

# CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP MEETING

## Conference Call Minutes March 11, 2014

### ACTIONS & DECISIONS

**ACTION:** Peter Claggett will put together a detailed version of the proposed land uses including specific examples.

**ACTION:** LUWG members will review Phase 6.0 land uses simultaneously with the sector workgroups.

**ACTION:** LUWG members will request a presentation from the AgWG at the next face to face meeting on the agricultural land use categories.

**ACTION:** Jurisdiction specific meetings will be scheduled in the next two months to review initial land cover datasets by Phase 6.0 categories.

### MINUTES

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions

- Jenny Tribo (Co-Chair) welcomed everyone to the call and confirmed meeting participants.

#### 2. Review Phase 6.0 Developed Land Uses

- If LUWG agrees on the Phase 6.0 land uses they will go to the sector workgroups for review and comment then back to the LUWG to elevate to the WQGIT for final approval.
- Why is tree canopy specified at less than 1 acre?
  - i. Tree canopy is specified at less than 1 acre because then the understory of tree canopy is most likely turf or landscaping. Larger urban parks might have unmanaged understories.
  - ii. Recommend a lower boundary size.
  - iii. Recommend that tree canopy be a land use, because it will be tracked anyway as an outcome in the bay agreement.
  - iv. The patch size threshold will need to be determined.
  - v. LUWG will also need to decide whether to treat tree canopy over developed land use separately from tree canopy over undeveloped land use.
- Request a short description and justification for each land use category prior to final LUWG decision.
- If roads don't load differently are there other reasons to model them separately?
  - i. Measuring extent and rate of change of impervious surface coverage is an aspect of the Bay Agreement.

- ii. Gravel roads have had specific strategies in the past; consider splitting gravel vs. paved roads in the land classifications.
- Residential and non-residential developed land uses are currently split for BMP tracking; however they can be combined if that break is not important to members.
- Another option is to have one impervious class and differentiate based on level of connectivity.
- MDE noted that connected and disconnected is the key piece. Recommend further breaks in the non-residential category: commercial, industrial, etc.
  - i. Data availability will limit the options.
- A different approach could be taken to show where the BMPs are on the landscape with this level of specificity, outside of the watershed model.
- PA recommended changing residential to connected, and non-residential to non connected. Recommend splitting turfgrass into residential and non-residential or institutional to account for fertilization differences, because not all turf grass is fertilized.
- WV: Recommend two different coverages: one for the model, which would be simpler, and one more detailed for management purposes. This would require a crosswalk to bridge between the two classifications.
  - i. Workgroup agreed with this approach.

**ACTION:** Peter Claggett will put together a detailed version of the proposed land uses including specific examples.

**ACTION:** LUWG members will review Phase 6.0 land uses simultaneously with the sector workgroups.

### 3. Review Natural Land Uses

- Are there plans to change the scale of the river system in Phase 6.0?
  - i. 24k or 100k or dataset from a local jurisdiction could be used.
  - ii. Currently 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> order streams do not exist in the model.
  - iii. Riparian land use is defined with a stream layer
- Consider splitting floodplain and riparian into urban vs. non-urban.
  - i. Or a continuous gradient based on the amount of impervious or agricultural cover
- Herbaceous is the catch all category that is not captured elsewhere else.
- Wetland mapping data sources are the NWI and jurisdiction data sets.
  - i. The Habitat GIT will be convening a wetland expert panel to determine loading rates.
  - ii. Recommend breaking tidal into categories based on salinity.
  - iii. Recommend splitting tidal between herbaceous/woody.
    - 1. This difference would need to be parameterized
- Tracking beaches may help with management and MS4s
  - i. Consider including beaches in another land use, such as open water.

- ii. Beaches are likely not a significant loading difference.
- iii. Group should consider whether adding this or any category adds to the credibility of the model.

#### **4. Review Agricultural Land Uses**

- The three datasets being considered for agricultural land use information are the USDA-NASS annual data, the 5 year Census of Agriculture Data, and the Cropland Data Layer.
- LUWG members recommended that the Agriculture Workgroup should determine their land use classes.
  - i. LUWG members will request a presentation from the AgWG on which data sets will be used and how the land use categories will work.
- Clarification: farmstead is an impervious cover in agricultural land uses. Possible to eliminate this land use if not enough information from the jurisdictions.

**ACTION:** LUWG members will request a presentation from the AgWG at the next face to face meeting on the agricultural land use categories.

#### **5. Use of Tetra Tech to solicit land use data from local jurisdictions that have not yet provided data to the CBP**

- TetraTech could directly contact jurisdictions by county for land use and land cover or at least tax parcel data.
- PA prefers using the publicly available PASDA data from Penn State first, and then recommends contacting the counties.
- WV supports the approach, and recommends placing priority on the 8 eastern counties in WV.
- Mary Gattis (LGAC): Recommends asking LGAC members at their meeting later this week to help with outreach for more data.
- Workgroup agreed with prioritization based on population.

#### **6. Next Steps**

- Jurisdiction specific meetings will be scheduled in the next two months to review initial land cover datasets by new categories.
  - i. Workgroup agreed with this approach.
- A face to face meeting will be scheduled for the AgWG presentation and to review workgroup comments on the land uses before finalizing them for the WQGIT.

**ACTION:** Jurisdiction specific meetings will be scheduled in the next two months to review initial land cover datasets by Phase 6.0 categories.

**Adjourned**

**Next Meeting:** June 10<sup>th</sup>, 10:00AM-3:00PM Annapolis, MD

**Participants**

Karl Berger (Co-chair), MWCOG

Jenny Tribo (Co-chair), HRPDC

Peter Clagget (Coordinator), USGS/CBPO

Megan Grose, WV DEP

Emma Giese, CRC

Ted Tesler, PA DEP

Jeff White, MDE

Brian Bloch, DE

Steve Stewart, Baltimore County

Lee Epstein, CBF

Mary Gattis, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Robert Hirsch, Baltimore County

Norm Goulet, NVRC

George Onyullo, DDOE

Stephanie Martins, MDP

Jennifer Greiner, Habitat GIT coordinator