



### Steering Committee Meeting- Minutes

May 23, 2016

1:00 – 2:00 PM

*Facilitated by Claire Jantz and Antonia Price*

#### Meeting Participants

Claire Jantz (SU)	Clare Billett (WPF)	Megan Boatright (NLT)
Antonia Price (SU)	Scott Haag (ANS)	Stephanie Pendergrass-Dalke (Pinchot)
Peter Claggett (USGS)	Karen Reavy (DRBC)	Eric Olsen (TNC)
Jarlath O'Neil-Dunne (UVM)	Jamie Myers (NPS, UPDE)	

#### Overall Status

Claire Jantz, Antonia Price, Jarlath O'Neil-Dunne, and Peter Claggett provided a brief project update. Participants were encouraged to participate in discussions, in an effort to move away from the previous “report out” meeting style.

- Shippensburg University (Antonia): US-IALE meeting details and workshop summary available online/in most recent newsletter. Submitting IRB to review workshops and summarize information. Working on the “target end user” survey- need your help on this (more info below). Attended Pennsylvania Land Trust Association (PALTA) conference last week, and had the opportunity to meet with many of our SC members. Would like to have an in-person meeting soon.
- University of Vermont (Jarlath): DE land cover data released, PA expected early June, NJ expected mid June, and NY/headwater area expected late June/early July. Running into issues, finding bad LiDAR tiles in PA. First ones to look at the point clouds, with the original LiDAR data- contractor deleted original files. Will let group know if the mid-summer delivery times are expected to change. Did not get any feedback on the DE data. Rolling out PA data for review (NLT planning on this).
- USGS (Peter): Been focusing on getting all the statewide inputs together to run the CBLCM. Will run full state then carve out DRB. In process of validating model against MD commercial and residential property records (most extensive database in region, going back decades). Validating before going statewide. (Claire) We are working in parallel in Shippensburg with SLEUTH model. Planning to meet up in the next month to compare notes and see what we have been finding. Plus see how to get models to work together effectively. Should have a lot to share for our next meeting.

- Other: (Megan) Attended DRWI GIS workgroup. Room at capacity. Spent time discussing GIS/research based analysis throughout basin. Seeing where there are similarities/differences. Moving forward, want to meet three times a year. Trying to determine who is the right group to facilitate meeting. How self govern, keep updated, and logistically get together and discuss research. Is there a place online to post updates? (Scott) May be a good place to overlap for an in-person SC meeting. (Claire) Scott Drzyzga attended PA GIS meeting last week. Presented an overview of this project- mentioned Jarlath's data products. Many were not aware of this data coming online, or of the 1 m tree cover available for PA. There was a lot of excitement at this meeting. Variety of state/local GIS practitioners, not up to date with data. May want to follow-up and see if there are folks interested in seeing the preliminary data.

### **DISCUSSION: Phase II Planning for WPF**

- (Claire) Going to PALTA conference was useful, because it helped us see all the river basin projects coming together. We have been contacted by Steven Schwartz from the Pocono/Kittatinny cluster, and had a good conversation of how our data might fit in to the Phase II planning for their cluster. We would like to have a conversation about the Phase II planning process and how our data, and Jarlath's, might fit in to planning for the clusters.
- Timeline, Involvement, P/K Cluster Needs: Want to have a better idea so that if clusters contact us about how the data can be used, we can talk to them intelligently.
- (Scott) Academy's perspective, Phase II planning and GIS work (Stream Reach Assessment Tool)- for preservation clusters, data gap in what is coming down the pike. We are talking about using SLEUTH model and predictive datasets from USGS to compare to existing estimates of connectivity between developed land and stream water quality. A lot of interest from clusters in looking at that. Part of the challenge is how much analysis to do for the clusters. Some of the datasets are so big, need ways to transfer data to users. Will be finishing SRAT, results by end of July. Compare where predictive nutrient and sediment loading will be, based on what work DRWI partners can do. Planning tool for Phase II for prioritizing focus areas. Over next year, working with clusters to refine results, use other tools out there with clusters to translate scientific data into their planning process.
- (Clare) Beyond the SRAT tool, there is a planning group putting together a suite of supporting guidance on what the Phase II planning effort will look like. Will send that to the clusters over the next couple of months before they get funding in July for planning efforts. Most of clusters will start efforts around September, creating draft plans in May/June 2017, with review meetings and sessions with external experts. Each cluster/organization in clusters has written RMA's, some commonalities, many differences. Sending "Cadillac version" of outline to Antonia for distribution. (Scott) How will we connect results coming out of this work to that process? The clusters are on a tight timeline. (Clare) Clusters likely won't have funding until August/September.

Some groups will not be starting this process until after Christmas. (Scott) The quicker that we connect them to the datasets and the size of the datasets is interesting to me. How will they ingest and use this? An important conversation to have now. (Clare) How much will this be done through self-service online? Front end user process? Still needs to be determined (on table to be resolved). At PALTA, you said you were prepared for one-on-one services, and preparing data for clusters. I assume this is on paper, or through ESRI. Seems unlikely that they will have the ability to go online and have datasets they can use themselves. (Scott) I will need to connect with this group more closely to understand products and when they are coming out. How much do we as a group want to be involved with the clusters? There will likely be a lot of questions about the data coming out. (Clare) There is no money for Shippensburg to go to those meetings and do that work. Would have to come from the cluster pool funds. Cannot have the Shippensburg grant diverted into Cluster support when there is no money in the budget to support that. (Claire) We will communicate with you/anyone else using these datasets on how they were done, best practices for using them, etc. Plan to document data and provide guidance on how to use them most effectively. Make sure that people are comfortable using them and talking about them. We are happy to provide support to the clusters, using their consultant funds.

- (Megan) Clusters are really looking at how to take the watershed wide information/OSI prioritizations and look at the parcel level. At NLT, we are adding information to the OSI parcel data- we have looked at that/maps package so that ultimately, folks looking at parcels can look at the high priority data (adding land cover- parcel based). Have started that work, will have to update with land cover info from Jarlath/any changes from OSI this winter. Clusters know there will be GIS data to help, but not available until fall or winter. OSI has map packages they put out with grant funding. Everything symbolized the way it needs to be, helpful with grants. If thinking of how to share GIS data with clusters, this may be a start on how to do that.
- (Clare) To clarify, ANS has money built in to support clusters. That was not built in to the Shippensburg grant. (Claire) We have been looking at ways to share data- this discussion is helpful, because it lets us think about how to package our final products. We do not want scope creep- we have some timelines to keep for this project!

### **DISCUSSION: Target End User Survey**

- Did anyone get a chance to look at the survey? (Megan) It seems a little long, may be different once in digital format.
- As a reminder, this is based on the information from our 5 workshops in the DRB. We have been looking at word frequency, and creating word clouds as a way to visualize information. We hope people will be able to comment on what they agree on, or disagree with. We want to make sure that the information we gathered covers the full scope of issues in the DRB. We relied heavily on the One Region Forward Project:

<http://oneregionforward.polldaddy.com/s/where-do-we-want-to-go>. This is very well done. Long survey, but not so bad once you actually do it.

- Once approved by IRB, it is really important that we get this out to as many people as we can. Please send this to your contact lists, maybe with an email intro. If you have any team meetings, please talk about the importance of the survey so it isn't one more email that gets lost.
- (Eric) Who is the end target audience for this product? (Claire) We have a few different audiences: professional planners and conservation practitioners (targeted for our SC- you guys are good representatives of the professional users). For the survey, there are a lot of other folks working in county planning offices, etc. that do not seem as connected to the DRB as a whole. May run into these issues in their daily professional lives. We want to "mine them" for more detailed information. We want to incorporate local scale information where we can. (Eric) Did you have many local, municipal planning folks at the workshops? This will be helpful to "sharpen the pencil finer" for where we are targeting work. Highest level of impact probably from decision makers, whether the municipal or planning level. Maybe stronger engagement from them to generate information they can actually use. (Claire) We had municipal officials, township supervisor, and national park supervisors- range in the scale of governance. County planners have been awesome to work with, because they know what is going on, on the ground. It's hard to balance the basin wide approach and local information, especially with our timeline. Want ownership and buy-in from those interactions.

### **DISCUSSION: Participant Map Tool**

- From the workshops, there were many people that had never talked to each other before. They asked if there was a way they could stay in touch with one another. We created an Arc GIS map (internal) of stakeholders and participants. Should only be professional contact information. Link: <http://arcg.is/1SUMhaC>. We are working on IRB, helping people make sure their privacy is maintained.
- Let us know if you have any thoughts or feedback.
- (Scott) Map is interesting. Have you thought of linking this to a forum for people to talk back and forth about how they use the data? (Claire) No- Scott has set up a table that can automatically update the map. Should be relatively easy to add people, but do not have a discussion board. (Antonia) Getting ready to update the website. Could build that in if it seems like a need/something we should host. (Scott) Sometimes you create a discussion board, and people don't use it. Could be a good way for organizations to talk about how they use your data, give you credit, and ask questions. (Claire) Not sure if that's something we could pull in within the current scope. There's a gap. Maybe the DRWI website could be a place for a portal, or place for people to understand the project/who is doing what.

- (Megan) Cross communication of what everyone is doing across the watershed is such a huge thing to think about. We could talk about this just with data and mapping, but clusters are looking for ways to share data, post reports of what they have done. This is a big issue. You want a way to share data, but not a daily email with tons of information... finding that perfect balance is tricky. It would be great for the data side of things, but could exponentially grow. (Antonia) Is there any infrastructure or plans right now for something like this, or a way for people to share these reports? (Scott) Just getting involved in the translational side of this. Not sure. (Clare) Talking with the coordinating committee, ICL has said to hold off. When it actually materializes, only a few people uses. ICL would be the group/partner to move that forward- the how/when/why this would get launched. Forward that information you have collected to ICL (point person for collaborative info). (Scott) Could also roll our information geographically, with data you have of where people are working. Seems powerful.

### Sea Level Rise/Storm Surge

- One of our graduate students (Joshua Barth) has been working on the combined impact of sea level rise and storm surge. NOAA has generated a similar product, but at a very coarse resolution. He has taken NOAA tide gauge data and forecasts for sea level rise, and combined that with SLOSH model- models impacts of hurricanes. He ran this for no sea level rise, 2 feet up to 6 feet, for category 1-4 hurricanes. For each scenario of sea level rise and hurricane level, we have potential inundation maps for the east coast and Delmarva Peninsula. This is to incorporate into our modeling work- at 10m resolution. You can see what might be impacted- climate change has been a huge topic during our workshops. We still want to do some QA/QC and comparisons to NOAA data. Should we share this separately, or just put into our models? (Clare) From my perspective, it would be helpful to release separately. There's a huge potential use of this. OSI does a resiliency fund- might be interested in seeing more detailed data, people could find many new ways to use this information- the clusters too. Clusters may be more interested in precipitation. (Claire) We are looking for proxy datasets to estimate flood risks. We won't have time to develop a comprehensive assessment to look at the impacts of climate change on land use. This is relevant to the coastal areas- on the other side of the fall line there are different issues. (Clare) May be relevant to two clusters.

### Updates/Upcoming

- Scenario Development Retreat in late June- details TBD
- (Stephanie) Still planning the Science of Source Water Workshop- July, details TBD
- 2016 Meetings: August (webinar) OR September (in-person?), November

### **Action items**

- Review Target End User Survey
  - Share final version with your contacts in June
- Review Participant Map
- Contribute to Scenarios/Storylines
  - Draft scenario storylines- Spring/Summer 2016
  - Finalize scenario storylines- Summer/Fall 2016
  - Release scenario forecasts- Winter 2016