

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Agenda

June 28, 2023

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

[Meeting Materials](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The LUWG approved of the [March](#) minutes.

Decision: The LUWG approved the workgroup's [updated scope and purpose](#). This will be presented to the WQGIT for subsequent approval at a later date.

Action: Please complete [this brief survey](#) (~5 min) **by COB Wed, July 26** with a short description of projects using the LULC high-resolution data to help compile information about how the dataset is being used.

Action: If you have feedback on the land use viewer used for the review process, reach out to Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org) before the September meeting.

Action: Members are encouraged to send reminders to localities to submit ancillary data - please send to cic@chesapeakeconservancy.org.

Action: Please reach out to Sarah McDonald (smcdonald@chesapeakebay.net) with any additional feedback on the [draft LUMM indicators](#).

Action: If you have any feedback or additional ideas on the development of a [land use strategy](#) for beyond 2025, please share with the LUWG leadership (pclagget@chesapeakebay.net; kfilippino@hrpdcva.gov; pickford.jacqueline@epa.gov).

Meeting Minutes

1:00 [Welcome, Roll Call, Review of Meeting Minutes, Action Item Update](#) – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (15 min).

Announcements:

- Please put your name and affiliation in the chat box for attendance purposes.
Thank you!
- **Decision:** The LUWG approved of the [March](#) minutes.
- Update on SRS process for the LUMM and LUOE outcomes – Jackie Pickford, CRC
- *[Tentative]* Update on Phase 6 CAST Schedule from WQGIT – Jackie Pickford, CRC
- LULC Use Case Survey – Jackie Pickford, CRC
- **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, September 20th, 2023.

Action: Please complete [this brief survey](#) (~5 min) **by COB Wed, July 26** with a short description of projects using the LULC high-resolution data to help compile information about how the dataset is being used.

- 1:15 Approval of Updated LUWG Scope and Purpose – Peter Claggett, USGS (10 min).
At the March meeting, Peter presented proposed updates to the LUWG scope and purpose and asked the group for feedback via email. The feedback was incorporated into the [final revised scope and purpose](#), which the LUWG voted on for approval. Following the approval, the WQGIT will be asked to subsequently approve the updates.

Discussion

KC Filippino: To clarify, we're not cutting out local gov review, we're just spending less time in the workgroup discussing the finer details of the data and rules.

Decision: The LUWG approved the workgroup's [updated scope and purpose](#). This will be presented to the WQGIT for subsequent approval at a later date.

- 1:25 Update on Status and Timeline for 2021/2022 data - Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy (20 min).
Katie provided an update on the status and a revised timeline for the production of the 2021/2022 high-resolution LULC data, as well as an update on the accuracy assessment for the 2022 and 2024 editions.

Discussion

KC Filippino: For the accuracy assessment, you'll regroup and do something for the 2022 edition? What do you mean by one layer?

Katie Walker: For the 2022 edition, we're going to resample and instead will just have one accuracy assessment per class for the entire watershed, rather than an assessment per class per jurisdiction.

Peter Claggett: We will still be able to look at the errors spatially though, so we can make inferences about the cause of errors. Will also be able to tell confusion between specific classes, which will be helpful.

KC Filippino: When will the 2022 assessment be completed?

Katie Walker: Our goal is to have the final 2022 numbers by the next LUWG meeting.

KC Filippino: We have 2021 data for DE and MD. Any clue on the other states?

Katie Walker: DE, MD, and VA are all 2021. PA and WV are 2022.

Peter Claggett: NY is a hybrid of 2021 and 2022 imagery.

Cassie Davis (in chat): Request to not have the 6-week window for jurisdictions be during September-December when we have our BMP progress due. A lot of the same people will be reviewing both, at least for NY.

Katie Walker: Yes, it will be December to March.

KC Filippino: Will the stakeholder review involve a web viewer?

Katie Walker: Yes, it will be similar to last time, but if you have feedback on the review application to make it easier to interact with, let us know between now and September. Also, for the September meeting, we will be providing a more detailed timeline for the review process

and a more thorough discussion about specific changes that have been made to classes and other various decisions.

KC Filippino: About the forest and tree canopy (TC) module considerations slide - this will result in less TC over turf?

Katie Walker: It would result in less forest. Not significantly less, but there will be less oddly shaped patches of forest and less defined forest in some areas.

KC Filippino: So it will result in more TC over turf?

Katie Walker: Yes.

KC Filippino: Can we have a running list of these forest decisions? Is this what was developed by the FWG?

Katie Walker: Yes. This aligns with what we talked about with the FWG. These details are nuances for how we better align with the FIA data. Sarah will be giving a more detailed update on this at the Sep meeting.

Sarah McDonald: In short, we're reducing TC over turf footprint, limiting it to parcels and smaller parcels around structures, and then making sure forest with really thin patches are called 'TC other' or 'TC' and not forest.

Peter Claggett: CIC did a forest technical study for MD that was done to support the reauthorization of the Forest Conservation Act. Within that legislation, the state of MD has adopted our mapping definition for forest. It resonated with them and had enough credibility to adopt.

Dave Montali: Is this revision going to turn TC over turf into turf or 'other TC' ?

Sarah McDonald: It will be 'other TC'. There will be a lot less trees over turf.

Dave Montali: So less trees over turf, but that won't increase turf, it will be classified as 'other TC' which is treated as forest in the WQ models. Correct?

Sarah McDonald: Yes, correct.

Mark Symborski: If it was canopy over turf, it is now classified as 'other TC', and then that will be considered as forest for WQ?

Sarah McDonald: Yes.

Mark Symborski: Is all 'other TC' considered forest?

Sarah McDonald: For the WQ model, all "other TC" is considered forest.

Mark Symborski: Is there a separate non-forest TC class?

Sarah McDonald: Yes, two - TC over impervious and TC over turf. They are treated separately in the WQ model.

Peter Claggett: TC over impervious and TC over turf have unique land uses in the Phase 6 model and have unique loading rates. There will be less TC over turf grass with these refinements.

Deb Sward: Related to parcel boundaries - previously there was discussion about TC over turf being limited to parcel structures. Is that still the case?

Katie Walker: Yes, that's correct.

Katie Brownson (in chat): It would be good to talk more about bullet 2- what is going to be counted as regenerative successional lands, what the minimum forest patch size is, etc.

Katie Walker: Yes, bullet two is still being considered. We're testing what that change would look like and will be reaching out to forestry stakeholders before it's finalized.

Sarah McDonald (in chat): Katie, great point. Currently we are including harvested forest and natural succession classes as regenerative. This is something we can surely discuss in a smaller group or FWG.

Katie Brownson (in chat): Sounds good, yes, let's definitely bring that one to the FWG before things get finalized.

Sarah McDonald (in chat): The minimum patch size is the same as FIA, minimum 1-acre area and 36-meter diameter.

Katie Brownson (in chat): Thanks Sarah, just wanted to clarify b/c Bullet 2 made it sounds like those minimum patch size requirements could be relaxed in some circumstances.

Action: If you have feedback on the land use viewer used for the review process, reach out to Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org) before the September meeting.

- 1:45 Revisiting the local review process / update on data requests – Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy (20 min).
Katie provided an update on the local review process and data requests for the 2021/2022 high-resolution LULC data. There was time for discussion and feedback from the group.

Discussion

Patrick McCabe (in chat): cic@chesapeakeconservancy.org. Please email this email! Thanks!

Arianna Johns (in chat): Please send me a list of those localities still needed.

KC Filippino: Yes, Arianna, I can send that to you for VA.

Action: Members are encouraged to send reminders to localities to submit ancillary data - please send to cic@chesapeakeconservancy.org.

- 2:10 Review DRAFT Land Use Methods and Metrics (LUMM) Indicators – Sarah McDonald, USGS (25 min).
Sarah reviewed the draft metrics/indicators for the LUMM outcome, as well as the associated review and approval process needed from various CBP workgroups and GITs. The LUWG will be asked to approve these indicators at a future meeting (date TBD).

Discussion

Katie Brownson: Distinguishing between riparian forest and riparian tree cover is important. We have an outcome in the CB Watershed Agreement for riparian forest, but not for riparian tree cover, so riparian forest indicator would be more valuable.

Sarah McDonald: For riparian forest, we're talking about forest and not forest and extent? Correct?

Katie Brownson: Yes. Forest and tree canopy over turf (TCOT). Don't think we want to be counting harvested areas as forest.

Sarah McDonald: Would it also be valuable to have some estimate on pervious? Should wetlands be included in that land?

Katie Brownson: Don't have a strong opinion on that.

KC Filippino: Can you explain the colors in the map?

Sarah McDonald: Green is the amount of tree cover in riparian zones, adjacent to streams. Darker green is basically all tree cover. Pink is the reduction in tree cover in the riparian zone, and yellow represents increases in tree cover. Basically, within that riparian zone in VA, I think

all of that is showing harvest - not converting land to development, rather, its being harvested and then growing back.

KC Filippino: I would think different jurisdictions would have different policies in place on replacing buffers in those areas. That information might be helpful for you.

Sarah McDonald: Thanks KC.

KC Filippino: Are some of these indicators on Chesapeake Progress?

Sarah McDonald: The indicators are complete but we're waiting on them to get posted.

Peter Claggett: There will be a press release next week. Community tree cover indicator and the impervious indicator will be released on Chesapeake Progress soon after.

KC Filippino: How is impervious cover and impervious change indicator different from land conversion from forest, farmland, and wetlands to development?

Sarah McDonald: The impervious indicator is strictly the change in impervious lands - that includes structures, roads, sidewalks, etc. The conversion from forest, farmland and wetlands are their own three indicators, which track conversion to development, so that also includes pervious development like turf grass, TC over turf grass, solar fields, etc.

Katie Brownson (in chat): It would probably be good to get the FWG to review the proposed riparian forest/TC indicators as well.

KC Filippino: Urban Stormwater WG might want to review the impervious change indicator.

Peter Claggett: We should also talk to the Habitat GIT. We need to have a clear message about forest harvest as a partnership.

Sarah McDonald: Reach out with additional feedback on the indicators. Would like to propose some by the next few meetings.

Action: Please reach out to Sarah McDonald (smcdonald@chesapeakebay.net) with any additional feedback on the [draft LUMM indicators](#).

- 2:35 Developing Recommendations for Beyond 2025 – Peter Claggett, USGS (20 min).
Peter led an initial discussion on developing a land use strategy for the “Beyond 2025” Management Board Committee to consider when planning for the future of the partnership. The LUWG was asked to provide feedback on what should be included in this strategy.

Discussion

George Onyullo (in chat): <https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-development-growth-outpacing-progress-watershed-efforts-restore>

KC Filippino: All the bullets on ‘what needs to change’ slide were discussed at the MB beyond 2025 committee meeting, which I think is really important. But the “how” was not discussed, so I’m open to ideas. Also, to the last bullet - how do we engage localities and get their buy-in to provide local data in order to improve our data products? How are states/jurisdictions engaging with their local partners? One idea - statewide repository for localities to upload their data, instead of asking for these data requests constantly.

Norm Goulet: I think we’re doing all we can do to engage local government. I’m not sure there’s more we can do. This is not a priority for them. Unless we can find a stronger reason for them to do it, it will always fall off their radar. Statewide repository won’t work in VA because we need legislative approval. Not sure what to do other than prove to localities the reason why it’s so important.

KC Filippino: I know there are other groups I could be engaging more, like local planners. Maybe once the use case survey is conducted, we'll know more about how this data is valuable and can start using that info.

Katie Brownson: I'm wondering with the next cooperative agreement for LU monitoring if there are opportunities to build in the outreach and communication aspects instead of being an afterthought or something done on an ad-hoc basis.

KC Filippino: Definitely something we can consider. Also, something that the LUWG can do - wondering if we can get an analysis on the tree canopy factsheets and how those are used, and what other tools are being used at the local level. Tools developed bottom-up are more valuable. If someone knows what the localities are interested in, then we can develop tools to meet those needs.

Samuel Canfield: Showing up to the local gov meetings. Might be resource intensive, but there's a portion of WV - portion 8 - that we've been doing that in and have seen some successes. But understand that might not be reasonable in larger states.

Deb Sward: In terms of tools being relevant to local jurisdictions, part of that is collecting local data that is processed to be used statewide. At MDP, the land preservation data standard that Renee Thompson put together for protected lands to make sure that the local data can be scaled up to be used at the regional and state level has been really useful.

Peter Claggett: The partnership can also create data that relieves reporting burdens at the local level. We could say if localities standardize local land use data, then we can map the MS4 region or something else that helps relieve the administrative burden for them. For different green infrastructure plans, local TMDLs, comprehensive plans, etc. we can bring a lot of information to them and put it in an accessible format for them. Strategy-wise - we could "trade".

KC Filippino: What are the next steps for developing a strategy?

Peter Claggett: Maybe let's focus on refining it. For example, explaining how to make our data more actionable and what that means - checks to evaluate, visitations to our website, send use case surveys, etc. Also, can leverage the use case survey - can we make the data more useful for how people are already using it? Should start from where people are already using it and build from those successes.

KC Filippino: Okay, let's refine this, build in the use cases to better inform it, and start thinking about the "how". Would be helpful to inform the WQGIT of this after it's drafted. Let's keep this topic on the agenda for September. If anyone has suggestions, ideas, or pilot projects, please send them to us.

Peter Claggett: Also, if workgroup members know of legislation that is being considered in their states that could be informed by our data, then please share it. Want to be relevant at the local level, as well as relevant to state and federal policy. If there are specific analyses we need to do to the data that could better inform policies, let us know sooner rather than later.

Action: If you have any feedback or additional ideas on the development of a [land use strategy](#) for beyond 2025, please share with the LUWG leadership (pclagget@chesapeakebay.net; kfilippino@hrpdcva.gov; pickford.jacqueline@epa.gov).

2:55 Recap of Actions and Decisions – Jackie Pickford, CRC (5 min)

3:00 Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 from 1 – 3 PM.

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC	Jeff Sweeney, EPA
KC Filippino, HRPDC	Katie Brownson, USFS
Peter Claggett, USGS	Lori Mae Brown, DNREC
Katie Walker, CIC	Mindy Neil, WVDEP
Sarah McDonald, USGS	Mark Symborski, MCPD
Allie Wagner, NRCS	Nicole Christ, MD
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ	Patrick McCabe, CIC
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC	Norm Goulet, NVRC
Dave Montali, WV Tetra Tech	Samuel Canfield, WVDEP
Deb Sward, MDP	Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Doug Myers, MD Senior Scientist	Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Erin Penzelik, PA DEP	Steven Guinn, CIC
George Onyullo, DOEE	Travis Stoe, PADEP
Grace Antonishek, MDE	Tyler Trostle, PADEP
Jenna Schueler, CBF	Young Tsuei, DOEE

Acronym List

CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program
CIC: [*Chesapeake Conservancy*] Conservation Innovation Center
COB: Close of Business
CRC: Chesapeake Research Consortium
FWG: Forestry Workgroup
LULC: Land Use / Land Cover
LUMM: Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome
LUOE: Land Use Options Evaluation Outcome
LUWG: Land Use Workgroup
MB: Management Board
QPM: Quarterly Progress Meeting
SRS: Strategy Review System
TC: Tree Canopy
USGS: United States Geological Survey
WQ: Water Quality
WQGIT: Water Quality Goal Implementation Team