

Chesapeake Bay Watershed Historical Land Use (1985-2013) Workplan

Sarah M. McDonald

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Overview and Background	2
Project Goals.....	3
Deliverables	3
Timeline	3
Methods.....	4
Data.....	4
Analysis	5
Validation.....	6
Figures	8
Bibliography	11
Appendix A: Land Use Definitions.....	13
Appendix B: Workplan Review Feedback	15

Overview and Background

The purpose of this document is to describe the goals, deliverables, methods, and timeline of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Annual Historical Land Use (1985-2013), also referred to as “back-cast”. The back-cast is part of a larger project to represent land use conditions from 1985-2100 (Figure 1). The back-cast will be used in three ways for the Phase 7 Chesapeake Bay suite of water quality models. Gary Shenk describes three ways the historical land use information is used in the planning target process (personal communication, January 16, 2025).

1. Phase III planning targets and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) allocations were based on necessary change in anthropogenic sources of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment from 1995 and so an accurate land use trend will be important for appropriate goal setting, if the partnership follows past precedent.
2. The historical land use is used as an input to CalCAST, a statistical version of Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (CAST) used to estimate optimal parameters for use in CAST during the development period (Berger et al., 2024), to estimate spatially explicit loading rates from monitored loads. The resulting loading rates are input to CAST to apply Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other information to produce Nitrogen (N), Phosphorus (P), and Sediment (S) loads. An accurate land use status and trend is important for producing a model that best matches observed data.
3. The historical land use is used as inputs to scenarios run in CAST and the Dynamic Watershed Model representing those land use years. The scenarios are evaluated against monitored loads to evaluate model performance and load reduction progress in the [TMDL](#) indicator and [Monitored and Expected Total Reduction Indicator for the Chesapeake \(METRIC\)](#).

The methods described in this document differ from the methods used to produce the back-cast in Phase 6. The Phase 6 back-cast was built using the Decennial Census and deconstructing residential development to be farm or forest at the Land River Segment (LRSEG) scale (Claggett, 2020, p. 24). The Phase 7 back-cast has annual land cover information at 30-m resolution. It is expected that the Phase 7 back-cast will have more temporal variability than the Phase 6 back-cast, but the magnitude and spatial difference of land use change and their effects on loading rates is unknown until the analysis is complete. It is also expected that the Phase 7 back-cast will show more development change than Phase 6, as it will include commercial and industrial development in addition to residential. The Phase 7 back-cast will include non-development change, such as timber harvesting.

Project Goals

The goal of the project is to accurately capture land use trends from 1985-2013 to inform the calibration of the Phase 7 Watershed Model. This project will utilize the spatial and categorical accuracy of 1-meter resolution Land Use/Land Cover (LULC) to represent the present and the temporal accuracy of Landsat derived products to deconstruct the landscape back through time. The land use schema, to be finalized by the Land Use Workgroup (LUWG), represents land uses that have unique assumptions about their sediment and nutrients loads and best management practices (BMPs). The land use classes are described in Appendix A. Figure 2 shows the difference between the LULC, Phase 7 land use, and CAST land use.

Deliverables

The deliverable of this project is a database containing annual acres of Phase 7 land use classes by summary unit¹. The database will be shared in both tabular and vector formats. An accompanying white paper detailing methods, trends, and validation will be posted with the [Phase 7 model documentation](#).

Timeline

The remaining high-level timeline aims to deliver a draft product by end of September and the final product by the end of November. See the Methods section for more detailed information.

	2025						
Task	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
LUWG methods approval							
Draft methods							
Deliver draft product							
LUWG update on trends							
Address feedback and finalize methods							
Deliver final product to CAST team							

¹ Summary units refer to a combination of Land River Segments (LRSEGs), federal lands, Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs), and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s).

Methods

This section describes the methods to produce the Phase 7 land uses (Appendix A) by summary unit. In general, the workflow is as follows:

1. Map land use change for 5 aggregate land use classes at 30-meter resolution using the annual National Land Cover Database (NLCD).
2. Summarize the 5 aggregate land use change acres per year to the summary units, and the CB-LULC 2013/14 acres of the Phase 7 classes.
3. Expand the 5 land use classes to the Phase 7 classes tabularly using additional data (e.g. agricultural census, Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA)).
 - a. This step will involve parallel efforts not described in this document to develop methods with CBP workgroups on how to expand specific classes at the modeling segment scale. For example, working with the Timber Harvest Task Force on incorporating clear-cut and non-clear cut timber harvests.

Data

The Chesapeake Bay Land Use and Land Cover (LULC) Database 2024 Edition (Claggett et al., 2025) is a high-resolution land use product representing the current conditions of the landscape (2013/14, 2017/18, 2021/22). These data include 56 classes, which are aggregated to the Phase 7 land use schema (see Appendix A for a list of Phase 7 land uses).

The annual National Land Cover Database (NLCD) (USGS, 2024) includes a collection of Landsat-derived annual products, including land cover, land cover change, fractional impervious, land cover confidence, impervious descriptor, and spectral change day of year from 1985 to 2023.

The USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) conducts the census of agriculture every five years and reports agricultural information at the county-scale. These data can be aggregated to assess acres of cropland and pasture and hay at the county scale every 5-years back to 1985.

David Helmers of the SILVIS Lab at the Department of Forest & Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, adapted the Decennial Census housing and population tables to produce a consistent census-block scale database of housing and population estimates. The housing density dataset represents 1990, 2000, and 2010.

The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) provides tax parcel data that contains useful attributes for validation, such as “year built.”

Geographic Information Retrieval and Analysis System (GIRAS) is a 30-meter resolution Land Use/Land Cover raster dataset derived from 1970s and 1980s aerial imagery (Price et al., 2007).

Analysis

The first step of the analysis is to create a comparable classification schema between NLCD and the Chesapeake Bay LULC (CB-LULC). This analysis is focused on an aggregate classification schema for the change detection steps. The aggregate schema includes developed, forest, natural, agriculture, and water. See Figures 3 and 4. There are two primary reasons for the aggregate schema. The first is to ensure a consistent schema between NLCD and CB-LULC in which trends from both datasets over the same time frame can be compared. The second is due to distinctions in the NLCD classification schema that are irrelevant to the Phase 7 classification, as well as classes in Phase 7 that aren't detectable from NLCD directly. An example of the former is NLCD has four forest types, whereas Phase 7 only calls for one. An example of the latter is Phase 7 requires timber harvest and construction, which are not distinct classes in NLCD. The aggregate schema aims to simplify NLCD to a state in which it is compatible with Phase 7 and CBP can apply our own definitions of classes using region-specific data to better align with the Phase 7 schema (e.g., incorporate state-reported data, agricultural census).

The CB-LULC crosswalk to Phase 7 classes is being reviewed by workgroups and GITs, but can be used to create a high-resolution version of the aggregate schema. These data will be resampled from 1-meter resolution to 30-meter resolution, to match the resolution of NLCD. Cells with more than one aggregate land use will be classified as the class with the most area in the cell (i.e. the most 1-meter cells of the class). In some cases, a land use that is not the majority but meets a certain threshold may take precedence. For example, a rural house on a farm field may be majority agriculture, but could be classified as development as to not lose the impervious surfaces. In cases of a tie, the class will be assigned in a hierarchical order that is to be determined. The final rules applied in the aggregation process will be recorded in the Phase 7 documentation. Once the 30-meter, aggregate schema version of the 2013/14 CB-LULC (2024 edition) has been created, a pivot table comparing the area of each NLCD (2013/14) land cover class by each aggregate class will be produced. Given the CB-LULC mapped dates vary by jurisdiction, the year of NLCD will be selected to match the year of CB-LULC. The results of this table will determine the crosswalk of NLCD classes to the aggregate schema.

The next step is to compare the three dates of CB-LULC with the same three dates of NLCD, at the same resolution and with the same schema (Figure 5). The crosswalks identified in the first step will be used to create the six raster datasets representing 2013/14, 2017/18,

and 2021/22 conditions. Trends between the datasets will be compared first at the county scale. First, comparisons of area by class for 2013/14 conditions will be assessed, followed by net change per class between 2013/14 and 2021/22. Next, similar comparisons will be made at a finer scale (i.e. catchments), and at a much finer scale of 1 square kilometer hexagons (or hexes). Regressions comparing the total area and net change by class at varying scales is one method to assessing how well two datasets compare spatially across the landscape. Pivot tables representing change between classes over time at the regional and county scales will be created for both NLCD and CB-LULC, giving insight on specific land use transitions.

With the context of how NLCD and CB-LULC compare in the present, NLCD can be used to deconstruct the land use back through time. Areas with no mapped change in NLCD are equivalent to the 2013/14 CB-LULC land use. Areas with NLCD mapped change are equivalent to the 2013/14 CB-LULC back through time until the change mapped by NLCD occurs. The land use in these areas during and prior to the change detected by NLCD are classified as the land use mapped in NLCD. The fractional impervious layers from NLCD are summarized within change patches per year by catchments and counties, to allow for separation of impervious with pervious development.

The aggregate classes can be tabularly broken down to better align with Phase 7 classes once summarized by summary unit (Figure 6). The harvest class is implied (clear cuts), when forest transitions to and from natural lands is observed over time, the first 3 years after the forest is cleared is reclassified to harvest. Methods for determining harvests that are not clear-cuts (e.g., thinning) will be developed with the Timber Harvest Task Force and will likely extrapolate Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) proportions of clear-cuts to total harvests. Methods to divide agriculture into Cropland and Pasture/Hay classes are in development, but will utilize the Agricultural Census and the 2013/14 CB-LULC to determine the proportion of cropland and pasture/hay per summary unit. Figure 7 shows draft methods to separate change in development into change in solar infrastructure, solar pervious, impervious roads, impervious non-roads, turf grass, tree canopy over turf grass, compacted pervious, tree canopy over impervious, and construction.

Validation

To validate development trends, the mapped impervious change will be compared with the Maryland tax parcels data on the year structures were built.

Since the Census of Agriculture is used to differentiate between cropland and pasture, it can't be used to validate those numbers. It can, however, be used to validate the overall agricultural footprint. A multiple linear regression will be computed to compare county-

scale estimates of agriculture that were mapped and that were reported by the census over time.

Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data can be used to validate forestry trends over time. The FIA data samples plots every year, with the design that the samples can be extrapolated to the rest of the county and state.

Figures




Figure 1 Phase 7 land use products that work together to create a seamless land use time series, built from the high-resolution Land Use/Land Cover “present” day data.




Figure 2 Description of the three ways the Chesapeake Bay Program uses the term “land use”. The high-resolution land use/land cover (LULC), or CB-LULC, is used to create the other two land use products. The Phase 7 aggregate land use refers to the schema (or classification) that the back-cast will use, described in Appendix A. The CAST land use is the final land use for modeling, which is built from the phase 7 aggregate land use data.




Figure 3 CB-LULC (left) displaying Phase 7 aggregation schema and NLCD (right) displaying its native 16 classes.




Figure 4 CB-LULC (left) and NLCD (right), displaying a common 5-class schema.




Figure 5 CB-LULC (left) and NLCD (right) displaying change from 2014 to 2021 using the same 5-class schema.




Figure 6 Visual crosswalk of the 5-class aggregation to the Phase 7 land use classes.




Figure 7 Draft methods to translate the 5-class schema developed class to the numerous Phase 7 developed classes, including solar infrastructure, solar pervious, roads, impervious non-roads, turf, tree canopy over turf, tree canopy over impervious, and compacted pervious.

Bibliography

Berger, K. K., Filippino, G., Shenk, N., Goulet, M., Lookenbill, D., Moyer, G., Noe, A., Porter, J., Shallenberger, B., Thomas, and G. Yactayo (2024). Using Local Monitoring Results to Inform the Chesapeake Bay Program's Watershed Model. STAC Publication Number 24-002, Edgewater, MD. 35 pp., https://www.chesapeake.org/stac/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/FINAL_Report_Local-Monitoring_24_002.pdf.

Claggett, P. R., (2020). Chesapeake Bay Program Phase 6 Watershed Model – Section 5 – Land Use Draft Documentation for Midpoint Assessment. <https://cast-content.chesapeakebay.net/documents/5%20Land%20Use%202020%2003%20Draft.pdf>

Claggett, P. R., McDonald, S. M., O'Neil-Dunne, J., MacFaden, S., Walker, K., Guinn, S., Ahmed, L., Buford, E., Kurtz, E., McCabe, P., Pickford, J. A., Royar, A., Schulze, K., 2025, Chesapeake Bay Land Use/Land Cover (LULC) Database 2024 Edition: U.S. Geological Survey data release, <https://doi.org/10.5066/P14BEBRC>.

Cohen, W. B., Yang, Z., Healey, S. P., Kennedy, R. E., & Gorelick, N. (2018). A LandTrendr multispectral ensemble for forest disturbance detection. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 205, 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.11.015>

Fu, B., Lan, F., Xie, S., Liu, M., He, H., Li, Y., Liu, L., Huang, L., Fan, D., Gao, E., & Chen, Z. (2022). Spatio-temporal coupling coordination analysis between marsh vegetation and hydrology change from 1985 to 2019 using LandTrendr algorithm and Google Earth Engine. *Ecological Indicators*, 137, 108763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.108763>

Helmets, D. P., 1990, 2000, 2010, Census block level housing change 1990-2010 for the Conterminous United States, <http://silvis.forest.wisc.edu/data/housing-block-change/>.

Hu, T., Zhang, M., Li, X., Wu, T., Ma, Q., Xiao, J., Huang, X., Guo, J., Li, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). Extraction of Building Construction Time Using the LandTrendr Model With Monthly Landsat Time Series Data. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 17, 18335–18350. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2024.3409157>

Kennedy, R. E., Yang, Z., & Cohen, W. B. (2010). Detecting trends in forest disturbance and recovery using yearly Landsat time series: 1. LandTrendr — Temporal segmentation algorithms. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114(12), 2897–2910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2010.07.008>

Kreiger, J. (2020, January 12). *Evaluating a random forest model*. Medium. <https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/evaluating-a-random-forest-model-9d165595ad56>.

Maryland Department of Planning, n.d., Parcels,
<https://planning.maryland.gov/Pages/OurProducts/DownloadFiles.aspx>.

Price, C.V., Nakagaki, N., Hitt, K.J., and Clawges, R.M., 2007, Enhanced Historical Land-Use and Land-Cover Data Sets of the U.S. Geological Survey: raster format files: U.S. Geological Survey data release, <https://doi.org/10.5066/P9MY8D4K>.

USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007, 2012 Census of Agriculture. Complete data available at www.nass.usda.gov/AgCensus.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), 2024, Annual NLCD Collection 1 Science Products: U.S. Geological Survey data release, <https://doi.org/10.5066/P94UXNTS>.

Zhu, L., Liu, X., Wu, L., Tang, Y., & Meng, Y. (2019). Long-Term Monitoring of Cropland Change near Dongting Lake, China, Using the LandTrendr Algorithm with Landsat Imagery. *Remote Sensing*, 11(10), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11101234>

Appendix A: Land Use Definitions

Impervious, Roads (ROAD)

Paved roads and bridges. Dirt and gravel roads may be mapped as impervious depending on the spectral characteristics of the substrate.

Impervious, Non-Roads (IMPO)

Impervious surfaces that are not roads, including buildings (e.g. houses, malls, sheds, and warehouses), sidewalks, parking lots, and rail lines.

Tree Canopy over Impervious (TCIS)

Tree canopy overhanging roads and non-road impervious surfaces rendering them partially or completely invisible from above.

Turf Grass (TURF)

Herbaceous lands associated with residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational areas (e.g. residential lawns, sports fields, cemeteries, golf courses, and airports) that is assumed to be altered through compaction, removal of organic material, and/or fertilization.

Tree Canopy over Turf Grass (TCTG)

Tree canopy overhanging herbaceous lands in developed areas assumed to be turf grass or otherwise altered through compaction, removal of surface organic material, and/or fertilization.

Solar Infrastructure (SOLI)

Field-mounted solar panel arrays and impervious surfaces associated with solar (e.g. structures, generators)

Solar Pervious (SOLP)

Herbaceous land surrounding solar panel arrays that it assumed to be managed to prevent tree growth.

Compacted Pervious (COMP)

Herbaceous land that is assumed to be unfertilized and where the regrowth of trees is suppressed. This includes utility transmission lines, pipelines, road rights-of-way, surficial mining operations, and landfills.

Construction (CONS)

Barren lands that transition to developed lands (i.e. impervious, turf grass).

Forest (FORE)

Contiguous patches of tree canopy and herbaceous lands where the understory is assumed to be undergoing natural or managed succession.

Harvested Forest (HARF)

Herbaceous lands that are cleared tree canopy patches (i.e. clear cuts) that are undergoing succession to become forested again.

Wetlands, Riverine Non-Forested (RIVW)

Wetlands adjacent to non-tidal streams and rivers (within the floodplain or at the headwaters).

Wetlands, Terrene Non-Forested (TERW)

Wetlands that are not adjacent to non-tidal streams and rivers or tidal waters.

Cropland (CROP)

Herbaceous lands used to produce grains, legumes, vegetables, fruits and nuts, grapevines, or other agricultural crops.

Pasture and Hay (PAST)

Herbaceous lands used for grazing livestock (e.g., cattle, goats, sheep) or producing fodder (e.g., hay and alfalfa).

Water (WATR)

Tidal waters (e.g. Chesapeake Bay), lakes and reservoirs, riverine and terrene ponds, large rivers, and water within smaller channels visible through the tree canopy.

Appendix B: Workplan Review Feedback

The draft workplan was circulated via email to Land Use Workgroup for review between January 2nd through 31st, 2025. Below is a table of the feedback received.

Reviewer(s)	Question/Comment
Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) - Jason Dubow, Michael Haxel, Deborah Herr Cornwell, Deborah Sward	MDP assumes the final product will be tabular due to interpolations that aren't spatially allocated (e.g. impervious vs. pervious development). Can the Bay Program clarify what the "additional 30-meter resolution raster datasets" would include? For example, the aggregate classes vs. the phase 7 classes? What factor(s) would determine whether these spatial deliverables would be produced?
	Through resampling, MDP assumes certain types of development would be generalized out, such as rural and very low-density residential development on parcels > 5 acres with very little turf grass and/or impervious surface. The proposed validation efforts using CAMA and Census information could potentially identify this phenomenon, and it may be something to consider addressing as part of the Part 2 effort.
	MDP requests clarification on whether the 2013 vintages of CB-LULC and NLCD be used for this pivot table.
	The deliverable is a database of land use at the segment scale - but it also sounds like the method would be applied to smaller scales (HUCs? Hexes?); would this be watershed-wide, or only for pilot areas? If it's watershed-wide, MDE and MDP would like to see these smaller scales also available in the database for state or local policy-making decisions.

Reviewer(s)	Question/Comment
<p>Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) - Alisha Mulkey</p> <p>Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) - Jason Dubow, Michael Haxel, Deborah Herr Cornwell, Deborah Sward</p>	<p>MDA requested clarification on how nursery (indoor) and greenhouse structures be captured and categorized. Also, urban agriculture, which may include smaller parcels with raised beds? MDP assumes classifications could vary depending on whether urban agriculture is classified as agricultural in the CB-LULC or meets criteria for turf grass (small parcel w/ structure). MDP assumes agriculture would need to comprise the majority of a 30-meter pixel to be “backcast” as agriculture. Has CBP observed any other patterns related to how urban greenhouses, nurseries, agriculture, raised beds may appear in the high-resolution and backcast efforts?</p>
<p>Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) - Shannon McKenrick</p>	<p>MDE requested clarification on the necessity of reclassing both the NLCD and the model LU into an "aggregate schema" for Part 1 of the methodology. Is this only to do a statistical analysis on their comparability? It seems like the bulk of the method relies on identifying areas of change in the NLCD and then using fractional land uses to reclass those areas into the equivalent model land use. I can't seem to work out a reason to create a third classification in this case -- unless its for the potential 30m "annual conditions" rasters.</p>
<p>U.S. Forest Service – Katie Brownson</p>	<p>Is there a need for a more explicit consideration of how to back-cast non-clearcut acres that aren't being captured in the NLCD data? I know we had discussed using the FIA-derived estimates of % clearcuts (as a function of total harvest) to extrapolate out an estimate of total harvest acres from the NLCD data. And also potentially piloting this approach with a state where we have good historic reporting data to gauge accuracy. Is that something you are still considering?</p>
<p>Hampton Roads Planning District Commission – KC Filippino</p>	<p>Can you provide examples of land use changes that will impact and or advise calibration? Also, what model segmentation will you be using? Will the final data set from</p>

Reviewer(s)	Question/Comment
	<p>1985-2013 be much different from what it is currently? If so, how will that be communicated and how will it translate into loads? Will the P7 model will have these actual acres in it? It will include the backcast 1985- 2013, and the new data 2013/14, 2017/18, ad 2021/22. But what about the years in between? Will that still just be change data or will you be modeling it like the back-cast?</p>
<p>Carroll County Government, Department of Planning & Land Management – Andrew Gray</p>	<p>Why does “Bare Developed” under CB-LULC correlate to “Construction” under Phase 7?</p> <p>Why does “Riverine Wetlands Harvested Forest”, “Harvested Forest Barren”, “Harvested Forest Herbaceous”, “Terrene Wetlands Harvested Forest”, and “Tidal Wetlands Harvested Forest” under CB-LULC correlate to “Natural” under Aggregate Schema?</p> <p>Why does “Bare Shore” under CB-LULC correlate to “Water” under Phase 7?</p> <p>Why would “Rail Lines” be under Impervious, Non-Roads (IMPO) in the Appendix. Would the ballast be pervious?</p>