

MINUTES
Chesapeake Bay Program
Land Use Workgroup (LUWG)
Conference call
October 15th, 2012

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18851/>

ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

DECISION: The September 17th meeting minutes were accepted.

ACTION: Claggett, Tribo, and Berger will draft a questionnaire on land use data for the jurisdictions and LUWG members.

ACTION: LUWG members should provide Peter Claggett with feedback or suggestions on the proposed workplan by December 7th.

MINUTES

1. Welcome & Introductions

2. Review of minutes

- Karl Berger (MWCOC) asked for comments or corrections to the [September 17th minutes](#)
 - None were heard.

DECISION: The September 17th meeting minutes were accepted.

3. LUWG Midpoint Assessment Priorities

- Jenny Tribo (HRPDC) noted there were some basic revisions to the LUWG's [Midpoint Assessment Priorities](#) based on comments from the workgroup
- Berger mentioned the workgroup chairs will discuss the priorities on a panel during the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) face-to-face [meeting on October 22nd-23rd](#)
 - He noted the LUWG's priorities were receiving support from across the Partnership
- Dana York asked for clarification to #3 under "suggested revisions" – investigate differential loading rates for expanded urban and natural land use classes
 - Peter Claggett (USGS/CBPO) explained his expectation that the sector workgroups would need to provide the technical expertise to establish differential loading rates for land use classes
 - York: should "agricultural" be there in addition to "urban" and "natural?"
 - P. Claggett: yes, should probably add it since it's included with #1

4. Review of LUWG Roles and Responsibilities

- Berger reviewed the [draft summary of the LUWG's roles and responsibilities](#)
- No comments or questions were heard

5. LUWG Draft Workplan

- Peter Claggett (USGS) described the [Draft LUWG Workplan](#) and he explained that he considered steps needed to achieve the workgroup's roles/responsibilities, starting with the Primary Roles and Responsibilities

- **For #1 – Develop protocols and methods for using local LULC data** – P. Claggett discussed the [draft initial land use classification list](#)
 - Draft list shows we can easily go from 9 to over 20 Land Use/Land Cover classes, depending on the splits
- P. Claggett asked the workgroup to let him know if they felt any steps were missing or if they needed clarification for anything
- Matt Johnston (UMD) pointed out that for each step, the LUWG should consider the amount of complexity it could add to the next version of the model, and how that may affect credibility with local jurisdictions.
- Berger noted that even though there are potentially a lot of new land uses, especially in the urban sector, they do not all require unique loading rates, e.g. the split between regulated and unregulated, which doubles the number but has the same loading.
- **For #2 – increase spatial, temporal, and categorical resolution**
 - P. Claggett: One reason EPA/CBP has not accepted local data in the past is a lack of a historical record (~20 yrs); might be possible to open up the back-casting process to make it more credible at local level
- Berger: does that mean we could use the same back/fore-casting system for data sets other than current watershed land use dataset?
 - P. Claggett: Right. STAC suggested there should be consistency in assumptions. Moving forward, jurisdictions don't have to have 20 years of data for it to be useful to inform the model
 - Darold Burdick (Fairfax County): Is it possible to use information from a down-zoned area like the Occoquan to inform this process?
 - P. Claggett: local zoning information is one of most critical layers as we project future growth; even though zoning changes, it is extremely important information.
- Dana York (Green Earth Connection): is NASS Cropland Data Layer a geospatial layer?
 - P. Claggett: it's a geospatial layer, with 30-m resolution with about 40 different crop types
- P. Claggett: probabilistic LULC might be something to consider, perhaps bring in experts that know how to do this for a STAC workshop
 - Berger: if we want a STAC workshop, there are deadlines to consider
 - Chris Pyke (STAC): we consider proposals quarterly; this is certainly a priority, would be a 2013 activity, could be on STAC agenda as soon as March
 - Stephanie Martin (MDP): would probabilistic LULC be reserved for areas without local LULC data?
 - P. Claggett: correct
- **For #3 – Improve accuracy, plausibility, and usefulness of future land use scenarios**
- P. Claggett noted that the American Farmland Trust is making projections for agricultural areas, but the information may not be available in time for the 2017 midpoint assessment since it's a three year project. So the LUWG may want to explore ways to make its own projections.
- Mary Gattis felt the probabilistic LULC could be useful to help address some of the issues with scenarios
- Lee Epstein: what's the expected timing for this?

- P. Claggett: taking a little longer to incorporate scenarios, hoping to have results by December, to present in February
- Berger asked Claggett if these projections/scenarios will replace the current (SLEUTH) methods.
 - P. Claggett: Yes. They will. This is in response to STAC's suggestion over the past few years to present a range of scenarios rather than just one.
- **#4 – Evaluate accuracy and utility of land use datasets, estimates, and scenarios**
- P. Claggett explained that the data collected under #1 could also be used to refine and check the assumptions made for scenarios and projections
- Pat Buckley (PA DEP) asked which Pennsylvania counties were included out of the eight counties reviewed previously (Claggett: Lancaster was the only one)
 - Buckley: Not clear if we'll get participation from other counties' planning offices
 - P. Claggett: only a small number of counties probably have the data; probably best to focus on southeastern PA counties in the watershed
 - Buckley: Planning to contact these counties directly?
 - P. Claggett: hope this would happen through LUWG membership
 - Buckley noted that the southeast counties are high-growth; she felt skeptical of projections/assumptions derived from data from those counties, as it would not apply to rural northern counties
 - Gattis: would be more than happy trying to help reach out through state planning association and similar organizations; confident that other county planners will be interested in participating
 - She observed there is more growth occurring in rural areas because of Marcellus shale drilling, so this would be an issue to consider how it affects LULC
- Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission) suggested that Claggett and others write-up a survey/questionnaire, or something that describes the kind of data being sought; this would be useful for outreach and discussion purposes
 - P. Claggett agreed this would be useful and offered to generate a draft for one of the next LUWG calls or meeting
- Stephanie Martin (MDP): agree with Gattis' idea to consider growth by state or by region, given unique factors (e.g., recent septic legislation in Maryland - SB236; Marcellus shale drilling in PA)
- Berger felt a discussion of these issues would warrant a full face-to-face meeting
- Buckley: concern regarding Marcellus Shale, the actual drilling has dropped off significantly due to drop in prices; skeptical about basing projections on older research
 - Johnston: northern PA counties actually have great planning datasets now. Nature Conservancy study is old data, but reaching out to northern tier counties could yield great datasets
 - Gattis: aside from residential growth, it's important to consider loss of forest
- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): how are those categories going to be filled? There are some limitations on what we're able to report
 - P. Claggett: Exactly. This will be an iterative process. Take a look at list, and comment on what classes are, and are not, useful; want to shorten the list based on available information, feasibility, and other factors

- Tesler: concerned about inequities that may potentially penalize areas that don't have the best data
- **For #5 – Explore methods for reporting land use changes to evaluate progress runs and explore use of land use projections to develop/assess 2-year milestones**
 - **Post-meeting note:** Progress runs are done annually, not every two years as implied in the original meeting documents.
- P. Claggett: it would be nice to compare what's been done (BMPs) with the land use changes that have occurred, but this information is even harder to get; need to understand which localities are able to provide this scale of BMP data. First step would be similar to Norm's suggestion.
- Dan Baldwin (MDP): do we have understanding of what sort of scope of local datasets are available, watershed wide?
 - P. Claggett: no, that's #1 under the secondary items
- Buckley: appreciate Mary's offer to help with outreach; Denny Puko from PA Dept. of Economic & Community Development is only certified urban planner for the Commonwealth, would be great LUWG member if he had time or staff.
 - She reiterated Tesler's point about potential for inequities; this is a very difficult undertaking for PA.
- Gattis: we're all grappling with cutbacks, Tesler raised a valid point and we need reality check. If we can get a broad constituency from PA to understand data availability, that would clarify what's achievable. Would hate to assume that it's not possible without more info.
 - Buckley: don't see the state having ability to assist w/ ground-truthing
- Baldwin: the Healthy Watersheds GIT is also working to collect some data, could possibly reduce effort by collaborating with them
- Berger: problem may not be the land use, but the loading rates that are plugged in once a land use is selected; suggest getting input from Gary Shenk to understand land use loading impacts
- P. Claggett: we are still at data-gathering stage right now
 - Burdick: to kick-start that...would send questionnaire to the workgroup?
 - York: who exactly will it be sent to?
 - P. Claggett: members of LUWG workgroup
- P. Claggett: take comments on workplan and continue to flesh it out over next couple weeks; will work with Berger and Tribo to develop questionnaire for jurisdictions

ACTION: Claggett, Tribo, and Berger will draft a questionnaire on land use data for the jurisdictions and LUWG members.

ACTION: LUWG members should provide Peter Claggett with feedback or suggestions on the workplan over

- Berger: what should main topics be for the next couple meetings? Tribo and I felt it might make more sense to have a face-to-face in November; schedule a series of presentations to get at some of the issues just discussed, describe what data is or is not available in the jurisdictions
- Buckley: we don't have anyone in state govt that performs those functions. Gattis is from a more sophisticated county and should not be viewed as representative of other PA counties
 - Berger: we'll have to keep that in mind

- Berger: Maryland can probably put something like that together.
 - Baldwin: we'd be thrilled to present
 - Jeff White (MDE): we have MS4 pervious/impervious data, if MDP would like help with that
 - Bryan Hall (DE DNREC): DE has a bunch of recent and historic data, happy to present too
 - Beverly Quinlan (VA DCR): until we do survey, don't have local land use data
 - Burdick: we have quite a bit of local data in Fairfax, can check with GIS folks, but the questionnaire would be helpful
- Tribo: at least MD and DE present in November, maybe a couple local presenters from PA and VA; once we get survey, other jurisdictions can maybe present in December
 - Baldwin: Maryland can present in Nov
 - Gattis: will coordinate w/ Kirk Stoner (and others), can have a Lancaster Co presentation
 - Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): we can also present on relationship of land uses and loading rates
 - Buckley: please utilize existing workgroups as much as possible, don't want to ask people to attend more meetings than they already do
 - Berger: so the AgWG would be able to work out some of the differences in the agriculture data sets
 - York: great idea; should provide data to AgWG in advance
 - Berger: survey maybe go out before December (hopefully); perhaps focus on Peter's discussion of methodology in January
- Goulet recalled a discussion about shifting to 2025 land use, and noted if we're going to move forward on that, will have to do so soon.
 - Berger: we would know about this after WQGIT
 - Buckley: the WQGIT hasn't had a substantive discussion of 2025 land use, so don't assume there's a consensus
 - Berger: will hold off for guidance from WQGIT on this issue
 - P. Claggett: willing to present to WQGIT on this
 - Tribo: would suggest scenarios for Jan/Feb

Adjourned

Next meeting:

Monday, November 19th 10:00AM – 3:00PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18999/>

Participants

Name	Affiliation
Karl Berger (Co-Chair)	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Jenny Tribo (Co-Chair)	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Peter Claggett (Coordinator)	USGS/CBPO
Beverly Quinlin	VA DCR
Bryan Bloch	DE DNREC
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County Office of Planning and Zoning
Douglas Griffith	WV Dept. of Agriculture
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Mary Gattis	Lancaster County Planning Commission
Rob Gunter	Queen Anne's County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County Dept. of Environ. Prot. & Sustainability
Norm Goulet	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Chris Pyke	STAC
Lee Epstein	CBF
Laura Muhs	Dept. of Defense
Dana York	Green Earth Connection
Aaron Ristow	Upper Susquehanna Coalition
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Matthew Pennington	Eastern Panhandle Planning & Development Council
Sally Claggett	US Forest Service/CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA/CBPO
Matt Johnston	UMD/CBPO
David Newburn	UMD
Stephanie Martins	MDP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Julie Winters	EPA/CBPO
Barry Evans	Penn State
Justin Shafer	City of Norfolk
Pat Buckley	PA DEP
Margaret Kaii-Ziegler	Anne Arundel County Dept. of Planning & Zoning
Jeremy Hanson	CRC/CBPO