

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

Jan 19th, 2022

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The LUWG approved the [December meeting minutes](#).

Action: The LUWG will discuss drafting a recommendation to pursue collecting data beyond 2025 at the February meeting.

Action: Please provide feedback on any additional Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicators to Peter Claggett (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net) by **COB Friday Feb 11th**.

Action: Please provide any additional feedback on the proposed LUWG priorities for 2022 to Peter Claggett, KC Filippino, Karl Berger, and Jackie Pickford (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net; kfilippino@hrpdcva.gov; kberger@mwkog.org; pickford.jacqueline@epa.gov) by **COB Friday Feb 11th**.

1:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Review of Meeting Minutes, Action Item Update – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (15 min).

Announcements:

- **Decision:** The LUWG approved the [December meeting minutes](#).
- **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, Feb 16th from 1:00 - 3:00 PM.

1:15 Water Quality GIT (WQGIT) Phase 7 Updates – KC Filippino, HRPDC (15 min).

The official outcomes and Phase 7 schedule are still pending from the WQGIT October meeting. KC announced LUWG related updates from the [WQGIT December](#) meeting and reviewed the draft WQGIT [Phase 7 planning document](#) as it relates to land cover, land use, and change products. She specified that CAST-21 is still being finalized and there will be a [virtual meeting](#) on February 14th to discuss CAST-21 data inputs and results. The Version 1 high-res land use change from 2013/14-2017/18 will be used in CAST-21. The Version 2 high-res land use change data from 2013/14-2017/18 will be used in CAST-23. The high-res land use change data from 2017/18-2021/22 will be used in CAST-25. The mapped, wall-to-wall data will not be used until Phase 7 of the model. There was also discussion about drafting a recommendation from the LUWG on pursuing the collection of data beyond 2025, once the cooperative agreement with the Conservancy ends.

Discussion

Karl Berger: Once the cooperative agreement with the Conservancy is up, it may be incumbent upon us to seek a new plan or hope they will extend the contract beyond 2025, maybe assess the

frequency at which this is done. It may be helpful for LUWG to weigh in on that issue at some point in the future.

Renee Thompson: At the Management Board and Principals' Staff Committee levels we received a draft internal workplan and I didn't see land use, high-res land change, or geospatial contract listed at all in the document, so I think we should make sure to have this issue on their radar.

Dave Montali: I like Karl's suggestion about sitting back and assessing the frequency at which this is done.

Peter Claggett: Professionally, I think 4-5 years is the way to go.

KC Filippino: Maybe this needs to be an agenda item in the future that provides an official recommendation from the LUWG to pursue collecting data beyond 2025 and pick the frequency at which to do so. It doesn't appear to be explicit in the work plan right now. Let's make this a February agenda item to discuss.

Peter Claggett: I don't think we'll be able to answer the question of frequency until we have the 2021/22 data.

Karl Berger: We can still draft a recommendation without specifying frequency initially.

Norm Goulet: We track the land use in the Occoquan basin on a 5 year basis and we see sufficient change within that time period. I wouldn't recommend going past 5 years.

Dave Montali: It says in the document there will be 18 to 20 classes in Phase 7. Who makes the decision on the classes?

Peter Claggett: The LUWG, probably the WQGIT, and perhaps some expert panels. That detail is proposed/suggested but not final.

Action: The LUWG will discuss drafting a recommendation to pursue collecting data beyond 2025 at the February meeting.

1:30 Updates and Schedule for 2022 – Peter Claggett, USGS, All (1 hr 30 min).

Peter discussed the LUWG schedule for 2022 and what to expect for the upcoming year.

Proposed LUWG priorities included the following:

- 1. Finalization of the 2017/2018 Version 2 land use and land use change data*
- 2. Development and review of the 2021 land use data for MD and DE*
- 3. Finalization of the Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicators*
- 4. Initiate improvements to the Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM)*
- 5. Other?*
 - o Support for floodplain/shoreline management and climate resiliency*
 - o Support for the "America the Beautiful" initiative*

Peter also updated the group that the V2 2017/2018 data is still on track and will be published on a viewer and available for download in February 2022, along with a white paper. The accuracy assessment for the V2 data won't be produced until March-May 2022.

Discussion

- 1. 2017/2018 LU and LU change data*

Karl Berger: For 2017/18 V2 data, the tabular data will be available at the county scale and land river (LR) segment scale? Both will include the actual acres of land uses, right?

Peter Claggett: Yes. We'll also aggregate the change and wall to wall land use to the 13 phase 6 classes and turn that into 13 rasters.

Norm Goulet: Tabular data by LR seg might be useful for other purposes.

Peter Claggett: We can do that for the 13 phase 6 classes.

2. LU Data for MD and DE

Dave Montali: Can we have an agenda item in the future to discuss rules for the new data, maybe Spring/Summer? And if we do decide to make a change, would we make that change retroactively to 13/17?

Peter Claggett: Anything that we change for 2021/2022 will be retroactively applied to all other dates.

Katie Walker: The white paper will help guide that discussion because it will be documenting how we came to 2017/18 data as it is. We will reach out to LUWG before the 21/22 process begins to review the decisions made for data production.

3. LU Methods and Metrics Indicators

KC Filippino: Who determines the indicators? Are we the only group that has given feedback?

Peter Claggett: Mainly the LUWG and the Healthy Watershed Goal Implementation Team (HWGIT), with some input from the Forestry Workgroup (FWG). The indicators presented here are only proposed indicators and we will make a decision on them at a future date. The Status and Trends Workgroup (STWG) also has to approve them.

Dave Montali: If a patch becomes fragmented, it would be counted as a transition from forest to rural, which might be interpreted as a loss of forest when it's actually a fragmentation of forest.

Peter Claggett: Maybe we just use the tree canopy metric in the riparian zone instead of the forest definition. Good suggestion.

Renee Thompson: We may want to include percent natural lands in the riparian zone.

Sarah McDonald: Instead of "urban tree canopy", maybe change the wording to "tree canopy over development".

Mark Symborski: Would it be possible to distinguish non-forest natural areas in the riparian zone? Could be useful for local gov.

Peter Claggett: Yes, ideally. It would be helpful if you provided imagery examples of that for us to test out if we can classify it.

4. CBLCM v6

Peter Claggett: I will change the blue priorities here to indicate CAST-25 rather than CAST-23.

5. Other?

Labeeb Ahmed (in chat): Climate Resiliency WG has a GIT funded project where they evaluate how different marsh migration models behave.

Action: Please provide feedback on any additional Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicators to Peter Claggett (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net) by **COB Friday Feb 11th**.

Action: Please provide any additional feedback on the proposed LUWG priorities for 2022 to Peter Claggett, KC Filippino, Karl Berger, and Jackie Pickford (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net; kfilippino@hrpdcva.gov; kberger@mwco.org; pickford.jacqueline@epa.gov) by **COB Friday Feb 11th**.

3:00 Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Chat

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP: PA thinks it is a good idea to discuss a recommendation in February to make sure it is documented as a priority for future funding.

Renee Thompson: Understanding these natural areas can also help us with tree planting, restoration, certain habitats and migration potential

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP: Can you please send out an email with these requests for information with a due date. It helps me keep track of these important responses. Thank you!

Jackie Pickford (she/her): Yes, I'll send one out Lisa

Labeeb Ahmed (USGS): Climate Resiliency Workgroup has a grant funded project where they evaluate how different marsh migration models behave.

Participants

Jackie Pickford, CRC
Karl Berger, MWCOG
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Peter Claggett, USGS
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Mindy Neil, WV DEP
Lori Brown, DNREC
Deb Sward, MDP
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
Young Tsuei, DC DOEE
Jeff Sweeny, EPA

Lee Epstein, CBF
Mark Symborski, MCPD
Renee Thompson,
Labeeb Ahmed,
USGS/CBPO
Nicole Christ, MDE
Helen Golimowski,
Devereux Consulting
Sarah McDonald,
USGS/CBPO
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Clint Gill, DE
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech

Andrew Szwak
Gopal Bhatt
Jacob Czawlytko,
Chesapeake Conservancy
Jason Vogl
Katie Brownson, USFS
Katie Walker, Chesapeake
Conservancy
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Ted Tessler, PA DEP
Travis Stoe, PA DEP
Shannon McKenrick, MDE