CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP
Meeting Minutes
February 16th, 2022
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Meeting Materials: Link

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The LUWG approved the January meeting minutes.

Decision: The LUWG endorses the proposal of a STAC workshop on the incorporation of local data in the development of the Phase 7 watershed model.

Decision: The LUWG endorses the proposed generalized land use classes for the 2017/18 land use data.

Action: Members are encouraged to provide additional feedback about the land use classes to Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org).

Decision: The Land Use Workgroup recommends the extension of very-high resolution land cover/use change monitoring by the Bay Program, which currently is funded only until 2024, through at least the year 2030. The workgroup requests that the Water Quality, Habitat, and Maintain Healthy Watersheds GITs endorse this recommendation and elevate it to the Chesapeake Bay Commission, Management Board, and Principals' Staff Committee to ensure adequate funding is allocated for a new cooperative agreement to do this work.

Decision: The LUWG approves the recommendation to the HWGIT that the proposed landscape indicators should serve as the official 2022 metrics for the Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome.

Action: Members are encouraged to provide additional feedback on the Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome indicators to Peter Claggett (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net).

1:00   Welcome, Roll Call, Review of Meeting Minutes, Action Item Update – KC Filippino, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (10 min).

        Announcements:
        ● **Decision:** The LUWG approved the January meeting minutes.
        ● **Decision:** The LUWG endorsed the proposal of a STAC workshop on the incorporation of local data in the development of the Phase 7 watershed model.
        ● <mark>Next Meeting:</mark> Wednesday, March 16th from 1:00 - 3:00 PM.

1:10   Rollout of Final 2017/18 Land Use Data Products - Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy (30 min).
        Katie presented on the rollout of the final 2017/2018 land cover and land use data and the 2013/14-2017/18 land cover and land use change products. The data will be released in March 2022 via two websites.

        Discussion

KC Filippino: Are the 10-meter rasters for tree canopy downloadable at certain scales?
Katie Walker: It will be posted as a wall-to-wall product for the full 206 counties in the Bay watershed.
KC Filippino: Will there be a release of the 2013/14 land cover/land use product?
Peter Claggett: No. We will provide the change data and the 2017/18 data, so if folks want to overlay those data products to get the 2013/14 data they are able to do so. We will probably pull the previous 2013/14 data from the web because those data won't be comparable to the new data.
Allie Wagner: In Northern VA, it would be helpful to have an updated 2013/14 1-meter dataset.
Katie Walker: Noted. After the release of the new data our team can discuss if we want to produce the updated 2013/14 dataset and release it at a later date.
Mark Symborski: Are impervious surfaces and tree canopy part of the 54 classes?
Katie Walker: Yes, they will be.
Dave Montali: Will there be a viewer tool to compare V1 and V2?
Peter Claggett: We probably won't be doing the comparison until after the public release of this data, when it is needed for CAST-23.
Lee Epstein: What happened to the nontidal wetlands?
Peter Claggett: We renamed them as "wetlands, riverine non-forested" and "wetlands, terrene non-forested".
Lisa Beatty: Are the loads for non-tidal wetlands still the same?
Peter Claggett: Yes, everything is the same aside from the name.
Young Tsuei (in chat): How about putting (Non-Tidal) after the names under 12 - 5.2 and 13 - 5.3 to clarify that they were renamed but still non-tidal?
Lisa Beatty: Are you going to differentiate between mines and oil/gas pads as a separate subset?
Peter Claggett: No, I'm not sure how consistently we could do that across space.
Mark Dubin: How are you planning to differentiate between cropland vs pasture with the imagery? I know you've had difficulty identifying hay vs pasture in the past.
Peter Claggett: For now, pasture/hay will be in the same classification. We can change the name.
Dave Montali: Can we have some clarity on the definitions of what goes into extractive?
Katie Walker: Yes, we will have a very clear definition and documentation sheet.
Renee Thompson (in chat): Is there a reason no watershed (huc12, catchment) metrics are being calculated for download?
Peter Claggett (in chat): The public rollout for these data will not include indicators. The LUMM indicators will have more interpretation of the data.

Decision: The LUWG endorses the proposed generalized land use classes for the 2017/18 land use data.

Action: Members are encouraged to provide additional feedback about the land use classes to Katie Walker (kwalker@chesapeakeconservancy.org).

1:40   Accuracy Assessment - Peter Claggett, USGS (20 min).
Peter discussed the plan moving forward with the accuracy assessment of the 2017/18 land cover and 2013/14-2017/18 land cover change data and described what is feasible to produce with the time and resources available. The goal is to have the accuracy assessment results in early Summer 2022.

Discussion
Karl Berger: Will the results of this play into the assessment of 2021/2022 land use and land cover?
Peter Claggett: Absolutely.
Karl Berger: This doesn't affect the timeframe of the production of the 2021/22 data, right?
Peter Claggett: Yes, UVM won't be dealing with this. Only the Conservancy will.
Norm Goulet: Can we subdivide the tree canopy change between tree canopy for developed and tree canopy for harvesting?
Peter Claggett: We can do that after the fact. But if we stratify any further, it may be problematic.

2:00   Land Cover and Land Use Monitoring Recommendation – KC Filippino, HRPDC (30 min). The cooperative agreement with the Chesapeake Conservancy expires in 2024. As such, the LUWG discussed making a recommendation to the Water Quality GIT to continue monitoring high-resolution land use change through the year 2030. The details of this recommendation, such as time interval and frequency of data collection, have not yet been determined.

Decision: The Land Use Workgroup recommends the extension of very-high resolution land cover/use change monitoring by the Bay Program, which currently is funded only until 2024, through at least the year 2030. The workgroup requests that the Water Quality, Habitat, and Maintain Healthy Watersheds GITs endorse this recommendation and elevate it to the Chesapeake Bay Commission, Management Board, and Principals' Staff Committee to ensure adequate funding is allocated for a new cooperative agreement to do this work.
Action: The LUWG leadership will distribute the final land cover and land use monitoring recommendation with updated language and a path forward.

Discussion
Norm Goulet: Add MB, PSC, CBC, and CBPO to the recommendation. Also might be helpful to shop this around to other GITs, such as the HWGIT, for approval as well.
Renee Thompson: There are a lot of outcomes that rely on this data so it might be helpful to list out those uses to make the case for this data.
Lisa Beatty: Also include that local, state, *and* federal governments use this data.
Norm Goulet: Yeah, let's provide some examples of how others use this data as well. State and federal agency use.
Mark Dubin: Might be worth getting letters of support from the sector workgroups as well.
Sally Claggett (in chat): The WQGIT could pen a letter for all WQ workgroups to sign.

2:30   Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicators - Peter Claggett, USGS (20 min). Peter presented a refinement of the Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicators based on feedback from the last LUWG meeting.

Discussion

Karl Berger: I think tree canopy over development is a good indicator. I'd like to see how much impervious has increased because of garages, sheds, etc. associated with that increase is probably a decrease in tree canopy, so I'd like to see both - how tree canopy changes due to forest but also how it changes in places due to increases in impervious, where forest will never be.

Norm Goulet: I agree with Karl.

Renee Thompson: Peter, I'd like to work with you to explore the scale and consistency among the metrics. Also, after Peter gets some visuals for the indicators, we can circle back in April when we bring this to the HWGIT to the LUWG.

KC Filippino: I like that idea and I would like some visuals. Let's circle back on this decision at a later date.

Decision: The LUWG approves the recommendation to the HWGIT that the proposed landscape indicators should serve as the official 2022 metrics for the Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome.

Action: Members are encouraged to provide additional feedback on the Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome indicators to Peter Claggett (PClagget@chesapeakebay.net).

3:00   Adjourn

Meeting Chat

George Onyullo (DC-DOEE): DC is considered as a state for purposes of CWA. Is that how it will be viewed as part of the six geographic scales?

Peter Claggett: Yes George

Young Tsuei: I don't have sound... how about putting (Non-Tidal) after the names under 12 and 13, 5.2 and 5.3 similar to the 8 - 5.2 and 5.3

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP: I think indicating non-tidal will alleviate repeat questions

Renee Thompson: My only comment was related to scale. Is there a reason no watershed (huc12, catchment) metrics are being calculated for download?

Peter Claggett: The public rollout for these data will not include indicators.

Arianna Johns: VA votes Approve to make recommendation with addition of making chain of command explicit

Lisa Beatty, PA DEP: PA votes to Approve the recommendation to the WQGIT to continue monitoring high-resolution land use change through the year 2030.

Norm Goulet: agree with Lisa

Sally claggett, usfs: The WQGIT could pen a letter for all WQ workgroups to sign

Arianna Johns: I know there is a focus on increasing developed tree cover in VA and this data would help I feel

Katie Brownson, USFS (she/her): I lost connectivity for a minute so apologies if I missed it, but will these % change metrics be percentages of the total land area in the geography? And will they be net % change? Or will they show both losses and gains?

Norm Goulet: urban heat island analysis

Peter Claggett: Katie- they will be net change metrics as % of land area.

<u>Participants</u>
Jackie Pickford, CRC
Karl Berger, MWCOG
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Peter Claggett, USGS
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Lori Brown, DNREC
Deb Sward, MDP
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP
George Onyullo, DOEE
Jeff Sweeny, EPA
Lee Epstein, CBF
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Mark Symborski, MCPD
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Nicole Christ - MDE
Mark Dubin, UME/CBPO
Rick Turcotte USDA Forest Service WV
Young Tsuei - DOEE
Labeeb Ahmed, USGS-CBPO
Sarah McDonald, USGS-CBPO
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech, WV and MWG
Rex Robichaux - Virginia DEQ
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting
Katie Brownson, USFS
Shannon McKenrick - MDE
Katie Walker, Chesapeake Conservancy