



Chesapeake Bay Tree Cover Status and Change

Fact Sheet Data Guide

By Marie G Bouffard, UVM Spatial Analysis Lab, in collaboration with partners listed below

March 2023





Why do trees matter?

Trees provide numerous public benefits in the form of ecosystem services. Ecosystem services refer to all the ways we benefit from the services that healthy natural systems provide, such as improved air quality, reduced stormwater runoff, carbon sequestration, temperature regulation, and wildlife habitat.

Why map tree cover?

It is important to map and monitor tree cover change over time to detect trends that can inform management decisions. This information can be used to improve access to ecosystem services, decide where new trees should be planted, and ensure healthy tree cover for future generations.

Sections

1 | Introduction
Pages 1 - 3

2 | Land Cover Change Mapping
Pages 4 - 5

3 | Land Use/Land Cover Classification
Pages 6 - 8

4 | i-Tree Benefits
Page 9

5 | Tree Cover Change
Page 10 - 11

6 | Additional Resources
Page 12 - 14


About the Data

The Chesapeake Conservancy's Conservation Innovation Center, University of Vermont Spatial Analysis Lab, and the U.S. Geological Survey are working together to create very-high resolution land use and land cover datasets for the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

These data will be used to describe land use and land cover conditions and change over time. The data are foundational, authoritative, and transformative to the Bay restoration effort. They are foundational because they inform most outcomes in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement and will serve as the basis for developing the next generation of watershed models. They are authoritative due to their accuracy and transparency; any person viewing the data can recognize features and areas of interest and compare them to their local knowledge. They are transformative because they will ultimately change the way restoration and conservation actions are implemented, enabling both to be targeted at a fine scale to locations where they will be most effective.

Moreover, establishing accurate trends in impervious cover, forests, and tree canopy will enable the Chesapeake Bay Program Partners to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of stormwater and forest management activities. The data are being developed for the years 2013/2014, 2017/2018, and 2021/2022 and derived from aerial imagery coupled with a variety of ancillary datasets.

[See Land Use/Land Cover Classification Methods documentation](#)



Land Cover Change Mapping

Land Cover Mapping Workflow

1 Preliminary Road Mapping

New or modified roads were digitized manually using the 2013/2014 and 2017/2018 National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) Imagery as reference imagery. The digitized layer with new, modified, or removed roads was then used in subsequent modeling routines to guide change detection for the Impervious class.

Object Based Image Analysis

2

Automated feature extraction was performed in eCognition, state-of-the-art software for performing object-based image analysis. This technique groups pixels that form meaningful landscape objects, providing a more realistic, contextual representation of features than by looking at pixels individually.

3 Modeling Scenarios

All mapping was performed at the county/municipality level. The small extent was necessary due to the large size of the high-resolution imagery mosaics and varying data availability by region for Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), NAIP imagery, and vector GIS datasets. After assessing the availability and quality of the inputs for each county, a specific modeling scenario was identified and coded into an eCognition rule set that executed the complete mapping workflow.

Change Detection Classes

4

To represent change across the analysis period, the original 12-class classification scheme was expanded to include all types of change that were likely to occur in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Change types with a low probability of occurrence or classes that could not be mapped effectively with the available data were excluded.

5 Automated Feature Extraction

2013/2014 land cover was revised from the original land cover map in order to avoid false change estimates resulting from differences in techniques between the two studies. After finalizing the revised 2013/2014 map, the LiDAR, imagery, and thematic datasets available for 2017/2018 were used to perform change detection, assigning altered 2013/2014 features to one or more of the change classes to explicitly track individual land-cover conversions.

Data Types

2013/2014 Land Cover

The original 1-meter resolution 2013/2014 land cover was used as a starting point for all subsequent analyses.

NAIP Imagery

NAIP imagery acquired by the USDA Farm Services Agency allowed for high resolution land-cover classification.

LiDAR

Where available, LiDAR facilitated mapping and differentiation of tree canopy and buildings.

Thematic GIS Datasets

Thematic GIS datasets developed by individual municipalities, including building footprints, roads, parking lots, sidewalks, and water bodies, informed improvements to the original 2013/2014 land cover and subsequent change analysis to 2017/18. To address the lack of Emergent Wetlands class in the 2013/2014 land cover for Virginia, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Coastal Change Program (C-CAP) land cover and NOAA's tidal shore elevation data were used as guides for mapping tidally-influenced wetlands.


Change Mapping

1 2013/2014 Land Cover Adjustments

The mapping workflow initially focused on improving the 2013/2014 land cover, where necessary, using the available data inputs to add features omitted from parts of the original layer and to remove erroneous ones. This step was important to avoid false change estimates.

2 Change Detection

After finalizing the revised 2013/2014 map, NAIP and LiDAR imagery coupled with thematic datasets available for the 2017/2018 timeframe were used to detect changes in land cover from 2013/2014 to 2017/2018.




¹ Represents the best possible scenario, actual data inputs varied by county based on availability

² Land-cover change detection map can be reclassified to yield 2013/2014 and 2017/2018 maps

Land Use/Land Cover Classification

The very-high resolution land cover and change data described in Section 2 are combined with ancillary datasets to generate the land use/land cover datasets used in Chesapeake Bay Program modeling tools. A team at the Chesapeake Bay Program led by US Geological Survey and the Chesapeake Conservancy, with stakeholder input from many groups including the Chesapeake Bay Program's Land Use Workgroup and Forestry Workgroup, developed a detailed 54 class land use/land cover dataset for the watershed.



Class Definitions

The following provides the official definitions for some of the major land use/land cover classes that are summarized in the County Tree Cover Status & Change Fact Sheets. Please note that the fact sheet's land use/land cover pie chart is a land-based summary; the area classified as "Water" is intentionally excluded to generate land-based tree cover percentages. In most city/municipal scale fact sheets, any land classified as Agriculture or Non-Forested Wetlands is included in Other, resulting in a 4 class pie chart.



Tree Cover includes

Forest (FORE) = All contiguous patches of trees ≥ 1 acre in extent with a patch width ≥ 240 -ft somewhere in the patch. The 240-ft girth references potential altered microclimate conditions extending inwards up to 120-ft from the patch edge. The forest understory is assumed to be undisturbed/unmanaged. Forests that are also wetlands are included in this class.

Tree Canopy over Turf Grass (TCTG) = Trees within 30-ft of structures or adjacent turf grass and other impervious in rural wooded areas and within 60-ft of structures or adjacent turf grass and other impervious in more developed areas. The understory in these areas is assumed to be turf grass or otherwise altered through compaction, removal of surface organic material, and/or fertilization.

Tree Canopy over Impervious Surfaces (TCIS) = Tree Cover that overlaps with roads, structures, or other impervious surfaces rendering them partially or completely invisible from above.



Tree Cover Continued

Tree Canopy, Other (TCOT) = All trees that do not qualify as “Forest” but are presumed to have an undisturbed/unmanaged understory. Such areas include narrow windbreaks adjacent to cropland and roads and tree canopy patches not qualified as “forest” that are fully surrounded by agriculture. Wetlands with “other tree canopy” are included in this class.



Agriculture includes

Cropland (CROP) = Barren and low vegetation lands on large parcels that are mapped as cropland in the 2018 Cropland Data Layer

Pasture/Hay (PAST) = Barren, low vegetation, and scrub shrub lands on large parcels that are mapped as pasture in the 2019 National Land Cover Dataset or the 2018 Cropland Data Layer



Turf Grass includes

Turf Grass (TURF) = Low vegetation lands that have been altered through compaction, removal of organic material, and/or fertilization. These include low vegetation lands within small, developed parcels (≤ 1 acre with $\geq 93 \text{ m}^2$ of impervious cover), recreational fields, and other turf-dominated land uses (e.g., cemeteries, shopping centers, golf courses, airports, hospitals, amusement parks).



Impervious includes

Impervious Roads (ROAD) = Paved, and some unpaved, roads and bridges. Dirt and gravel roads may be mistakenly mapped as impervious depending on the spectral characteristics of the substrate.

Impervious Structures (IMPS) = Human-constructed objects made of impervious materials that are greater than approximately 2 meters in height. Houses, malls, and electrical towers are examples of structures.

Impervious, Other (IMPO) = Human-constructed surfaces through which water cannot penetrate, and that are below approximately 2 meters in height, e.g., sidewalks, parking lots, runways, solar panels, rail lines, and some private roads. Barren, low vegetation, scrub-shrub, and emergent wetland cover types within 3 meters of rail lines were reclassified to impervious surfaces and included in this class.



Other includes

Pervious Developed, Other (PDEV) = Barren lands in developed parcels and barren or low vegetation lands that may represent the early stages of development, utility rights-of-way, portions of road rights-of-way, landfills, and the pervious portions of solar fields adjacent to panel arrays.

Harvested Forest (HARF) = Barren and low vegetation resulting from recently cleared forests and other tree canopy in association with a timber harvest permit (DE, MD, PA, VA, WV) or having a land use history of forest rotation since the mid 1980's. Timber harvest permit data were not reported to the Chesapeake Bay Program by either New York or the District of Columbia.

Natural Succession (NATS) = Barren, herbaceous, or scrub-shrub lands that are not classed as cropland, pasture, turf grass, or pervious developed. These areas are presumed to be undergoing either natural or managed succession and will eventually become forested although this process may take years to complete. Abandoned mine lands are included.

Extractive (EXTR) = Barren lands and impervious surfaces within quarries, surface mines, and other surficial excavation sites.



Non-Forested Wetland includes

Tidal Wetlands, Non-forested (TDLW) = All wetlands mapped as estuarine or marine according to National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) plus any adjacent freshwater emergent wetlands, and emergent wetlands mapped from high-resolution imagery outside Virginia and within 1-ft of adjacent tidal water elevations derived from NOAA's Sea Level Rise dataset.

Riverine Wetlands, Non-forested (RIVW) = National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) non-pond, non-lake wetlands, emergent wetlands along streams mapped from high-resolution imagery outside Virginia, state designated wetlands, and potential non-tidal wetlands (for Pennsylvania only) located within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain, Digital Elevation Model (DEM)-aligned 1:24,000 scale buffered stream network, Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO) hydric or frequently flooded soils.

Terrene Wetlands, Non-forested (TERW) = National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) non-pond, non-lake wetlands, emergent wetlands mapped from high-resolution imagery outside Virginia, state designated wetlands, and state potential non-tidal, non-floodplain wetlands (for Pennsylvania only). These are spatially isolated wetlands on ridges and slopes that are most prevalent in the coastal plain where streams may originate from wetland complexes.

Estimating the value of ecosystem services with i-Tree

Ecosystem services are often difficult to account for but are important to consider in community planning. This analysis used [i-Tree Landscape](#) models which are part of the i-Tree forestry assessment suite of tools developed by the USDA Forest Service and partners. Using the very high-resolution land cover data for 2017/2018, these models helped quantify the monetary value of some of the tangible benefits of tree cover: air pollution removal, stormwater runoff reduced, and carbon sequestered.

i-Tree Outputs

Factors used to estimate pollution removal in terms of g/m² tree cover include: leaf area index, percent evergreen trees, weather, population, and pollution data for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulate matter (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀).



Air Pollution Removal

The estimated value of the air pollution reduction is based on local health impact estimates from the US EPA BenMap model.

Estimates for the volume of stormwater intercepted, transpired, and evaporated are based on total tree cover, height, canopy percentage, crown width, leaf area indices and local weather data.



Reduced Runoff

The value of avoided runoff is estimated using the i-Tree Eco model which uses the US national average dollar value of \$0.008936/gallon based on studies of stormwater control and treatment costs.

Carbon storage and sequestration values are calculated separately for forested and non-forested land cover classes. Carbon sequestration for trees in non-forest areas is estimated using values from urban forests (Nowak et al. 2013)




Carbon Sequestration

The value of carbon sequestration for forested regions is estimated at \$188 per metric ton based on the social cost of carbon (Interagency Working Group, 2016)

Tree Cover Change

Gains and Losses


The Fact Sheets summarize tree cover gains, losses, and net change (gains-losses) related to developed and developing lands. Gains include acres that transitioned from a non-treed developed class (impervious, turf, other pervious developed) to one of the four tree cover classes (forest, tree canopy over turf, tree canopy over impervious, other tree canopy). And vice versa, losses include acres that transitioned from a non-treed developed class to one of the tree cover classes.



A few important caveats should be noted. First, these regional datasets are based primarily on NAIP imagery (supplemented by LiDAR datasets where available) and pick up losses of tree cover more readily than gains. Newly planted trees can take 10-15 years to be reliably detected, so that should be taken into account when interpreting the fact sheets. Local analyses using two dates of high quality LiDAR could yield different net change results, picking up more of the gains from newly planted trees and growth at the margins of existing canopy.

In addition, it has been observed that tree cover loss on developed and developing lands, as summarized in these fact sheets, may be overestimated in some counties where there is a higher level of forest management activity (timber harvest and regeneration cycles). Significant effort went into gathering and analyzing available timber harvest data and patterns to correctly classify them as “Harvested Forest”, but data gaps can cause errors in classification. In these cases, part of the acreage categorized as “losses” may represent transitions from a more mature forest to a young, regenerating forest, without the loss of watershed benefits that we associate with land conversion to development.

How is tree cover changing on developed and developing lands?



The Fact Sheet hexagon map shows the spatial distribution of change in tree cover, net gains (green), no/minimal change (orange), or net loss (red).

To view the actual areas where gains and losses were mapped, visit the [Land Use Change Viewer](#).

The maps use hexagons of 1,000 acres or 100 acres depending on county size to summarize the net tree canopy change between two time periods 2013 or 2014 and 2017 or 2018. Maps with 1,000 acre hexagons have a loss threshold of 1 acre per hexagon showing as red, anything between 1 acre and 0 acres of loss is considered nominal change. Maps using 100 acre hexagons use a 0.1 acre loss threshold in the same way. Hexagons containing entirely water or with less than 50% of their area within the county boundaries were omitted.

Additional Resources



Chesapeake Land Use/Land Cover Datasets and Tools

Links to all of these resources and the full set of county fact sheets (and municipal, when available) can be found on the [Chesapeake Tree Canopy Network Understand Your Canopy Page](#).

GIS Datasets

The local Tree Cover Status & Change Fact Sheets are just a starting point for understanding what is happening with tree canopy at the community scale. We encourage those with GIS expertise to download and utilize the actual Land Use/Land Cover and Change datasets as a foundation for further analysis of planting opportunities and information on gains and losses. The land use/land cover data can be overlaid with parcel data and local land use/zoning data to identify areas of existing and potential tree canopy on different types of **private lands** (low/medium/high density residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) and **public lands** (street tree/rights-of way, parks, schools, Homeowner Association common spaces, etc.). Further prioritization of areas to conserve or expand tree canopy can be achieved by overlaying available data layers related to social, economic or environmental priorities (see equity tools on next page).

For a local example using similar data to assess and communicate tree canopy changes over time, see the [District of Columbia Tree Canopy Change Story Map \(2006-2020\)](#).

Land Use/Land Cover Change Matrices

For each county that is in or adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay watershed, a Land Use/Land Cover Change matrix is available showing acres of change between each combination of land uses in 2013/2014 and 2017/2018. Although it takes some time to familiarize yourself with the land use codes and matrix format, the product condenses a rich amount of land use/land cover change information in one table. The matrices are accessible through the Land Use Change Map Viewer as shown on page 15.

See Appendix B in the [methods documentation](#) for details on interpreting Land Use/Land Cover Change Matrices

Map Viewers

2013/2014 NAIP

2017/2018 NAIP

Land Use / Land Cover Change,
2013-2018

On the Land Use Change Viewer, select a county and click Download Links to access the GIS data and land use/land cover change matrices available for that county.

Download Links	
County Name	Cumberland County
State	PA
Land Use Land Cover 2017/2018	Download
Land Use Land Cover 2013/2014	Download
Land Use Land Cover Change	Download
Land Cover 2017/2018	Download
Land Cover 2013/2014	Download
Land Cover Change	Download
Land Use Land Cover Matrices	Download
Land Use Land Cover Summaries	Download

For those who want to simply view and explore the data online, map viewers are available for the 2017/2018 land use/land cover data, as well as the land use/land cover change data (2013/2014 – 2017/2018) at [this link](#).



Equity Mapping Tools

There are a number of mapping tools available for exploring demographic information and environmental justice data layers. The following tools are a good starting point.

- [Tree Equity Score](#)
- [Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool](#)
- [EPA's Environmental Justice Screening & Mapping Tool \(EJ Screen\)](#)
- [Chesapeake Bay Environmental Justice & Equity Dashboard](#)



Other Resources

Local Government Curriculum

[Capitalizing on the Benefits of Trees & State Tree Resource Guides](#)

Funding

[Financing Urban Tree Canopy Programs](#)
(Guidebook for Local Governments in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed)

Schools

[Trees and Schools: Growing the Connection](#)
(A Resource Guide for Chesapeake Communities)

Policy

[Making Your Community Forest-Friendly: A Worksheet for Review of Municipal Codes and Ordinances](#)

Public Health

[HealthyTrees HealthyLives Website](#)

Case Studies

[Vibrant Cities Lab](#)

Chesapeake Tree Canopy Network: [Community Spotlight](#)

This guide was funded in part by a grant from the USDA Forest Service. This institution is an equal opportunity provider.