

Subject: : Tips and Tricks

Topic: : guesing width of small streams from maps

Re: guesing width of small streams from maps

Author: : Stone\_Fly

Date: : 2013/8/21 18:40:45

URL:

Quote:

Tups wrote:

Stone Fly: Fair enough. As I said, most of us prefer the term "watershed" over "catchment," or at least we are more familiar with watershed. In any case, I just wanted to make sure that the readers understood I was talking about "area" (sq. miles) as opposed to a boundary delineation.

dryflyguy: The more branches (tribs.) that feed a stream, the larger its catchment area will be, and the greater its flow will be. Each of the streams in question is a first order stream, meaning it has no branches, but only a single channel. Each is a first order trib. to the catawissa.

When two first order streams join, they form a second order stream. When 2 second order streams join, they form a third order stream, and so on.

Fair enough Tups. I though it was interesting that none of those streams had tributaries. Usually streams that flow a couple of miles will have a couple of small tribs.