



#### Maryland Parcel Evaluation Tool 101







The Parcel Evaluation Tool was prepared by the Maryland Environmental Service using Federal funds under award number NA15NOS4190165 from NOAA, U.S. Department of Commerce. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA or the U.S. Department of Commerce. The authors acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, administered by the Office for Coastal Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

# **MD DNR Parcel Evaluation Tool**



- The Parcel Evaluation Tool provides a Conservation Benefits and Ecosystem Service Assessment Report Card for every land parcel in Maryland.
- Report card values reflect many of the ecological priorities established for Stateside Program Open Space (POS).
- Additionally, land trusts have asked for this information to help them target and evaluate lands for protection, as well as to document conservation values for tax benefits.
- Tool compliments existing internal DNR parcel evaluation process.





#### **Two components:**

#### 1) Conservation Benefit Assessment

2) Ecosystem Service Assessment



- Provides a "star" benefit rating (1= low to 5
  = high) for each of seven categories of
  ecological benefit
- Benefit rating valuation methods were developed in consultation with experts from units across DNR
- Values are used by the DNR to score lands acquired by the state

| Benefit Ratings   |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <u>Habitat</u><br><u>Connectivity</u><br>★★★★★                | The state's remaining large blocks of forest and wetlands (hubs) and the habitat pathways (corridors) that connect them.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR, <u>Green Infrastructure - Hubs and Cooridors</u> . 2005  |  |  |  |  |
| <u>Rare Species &amp;</u><br><u>Wildlife Habitat</u><br>★★★★☆ | As described by the Biodiversity Conservation Network(BioNet), these are habitats of the state's rarest plants and<br>animals, as well as high quality and rare natural communities and other living resources of conservation concern.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR, BioNet Version 2. 2017  |  |  |  |  |
| Support of Aquatic<br>Life<br>★★★★☆                           | Watersheds that support high quality streams and riverine areas that are important for aquatic biodiversity and<br>freshwater recreational fisheries.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR, Stronghold Watersheds 2011., MDE Maryland Water Quality Tier II Catchments. 2016.,<br>MDE Surface Water Use Class 2014.   |  |  |  |  |
| Forests Important<br>for Water Quality<br>Protection<br>★★★★☆ | Forests for healthy watersheds that are the most effective in preventing pollution to streams, rivers and bays and<br>maintaining healthy stream hydrology.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR Forests Important for Water Quality. 2011.   |  |  |  |  |
| <u>Targeted Ecological</u><br><u>Area</u><br>YES              | Lands and watersheds identified as the most ecologically valuable areas in the State and are preferred for conservation funding through Stateside Program Open Space(POS). At least 50% of the parcel must be in a Targeted Ecological Area to meet ecological criteria for POS. Data Source: Maryland DNR, <u>Maryland Focal Areas - Targeted Ecological Areas</u> 2011.   |  |  |  |  |
| <u>Coastal Community</u><br><u>Resiliency</u><br>★☆☆☆☆        | Areas along the shoreline where natural habitats, such as marshes and coastal forests, have the potential to reduce the<br>impact of coastal hazards to the adjacent coastal communities by dampening waves, stabilizing sediment, and<br>absorbing water.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR, <u>Maryland Coastal Resiliency Assessment - Priority Shoreline Areas</u> and <u>Marsh Protection</u><br><u>Potential Index</u> , 2016. |  |  |  |  |
| <u>Future Wetland</u><br><u>Habitat</u><br>★☆☆☆☆              | Areas important for inland wetland migration resulting from sea level rise that will support high value coastal habitats of<br>the future.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR, <u>Maryland Sea Level Rise Wetland Adaptation Areas</u> , 2016.  |  |  |  |  |
| Proximity to<br>Protected Lands<br>★★★★★                      | Conservation opportunities located near other protected land areas contributes to landscape scale protection which is<br>key for conserving healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.<br>Data Source: Maryland DNR and Dept. of Planning, <u>Protected Lands</u> . 2017.  |  |  |  |  |



- Habitat Connectivity (\*\*\*\*\*)
  - The state's remaining large blocks of forest and wetlands (hubs) and the habitat pathways (corridors) that connect them.
  - Data Source: Maryland DNR, Green Infrastructure -Hubs and Corridors. 2005





Photo Source: dnr.maryland.gov

http://dnr.maryland.gov/land/Pages /Green-Infrastructure.aspx

- Rare Species & Wildlife Habitat (\*\*\*\*\*)
  - As described by the Biodiversity Conservation Network(BioNet), these are habitats of the state's rarest plants and animals, as well as high quality and rare natural communities and other living resources of conservation concern.
  - Data Source: Maryland DNR, BioNet Version 2. 2017





http://dnr.maryland.gov/wildlife /Documents/BIONET FactSheet.







- Watersheds that support high quality streams and riverine areas that are important for aquatic biodiversity and freshwater recreational fisheries.
- Data Source: Maryland DNR, Stronghold Watersheds 2011., MDE Maryland Water Quality Tier II Catchments. 2016., MDE Surface Water Use Class 2014.
- NOTE: Current rating values focus on freshwater ecosystems. Consideration of tidal ecosystems and blue infrastructure will be incorporated soon.











- Forests Important for Water Quality Protection (\*\*\*\*\*)
  - Forests for healthy watersheds that are the most effective in preventing pollution to streams, rivers and bays and maintaining healthy stream hydrology.
  - Data Source: Maryland DNR Forests Important for Water Quality. 2011.





#### • Coastal Community Resiliency $(\star\star\star\star\star)$

- Areas along the shoreline where natural habitats, such as marshes and coastal forests, have the potential to reduce the impact of coastal hazards to the adjacent coastal communities by dampening waves, stabilizing sediment, and absorbing water.
- Data Source: Maryland DNR, Maryland **Coastal Resiliency Assessment - Priority** Shoreline Areas and Marsh Protection Potential Index. 2016.

Protect and restore natural buffers to reduce coastal risk



and agricultural areas 🕳 🖶

Natural barriers such as beaches 🥢 , dune vegetation 🦍 , wetlands 👟 , coastal forests 🏪 , and vegetated stream buffers 📟 protect residential areas 👔 and urban areas 👖 from flooding, erosion, and inundation. Natural barriers also protect crops 🐖





- Future Wetland Habitat
  (\*\*\*\*\*)
  - Areas important for inland wetland migration resulting from sea level rise that will support high value coastal habitats of the future.
  - *Data Source:* Maryland DNR, Maryland Sea
    Level Rise Wetland Adaptation Areas. 2016.





#### • Protected Lands (\*\*\*\*\*)

- Conservation opportunities located near other protected land areas contributes to landscape scale protection which is key for conserving healthy aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems.
- Data Source: Maryland DNR and Dept. of Planning, Protected Lands. 2017.





- Targeted Ecological Area (YES or NO)
  - Lands and watersheds identified as the most ecologically valuable areas in the State and are preferred for conservation funding through Stateside Program Open Space(POS). At least 50% of the parcel must be in a Targeted Ecological Area to meet ecological criteria for POS.
  - Data Source: Maryland DNR, Maryland Focal Areas - Targeted Ecological Areas 2011.





#### **Ecosystem Service Assessment**

- Ecosystem Services = "the benefits that people gain from the environment"
- Assessment considers 7 ecosystem services provided by forests and wetlands across the state
- Report card provides quantitative values for the **biophysical** quantity of the benefit , as well as the resulting **economic** value of each service
- Quantification methods leverage existing ecological models and datasets

| Ecosystem Service Assessment  |                     |                             |             |                          |  |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|
|   | Annual Parcel-L     | Annual Parcel-Level Values* |             | Annual Per-Acre Values** |  |
| Ecosystem Service Name<br>(and biophysical unit)(range)   | Biophysical         | Economic                    | Biophysical | Economic                 |  |
| Air Pollution Removal: Carbon Monoxide (CO)<br>(kg per year)(0-1.35 kg per acre per year)                   | 2.56                | \$3.77                      | 0.31        | \$0.46                   |  |
| Air Pollution Removal: Nitrogen Dioxide(NO <sub>2</sub> )<br>(kg per year)(0- 9.01 kg per acre per year)    | 41.86               | \$13.54                     | 5.09        | \$1.65                   |  |
| Air Pollution Removal: Sulfur Dioxide(SO <sub>2</sub> )<br>(kg per year)(0- 6.67 kg per acre per year)      | 5.53                | \$0.43                      | 0.67        | \$0.05                   |  |
| <b>Air Pollution Removal: Ozone</b> (O <sub>3</sub> )<br>(kg per year)(0-34.35 kg per acre per year)        | 167.27              | \$244.96                    | 20.33       | \$29.77                  |  |
| Air Pollution Removal: Particulate Matter(PM <sub>10</sub> )<br>(kg per year)(0-8.34 kg per acre per year)  | 25.91               |                             | 3.15        |                          |  |
| Air Pollution Removal: Particulate Matter(PM <sub>2.5</sub> )<br>(kg per year)(0-1.80 kg per acre per year) | 9.86                | \$652.89                    | 1.20        | \$79.34                  |  |
| Carbon Sequestration<br>(mT per year)(0-4 mt per acre per year)   | 6.03                | \$839.24                    | 0.73        | \$101.99                 |  |
| <b>Groundwater Recharge</b><br>(m3per year)(445 - 1236 m3 per acre per year)                                | <mark>654.08</mark> | \$3,631.00                  | 79.49       | \$441.27                 |  |
| Nitrogen Uptake Potential Index<br>(1 = low to 3 = high)*   | 1.00                | \$296.00                    | No Data     | \$35.97                  |  |
| Stormwater Mitigation Potential Index<br>(1 = low to 5 = high)*   | 2.43                | \$7,291.00                  | No Data     | \$886.06                 |  |
| Wildlife Habitat and Biodiversity Potential Index<br>(0 = low to 100 = high)*                               | 83.19               | \$8,720.00                  | No Data     | \$1,059.72               |  |
| Surface Water Protection  | No Data             | \$0.00                      | No Data     | \$0.00                   |  |
| Total Annual Economic Value   | No Data             |                             | No Data     | \$2,658.03               |  |

# The Eco-Price Method for Valuing Ecosystem Services



- Ecosystem services are paid for in many different ways
- We look at the many different ways society invests in protecting or replacing the environment
  - In a market
  - Cost of restoration
  - Avoidance costs
  - Through mitigation fees
  - Cost to regulate

This method assesses the **Social Value** for decision making which is not the same as **Market Value** 

# Eco-Price Method Example Nitrogen Removal



- Price Signals
  - Bay Restoration Fund
    - It costs, on average \$13.33 per lbs of nitrogen load reduction
  - Nutrient Trading in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed
    - \$3.80 per lbs nitrogen on the PA market
  - Maryland BMP Cost Share
    - \$1.80 per pound of nitrogen reduction
  - Average cost for BMP implementation/maintenance
    - 14.50 per pound nitrogen reduction
- Average: \$8.36 per pound of N





#### **Ecosystem Service Assessment**

- Values can be used:
  - by DNR to evaluate lands acquired by the state
  - Calculate the cost of impacts to activities on existing state lands
  - To estimate the benefits of ecological restoration
    - working to leverage data available through the Maryland <u>Watershed Resources Registry (WRR)</u>, which ranks lands based on potential for upland, riparian, wetland, and stormwater infrastructure restoration.

Ecosystem Services Drivers of Chang

NOTE: Ecosystem service monetary values are meant to inform decision making and tradeoffs but do not imply market value or value to be paid by the state for land acquisition



#### **Absolute Values:**

- Air Pollution Removal (kg/yr)
  - Trees remove pollution from the air that would otherwise contribute to human health problems, such as asthma and cardiovascular stress.
  - Data Source: US Forest Service iTree Landscape Tool





https://landscape.itreetools.org/



#### **Absolute Values:**

- Carbon Sequestration (mT/yr)
  - Ecosystems take up carbon and store it in their biomass, offsetting some of the emissions from human activity and helping to reduce climate change.
  - Data Source: US Forest Service iTree Landscape Tool; DNR







#### Absolute Values:

- Groundwater Recharge (m<sup>3</sup>/yr)
  - Ecosystems allow for water to percolate through the soil and recharge aquifers, which Maryland relies on for 50% of its drinking water supply.
  - *Data Source:* USGS "Estimated Mean Annual Natural Groundwater Recharge, 2002" for MRB1 Catchments (mid-Atlantic)





https://water.usgs.gov/GIS/metadata/usg swrd/XML/mrb e2rf1 recharge.xml



#### **Relative (Index) Values:**

- Wildlife Habitat and Biodiversity Potential Index (1=low to 100=high)
  - Certain forests and wetlands are better able to support wildlife and more likely to support rare and threatened species. These are typically ecosystems that are less impacted by people.
  - Data Source: Maryland DNR, BioNet Version 1

Maryland's Biodiversity Conservation Network (BioNet)







#### **Relative (Index) Values:**

- Nitrogen Uptake Potential Index (1=low to 5=high)
  - Nitrogen pollution is critically important to the health Chesapeake Bay. Forests and wetlands remove nitrogen through taking it up in their biomass and soils.
  - Data Source: USGS Spatially Referenced Regression on Watershed Attributes Model (SPARROW)





National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Project

https://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/sparro w/#



#### **Relative (Index) Values:**

- Stormwater Mitigation/Flood Prevention Potential Index (1=low to 5=high)
  - Forests and wetlands absorb rainfall, lessening the amount of runoff that would otherwise cause erosion, need to be treated by stormwater systems, or cause flood damage.
  - Data Source: Modified version of the Maryland <u>Watershed Resources Registry</u> (WRR) Stormwater Preservation Model







http://watershedresourcesregistry.c om/detailsHp.html



#### Surface Water Protection

- Forests reduce pollutant runoff into reservoirs, increasing water quality in the reservoir and reducing the cost of treating water to meet drinking water standards.
- Data Source: 8 digit watersheds ; Literature Review



# **More Information**



• The GreenPrint Map

http://geodata.md.gov/greenprint/

- Chesapeake & Coastal Service Ecosystem Service Website <u>http://dnr.maryland.gov/ccs/Pages/Ecosystem-Services</u>
- Maryland Ecosystem Service Webinar

<u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=56mDu3lH0-</u> <u>0&feature=youtu.be</u>

### **More Information**



Christine Conn <u>christine.conn@maryland.gov</u>

Kevin Coyne <u>Kevin.coyne@maryland.gov</u>