GIT	Layer	Layer Description
1	Priority Living Resources Areas – Water Column (surrogate for Fish Habitat)	Target species were acquired from the list in Habitat Requirements for Chesapeake Bay Living Resources, Second Edition (1991) to contribute to a map of priority living resource areas. Water column species which had habitat requirements that could be directly affected by excess nutrients or sediments were identified and included in this spatial depiction. Species selected for water column habitat included: menhaden, striped bass, anchovy, alewife, hickory shad, American shad, yellow perch, white perch, blueback herring, largemouth bass, and chain pickerel. This map was combined with the bottom dwelling habitat map, and overlapped areas were included in the development of a priority living resources map.
1	Priority Living Resources Areas – Bottom Dwelling (surrogate for Fish Habitat)	Target species were acquired from the list in Habitat Requirements for Chesapeake Bay Living Resources, Second Edition (1991) to contribute to a map of priority living resource areas. Bottom dwelling species which had habitat requirements that could be directly affected by excess nutrients or sediments were identified and included in this spatial depiction. Species selected for bottom dwelling habitat included: blue crab, oyster, soft shell clam, hard shell clam, spot, speckled sea trout, postlarval blue crab, catfish, summer flounder, Atlantic sturgeon, and croaker. This map was combined with the bottom dwelling habitat map, and overlapped areas were included in the development of a priority living resources map.
1	Potential Oyster Habitat	This layer is derived from NOAA's Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard. This data describes the bottom substrate conditions that can support oyster populations if potential salinity or depth (dissolved oxygen) constraints are met. Benthic data were aggregated from multiple sources to create a baywide record of seabed material in the Chesapeake Bay. Habitat polygons are classified with an adaptation of the Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard (CMECS) Substrate Component (SC). Source data were collected during the interval 1842-2014. Because of potential temporal changes in bottom conditions and deficiencies in survey methodology, benthic habitat characterizations may be in error in some areas. These are, however, the best data currently available. This is a dynamic dataset. As new surveys occur the resulting CMECS habitat characterizations will spatially replace existing habitat depictions
1	National Fish Habitat Inland Assessment (risk of current habitat degradation)	The National Fish Habitat Partnership compiled freshwater datasets available at the national scale to develop habitat vulnerability scores across the United States. Datasets included anthropogenic disturbances and accounted for natural variation at different spatial scales. Chesapeake Bay watershed scores depict the current risk of habitat degradation and do not represent regional or local data sets for specific watersheds or geographies. The most limiting disturbances for Chesapeake Bay habitats were found to be agriculture, urbanization, mining and nutrients. The areas shown on this map indicate a very low, low, or moderate risk of habitat degradation within the watershed.
2	Habitat Composite	Composite Created with guidance from Habitat GIT and Steve Fuller of NALCC. Data from RCOA tool. Composite of Aquatic Core Network (Lentic and Lotic Cores), Terrestrial Cores and Connectors Network, and the top 1/3 values (based on a quintile distribution with 3 classes) of the SGCN Habitat Condition dataset.
2	Brook Trout	Composite of High Quality and Low Stress (Low-Moderately Low) Brook trout habitat at the HUC 12's scale and Brook Trout Only catchments based on EBTJV 2015 Population Assessment. EBTJV 2015 Population Assessment- "Brook Trout Only" Classified Catchments NALCC CBW BT Assessment- Habitat Quality Score (where BT are predicted to be under NO stress, considers climate change) NALCC CBW BT Assessment- Brook Trout Total Stress (areas of habitat under anthropogenic stress)
2	American Black Duck Habitat Goals Greater than Zero	Habitat goals (in Hectares) to meet 2012 NAWMP population objectives for black ducks based on current habitat conditions (ca. 2010). HUC12s that are zero and positive mean that they are at or above the habitat goal and could be targeted for acquisition while HUC12s that are negative show the hectares needed to reach habitat goal and may need protection as well as restoration and enhancement. Habitat goal zeros (0) and Nulls Nulls indicate there was no supply (no wetlands) or demand (no harvest data) for that HUC. Zeros indicate there were wetlands but they were given no value to Black ducks - a zero score in the Habitat Capability layer from UMASS - and there was no demand (no harvest data) for that HUC. Model Run October 3 2016 https://acjv.org/ABDU/abdu_cbt_finalreport_15dec2016_v5.pdf
3	Designate Use Attainment	The Bay and its tidal tributaries can be divided into 92 segments. Each of these segments contains up to five "designated uses," including deep channel; deep water; open water; shallow water; and migratory fish, spawning and nursery. Each of these designated uses—also known as aquatic habitats—has its own set of criteria for dissolved oxygen, water clarity/underwater grasses and chlorophyll *a* designed to protect those uses. This map shows the segments that have been designated as attaining all designated use criteria. Attainment of Water Quality Standards is the ultimate goal of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.
4	State Identified Healthy Waters and Watersheds	The data presented in this map is based on state derived definitions and classifications of their own healthy waters and watersheds. Healthy watersheds begin with healthy streams, and bring resilience to the region in the form of clean water, critical habitat and social and economic benefits. Healthy watersheds are also a bargain: protecting them is much less expensive than restoring degraded waters.