

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Call Summary

October 22, 2015
10:00AM-12:00PM

Calendar event page: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/22606/>

Action and Decision items:

ACTION: The LUWG agreed to draft a memo to be sent to the WQGIT recognizing the potential for reconciliation issues of land use acres during the production of the final Phase 3 land use. The memo will recommend that the LUWG serve as the group tasked with reconciling the extent of overall Phase 6 land uses within land river segments, in consultation with the appropriate sector workgroups and subject to final decision by the WQGIT or the relevant decision making body.

ACTION: The LUWG will distribute the link to the land use website to the LUWG members, for them to assess usability and process and report back to Peter, Quentin, and Karl.

The Land Use Data Team will also prepare a document outlining the major proposed steps in the land use review and local government outreach process, for comment and review by the LUWG.

10:00am **Welcome and introductions** – K. Berger

10:05am **Finalization of Phase 6 Land Use Dataset** – P. Claggett

- Peter Claggett gave a presentation on the finalization of the Phase 6 Land Use Database, Version 2. Topics covered include:
 - Reconciling data from disparate sources at the 10m pixel level.
 - Estimating rural residential impervious and turf grass acres.
 - Incorporating Maryland land use data
 - Mass balancing acres by CSO and County
 - Hindcasting to 1984
 - Forecasting to 2013.
- Greg Evans: In the future, regarding riparian forest buffers, will the model be able to determine the species composition of those buffers, and therefore make some assumptions on the values of those buffers for meeting water quality benefits?
 - Claggett: We're not distinguishing that in these data; we're just looking at tree cover, and based on size and clustering we determine if it's forest or tree canopy. We have Landsat data that differentiates evergreen mix and

deciduous, which we could overlay, but I don't think the high res will be distinguishing that. The best we could do for a separate application, would be to separate it out for evergreen and deciduous.

- Karl Berger: So these decision rules will be posted, but keep in mind they aren't finalized. We're willing to consider changes if there are better ideas, but I want the workgroup to be clear that this is where they have a chance to weigh in on the detailed methodology. For people at the local level, when they're reviewing this, they will probably look more at the rasters than at these formulas.
 - Claggett: Right. And a lot of these rules will be obsolete with Version 3, because we'll have wall to wall 1 meter coverage. The reason we have all these rules is because we have data coming in from many different sources. The one class that won't change much is turf grass, but a lot of the other rules we won't need because the reconciliation will have already occurred in the mapping at 1 m resolution. There will be new rules similar to these for the 1 m resolution data, though.
- Evans: Will these estimates of impervious and turf change?
 - Claggett: Yes, they will change. With the high resolution data, we will be able to actually map the turf grass, I'm hoping.
- Berger: So the set of rules for mass balance totals will be changing for version 3, right?
 - Claggett: I will cover that shortly. It will be different, but when we get the high res data, we'll need rules to bump up the agriculture census related acres, because the high res data will be more accurate.
- Robert Hirsch: Since the ag census acreage is brought in at the end and everything else is reduced to fit ag census, it seems like you're considering ag census numbers to be more accurate and reliable than the other data.
 - Claggett: Correct.
 - Berger: I would like to put forward to the LUWG that this workgroup should be in charge of reconciling acreage, and we certainly welcome input from the AgWG, and maybe even have a joint session with the AgWG when the reconciliation is occurring. But this is the workgroup that makes sure all of the acres add up, and we should be the final recommendation body on that issue. Perhaps we should put this forward in a memo to the WQGIT, because I can see this becoming an issue.
 - Mary Gattis: Has the AgWG been apprised of this issue?
 - Claggett: The AgWG is aware of this issue. I informed them that they have 25,000 acres too many in Lancaster County. Talking to the modeling team, that wasn't that much of a surprise. There also are accuracy numbers reported by the ag census county by county, but I don't think they will be surprised. They realize it's not perfect, but we need to determine which classes we are confident in, and that will inform the future decision rules.

- Gattis: Given that, then I would support what Karl said in terms of drafting a memo.
- Bill Keeling: So this memo will be for all land uses, not just Ag?
 - Berger: Right, so if there are issues with other land uses like wetlands, then we would be the group to shepherd that reconciliation process. Maybe this is a memo to the WQGIT, and if we produce it then we will send it out for review by the LUWG before it's officially delivered to the WQGIT.

DECISION: The LUWG agreed to draft a memo to be sent to the WQGIT recognizing the potential for reconciliation issues of land use acres during the production of the final Phase 3 land use. The memo will recommend that the LUWG serve as the group tasked with reconciling the extent of overall Phase 6 land uses within land river segments, in consultation with the appropriate sector workgroups and subject to final decision by the WQGIT or the relevant decision making body.

11:10am **Status of High-Resolution Land Cover Data Production – P. Claggett**

- Peter Claggett gave an update on the status of the website development and timeline for working with the high resolution data.
- Claggett: When the conservancy finishes a county, and the respective county can QAQC that data, then it will come to us, and we can produce the Phase 6 land use as soon as we get the data. Then the data will go up on the website we've built, and it will also go out to the counties so they can review it. We need every state to give us contact information for each county or whomever is responsible for approving the final Phase 6 land use database, preferably at the local level. We've been working with PA on this, and we have a list of county contacts, mainly GIS and planners, who had given us information for PA counties. We gave that list back to DEP in PA, and they've cross-checked it with people they know. So we're developing a definitive contact list there, and we can give them a heads up to expect the final data. Once we get comments back from the counties, and make any needed adjustments, then we finalize the data and it's done. We still need this information for the other states though.
- Megan Grose: I think I would likely serve as that go-between for WV. Could you send me a list of the people you've already contacted so I have an idea of who may already be involved?
- James Gregory offered serve as the POC for Delaware.
- Bill Keeling, or a representative from DEQ, will report back to Peter/Quentin about how VA will handle their contacts.
- The VA DEQ and Rich Batiuk from CBPO met to discuss the EPA funding of mapping of VA with leaf-on imagery. Claggett explained that the LUWG needs to assess the degree to which the tree canopy data between the various

contractors differs in Virginia. To do this, Claggett proposed each contractor in VA will classify the same piece of land, and the results will be interpreted and shared to determine how to move forward. The soonest this comparison could happen is likely December, but ideally it should happen as soon as possible. Claggett noted that even when ignoring the tree canopy issue, doing this comparison is useful for understanding the utility of the products for informing a variety of outcomes specified in the 2014 Bay Agreement. Bill Keeling noted that Virginia DEQ is considering this proposal but no decisions have been agreed to as of yet.

11:25am

Phase 6 Land Use Website and Local Government Review Process

– Q. Stubbs

- Quentin Stubbs gave a presentation of the process for rolling out the Phase 6 land use website and the coordination effort with local governments.
- Darold Burdick asked whether the website viewer would be distributed to the public, or specifically the counties and states.
 - Claggett: We'd rather not restrict it to people, but we do have a target audience, so we're thinking that we're not going to advertise it, but rather contact people directly.
- Berger: If you end up with a million comments, then you may want to have a prioritization scheme, so that comments from local governments and reviewers will be prioritized over comments from concerned citizens.
- Claggett: Because our non-road impervious data and our tree canopy data is down-sampled from Landsat, it's pretty coarse and so you'll see commission errors everywhere. What I would prefer, and would like to communicate, is that we'll have a webinar where we make people aware that this site exists, so if they want to see the data that's informing Phase 6 currently, then they can. The real purpose is for review on the final Phase 6 datasets, where we don't want to see commission errors. That's where I think the local governments' time and our time will be best spent.
- States will have the opportunity to review the land use website, which will be informed by the focus group and commentary. There will be a webinar to introduce this website, and explain its usability to the representatives from the states. States can volunteer to participate in the webinar and in the focus groups to assess and inform the usability of the land use website.
- Mary Gattis suggested going to some of the local conferences to reach out to the state representatives.
- Claggett suggested distributing the website link to all of the LUWG members to have them beta test the usability of the website, and provide feedback to Peter, Quentin and Karl.

ACTION: The LUWG will distribute the link to the land use website to the LUWG members, for them to assess usability and process and report back to Peter, Quentin, and Karl. The CBP Land

Use Data Team will also prepare a document outlining the major proposed steps in the land use review and local government outreach process, for comment and review by the LUWG.

- Berger: How much time are we going to give for review by local jurisdictions? This is something that we need to discuss, because this is a time-sensitive project.
- Gattis: What do we mean by approval?
- Berger: We could debate this, but we're giving them a chance to review and comment, but we don't want local government elected officials to be officially approving their land use.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will distribute the drafted workplan to the LUWG.

12:00pm **Adjourn**

The next meeting will be held on Monday, December 7th.

Agenda topics for the December 7th meeting:

- Process and status of Methods and Metrics Workplan
- Discussion of forecasting

Participants:

Karl Berger, MWCG

Megan Gross, WVDEP

Jeff White, MDE

Steve Stewart, Baltimore County, MD Dept. of Environmental Protection and Resource Mgmt.

James Gregory, DNREC

Sarah, DC-DCOEE

Greg Evans, VA Dept. of Forestry

Darold Burdick, Fairfax County

Norm Goulet, NVRC

Bill Keeling, DEQ

Quentin Stubbs, CBPO

Mary Gattis, LGAC Coordinator

Kevin Lariscy, USAEF

Leslie Middleton, Bay Journal

Doug Myers, CBF

Alisha Mulkey, MDA

Jenny Tribo, HRPDC

Shannon McKenrick, MDE

Robert Hirsch, Baltimore County
Stephanie Martins, MDE
Seung Ah Byun, Brandywine Conservancy