



Land Use Workgroup Meeting - June 2026

June 17th, 2026
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: If voting members have any changes to their primary or alternate representative, please email Julia and Jackie. The current list can be found in the coordinator updates [presentation](#) (slide 4).

Action: Julia will send out an office hours invite for the CBLCM Office Hours for July 15th, 3 - 4 PM. All are welcome to attend if interested.

Minutes

Purpose: To introduce the workgroup's new chairs and membership, discuss the first steps towards creating a management strategy for the Land Use Decision Support Outcome (LUDS), and give an overview of the Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM).

I. Introductions and Announcements

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS, LUWG Coordinator

II. Coordinator Updates

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS, LUWG Coordinator

Action:

If voting members have any changes to their primary or alternate representative, please email Julia and Jackie. The current list can be found in the coordinator updates [presentation](#) (slide 4).

Discussion Notes:

- Jackie Pickford: Previously, we've had a few discussions about splitting up the Land Use Workgroup into two separate groups, one to kind of focus on more of the technical aspects and then one to focus more on our outcome. We are pivoting from that; we are no longer going to be splitting into two groups. The LUWG will still be doing both the technical content and the outcome, however, we're going to try to be a little bit more strategic about our

time. So the main focus of our regular quarterly meetings is still going to be the land use decision support topics - communication of the data, applications of the data, things like that. And then for those mapping and modeling topics, while we will touch on them in the quarterly meetings, we plan to host office hours on an as needed basis to get more of the technical details and discuss that more in depth. These meetings will not be required. Basically, people can join as their interests align with the topics. And we do plan to pull in some members from some of the Clean Water Goal Team work groups, just as their expertise aligns with the topics that we're discussing.

We will ultimately come back to the LUWG to give a final summary or a path forward, and all official decisions will still require consent from the LUWG. We probably won't really start ramping up these office hours until the land use/land cover data is further in development. But we may have one or two this summer focused on the land use forecasts if we feel like more discussions are needed outside of our regular quarterly meetings.

- Jackie Pickford: We need our Management Strategy done by August this year. The land use forecasts also have a similar timeline. The land data team will be making updates to the land use forecast model, and will be briefing the group in May, June, and July, with final workgroup approval by August so it can go to the Clean Water Goal Team and the Urban Storm Water Work Group to be incorporated into CAST in October.
- Owen Bailey: Why does the historical land use start in 1985?
 - Peter Claggett: It is as far back as LandSat satellite imagery classified into Land Use/Land Cover data goes. Any further back and it becomes very fuzzy.

III. Management Strategy Update

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS/Coordinator; Debbie Cornwell, MDP/Chair; Rosa Hance, CCWC/Vice Chair

Discussion Notes:

- Katie Brownson: I am thinking about the tree canopy fact sheets, we can point to that as a success, and something that we hear is that local governments are finding them helpful. But the whole reason we were able to do that is because the Forest Service had a little bit of funding randomly one year and we found something we thought would be useful to do with the land use data. So it was very opportunistic, not something the Bay Program had put a lot of thought and intention into. My point is that sometimes there are little pockets of funding we can tap into, where we can think about what can we do to improve the translation or use of the products, but maybe there has not been so much of a systematic approach to evaluating the highest needs and what we are hearing from partners in terms of what they want. That is one of the things I am excited about in this new outcome, and I think there are some current components of the agreement that puts more of the translation on the front end.
 - Rosa Hance: do you have any examples of where the fact sheets have gone and who has used them?
 - Katie Brownson: Yeah, I know the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments has used it extensively. They have a tree canopy working group and they use the fact sheets to have a region-wide look at tree canopy and tree canopy change. They ended up using the fact sheets and some of the data to develop their regional tree canopy goals. That's one use case that we have heard a bit about. And they were anxiously awaiting the update to the fact sheets when we put out the new ones last year. And we heard Ken Hyer was at a random community meeting in Goochland, Virginia, and they were using it in their local government meeting without any prompting by the Bay Program. So you hear little stories like that, which

makes me think that maybe they are getting picked up, but we haven't really done a good systematic look at how they're being used.

- Owen Bailey: I posted the answer about the regional GIS labs; on the Eastern Shore, Washington College and Salisbury offer GIS support to local governments. I know that they have helped with a couple of studies and research projects on land use, but I don't know if they use this data set. It would be helpful to know if these groups that are supplying services for multiple counties and municipalities and rural areas that don't have GIS capabilities are using the data.
- Deborah Herr Cornwell: Are our current indicators effective, or do they need to be revised?
- Jackie Pickford: To shed some light on what the current indicators are: I am not an expert, they were set before my time, but we do have one for impervious surface cover, which I covered in my presentation. We had another one on watershed population from 1950 to 2050, and that was just population projections, and I think we have been updating that. I don't know if there was one for the rate of forest conversion.
 - Peter Claggett: Forest conversion indicators weren't developed yet because we were waiting for the back cast, but since we now have that dataset, we can finalize that indicator. Another thing I will add –a critique from CBF years ago, which still resonates with me, is that when we document change on our landscape, not only is there a lag from the data, the imagery is required to translate that into land use change. So right that is a two year lag. Once you see it, it's already been done. All the permitting has happened, everything's been approved for new development. You may not like what you see, but there's not much you can do about it. And the point at which you can intervene is very early on with the public and people is like really early on in the process when developers are making a pitch and there's maybe an initial zoning change or something like that. Or the permit stage, which, maybe even that is too late. Now, I have heard that the Chesapeake Conservancy independently is developing a building permit database or something like that, development permit database. If we had something like that, it might engender more proactive engagement with the public and others when new developments, large developments get proposed. But right now, we're kind of stuck with like this after the fact documentation.
- Jackie Pickford: There was a comment about maintaining confidence in the data I thought was interesting. It reminds me of a research project one of my coworkers at the Bay Program did, and they found that people most frequently use data recommended to them from colleagues, and are more likely to use a local or state data set than federal or regional/multi-state. So that might be a challenge moving forward.
 - Deborah Herr Cornwell: At the state, we are working to promote the Bay Program land use data for local jurisdictions and their planning. There may be some low-hanging fruit in terms of making the data really easy to access. A lot of the states have GIS portals, so we can make it so that they program web GIS services link in their portals. There may be ways to make these resources more discoverable on state networks. A key thing will be allowing local jurisdictions to use web GIS services to extract summary statistics at smaller levels of geography.

IV. Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM) Initial Briefing

Lead: Lead: Peter Claggett, USGS, Healthy Landscapes Goal Team Coordinator

Action: Julia will send out an office hours invite for the CBLCM Office Hours for July 15th, 3 - 4 PM. All are welcome to attend if interested.

Discussion Notes:

- Norm Goulet: I want to throw in something real quick- I don't know if we could even try to factor this in, but we were overpredicting in the last model as you show. I am thinking we might be overpredicting again. The 2008 aspect had a major impact on our predicting; I am wondering if the COVID impacts are going to be similar.
 - Peter Claggett: It definitely could, it slowed economic growth in general. I don't know the answer to that... we have COVID, some influx of funds especially in this area for infrastructure projects, and the large decreases in federal employment which hit this region hard. So there are a lot of factors. I've been looking at population projections in general and things have been slowing down, which tend to be mostly due to domestic migration, but it depends. For Phase 7, they just want the best guess, or the "business as usual" scenario. There is a possibility for the LUWG to help develop other scenarios if you all are interested in that..
 - Norm Goulet: I am thinking we might want to look a little closer at the trend data from 2020 to 2025 as something that will have a heavy influence from now until 2040, since there has been a lot of change in the last five years.
 - Peter Claggett: One button we could tweak is the population projections, which we get from the states, done by demographers. If I had to put my money on somebody's forecasts, it would be theirs, but if the members of the LUWG and USWG want to ratchet those down a bit, we can look at the relative to trends over the last five years, but that is the workgroups' call not mine.
- Norm Goulet: One other thing I have heard is that we need documentation on the assumptions on the methodology. That can't be a black box.
 - Peter Claggett: I will send that out. It is also on my hidden slides you can browse at your leisure.

V. Adjourn

Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 22nd, 1-3pm

Attendees:

- Julia Fucci, CRC
- Jackie Pickford, USGS
- Deborah Herr Cornwell, MDP
- Rosa Hance, Choose Clean Water Coalition
- Normand Goulet, NVRC / VA
- Nathan Stephens
- Lori Brown, DNREC
- Peter Claggett, USGS
- Susan Shingledecker, Chesapeake Conservancy
- Deborah Sward, MDP
- Thomas Butler, EPA
- Alisha Mulkey, MDA
- Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
- Cass Klingaman, PA DEC
- Owen Bailey, Eastern Shore Land Conservancy
- Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
- Kathryn Barnhart, EPA
- Katherine Brownson, USFS, MD

- Alisha Mulkey, MDA
- Bruce Naylor, PA DEP
- Ellen Mussman, MDP
- Mark Symborski
- Young Tsuei, DOEE
- Emily Beach, Chesapeake Conservancy
- Cassandra Davis, NYDEC
- Marel King, CBC