

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

June 15th, 2022

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The LUWG approved the May [meeting minutes](#).

Action: The Chesapeake Conservancy is planning a more structured way to receive feedback for the Version 2 data. More guidance and timeline to come. Please email Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org) with any immediate feedback in the meantime.

Action: The Chesapeake Conservancy will produce a formal document that outlines the lessons learned from the 2017/18 mapping effort in more detail.

Action: The LUWG leadership will send out a survey to the LUWG as an opportunity to provide feedback on the role of the workgroup in the 2021/22 mapping effort.

Action: KC Filippino, Chair, and Jackie Pickford, Staffer, will follow up with the LUWG on the guidelines for GIT funding projects and ask for feedback from the group on potential projects.

1:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Review of Meeting Minutes, Action Item Update – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (10 min).

Announcements:

- **Decision:** The LUWG approved the May [meeting minutes](#).
- **Action:** The Chesapeake Conservancy is planning a more structured way to receive feedback for the Version 2 data. More guidance and timeline to come. Please email Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org) with any immediate feedback in the meantime.
- **Announcement:** No July meeting or August meeting TENTATIVELY. Will come back in September with concrete plans for review and process of data.
- **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, July 20th from 1:00 - 3:00 PM

1:10 The Maryland Department of Planning's Statewide Land Use Map Update - Deborah Sward, Maryland Department of Planning (25 min).

Deb presented an overview of Maryland Department of Planning's statewide land use mapping update for 2020 followed by a discussion about potential differences between Maryland Department of Planning's land use and the future 2021/22 Chesapeake Bay Program's land use/land cover data.

Discussion

Peter Claggett (in chat): Was an improvement \$ value used as a threshold for what constitutes an "improvement" in your rule set.

Deb Sward (in chat): An improved parcel generally has a residential, commercial, or industrial building (based on CAMA building codes) or an improvement of some kind based on the parcel's commercial and industrial use code). This could be a building or something like a fence of any improvement value.

Peter Claggett: Is the CAMA data unique to Maryland?

Deb Sward: I think so, yes.

Peter Claggett: In the past, for our data we've tried to be consistent across jurisdictions in the type of data inputs, but maybe we could reconsider that moving forward.

Peter Claggett (in chat): Do counties with their own land use classification require a many-to-one correspondence with the statewide map?

Deb Sward: We did a survey in the beginning and some people say the state data is too coarse for their purposes, and some say they had their own data but still used our data for different applications. We're still working through the process of rolling up the data for some counties.

Samuel Canfield: Might be worth distinguishing fences that are commercial and industrial vs fences that are residential.

1:35 Maryland's Healthy Watersheds Assessment – Nancy Roth, Tetra Tech (25 min).

Nancy presented an overview of the Maryland Healthy Watershed Assessment pilot project supported with GIT* funding. Nancy's presentation highlighted the utility of the latest high-res land use/land cover data.

Discussion

Samuel Canfield: Have you considered VRP over random forest (RF) technique?

Nancy Roth: Yes, but I'm not the modeler. Brian Pickard does the modeling, I don't remember the reason he chose RF.

Samuel Canfield: Reduction of variables of covariance has not been implemented yet, correct?

Nancy Roth: Yes, we have a couple more runs since we just got some of the metrics in. This is just preliminary.

Samuel Canfield: A beneficial process is variance inflation factor (VIF) which takes into account collinearity between different covariant. If you use "R", there is code for a backwards and forwards selection process within the modeling code.

KC Filippino: Will this be used to guide funding for projects that might help conserve these areas that you've identified?

Nancy Roth: MD Forest Service is in the middle of tree planting goal and is interested in using this and the high-res data to do tree plantings, so that's an immediate application of this.

2:00 Preliminary Lessons Learned from the production of the 2017/18 LULC* data- Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy (40 min).

Katie reviewed the lessons learned from the initial 2013/14 mapping effort, how they were addressed in the latest 2017/18 mapping effort, and what additional lessons were learned that will inform the 2021/22 mapping effort. There will be a more formal document produced in the future that outlines the lessons learned in more depth.

Discussion

KC Filippino: For the standardized metadata template, would you send that out or would you do that on your end?

Katie Walker: That will be on our end. We didn't have a standardized way of doing that previously.

KC Filippino: Hard to have "pencils down" deadline when it is such an iterative process. Have you thought about how that will work?

Katie Walker: Agreed. A lot of the process will be iterative, but we still want to make a hard deadline for the final release of the data or at least the final processing/quality control portion.

Peter Claggett: Need to know from LUWG what they want to participate in and what they don't. Need to clarify the role of the workgroup in the schema of this dataset.

KC Filippino: Maybe we can send out a survey to the WG about what worked, what didn't, and what the WG wants moving forward.

Action: The Chesapeake Conservancy will produce a formal document that outlines the lessons learned from the 2017/18 mapping effort in more detail.

Action: The LUWG leadership will send out a survey to the LUWG as an opportunity to provide feedback on the role of the workgroup in the 2021/22 mapping effort.

2:40 GIT* Funding Brainstorm Session - All (20 min).

KC briefly mentioned the opportunity for GIT funding projects and asked the LUWG for feedback via email.

Action: KC Filippino, Chair, and Jackie Pickford, Staffer, will follow up with the LUWG on the guidelines for GIT funding projects and ask for feedback from the group on potential projects.

3:00 Adjourn

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC

KC Filippino, HRPDC

Peter Claggett, USGS-CBPO

Deb Sward, MDP

Katie Walker, CIC

Gopal Bhatt

Sarah McDonald, USGS-CBPO

Ruth Cassilly, UMD-CBPO

Rex Robichaux, VA

Norm Goulet, NVRC

Nichole Christ, MDE

Nathan Timm, MDE

Nancy Roth, Tetra Tech

Mark Symborski, M-NCPPC

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jacob Czawlytko, CIC

Sally Claggett, US Forest Service-CBP

Ted Tesler, PADEP

Lori Brown, DE DNREC

Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting

Shannon McKenrick, Maryland Dept. of Environment

Dave Montali, WV, Tetra Tech, MWG

Arianna Johns VA DEQ

Allie Wagner, NVRC

Rick Turcotte, USDA Forest Service, Morgantown Field Office

Young Tsuei, DC Dept of Energy and Environment

Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP

Tree Zuzzio PA Department of Community and
Economic Development
Labeeb Ahmed, USGS