

# CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP Meeting Summary

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office

February 26, 2015

10:00AM-3:00PM

Meeting materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/22430/>

## ACTIONS & DECISIONS

**DECISION:** Land Use Workgroup members approved of the scope of work, with changes discussed during the meeting, for the Chesapeake Conservancy to produce high resolution land cover data for the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

**ACTION:** Send any minor technical changes to the Chesapeake Conservancy scope of work to Peter ([pclagget@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:pclagget@chesapeakebay.net)) by COB 3/6.

## MINUTES

### 1. Introductions

### 2. Schedule, deliverables, and announcements

- Karl reviewed the schedule ([GANTT chart](#)) for developing the Phase 6 land uses including decision points, deliverables, and review periods.
- The source sector workgroups are reviewing the land use loading information now. The Modeling Workgroup will be taking input from these groups and providing a recommendation to the WQGIT in late spring.
- Land Use Workgroup will refer back to the GANTT chart at subsequent meetings.

### 3. High-res Land Cover (LUWG approval of scope of work)

- The Principals' Staff Committee is considering a Chesapeake Conservancy proposal to produce high resolution land cover data for the Chesapeake Bay watershed. In preparation for this decision by the PSC, the Land Use Workgroup is being asked to review and approve the technical scope of work.
- Peter gave an overview of the role of high-res land cover data in Phase 6.
- How is this being funded?
  - EPA is taking the lead on funding.
- How does it fit with the VGIN effort for collecting high-res data in the Bay portions of VA?
  - An RFP will go out to collect similar information for the state of VA. The Chesapeake Conservancy plans to submit a proposal.
- Will this Bay wide project go out for public bid?
  - Not expected to go out for public bid at this point.
- The Chesapeake Conservancy has said they could deliver results by the deadlines needed within the Partnership to finalize land uses.

- How useful is having this base data a few years down the road?
  - Benefit is that it serves as a uniform baseline for looking at change for the land use metrics outcome.
- MDE: Would it be possible to make requests by state – such as asking the Conservancy to focus on leaf off data in MD, because MD already has tree canopy data.
  - Claggett: Yes. That should be built in to their methodology. Let us know as soon as possible what the state by state concerns are, so we can include these in to the scope.
- MDP: Some localities in MD are updating their planimetric data. Timing of these updates not confirmed for all localities.
  - Claggett: Conservancy will have to be sensitive to the timing of when datasets will be available, if they plan to compile these outside data sources.
- Berger: How will the Conservancy coordinate with the states, localities and CBPO?
  - Claggett: Now that we know about these other data sources and timing, we will build this in to the workplan. We'll ask them to produce a schedule by county, and iterate that with the jurisdictional members of the Land Use Workgroup.
  - Chair: Will need states to designate a contact person to coordinate with Conservancy, and LUWG on this effort.
- DDOE: DC may have some data updates coming as well.
- EPA: Note the timing of this proposal will not allow the Partners a full year to review the version of Phase 6.0 model that incorporates this data. Do we anticipate major changes in the model due to this data? Are states ok with less time to review?
  - Claggett: There will be one month review period in summer 2016. In some cases the changes should be minor.
  - Berger: Not expecting major changes in loads at the state level.
- Baltimore County: Has someone looked in to accuracy levels and level of effort?
  - Claggett: Yes, they have assured us that with combine LIDAR and manual correction they can reach 95% accuracy.
- Chair: Are there any objections to approving the scope of work with the adjustments discussed today?
  - DE: From technical perspective agree with the scope; DE unlikely to consider funding this process since they already have high-res data.
  - MD has additional minor technical comments that they will send via email by COB 3/6.

**DECISION:** Land Use Workgroup members approved of the scope of work, with changes discussed during the meeting, for the Chesapeake Conservancy to produce high resolution land cover data for the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

**ACTION:** Send any minor technical changes to the Chesapeake Conservancy scope of work to Peter ([pclagget@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:pclagget@chesapeakebay.net)) by COB 3/6.

#### 4. Moderate-resolution Gap Filling Methods & Data Availability

- Peter presented methods and draft results for mapping the Phase 6 land uses in jurisdictions that did not submit any local land use/cover data.
- Brandywine Conservancy: Note that the local data in Chester County in PA is more detailed than national datasets.

- Claggett: We have requested stream data from localities in the past, will check to see if we have it from Chester County. If we have a local dataset for any jurisdiction, we will use it instead of the NHD.

## **5. Mapping Agricultural Uses**

- Adam Ridley, USGS, presented a method and draft results for mapping the location of commodity crops, specialty crops, and hay/pasture forage throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed using the NASS Cropland Data Layer (2008-2013).
- MDA: Would it be possible to review the discrepancies by county, for LUWG to review how much infill would be occurring?
  - Not at this point.
- Chair: Will the Agriculture Workgroup review this methodology?
  - Claggett: When Adam presented this to the AgWG last week, concerns were raised about the misclassification between types of agricultural land. From a mapping perspective – LUWG will need to recommend which option to use to fill in the gaps. The goal is to get the proportions correct at the land river segment scale.
  - Chair recommended these maps be rolled out to the community, similar to how the urban maps will be shared with local governments.

## **6. Mapping Maryland**

- Jeff White presented MDE/MDP's plan for developing the Phase 6 land use dataset for Maryland.
- Chair: Note that version 6 of the model will not be one size fits all, and MD is pursuing their own methodology, other states are relying on the CBPO produced methodology.
- Chair: With the rollout of maps this year, we will need to clearly communicate that future changes to the land uses are coming from MDE and MDP
  - MDE: Localities will know that this effort is underway. Communication concern would be with other interested parties.

## **Lunch**

## **7. Mapping Delaware & Wetlands**

- Quentin Stubbs presented methods for mapping the Phase 6 land uses in Delaware and discussed current plans by the Wetlands Expert Panel on how best to map wetlands.
- DE has 2012 impervious data now, they will send to Quentin.
- Chair recommended a separate call to go in to more detail on DE land use. Separate calls could be set up for other states as well.

## **8. Mapping Virginia**

- Fred presented preliminary Phase 6 land use results for Fairfax County, Virginia.
- LUWG recommended dropping residential driveways out of the loading rate data for roads (instead combine them with other impervious), because some jurisdictions will have them reported differently than others.

## 9. Mapping Pennsylvania

- Renee presented preliminary Phase 6 land use results for Lancaster County, Pennsylvania.
- CBF: What about other counties in PA that do not have as much data?
  - Thompson: In general most of PA is not as complete as this county.
- Chair: When we roll out the maps, include notes or documentation showing the data sources and how they were used.
- Will all data be at 10m resolution with the CBPO method?
  - Yes, some counties will have more detail, but for consistency will roll them up to 10m.
  - However, if MD eventually published 1m data, that would be at that finer scale.

## 10. Land use loading rate Targets

- Olivia presented an update on the land use loading rate targets for the Phase 6 Watershed Model.
- Some remaining issues that will need to be addressed: a category of unfertilized open (within ag, different from urban) and farmsteads (which are difficult to map).
- Chair noted that the agriculture specific issues should be addressed by the AgWG.

## 11. Discussion & Schedule

- Possible agenda items for the March 26 meeting include:
  - West Virginia mapping example (similar to what was done today).
  - Examples of how land use would be mapped in a jurisdiction with less data.
  - Phase 6.0 land use for the entire watershed (not incorporating the local data) showing what would be done in the absence of local data.
  - List of decision rules related to urban tree canopy, and other parameters

## Adjourned

## Participants

Karl Berger, Co-Chair	MWCOG
Peter Claggett, Coordinator	USGS
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County
George Onyullo	DDOE
Bryan Bloch	DNREC
Jennifer Walls	DNREC
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Jeff White	MDE
Stephanie Martins	MDP
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Emma Giese, staff	CRC

Olivia Devereux	DEC
Katherine Antos	EPA
Lee Epstein	CBF
Mary Gattis	LGAC Coordinator
Fred Irani	USGS
Quentin Stubbs	USGS
Renee Thompson	USGS
Adam Ridley	USGS
Kristen Wolf	PADEP
Ted Tesler	PADEP
Greg Evans	VDF
John Wolf	USGS
Sally Claggett	USFS
Justin Shafer	Norfolk
Seung Ah Byun	Brandywine Conservancy
Sarah	DDOE
Lucia Woo	