

WATERSHED CHARACTERIZATION REPORT

CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

SEPTEMBER 2012 | FINAL DRAFT

PREPARED FOR

SIDNEY CENTER IMPROVEMENT GROUP, INC.
P.O. Box 456
SIDNEY CENTER, NEW YORK 13839



PREPARED BY

KCI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
936 RIDGEBROOK ROAD
SPARKS, MD 21152



FUNDED BY

**CHESAPEAKE NETWORK FOR EDUCATION OF
MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**



And

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION



Acknowledgements

The Carr's Creek Watershed Characterization report is a collaborative effort between KCI Technologies, Inc., the Sidney Center Improvement Group, National Park Service at the Chesapeake Bay Program, Delaware County, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and West Virginia University. The principal authors of this document are Megan Crunkleton, Michael Pieper, and William Frost all of KCI Technologies, Inc., and Wink Hastings of the National Park Service at the Chesapeake Bay Program.

The following individuals were instrumental in providing mapping, data support, data analysis, quality control, and reporting. The contributions of each were vital to the successful completion of the project and have furthered the protection and restoration of natural resources in the Carr's Creek watershed.

Megan Crunkleton | KCI Technologies, Inc.

William Frost P.E., D.WRE | KCI Technologies, Inc.

Michael Pieper, CSE | KCI Technologies, Inc.

Wink Hastings | National Park Service, Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance

Joe Lally | Sidney Center Improvement Group, Inc.

Michael Sellitti | Sidney Center Improvement Group, Inc.

Spencer DeVaul | Delaware County

Michael Jastremski | Delaware County

Wayne Reynolds | Delaware County

Michael Strager , Ph.D. | West Virginia University

Steven Swenson, TWS AWB | New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Katie Theoharides |Theoharides Consulting

Peter Hujik | Otsego Land Trust

Karen Clifford | Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation District

For more information pertaining to this study, please contact:

Sidney Center Improvement Group, Inc.

Email | scigny@gmail.com

Phone | 607.369.2863

Web | www.scigny.org

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Goals and Objectives.....	1
1.2	Regulatory and Programmatic Environment	1
2	Watershed Characteristics.....	5
2.1	Watershed Delineation and Hydrography	5
2.2	Landscape	5
2.2.1	Climate	5
2.2.2	Ecoregion	6
2.2.3	Physiography.....	6
2.2.4	Topography	6
2.2.5	Geology	6
2.2.6	Soils	7
2.2.7	Erodibility	7
2.2.8	Forest Cover.....	8
2.2.9	Wetlands	8
2.3	Living Resources and Habitat	9
2.3.1	Sensitive Species	9
2.3.2	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species	9
2.4	Water Quality.....	10
2.4.1	Use Designations.....	10
2.4.2	303(d) Impairments	11
2.4.3	NPDES and SPDES Permittees	11
2.4.4	Superfund Sites	11
2.4.5	Wastewater Treatment Plants.....	12
2.4.6	Septic Systems.....	12
2.5	Flooding.....	12
2.5.1	June 2006 Flooding	13
2.5.2	Other Significant Events.....	13
2.6	Demographics and Population.....	13
2.7	Land Use.....	14
2.7.1	Existing Land Use and Land Cover.....	14
2.7.2	Imperviousness	15
2.7.3	Zoning.....	16
2.8	Protected Areas	17
2.8.1	Conservation Areas	17
2.8.2	Buffer Protection.....	17
2.9	Stormwater	18

2.9.1	Stream Crossings/Culverts	18
2.9.2	Storm Drains	18
2.9.3	Stormwater Management.....	18
3	Current Condition Assessment	19
3.1	Stream Assessment.....	19
3.1.1	Valley Type	20
3.1.2	Habitat.....	20
3.1.3	Riparian Buffer	20
3.2	Pollutant Load Modeling.....	20
3.3	Flooding.....	22
3.3.1	H/H Modeling.....	22
4	Summary of Problems.....	24
4.1	Streambank Erosion.....	24
4.2	Reduced or Absent Riparian Buffer	24
4.3	Flooding.....	24
4.4	Water Quality.....	25
4.5	Summary.....	25
5	Conservation and Restoration Priorities	26
6	References.....	27

List of Tables

Table 1 - Review of Existing Land Use and Water Resource Regulations	3
Table 2 - Watershed Drainage Area and Stream Miles.....	5
Table 3 - Hydrologic Soils Groups in Acres and Percent	7
Table 4 - Rare species within Carr's Creek watershed	9
Table 5 - Use Designations of Carr's Creek sub-tributaries	10
Table 6 - Summary of floods	12
Table 7 - 2001 Land Use for Carr's Creek watershed.....	14
Table 8 - 2001 Land Cover for Carr's Creek watershed listed from largest to smallest.	15
Table 9 - Impervious Area in Carr's Creek watershed.....	16
Table 10 - Town of Franklin Zoning Requirements.....	16
Table 11 - Summary of Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment	19
Table 12 – Pollutant Sources.....	22
Table 13 - Road Crossing Overtopping.....	23

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Flooding Events 1913 to 2011.....	13
Figure 2 - Stream Corridor Assessment Results.....	19
Figure 3 - Nitrogen and Phosphorus Sources.....	21
Figure 4 - Watershed Issues Summary.....	25

List of Maps

Map 1—Carr's Creek Watershed Vicinity Map

Map 2—2007 Ortho Imagery of Carr's Creek Watershed

Map 3—Steep Slopes

Map 4—Surficial Geology

Map 5—Hydrologic Soil Groups

Map 6—Erodibility

Map 7— Natural Resources: Forest Cover and Wetlands

Map 8—Floodplain

Map 9—Existing Land Use

Map 10—Zoning

Map 11—Stream Crossings/Culvert Locations

Map SC1—Segments of Carr's Creek Surveyed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Map SC2—Channel Alteration Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Map SC3—Erosion Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Map SC4—Exposed Pipe, Pipe Outfalls, and Stream Crossing Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Map SC5—Fish Barriers, Inadequate Buffer, and Unusual Condition Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Land Conservation Priority: Wildlife Habitat

Land Conservation Priority: Working Lands

Land Conservation Priority: Wetland Resources

Land Conservation Priority: Water Quality

Land Conservation Priority: Forest Resources

Land Conservation Priority: Combined/Overall Land Conservation

Resource Restoration Priority: Riparian Stream Buffer

Resource Restoration Priority: Stream Bank Erosion

Resource Restoration Priority: Instream Debris

Resource Restoration Priority: Stormwater Controls

Resource Restoration Priority: Combined/Overall Resource Restoration

1 Introduction

The Sidney Center Improvement Group (SCIG) is in the process of developing a watershed management plan for the Carr's Creek Watershed. Carr's Creek, located in Delaware County, NY, is a direct tributary to the Susquehanna River with a confluence located at the Town of Sidney.

The community of Sidney Center is located centrally in the watershed at the intersection of County Highways 23 and 35 (see Map 1). The northern border of the Town of Sidney, marked by the Susquehanna River, is the border of Otsego County, New York, and the west town line is the border of Chenango County, New York. According to the United States Census Bureau, the town has a total area of 50.7 square miles (131.2 km²), of which, 50.3 square miles (130.3 km²) of it is land and 0.4 square miles (1.0 km²) of it (0.75%) is water.

In 2006, a severe flooding event in Carr's Creek, and throughout Delaware County, prompted the completion of a Flood Recovery Plan, which called for the study and proper mitigation of Carr's Creek and its tributaries to protect the watershed's infrastructure and the community at large. SCIG received a grant from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to develop a watershed management plan for Carr's Creek.

The purpose of this Watershed Characterization Report is to describe the current watershed conditions and to set priorities, based on condition and need, for preservation and restoration. Future efforts will document more specifically the management strategies recommended, funding mechanisms, public participation practices, and implementation plans.

1.1 Goals and Objectives

The goals of the plan are to restore and sustain ecological function of Carr's Creek and its tributaries, to preserve and restore natural resources and working lands, and to reduce the risk of future severe flooding as experienced in 2006. Additional long-term goals include:

- Re-establishment of environmental functions in the river;
- Protection of important natural resources through conservation easements;
- Elimination of fish barriers;
- Livestock exclusion from streams;
- Reduction of risk of severe flooding; and
- Reducing bacterial contamination, excessive sedimentation, and high water temperatures that impact the trout fishery.

The project will contribute toward the 2011 Chesapeake Bay milestones for reduction of nitrogen and phosphorus and meet the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Watershed Plan Elements and guidelines based on Section 319 of the Clean Water Act.

1.2 Regulatory and Programmatic Environment

Regulations and ordinances that guide land use and protection of natural resources within the Carr's Creek watershed are promulgated primarily at the town, state and federal levels, with a few exceptions, most notable Section 239 of General Municipal Law, which provides for review of certain projects by the County Planning Board; and the Susquehanna River Basin Compact, which provides approval authority for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for water withdrawals over a certain threshold. Local land

use regulations create the framework for development according to each town's adopted Comprehensive Plan. Regulations under NYS Environmental Conservation Law and other relevant sections of the NYS Code protect public health and safety, water quality and drinking water supplies through various compliance requirements.

The purpose of this review is to identify and evaluate the controls, policies and programs in place to guide development to appropriate areas and conserve natural resources. Plans and regulations reviewed address land use planning and zoning, flood damage prevention, water quality protection, land conservation, aquatic buffers, erosion, and storm water. Because the focus of the Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan is water resources, the review concentrated on water quality and water quantity. This review followed a process developed by the Center for Watershed Protection entitled, "Assessing Your Watershed Protection Programs and Regulations." The findings are summarized in Table 1. This evaluation will subsequently be used to recommend changes and/or additions to existing regulations.

Table 1 - Review of Existing Land Use and Water Resource Regulations

REGULATION AND/OR PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	MECHANISMS SUPPORTING WATER RESOURCE GOALS	EFFECTIVENESS IN ADDRESSING WATER RESOURCE GOALS	COMMENTS
Town of Sidney Comprehensive Action Plan	-develop new ideas, identify community needs, and establish goals and strategies to guide the pace and direction of future changes -action plan updated periodically as needed	-action plan does not currently support water resource management	-plan does not address water resource goals -no provision for integrating watershed management -plan does not address flood damage prevention	-plan adopted before 2006 and 2011 floods -plan indicates water/sewer as "future challenges"
Town of Sidney Highway Management Plan	-identify town road and natural disaster issues + budget needs -inventory/map roads + storm water structures -evaluate road/related structure condition -create map-books of highway infrastructure location	-identification of natural disaster issues (including flooding) -inventory/evaluation of road stream crossings and storm water structures	Road bridge /culvert replacement and re-sizing to accommodate increase stream flows	-proper bridge/culvert re-sizing requires stream flow modeling
Town of Sidney Zoning Ordinance	-zoning districts consist of Residential, Residential-Agricultural, Commercial-Manufacturing, each with varying use and lot size requirements	No provisions to support water resources (except in Flood Hazard zones appended by 1987 Flood Damage Prevention ordinance)	-no provision for review + approval of most projects by the Planning Board (Town has not approved a proposed zoning amendment with a Site Plan Review provision)	-Site Plan review authority has been an effective tool for addressing water resource issues in other municipalities in Delaware County. Approval of Site Plans triggers a review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, which provides for mitigation of significant environmental (and other) impacts
Town of Sidney Subdivision Regulations	-Planning Board approval authority for subdividing land parcels. Meant to ensure that all parcels resulting from subdivision are suitable for development under all applicable land-use laws	-subdivision approval includes provisions for natural resource protection. Approval requires a review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, which provides for mitigation of significant environmental (and other) impacts	-regulations do not specifically address water resource management	

REGULATION AND/OR PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	MECHANISMS SUPPORTING WATER RESOURCE GOALS	EFFECTIVENESS IN ADDRESSING WATER RESOURCE GOALS	COMMENTS
Town of Sidney Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance	-regulate development in designated floodplain as depicted on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (1% annual-chance floodplain, AKA 100-year floodplain)	-permit required by local Floodplain Administrator	-buildings/utilities must be elevated or flood-proofed, stored materials anchored, obstructions mitigated	Pre-FIRM (i.e. structures built before 1974) are grandfathered until they are "substantially" damaged (greater than 50% of assessed value) at which point they must come into compliance
Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan	-guides risk-reduction of County agencies and municipalities including flooding. After 2011-2012 update, Town of Sidney will adopt their own section ("Jurisdictional Annex") of the AHMP along with the update	-basis for developing flood mitigation projects	While water quality is not addressed directly in the AHMP, many mitigation projects have a substantial water quality benefit	Any flood mitigation activities in the CCWP must be coordinated with the AHMP and the Town of Sidney's municipal annex to the AHMP
Delaware County Action Plan for Economic Vitality and Water Quality	-enhances/protects County's economy and reduces contaminant loading in water bodies. Sets up a framework for collaboration between Delaware County agencies and important stakeholders	DCAP Core Group (composed of DelCo Departments of Watershed Affairs, Public Works, Planning, Emergency Services, and Economic Development, as well as the DelCo Soil and Water Conservation District and Cornell Cooperative Extension) meets every other week. The DCAP Core Group should be considered a resource for implementing the CCWP		
Susquehanna-Chemung Action Plan	-ecosystem approach to conserve and protect water resources	-broadly supportive of water resource management goals/strategies		

2 Watershed Characteristics

2.1 Watershed Delineation and Hydrography

Located in Delaware County New York, the Carr's Creek watershed drains directly into the Susquehanna River, which is the natural border between northern Delaware County and the southern edge of Otsego County (Map 1 and Map 2). The Carr's Creek watershed extends into three towns: Sidney, Franklin, and Masonville. The majority of the watershed is located in the town of Sidney, with the hamlet of Sidney Center located approximately in the center of the watershed. The headwaters of Carr's Creek originate near Merrickville, NY in the Town of Franklin and a small portion of the watershed also extends into the Town of Masonville along County Highway 27. In addition to Sidney Center and Merrickville, the hamlets of Franklin Depot and Youngs Station are also located in the Carr's Creek watershed.

The Carr's Creek watershed is approximately 19,009 acres in area (Table 2), and includes 54.5 miles of mapped stream channel. Named stream channels include the mainstem of Carr's Creek (41.9 miles) and Willow Brook (12.6 miles).

Table 2 - Watershed Drainage Area and Stream Miles

Towns	Drainage Area (Acres)	Stream Miles
Sidney	15,106.3	44.5
Franklin	3,638.9	10.0
Masonville	263.6	0.0
TOTAL	19,008.9	54.5

To assist in describing the Carr's Creek watershed in this study, the watershed has been subdivided into three subwatersheds (Map 1) with all three subwatersheds joining at the confluence at Sidney Center. The Willow Brook subwatershed drains north from the northern border of Masonville and Walton to the confluence with Carr's Creek. The Carr's Creek Upstream subwatershed drains from Merrickville to the confluence with Willow Brook. The Carr's Creek Downstream subwatershed drains from Sidney Center to the Susquehanna River.

2.2 Landscape

2.2.1 Climate

Climate influences soil formation and erosion processes, stream flow patterns, vegetation coverage and a significant part of the geomorphology of a watershed. Rainfall not only provides water to streams and vegetation, but the intensity, frequency and amount of rainfall can greatly influence watershed characteristics.

Delaware County is located in the Northeast climate region of the U.S. (Karl and Koss, 1984) and has a temperate climate with a mean monthly rainfall of 2.31-4.31 inches and a mean annual rainfall of 39.30 inches. Air temperature of the area ranges from an average low temperature of 22.2°F in January to an average high of 68.7°F in July (NOAA, 2011).

2.2.2 Ecoregion

There are 12 major ecozones and 40 minor ecozones throughout the state of New York. Delaware County is located in the Major Ecozone of Zone A: Appalachian Plateau and the Minor Ecozone of A03: Central Appalachians (NYSDEC, 1990). The Appalachian Plateau major ecozone accounts for approximately one-third of New York. The Central Appalachians minor ecozone comprises 18 percent of New York.

2.2.3 Physiography

The Carr's Creek watershed is situated at the foothills of the Catskill Mountains in the Southern New York section of the Appalachian Plateaus province in the Appalachian Highlands physiographic division (USGS, 2003). The Appalachian Plateau is the western part of the Appalachian mountains, extending from New York to Georgia and Alabama.

2.2.4 Topography

To document the presence of steep slopes and the influence of topography on the watershed an evaluation of steep slopes was prepared. Slopes for this study were divided into the following four categories:

- Gently to Strongly Sloping: <15%
- Moderately Steep: 15%-25%
- Steep: 25%-35%
- Very Steep: >35%

The majority of slopes within the watershed are less than 15% (63 percent of the watershed; Map 3). Approximately one-fourth of the watershed (26 percent) falls in the 15%-25% slope category. The 25%-35% and >35% categories account for 5 percent and 1 percent of the watershed, respectively. The western and central parts of the watershed have the highest elevation, with the largest section of steep slopes extending east from Sidney Center to just north of Franklin Depot—25%-35% slopes with a small section of >35% slopes. The south eastern headwaters portion of the watershed is a more gradually sloping zone, particularly around the village of Merrickville.

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in Chapter 5 of the Stormwater Management Design Manual, recommends avoiding, if possible, the development on slopes with a grade of 15% or greater to limit soil loss, erosion, and excessive stormwater runoff and degradation of surface water (CWP, 2010). No development, regrading, or stripping of vegetation should be considered on slopes exceeding 25%.

2.2.5 Geology

The geologic formations underlying a watershed have a significant effect on the water resources. Geology is a major determinant of the type of topography and surface features, as discussed earlier. The chemical composition and minerals of the parent rock or unconsolidated sediments determines in large part the soil characteristics, including erodibility and infiltration rates.

As shown in Map 4, surficial geology of the watershed is dominated by the till material group (88 percent; NYSED, 2011)—in particular, glacial tills. Prevalent throughout the state of New York, glacial tills are deposits left by a continental glacier. Relatively impermeable, tills are variable in texture (clay,

silt-clay, boulder clay) and are usually poorly sorted sediments. Potential land instability on steep slopes is also attributed to the till material group. Recent glacial deposits are prevalent along the majority of the floodplain of Carr's Creek mainstem.

Bedrock geology consists primarily of Lower Walton Formations of Upper Devonian shale and sandstone (Dicken et al., 2005). Bedrock outcrops are located running east to west along Dunshee Road and County Highway 35 and are also present along the northern border of the watershed. Kame deposits and outwash sand/gravel are also present but account for a negligible amount of the watershed.

2.2.6 Soils

Soil conditions are an important factor when evaluating water quantity and quality in streams and rivers. Soil type and moisture conditions greatly impact the amount and quality of runoff. In addition, the magnitude of the runoff is affected by the combination of soil type and slope. Soils also affect how land may be used and its potential for vegetation and habitat. Soils are an important consideration in targeting projects aimed at improving water quality or habitat.

As shown in Table 3 and Map 5, the majority of soils (93.2 percent) are classified as hydrologic soil group C. These soils have relatively high runoff potential, meaning that water transmission, or infiltration, is somewhat restricted. Hydrologic soil groups B and D account for approximately 5 percent of the soils in the watershed (3.8 and 1.7 percent, respectively) and are generally found along streams valleys, particularly in the most downstream portions of the Carr's Creek mainstem near Youngs Station. Soils in group B have moderately low runoff potential with unimpeded water transmission through the soil while D soils have a high runoff potential with restricted or very restricted water movement through the soil. Soil groups A and A/D account for approximately one percent of the soils in the watershed (0.6 and 0.4 percent, respectively). Soils in group A have the lowest runoff potential and water is transmitted freely through the soil.

Table 3 - Hydrologic Soils Groups in Acres and Percent

	A	A/D	B	C	D	Water
Runoff Potential	Low	mixed	Moderately Low	Moderately High	High	na
Acres	111.70	80.34	730.39	17718.44	320.15	47.84
Percent	0.59	0.42	3.84	93.21	1.68	0.25

2.2.7 Erodibility

Soil erodibility is a measure of the soil's susceptibility to erosion. The Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) developed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agricultural Research Service is a model used to describe soil erosion processes. In the USLE, erodibility is described quantitatively using the K factor, which represents both the susceptibility of soil to erosion and its contribution to the rate of runoff. For example, clay soils have low K values because they are resistant to detachment. Coarse soils such as sand can also have low K values because even though they are easily detached, they are less susceptible to runoff. Silts have the highest K values because they detach easily and produce high rates of runoff (Institute of Water Research, 2002).

Subwatersheds with the largest percentage of highly erodible soils offer the greatest potential for addressing soil conservation with best management practices (BMPs) aimed at maintaining topsoil, such

as riparian buffer forestation. Combining this indicator with other information, such as cropland, slope steepness and distance to streams would help to determine where to retire highly erodible land from farming, a type of BMP. Additionally, a high K value helps to identify areas where urban development near streams, such as road construction or utility placement may have particularly adverse watershed impacts.

Soil erodibility was divided into four categories:

- No Data
- Low Erodibility (K factor <0.24)
- Medium Erodibility (K factor 0.24-0.32)
- High Erodibility (K factor >0.32)

Map 6 presents the soil erodibility categories based on K factor for Carr's Creek watershed. The majority of the watershed consists of soils with medium erodibility (97 percent of the watershed) with approximately one percent low erodibility and one percent high erodibility (one percent of the watershed has no data and in most instances accounts for water).

Based on local observation, the majority of erosion within the Carr's Creek watershed during normal flows occurs from stream banks with little or no riparian vegetation and banks damaged by previous flood events. Severe erosion occurs during extreme storm events (i.e. 100+ year storms) when large quantities of sediment and rock are transported downstream and then deposited in the stream channel as energy dissipates.

2.2.8 Forest Cover

Among land cover types, forest cover provides the greatest protection for soil and water quality. Carr's Creek watershed is a heavily forested area with 11,712 acres of forest cover (deciduous, evergreen, and mixed forest); which comprises over half of the watershed (62 percent; Map 7).

In 2010, NYSDEC in cooperation with the USDA Forest Service, conducted a statewide aerial survey of tree health. According to the *2010 Forest Health Aerial Survey Report*, approximately 23.3 million acres were surveyed statewide with approximately 1.5 million acres of forest damage observed (NYSDEC(a), 2011). The majority of forest damage, including forest mortality, was caused by frost damage and biotic damage from the forest tent caterpillar (*Malacosoma disstria*). Damage from the forest tent caterpillar as well as severe frost damage was observed in Delaware County. However, minimal forest damage was observed in the vicinity of Carr's Creek watershed.

2.2.9 Wetlands

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (USEPA, 1972) defines wetlands as the following:

Wetlands are "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soils. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

Wetlands are environmentally sensitive habitats that play an integral part in supporting the water quality and water storage of a watershed. These reservoirs help to control flooding by retaining surface

runoff and releasing steady flows of water downstream. Wetlands also support biological diversity, erosion control, and sediment retention.

Based on the National Wetland Inventory, there are 452 acres of wetland habitat throughout the watershed (USFWS, 2011) the majority of which are freshwater ponds (220 acres; Map 7). Freshwater forested/shrub and freshwater emergent wetlands cover 126 and 90 acres, respectively, with 17 acres of riverine wetlands.

2.3 Living Resources and Habitat

2.3.1 Sensitive Species

Much of the Carr's Creek and Willow Brook mainstems and tributary systems support Eastern brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) and Brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) both from stocked populations and spawning natural populations. Refer to section 2.4.1 below for details in the Use Designations related to trout resources. Carr's Creek is one of multiple streams, ponds and reservoirs throughout Delaware County stocked annually with trout. A total of 420 Brown trout (*Salmo trutta*), 8-9 inches in length, were stocked in April 2011 in Carr's Creek (NYSDEC(b), 2011).

2.3.2 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species

The New York Heritage Program (NYHP) documents multiple rare plants and animals in Delaware County with a generalized distribution that may be within the vicinity of Carr's Creek watershed (NYSDEC, 2009).

2.3.2.1 Federal Endangered Species Act Listings

The dwarf wedgemussel (*Alasmidonta heterodon*) is a freshwater mussel that is listed as 'Endangered' under the Federal Endangered Species Act and by New York State. The dwarf wedgemussel was last documented in Delaware County in 2002. The northern monkshood (*Aconitum noveboracense*) is a flowering plant that is listed as 'Threatened' under the Federal Endangered Species Act and by New York State. The most recent year the northern monkshood was observed in Delaware County was in 1996.

2.3.2.2 New York State Listings

In addition to the dwarf wedge mussel and northern monkshood listed in section 2.3.2.1, Table 4 presents rare or state-listed animals and plants, significant natural communities and other significant habitats, which NYHP databases indicate occur, or may occur, within Carr's Creek watershed or in the immediate vicinity of the watershed.

Table 4 - Rare species within Carr's Creek watershed

Common name	Scientific name	Type	Group	NY Legal Status	NYS Rank
Hellbender	<i>Cryptobranchus alleganiensis</i>	Animal	Amphibians	Special concern	Imperiled
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Animal	Birds	Threatened	Imperiled
Yellow lampmussel	<i>Lampsilis cariosa</i>	Animal	Mussels	Unlisted	Vulnerable
Green floater	<i>Lasmigona subviridis</i>	Animal	Mussels	Threatened	Critically imperiled

2.4 Water Quality

2.4.1 Use Designations

NYSDEC has established water quality classifications of surface waters and groundwater throughout the state which are described in 6 NYCRR Chapter X – Division of Water §701. Carr's Creek and Willow Brook are both sub-tributaries in the Susquehanna River drainage basin. Use designations of Carr's Creek and Willow Brook sub-tributaries are listed and described in Table 5.

Two portions of Carr's Creek mainstem are classified as trout waters: the first section extends from Merrickville to Sidney Center, the second section runs from Dunshee Road to 0.4 miles south of Quarry Road. One sub-tributary of Carr's Creek, located in Franklin Depot along Stillson Road, is also considered trout waters. The remaining portions of Carr's Creek mainstem and all other sub-tributaries to Carr's Creek are classified as Class C fresh surface waters.

The majority of Willow Brook stream reaches are classified as Class C fresh surface waters. One portion of Willow Brook, which extends between Budine Road and Pine Swamp Road, is classified as trout waters. One sub-tributary of Willow Brook, located north of the boundary of Masonville, is classified as Class AA fresh surface waters, which holds the same standards as Class C surface waters with the addition of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes.

DEC is currently updating the use classifications regarding trout, and based on communication with DEC it is expected that most all segments of Carr's Creek and Willow Brook will be listed as TS, trout spawning waters.

Table 5 - Use Designations of Carr's Creek sub-tributaries

Regulation	Class	Definition
§701.5	Class AA fresh surface waters	(a) The best usages of Class AA waters are: a source of water supply for drinking, culinary or food processing purposes; primary and secondary contact recreation; and fishing. The waters shall be suitable for fish, shellfish, and wildlife propagation and survival. (b) This classification may be given to those waters that, if subjected to approved disinfection treatment, with additional treatment if necessary to remove naturally present impurities, meet or will meet New York State Department of Health drinking water standards and are or will be considered safe and satisfactory for drinking water purposes.
§701.8	Class C fresh surface waters	The best usage of Class C waters is fishing. These waters shall be suitable for fish, shellfish, and wildlife propagation and survival. The water quality shall be suitable for primary and secondary contact recreation, although other factors may limit the use for these purposes.
§701.25	Trout waters (T)	The symbol (T), appearing in an entry in the "standards" column in the classification tables of Parts 800 through 941 of this Title, means that the classified waters in that specific Item are trout waters. Any water quality standard, guidance value, or thermal criterion that specifically refers to trout or trout waters applies.
§701.25	Trout waters (TS)	The symbol (TS), appearing in an entry in the "standards" column in the classification tables of Parts 800 through 941 of this Title, means that the classified waters in that specific Item are trout spawning waters. Any water quality standard, guidance value, or thermal criterion that specifically refers to trout, trout spawning, trout waters, or trout spawning waters applies.

2.4.2 303(d) Impairments

Under the Federal Clean Water Act, the state of New York is required to assess and report on the quality of waters throughout the state. Where designated uses are not fully supported, Section 303(d) requires states to list these water bodies as impaired waters. States are then required to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the listed impaired waters. The Final NYS 2010 Section 303(d) List was approved by the USEPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) on June 29, 2010.

While two segments in the Susquehanna Drainage Basin were listed on the 2010 303(d) List, Carr's Creek, Willow Brook, and all of their sub-tributaries to the Carr's Creek watershed were not included and therefore currently meet their designated uses (NYSDEC, 2010).

2.4.3 NPDES and SPDES Permittees

The Federal Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of pollutants through a point source into a "water of the United States" without the requirement of a NPDES permit (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; USEPA, 2002). In addition to NPDES permitting, New York State has also initiated a state program, approved by USEPA, known as the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES). The SPDES program is broader in scope than that required by the Clean Water Act because it controls wastewater and stormwater discharges of point sources to groundwaters as well as surface waters.

Currently, there are no NPDES or SPDES permittees within the Carr's Creek watershed.

2.4.4 Superfund Sites

The federal government established the Superfund program to clean up the nation's abandoned and uncontrolled hazardous waste sites.

The Sidney Landfill is a listed Superfund site (EPA ID#: NYD980507677) located approximately 2.5 miles southeast of Sidney Center in the southern portion of the Carr's Creek watershed within the Willow Brook subwatershed. Added to the National Priorities List in 1989, Sidney Landfill covers 74 acres along the eastern side of Richardson Hill Road and is characterized by steep hills with farmlands and wooded areas. The landfill consists of approximately 20 acres and from 1964 through 1972 accepted municipal and commercial waste including waste oils. The groundwater contained volatile organic compounds (VOCs), including solvents and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

At this time, physical cleanup activities have been completed with site maintenance and monitoring occurring on a quarterly basis. Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Section 121(c), EPA must conduct five-year reviews of the site. The most recent EPA review occurred in June 2009, which concluded that the implemented remedy is protecting public health and the environment.

An additional Superfund site, Richardson Hill Road Landfill (EPA ID#: NYD980507735) is located approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the Sidney Landfill yet just outside of the Carr's Creek watershed boundary.

2.4.5 Wastewater Treatment Plants

Of the two wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) located in Delaware County—Walton and Delhi; neither are located in the Carr's Creek watershed.

2.4.6 Septic Systems

The majority of development within Carr's Creek watershed is on private septic systems with a very small percentage on common/public systems (<1 percent).

2.5 Flooding

Flooding has been a reoccurring problem for towns and villages throughout the Carr's Creek watershed and in Delaware County. Table 6 presents a summary of the major floods that have occurred in the sub-basin which includes the Town and Village of Sidney over the past 15 years. Map 8 depicts the 100-year floodplain (provided by Delaware County) extent throughout the Carr's Creek watershed.


Table 6 - Summary of floods

Beginning Date	Ending Date	Type of Flood	Type of Event	Location	Estimated damages
1/19/1996	1/20/1996	Flash Flood	Snowmelt, heavy rain	Countywide	\$9.3 million
1/6/1998	1/12/1998	Flood	Snowmelt, heavy rain	Sidney/western Delaware County	\$410 thousand
7/8/1998	7/8/1998	Flash Flood	Thunderstorm	Sidney Center	\$650 thousand
2/27/2000	2/29/2000	Flood	Snowmelt	Sidney/western Delaware County	\$50 thousand
3/26/2002	3/28/2002	Flash Flood	No information	Western Delaware County	Not reported
9/18/2004	9/18/2004	Flash Flood	Hurricane Ivan	Countywide	\$12 million
4/2/2005	4/5/2005	Flood	No information	Countywide	\$150 thousand
6/27/2006	6/28/2006	Flash Flood	Stalled frontal system	Countywide	\$ 250 million
5/20/2011	5/20/2011	Flash flood	Heavy Rain	Countywide	No data
9/7/2011	9/8/2011	Flood	Tropical Storm Lee	Countywide	No data

Source: DCPD, 2006; NCDC, 2012 with additions by KCI

In addition to these events, Figure 1 below details a chronology of flooding events in Sidney Center from 1913 to 2011.

Figure 1 - Flooding Events 1913 to 2011



2.5.1 June 2006 Flooding

In response to the June 2006 flooding event, Delaware County Planning Department prepared a *Post Flood Recovery and Reconstruction Plan* for the Town of Sidney, which details the actions necessary to redevelop areas that were most harmed by the flooding and the necessary steps to ensure that all redevelopment projects are prioritized in order of necessity and that all projects are done in accordance to local, regional, state and federal laws and plans (DCPD, 2006).

The plan also addresses the actions that are necessary for the Town to limit the exposure of future flooding. For example, repairing damaged infrastructure and cleaning out streams to accommodate future storms and spring runoff and developing municipal plans and land use controls to ensure safety of lives and property during a flood event.

2.5.2 Other Significant Events

Starting September 7, 2011, heavy rain from the remnants of Tropical Storm Lee flooded the Susquehanna River valley and Carr's Creek watershed.

On September 13, 2011, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) officially declared Sidney a federal disaster area as a result of Tropical Storm Lee (Sidney Chamber of Commerce, 2011). For one week, residents were under a Boil Water Advisory and were urged to stay out of the water as several propane and oil leaks were reported.

2.6 Demographics and Population

As of the census of 2000, there were 6,109 people, 2,565 households, and 1,641 families residing in the Town of Sidney. Communities and locations in the Town include: East Sidney, Franklin Depot, Sidney – The Village of Sidney, Sidney Center, South Unadilla, and Youngs.

The population density was 121.5 people per square mile (46.9/km²). There were 2,987 housing units at an average density of 59.4 per square mile (22.9/km²). The racial makeup of the town was 96.35% White, 0.85% Black or African American, 0.33% Native American, 0.77% Asian, 0.03% Pacific Islander,

0.39% from other races, and 1.28% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race were 1.44% of the population.

There were 2,565 households out of which 29.6% had children under the age of 18 living with them, 47.7% were married couples living together, 11.7% had a female householder with no husband present, and 36.0% were non-families. 30.3% of all households were made up of individuals and 16.1% had someone living alone who was 65 years of age or older. The average household size was 2.35 and the average family size was 2.90.

In the town, the population was spread out with 25.4% under the age of 18, 6.5% from 18 to 24, 25.3% from 25 to 44, 23.9% from 45 to 64, and 18.9% who were 65 years of age or older. The median age was 40 years. For every 100 females there were 90.8 males. For every 100 females age 18 and over, there were 87.0 males.

The median income for a household in the town was \$30,078, and the median income for a family was \$35,351. Males had a median income of \$28,168 versus \$25,014 for females. The per capita income for the town was \$16,335. About 11.1% of families and 14.3% of the population were below the poverty line, including 19.9% of those under age 18 and 10.3% of those age 65 or over.

2.7 Land Use

The type and density of various land uses can have a dramatic effect on water quality and stream habitat. Forested areas slow stormwater flow and allow water to gradually seep into soils and drain into streams. Vegetation and soils bind nutrients and pollutants found within stormwater—improving water quality as it infiltrates the ground. Developed areas, with a high percentage of impervious surfaces (buildings, paved roads, parking lots, etc.), do not slow stormwater flow—increasing the amount of pollutants entering streams. Increased stormflow can negatively affect stream habitat by increasing bank erosion and decreasing instream and riparian habitat. Agricultural land, if managed incorrectly, can also increase nutrients and bacteria in streams.

Land use/land cover data was analyzed using the National Landcover Database for the United States (2001) available through the Multi-Resolution Land Characterization (MRLC) Consortium (Homer et al., 2004).

2.7.1 Existing Land Use and Land Cover

The majority of the 19,009 acre drainage area of the Carr's Creek Watershed is forested land (66 percent), mainly consisting of deciduous forest (Map 9; Table 7 and Table 8). Close to a third of the watershed is agricultural land (30 percent), the majority consisting of pasture/hay. Developed land accounts for less than one percent of the watershed.

Table 7 - 2001 Land Use for Carr's Creek watershed.

Land Use Description	Acres	Percentage
Forest/Brush	12498.70	65.75
Agriculture	5732.31	30.16
Barren Land	695.78	3.66
Developed Land	82.07	0.43
Total land area	19008.86	100.00

Table 8 - 2001 Land Cover for Carr's Creek watershed listed from largest to smallest.

Land Cover Class	Acres	Percentage
Deciduous Forest	9278.05	48.81
Pasture/Hay	5016.53	26.39
Mixed Forest	1673.98	8.81
Evergreen Forest	759.72	4.00
Cultivated Crops	715.78	3.77
Developed, Open Space	636.90	3.35
Grassland/ Herbaceous	340.45	1.79
Woody Wetlands	251.75	1.32
Shrub/ Scrub	186.08	0.98
Developed, Low Intensity	73.85	0.39
Open water	58.89	0.31
Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	8.67	0.05
Developed, Medium Intensity	5.56	0.03
Developed, High Intensity	2.67	0.01
Total land area	19008.86	100.00

2.7.2 Imperviousness

As mentioned in Section 2.7, impervious surfaces concentrate stormwater runoff, accelerating flow rates and directing stormwater to the receiving stream. This accelerated, concentrated runoff can cause stream erosion and habitat degradation. Runoff from impervious surfaces picks up and washes off pollutants and is usually more polluted than runoff generated from pervious areas. In general, undeveloped watersheds with small amounts of impervious cover are more likely to have better water quality in local streams than urbanized watersheds with greater amounts of impervious cover. Impervious cover is a primary factor when determining pollutant characteristics and loadings in stormwater runoff.

The degree of imperviousness in a watershed also affects aquatic life. There is a strong relationship between watershed impervious cover and the decline of a suite of stream indicators. As imperviousness increases the potential stream quality decreases with most research suggesting that stream quality begins to decline at or around 10% imperviousness (Schueler, 1994; CWP, 2003). However, there is considerable variability in the response of stream indicators to impervious cover observed from 5 to 20% imperviousness due to historical effects, watershed management, riparian width and vegetative protection, co-occurrence of stressors, and natural biological variation. Because of this variability, one cannot conclude that streams draining low impervious cover will automatically have good habitat conditions and a high quality aquatic life.

As shown in Table 9, a very small percentage (2.6 percent) of Carr's Creek watershed consists of impervious surfaces.

Table 9 - Impervious Area in Carr's Creek watershed

Impervious Acres	Impervious Percent
497.0	2.6

2.7.3 Zoning

2.7.3.1 Town of Franklin

Two zoning districts in the town of Franklin are present within Carr's Creek watershed: Rural III and Rural V. Out of a total of 152 parcels located within the Carr's Creek watershed, 64 percent are zoned as Rural III. The remaining 36 percent of parcels are zoned as Rural V.

As written in the Town of Franklin Zoning Law, the Rural III district allows for lower density development of residential, agriculture and limited commercial establishments. The Rural III district encompasses all lands within 500 feet of the center line of a town road, with direct frontage on the right-of-way. The Rural V district permits only low density residential development with limited commercial uses and includes all lands not within 500 feet of an existing town. Permitted uses for both rural zones include: one, one- or two-family dwelling per lot; one mobile home per lot; agricultural practices; forestry management; and, wildlife management. Table 10 lists density, height, area, and yard requirements for Rural III and Rural V zoning districts.

Table 10 - Town of Franklin Zoning Requirements

Requirements	Rural III	Rural V
Minimum lot area	3 acres	5 acres
Minimum frontage	300 feet	350 feet
Maximum height	35 feet	35 feet
Front setback	75 feet from road center line	75 feet from road center line
Side/rear setback	25 feet	30 feet
Maximum lot coverage	20%	15%
Maximum lot depth to width ratio	4:1	4:1

2.7.3.2 Town of Sidney

The Town of Sidney is divided into four classes of districts: Residential, Residential-Agricultural, Commercial, and Manufacturing. The majority of the parcels located within the Carr's Creek watershed are zoned as Residential-Agricultural (78 percent). The remaining 22 percent is split between Residential (18 percent) and Commercial (4 percent).

As stated in the Town of Sidney Zoning Ordinance, permitted uses for the Residential district include single family dwellings, public buildings or recreational areas (e.g. churches, schools, libraries, playgrounds) not operated for financial gain. Land or buildings used by the Town of Sidney for administrative purposes, water supply, sewerage facilities, fire, or police stations is also permitted within the Residential district. Residential-Agricultural permitted uses include those regulated under the Residential district in addition to agricultural facilities including floricultural, horticultural, and forest farming; animal hospitals, riding stables, and private wildlife reservations; cemeteries; and, mobile

home parks. Permitted uses for the Commercial district include any permitted use in the Residential district (except mobile home parks) in addition to, but not limited to, the following: retail stores; service shops; restaurants; hotels, banks, and offices; commercial recreation facilities; public garages and auto repair shops.

2.8 Protected Areas

2.8.1 Conservation Areas

NYS DEC and local agencies may designate specific geographic areas within their boundaries as "Critical Environmental Areas" (CEAs; NYSDEC(c), 2011). Critical Environmental Areas must have an exceptional or unique character with respect to one or more of the following:

- A benefit or threat to human health;
- A natural setting (e.g. fish and wildlife habitat, forest and vegetation, open space and areas of important aesthetic or scenic quality);
- Agricultural, social, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, or educational values; or,
- An inherent ecological, geological or hydrological sensitivity to change that may be adversely affected by any change.

While there are no CEAs within the Carr's Creek watershed, Carr's Creek is a stocked and naturally reproducing trout stream that is protected by the NYDEC. A Protection of Waters Permit is required for disturbing the bed or banks of a stream with a classification of C(T) or higher, which includes all of Carr's Creek and Willow Brook, whether the disturbance is temporary or permanent. Further, the NYDEC's Protection of Waters Regulatory Program by way of Title 5 of Article 15 of the Environmental Conservation Law seeks to preserve and protect the states lakes, rivers, streams and ponds. Through this program the DEC requires that projects that disturb or will discharge to a regulated waterbody, including commercial, industrial or multi-residential development projects go through an environmental clearance process, including satisfying the requirements of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) to receive the proper environmental permits.

There are also no state forests, forest preserves, state parks, special use areas, or wildlife management areas in the Carr's Creek watershed. Pine Hill State Forest is the closest conservation area to the vicinity of Carr's Creek and is located approximately 1 mile to the west of the watershed's boundaries.

2.8.2 Buffer Protection

Stream corridor buffers are not currently protected through specific local or state regulation. There are however state and federal regulations related to forest impacts and timber harvesting that can apply to stream corridor buffers in certain situations. Depending on the project, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may require a permit for impacts at stream crossings and the NY DEC requires a permit for impacts to stream crossings for certain classifications of streams and wetlands. Further, NY DEC requires minimum residual stand densities for timber harvesting in wetlands, and protects State Wild, Scenic or Recreational Rivers with a 150 buffer from forest management roads. Carr's Creek and Willow Brook do not have this designation.

Delaware County, in partnership with the Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation Program, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are creating Stream Corridor Management Plans for the East Branch and West Branch of the Delaware

River. The plans are voluntary programs to address issues related to stream stability, property protection, flooding, aesthetics, recreation and ecology. The plans offer information for landowners on the benefits and management of riparian buffers and recommends buffer widths for various scenarios including 25 feet wide for mid-sized streams in residential settings and 35-180 feet in agricultural lands (DCSWCD, 2006).

2.9 Stormwater

2.9.1 Stream Crossings/Culverts

Stream crossings are critical components of local infrastructure both in terms of transportation connectivity and their potential impact on the stream system. Impacts can include presenting a barrier to aquatic organism passage, particularly fish, and crossings can also be locations where stream bank and stream bed erosion can occur due to the placement of bridge footers and culvert bottoms. Stream crossing flooding and the need to keep transportation corridors open during emergency events is a particularly important challenge in the Carr's Creek Watershed.

Many stream crossings occur throughout the watershed. Map 11 displays the locations of the County and Town bridge structures in addition to culvert crossings which are distinguished between driveway pipes and cross pipes. Based on the analysis of data provided by Delaware County Department of Public Works there are 17 County bridges, six town bridges, and 438 culvert crossings in the Carr's Creek Watershed. Of the culvert crossings, a majority are small crossings of 2 feet in diameter or smaller; however, 22 culverts are greater than 4 feet in diameter.

2.9.2 Storm Drains

The Carr's Creek watershed is a disconnected system without storm drains and curb and gutter use. Open swales and roadside ditches are used to direct runoff.

2.9.3 Stormwater Management

The need for extensive structural stormwater management facilities related to water quality treatment for roadways and parking lots is low in the Carr's Creek watershed due to the small amount of impervious surface (2.6 percent) in the watershed. In addition, the watershed and Delaware County are not covered under a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit. Specific information on the type and location of stormwater management facilities was not available for this report; however, it is assumed to be of minor significance.

3 Current Condition Assessment

3.1 Stream Assessment

In 2008, trained citizens conducted stream corridor assessments throughout the Carr's Creek watershed by walking segments of Carr's Creek and Willow Brook (Map SC1). The assessment focused on erosion sites, cows in streams, trash dumping, fish barriers, and any other occurrences that would be detrimental to overall stream health. Table 11, Figure 1, and Maps SC1 through SC5 present the results from the 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment in Carr's Creek watershed.


Channel alteration was observed at 14 sites with the type of material used for the alterations ranging from earth channel to concrete, rip-rap, and steel bridge abutments and the length of channel alterations ranging from 50 feet to 300 feet (Map SC2).

Multiple erosion sites (55 sites) were observed throughout the assessed portions of Carr's Creek and Willow Brook (Map SC3) with the most erosion sites occurring along Carr's Creek adjacent to County Highway 23 near Dunshee Road and adjacent to Franklin Depot Road near Franklin Depot. Eroded bank length ranged from 30 feet to as much as 500 feet to 0.25 miles (1,320 feet) with exposed bank heights ranging from 1 foot to 40 feet. The majority of erosion sites were located on meanders with pasture/crop fields, lawn, shrubs, or small trees within the riparian buffer. Mature trees within the riparian buffer zone help with erosion control as the root systems within the soil add stability to a stream bank.

Table 11 - Summary of Sites found in Carr's Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment

Channel Alteration	Erosion Sites	Exposed Pipes	Fish Barriers	Inadequate Buffers	Pipe Outfalls	Stream Crossing	Trash Dumping	Unusual Conditions
14	55	6	5	5	4	7	2	11

Figure 2 - Stream Corridor Assessment Results



As shown in Map SC4, few exposed pipes (6) and pipe outfalls (4) were observed throughout the Carr's Creek watershed. Seven stream crossings were found primarily along the main tributary of Carr's Creek and generally consisted of informal vehicle crossings, county bridges, and in one instance, a bridge for cattle crossing. All stream crossings were considered to be causing minimal to no impact to the stream.

Map SC5 presents Stream Corridor Assessment data for fish barriers, inadequate buffer, and unusual conditions found in Carr's Creek watershed. Five fish barriers were recorded; all sites were located along the downstream portion of Carr's Creek. Observed fish barriers included fallen trees in stream, beaver dams, dry channels, and boulder blockages. Due to the prominent agricultural land use found along Carr's Creek and Willow Brook (27 percent pasture/hay, Table 8, Section 2.7.1), inadequate buffers were observed throughout the watershed.

Two trash dumping sites were observed along County Highway 23 near Franklin Depot—one site consisting of tree trunks and a metal roof, while the other site consisted of a washed out informal bridge. Eleven unusual conditions were observed throughout the watershed ranging from debris dams to excessive algae/unusual water color and clarity in a pond downstream of East Sidney Lake.

3.1.1 Valley Type

The Carr's Creek watershed can be classified as Valley Type VIII. Valley Type VIII is characterized as "wide, gentle valley slope with well-developed flood plain adjacent to river and/or glacial terraces" (Rosgen, 2007).

3.1.2 Habitat

Detailed information on stream habitat is not presently available for Carr's Creek and Willow Brook. Stream habitat for macroinvertebrate and fish populations consists of a combination of riffles, pools, glides and eddies with instream woody debris. A complexity of flows, depths, velocities and habitats is preferable with shaded and stable reaches. Based on visual observation and the understanding that the system supports trout populations the status of the habitat quality in Carr's Creek is generally in good condition. Segments of erosion, inadequate riparian buffer, and instream sediment deposition are present; however, good water quality conditions and a prevalence of desirable gravel and cobble substrate provide available cover for macroinvertebrates and spawning areas for trout.

3.1.3 Riparian Buffer

Streamside vegetation observed during the Stream Corridor Assessment consisted of willows, sycamores, and sedges with the occasional presence of invasive species such as Japanese knotweed (*Polygonum cuspidatum*) and multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*) also observed. Riparian buffer width varies throughout the watershed depending on local land use—with excellent buffers in forested areas and depreciated buffers for streams adjacent to roadways (e.g. through Sidney Center). Vegetative protection is also variable throughout the watershed, ranging from stable root systems of mature trees to mowed lawns or pasture grasses.

3.2 Pollutant Load Modeling


Pollutant load modeling is a type of water quality modeling that is used to estimate the amount of a pollutant entering a particular water body. In itself, the modeling is not sufficient to determine if there will be water quality problems because there are physical, chemical and biological processes in the downstream receiving waters that can change the effects of the loads by reducing or compounding

them. Estimating pollutant loading, however, is a less complex modeling task than estimating receiving water quality. The model used for this study is uncalibrated, meaning that there were no onsite samples of runoff or dry weather pollutant loads to be used to adjust the input parameters. The results, however, are still a useful guide to watershed management, if used to indicate the relative effects of different types of pollutant sources or management measures.

The Generalized Watershed Loading Function (GWLF) model was used to estimate pollutant loads. The model includes loads from rural (forest and agricultural) runoff, urban runoff, point sources, septic systems, and groundwater. Pollutants modeled included total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP). The model provides procedures to estimate improvements from changes in land use or other practices.

The charts below summarize the results. Fifty percent of the nitrogen loads were from rural sources, and 26 percent was from septic systems, both working and failed. Twenty percent of the load is from uncontrollable sources: groundwater, open water, and forest/wetland.

Figure 3 - Nitrogen and Phosphorus Sources



The majority of the phosphorus load was estimated to be from rural sources. These sources, plus septic systems, accounted for 90 percent of the total. Eight percent of the load was from uncontrollable sources, including groundwater and forest/wetland.

Table 12 below breaks down the runoff loads from each type of land use in more detail:

Table 12 – Pollutant Sources

SOURCE	AREA (ac)	RUNOFF (in)	TN (lb/yr)	TP (lb/yr)
URBAN SOURCES				
Developed/Low	74.13	1.09	44.10	0.00
Developed/Med	4.94	1.38	0.00	0.00
Developed/Hi	2.47	7.48	22.05	0.00
Roadway R/W	637.52	2.66	1,190.70	154.35
RURAL SOURCES				
Row Crops	716.59	2.66	6,085.80	4,101.30
Grassland	341.00	0.76	242.55	110.25
Pasture/Hay	5,016.13	0.93	4,079.25	1,278.90
FOREST/WETLAND				
Deciduous Forest	9,278.61	0.80	463.05	242.55
Evergreen Forest	758.60	0.66	44.10	22.05
Mixed Forest	1,672.87	0.80	88.20	44.10
Shrub/Scrub	185.33	0.53	220.50	176.40
Woody Wetlands	252.04	1.32	22.05	0.00
Herbaceous Wetlands	9.88	1.50	0.00	0.00
OPEN WATER	59.30	32.58	88.20	0.00

3.3 Flooding

3.3.1 H/H Modeling

SCIG requested that KCI Technologies Inc. prepare a Hydrologic and Hydraulic (H/H) analysis for the Carr's Creek Watershed in support of watershed management efforts (KCI, 2012). The objective of this study is to estimate the volume and peak discharges corresponding to design storms with 1-, 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, and 100-year return periods for eight subwatersheds including the main stem of Carr's Creek, Willow Brook Tributary and two unnamed tributaries of Willow Brook. These discharges are used to model the reaches and five crossings to estimate the hydraulic response of the system for each design storm including water surface elevation, velocity; and shear stress. The results are being used in the current watershed planning studies and the model can provide a means to investigate the impact of various management scenarios in the future.

The model utilizes land cover, soils, topography, stream channel information and stream crossing data to estimate peak flows and channel response in terms of stream discharge, water surface elevations and potential for road crossing overtopping. The modeling effort included extensive calibration and validation against regional gage data and the June 2006 flooding event. Initial model inputs were enhance with the inclusion of newly available LIDAR data that increased the accuracy of general topographic data and stream channel geometry and dimensions in particular.

A total of five crossings were modeled in HEC-RAS. They were selected based on the potential for flooding impact on community or populated areas, and potential need for replacement. Three crossings were on Carr's Creek (one culvert – CC2 under Franklin Depot Road West from Powers Road intersection

and two bridges – CC9 under Franklin Road West of Wheat Hill Road intersection and CC11 under Route 23 East from Franklin Road intersection) and two bridges were on Willow Brook (WB7 under Route 27 West from Route 23 intersection and WB9 under Route 35 between Flynn Ave and Route 23). Geometry dimensions describing the crossings were derived from data and photos provided by project partners.

Table 13 summarizes the frequency and depth of overtopping. Model results show that the most frequently overtopped crossing was CC02, a small culvert under Franklin Depot Road. The other structures overtopped less frequently, at either the 10-, 25-, or 50-year event. All the structures overtopped for the 100-year event.

Table 13 - Road Crossing Overtopping

Crossing	Storm Return Period (frequency)	Overtop depth (upstream)	Overtop depth (downstream)	Water Surface Elevation (upstream)	Water Surface Elevation (downstream)	Road Elevation
CC02	1	0.33	0.28	1,613.33	1,613.28	1,613.00
	2	0.60	0.46	1,613.60	1,613.46	
	5	1.22	0.93	1,614.22	1,613.93	
	10	1.54	1.15	1,614.54	1,614.15	
	25	1.80	1.36	1,614.80	1,614.36	
	50	2.02	1.58	1,615.02	1,614.58	
	100	3.15	2.54	1,616.15	1,615.54	
CC09	10	0.73	0.69	1,324.73	1,324.69	1,324.00
	25	0.91	0.81	1,324.91	1,324.81	
	50	1.09	0.93	1,325.09	1,324.93	
	100	1.57	1.43	1,325.57	1,325.43	
CC11	100	1.42	1.26	1,290.42	1,290.26	1,289.00
WB7	50	1.30	0.59	1,363.80	1,363.09	1,362.50
	100	1.83	0.89	1,364.33	1,363.39	
WB9	25	1.59		1,294.79		1,293.20
	50	1.68	0.73	1,294.88	1,293.93	
	100	2.37	1.10	1,295.57	1,294.30	

4 Summary of Problems

Through a compilation of mapping data, monitoring and assessment results, and H/H and pollutant load modeling, KCI developed a summary of the resource issues and problems facing the watershed. To begin, parts of the stream network are in very good condition, as evidenced by the designation of sections of the watershed as Use Class C with trout spawning areas. Trout are very intolerant to pollution, habitat degradation and to increases in water temperature, so they are a good indicator that long-term conditions are good. Likewise, during the macroinvertebrate bioassessment, stoneflies, mayflies, caddisflies, and blackflies were all identified, among others. The stoneflies and mayflies are generally sensitive to water quality degradation and are therefore good indicators of an overall good condition.

Other areas of the streams and watershed showed evidence of problems, however, including the following:

4.1 Streambank Erosion

During the stream assessment, 55 sites were flagged with active erosion, for a total of 1.26 miles of stream. Stream erosion can be a significant source of sediment and nutrient loads, particularly phosphorus. This excess sediment changes the flow and habitat characteristics and can smother the gravel and cobble bottoms that are important in the life cycle of sensitive macroinvertebrates.

4.2 Reduced or Absent Riparian Buffer

Five sites were noted during the stream assessment with inadequate buffer. Forested stream buffers are desirable for a number of reasons. They provide shade for the streambed, which helps keep water temperature from increasing. Higher temperature reduces dissolved oxygen, which in turn, affects sensitive species. Leaves, woody debris, and detritus from the buffer also provide habitat and a food source for species on the bottom of the food chain, leading to improved biodiversity. Finally, root systems from buffer vegetation help anchor soil on stream banks, reducing or preventing erosion.

4.3 Flooding

Reports of flooding in Sidney Center date back 100 years, with one of the most severe instances occurring recently in June 2006. Flooding issues include overtopping of road crossings. This was noted during the 2006 flood. The H/H modeling showed that there is the potential for frequent overtopping of the modeled road crossings. Three of the five modeled bridges and culverts overtopped for the 25-year storm.

Upstream watershed characteristics contribute to the potential for flooding. Two features in particular cause a high rate of runoff. The first is the underlying geology of glacial till, and the soils derived from it. The majority of soils in the watershed have low infiltration rates and high runoff potential. That is a large percentage of the rainfall runs off instead of soaking into the soil. The second feature is the topography. A substantial portion of the watershed consists of steep slopes. Along with this, there are few locations where runoff is ponded or stored before it flows to ditches or tributaries to the stream network.

Development in the floodplain has also contributed to flooding. Several structures in Sidney Center have been built within the floodplain of both Willow Brook and Carr's Creek, and are vulnerable to flooding during a substantial storm event.

4.4 Water Quality


While overall, there were no significant impairments identified, there are two sources of pollutants that could contribute to poor water quality: septic system discharges and agricultural runoff. Septic systems, even those in good working order, export nitrates from the leach field to groundwater which eventually makes its way into stream baseflow. In areas with a high enough density of septic systems, this can contribute to poor stream quality. Failed septic systems are a source of pathogens, which can be a health issue in significant concentrations.

Agricultural runoff is a source of soil washed off from fields, which contains nitrogen and phosphorus, along with sediment. Because of the amount of area in agriculture within the watershed boundaries, this was the single largest potential source identified with the pollutant load modeling.

4.5 Summary

Many of these water quality issues interact with one another, so that an issue which might not be significant on its own may be a factor in causing other, more serious degradation. Figure 4 illustrates this process.

Figure 4 - Watershed Issues Summary



By themselves, soils and slopes may not be a problem in a watershed; however coupled with land use changes such as deforestation or urbanization, they can lead to higher runoff rates. High flows, with poor buffers may be a cause of streambank erosion and habitat impairment. High runoff rates alone in an urbanized area may not be a problem, but if they occur in areas with floodplain development or road crossings that were designed for lower flows, they can lead to flooding problems.

5 Conservation and Restoration Priorities

The completed watershed management plan will provide recommended management actions to restore, protect and manage the watershed. Such actions, i.e. best management practices (BMP's) or resource protection are most effective when strategically located at sites that will have a substantial influence on natural habitat, water quality, and stream flows. In October 2011, the Sidney Center Improvement Group sponsored a workshop to develop criteria for selecting prospective restoration and protection areas. Guided by Michael Strager, Ph.D. of West Virginia University, the prioritization process combined the experienced views of resource professionals with the knowledge of local residents and stakeholders. Following the workshop, maps were prepared delineating these priority areas which will be integrated into the watershed management plan.

The conservation and restoration priorities delineated on the maps represent a landscape-level analysis for achieving the key watershed management goals of reducing flood risk, protecting natural stream corridors, improving stream and riparian habitats, and sustaining natural stream flows. These maps will guide the selection of sites best suited for implementing specific actions recommended in the watershed plan. Site-specific characteristics will also be considered on a project-by-project basis as appropriate. Areas delineated for resource protection consisted of working lands (farm and timber lands), wildlife habitat, wetlands, water quality, and forests. Important restoration needs include flood reduction measures, stream bank stabilization, inadequate bridges and culverts, and riparian buffers.

The developed maps are included at the end of this report and are organized as such:

Land Conservation Priorities

- Wildlife Habitat
- Working Lands
- Wetland Resources
- Water Quality
- Forest Resources
- Combined/Overall Land Conservation

Resource Restoration Priorities

- Riparian Stream Buffer
- Stream Bank Erosion
- Instream Debris
- Stormwater Controls
- Combined/Overall Resource Restoration

6 References

- (CWP) Center for Watershed Protection. 2003. Impacts of impervious cover on aquatic ecosystems. Center for Watershed Protection, Ellicott City, Maryland. 142p.
- (CWP) Center for Watershed Protection. 2010. New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual: Chapter 5—Green Infrastructure Practices. Ellicott City, MD.
- (DCPD) Delaware County Planning Department. 2006. Town of Sidney Post Flood Recovery and Reconstruction Plan.
- (DCPD) Delaware County Planning Department, Town of Franklin. 2007. Zoning Law for the Town of Franklin, New York. Revised Law Prepared by: Planit Main Street, Inc.
- (DCSWCD) Delaware County Soil and Water Conservation District. 2006. West Branch of the Delaware River Stream Corridor Management Plan.
- Dicken, C. L., S. W. Nicolson, J. D. Horton, S. A. Kinney, G. Gunther, M. P. Foote, J. A. L. Mueller. 2005. Integrated Geologic Map Databases for the United States: Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. U.S. Geological Survey. Reston, VA. Internet. Available from <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1325>; accessed 12 September 2011.
- Homer, C. C. Huang, L. Yang, B. Wylie and M. Coan. 2004. Development of a 2001 National Landcover Database for the United States. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing, Vol. 70, No. 7, July 2004, pp. 829-840.
- Institute of Water Research 2002. RUSLE: On-Line Soil Erosion Assessment Tool. Institute of Water Research, Michigan State University. Online tool created by Dr. Da Ouyang and available online at: <http://www.iwr.msu.edu/rusle/>
- Karl, T.R. and W. J. Koss, 1984: "Regional and National Monthly, Seasonal, and Annual Temperature Weighted by Area, 1895-1983." Historical Climatology Series 4-3, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC, 38 pp.
- (KCI) KCI Technologies, Inc. 2012. Hydrologic and Hydraulics Report, Carr's Creek Watershed. Prepared for the Sidney Center Improvement Group by KCI Technologies, Inc. Sparks, MD.
- (NCDC) National Climatic Data Center. 2012. Storm Events Query – Delaware County, New York. <http://www4.ncdc.noaa.gov/cgi-win/wwcgi.dll?wwevent~storms>; accessed 20 February 2012.
- (NOAA) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Weather Service, Binghamton Weather Forecast Office. Normals for Binghamton, NY (1981-2010 data). Internet. Available from http://www.erh.noaa.gov/bgm/climate/bgm/bgm_normals.shtml ; accessed 8 September 2011.
- (NYSDEC) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Habitat Inventory Unit. 1990. Ecological Zones - New York State. Albany, NY.

(NYSDEC) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2009. Nature Explorer: A Gateway to New York's Biodiversity. Internet. Available from <http://www.dec.ny.gov/natureexplorer/app/>; accessed 15 September 2011.

(NYSDEC) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2010. Final New York State 2010 Section 303(d) List of Impaired/ TMDL Waters.

(NYSDEC(a)) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2011. Forest Health Aerial Survey 2011 Report.

(NYSDEC(b)) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2011. Spring 2011 Trout Stocking for Delaware County. Internet. Available from <http://www.dec.ny.gov/outdoor/23327.html>; accessed 7 September 2011.

(NYSDEC(c)) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2011. Critical Environmental Areas. Internet. Available from <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/6184.html>; accessed 14 September 2011.

(NYSDEC) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Register and Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York (NYCRR). 6 NYCRR: Chapter X – Division of Water §701: Classifications – Surface Waters and Groundwaters.

(NYSDEC) New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Register and Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York (NYCRR). 6 NYCRR§931: Susquehanna River Drainage Basin.

(NYSED) New York State Education Department. 2011. Geographic Information System: Statewide Based Coverages. Internet. Available from <http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/gis/>; accessed 14 September 2011.

Rosgen, D.L. 2007. Chapter 11 In J. Bernard, J.F. Fripp & K.R. Robinson (Eds.), Part 654 Stream Restoration Design National Engineering Handbook (210-VI-NEH). Washington, D.C.: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Schueler, T. 1994. The importance of imperviousness. Watershed Protection Techniques, 1(3), 100-111.

Sidney Chamber of Commerce. 2011. Internet. Available from <http://www.sidneychamber.org/>; accessed 14 September 2011.



(USEPA) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1972. Clean Water Act of 1972: Section 404. Internet. Available from <http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/facts/fact11.html>; accessed 19 September 2011.

(USEPA) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wastewater Management. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Internet. Available from <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/faqs.cfm#107>; accessed 12 September 2011.

(USFWS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-79/31. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation, Washington, D.C.

(USGS) U.S. Geological Survey. 2003. A Tapestry of Time and Terrain: The Union of Two Maps – Geology and Topography. Internet. Available from <http://www.nationalatlas.gov/tapestry/physiogr/physio.html>; accessed 13 September 2011.

Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 1 - Carr's Creek Watershed Vicinity Map

- Streams
- Town Border
- Willow Brook Subwatershed ID
- Carr's Creek Watershed
- County Boundary

Contains information copyrighted by the New York State Office of Cyber Security, 2011.





Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan




0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles

Map 2 - Ortho Imagery of Carr's Creek Watershed (2009/2010)


-  Carr's Creek Watershed
-  Town Border




Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 3 - Steep Slopes



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 4 - Surficial Geology

t – Till:
Variable texture (e.g. clay, silt-clay, boulder clay), usually poorly sorted diamict, deposition beneath glacier ice, relatively impermeable (loamy matrix), variable clast content—ranging from abundant well-rounded diverse lithologies in valley tills to relatively angular, more limited lithologies in upland tills, tends to be sandy in areas underlain by gneiss or sandstone; potential land instability on steep slopes, thickness variable (1-50 meters)

al – Recent deposits:
Generally confined to floodplains within a valley, oxidized, non-calcareous, fine sand to gravel, in larger valleys may be overlain by silt, subject to frequent flooding, thickness 1-10 meters

k – Kame deposits:
Includes kames, eskers, kame terraces, kame deltas, coarse to fine gravel and/or sand, deposition adjacent to ice, lateral variability in sorting, coarseness and thickness, locally firmly cemented with calcareous cement, thickness variable (10-30 meters)

og – Outwash sand and gravel:
Coarse to fine gravel with sand, proglacial fluvial deposition, well rounded and stratified, generally finer texture away from ice border, thickness variable (2-20 meters)


r – Bedrock:
Exposed or generally within 1 meter of surface.

New York State Education Department. Geographic Information System: Statewide Based Coverages.
<http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/gis/>



0 0.250.5 1
Miles

Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan




0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles

Map 5 - Hydrologic Soil Groups



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan




0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles

Map 6 - Erodibility

K erodibility factor



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 7 - Natural Resources: Forest Cover and Wetlands



Wetlands data from National Wetland Inventory (USFWS, 2011).


2001 Landcover data from National Landcover Database for the United States (Homer et al., 2004).



0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan




Map 8 - Floodplain

 Floodplain

0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 9 - Existing Land Use

2001 Landcover data from National Landcover Database for the United States (Homer et al., 2004).


Carr's Creek Watershed	Developed, Medium Intensity	Evergreen Forest	Pasture/Hay
Open water	Developed, High Intensity	Mixed Forest	Cultivated Crops
Developed, Open Space	Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay)	Shrub/Scrub	Woody Wetlands
Developed, Low Intensity	Deciduous Forest	Grassland/Herbaceous	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands



0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan



Map 10 - Zoning

Sidney Zoning

- Commercial
- Residential
- Residential-Agricultural

Franklin Zoning


- Rural III
- Rural V



0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles



Carr's Creek Watershed Management Plan




Map 11 - Stream Crossings/Culvert Locations

- ◇ County Bridges
- ◆ Town Bridges
- Cross Pipe
- Driveway Pipe
- Streams
- Carr's Creek Watershed


Map SC1

Segments of Carrs Creek Surveyed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment




Map SC2

Channel Alteration Sites found in Carrs Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment




Map SC3

Erosion Sites found in Carrs Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment




Map SC4

Exposed Pipe, Pipe Outfalls, and Stream Crossing Sites found in Carrs Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment



Map SC5

Fish Barriers, Inadequate Buffer, and Unusual Condition Sites found in Carrs Creek Watershed during 2008 Stream Corridor Assessment



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

— Carr's Creek Watershed

- - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Wildlife Habitat

Resource Not Present

Low Priority Resource

Medium Priority Resource

High Priority Resource



Wildlife Habitat

(in order of rank)

1. Stream corridors
2. Aquatic species
3. Upland habitat in proximity to protected areas
4. Habitat for upland species



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Wildlife Habitat:
 Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Mapping
 Project (TNC, 2011)
 Streams (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 US Protected Areas Database (CBI, 2011)
 National Conservation Database (NCED, 2011)
 Protected Stream Reaches (NY DEC, 2010)



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

— Carr's Creek Watershed
- - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Working Lands

Resource Not Present
Low Priority Resource
Medium Priority Resource
High Priority Resource

Working Lands


(in order of rank)

1. Lands in agricultural production
2. High value lands for forestry



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
Data sources for Working Lands:
National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
Streams (KCI, 2011)
Natural Heritage Element Occurrence
Records (NY DEC, 2011)
National Elevation Dataset (USGS, 2012)
Wetlands (KCI, 2011)
Protected Areas Database (CBI, 2012)
National Conservation Easement
Database (CBI, 2012)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Miles



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

— Carr's Creek Watershed
- - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Wetland Resources

Resource Not Present
Low Priority Resource
Medium Priority Resource
High Priority Resource

Wetland Resources


(in order of rank)

1. Presence of unique wetland features (peatland)
2. Wetlands that are streamside
3. Size and extent of wetlands



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
Data sources for Wetland Resources:
Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Mapping
Project (TNC, 2011)
Wetlands dataset (KCI Technologies, 2011)
Streams (KCI Technologies, 2011)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

— Carr's Creek Watershed
 - - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Water Quality

Resource Not Present
 Low Priority Resources
 Medium Priority Resources
 High Priority Resources

Water Quality


(in order of rank)

1. Quality Fisheries
(Protected Stream Reaches)
2. Wetlands, Riparian Buffers
and Floodplains
3. Percent Canopy Cover



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Water Quality:
 NLCD Canopy Cover Dataset (NLCD, 2011)
 Wetlands dataset (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Streams (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Floodplain (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Protected Stream Reaches (NY DEC, 2010)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
 Miles



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

- Carr's Creek Watershed
- - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Forest Resources

- Resource Not Present
- Medium Priority Resources
- High Priority Resources

Forest Resources


(in order of rank)

1. Natural Heritage Sites
2. Forest species
3. Large forest blocks (>250 acres)



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Forest Resources:
 Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Mapping
 Project (TNC, 2011)
 Streets (KCI, 2011)
 Natural Heritage Element Occurrence
 Records (NY DEC, 2011)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



LAND CONSERVATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

— Carr's Creek Watershed
 - - - 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Overall Conservation Priorities

□ Resource Not Present
 □ Low Priority Resource
 □ Medium Priority Resource
 □ High Priority Resource

Overall Conservation Priorities


(in order of rank)

1. Water Quality
2. Forest Resources
3. Wildlife Habitat
4. Working Lands
5. Wetland Resources



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Land Conservation Priorities:
 NE Terrestrial Habitat Mapping Project (TNC, 2011)
 Streets (KCI, 2011)
 Natural Heritage Element Occurrence
 Records (NY DEC, 2011)
 Wetlands dataset (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Streams (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Floodplain (KCI Technologies, 2011)
 Protected Stream Reaches (NY DEC, 2010)
 US Protected Areas Database (CBI, 2011)
 National Conservation Database (NCED, 2011)
 NLCD Canopy Cover Dataset (NLCD, 2011)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
 Miles



RESOURCE RESTORATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

Streams

2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Buffers

- Restoration Target Not Present
- Low Priority Restoration Target
- Medium Priority Restoring Target
- High Priority Restoration Target

Buffers


(in order of rank)

1. Lack of existing riparian buffers
2. Invasive species (not mapped)
3. Adjacent pollution sources
4. Livestock in streams



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Buffers:
 National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
 Streams (KCI, 2011)
 Personal Communication, Wink Hastings, 2012

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



RESOURCE RESTORATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

Streams
2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

Stormwater

Restoration Target Not Present
Low Priority Restoration Targets
Medium Priority Restoration Targets
High Priority Restoration Targets
CarrsCreek_10mileBuffer

Stormwater


(in order of rank)

1. Lack of vegetated landcover
2. Areas with steep slopes
3. Soils conducive for water retention
4. Stream headwaters



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
Data sources Stormwater:
National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
Streams (KCI, 2011)
National Hydrology Dataset (NHD, 2012)
National Elevation Dataset (NED, 2012)
Surficial Geology (NYS Geological Survey, 1999)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



RESOURCE RESTORATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

2 Mile Buffer of Watershed

CarrsCreek_10mileBuffer

Streams

Debris

Restoration Target Not Present

Low Priority Restoration Target

Medium Priority Restoration Target

High Priority Restoration Target

Debris

(in order of rank)


1. Public safety (ponds that could flood)

2. Property loss (developed areas in floodplain)



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
Data sources for Debris:
National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
Streams (KCI, 2011)
Floodplains (KCI, 2012)
Waterbodies (KCI, 2012)
Personal Communication, Wink Hastings, 2012

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



RESOURCE RESTORATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

- Streams
- 2 Mile Buffer of Watershed
- Erosion**
- Restoration Target Not Present
- Low Priority Restoration Target
- Medium Priority Restoration Target
- High Priority Restoration Target

Erosion


(in order of rank)

1. Property impacted by erosion
2. Priority areas for shoreline stabilization
3. Length of bank erosion
4. Height of bank erosion









Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Erosion:
 National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
 Streams (KCI, 2011)
 Stream Corridor Assessment Data (KCI, 2011)

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles



RESOURCE RESTORATION PRIORITIES CARR'S CREEK WATERSHED

-  Streams
-  2 Mile Buffer of Watershed
- Overall Restoration Priorities**
-  Restoration Target Not Present
-  Low Priority Restoration Target
-  Medium Priority Restoration Target
-  High Priority Restoration Target

- Overall Restoration Priorities**
(in order of rank)
1. Stream crossings (not mapped)
 2. Stormwater
 3. Buffers
 4. Erosion
 5. Debris



Maps: Theoharides Consulting, July 2012
 Projection: UTM 18N NAD 1983
 Data sources for Restoration Priorities:
 National Land Cover Dataset (NCLD, 2011)
 Streams (KCI, 2011)
 Stream Corridor Assessment Data (KCI, 2011)
 Personal Communication, Wink Hastings, 2012
 National Hydrology Dataset (NHD, 2012)
 National Elevation Dataset (NED, 2012)
 Surficial Geology (NYS Geological Survey, 1999)

