Chesapeake Fish Passage Prioritization - Dam Fact Sheet

CFPPP Unique ID: VA_737 KILLERNEY DAM

Bay-wide Diadromous Tier 9
Bay-wide Resident Tier 11
Bay-wide Brook Trout Tier N/A

NID ID VA07504

State ID 737

River Name Big Lickinghole Creek

Dam Height (ft) 24

Dam Type Earth

Latitude 37.8319

Longitude -77.9772

Passage Facilities None Documented

Passage Year N/A

Size Class 1a: Headwater (0 - 3.861 sq mi)

HUC 12 Big Lickinghole Creek

HUC 10 Lickinghole Creek-James River

HUC 8 Middle James-Willis

HUC 6 James

HUC 4 Lower Chesapeake







| Landcover | | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------|--|
| NLCD (2011) | | Chesapeake Conservancy (2016) | | |
| % Impervious Surface in Upstream Drainage Area | 3.09 | % Tree Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 64.74 | |
| % Natural Cover in Upstream Drainage Area | 76.43 | % Tree Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 74.98 | |
| % Forested in Upstream Drainage Area | 66.51 | % Herbaceaous Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 2.38 | |
| % Agriculture in Upstream Drainage Area | 3.56 | % Herbaceaous Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 5.82 | |
| % Natural Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 100 | % Barren Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 0 | |
| % Natural Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 80.6 | % Barren Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 0 | |
| % Forest Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 75.23 | % Road Impervious in ARA of Upstream Network | 0.5 | |
| % Forest Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 55.6 | % Road Impervious in ARA of Downstream Network | 1.6 | |
| % Agricultral Cover in ARA of Upstream Network | 0 | % Other Impervious in ARA of Upstream Network | 1.13 | |
| % Agricultral Cover in ARA of Downstream Network | 0 | % Other Impervious in ARA of Downstream Network | 1.49 | |
| % Impervious Surf in ARA of Upstream Network | 0 | | | |
| % Impervious Surf in ARA of Downstream Network | 0.89 | | | |



Chesapeake Fish Passage Prioritization - Dam Fact Sheet

CFPPP Unique ID: VA_737 KILLERNEY DAM

| Network, System Type and Condition Functional Upstream Network (mi) Total Functional Network (mi) Absolute Gain (mi) # Downstream Hydropower Dams # Size Classes in Total Network # Downstream Dams with Passage # Upstream Network Size Classes # of Downstream Barriers NFHAP Cumulative Disturbance Index Dam is on Conserved Land # No # Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network # Oonserved Land in 100m Buffer of Downstream Network | |
|--|-------|
| Total Functional Network (mi) 2.72 # Downsteam Natural Barriers # Downstream Hydropower Dams # Size Classes in Total Network # Downstream Dams with Passage # Upstream Network Size Classes # of Downstream Barriers NFHAP Cumulative Disturbance Index Dam is on Conserved Land # Oownstream Barriers High No % Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | |
| Absolute Gain (mi) # Size Classes in Total Network # Upstream Network Size Classes # Upstream Network Size Classes # Upstream Network Size Classes # If the properties of Downstream Barriers # High No # Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network # Downstream Hydropower Dams # Opstream Dams with Passage # of Downstream Barriers High No | 0 |
| # Size Classes in Total Network 1 # Downstream Dams with Passage # Upstream Network Size Classes 1 # of Downstream Barriers NFHAP Cumulative Disturbance Index High Dam is on Conserved Land No % Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | 0 |
| # Upstream Network Size Classes 1 # of Downstream Barriers NFHAP Cumulative Disturbance Index High Dam is on Conserved Land No % Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | 2 |
| NFHAP Cumulative Disturbance Index High Dam is on Conserved Land No Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | 4 |
| Dam is on Conserved Land % Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | 5 |
| % Conserved Land in 100m Buffer of Upstream Network 0 | |
| | |
| % Conserved Land in 100m Ruffer of Downstream Network | |
| o conserved Edita in 100m Barrer of Bownstream Network | |
| Density of Crossings in Upstream Network Watershed (#/m2) 2.3 | |
| Density of Crossings in Downstream Network Watershed (#/m2) 1.4 | |
| Density of off-channel dams in Upstream Network Watershed (#/m2) 0 | |
| Density of off-channel dams in Downstream Network Watershed (#/m2) 0 | |
| | |
| Diadromous Fish | |
| Downstream Alewife Historical Downstream Striped Bass None Docum | ented |
| Downstream Blueback Historical Downstream Atlantic Sturgeon None Docum | ented |
| Downstream American Shad None Documented Downstream Shortnose Sturgeon None Docum | entec |
| Downstream Hickory Shad None Documented Downstream American Eel Current | |
| Presence of 1 or More Downstream Anadromous Species Historical | |
| # Diadromous Species Downstream (incl eel) 1 | |
| | |
| Resident Fish Stream Health | |
| Barrier is in EBTJV BKT Catchment No Chesapeake Bay Program Stream Health FA | |
| | /A |
| | /A |
| Barrier Blocks a Modeled BKT Catchment (DeWeber) No MD MBSS Combined IBI Stream Health N | /A |
| Native Fish Species Richness (HUC8) 51 VA INSTAR mIBI Stream Health H | igh |
| # Rare Fish (HUC8) 0 PA IBI Stream Health N | /A |
| # Rare Mussel (HUC8) 3 | |
| # Rare Crayfish (HUC8) 0 | |

