



Healthy Watersheds GIT & Land Use Workgroup: Outcome Assessment Feedback

January 13th, 2025 - Joint HWGIT & LUWG Meeting

Review of the Current Outcomes

Click "Next" to continue...



Land Use Methods and Metrics Development (LUMM) Outcome

"Continually improve the knowledge of land conversion and the associated impacts throughout the watershed. By 2021, develop a Chesapeake Bay watershed-wide methodology and local level metrics for characterizing the rate of farmland, forest and wetland conversion, measuring the extent and rate of change in impervious surface coverage and quantifying the potential impacts of land conversion to water quality, healthy watersheds and communities. Launch a public awareness campaign to share this information with citizens, local governments, elected officials and stakeholders."

Link to the Chesapeake Bay Program webpage for this outcome: <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/goals/land-conservation#land-use-methods-and-metrics-development>

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the [LUMM Outcome](#)?

Remove the Outcome. The outcome has become a built-in component to the program.

Remove, continue to discuss the importance of the data and how and where it fits into other outcomes, but no need for it to be its own outcome.

This outcome has become institutionalized and should be included in the list of indicators with periodic assessments.

Don't agree with stating removal as first choice, for now maybe suggest consolidating with another outcome or updating the metrics.

Updating language about public awareness campaign; development is one of the largest threat to the watershed; how do we quantify the public awareness campaign to make it SMART?

Agree that this is more of an output than an outcome - but it is so critical to multiple other goals/outcomes, so need to reiterate that removal doesn't mean reduced investments

Focus on indicator measures used to develop the outcome and engage stakeholders on best we can achieve more of these indicators

Remove outcome + consolidate data driven efforts underneath revisions/updates that enshrine conservation as a pillar

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the [LUMM Outcome](#)?

For the 2-pager, can you be more specific about where (which goal/outcome) each component of the work will be carried forward into management strategies?

I like the idea of incorporating this into the partnership as foundational data and incorporating it into other outcomes. It makes sense that it's really not an outcome. It's still a priority!

Outcome at least needs to be reworded "By December 2021".

Consider maintaining the outcome, but representing it as a Co-Outcome or have Outcomes and major Outputs.

Remove, but be careful that it doesn't result in loss of autonomy to needs of one or two outcomes and not broader CBP needs

Consolidate with a clear commitment to data needed for adaptive management and modelling, covering land use, SAV, etc.

All indicators should be merged into their subordinate outcome and thus, be removed.

Can visibility be gained through framing it as a habitat conservation goal? Consolidate with Habitat GIT?



Land Use Options Evaluation (LUOE) Outcome

"By the end of 2017, with the direct involvement of local governments or their representatives, evaluate policy options, incentives and planning tools that could assist them in continually improving their capacity to reduce the rate of conversion of agricultural lands, forests and wetlands as well as the rate of changing landscapes from more natural lands that soak up pollutants to those that are paved over, hardscaped or otherwise impervious. Strategies should be developed for supporting local governments' and others' efforts in reducing these rates by 2025 and beyond."

Link to the Chesapeake Bay Program webpage for this **outcome**: <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/goals/land-conservation#land-use-options-evaluation>

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the **LUOE Outcome**?

Remove, no champion, lack of ability to effect change. Could consolidate with any new conservation outcome

Update: make more intentional with connecting to local decision makers. Other than the existing toolkit.

If developers are still claiming that development results in less nutrient and sediment loads, then all factors are not in the equation. (ex. imperviousness, carbon emissions, loss of habitat)

Remove/reduce. These are vital activities but the results, tools, etc. are outputs that could fall under new or revised conservation-oriented goal or outcome.

Revamp? Some of the outcome language reads more like an output, but think there could be some sort of Land Use Planning outcome that supports the recommendations from the HW small group in B25

update to reinforce connection between good zoning and planning practices

At the very least, the name should change but I recommend revising or consolidating with a conservation outcome.

This outcome also ties in with impacts to communities, which was mentioned at the beginning of this meeting. Preservation without ways to accommodate growth elsewhere affects housing affordability, etc

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the [LUOE Outcome](#)?

Focus on a subset of achievable actions that can result in interconnected protected/enhanced lands and larger, significant benefits.

Is infill of properties tracked vs. conversions?

See if all states take this principal into consideration with their overall land use laws.

Consolidate into protected lands, possibly highlight co-benefits such as flood resiliency that have significant local importance

Has there been a consideration of combining LUMM and LUOE together? LUMM - producing the product, LUOE - communicating the product to the public.

Revise/consolidate with an outcome focused on land use that protects water quality and habitat, maybe with land conservation with active stewardship, backed by data such as the healthy ws assessment

Comment 1 of 3:
Consolidate/Update this Outcome with Protected Lands Outcome. The updated Outcome (name TBD) should update the acreage goal for lands under permanent protection and should explicitly

Comment 2 of 3: include permanent farmland protection of high priority areas or soils. The updated Outcome should add distinct (new) language to include preservation of existing tree canopy & farmland



Healthy Watersheds Outcome

"100 percent of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy."

Link to the Chesapeake Bay Program webpage for this outcome:

<https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/goals/healthy-watersheds#healthy-watersheds>

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the [Healthy Watersheds Outcome](#)?

A crosswalk of LULC, LUOE, and HWsheds to look for overlap and measurable indicators would consolidate outcomes.

Replace with a more holistic land conservation outcome?

Update or consolidate. This ties together water quality and habitat; tidal and nontidal. If we don't have healthy watersheds we will struggle or fail to realize the Vision of the agreement.

Consolidate with an outcome on Land Protection and Stewardship, retaining important cross-boundary coordination on advancing healthy watershed context, not just in-stream/riparian conditions.

Established a standard definition of Watershed Health which would include metrics on terrestrial and aquatic living resources for determination of existing conditions, trends, and influences.

Update: healthy watersheds are the nexus of all of the other stream, water quality, LU, etc outcomes

Consider revising to a Watershed Health Goal that will allow better connections across watershed health and stream health (though I'm not currently suggesting we combine SH and HW)

Healthy Watersheds are a combination of many other Outcomes, terrestrial, aquatic. Could the next HWA be focused in a way to coordinate/consolidate these outcomes (isn't this a need/request?).

What **advice** do you have for the Management Board on **how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, or replace** the **Healthy Watersheds Outcome**?

A sense of watershed health is important precursor to understand resilience. Keeping and updating this outcome (and the logic behind the GW Goal) is crucial to future work and vision attainment.

If kept, remove "state-identified" and have a uniform way to define healthy throughout the watershed. Define watershed scale such as HUC 12 or something broader.

Obvious statement: Utilize the Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment to establish what is a "healthy" watershed for jurisdictions as they agree to outcomes.

Remove. The Outcome is redundant with the Stream Health Outcome and not well defined. State drivers already exist outside CBP to address impaired waters and anti-degradation.

Thank you for your feedback!

If you have any other thoughts, questions, or concerns, please reach out to the HWGIT and LUWG staffers, Marilyn Yang (myang@chesapeakebay.net) and Caroline Kleis (kleis.caroline@epa.gov)