.68	99	0.01
<b>Totals</b>	<b>859,854</b>	<b>64.70</b>	<b>435,408</b>	<b>32.76</b>	<b>12,135</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>379,200</b>	<b>28.53</b>	<b>19,244</b>	<b>1.45</b>

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

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
Benton	0	0	0	0
Boone	0	0	0	0
Fountain	0	0	0	0
Hendricks	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	2	907	2	593
Parke	0	0	0	0
Putnam	0	0	0	0
Tippecanoe	2	990	2	1,246
Vermillion	1	162	1	222
Vigo	0	0	0	0
Warren	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,059</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,061</b>

**Data Source** = Indiana Board of Animal Health, 2006 (Slaughter Processing), [http://www.in.gov/boah/food\\_safety/inspection/meat\\_poultry.html](http://www.in.gov/boah/food_safety/inspection/meat_poultry.html)

### Confined Livestock 2006

	CAFO/CFO*	Dairy		Beef		Swine		Poultry		Sheep	
		Farms	Animals	Farms	Animals	Farms	Animals	Farms	Animals	Farms	Animals
Benton	4	0	0	1	450	3	4,539	0	0	0	0
Boone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fountain	7	1	3,385	0	0	6	13,445	0	0	0	0
Hendricks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	17	1	100	2	800	16	63,812	0	0	0	0
Parke	6	0	0	0	0	6	15,152	0	0	0	0
Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tippecanoe	20	1	540	2	1,280	19	29,477	1	61,850	2	540
Vermillion	5	0	0	0	0	5	35,025	0	0	0	0
Vigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warren	6	1	425	0	0	5	12,127	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4,450</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,530</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>173,577</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>61,850</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>540</b>

\*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.

### Biofuel Plants

	Ethanol	Biodiesel
Benton	0	0
Boone	0	0
Fountain	0	0
Hendricks	0	0
Montgomery	1	0
Parke	0	0
Putnam	0	0
Tippecanoe	0	0
Vermillion	0	0
Vigo	0	0
Warren	0	0
White	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

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

### Surface and Groundwater Resource Concern Areas

	Impaired Streams (Mi.)	Impaired Lakes (Ac.)	Wellhead Protection (Ac.)	Karst (Ac.)	% Karst
Benton	0.00	0	1,089	0	0.00
Boone	0.00	0	1,226	0	0.00
Fountain	117.81	0	2,155	0	0.00
Hendricks	0.00	0	0	0	0.00
Montgomery	7.50	0	3,021	0	0.00
Parke	31.71	0	4,264	0	0.00
Putnam	0.36	0	1,838	0	0.00
Tippecanoe	29.00	0	11,669	0	0.00
Vermillion	20.99	0	6,680	0	0.00
Vigo	0.44	0	0	0	0.00
Warren	17.59	0	921	0	0.00
White	11.73	0	0	0	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>237.14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32,861</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**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)

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.

### 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.)	
	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%	Ac.	%
Benton	50,506	3.80	1,319	0.10	92,766	6.98	302	0.02	1,417	0.11	9,167	0.69	12,274	0.92	1,664	0.13	0	0.00
Boone	8,046	0.61	13,427	1.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2,508	0.19	190	0.01	16	0.00	9	0.00
Fountain	47,883	3.60	5,412	0.41	260	0.02	759	0.06	8,095	0.61	16,254	1.22	56,592	4.26	6,628	0.50	6,204	0.47
Hendricks	1,301	0.10	1,608	0.12	2,826	0.21	0	0.00	62	0.00	168	0.01	44	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Montgomery	30,456	2.29	118	0.01	83,990	6.32	0	0.00	1,481	0.11	6,536	0.49	22,707	1.71	997	0.08	1,005	0.08
Parke	9,914	0.75	139,091	10.47	62,047	4.67	0	0.00	33,179	2.50	47,033	3.54	85,714	6.45	20,363	1.53	34,407	2.59
Putnam	6,870	0.52	45,589	3.43	25,437	1.91	0	0.00	7,705	0.58	11,663	0.88	28,609	2.15	1,305	0.10	5,378	0.40
Tippecanoe	65,041	4.89	25,116	1.89	133,877	10.07	4,507	0.34	5,918	0.45	16,087	1.21	26,485	1.99	6,915	0.52	123	0.01
Vermillion	17,119	1.29	4,558	0.34	44,330	3.34	203	0.02	18,430	1.39	11,998	0.90	20,928	1.57	2,178	0.16	8,874	0.67
Vigo	275	0.02	1,365	0.10	560	0.04	27	0.00	106	0.01	162	0.01	288	0.02	65	0.00	8	0.00
Warren	33,418	2.51	5,471	0.41	73,865	5.56	993	0.07	7,265	0.55	24,082	1.81	75,126	5.65	6,420	0.48	12,982	0.98
White	13,019	0.98	97	0.01	16,410	1.23	49	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	168	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>283,848</b>	<b>21.36</b>	<b>243,171</b>	<b>18.30</b>	<b>536,368</b>	<b>40.36</b>	<b>6,839</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>83,658</b>	<b>6.30</b>	<b>145,658</b>	<b>10.96</b>	<b>329,125</b>	<b>24.77</b>	<b>46,551</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>68,990</b>	<b>5.19</b>

**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](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)

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.

### 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.)
Benton	20	212.38	126.20	43.29	25.86	11.44	0.00	0.00	5.58
Boone	10	15.28	3.72	8.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.17
Fountain	229	430.70	258.46	102.70	30.68	19.04	0.00	18.34	1.48
Hendricks	0	2.62	2.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery	319	147.31	107.51	37.62	2.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parke	2,515	467.13	265.03	71.18	41.96	37.63	14.73	18.09	18.49
Putnam	53	64.61	43.30	5.17	15.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48
Tippecanoe	245	319.32	174.53	53.77	48.87	3.32	0.00	18.74	20.09
Vermillion	307	193.58	90.48	33.05	19.62	20.50	0.00	20.98	8.94
Vigo	0	4.33	1.38	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.23	0.44	2.15
Warren	195	365.58	229.29	70.45	16.96	19.31	13.14	15.26	1.18
White	14	17.36	13.30	3.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,907</b>	<b>2,240.19</b>	<b>1,315.84</b>	<b>429.09</b>	<b>201.89</b>	<b>111.24</b>	<b>28.10</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>62.17</b>

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

**Stream Order** = A hierarchical 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 Resource Concern Areas

	% of Watershed
Benton	0.00
Boone	1.61
Fountain	0.00
Hendricks	0.23
Montgomery	0.00
Parke	0.00
Putnam	0.00
Tippecanoe	0.00
Vermillion	0.00
Vigo	0.11
Warren	0.00
White	0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1.94</b>

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
242,761.78	18.27	1,321.50	6,263.00	0.47

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/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
Benton	190	13	19	29	48	39	43	2	37	70
Boone	51	9	16	9	6	5	5	0	8	23
Fountain	428	25	93	139	66	43	61	4	79	144
Hendricks	8	1	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	4
Montgomery	244	24	68	50	41	27	34	3	32	99
Parke	348	15	101	107	64	26	36	6	61	147
Putnam	168	11	63	52	23	9	9	1	21	83
Tippecanoe	514	79	176	104	66	36	53	7	69	249
Vermillion	142	5	37	39	24	13	24	2	20	53
Vigo	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Warren	276	18	75	67	45	26	46	2	46	137
White	41	4	10	7	8	6	6	1	8	16
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,414</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>1,027</b>

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.

Ac.: Acres  
Ft.: Feet  
Mi.: Miles

#: Number  
%: Percent  
<: Less Than

>: Greater Than

All data are the measure of that parameter within the Indiana portion of 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	2,610	17,650	5,306	106,950	130	1,305	6,782	5,817	0	0	133	55	7,807	380	0	365
2006	388	3,265	626	71,387	125	715	1,967	1,864	0	0	170	34	7,123	265	0	296
2005	98	15,874	7,667	193,263	186	377	4,233	4,106	0	14	267	79	571	237	0	1,169
2004	220	7,057	2,731	25,650	146	765	1,699	0	0	n/a	244	57	154	162	19	0
2003	n/a	9,284	5,363	10,611	459	144	8,770	7,202	0	16	n/a	n/a	2,454	286	0	259
2002	n/a	11,770	3,604	37,939	514	211	7,000	6,320	0	4	n/a	n/a	1,627	622	0	359
<b>Totals (2002-2007):</b>	<b>3,316</b>	<b>64,900</b>	<b>25,297</b>	<b>445,800</b>	<b>1,560</b>	<b>3,517</b>	<b>30,451</b>	<b>25,309</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>19,736</b>	<b>1,952</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2,448</b>

**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, 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) + 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.

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.