

CHAPTER 7A. AGRICULTURE APPENDIX

Table 7A-1. Survey Response by County for Seneca Lake Watershed

Seneca Lake Watershed Counties	Surveys Sent	Survey Response	Responses not in watershed	Responses used in Analysis	Analysis responses as percent of surveys sent
Chemung	10	5	0	5	50
Schuyler	142	88	9	79	56
Seneca	51	26	3	23	45
Ontario	39	18	4	14	56
Yates	340	242	20	222	65
TOTAL	582	379	36	343	
% of Total(561)*		67	---	61	

*Seneca County 10 returned from post office; Schuyler County 9 dropped from initial mailing from death or moving. Therefore for the purposes of this report 563 surveys are considered sent to farms in the Seneca Lake watershed.

Table 7A-2. Survey Response of Silage Storage by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Survey Response	Farms with Livestock	Silage Stored	Type of Storage*		
				U	H	O
Chemung	5	5	5	4	1	2
Schuyler	79	49	18	11	8	1
Seneca	23	10	1	0	1	0
Ontario	14	2	1	1	0	0
Yates	222	132	91	80	17	9
TOTAL	343	198	116	96	27	12
% of Total(343)	---	57	34	28	8	3
% of Total(198)	---	---	59	49	14	6

*U – upright; H – horizontal; O – other

Table 7A-3. Survey Response of Milk Herds and Milk Waste Disposal by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Survey Response	Milking Herd Present	-----Type of Milk Center Disposal*-----				
			DW	SS	DFT	DSS	Other
Chemung	5	5	0	2	1	1	1
Schuyler	79	13	2	2	5	3	1
Seneca	23	1	1	0	0	0	0
Ontario	14	1	0	0	1	0	0
Yates	222	69	12	11	28	14	4
TOTAL	343	89	15	15	35	18	6
% of Total(343)	---	26	4	4	10	5	2
% of Total(89)	---	---	17	17	39	20	7

*DW – dry well; SS – septic system; DFT – drain field tile; DSS – drain soil surface

Table 7A-4. Survey Response of Barnyards and/or Feedlots and the Location to Streams by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Farms with Livestock	Barnyards and/or Feedlots	-----Distance from Streams-----			
			<50	50-99	100-199	>200
Chemung	5	4	1	0	0	2
Schuyler	49	41	7	1	7	24
Seneca	10	7	2	0	0	4
Ontario	2	2	0	0	0	2
Yates	132	107	1	5	21	76
TOTAL	198	161	11	6	28	108
% of Total(343)	58	47	3	2	8	31
% of Total(198)	---	81	6	3	14	55
% of Total(161)	---	---	7	4	17	67

Table 7A-5. Pastured Livestock and Method of Watering by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Farms with Livestock	Pastured Livestock	No Rotational Grazing	-----Watering Systems*-----			
				T	S	P	O
Chemung	5	5	5	0	2	1	1
Schuyler	49	51	15	32	17	32	4
Seneca	10	10	3	0	3	2	0
Ontario	2	2	1	1	0	0	1
Yates	132	121	68	89	27	32	17
TOTAL	198	189	92	122	49	67	23
% of Total(343)	---	55	27	36	14	20	7
% of Total(198)	---	95	46	62	25	34	12
% of Total(189)	---	---	49	65	26	35	12

*T- tanks; S – stream; P – pond; O – other

Table 7A-6. Survey Response of Gallons of Petroleum by County in the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Farms with Petroleum	-----Gasoline Fuel-----		-----Diesel Fuel-----	
		Above ground	Below ground	Above ground	Below ground
Chemung	5	2650	675	0	0
Schuyler	46	4224	2700	17245	2500
Seneca	17	1675	1000	3450	0
Ontario	10	3820	500	5070	500
Yates	163	27262	13250	91575	29600
TOTAL	241	39631	18125	117340	32600
% of Total(343)	70	---	---	---	---

Table 7A-7. Survey Response of Tillage Practices by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Grow Crops	-----Tillage Practices-----						
		Moldboard Spring	Plow Fall	Cons Tillage	No Till	Disk Vineyard	Roto- Till	Other
Chemung	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schuyler	32	22	12	2	10	8	1	2
Seneca	14	5	6	6	3	4	1	3
Ontario	11	11	7	5	2	1	3	3
Yates	142	129	63	30	23	11	6	12
TOTAL	189	167	88	43	38	24	11	20
% of total(343)	55	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
% of total(189)	---	88	47	23	20	13	6	11

Table 7A-8. Survey Response of Erosion in the Seneca Lake Watershed Counties

County	-----Number Of Farms With -----		
	Highly Erodible Land*	Gully Erosion	Ephemeral Erosion
Chemung	5	3	0
Schuyler	9	4	6
Seneca	9	4	8
Ontario	4	1	8
Yates	97	15	89
TOTAL	124	27	111
% of total(343)	36	8	32

* HEL as defined by the USDA NRCS

Table 7A-9. Survey Response of Fertilizer Use and Weed Control in the Five Counties for the Seneca Lake Watershed.

County	Fertilize Crops	Do not test Soil	Do not test PH	Do not Petiole Sample	-----Weed Control Methods-----		
					Cultivate	Crop Rotation	Chemical
Chemung	4	1	---	---	---	---	1
Schuyler	43	16	15	3	24	17	40
Seneca	14	6	4	2	6	11	12
Ontario	11	---	---	2	11	10	2
Yates	169	69	52	33	143	119	158
TOTAL	241	92	71	40	184	157	222
% of (343)	70	27	21	12	54	46	65
% of (241)	---	38	29	17	76	65	92

Table 7A-10. Survey Response of Pesticide Use by County in the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Pesticides Used	Kinds of Pesticides Used*				-----Deciding When to Use Pesticides-----				
		Yes	H	I	F	R	Apply Same Time Yearly	Refer to Use Field Records	Scout	Cost of Materials
Chemung	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schuyler	37	31	29	19	7	10	16	21	3	5
Seneca	12	10	7	8	3	2	7	6	1	3
Ontario	154	11	8	6	2	1	5	6	3	0
Yates	219	138	87	44	7	37	67	99	25	6
TOTAL	241	195	131	77	19	50	95	132	32	14
% of (343)	70	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
% of (241)	---	81	54	32	8	21	39	55	13	6

*H- Herbicide; I-Insecticide; F-Fungicide; R-Rodenticide

Table 7A-11. Survey Response of Pesticide Use by County in the Seneca Lake Watershed, cont.

County	Pesticides Used	Unused Pesticides	Help with Disposal	No Help with Disposal
Chemung	5	0	0	0
Schuyler	37	16	4	8
Seneca	12	5	2	2
Ontario	154	7	2	5
Yates	219	70	17	48
TOTAL	241	98	25	63
% of (343)	70	29	7	18
% of (241)	---	41	10	26

Table 7A-12. Methods for Deciding How Much Pesticide to Use in the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Pesticides Used	Methods for Deciding How Much Pesticide to Use in the Seneca Lake watershed							
		Label	Salesman	IPM	Magazine	Neighbors	CCE*	Personnal Knowledge	Other
Chemung	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Schuyler	37	26	9	12	1	1	18	14	2
Seneca	12	12	3	6	0	0	8	6	1
Ontario	154	9	3	4	1	2	6	10	1
Yates	219	133	49	31	3	13	42	59	5
TOTAL	241	185	64	53	5	16	79	89	9
% of (343)	70	54	19	15	1	5	23	26	3
% of (241)	---	76	27	22	2	7	33	37	4

*Cornell Cooperative Extension

Table 7A-13. Survey Respondents Comments of the Future of Farming for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Employed off Farm		Off Farm Income		-----Future of Farming for Seneca Lake*-----											
					Operate in 10 Years				Operate in 25 Years				Average Age	Average Years Farming		
	Y	N	Y	N	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D				
Chemung	U	U	U	U	1	1	2	1	0	0	3	2	U	U		
Schuyler	34	33	44	20	30	24	14	8	11	26	22	12	58	30		
Seneca	7	15	13	9	11	7	4	0	3	8	6	3	53	24		
Ontario	4	9	6	8	7	4	3	0	5	4	0	3	47	27		
Yates	68	148	89	117	109	87	8	6	85	117	14	11	44	21		
TOTAL	113	205	152	154	158	123	31	15	104	155	45	31	---	---		
% of (343)	33	60	44	45	46	36	9	4	30	45	13	9	---	---		
Average	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	51	26		

*Y=yes; N=no; A=very likely; B=likely; C=unlikely; D=very unlikely; U=unknown

Table 7A-14. Survey Response of Conservation Practices by County for the Seneca Lake Watershed

County	Survey Response	Grow Crops	-----C onserva tion Practice-----									
			Diversion Ditch	Grassed Waterways	Subsurface Drainage	Tile Outlet Diversion	Strip Cropping	Cover Crops	Crop Rotation	Filter Strips	Row Middle Mulch	Other
Chemung	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Schuyler	79	32	49	31	36	26	13	26	21	2	9	4
Seneca	23	14	13	13	19	8	2	13	7	2	5	0
Ontario	14	11	7	6	11	6	5	11	11	1	2	1
Yates	222	142	108	91	118	90	126	118	155	19	17	2
TOTAL	343	189	177	141	184	130	146	168	194	27	33	7
% of (343)	---	55	52	41	54	38	43	49	57	8	10	2
% of (189)	---	---	94	75	97	69	77	89	102	14	17	4