A prioritization model for maintaining Healthy Waters in Virginia



Modelers: Kirsten Hazler and David Bucklin

Goals

CBP desired outcome:

100% of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy



Prioritization model goals:

- Identify lands <u>most important</u> for protecting Virginia's Healthy Waters
- Identify lands where activities are likely to have the greatest impact on aquatic resources
- Target lands for conservation and BMPs at landscape scales

Prioritization using the

ConservationVision Watershed Impact Model (2021 version, draft)



ConservationVision Watershed Impact Model and Prioritization Guiding Documents



Relative Importance





"Importance" is driven by human values, and depends on the specific aquatic resources of concern. In this prioritization, importance is based on hydrologic position relative to known Healthy Waters sites.

Note:

"Importance" is limited by sampling effort; only documented healthy sites contribute to score.

Identifying Resources of Concern



online editing capabilities.

http://gis.vcu.edu/instar/

Relative Importance

For each Healthy Waters site, we delineated drainages at multiple scales:

mportance

- Entire drainage
- 10-km upstream
- 5-km upstream
- 3-km upstream
- 2-km upstream

Assumption:

• Areas hydrologically closer to a HW site are more important than those farther away

NHDPlus-HR flowlines and catchments used for drainage delineation



Relative Importance

We counted drainage overlaps from all HW sites, and rescaled sums to importance scores.

• Multiple scales, many sites



Assumption:

 Catchments contributing to multiple HW sites at multiple scales are more important than those contributing to a single site at a single scale



Watershed Impact Model

Karst

Position

Runoff Soil Loss Overland Potential Potential Flow Potential impact depends on: Equations and coefficients from • **OpenNSPECT** program Precipitation Soil Landscape Soil type • Sensitivity Slope steepness • Overland flow to surface waters • Prevalence of karst • Potential Impact

Soil Sensitivity: Runoff Potential



Soil Sensitivity: Soil Loss Potential

Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) factors

- R-factor: Rainfall/erosivity (OpenNSPECT)
- K-factor: Soil erodibility (gSSURGO)
- S-factor: Slope steepness (3DEP)
- C-factor: Cover management (OpenNSPECT, assuming barren land)
- L-factor: Slope length (not included)
- P-factor: Supporting practices (not included)



Predicting Soil Erosion by Water: A Guide to Conservation Planning With the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE)



Rescale product to score (max soil loss = 100)



Landscape Position: Overland Flow

Headwaters

• Presence within a headwater catchment (NHDPlus-HR)

Overland Flow Length

• Distance along flow path to stream, river, or water body (NHDPlus-HR)

Rescale flow length to score (adjacent to water = 100)

Discount score (x 90%) for areas outside of a headwater catchment

Overland Flow

Landscape Position: Karst

tes: Een USGS, NO

Prevalence of Sinkholes

• Kernel density of sinkholes (DMME)



Cross-section diagram by David Culver, American University.



• Euclidean distance to nearest karst geology (Weary & Doctor 2014)

Rescale sinkhole density to score (max density = 100)

Rescale karst distance to score (adjacent to karst = 100)

Calculate mean score



Potential Impact: Soil Sensitivity and Landscape Position



Potential Impact



Final Prioritization



Calculate product Slice into priority quantiles







Final Priorities

Conservation Priority

Rural/Open Space BMP Priority

Urban BMP Priority

1 (low)



Healthy Waters Prioritization Model: Three Outputs



Healthy Waters Prioritization Model: Conservation

Target areas for land acquisition and conservation easements



Healthy Waters Prioritization Model: BMPs

