

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Agenda

July 1st, 2020

1:00 PM – 3:45 PM

Zoom: <https://zoom.us/j/93253118997>

Conference Line: 1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 932 5311 8997

Meeting Password: 658665

Participant ID: Available through Zoom link

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **DECISION:** LUWG approved the meeting minutes from May
- **ACTION:** State representatives are encouraged to reach out to their local contacts to check on the status of the land cover review and to provide additional comments. Rachel Soobitsky will send the list of local contacts for PA (elbeatty@pa.gov) to help connect the correct people.
- **ACTION:** CIC will document and provide a crosswalk on how the Virginia data was manipulated to align different land classes from the 2013/14 analysis and 2017/18 analysis.
- **ACTION:** Peter Claggett (USGS) will discuss alternative stream classifications for the hyper-res hydrography data (e.g., perennial, intermittent, ephemeral, gully) with Matt Baker (UMBC) and David Saavedra (CIC). How the CBP classifies streams will require vetting through both the Habitat GIT and Water Quality GIT and therefore may require final Management Board. The goal is to produce a consistent characterization of streams and other fluvial landscape features throughout the Bay watershed.
- **ACTION:** Peter Claggett (USGS) will provide the LUWG with a whitepaper on land use decision rules and disseminate to appropriate workgroups to get on their agendas for discussion and feedback.
- **ACTION:** The LUWG is requested to send suggestions to Iris Allen (iris.allen@maryland.gov) on how to classify and track the land-use of the deforestation.
- **ACTION:** Peter Claggett will send Iris Allen, Sarah McDonald's analysis that identifies areas that have gone in and out of harvest to help project if the loss is more likely to lead towards future development or go back to forest to see if it has been in rotation in the past.
- **ACTION:** Move the decision on railroad classification to August 5th's meeting agenda.

1:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Review of meeting minutes, Action Item Update – K. Filippino, HRPDC

DECISION: LUWG approved the meeting minutes from May

1:10 Production Schedule, Review Process and Status for updates to High-res Land Cover Data – R. Soobitsky, Conservation Innovation Center - Chesapeake Conservancy

Rachel will provide an update on the status of the 2017 high-res land cover data production and review process and discuss the comments received to date from local jurisdictions.

Questions & Discussion:

Karl Berger: Has the pandemic put us behind schedule at all?

Rachel Soobitsky: There are a few delays, but we are still within the June 2021 deadline.

KC Filippino: Of the 7 counties where the review time has passed, is it no response or data looks good?

Rachel Soobitsky: Those ones I have gotten no response from yet which is why we are being really flexible. It is possible I may not have the right contact information. I've emailed state organizations with the counties and contacts that I have.

Karl Berger: Suggestion for the state folks on the call, seeing this list and looking at the ones that haven't responded – it may help for you as a state if you have contacts with those counties to ask about the data review or could you help with that process?

Lisa Beatty: If you could please send me the list of contacts for PA - we could help introduce you to the correct person. My email is elbeatty@pa.gov I do know that most Conservation District staff have returned to the office and are completing field work on a limited basis.

KC Filippino: Will there be a crosswalk for this?

Rachel Soobitsky: Yes, I can put those together when this is all finalized.

Peter Claggett: A lot of land cover information was lost when Virginia burnt in polygons and didn't classify what was underneath them so UVM and CIC had to do that work after the fact.

Rachel Soobitsky: Moving forward in the 9-class one that does not have wetlands we are working with UVM to get the detail back up to where it was before.

Norm Goulet: It will be really good to document that up front because when we get to the back-end of this and we start doing comparisons and seeing the differences, it will be good to remember that.

Peter Claggett: Point is well taken norm that we need to do a good job documenting. We need to do a good job documenting because there will be a lot of manipulations to the Virginia data and there will be inconsistencies in counties outside of the watershed vs. inside the watershed.

ACTION: State representatives are encouraged to reach out to their local contacts to check on the status of the land cover review and to provide additional comments. Rachel Soobitsky will send the list of local contacts for PA (elbeatty@pa.gov) to help connect the correct people.

ACTION: CIC will document and provide a crosswalk on how the Virginia data was manipulated to align different land classes from the 2013/14 analysis and 2017/18 analysis.

1:30 [Status of Hyper-res Hydrography production](#) – D. Saavedra, Conservation Innovation Center - Chesapeake Conservancy
David will provide an update on the status of hyper-res hydrography data production and review.

Questions & Discussion:

Peter Claggett: When will you be releasing the bank width and channel height for the areas like the Lower Susquehanna that have already been completed?

David Saavedra: As far as the timeline for the second draft I am not entirely sure. We have some students at UMBC who are working to re-vamp the manual correction process and last I heard they were about half-way finished. I would estimate we could start at the end of the summer.

Peter Claggett: Will you get to water permanence in the next 6-10 months?

David Saavedra: I am not sure, we have not started on that yet.

Karl Berger: Can you weigh in on the review process for what you produce? Do you anticipate county folks or technical experts?

David Saavedra: We had an advisory committee for the Lower Susquehanna with USGS and geomorphologist. We plan to do a third-party review for other areas. It is a little tough to get this in the hands of local stakeholders because some of these streams you can't see with local imagery and it can be challenging to go out and visit the site to see if it is a stream or not.

Karl Berger: I know you're not going to ground truth everything but I suggest there be other local eyes of this other than the conservancy and UBM that are already doing the work.

Peter Claggett: Matt Keefer from the Bureau of Forestry in PA DCNR and his GIS team are looking at the 2017 land cover and Ariana Johns expressed interest in looking at some of these data.

David, when you are ready to present bank height and channel width to technical review committee I think they would be interested in seeing that.

Norm Goulet: Suggest webinars by major basin as the information is completed in order to touch numerous relative people at once easily, allowing anyone interested to dive into the information.

KC Filippino: We could help facilitate that through the Land Use Workgroup

Karl Berger: Need to document the technical review of hydrography so that it is available to everyone.

Peter Claggett: One thing that would help with these basin presentations is getting feedback from the conservancy regarding how they would like to see the data and what is of interest.

Norm Goulet: The most important aspect of this is for the viewer to drill down to the areas that they are more knowledgeable with to see if what is classified as a stream is a stream

Peter Claggett: What is really important is this what is a stream vs. what is not a stream discussion.

David and Matt have minimized omission areas but that means that a lot of things that we would not call a stream are being classified as streams.

ACTION: Peter Claggett (USGS) will discuss alternative stream classifications for the hyper-res hydrography data (e.g., perennial, intermittent, ephemeral, gully) with Matt Baker (UMBC) and David Saavedra (CIC). How the CBP classifies streams will require vetting through both the Habitat GIT and Water Quality GIT and therefore may require final Management Board. The goal is to produce a consistent characterization of streams and other fluvial landscape features throughout the Bay watershed.

KC Filippino: This will be a touchpoint in the future once Peter and David get connected. Forestry workgroup would like to be part of that review so maybe we can put in a sub-workgroup to work on this.

Iris will report on an interpretation of high-res tree canopy change in select Maryland counties relative to rural vs urban areas, parcel size, patch size, critical areas, stream buffers, forest cover, forest health, and timber harvests.

ACTION: The LUWG is requested to send suggestions to Iris Allen (iris.allen@maryland.gov) on how to classify and track the land-use of the deforestation.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will send Iris Allen, Sarah McDonald's analysis that identifies areas that have gone in and out of harvest to help project if the loss is more likely to lead towards future development or go back to forest to see if it has been in rotation in the past.

Questions & Discussions:

Renee Thompson: This is a good place to start to look for CBP data and tools!: <http://data-chesbay.opendata.arcgis.com/>

Karl Berger: Where are we now? We are not ready to sit down with the forestry and land use work group to look at the old decision rules and make new ones but are we close? Is that still the process to do this in conjunction with the forestry workgroup?

Peter Claggett: Originally, we were hoping to do this in June at a joint meeting, but we just got the data to Iris and Matt about six-weeks ago. We do need to have a follow-up to have Matt and Iris present to the workgroup but that is TBD. There has also been discussion at the conservancy also looking at factsheets that combine the graphs and data for each county's tree canopy change.

Karl Berger: That factsheet or dashboard goal cannot happen without the first process of a joint forestry and land-use workgroup meeting. That should be done well-before the July 2021 CAST deadline.

2:10 Role of 1-meter vs 10-meter resolution Land Use Data – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter will discuss the distinct roles and differences between the 1-meter and 10-meter resolution versions of the 2013 and 2017 land use datasets.

Questions & Discussion:

Karl Berger: This is not all land-use workgroup decisions but more so here is what we can do from a land-use perspective. Ultimately, there are forestry work group decisions where we can supply a land-use change perspective, but the land use needs to be told how it's going to be used in the model. This includes the urban stormwater workgroup and the watershed technical workgroup as well for other applications.

Peter Claggett: Maybe we could put a whitepaper together that is a synopsis of the issues to the partnership on how to role this stuff up then bring it back to this group and circulate to other workgroups to get their feedback which would then come back to the land-use workgroup and we can put together recommendation to the WQGIT and then move it forward.

ACTION: Peter Claggett (USGS) will provide the LUWG with a whitepaper on land use decision rules and disseminate to appropriate workgroups to get on their agendas for discussion and feedback..

2:45 Land Use Decision Rights-of-Way and Turf Grass – J. Czawlytko, CIC-CC, and P. Claggett, USGS
Jacob will discuss turf grass issues and a proposed fix.

Issues: slightly overestimated due to assessment of road rights-of-way, use of unbounded moving focal windows, and inclusion of turf in fractional land uses, and over-generalized local land use data, misinterpretation of local data, or lack of local data.

Fix: replace moving focal windows with distance accumulation algorithms and parcel boundaries to constrain spread; reconsider width and/or classification of road rights-of-ways; acquire more local data; conduct more rigorous quality control over local data interpretation.

Peter will discuss rights-of-way issues and a proposed fix.

Issues: width of road rights-of-way may be overestimated; transmission line rights-of-way inconsistently mapped; pipeline and other rights-of-way not considered.

Fix: revisit rights-of-way width estimates and data availability.

Questions/Discussion:

Peter Claggett: That is the big difference between this approach and what we were doing before because we didn't have parcel data and now we have parcels and image segments for all counties and we have more experience working with context of high resolution data which have changed our minds in terms of how we can do this more accurately

Karl Berger: What is the actual decision process on this for the land-use workgroup members?

Peter Claggett: It is still going to be a couple more months until we can pull together all of these pieces and provide opportunities for people to weigh in and then bring back to LUWG for discussion about what people are satisfied with or not/can it be fixed or can it not be fixed? What we are asking is; is this an improvement over what we did before?

Karl Berger: What we would be reviewing is a combination of map data and tabular data so you could zoom into your county and see how it was classified and hopefully it is making sense to the local knowledge and this method overall is thus something we should move forward with. Is this basically what we are asking?

Peter Claggett: Yes

Karl Berger: For those of you who are more land-use expert or land-use analysis people if you want to be more involved in those details otherwise you would be looking at it from a result-perspectives and if the results match what we know about our individual localities.

Karl Berger: Right-of-Ways are something that should go back to the Urban Stormwater Group, we know that road-salt has an impact in changing nutrient dynamics. I am not objecting but would love to have some other perspective in addition to ours but I agree that we have got to look at the WIP and I'm not sure if I am happy with a category that rolls up to mixed open.

Peter Claggett: Yeah. We are only reporting the change here

Karl Berger: Right, sorry I forgot about that. Some of this when they re-do it all should hopefully stick to Phase 7.

Peter Claggett: In terms of tightening up the buffer and considering where we put it. As we role it up to 10 M we could say that road rights-of-way are half impervious, half mixed open. We could have some

flexibility there if we wanted to be more nuanced about it or if the urban stormwater workgroup wanted to be more nuanced about it, but they should be tightened up.

Norm Goulet: It kind of hit home a little bit when you threw out the total acreage but at the same time, those locality adjusted endured some major legal hurdles with the railroad having this classified as impervious for their storm water utility fees. The width aspect is probably more important and also the turf-grass is important. It is clearly not turfgrass but some sort of low-class vegetation. It is not about what is between the rails – it is what goes off on the side which is highly compacted and subjected to stormwater utility as imperviousness.

Peter Claggett: That is what I was measuring around 90 ft. total including the rails including everything from forest edge-forest edge.

Norm Goulet: That is probably what you want.

Peter Claggett: I will talk with the conservancy and how this meshes with what they are doing with the turf grass and we will get back to this next meeting with something more firmed up and then Lee Epstein can weigh in.

ACTION: Move the decision on railroad classification to August 5th's meeting agenda.

3:30 Discussion of upcoming meeting agenda topics – KC Filippino, HRPDC

Potential Agenda Items:

- Railroad and right-of-way decisions
- More decision rules

3:45 Adjourn

Next conference call: August 5rd, 2020 from 1:00pm to 3:00pm

Meeting Participants:

Iris Allen, MD Forest Service
Deborah Sward, MDP
Whitney Ahead, CRC
Peter Claggett, USGS
Karl Berger, MWCOG
KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Ariana Johns, VA DEQ
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Sebastian Donner, WV DEP
Cassandra Davies, NYS DEP
Rachel Soobitsky, CIC
Travis Stoe, PA DEP
Lee Epstein, CBP
David Saavedra, CIC

Alana Hartman, WVDEP
Renee Thompson, USGS
Susan Minnemeyer, Chesapeake Conservancy
Nora Jackson, CRC
Jeff Sweeney, EPA
Shannon Mckenrick, MDE
Jacob Czawlykto, CIC
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Ken Choi, MDP
Lori Brown, DE
Jacob Griffin, Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Labeeh Ahmed, EPA
Nicole Christ, MDE
Mark Symborki, MDP
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP
Katie Brownson, USFS
Erik Fisher, CBF
George Onyullo, DOEE
Jennifer Miller Herzog, Land Trust Alliance
Sarah McDonald, USGS
Sally Claggett, CBPO