

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Call Summary
May 4, 2016
10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23311/>

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: Pending WQGIT approval, for all states except Virginia, the CBP Land Data Team will develop a layer of active mines, to be used to reclassify mining areas as mixed open in the event that these areas are misclassified in the land use data.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will coordinate offline with Virginia, MDE, and CBF. Notes on possible solutions to the issues that have been raised will be recirculated to the LUWG for final input and deliberation. Proposed percentages to be used in the fractional model, derived from analysis by MDE, will be distributed to the workgroup when they are available.

- 10:00 Welcome and introductions/Review of meeting minutes – K. Berger, MWCOG
- The LUWG approved the minutes from the April 6th meeting.
- 10:05 Update on Phase 6 Land Use Database – F. Irani, USGS
- Fred updated the LUWG on the [production schedule](#) for the Phase 6 land use database. The current final delivery estimate for the Phase 6 land use database is October 2016.
 - Berger: So you have data ready to be processed, but until we finalize certain decisions and models, you can't finalize the draft land use to send out to the local governments to review?
 - Irani: Correct – this is our total backlog. We've been able to do some regional utilities, but we're still waiting to finish these counties based on the standing decisions.
 - Berger: Prior to October, you anticipate having everything finished and there'll be some output on a county by county basis coming out. When should we expect the local government review to begin?
 - Irani: When we have these questions answered, and we can actually create a prototype county, then I'll be able to run it through our schedule and we will have those dates available. We'll be able to give the counties a heads up in advance of their review period. I'd like to have it within the next week or so.
 - Berger: When you say October to finish everything, does that include everything (with local government review)?
 - Irani: When we say everything, yes this includes everything, with the local government review.

- Bill Keeling made comments about keeping to deadlines, and voiced concerns about the Phase 6 schedule changes in regards to planning for Phase III WIPs.
- Keeling: Do you already have some known issues in the model that you're needing guidance on? Or is this something you anticipate encountering?
 - Irani: We have the questions we need answered, and other specific questions on the local land use. We know what we need to know.

10:25

Recommendation to include Extractive as a separate land use –J. White, MDE

- Claggett: Extractives as a potential land use came up during the WQGIT's last meeting, and there was some concern on whether to include it in the Phase 6 model. The decision was pushed back to the LUWG on whether extractives would be included in the model.
- Jeff presented [Maryland's position](#) on including extractive as an explicit land use in the Phase 6 Model.
- Keeling: I thought this decision was made months ago, and voted on by the MB.
 - Claggett: I think we're all a bit confused, but one of the reasons this came up is because MD and other jurisdictions have good data on extractives, and we want to make sure areas of mixed open that are available for the ag census are taken out of the equation for the ag census, and represented as extractive. As we go down this road of excluding extractive from agriculture, MD has voiced preference for keeping extractives in the model because they have BMPs that could be placed on it.
 - Johnston: We have the land use in the model, and when we brought this issue to the MB – they only made a decision regarding Phase 5. They didn't make a decision on the Phase 6 extractive.
- Keeling: The problem is the load is under the NPDES discharges. By simulating a land use you're including a non-point that's already captured in the WLA – so you're double counting the loadings. The Bay Program was misaligning the BMPs we were reporting. The loads were mischaracterized in Phase 5 – so you may have it in the WIPs that they're attacking this source, but that source is most likely coming from somewhere else.
 - Claggett: So you're saying in your NPDES permits for mining operations in VA – that includes nutrients and sediment, and those nutrient/sediment discharges are explicitly accounted for as point sources as part of the WLA in the TMDL?
 - Keeling: I'm pretty sure I documented this to the point source people. Ours are being accounted for in a different way, yet we also had this huge non-point load affiliated with these facilities in Phase 5. So I don't want to go back to the assumptions in Phase 5.
 - Johnston: One option we had put on the table at the WTWG was whether all states could report these as point sources. Ning had said that although VA provided those, I don't think those were included in the industrial point-source load. But check with Ning.

- Keeling: These would all be part of an aggregated allocation to overall wastewater in VA. If this involves delaying Peter and his team, I don't think VA can support it, and I don't see VA doing this data.
- Irani: Does the area in these digitized areas agree with the permitted acreages?
 - White: No – the permitted acreage is greater than what we have digitized.
 - Irani: So this is what you've eyeballed, but is it official?
 - White: This is the disturbed acreage, but the permitted acreage includes all area that could be disturbed in the future.
 - Irani: And the dates of the imagery is consistent everywhere?
 - White: Yes – all dates are consistent in these images.

10:45

Extractive land use in Bay Jurisdictions – D. Saavedra

- David presented on the [status of extractive land uses](#) in other states.
- Johnston: You said this is the final product – does that break out abandoned or released from bond sites, versus the active ones?
 - Saavedra: Not at the moment – it's just a straight extractive raster, which includes abandoned mines.
 - Johnston: Is there any possibility to break it out?
 - Saavedra: I'm not sure if I could for all of the states because of how the data is presented – some states do not separate out which sites are active and which are abandoned.
- Claggett: So what's being proposed is that David will just focus on the active mines for digitizing in NY and VA, which would give us a better layer for the dataset that could represent mixed open, so we don't accidentally call those areas agricultural.
 - Epstein: At the least, I think that should be done.
 - Keeling: I'd need to compare, with all of the decisions that have already been made – I'm not sure what's being proposed here to do to that dataset.
 - Claggett: We have good reason to believe that if David can see an obvious scar on the landscape associated with one of these points, that it's not agriculture. Whether it's the exact boundaries of the mine is immaterial for this immediate decision. We would overlay that polygon onto your land cover, and say that those acres go into our mixed open class.
 - Claggett: I have tremendously more faith in a student's ability to hand-digitize a mining scar accurately than the automated approaches that the contractors are using. You can see on these images that these are not cropland acres, and if a contractor classified them as crop or herbaceous, then we know that it's wrong.
- Peter Claggett asked the LUWG for their positions on using the new active mine layer that will be developed by David to correct misclassification errors in the Phase 6 dataset.
 - Virginia abstained from voting, but noted that if they had to make a decision, they would lean towards MDE's Option 2 – extractive acres would be assigned to mixed open.

- Megan Grose, West Virginia: I can't really tell that it would make a difference either way. We would like to let Dave Montali weigh in on this later on. We applied some BMPs to our extractive in the Phase 5 model, and it worked fine for us.
- James Gregory, Delaware: Expressed support for option 2 – extractive acres assigned to mixed open.
- Jonathan Champion, DC: We aren't really affected by this in the District, so we can't express a preference at this time.
- Jeff White, MD: Prefers extractive acres explicit in P6 with a mixed open loading rate.
- Keeling: In the Phase 5 model world, PA has a huge proportion of the extractive lands, so I think you need to get their position on this matter before any type of decision can be made.
- Johnston: Jeff – if the consensus opinion is number 2, would that mean that you would want those broken out in MAST?
 - White: I think it would. Not ideal, but if that's what is decided then we would at least want that if it's possible.

ACTION: Pending WQGIT approval, for all states except Virginia, the CBP Land Data Team will develop a layer of active mines, to be used to reclassify mining areas as mixed open in the event that these areas are misclassified in the land use data.

11:05 Fractional land uses for Phase 6 – P. Claggett, USGS

- Peter [presented](#) the local and regional land uses that will be represented as fractions of currently approved Phase 6 land use classes.
- Bill Keeling stated that he supports paring down the work of the Land Data Team as much as possible in order to keep to the Phase 6 development timeline.
- Peter laid out a proposal for grouping the leftover land types into 3 broad categories, each composed of 2 different land uses, with fractional percentages to be determined.
- Epstein: Having looked at this in detail in at least one jurisdiction, I think these 3 categories are probably fine, with perhaps an exception for Parks and what is called Large Parcels. I'm not convinced that those two are the same as all of the other ones in green.
 - Claggett: The way that MDE and the CBP look at large parcels is a bit different. In the model structure, the majority of large parcels are classed potentially as ag space. If the high res land cover is low res veg or barren, with a large parcel and a small structure, that might all be cropland or pasture. The only large parcels we call turf is an area where 10% of that parcel is already impervious. IE – business parks, etc.
- Berger: So when you're looking at some of these land types, the pervious data layer has already been subtracted out of here?

- Claggett: Right – we’re only zeroing in on low veg and barren areas in these land types.
- Karl Berger noted that the current plan is to move forward with using MD information to generate the fractions to be used in the model.
- Grose: In the last set of models, all of our barren ended up being construction. So this is just what’s left over after everything else has been done?
 - Claggett: Right – and this is another value of having that extractive dataset, because that would help classify WVA data especially. But now we’re left with a bunch of barren areas, and we have to decide what to call it by using this fractional scheme; ie if it’s barren in a battlefield, we would call it a fraction of turf grass and mixed open.
- Peter Claggett polled LUWG jurisdictions on their opinions of using fractional percentages developed by MDE.
 - West Virginia: If we don’t have anything better anyway, and since it’s such a small part of the overall land use, then we are fine with using MD fractions.
 - DC: I don’t see a strong objection from the District’s perspective.
 - Delaware: No problems from our perspective either.
 - Keeling: My experience is that when MD numbers are applied to VA, then VA doesn’t fare well, and it doesn’t describe what’s happening south of the Potomac. We delineate things differently in VA – we have turf grass around impervious structure. I need to sit down with James and go through this, and let the decision be made at the GIT level.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will coordinate offline with Virginia, MDE, and CBF. Notes on possible solutions to the issues that have been raised will be recirculated to the LUWG for final input and deliberation. Proposed percentages to be used in the fractional model, derived from analysis by MDE, will be distributed to the workgroup when they are available.

11:40 Presentation on STAC’s on Roadside Ditch Workshop Results – R. Schneider, Cornell

- Rebecca presented the findings from a [recent STAC research workshop](#) on roadside ditch management.
- Claggett: We don’t have ditches represented in the land use currently, but in the next phase of the model, we could better account for these features.
- Rebecca Schneider suggested referencing the Dirt and Gravel Roads Center in PA in order to develop coverage of roadside ditches.

12:00 Adjourn

Next meeting: June 1st, 2016; 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM **Face-to-Face Meeting at CBP Offices**

Participants:

Peter Claggett, USGS

Lindsey Gordon, CRC

Dennis Cumbie, Loudon County, VA

David Saavedra, UMBC

Fred Irani, USGS

James Gregory, DNREC

Lee Epstein, CBF

Paul Patnode, M-NCPPC

Krystal Reifer, Montgomery County

Megan Grose, WVDEP

Karl Berger, MWCOG

Jeff White, MDE

Jonathan Champion, DOEE

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Stephanie Martins, MDP

Norm Goulet, NVRC

Steve Stewart, Baltimore Co., MD

Darold Burdick, Fairfax Co., VA

Sarah Stewart, RRPDC

Matt Johnston, UMD

Quentin Stubbs, USGS

Mark Symborski, Montgomery Co., MD

HRPDC

Natalie Gardner, STAC