

Local Action Quarterly Progress Meeting Summary November 15, 2018

Land Use Methods and Metrics Development

Outcome: Continually improve the knowledge of land conversion and the associated impacts throughout the watershed. By 2016, develop a watershed-wide methodology and local-level metrics for characterizing the rate of farmland, forest and wetland conversion, measuring the extent and rate of change in impervious surface coverage and quantifying the potential impacts of land conversion to water quality, healthy watersheds and communities. Launch a public awareness campaign to share this information with local governments, elected officials and stakeholders.

Challenges:

- Activities associated with the TMDL Mid-Point Assessment all but consumed the attention of the CBPO GIS Team and Land Use Workgroup from 2013-2018
- Updating datasets and model inputs will continue to strain GIS Team resources every odd year through 2025. Assessing the impacts of land change to habitats, streams, watersheds, and communities will further strain GIS Team resources.
- Resources to conduct a scientific literature review on high-resolution methods (Action 1.4).
- Emergence of new, affordable technologies to track wetland change.



Are we on track?

- We're on track to complete monitoring of land cover/use change throughout the watershed at 1-meter resolution by 2020 – four years past the original deadline of 2016. Incorporating high-resolution data into our historic assessments of land use change reveal that agricultural conversions to development are much greater than expected based exclusively on moderate resolution data.
- Assessing and communicating the impacts of land use change will depend on CBP management priorities and continued funding support for CBPO GIS Team activities.

Based on what we've learned, we plan to:

- Assess historic land use change by combining 2013 high-resolution land use data with annual, coarser-resolution, land cover/use data for the period 1985 – 2013.
- Update the high-resolution land use data every two years with hot-spot change detection techniques and every 4-5 years with complete remapping of the watershed at 1m resolution.
- Initiate cross-GIT conversations concerning land change impacts to habitats, watersheds, and communities.
- Extend the time frame to fulfill this outcome to December 2021.

Management Board Ask:

- Delegate updating of jurisdiction- specific datasets to the jurisdictions (e.g., MS4s, protected lands, sewer service areas, and zoning). This will help free-up resources to work on this outcome.
- Adjust the outcome language to extend the completion date to December 2021.

Land Use Options Evaluation Outcome

Monitoring & Assessment Outcome: By the end of 2017, with the direct involvement of local governments or their representatives, evaluate policy options, incentives and planning tools that could assist them in continually improving their capacity to the reduce the rate of conversion of agricultural lands, forests and wetlands as well as the rate of changing landscapes from more natural lands that soak up pollutants to those that are paved over, hardscaped or otherwise impervious. Strategies should be developed for supporting local governments' and others' efforts in reducing these rates by 2025 and beyond.

Challenges:

- “Participating partners” is made up of HWGIT coordinator and staffer
 - Not seeking to form a new workgroup. Aim to better tie into existing efforts.
- Factor: Education and outreach to local state governments
 - Gaps: HWGIT capacity; Knowledge on how to package materials and reach audience
 - Approaches: Gather materials and put them on a platform; Survey to determine effective options



Progress:

- GIT funding projects have driven progress on this outcome
 - Approach to Chesapeake Bay Land Use Policy Tasks
 - Conservation Land-Use Policy Toolkit
 - Healthy Watersheds Forest Retention Project

Cross outcomes with projects and workplan actions tied to Land Use Options Evaluation:

- Local Leadership, SAV, Healthy Watersheds, Brook Trout, Protected Lands, Tree Canopy, Fish Habitat
- See narrative for details on projects.

Management Board Ask:

- Support integration into existing CBP efforts
 - Let subject matter experts present to your relevant groups
 - Increase collaboration and incorporate policies, plans, and incentives for reducing land conversion into your outcomes
 - Tap into sources for local government engagement and outreach to provide content

Tree Canopy

Outcome: Continually increase urban tree canopy capacity to provide air quality, water quality and habitat benefits throughout the watershed. Expand urban tree canopy by 2,400 acres by 2025.

Challenges:

- Many drivers of loss (development, storms, pests)
- Weak or nonexistent local ordinances and staffing
- Inadequate or patchy funding
- People take trees for granted and sometimes focus on the negatives
- State progress is a work in progress. Hope to have complete report by May 2019
- Local action is fundamental
- Funding/policy – still highest needs locally
- More stormwater/WIP integration to drive implementation and tracking
- Need better tracking and reporting systems for urban tree BMPs



Progress:

- Funding and partnerships – state urban forestry programs; tree canopy financing guide – this should be a catalyst to build state and local capacity
- Policy and ordinances – three urban tree BMPs that can be used by localities:
 - Urban tree planting, urban forest planting, and urban forest buffers
- Technical knowledge and capacity – land cover data (more accurate assessment of change in tree canopy overtime). Solid watershed baseline for 2013
- Community Education and outreach – tree canopy website; collaboration with Diversity Workgroup
- Indicator for Tree Canopy outcome:
 - Two components*: 1) States report three urban BMPs annually to track progress towards meeting the Bay TMDL 2) Long term progress analyzed through remote sensing in CBP Land Cover updates *pending WQGIT approval

Management Board Ask: need to double check

- Build state and local capacity through new funding and policy strategies
 - Help us plant and protect more trees!
 - Provide CBP Communications, LGAC, and cross-outcome support for integrated messaging and outreach campaign
 - Support action team on tree canopy funding and policy strategies with high level state representation
- Promote tree canopy more vigorously through WIP efforts and state and local stormwater programs
 - Assure agency teamwork in integrating tree canopy goals in WIP planning and stormwater program delivery
- Increase local and partner engagement in tree canopy strategies and tracking progress
 - Engage local partners in Tree Canopy Summit 2.0 – come to the summit! Help your local partners participate and identify funding for support

Local Leadership

Outcome: Continually increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions.

Challenges:

- Access to resources – adequate sharing of knowledge and information
- No existing educational curriculum designed for local officials (and the curriculums that do exist do not resonate with local officials)
- How to capture the attention and focus of local officials and communities?
- How to increase opportunities for peer-to-peer knowledge?
- How to enhance the relationship between local officials and trusted officials?



Progress:

- Ecologix report: “Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Official Watershed Education and Capacity Building”
 - Report identified categories that resonate with local officials: economic development, infrastructure, public health and safety
- Development of methodology for surveying knowledge of local leaders
- How do we know if we’re on track? We measure a baseline.
 - Target audience: local officials from Bay watershed jurisdictions
 - Web based survey to collect data
 - “Hybrid” sample approach of both “known” and “unknown” local leaders
 - “known” local leaders are those who have interacted with the Bay Program and “unknown” local leaders are those who have not

Re-energized workgroup:

- Workgroup had been inactive for the last 15 months
- Recently hired coordinator
- Refreshed the workgroup representation (equal representation from various parts of watershed)
- New leadership bringing in new ideas
- Held in-person workgroup meeting on October 11, 2018

Management Board Ask:

- We have no “new” requests of the Management Board today!
- We want continued support in recognizing the **enormous** role that local governments play in meeting the Goals and Outcomes of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.
- The workgroup has put several efforts into place to address barriers to achieving this outcome.
- If significant obstacles are encountered before the next strategy review in 2020, the workgroup may consider a request for assistance from the Management Board.