

this meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

March 3rd, 2021

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: LUWG approved the February meeting minutes.

Action Requested: The LUWG is asked for feedback on the land use metrics.

- Did not have time to review in great detail during the meeting today.
- Peter Claggett will post the methods and metrics outcome document for LUWG members to review and provide feedback. It will be discussed in greater detail at a future LUWG meeting.

Decision: LUWG approved changing next month's meeting to March 31, 2021 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM.

Meeting Minutes

1:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Review of meeting minutes, Action Item Update – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

Decision: LUWG approved the February meeting minutes.

1:05 Update on High-resolution Land Cover and Hydrography Production – Rachel Soobitsky, Chesapeake Conservancy
Rachel provided a brief update on the production and review status of the high-resolution land cover and hydrography data.

Land Cover Update Discussion:

The Conservancy is still on track to complete the land cover production schedule by June. Counties for which data has yet to be issued and for which local review has not yet occurred are indicated in map form in her presentation. The presentation also detailed the systematic errors identified by the review process to date, which will be illustrated by graphic examples. For these remaining counties, it was unclear whether these systematic errors have already been fixed or not. Conservancy staff will check this status with UVM and inform the LUWG. PA DEP will touch base with Rachel to give an update on the PA counties. For the review process for southern Virginia, Peter said that Gloucester County, VA, will be ready sooner and might be a good example to use with other counties to give them an idea of what a completed county will look like.

Hydrography Update Discussion:

The yellow on slide 3 refers to counties that have not been QA/QC'd yet. Peter Claggett informed the group that new LiDAR may result in improvements in accuracy for that version. There are things that could happen in 2021 that could make that dataset more accurate. Retrospective corrections to 2017 will occur as we get better LiDAR data. KC Filippino clarified that for counties that have no data they won't be updated until the new classification.

- 1:10 Update on High-resolution Land Use Production – Jacob Czawlytko, Chesapeake Conservancy
Jacob provided a brief update on the production of the high-resolution land use data for the 14 prototype counties and the reasons why it has fallen behind schedule

Discussion:

Lisa Beatty asked if something like track changes could be used to see what changes were made to the LU classification document. Rachel Soobitsky noted that the changes were summarized within the document after the list of the land use classifications. Lisa Beatty suggested putting page numbers next to each change to direct the reader to where those changes were made.

Peter Claggett asked if CC could provide the LUWG a target date for:

1. When the first round of classes will be complete for the 14 counties
2. When the second round of classes will be complete for the 14 counties
3. When all the classes will be complete for the 14 counties

The low vegetation that is getting completed first is also the hardest to do. Everything else after this should be easier. Jacob said that once the code is stable and in production mode, they will be sharing the code to anyone that wants to dive in. KC Filippino is concerned with this approach and wondered if it will affect prior classes that have been reviewed. Jacob Czawlytko said that certain classes will be influenced and others will not. Norm agreed with KC; the incremental approach is good for internal review, but won't work for review at the local level. Peter said that external review by counties should wait until they have the whole product, but the piece-meal approach could work for WGs since they generally only care for how it will affect their group. For the completion of all classes, Jacob Czawlytko said it will most likely take 2 weeks and then some more time to tweak the rules. Dave Montali said that there is a review process for some counties so there is another month that will need to be added.

- 1:20 Review of Land Use for 14 Prototype Counties – Peter Claggett, U.S. Geological Survey
Peter was not able to present data for a subset of the 14 counties but discussed the schedule (see below) for review and approval of the 2017 land use data: What to look for in the data; How to provide feedback; Roles of the various sector workgroups: Land Use, Agriculture, Urban Stormwater, Forestry, and Wetlands.

Discussion:

Asked about the need for local review of the land use data for the prototype counties, most of the state representatives indicated that they would include this as part of their review process. Lisa Beatty suggested that we reach out to contacts to ensure that we have to right people to review the 14 counties, which would also make these contacts aware that this will be coming to them soon. NY and the USC is ready for their localities to look at this. MD and VA also want their localities to look at this too. WV has a couple people that would be interested, specifically for the Ag information. DE also would like their localities review and they have some folks in Ag too. Rachel indicated that she would include state contacts in her email outreach to counties, so everyone is on the same page. Norm Goulet said that there are a number of GIT representatives, like NGOs etc. that are not in the typical Bay loop and may need more time to review. Peter Claggett suggested that a revised schedule will have final approval by the WQGIT in May; however, he will also present preliminary information to the WQGIT in prior months so as to better prepare the membership for its May decision. Norm Goulet said that Peter should also provide the schedule for source sector WG meetings so that if WQGIT members cannot attend they can go to one of those meetings. Karl Berger suggested that if anyone does have a systematic issue that they should let the team know immediately and not wait for the next LUWG

this meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

meeting. Peter agreed and added that Rachel could add that in her email, so people know to send those mistakes to the team ASAP.

Lisa Beatty said that PA gave the abandoned and active mine information to the team and that if they are having trouble with the data to reach out so PA can get them in touch with the local contacts to help. She also emphasized that this data is extremely important to PA and that it should be classified not as Ag but as its own. If it is just lumped with Ag, it is not getting the right loading rate that it should be. Additionally, these counties have put a lot of money into making these areas viable habitat. Rachel Soobitsky said CC is having Washington College hand digitize all abandoned and active mines using points as reference, but the oil pads are trickier (for the entire Bay, including PA). Lee Epstein asked if abandoned mining lands are the same in Western PA as they are in Eastern PA? Lisa Beatty said she wasn't sure, but they did differentiate between active and passive sites (Lee Epstein will reach out to Lisa and get this information back to Peter). Peter Claggett followed up that the USC (Upper Susquehanna Coalition) clarified that abandoned mine areas can't be cropland because the ground is too compact so they should be classed as suspended succession. If the situation in NE PA is different, that would be helpful to know.

2:00 Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome – Peter Claggett, U.S. Geological Survey
Peter did a brief review and solicited feedback on metrics that are planned to be generated from the high-resolution land cover and hydrography data (e.g., % riparian forest) to meet the requirements of the Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome.

Action Requested: The LUWG is asked for feedback on the land use metrics.

- Did not have time to review in great detail during the meeting today.
- Peter Claggett will post the methods and metrics outcome document for LUWG members to review and provide feedback. It will be discussed in greater detail at a future LUWG meeting.

2:45 Wrap-up/Upcoming Meeting Schedule – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

Next meeting will be moved to 1 week earlier due to the Modeling WG quarterly meeting the first week of April.

Decision: LUWG approved changing next month's meeting to **March 31, 2021 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM.**

3:00 Adjourn

Next conference call: March 31, 2021 from 1:00 – 3:00 PM - Land Use Workgroup Meeting.

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Karl Berger, MWCOG
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Peter Claggett, USGS
Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP
Travis Stoe, PA DEP
Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Sarah McDonald, USGS

this meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

Gopal Bhatt, Penn State
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech (WV)
Mindy Neil, WV DEP
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Nicole Christ, MDE
Deborah Sward, MDP
Ruth Cassilly, UMD
Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG)
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
George Onyullo, DOEE
Rachel Soobitsky, CC
Jacob Czawlytko, CC
Patrick McCabe, CC
Miriam Pomilio, DE OSP
Dorothy Morris, OSPC
Lori Brown, DNREC
Clint Gill, DDA
Labeeb Ahmed, USGS
Sally Claggett, USFS
Rick Turcotte, USFS
Lee Epstein, CBF
Mark Symborski, Montgomery County Planning
Tori Nelson, UMBC

this meeting is recorded for internal use to ensure the accuracy of the meeting minutes

The following schedule has been updated as of 2-25-21 and illustrates the months when local review and sector workgroup feedback has been or will be solicited. **Red** cells refer to months for official approvals.

2017 Land Use Production Schedule		2020			2021											
Order	Task	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
1	Local review of 2017 Land Cover Data	University of Vermont Spatial Analysis Laboratory														
2	Draft Hyper-resolution Hydrography	UMBC, Chesapeake Conservancy Conservation Innovation Center (CIC)														
3	Cropland, Pasture, Orchards, and Turf Grass	AGWG		AGWG	AGWG	AGWG	AGWG, LUWG	AGWG, LUWG								
4	Suspended Succession, Bare Shore, and Solar Fields	LUWG				LUWG	USWG	LUWG								
5	Tidal & NonTidal Wetlands	WWG		WWG		WWG		WWG, LUWG								
6	Forests, Tree Canopy, Timber Harvests, and Natural Succession			FWG		FWG		FWG, LUWG								
7	Bare Construction, P6 Roll-up Decision Rules, FedFac Land Uses				LUWG		USWG, FedFac	LUWG								
8	Prototype Land Use in 14 counties			Chesapeake Conservancy												
9	Approve 2017 LU Mapping and P6 Roll-up Methods (14 counties)						LUWG	LUWG, WQGIT								
10	Complete 2017 Land Use Dataset (all 206 counties)						CIC									
11	Revise 2013 Land Use (to match 2017 for all counties)						CIC		LUWG	CIC						
12	Update MS4s, Sewer, Zoning, and Population Projections						CBP Land Data Team									
13	Revise Agricultural Forecast Methodology	AGWG					AGWG		AGWG							
14	Update Land Policy BMPs (future LULC scenarios)										LUWG					
15	Update 2013, 2017, and 2025 data for CAST-21										LUWG	WQGIT				
16	Public release- with streams, potential wetlands, minor fixes												WWG	LUWG	WQGIT	