

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

May 6th, 2020

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **DECISION:** LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the February and March meetings.
- **ACTION:** Rachel Soobitsky will send out the web viewer link after the WG meeting with the password included.
- **ACTION:** Rachel Soobitsky will collect the comments on the web viewer and group them by states.
- **ACTION:** Jacob Czawlytko will put together update on the communication piece built into the process during next update.
- **ACTION:** Peter asked the workgroup members to review the [document](#) that provides staff's preliminary rating of both the difficulty and priority status for 13 issues for which new decision rules may be needed and provide feedback back to Peter.
- **ACTION:** WG members have a week to review the list of counties to be used in the Decision Rule process ([Link](#): list of counties are on slide 3).

1:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Review of meeting minutes, Action Item Update – K. Berger, MWCOG

DECISION: LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the February and March meetings with the caveat that members have a week to submit any corrections.

1:10 Production Schedule, Review Process and Status for updates to High-res Land Cover Data – R. Soobitsky, Chesapeake Conservancy

Rachel will present a web-based viewer deployed to facilitate local review of the 2017 high-res land cover data and discuss the production schedule and review process.

- Karl asked if Rachel gets questions from the states and counties were reviewed.
 - Rachel said general feedback is positive.
- Karl asked if review the last time this was done helped to improve the product.
 - Peter responded that Conservancy produced lessons learned document after last round of review which informs this round of review.
 - Rachel can perform a detailed comparison between these two rounds if needed.
- Karl recommended grouping the responses by States so that State representatives can look into the review and maintain good communications with the local counties.

- Rachel responded that there are comments available on the web viewer in purple but she can collect those comments and group them by states.
- Renee commented that it would be great to make sure there is a communication piece built into the LU Scripting process and update.
 - Jacob responded that use of Python's notebook feature is possible for this purpose, but it may not be the best for final pipeline. He added that he can try to make it non-coder friendly and he will put together something on this issue for the next time an update is provided.
- **ACTION:** Rachel will send out the web viewer link after the WG meeting with the password included.
- **ACTION:** Rachel will collect the comments on the web viewer and group them by states.
- **ACTION:** Jacob will report back on the communication piece built into the scripting process for his next update.

1:30 Status of Hyper-res Hydrography production – D. Saavedra, Chesapeake Conservancy
David will discuss the status of hyper-res hydrography data production and review.

- Karl commented that the new hydrography data has several uses besides its use in the new and use for the watershed model, but it will directly inform the water land use category in the model.
 - Peter commented that it will also inform the next generation of the watershed model.
- Karl asked for member input on the issue of PA receiving new LiDAR DEM data by end of 2020 and whether the Bay Program should produce hyper-res hydrography using older LiDAR data or wait for the new data.
- Karl asked if Conservancy staff received any comments from local officials on the hyper-res hydrography already completed in the Lancaster and York County region of Pennsylvania and if that feedback will inform how the hydrography is done in other areas.
 - David responded most of the feedback came from a technical standpoint and related to the polyline stream network, an issue which Conservancy staff were aware of and was during a webinar the Conservancy conducted on its work in this area.
 - Peter commented that Conservancy did a good job addressing problems during the webinar. The reason that scientists participating in the review process did not provide a lot of feedback is because there were few additional issues that the Conservancy was not already addressing.
 - Peter added that the PA Bureau of Forestry under DCNR will review the data related to riparian buffer planting opportunities over the coming months. Karl said it would be helpful to extend the review to other Land Use Workgroup members and have the results posted on the Land Use Workgroup webpage. It

would be good to make the development of this new hyper-res hydrography layer as transparent as possible.

- Jacob responded that we can post review materials on the Conservancy website and the Bay Program website.
- Ted asked if the project would provide information on stream bank heights.
 - David responded that the polyline stream network will be attributed with bank height and will be available upon request.
 - Peter added that USGS published bank height metrics from the USGS' Floodplain and Channel Evaluation Toolkit just last week. The data are available for download by HUC10 ([Link](#)).
 - Travis added that is a group called TopoGeo within DCNR geologic service is developing similar hyper-res stream data for the remainder of the Commonwealth (PA). David responded that he has already been coordinating closely with that group.

1:45 Schedule and Process for Completing the new land use mapping for years 2013 and 2017 – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter will provide a strategy and schedule to produce updated new land use data with approval by the LUWG and WQGIT by September 1, 2021. Included in this discussion will be the selection of ~10 counties for evaluating all land use decision rules.

- **ACTION:** Peter asked the workgroup members to review the [document](#) – “Methodological Considerations for Mapping 2017 High-resolution Land Use,” which provides staff’s preliminary rating of both the difficulty and priority status for 13 issues for which new decision rules may be needed and provide feedback back to Peter.
- Karl asked the reasons for why some items such as “Cropland and Pasture” are rated as high priority.
 - Peter responded that priorities were based on relative importance to nutrient and sediment loads or to goals established in the 2014 Bay Agreement.
- Karl asked about how the prioritization process will inform the schedule by which the Workgroup addresses the issues, and whether the Workgroup should address the most challenging issues first or the most important issues.
 - Peter responded that with the Workgroup should address the most important issues first regardless of how challenging they are.
- Peter asked about the Conservancy’s ability to map culverts. David responded that culverts are mapped as buried streams.
 - Ted commented that PA DOT has mapped culverts in PA
 - Peter said it would be great to have another data set as a comparison.

2:30 Remapping Agriculture: issues, solutions, and timeframe. – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter will discuss errors of commission and omission associated with the current 2013 high-res land use data and a process and steps to resolve these issues in the new land use data.

- Peter presented a list of 11 counties representing all states and extremes in omission or commission errors for mapping agriculture. He said he would like to add 1-2 additional suburban or urban counties to the list.
- Norm commented that Loudoun County, VA, would be a good choice since it has a mix of urban, suburban and rural land uses.
- Lee recommended adding Baltimore County, MD.
- Renee asked if the current list provides a representative sample for addressing the confusion between turfgrass and pasture. Peter confirmed.
- Karl asked whether the new 2017 land cover data would be available in time for counties on the list.
 - Peter responded that new land cover data is not necessary for testing new land use mapping rules, the 2013 land cover would be sufficient.
- Dave Montali asked about the reasons why Hardy County, W VA, is in the set of counties in which the amount of agricultural land mapped in 2013 appears to significantly underestimate the true amount of agricultural land.
 - Peter is not sure of the reasons and he will perform more analysis to confirm the reason.
 - Dave added that West Virginia officials can connect Peter with local ag resources to provide more information.
- Peter mentioned he would like to keep the total number of counties on the list to no more than 12.
- **ACTION:** WG members will have a week to review the list of Ag Counties and urban counties and propose substitutions or additions.
- Karl recommended including the Ag Workgroup in the discussion of this particular mapping issue.

2:50 Discussion of upcoming meeting agenda topics. – KC Filippino, HRPDC

- Karl noted the Workgroup will have a call for in June.
- Peter added that the June call will not include the Forestry Workgroup as originally planned back in December 2019.

3:00 Adjourn

Next conference call: June 3rd, 2020 from 1:00pm to 3:00pm

Meeting Participants:

Peter Claggett, USGS
 Norm Goulet, NVRC
 Allie Wagner, NVRC
 Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC
 Nicole Christ, MDE
 John Griffin, Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
 Rachel Soobitsky, CIC
 Ken Choi, MDP

David Saavedra, CIC
Deb Sward, MDP
Jacob Czawlytko, CIC
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Dave Montali, WV DEP
George Onyullo, DOEE
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Renee Thompson, USGS
Sarah McDonald, USGS
Karl Berger, MWCOG
Lee Epstein, CBF
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Travis Stoe, PA DEP
Lori Brown, DNREC
Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP
Cuiyin Wu, CRC
Labeeb Ahmed, Attain
Jessica Rodriguez
Matt Monroe, WV Department of Agriculture
Jeff Sweeney, EPA
Clint Gill, Delaware Department of Agriculture
Sally Claggett, CBPO
Katie Brownson, CBPO
Kate Bresaw, PADEP
Dorothy Morris
Gopal Bhatt, CBPO
Linda LaSut