

## CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

May 18th, 2022

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

**Meeting Materials:** [Link](#)

### **Summary of Actions and Decisions**

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

**Action:** Katie Walker will share the link to the web viewer for the 2017/18 land cover, land use, and 2013/14 - 2017/18 land use change data.

**Action:** Please let Katie Walker ([kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org](mailto:kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org)) know if there is any user interface feedback for the web viewers that would make them easier to use.

**Action:** Katie Walker will provide instructions, guidance, and a due date for the upcoming review of the 2017/18 data.

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

#### *Announcements:*

- **Decision:** Approve the April [meeting minutes](#).
- **Announcement:** Classification of Solar - Peter Claggett, USGS
  - Recent discussions with EPA and solar industry representatives to address concerns about VA DEQ policy treating solar panels as impervious surface. Phase 6 model does not have a solar classification but we will moving forward.
  - STAC workshop planned for Fall or Spring 2023 will explore hydrological water quality impacts of solar fields. CBP will likely abide by recommendations from that workshop on how to treat solar in the Phase 7 model.
  - **Norm Goulet:** When does it become appropriate that this issue moves from LUWG to USWG? I'm not sure the LUWG wants to be involved in these discussions.
  - **KC Filippino:** I'm not sure. Hopefully the STAC workshop report/recommendations will provide direction on which groups should deal with it.
  - **Peter Claggett:** There is a regulatory/policy aspect to this. Maybe USWG can have something in parallel to the workshop that addresses that. Laura McPhillips is leading the workshop. I'll reach out to Laura to introduce you, Norm.
- **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, June 15th from 1:00 - 3:00 PM.

1:15 Release of final 2017/18 land cover, land use, and land use change data - Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy (30 min).

Katie gave an overview of the web viewers and data accessibility for the 2017/18 land cover, land use, and 2013/14 - 2017/18 land use change data. Katie Walker will share the data and viewer with full suite of contacts (localities, LUWG, ancillary data folks, statewide contacts, use-case scenario for active projects, etc.) once available. CIC will have published documentation in the next few months.

LU classification methods for 17/18 data: [Here](#).

CIC Webinar: May 24th at 1:00 PM

- Informational webinar and user tutorial. Will review how to use the viewers.
- Will be recorded.
- [Link to register](#).

Link to Press Release: [Here](#).

Link to CIC Website: [LC/LU Data Project](#)

**Action:** Katie Walker will share the link to the web viewer for the 2017/18 land cover, land use, and 2013/14 - 2017/18 land use change data.

**Action:** Let Katie Walker ([kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org](mailto:kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org)) know if there is any user interface feedback for the web viewers that would make them easier to use.

- 1:45 Comparison of version 1 and version 2 (final) data – Sarah McDonald, USGS (40 min)  
Sarah presented an overview of land use and change statistics from the final 2017/18 data and a comparison between the version 1 and version 2 land cover, land use, and land change data for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and select counties. The version 1 data will be used in CAST-21. The version 2 data will be used in CAST-23. Two journal articles will be produced - one on land use change and one on land use. Submission by mid-summer. Peter will share a draft of these once available. Following the discussion, Peter showed a comparison between ag census and 17/18 data.

### Discussion

**KC Filippino:** Crop and pasture ag increase is directly related to the shift in mixed open?

**Sarah McDonald:** Yes, for the most part.

**Cassie Davis:** Will that improved ag mapping impact the footprint of ag in CAST-23?

**Sarah McDonald:** The land use data will not. In CAST-23, we'll be using updated land use change data on top of the original 2013 mapping. We might be able to implement the 2017 updated mapping for Phase 7.

**Jacob Czawlytko:** The ag increases will mostly be coming from the suspended and natural succession classes.

**Norm Goulet:** Is this evenly distributed throughout the watershed? Or did you have "hot spots"?

**Sarah McDonald:** I think it's fairly consistent across the watershed.

**Jacob Czawlytko:** We decreased our reliance on the local land use and increased the reliance on the CDL and NLCD information. These trends are mostly in ag areas. Urban areas barely changed at all between the versions.

**Peter Claggett:** County by county, the changes in ag are a couple hundred acres between the 13 and 17 datasets. These V2 values compare favorably to the ag census.

**KC Filippino:** Is this broken down by state?

**Sarah McDonald:** Not here, but I do have tables for it by state that I can provide if you want.

**KC Filippino:** Can the journal articles be reviewed by the communications team?

**Sarah McDonald:** Appendix B goes through how to read these tables and specific transitions and how to interpret them.

**Norm Goulet:** Can we get a really high-level summary of this? Trying to explain this to local governments, watershed bodies, WQGIT or MB would be difficult. We need a high-level overview of the changes between V1 and V2, maybe a two pager without the detailed analysis.

**KC Filippino:** I think it has to be made clear that input was given and received and ancillary data was used to improve upon version 1 to create version 2. Need to make it clear, early and often, why and how the land use in CAST-23 is different from the land use in CAST-21.

**Peter Claggett:** Maybe we can itemize things that needed to be fixed in Version 1 and show that in doing so, it resulted in these overall changes in version 2.

**KC Filippino:** Another ask is to quantify the actual change and what the data is telling us.

**Norm Goulet:** Yeah, but I think you need to scale back the tables and information.

**Katie Walker:** Right, for the broader partnership, we'll say that we're using a different version and what the impact of that is on other processes, which would be loading rates, for example.

- 2:25 Schedule and Expectations for 2021/22 land use data - Peter Claggett, USGS (35 min). Peter presented on the schedule and expectations for the 2021/2022 land cover and land use data products, including the anticipated timeline and the role of the LUWG and localities in the process. The LUWG will have a comprehensive discussion about the details of the local review process at a future meeting.

## Discussion

**Katie Walker (in chat):** Peter, we can use a survey to collect feedback on the webpage! :) Maybe we can avoid dropping all those emails in your inbox.

**Lisa Beatty:** Will the local review be structured? How will that work?

**Peter Claggett:** I'm not exactly sure. We have the viewers available. What we want in the local review is identification of systematic errors.

**Lisa Beatty:** Can we have a standardized language of what you want from them, how to submit comments, instructions, as well as specific due dates?

**KC Filippino:** To clarify, we're talking about the review of local data for 21-22, with the knowledge that we're only going to have MD and DE available. The other states are listed on this timeline. Don't know if that same process was going to happen this time around.

**Katie Walker:** The rest of the counties are built into the timeline - October 2023 for local review. Both local review timelines will be next year. It will depend on when we get the NAIP imagery.

**Deb Sward:** To what extent are prototype counties being used?

**Peter Claggett:** First review of what we just produced is to inform the 21/22 mapping, which will then inform the redo of the 17/18 and 13/14 if needed. All counties can participate in that. Then when we start producing the data, because we'll be waiting on the imagery that won't come until later, we may hop around a bit and sample some counties in states other than MD and DE. Not sure they will be the same 14 counties as before. The counties we choose will depend on the availability of lidar and NAIP imagery.

**Deb Sward:** In MD, counties had interest in reviewing both the land use and land cover. But I definitely think we need an established timeline for those local reviews.

**Cassie Davis:** NY counties had a lot of interest in the land use, not a lot in the land cover. Personally, I think NY would like to have a local review of land use and not land cover.

**Peter Claggett:** Is there a need to have a local review of land cover? Or should we just do the local review for the land use?

**Deb Sward:** For land cover, was there feedback that was raised in the local review that was not previously raised?

**Peter Claggett:** It was helpful to have, but not sure it would be necessary to do again.

**Deb Sward:** I'd like to talk to other people in the state. But if there is already a detailed QA/QC process for the LC then it might not be as necessary.

**Lori Brown, DE (in chat):** Sorry, I am having mic issues. I would have to chat with folks, but I agree getting feedback on the land use is key. I know we have a couple of people that would do both, but it is challenging to get people to commit to reviewing.

**Lisa Beatty:** LC was useful for the first round, but if we're in a time crunch I think we should focus only on LU. Our local people like to do both, though. We didn't have many counties do LU review. It would be nice to have LU and LC review at the same time.

**Mark Symborski:** I think we'd like a chance to look at both LC and LU.

**Peter Claggett:** From a production perspective, it might be challenging to do both LU and LC review for all counties at the same time, because if there are edits to the LC, we have to rerun the entire LU, which would increase the budget and derail the timeline. But maybe there is a middle ground we can find with the prototype counties.

**KC Filippino:** To clarify, there is not a formal review this summer. We just encourage review of the current land use to refine the 2021/22 data.

**Lisa Beatty:** For PA, our suggestion for 2021/22 is for the counties to give feedback after the tutorial and webinar. Please give us a date by which you want feedback and explain at the webinar what you're looking for.

**KC Filippino:** Let's have a comprehensive discussion about the local review at a future meeting and jurisdictions should come back to the LUWG with what their expectations are.

**Action:** Katie Walker will provide instructions, guidance, and a due date for the upcoming review of the 2017/18 data.

3:00 Adjourn

### Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC

KC Filippino, HRPDC

Peter Claggett, USGS-CBPO

Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy

Cassie Davis, NYS DEC

Tree Zuzzio, PA DCED

Erik Fisher, Chesapeake Bay Foundation

Arianna Johns, VADEQ

Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting

Allie Wagner, NVRC

Karl Berger, COG

Sarah McDonald, USGS CBPO

Travis Stoe, PADEP

Katie Brownson, USFS

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP

Young Tsuei- DC Dept of Energy and Environment

Lori Brown, DE DNREC

Mark Symborski, M-NCPPC, Montgomery Planning

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Labeeb Ahmed, USGS

Deborah Sward, Maryland Department of Planning

Ruth Cassilly, UMD CBPO

Jacob Czawlytko, Chesapeake Conservancy

Norm Goulet, NVRC

Sophie Waterman, CRC

Patrick McCabe