

Land Conservation Outcome Justification

Goal: Conserve landscapes treasured by citizens to maintain water quality and habitat; sustain working forests, farms and maritime communities; and conserve lands of cultural, indigenous and community value.

Outcome: Protect an additional two million acres of lands throughout the watershed currently identified as high conservation priorities at the federal, state or local level by 2025, including 695,000 acres of forest land of highest value for maintaining water quality.

Current Condition:

- Cumulatively, GIS data indicates that 8,013,132 acres of land have been permanently protected in the Chesapeake Bay watershed through 2011. This figure includes permanent protection for:
 - 95,581 acres of land in Delaware ----- 21% of DE land within the watershed
 - 10,572 acres of land in the District of Columbia ----- 27% of DC land within the watershed
 - 1,247,568 acres of land in Maryland ----- 21% of MD land within the watershed
 - 299,745 acres of land in New York ----- 08% of NY land within the watershed
 - 3,231,252 acres of land in Pennsylvania ----- 23% of PA land within the watershed
 - 2,771,257 acres of land in Virginia ----- 20% of VA land within the watershed
 - 357,157 acres of land in West Virginia -----16% of WV land within the watershed

Supporting Details

1. Why is this outcome important?

The population in the Chesapeake Bay watershed continues to grow. By 2030, it is expected that nearly 20 million people will live in the region. The supporting development and land conversion this growth implies rank among the top stressors to the Bay's ecosystem and are a major threat to its restoration and protection. One strategy to combat loss of high value lands is to permanently protect them from development.

States, local governments, federal agencies and non-governmental organizations have identified millions of acres of lands with important conservation values—lands key to working farms and forests, to maintaining water quality, to sustaining fish and wildlife, to preserving our history, and to providing for outdoor recreation. These lands are what form the ecological and cultural heritage of the Chesapeake watershed. Population growth, development and climate change increase pressure on some of the most valuable lands.

For decades, Chesapeake Bay Program partners have pursued land conservation efforts through permanently protecting important conservation lands by buying key properties, accepting donations, arranging for easements and purchasing development rights. For example, in the past five decades programs established by state legislatures have produced major results: the Virginia Outdoors Foundation has conserved more than 600,000 acres; Maryland's Program Open Space has protected over 350,000 acres; and Pennsylvania's Farmland Preservation Program has protected more than 450,000.

This outcome builds on and renews the longstanding commitments of Chesapeake Bay Program partners to land conservation.

2. Generally, how was the outcome derived?

a. 'Protected' Definition

As defined by the Chesapeake Bay Program since 2000, protected lands means lands permanently protected from development, whether by purchase or donation, through a perpetual conservation or open space easement or fee ownership for their cultural, historical, ecological, or agricultural value. This definition includes non-traditional conservation mechanisms, including transfer of development rights programs that require a conservation easement for the "sending" property and purchase of development rights programs. Lands protected through easements and purchase of development rights typically remain in private ownership.

Protected lands include: county, town, city, state and federal parks; designated open space and recreational land; publicly owned forests and wetlands; privately owned working farms or forests with conservation easements; historically important lands, such as protected battlefields, colonial towns and farms; military-owned parks and recreational areas.

b. Goal History

Land conservation goals have been included in Chesapeake Bay Program Agreements for many years. The *Chesapeake 2000* Agreement contained commitments for land conservation. Specifically, the agreement included a commitment to, "strengthen programs for land acquisition and preservation within each state that are supported by funding and target the most valued lands for protection. Permanently preserve from development 20 percent of the land area in the watershed by 2010." These goals were met by 2010. Additionally, in 2007, the Chesapeake Bay Program set a goal for protecting 695,000 acres of high priority forest lands important for water quality.

c. Outcome Derivation

In 2009 and 2010, state, federal and non-governmental partners working on land conservation and public access met at a series of collaborative sessions to develop recommendations for supporting further progress in these areas. These sessions provided the basis for actions included in the *Strategy for Protecting and Restoring the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (2010)* and a new goal statement and outcomes for land conservation and public access. The land conservation and public access goals and outcomes have been in general use in subsequent collaborative working sessions and initiatives of state, federal and non-governmental land conservation and public access partners since that time.

3. Which partners (state, federal agencies, goal teams, and committees) were involved in creating this outcome?

The outcome for land protection was based on extensive consultations with state officials and non-governmental partners in land conservation, past land protection trends, and formally identified state and federal land conservation priorities and goals. The National Park Service coordinated this effort.

Consultations with state officials in developing what was then called the Chesapeake Treasured Landscape Initiative (CTLI) and these outcomes included:

- Full day workshop among more than fifty partners (July 2009) to develop basis for recommendations advancing land conservation and public access¹
- Conference call briefings on the draft Land Conservation and Public Access in the Chesapeake Bay Region report recommendations (August 2009)
- CTLI Partners Meetings: convened by Friends of the John Smith Trail in December 2009, and February and March 2010
- NCTC Retreat with state officials (February 2010)
- Direct individual consultations on outcomes with state officials (March 2010)
- Public and state comments on draft outcomes (April 2010)

4. What is the basis for the outcome?

- a. At the time the outcome was originally defined, how did the currently protected amount of acres break down by jurisdiction and type of protection and what was the baseline?**

¹ Partners engaged in the 2009 workshop and subsequent briefings became informally called the “Chesapeake Treasured Landscape Partners” or CTLI Partners and are now known as Chesapeake Large Landscape Conservation Partners (which is described in response to question 5). These partners include local and regional land trusts, conservation organizations, state agencies responsible for land protection programs and federal agencies with land protection programs.

At the time the outcome was originally defined in 2010, the most detailed information on the status of protected lands came from the Chesapeake Bay Program's tracking of land protection in the three states which signed the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement (Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia). This tracking did not include protected lands in the New York, West Virginia or Delaware portions of the Bay watershed (which constitute 16.5% of the Chesapeake watershed land base); a comparably detailed annual tracking of total of conserved lands watershed-wide was not available.

Table 1 identifies cumulative land protection progress for the Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania portions of the Chesapeake watershed through 2009 based on data reported annually by state agencies to the Chesapeake Bay Program. Of the 7.14 million acres protected in these jurisdictions, 64.6% were in state fee ownership and less-than-fee interests (e.g. conservation easements), 24.7% of protected lands were in Federal fee ownership and less-than-fee interests, 7.3% were in local government interests, while private and NGO interests accounted for 3.4% of protected acreage. Overall, 44.5% of these protected lands lay in Pennsylvania, 35.8% were in Virginia, and 19.5% were in Maryland.

Breakout data was not available on the type of protection, but the totals in Table 1 include both fee acquisition and less-than-fee interests.

For the headwater states of New York, Delaware and West Virginia, the extent of protected lands was indicated by GIS data that was provided to the Chesapeake Bay Program. Based on 2008 data, over 280,000 acres were protected in New York, 75,000 acres in Delaware and 320,000 acres in West Virginia. Combining these figures with the more detailed 7.14 million acre figure above indicated that total protected land in the watershed was more than 7.8 million acres, as of the end of 2009.

b. When the outcome was originally defined, what were the recent trends in land protection?

As illustrated in Table 1, the average annual rate of land protection between 2001 and 2009 in the Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia portions of the watershed was approximately 125,000 acres per year. The minimum of 67,813 acres conserved annually was recorded in 2001 while the maximum of 215,928 was recorded in 2002. These figures do not include land protection data from New York, West Virginia and Delaware, so actual annual land protection acreages for the watershed are likely higher.

c. How was the 2 million-acre outcome set? What assumptions were made about contributions from state, Federal, local and non-governmental entities toward that goal?

The trend data described under questions 4a and 4b above suggested that simple extrapolation of past trends in the Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland portions of the watershed (125,000 acres conserved per year) over 15 years would result in conserving 1.875 million acres by 2025; not including any land protection in New York, West Virginia or Delaware. The outcome amount is higher than this, but within a reasonable level of magnitude.

To assess existing state and federal land conservation priorities, information was aggregated from a number of formally identified prioritization mechanisms and state goals. These are depicted in Table 2.

The data in Table 2 show that state and federal agencies had in 2010 identified more than 2.5 million acres of priority unprotected land (see “More Information” for sources of the 2.5 million acres of priority unprotected land). Importantly, the amounts included in Table 2 – and the target acreage – represent a *conservative* estimate of current land conservation priorities. These amounts *only* include Federal and state priorities. Moreover, they do not fully incorporate existing state land conservation priorities for New York, Delaware and West Virginia. Nor do they include any NGO (land trust) or local government priorities. In addition, the prioritization schemes included do not fully represent high priority cultural landscapes. Thus, the actual total of land conservation priorities is anticipated to be higher than the Table 2 amounts.

A draft outcome of protecting 2.3 million acres by 2025 was proposed in early 2010. Some conservation partners suggested a higher level. Ultimately, based on consultations with state officials and other partners, an outcome of protecting 2.0 million acres of high conservation priority lands by 2025 was selected as an aggressive but reasonable land protection target.

d. What steps have been taken since the outcome was originally developed that improve upon baseline data or inform further prioritization and progress?

Status of Land Protection: The expansion to watershed-wide tracking, advances in geospatial data, and a broad regional commitment among many partners to land conservation data sharing through [LandScope Chesapeake](#)² created a need for transitioning to tracking protected lands in a GIS environment.

To support implementation of LandScope Chesapeake, USGS undertook a data collection effort between December of 2011 and July 2012 to complete an updated watershed-wide protected lands GIS layer. The data collected were in most cases current as of the end of 2011. Topology editing was used to identify and correct overlapping areas to enable a more accurate counting of total acres. This more

² See question 7 below for more information on LandScope Chesapeake

expansive data collection effort showed an increase of approximately 200,000 acres of protected land over the prior baseline, bringing the cumulative total to approximately 8 million acres of protected lands within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The difference between the two data collection efforts (2008 and 2011) is the result of two factors: (a) the addition of previously protected (prior to 2008) but newly digitized parcels to GIS databases; and (b) the addition of parcels newly protected since the last collection effort. Unfortunately, on a watershed-wide basis it is not yet feasible to determine the extent of either factor because state and other protected lands databases have not consistently included the date of protection (aka “date established”) for each parcel³.

Cumulatively, GIS data indicates that 8,013,132 acres of land have been permanently protected in the Chesapeake Bay watershed through 2011.

State agencies are the largest entity contributing to land protection; they own approximately 49% of the protected acres in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Watershed-wide, the federal government owns approximately 28% of the protected acres. Private organizations, non-governmental organizations, local governments, and other entities have also been very active in land conservation, and will remain critical partners in protection efforts that will be counted towards the two million acre goal. The attached Map 1 (page 11) “Protected Lands 2011: Chesapeake Bay Watershed” shows protected lands in the Chesapeake Bay watershed as defined by the Chesapeake Bay Program.

Tracking progress towards a conservation goal requires the ability to measure acres protected from one interval to the next. The 2011 data collection effort forms a new “working baseline” of geospatial protected lands data from which to measure future watershed-wide land conservation progress. However, this working baseline is anticipated to be revised in the coming two years as state and local protected lands databases are continuously updated to capture previously protected but unreported parcels.

5. Which partners (state, federal agencies, other GITs) need to be involved to achieve the outcome?

The outcome is intended to be met through conservation actions across all levels of government and the NGO sector, though specific subtargets are not apportioned to these sectors. As such, collaboration between partners across all levels of government and the NGO sector will be needed to achieve the outcome.

³ Additional information on the transition from tabular to GIS data tracking for protected lands in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is provided in the [Analysis & Methods documentation](#) for the Chesapeake Bay Program’s protected lands indicator.

Permanent land protection is carried out by local and regional land trusts, national non-governmental organizations, and local, state and federal agencies, all in collaboration with private landowners. It occurs through donations and purchases of properties or conservation easements; purchase or transfer of development rights programs operated by local governments; or sometimes as a result of development permitting processes. This means there are literally hundreds of entities involved in achieving the land conservation outcome.

A broad group of partners engaged in land conservation in the Chesapeake Bay watershed has been assembling annually since 2009 to foster collaboration and partnership strategies. Now called “Chesapeake Large Landscape Conservation Partners,” the group includes more than sixty representatives of local land trusts, conservation organizations, state and federal agencies, and regional landscape conservation initiatives within the watershed. Over the past four years, these partners have developed specific recommendations for advancing land conservation and public access, advised on the land conservation and public access goals and outcomes, engaged in establishing action teams for implementing initiatives, and set out next steps for enhancing collaboration. This group functions to support strategic collaboration on a large landscape scale, recognizing that it can provide avenues to fulfill goals in ways individual organizations’ efforts might not.

6. What are major factors influencing ability to achieve outcome?

The main influencing factors that will impact the ability of partners to protect lands include the availability of priority lands for conservation and the availability of funding sources and amounts. In terms of the former, there are significant levels of priority lands identified as described in table 2 and illustrated in LandScope Chesapeake; however, an individual landowner’s interest in pursuing permanent protection at a particular point in time is influenced by many factors. In regards to funding sources, the following assumptions were used when developing the outcome:

- Breakout information of total land conservation funding sources and past funding trends across all levels of government was not readily available at the time the outcome was developed. However, given past land protection trends, it is clear that state and local government and non-governmental organizations (more than 250 land trusts operate in Chesapeake watershed states) protect by far the largest number of acres on an annual basis. It was assumed this general pattern would continue.
- Chesapeake watershed states have a very long history of funding land conservation; these states have generally been recognized as leaders nationally. While land conservation funding does tend to fluctuate from year to year based

in part on larger economic trends it was assumed that these programs will continue.

- At the Federal level, anticipated funding sources include Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), Farm Bill conservation easement programs (e.g. Farm and Ranchland Protection Program, Wetlands Reserve Program), Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program and Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). In terms of future Federal funding in these sources, it was assumed the Chesapeake watershed would continue to receive a proportional share based on existing formulas and planned funding levels. Further, there would be efforts to attract additional portions of national funding towards the Chesapeake.

Based on the opportunistic nature of land conservation, fluctuations in funding for land acquisition, and the trends of land conservation from the past decade, variation between the numbers of additional acres permanently protected each year is anticipated.

A significant factor that could increase the ability to achieve the outcome would be to address a problem with the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model, which currently does not provide an incentive for land protection. Accurately capturing the benefits of natural landscape features such as forests, riparian buffers, streams, and wetlands in the Watershed Model has been a challenge. Assigning a more accurate nutrient and/or sediment loading rate of these natural landscape features based on their ecological health/condition, management status, and/or landscape position would likely increase the incentive to protect these landscapes.

Protected lands avoid future increases in nutrient loading due to development. Protection is preventative medicine for watershed health, and far cheaper in the long run than restoration actions. Not crediting protected lands in some way in the model is short-sighted.

7. What management strategies will ensure the outcome is met?

The Chesapeake Large Landscape Conservation Partners described above serve as a means for fostering collaboration to advance progress towards the outcome. The partners have identified both an extensive set of specific initiatives to support progress and overall approaches for moving forward. These are outlined in more detail in several summary reports produced as a result of partners' sessions.⁴ Complementary reports

⁴ *Landscape Conservation & Public Access in the Chesapeake Bay Region* (2009); *Landscape Conservation in the Chesapeake Watershed: Building the Foundation for Success* (2012)

that contribute to management strategies have also been developed by organizations and agencies also participating in the partners group.⁵

One specific initiative intended to facilitate strategic land conservation and collaboration is development of LandScope Chesapeake. In late 2010, Chesapeake watershed land conservation partners began collaborating on development of a watershed-wide land conservation priority system. The intent was to create a means for fostering further joint conservation efforts, supporting strategic conservation and tracking progress. By 2012, this system was launched as LandScope Chesapeake (www.landscape.org/chesapeake) through a broad partnership among NatureServe, watershed states, the National Park Service, US Geological Survey and many others. This effort has improved information on the status of land protection and sharing of conservation priorities.

LandScope Chesapeake now contains over 150 GIS data layers addressing a broad range of information and conservation priorities. This includes priorities associated with conservation of wildlife habitat, scenic resources, cultural and historic resources, sensitive species, working lands, and ecological value (including value for supporting water quality). There is no other comparable source of data across the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Yet, LandScope partners are continuously working to expand and update this data.

Partners are now positioned to begin using LandScope for supporting collaboration and informing strategic conservation. Coupled with the ability to track progress provided through the tool (described in question 8), this will bring added ability to focus conservation efforts while working towards the broader land conservation outcome.

In addition, the Chesapeake Large Landscape Conservation Partners have also identified a series of principles for advancing progress towards landscape conservation goals, including:

- Embracing iconic landscapes with multiple values: large landscape conservation in the region focuses on areas with multiple values (ecological, historical, cultural, recreational, aesthetic, water quality, etc.).
- Developing focus and priorities: there is a need to align funding, programming, and resources, and to focus on areas where there is an opportunity to succeed in a reasonable time frame (e.g. 5 years).
- Building and communicating common stories: partners must communicate common conservation stories more effectively – both among partners and with the public.

⁵ For example: *Conserving Chesapeake Landscapes: Protecting Our Investments, Securing Future Progress* (2010), Chesapeake Bay Commission and Chesapeake Conservancy.

- Sharing information and knowledge among partners: there is high value in conservation partners gathering together at the session, communicating regularly and using key tools to facilitate collaboration.
- Building diversity: the group of people and entities engaged in large landscape conservation in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed must be broadened.
- Supporting and using multiple funding sources: partners must work to protect existing funding sources for land protection, attract a larger share of national large landscape conservation funding, and seek and develop new and innovative sources.

These principles inform strategies for achieving conservation goals.

8. What data will be used to measure progress?

Regional tracking of permanently protected lands in the Chesapeake Bay watershed has been carried out since 2000. This was originally stimulated by the goal of protecting twenty percent of the Bay watershed in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia, set through the Chesapeake 2000 Agreement. Reporting and tracking toward this goal was performed through a tabular spreadsheet based on acreage totals reported to the Chesapeake Bay Program on an annual basis.

The expansion to watershed-wide tracking, advances in geospatial data, and a broad regional commitment among many partners to land conservation data sharing through LandScope Chesapeake called for an improved approach to assembling land protection tracking data. As such, the Chesapeake Bay Program has transitioned to tracking protected lands in a GIS environment on a biannual basis.

Unlike pure tabular data, land protection information associated with a GIS database better serves the needs of multiple users and objectives. It allows visualizing protected lands on the landscape and assessing progress relative to various conservation goals, such as protecting targeted ecological areas, wildlife corridors, forested shorelines, etc.

Additionally, LandScope Chesapeake has produced an easy reporting tool to track the status of land protection in different jurisdictions in the watershed. This allows users to select the entire watershed, states or counties and generate reports on protected lands. This tool will be expanded in the future to allow users to calculate protected land status for subwatersheds and selected land cover types. The combination of this tool, and planned regular updating of protected lands GIS data layers is expected to replace annual data calls for Chesapeake watershed land protection progress.

TABLE 1 - Selected Annual State Land Preservation Trends and Totals in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Contact: Jake Reilly, Chesapeake Research Consortium/CBPO | Source: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/status_landspreserved.aspx?menuitem=19730 | Data updated 2/28/10 |
|---|---|----------------------|

For the purposes of this goal, preserved land includes land that is permanently protected from development with a perpetual conservation or open space easement or fee ownership. These land interests are held by federal, state or local governments or non-profit organizations for natural resource, forestry, agriculture, wildlife, recreation, historic, cultural or open space use, or to sustain water quality and living resources. Parks, wildlife refuges and private lands protected through conservation easements are counted in this measure.

Note: This data does not reflect land conservation efforts in New York, West Virginia, or Delaware. 2001 includes only additional acreage preserved in Maryland and Virginia

Maryland

| Entity | Baseline | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | Cumulative (by entity) | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|---------|
| Federal | 86,797 | | | | | | | | | | 86,797 | 6.19 |
| Local | 223,530 | 5,892 | 4,613 | 3,744 | -288 | | 24,999 | 35,366 | 4,212 | 20,359 | 322,427 | 22.98 |
| Nonprofit | 55,042 | -29,392 | 4,139 | 11,093 | 2,327 | 4,094 | 96 | 205 | | | 47,604 | 3.39 |
| State | 672,259 | 60,902 | 48,153 | 50,438 | 16,725 | 13,945 | 14,485 | 19,511 | 13,214 | 36,572 | 946,204 | 67.44 |
| MD Annual Total | 1,037,628 | 37,402 | 56,905 | 65,275 | 18,764 | 18,039 | 39,580 | 55,082 | 17,426 | 56,931 | | |
| MD Cumulative Total | | 1,075,030 | 1,131,935 | 1,197,210 | 1,215,974 | 1,234,013 | 1,273,592 | 1,328,674 | 1,346,101 | 1,403,032 | | |

Pennsylvania

| Entity | Baseline | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | Cumulative (by entity) | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|---------|
| Federal | 8,847 | | | | | | | | | | 8,847 | 0.28 |
| Local | 11,409 | | | | | 283 | 12,540 | 32,564 | 19,287 | 13,052 | 89,135 | 2.81 |
| Nonprofit | 2,859 | | | | | 5,235 | 11,839 | 7,111 | 4,192 | 1,721 | 32,957 | 1.04 |
| Private | 84,578 | | | | | | | | | | 84,578 | 2.66 |
| State | 2,736,970 | | 125,032 | 32,135 | 29,349 | 11,688 | 3,134 | 5,622 | 15,076 | 1,469 | 2,960,475 | 93.21 |
| PA Annual Total | 2,844,663 | | 125,032 | 32,135 | 29,349 | 17,206 | 27,513 | 45,297 | 38,555 | 16,242 | | |
| PA Cumulative Total | 2,844,663 | | 2,969,695 | 3,001,830 | 3,031,179 | 3,048,385 | 3,075,898 | 3,121,195 | 3,159,750 | 3,175,992 | | |

Virginia

| Entity | Baseline | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | Cumulative (by entity) | Percent |
|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------|---------|
| Federal | 1,658,201 | 216 | 750 | 971 | 4,380 | 0 | 604 | 1,256 | 478 | 417 | 1,667,273 | 65.27 |
| Local | 85,972 | 38 | 747 | 699 | 4,060 | 0 | 2,995 | 5,863 | 6,987 | 2,777 | 110,138 | 4.31 |
| Nonprofit | 16,533 | 3,153 | 9,627 | 2,583 | 8,000 | 3,034 | 7,569 | 8,342 | 7,752 | 6,957 | 73,550 | 2.88 |
| Private | 411 | | | | | | | | | | 411 | 0.02 |
| State | 370,127 | 27,004 | 22,867 | 34,525 | 19,352 | 34,780 | 41,994 | 57,481 | 45,376 | 49,549 | 703,055 | 27.52 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| VA Annual Total | 2,131,244 | 30,411 | 33,991 | 38,779 | 35,792 | 37,814 | 53,162 | 72,942 | 60,592 | 59,700 |
| VA Cumulative Total | | 2,161,655 | 2,195,646 | 2,234,425 | 2,270,217 | 2,308,031 | 2,361,193 | 2,434,135 | 2,494,727 | 2,554,427 |

Watershed

| Entity | | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | Cumulative (by entity) | Percent |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| Federal | 1,753,845 | 216 | 750 | 971 | 4,380 | 0 | 604 | 1,256 | 478 | 417 | 1,762,917 | 24.71 |
| Local | 320,911 | 5,930 | 5,360 | 4,443 | 3,772 | 283 | 40,534 | 73,793 | 30,486 | 36,188 | 521,700 | 7.31 |
| Nonprofit | 74,434 | -26,239 | 13,766 | 13,676 | 10,327 | 12,363 | 19,504 | 15,658 | 11,944 | 8,678 | 154,111 | 2.16 |
| Private | 84,989 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84,989 | 1.19 |
| State | 3,779,356 | 87,906 | 196,052 | 117,099 | 65,425 | 60,412 | 59,613 | 82,614 | 73,666 | 87,590 | 4,609,733 | 64.62 |
| Annual Total | | 67,813 | 215,928 | 136,189 | 83,905 | 73,059 | 120,255 | 173,321 | 116,574 | 132,873 | | |
| Cumulative Total | 6,020,227 | 6,088,040 | 6,303,968 | 6,440,157 | 6,524,062 | 6,597,121 | 6,717,375 | 6,890,696 | 7,007,270 | 7,140,143 | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Average Annual Protection: | 124,435 acres |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|

| State | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|
| Maryland | 19.65 |
| Pennsylvania | 44.48 |
| Virginia | 35.78 |

TABLE 2 - Existing Land Conservation Priorities in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed

| Goal Source | Acres Protected | Goal | Unprotected | Priority Lands | Source |
|---|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| CBP Forest Directive - PA | 18,000 | 100,000 | 82,000 | See Forest Directive subtotal line below . | |
| CBP Forest Directive - NY | 15 | 15,000 | 14,985 | See subtotal line below . | |
| CBP Forest Directive - WV | 2,885 | | | See subtotal line below . | |
| CBP Forest Directive - DE | 2,500 | 15,000 | 12,500 | See subtotal line below . | |
| CBP Forest Directive - MD | 25,900 | 250,000 | 224,100 | See subtotal line below . | |
| CBP Forest Directive - VA | 94,200 | 315,000 | 220,800 | See subtotal line below . | |
| Sub-total CBP Forest Directive | 143,500 | 695,000 | 551,500 | Forests in areas of highest water quality value | Contact Sally Claggett (USFS/CBPO) for data on state implementation of the |
| MD DNR Targeted Ecological Areas (Greenprint) | 636,480 | 2,117,000 | 1,480,520 | Forests and wetlands, rare species habitats, aquatic biodiversity hotspots and areas important for protecting water quality | http://www.greenprint.maryland.gov/ |
| MD Farm Preservation (Agprint) | 480,640 | 1,030,000 | 549,360 | Vulnerable rural resource areas based on local zoning, development pressures, and | http://www.agprint.maryland.gov/ |
| VA DCR - Office of Land Conservation (Gov. Kaine) | 424,100 | 400,000 | 0 | Scenic resources, historic areas, natural areas, recreational lands, working landscapes and key watershed lands | http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/land_conservation/400000acres.shtml |
| VA DCR - Office of Land Conservation (Gov. McDonnell) | 0 | 400,000 | 400,000 | Details pending; Virginia land conservation priorities supported by Virginia Conservation Lands Needs Assessment. | http://www2.timesdispatch.com/rtd/news/state_regional/http://www.appomattoxnews.com/2010/governor-mcdonnell-comments-on-conservation-easement.html state_regional_govtpolitics/article/MCDO23_20090422-223254/263080/ |
| National Wildlife Refuge Acquisition Priorities | N/A | N/A | 10,600 | Units managed primarily for fish and wildlife conservation | |
| NPS Unit Acquisition Priorities | N/A | N/A | 28,000 | Units managed for recreational, cultural, historical, and scenic values | |
| Sub-total Aggregate Land Conservation Priorities | 1,684,720 | 4,642,000 | 3,019,980 | | |
| Subtractions to avoid double counting | | | | | |
| CBP Forest Directive - MD | 25,900 | 250,000 | 224,100 | Conservative approach assumes all high value forest directive priorities in MD are included in MD Greenprint TEAs. | |
| CBP Forest Directive - VA | 94,200 | 315,000 | 220,800 | Conservative approach assumes all high value forest directive priorities in VA are included in the Governor's land conservation goals. | |
| National Wildlife Refuge Acquisition Priorities | N/A | N/A | 10,600 | Conservative approach assumes all NWR priorities are included in state land conservation priorities. | |
| NPS Unit Acquisition Priorities | N/A | N/A | 28,000 | Conservative approach assumes all NPS priorities are included in state land conservation priorities. | |
| Sub-total of Subtractions to avoid double counting | 120,100 | 565,000 | 483,500 | | |

TABLE 3 - Federal Funding Sources for Land Conservation in the Chesapeake Region (millions)

| Funding Source | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Total |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Federal LWCF | | | | | | | |
| US Fish & Wildlife Service^ | 5.48 | 5.76 | 2.90 | 6.51 | 1.94 | 9.11 | 31.70 |
| National Park Service* | 7.50 | 1.68 | 5.00 | 5.91 | 5.58 | 2.44 | 28.11 |
| US Forest Service (Forest Legacy) | - | - | 4.03 | 1.73 | 3.26 | 5.97 | 14.99 |
| Stateside LWCF (thousands)^ | | | | | | | |
| Delaware | 0.85 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.38 | 2.25 |
| Maryland | 1.74 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 4.47 | 0.53 | 0.77 | 8.59 |
| New York | 4.46 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 1.14 | 1.34 | 1.97 | 11.67 |
| Pennsylvania | 2.99 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 1.32 | 7.83 |
| Virginia | 1.99 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.51 | 0.60 | 0.88 | 5.22 |
| West Virginia | 0.97 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.43 | 2.54 |
| District of Columbia | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.45 |
| Farm Bill (millions) | | | | | | | |
| Farmland Protection Program | 14.6 | 5.7 | 7.3 | 15.0 | - | - | 42.6 |
| Wetlands Reserve Program | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 7.1 | - | - | 14.6 |
| CELCP Awards (thousands) | | | | | | | |
| Maryland | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 |
| Virginia | 6.1 | 1.9 | - | - | 3.0 | - | 11.0 |
| DoD REPI** | | | | | | | |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground (MD) | - | - | - | 1.48 | 1.79 | 3.16 | 6.43 |
| Fort A.P. Hill (VA) | - | - | - | 6.76 | - | - | 6.76 |
| Marine Corps Base Quantico (VA) | - | - | - | 2.86 | - | - | 2.86 |
| TOTAL (millions) | \$48.8 | \$22.1 | \$25.9 | \$54.8 | \$19.6 | \$26.4 | \$197.6 |

Source: Sally Claggett, USFS/CBPO

Source: E.O. Sec. 202b Report

Source: E.O. Sec. 202b Report

<http://www.deq.virginia.gov/coastal/celcp.html#table>

Source: Charlie Wilson, DoD/Navy Bay Program

Source: Charlie Wilson, DoD/Navy Bay Program

Source: Charlie Wilson, DoD/Navy Bay Program

^ Denotes total funding to watershed states, not funding specifically to watershed portions.

* Reflects Federal LWCF funding for projects in MD, VA and PA only.

** REPI Funding reported for 2008 indicates total funding from 2005-2008.

Notes: At the time of publication, data was unavailable for CELCP awards to MD during the 2005-2010 period, NRCS funding in the watershed for FY09 and FY2010, and Forest Legacy funding in the watershed for FY05 and FY06.

LWCF Stateside Acquisition Grants awarded within Chesapeake Bay Watershed

| Jurisdiction | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Total Funding |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| DE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MD | - | 1,450 | 1,065 | 938 | - | - | 3,453 |
| NY | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PA | - | - | 190 | - | - | - | 190 |
| VA | - | - | - | 100 | 108 | - | 208 |
| WV | 155 | - | - | - | - | - | 155 |
| DC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TOTAL (thousands) | 155 | 1,450 | 1,255 | 1,038 | 108 | - | 4,006 |

