

LUWG [September Quarterly](#) Menti Results (9/20/2023)

Question 1: What type of organization do you work for? (e.g., state gov, local gov, ngo, etc)

Responses:

Federal Gov – 3
Local Gov – 2
NGO – 4
State Gov – 9
Regional Gov – 1
Planning District for Multiple Local Governments – 1

Question 2: What sector do you work in?

Responses:

State Gov – 9
Local Gov – 4
Federal Gov – 3
NGO – 4
Private Sector – 0
Other – 0

Question 3: What position do you hold? (e.g., planner, engineer, consultant, etc)

Responses:

Analyst – 2
Coordinator -1
Engineer – 1
Environmental Program Specialist – 3
Environmental Scientist/GIS Specialist – 1
Geographer – 1
Program Manager – 2
GIS Planner – 1
Environmental Planner – 1
Water Resources Planner - 1
Planner – 3

Question 4: Are there any members not currently represented in the LUWG that you think should be?

Responses:

Communications people
Consultants
EPA
Land use change model
Land use planners

Landscape ecologists
 Local Gov – County, Municipal
 Local Gov/Planners
 No opinion
 Not Really
 Other Workgroup reps
 Planning associations
 Private industry lacks representatives
 Regional Planning and Development Boards
 Restoration groups
 There don't seem to be a whole lot of representatives with ag expertise
 Wildlife/habitat people that use the LU data
 More planners working at different levels of government and organizations – maybe some from public works as well.
 Occasionally it may be helpful to include subject matter experts on highly specialized issues (solar)

Question 5: What topic discussed at the LUWG has been most valuable to you and your work?

Responses:

This was a ranking question. Below is a table of each item and how many times it was put in first place

<i>Item</i>	<i># of 1st place results</i>
Local review of high-resolution land use	5
How the data is applied in CAST	6
Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome	0
Land use change model	1
Applications of the high-resolution data	4
Communication of the high-resolution data	1
Other: Please describe in the chat	0

Question 6: What would you like to hear about at our meetings? Who would you like to hear from?

Responses:

All applicable applications of the data and like to hear from all of you. You individually bring different expertise to the table.

Applications – I like the idea of seeing how members and people outside our group are using the land use data

Applications of the data outside of CAST

Applications of the data, especially at the local level; How the data can help foster smarter growth at all levels; how the data and its implications can be communicated by decision makers

CAST

Continue discussions that help us get under the hood of the land change and water quality modeling

Examples of land use data that have led to policy changes (could be from outside the Bay watershed)

Hearing directly from local governments about what is helpful and not helpful

Historical trends can inform future land use planning decisions

How state agencies can use the data statewide

How the Land Use feeds into the TMDL modeling and CAST and how that ultimately impacts our state's responsibilities/accomplishments relative to water quality

Learning more about what the high-res data is telling us about the watershed and how it is changing as we/others continue to analyze and use it

Local and NGO uses of the Land Use data, metrics, and CHWA

Local governments and high-res Land Use applications

No strong opinion, existing content OK by me

Policy connections

Potential policy connections

Subject matter experts who can weigh in on specialized issues that affect LUWG decisions

What locals are using the data [for] and how

You're all doing a great job!

Question 7: Meeting Structure: What is working and what isn't? If it's helpful, use CONTINUE, STOP, and START in your response.

Responses:

CONTINUE opportunities for collaboration across workgroups for decisions affecting multiple workgroups

CONTINUE detailed agendas before the meeting

CONTINUE discussions of how Land Use update will be used in Phase 7 CAST

CONTINUE local review

CONTINUE making connections to the model even if they are infrequent

CONTINUE quarterly meetings

CONTINUE to provide meeting materials in advance including agenda, PPTs, etc.

CONTINUE having virtual meetings or at least a virtual attendance option

CONTINUE quarterly meetings

Keep it the same, I think it works well

Keep quarterly virtual meetings, maybe once a year in person meetings, try to encourage more discussion

Quarterly meetings are good. Provide slides as far in advance as practicable

Quarterly schedule is recommended

START discussions on how these data can impact policy

START getting different voices heard

START incorporation of use cases into the agenda

START more interactive discussions

STOP overly technical presentations, although there haven't been that many recently

The structure is good on my end

Question 8: Are there any existing policies or legislation that could be enhanced with LULC data?

Responses:

Informing future land use planning

I think that's a great topic to explore

Informing stormwater regulations or policies

Conservation Practices

Using LU change data to evaluate tree canopy loss or growth (especially for Stream Restoration or other BMPs)

Solar commitments

Land Use planning; Climate change mitigation and adaptation; Stormwater and flood management,

Forest conservation and non-forest tree canopy enhancement

Historical trends can help inform future land use planning decisions

Forest conservation

Heat island policies

Resilience needs and practices for future precipitation concerns

Explore model local laws

Impervious surfaces management

Question 9: If data isn't provided to your jurisdiction statewide already, would you value statewide data?

Responses:

Yes!

Yes! – NY

Yes

Yes would definitely value the entire state mapped

Yes – VA

Yes!

Yes