

## Land Use Decision Support (LUDS) Management Strategy Brainstorm

### READ ME FIRST

To support a clear and efficient review process, we have structured this document using the color-coding system described below:

- **Black Text:** Core template structure. No feedback needed.
- **Blue Text:** Template instructions (i.e., advice on how to fill out certain sections).
- **Red Text:** Preliminary ideas from LUWG coordination team. Feedback is encouraged.
- **Highlighted Text:** Specific input needed from signatories & other partners.

Please feel free to leave comments in this document or email the LUWG coordination team with any feedback, questions, or input on this initial brainstorm.

### Land Use Decision Support Outcome

Develop and disseminate relevant and actionable land use information in consultation with local governments, to organizations and communities involved in local and regional land use planning. This information should include past, present and future conditions, as well as the potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences of changing conditions.

- Develop at least five use cases annually, informed by and provided at the county, watershed or municipal scale to inform land use planning and decisions and maintain the ecological integrity of watersheds supporting good stream health. Use cases can include watershed protection, aquatic connectivity, stormwater, tree canopy, agricultural preservation or redevelopment.

- Highlight at least two widely applicable land use cases annually to showcase best practices and share this information with local governments and partners through diverse communications products.

**Commented [1]:** Language taken from Watershed Agreement – no feedback needed.

## Baseline and Current Condition

### Land Use Decision Support Outcome

- High-resolution data for three points in time, new data coming out in 2028 – have a rough idea of how it's being used but unsure how effectively it's affecting land use decision-making.
- Currently have a repository of use cases for LULC data – about 39 use cases documented from 2023 [for the 2022 Edition (previous version) of the data], but not in a format that is very accessible or communicated effectively
- Previous projects related to this outcome:
  - o [Local Government Engagement Strategy](#) (2019): brief overview of how to engage with local governments. Pages 6-7.
  - o Community Response to Land Use Change (p 65): GIT Funding Project

## Monitoring Progress and Indicators

### Indicator: Impervious Surface Cover

Our impervious surface cover indicator reports the extent of the Chesapeake Bay watershed that is covered by impervious surfaces, the change in impervious cover over time and the types of impervious cover that most contributed to these changes.

[Analysis and Methods](#) document for Impervious Surface Change Metric.

### Monitoring: [Outcome or Target Name]

[If an Indicator will be developed but does not yet exist, describe the future Indicator, along with the plan and timeline to attain and report the necessary information]

### Monitoring: [Outcome or Target Name]

[If an Indicator will not be developed, describe how progress toward Outcome or Target attainment will be demonstrated, how often progress will be assessed and how CBP will communicate progress to support partner decision-making]

### Other ideas for monitoring progress (not an official indicator):

- Documentation of # of use cases of CBP land use and other relevant data – how many use cases we've collected or highlighted each year (tracking presentations or attendees?).

## Land Use Planning and Decision Support Situation Analysis

The following table identifies challenges that will impact progress towards attaining this outcome and its targets. This analysis considers scientific, environmental, fiscal or policy-related developments that have already or may influence work during the upcoming six-

year Management Strategy cycle. Consideration is given to which challenges are within and outside of CBP's ability to influence. Challenges associated with Changing Environmental Conditions are denoted with an asterisk (\*). Challenges listed in bold font have been identified by the Goal Team and its Workgroups as being priorities for the Workgroup to seek to address or make progress against through the development and implementation of Management Approaches. [Add or remove rows from the following table as needed to document challenges to Outcome and/or Target attainment. Place an "X" in the corresponding box to classify each challenge as being "within CBP's ability to influence" or "outside of CBP's ability to influence"]

**Within our ability to influence:**

- **Strengthening our approach to collecting use cases and sharing information:**
  - Ensuring our approach utilizes broad outreach and relationship building; 2-way networking to both collect use cases and distribute information in a way that is effective and efficient to decision-makers.
- **Means/methods of disseminating information to partners, Local Government Leadership WG/Local Government Advisory Committee, and other stakeholders.**
- **Understanding land use decision processes across the watershed:**  
Decision-making varies significantly by jurisdiction—who makes decisions, when, and what data (if any) they rely on. This variability complicates targeted support.
- **Building trust and recognition for the LUWG among audiences that decision-makers already rely on as trusted sources:**  
Will be a challenge to ensure we're engaging the right people and organizations who can help carry our information to decision-makers. Defining these key audiences and making sure our network actually reaches them will be critical. In addition, 2-way input and direct involvement of locals requires a sustained pathway of mutual listening and learning.
- **Identifying and addressing local priorities effectively:**  
Aligning with the LGLWG is essential for gaining insight into local needs and improving connections with planning organizations. While we are making progress in identifying local needs, packaging LUWG data in a way that directly supports those needs will continue to challenge our limited time and resources. Important for us to harmonize economic development objectives with environmental objectives. Framing issues as meeting a multitude of objectives including disaster preparedness and resiliency, workforce development, and sustainable growth.
- **Adapting to rapidly evolving landscape-monitoring technologies:**  
Incorporating new tools and methods requires continuous learning and integration. Communication of those changes and how they affect previous iterations of the data will also be a challenge.
- **Clarifying who the key land use decision-makers are and when decisions occur:**  
This includes understanding whether LUWG has established trust or recognition

among those audiences and whether our network reaches those audiences, and how to build trust and improve recognition. Important to note that since all jurisdictions do not make land use decisions at the same level of government depending on the project type and landowner/applicant, some dynamic adjustments will be necessary.

- **Improving communication and coordination with the Local Government Leadership Workgroup (LGLWG) and other CBP groups:**

Already started some efforts on this – a newly established framework to engage with local governments, as well as a new Healthy Landscapes Goal Team to coordinate across relevant outcomes, such as Forestry, Adapting to Changing Environmental Conditions, and Protected Lands.

- **Continued financial support** to monitor the landscape over time
- **Continued financial support** to create tools and resources based on updated data (e.g., funding for development of resources similar to the tree canopy fact sheets, but for impervious surfaces, solar, etc.)

**Outside our ability to influence:**

- **Changing technology** to monitoring the landscape (future iterations of the LULC data will continue to be a challenge as we work through new technologies and methodologies)
- **Population growth**
- **Vulnerability of high-value watersheds/habitats to development**
- **Growth pressure** can impact political decisions for where and whether growth should be concentrated;
- **Legislative authority** to shape growth patterns, for example, through conservation zoning, might be difficult to obtain
- **Dynamic permitting landscape** dependant on land use for certain purposes

	Within CBPs ability to influence	Outside of CBP's ability to influence
<b>Challenges</b>		



#### Maryland

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### New York

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### Pennsylvania

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### Virginia

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### West Virginia

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### Chesapeake Bay Commission

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- [Featured Program with hyperlink] ([Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2025]) [one sentence max description of how program relates to Outcome attainment]

#### **Management Approaches for Outcome [#]: Land Use Planning and Decision Support**

[Management Approaches will outline the general approach needed to fill existing gaps and identify the partnership's role in that approach. These are the actions that the program will undertake to address the challenges to goal and outcome attainment that are described in the Situation Analysis. The Management Approach section should include how local governments and other stakeholders will be kept informed and involved.

- Each Management Approach should seek to address one or more stated challenge(s).
- Management Approaches should be specific enough to guide partnership efforts over the coming six years and to enable the partnership to determine if work related to the Management Approach has progressed at an appropriate pace. Example: a Management Approach would not be “communications and outreach,” but rather “Assess Blue Crab Stock Status and Communicate the Results to Managers and the Public.” Management Approaches should be specific enough to be meaningful and provide transparency about the work that partners will collaboratively undertake.
- Management Approaches at the Goal and/or Outcome-level should describe and seek to address “signatories, other state and federal agencies, local governments, Indigenous representatives, nonprofit and private partners are engaged; where actions, tools, financial support and technical assistance are needed to empower

local governments and others to do their part; and what steps are necessary to facilitate greater participation in achieving the Outcome.”

- Outcome-level Management Approaches should speak to the strategies and actions that Chesapeake Bay Program Partners should undertake over the next six years to address challenges that impact specific Outcomes.
- For each Goal-level Management Approach, a statement should be included to describe which Outcome workplans will include related projects or actions.]

Management Approach [Goal number].[Outcome number].1:

Management Approach [Goal number].[Outcome number].2:

### Participating Partners

The following partners participated in the creation of this Management Strategy and expressed their intention to collaborate on Management Strategy implementation over the next six years. Per the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, “participation in developing Management Strategies or in the achievement of Outcomes varies by signatory based on differing priorities across the watershed. This participation may include commitments such as sharing knowledge, data or information, educating the public, working on future legislation and developing or implementing programs or verified practices” (2025). Signatory partners may join implementation efforts at any time. Partners also recognize that Signatory participation is voluntary and may vary accordingly.

- **Signatory Partners**
  - District of Columbia Department of Energy & Environment
  - Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
  - New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
  - Maryland Department of Planning
  - Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
  - West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
  - Chesapeake Bay Commission
  - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- **Other Partners**
  - Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
  - Eastern Shore Land Conservancy
  - Chesapeake Conservancy
  - Choose Clean Water Coalition

## Appendix 1. Signatory Statutory Authorities Driving Outcome Attainment

The law and regulation of signatory partners may support, justify or motivate their participation in the collaborative work of the Chesapeake Bay Program related to the attainment of specific Outcomes and Targets of the Watershed Agreement.

The following documentation identifies core statutory authorities that provide part of the impetus for the attainment of Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Outcomes and their related Targets. While Chesapeake Bay Program partners acknowledge that the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement is voluntary, subject to the availability of appropriated funds, and does not preempt, supersede or override any other law or regulation applicable to each signatory, they also acknowledge that the law or regulation of individual signatories can support each partner’s participation in outcome attainment. The table below is not an exhaustive list of all relevant laws and regulations. Rather, this appendix identifies the driving motivators that can bring about signatory partner engagement in efforts described in this Strategic Plan, associated Management Strategies, and Workplans.

**Goal [#]: Healthy Landscapes**

Outcome: Land Use Planning and Decision Support	
Signatory	Statutory Authority
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	
[Signatory Name]	