

**SUMMARY**  
**Land Use Workgroup (LUWG)**  
**Conference call**  
**January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013**

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19130/>

**SUMMARY OF DECISIONS AND ACTIONS ITEMS**

- ACTION: LUWG members should email potential STAC workshop topics to Claggett, Tribo, and Berger by the first week in February.

**MINUTES**

**Welcome and introductions**

- Karl Berger (MWCOG; Co-Chair, LUWG) convened the call shortly after 10:00AM.
- Peter Claggett (USGS; Coordinator, LUWG)

**Discussion of Local Data Request**

- Jenny Tribo (HRPDC; Co-Chair, LUWG)
- Beverly Quinlan (VA DCR) raised concerns that the March 11<sup>th</sup> deadline may not allow enough time to make the necessary requests and contacts.
- Jeff White (MDE) agreed and suggested extending the deadline to March 29<sup>th</sup>.
- Claggett clarified that the deadline is certainly negotiable.
- Pat Buckley (PA DEP) also agreed with extending the deadline, and possibly extending it even further, e.g. a four month deadline.
- Berger clarified that not all data would be needed by March 11<sup>th</sup>. They just want some data to begin working through issues with incorporating the local information. Additional data will continue to be collected over the following months.
- Claggett explained that waiting until the end of March or into April may cut into assessment time. He would like to receive some data by the March 11<sup>th</sup> deadline. Would not want to wait until June for all data to come in.
- Mary Gattis (Lancaster County Planning Commission) has passed the request to Lancaster County's GIS department. She suggested that she and Buckley can contact a few select counties to move things forward.
- Stephanie Martins (MDP): There are certain layers that MDP can provide over next month or two.
- Quinlan: Will certainly try to forward the information as it comes in. Would not want the counties to feel discouraged by the short deadline.
- George Onyullo (DDOE): DDOE is able to give you some readily available data that we have. We should take into account the request from states needing more time.
- Dave Bubniak (Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board): Some of this data does not exist in New York. Are there plans to set up an ftp or electronic transfer site to send files to?
- Claggett: Can either provide access to the Partnership's ftp site, or locality could give him access to their ftp. Can notify him as they upload information.

- Buckley: Would ask CBPO to provide the counties with ftp access. DEP will not collect and submit the data on behalf of the counties.
- Claggett: would hope that all the data would come with at least some metadata, if not complete metadata.
- Burdick: Would the state formally make this request down to the local and regional entities so there is more weight to the request?
- Quinlan: We hope DCR can work through the regional commissions to request land use info from local governments.
- Megan Grose (WV DEP): have shared the request to a handful of people who may have more localized data and also working with staff to see what data DEP already has. Do not expect that many entities will have very localized data, and prefer for the data to flow through me before submitting it to the CBP.
- Claggett: We will request data by the end of June, though data can certainly be submitted sooner if available: will set up the ftp with a folder for each state.
- Burdick: Create sub-folders for the counties so the county data does not get mixed up?
- Quinlan: This is our first discussion of the logistics of the data flow.
- Claggett: Perhaps the data will work differently for each state.
- Tribo: We also discussed the collection of improved federal information.
- Jeff White (MDE): We have a list of federal contacts from WIP development
- Berger: Do we want the federal agencies to work directly with the states or the Bay Program?
- Claggett: Not sure which option is better. There is a federal facilities team at the CBPO, but each department or agency handles data differently. If the states already have a means of collecting data and are willing to do so, that may be best for those states. Encourage local jurisdictions with large portions of federal land to work with those facilities so that provide information to the state or CBPO.
- Berger: In some cases, locals have established contact and been successful getting the requested data, but other localities may lack these relationships or success.
- Quinlan: The request states “preferably in GIS vector or raster data format.” If there is no intent to handle PDFs or other formats, the request should be more specific.
- Quinlan: What about CADD?
- Claggett: Haven’t dealt with it in the past, but could potentially translate the CADD into geo-spatial information.
- Jim Baird: This request is more an opportunity for the jurisdictions than a requirement. This point was not completely clear in the original request.
- Claggett: Correct.
- Grose: It is my understanding that the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup may be looking into sewer shed information.
- White: When we send out the request we will frame it more as a data improvement “opportunity” than a request.
- Claggett: This helps address the issue raised by Baird.

### **Establishing Phase III WIPs on 2025 Land Use Conditions**

- Claggett explained that during its last call on January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the WQGIT discussed the issue of developing [Phase III WIPs on future 2025 land use](#), rather than a 2017 or

2010 land use. He described some advantages associated with that approach. A future land use would theoretically allow for more accurate planning for BMP implementation, since land use and population will change.

- He pointed out that in 2017, the most recent data available will typically be about 2-years old due to a time lag in the data. So, in 2017, a 2017 land use would be based on a forecast.
- He noted this discussion can go into more detail at a face-to-face meeting, but asked for the workgroup's thoughts and input.
- Buckley mentioned that Pennsylvania raised reservations during the WQGIT call about using a future land use. Also concerned that these future projections will not be as accurate as ones for a current year land use.
- Denny Puko (PA Dept. of Comm. & Econ. Development): Is the linear trend in population being applied equally and linearly to where the growth occurs? Due to changes in lifestyle and preferences, the growth in populations will not be equal between rural and urban areas.
- Claggett: in the past we used a linear extrapolation. We understand those changes as described by Puko and see them on the ground, and plan to simulate these changes in any future projections.
- Berger: There was no decision by the WQGIT at this time. This type of decision is above the LUWG's level. Regardless of which land use is used in the WIPs, there is still a need for Peter and CBPO staff to continue to refine their projections.
- Baird: Thought that one of the reasons for doing a 2025 land use would be to account for non-linear patterns in population growth. The AFT thinks that the 2025 land use would be a potential opportunity to better account for and incentivize conservation and farmland preservation. Definitely support continued discussions on this subject.

### **STAC Workshop Request**

- Berger described the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee's [request for workshop proposals](#). March 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline for proposals for the next fiscal year. He noted that two potential topics are (1) using and developing a probabilistic land use, or (2) potential land use loading rates for different land use categories. He noted the CBP is considering the formation of an expert panel or panels to consider loading rates from different land uses, so a workshop could potentially be a way to launch that process.
- Claggett explained the concept of a probabilistic land use. If an area is divided up based on probability, the sums of land uses at the segment- or watershed-level are more accurate. A down side is that it would be much more complicated to compare a probabilistic dataset to an explicit local dataset. These technical issues are examples of things that academic experts could address at a STAC workshop.
- Berger: would be okay with more than one suggestion, but should use the February meeting to choose which one is a higher priority.
- Buckley requested written descriptions about these proposals to help the LUWG make an informed decision.
- Claggett asked for LUWG members to continue to brainstorm potential STAC workshop topics, considering expert or technical input from academics.

- Berger: if a LUWG thinks of a potential topic, they should email Claggett, Tribo and Berger a half page description within the next two weeks (first week in February)
- ACTION: LUWG members should email potential STAC workshop topics to Claggett, Tribo, and Berger by the first week in February.

### **Comparison of MDP Land Use Data with 5.3.2 Land Use**

- Claggett described some of the gaps and overlaps between the MDP's and CBPO's 5.3.2 LULC data. For details, [view the PDF version of his presentation here](#).
- David Newburn (UMD): There has been success with using nighttime satellite imagery, because Landsat imagery doesn't get a good signal on low density, in mapping ex-urban developments. There might be a way of improving on that at the watershed level.
- Claggett: The Frederick county data is 1-meter resolution that distinguishes pervious and impervious. To aggregate it up to 30-meter resolution, added pixels that were partially impervious (darker gray).
- Johnston: Interested to see how a canopy cover layer might account for differences between CBP and local datasets. What happens to the datasets when incorporating canopy cover? Will the LUWG tackle this issue?
- Claggett: The Forestry workgroup is the lead on this, but they have asked the LUWG to provide the technical land use perspective.

### **February meeting topics and proposed topics for future meetings**

- Tribo described the tentative topics for the February meeting:
  - Finalize STAC proposal(s)
  - Requested other workgroups to finalize their land use list, will review the list submitted by the workgroups
  - Status update on requested data from counties/localities
  - Data comparisons from the jurisdictions
- Claggett explained the rationale for having the jurisdictions.
  - Martins and White indicated they will be able to present a comparison from Maryland's perspective.
  - Grose: Can probably put something together on how WV DEP tracks land use change.
  - Tribo: Can put together a presentation on the tracking in Hampton Roads.
- Claggett: The AgWG is looking at potential major changes to how agricultural land use is portrayed in the model. There will be enough to discuss to hold at least one joint meeting between the workgroups.
- Berger explained the LUWG will resume its regular third-Monday monthly meeting schedule, with the exception of the rescheduled meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup>. Every other month will be a face-to-face meeting, depending on needs.

### **Adjourned**

Next meeting:  
Monday, February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
10:00AM – 3:00PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19206/>

**Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Email</b>
Karl Berger, Co-Chair	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	kberger@mwkog.org
Jenny Tribo, Co-Chair	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	jtribo@hrpdca.gov
Peter Claggett, Coordinator	USGS	pclagget@chesapeakebay.net
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Jim Baird	American Farmland Trust	jbaird@FARMLAND.ORG
Bryan Bloch	DNREC	Bryan.Bloch@state.de.us
Dave Bubniak	Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board	gisstc@stny.rr.com
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@pa.gov
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County, VA	Darold.Burdick@fairfaxcounty.gov
Sally Claggett	USFS	sclaggett@fs.fed.us
Lee Epstein	CBF	LEpstein@cbf.org
Barry Evans	PSU	bme1@psu.edu
Mary Gattis	Lancaster County Planning Commission	gattism@co.lancaster.pa.us
Megan Grose	WV DEP	megan.e.grose@wv.gov
Leslie Grunden	Caroline County	lgrunden@carolinemd.org
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO	mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net
Stephanie Martins	MDP	smartins@mdp.state.md.us
David Newburn	UMD	dnewburn@arec.umd.edu
George Onyullo	DDOE	george.onyullo@dc.gov
Denny Puko	PA Dept. of Comm. & Econ. Development	dpuko@state.pa.us
Beverly Quinlan	VA DCR	Beverly.Quinlan@dcr.virginia.gov
Aaron Ristow	Upper Susquehanna Coalition	
Justin Shafer	DPW, City of Norfolk	Justin.Shafer@norfolk.gov
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County, Dept. of Environ. Prot. & Sustainability	sstewart@baltimorecountymd.gov
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff White	MDE	jjwhite@mde.state.md.us
Dana York	Green Earth Connection, LLC	dyork818@yahoo.com