

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Face-to-Face Meeting
December 7, 2015
10:00AM-3:00PM

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23177/>

Draft Call Summary

Action and Decision Items:

ACTION: Lindsey Gordon will distribute the link to the land use website to the workgroup, asking for input on the website structure and layout.

DECISION: The LUWG tentatively approved the drafted Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan, elevating it to the GIT-level for approval, and pending revisions to some of the language as suggested by LUWG meeting participants.

ACTION: The LUWG is asking for volunteers to participate and engage in completing activities and performance targets listed in the drafted Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan. Please send an email to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) CC Peter Claggett (pclagget@chesapeakebay.net) if you would like to participate in these actions.

ACTION: Anyone with local county contact information, for the Phase 6 land use review process, should send the information to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov).

DECISION: The LUWG came to consensus on proceeding with the outline proposed by Peter Claggett for modeling 2025 Phase 6 land use.

ACTION: LUWG members and IPs should send any comments or edits on the proposed LUWG governance protocol to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) by December 21st.

ACTION: The LUWG will be asking signatory groups to identify representatives for the LUWG, with an alternate member identified if available. Submissions will be due to Lindsey (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) by no later than COB Friday, January 1st.

Phase 6 Land Use- Loose Ends and Moving Parts – P. Claggett, F. Irani
Fitting the Ag Census: Proposed land use adjustment methodology

- Peter Claggett briefed the LUWG on the problem with fitting the Ag Census into the mapped Phase 6 Land Uses, and reviewed the proposal to revise the current methodology.
- Stephanie Martins noted that MDE is working on a similar methodology for MD, and is working on a couple of county examples. MDE would be willing to present those results during a future meeting, if needed.
- Bill Keeling expressed concern in adjusting acreage based on the Ag census if there is more accurate, remotely sensed ag data. He asked if there will be defined error based on the other products.
 - Berger: So this method is kind of rewarding folks for having more accurate data for a particular land class. So if a state has invested resources to more accurately map a land class, it will be reflected in this method.
 - Keeling: I see a more systemic issue in where we use the NWI overload. I don't see it as all that accurate compared to the remotely sensed information.
 - Claggett: That's a great point, and we may want to have more discussions about that.
- Peter Claggett proposed that the LUWG not hand off the issue of fitting construction into the mapped Phase 6 land uses to another workgroup, but rather work with the WTWG to come up with some recommendations.
 - The LUWG supported Peter in this decision.

Erosion, Wetlands, and Riparian Buffers

- Peter Claggett briefed the LUWG on updates to wetlands, buffers, and erosion in the Phase 6 model, and upcoming projects.
- Claggett: We will consider accepting other wetlands data sets that the states produce, but we don't have the capabilities or resources to do it for them right now.
- Peter Claggett also gave a presentation on the modeling of erosion in the Bay Model, including estimates of bank erosion and floodplain deposition.
 - Karl Berger mentioned that this is an improvement upon the previous methodology, but it's not perfect and there is still some uncertainty.

Converting Land Cover to Land Use

- Fred Irani reviewed a drafted cross-walk to demonstrate how land cover data from WSI, The Chesapeake Conservancy, and UVM will be translated into Land Use for the Phase 6 model.

Data production and Local Government Review schedule

- Fred Irani provided an overview of the data production and local government review schedules and processes, and the crosswalk for incorporating data from the Conservancy and UVM, and WSI into the Phase 6 Bay Model.
- Sally Claggett: How is WSI separating out turf grass, pasture, and cropland?
 - Keeling: We've brought in ancillary data sets, and WSI has already digitized all ag-land fields. I think turf grass is more of what's left over from that process.
- Peter Claggett reminded the LUWG that the jurisdictions and local governments will have 28 days to review the high-res land use the CBP will create.

Phase6 Land Use Website

- Peter Claggett briefed the workgroup on the local review process of Phase 6 land use. Local governments will be given 4 weeks to review the data.
- Mary Gattis: So the Conservancy and UVM are administering their own local government review process, and then you will be contacting these local governments again to implement your own review? What's the difference in time between those two things?
 - Claggett: Probably 4-6 weeks. But it would be a good idea to make sure that we all have consistent messaging to the local governments, and be as clear as possible.

ACTION: Anyone with local county contact information, for the Phase 6 land use review process, should send the information to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov).

Local government webinar for reviewing data

ACTION: Lindsey Gordon will distribute the link to the land use website to the workgroup, asking for input on the website structure and layout.

- Peter Claggett walked through the new Phase 6 land use viewer website, and how the CBP will reconcile differences in the land use on the website, and comments received from the local counties.
- Rob Hirsch: The 10 m raster data that you're asking locals to review – will that have the corrections to adjust to the ag census and construction data? Or will those adjustments happen after?
 - Claggett: Those will happen after, because that's at the tabular level, not the raster level. But you raise an interesting question: should we, as part of the Land Use review, try to incorporate the Ag census and provide tables at the LRSEG level? Is that what you're asking?
 - Hirsch: Yeah, I was curious about that. Reviewing the map is great, but if different tabular data is going to be used, I want to make sure all the locals are aware of that, because some people might get frustrated if the final data looks different from what they reviewed. It's also very helpful to have the final bay model beta in a raster form.
 - Claggett: You're going to get what will hopefully not change that much from the ag census, but you'll get a database of 14 10m rasters. Unfortunately it won't match the tabular data exactly.
 - Gattis: I think we need to make sure we can cover ourselves, in a sense, in case a local government identifies any issues in the data-set and we explain how we did or did not work to address their concern.
 - Berger: Somehow we have to figure out how to address the reconciliation issue in this first roll-out, and try to explain to the local governments how this will work. But will this even affect a lot of counties?
 - Claggett: Most counties have extra space, so hopefully this won't be too common.

Review of Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan – K. Berger, P. Claggett

- Peter Claggett reviewed the current draft of the Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan, and explained the justification for each of the key actions and performance targets.
- Berger: I still think our top priority is getting the Phase 6 land use finished. So I would suggest that you work on the workplan to the extent of your capacity, but I still hope that the Phase 6 land use will remain a priority.
- Norm Goulet: I suggest that you really bring this up to the WQGIT and give them a heads up that there is a priority issue that's conflicting with something that the Management Board has requested.

DECISION: The LUWG tentatively approved the drafted Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan, elevating it to the GIT-level for approval, and pending revisions to some of the language as suggested by LUWG meeting participants.

ACTION: Lindsey Gordon will distribute an email asking for volunteers to participate and engage in completing activities and performance targets listed in the drafted Land Use Metrics and Methods Workplan.

Plan for developing and vetting land use for 2025 forecast- P. Claggett

- Peter Claggett briefed the LUWG on establishing Phase III WIPs on 2025 conditions.
- David Newburn: The conservation scenario is aspirational, but it really has to do with regulatory mechanisms in my experience.
 - Claggett: The conservation scenario was purely hypothetical. I think for the CBP purposes, we wouldn't want to run a land conservation scenario for the Phase III WIPs. We'd probably want more of a trend scenario. For the TMDL, they're interested in the current trajectory of growth.
 - Gattis: Is it possible to run a worst-case scenario, to see how that shapes up?
 - Claggett: We can certainly try to do that, and we want to produce scenarios that are most important for policy decisions.
- Stephanie Martins: We have a growth model that does a similar type of analysis, so perhaps we could contribute and collaborate on that.

DECISION: The LUWG came to consensus to proceed with the outline proposed by Peter Claggett for modeling 2025 Phase 6 land use.

Review of proposed governance document – K. Berger

- Karl Berger briefed the LUWG on the proposed governance protocol and asked the LUWG to provide any edits or comments on the governance document to Lindsey Gordon.

ACTION: LUWG members and IPs should send any comments or edits on the proposed LUWG governance protocol to Lindsey Gordon (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) by December 21st.

ACTION: The LUWG will be asking signatory groups to identify representatives for the LUWG, with an alternate member identified if available. Submissions will be due to Lindsey (Gordon.lindsey@epa.gov) by no later than COB Friday, January 1st.

Review of proposed 2016 LUWG Meeting Calendar – K. Berger

DECISION: The LUWG approved the proposed 2016 meeting calendar.

Adjourn

Next conference call:

Wednesday, January 6th 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Participants:

Karl Berger, MWCOG, LUWG Chair
Peter Claggett, USGS, LUWG Coordinator
Fred Irani, USGS
Lindsey Gordon, CRC Staff
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Sally Claggett, USFS
Lee Epstein, CBF
Megan Grose, WV DEP
Stephanie Martins, MD Dept. of Planning
Steve Stewart, Baltimore County
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
James Gregory, DNREC
George Onyullo, DOEE
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Norm Goulet, Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Leslie Middleton, Bay Journal
Darol Burdick, Fairfax County
Jenny Tribo, HRPDC
Mark Symborski, MC MNCPPC
Mary Gattis, LGAC Coordinator
Renee Thompson, USGS
Sharon Baumann, USGS
Sarah, RRPDC
David Newburn, UMD

Denny Puko, PA DCED

DRAFT