

# CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY

**August 12, 2014  
10:00AM-11:30PM**

## **ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS**

**DECISION:** LUWG members agreed to the process and next steps for adopting the land use classification:

- Emma will distribute the 7/15 and 8/11 meeting minutes to LUWG members
- LUWG will share the comprehensive proposed land use list and the meeting minutes with the Modeling Workgroup to discuss on 9/4 and 9/30-10/1
- LUWG will meet in September to discuss feedback from the Modeling Workgroup and prepare for the WQGIT meeting.
- WQGIT will finalize the comprehensive list on 10/7-10/8
- April 30, 2015 will be the proposed deadline for science to support each of the proposed land uses in order to keep them on the list

## **MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

- Jenny Tribo, Co-Chair, welcomed everyone to the call and confirmed call participants.

### **2. Finalizing Proposed Phase 6.0 Land Uses**

- Peter Claggett, LUWG Coordinator, presented the [current list of Phase 6.0 land uses](#), which were developed during the joint Urban Stormwater and Land Use Workgroup meeting on July 15th.
- Peter clarified that the Modeling Workgroup will have a chance to review the land use classifications as well.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): Noted that there may not be enough signatories on the call to hold a vote today.
  - Karl Berger (MWCOG): If there is not complete consensus, LUWG may have to re-visit this later to hold a vote.
- Claggett: The Land Use Workgroup is focused on the developed land use classes; the Agriculture Workgroup and Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee are developing the agricultural land uses.
- Megan Grose (WV DEP): How will rural developments or large lot subdivisions be categorized?
  - Claggett: On a 5 acre lot with a house, driveway, yard and trees, we would look at each portion separately. The house and driveway would be captured with high res local data or satellite imagery and categorized as impervious, the yard would be categorized as turfgrass, and the canopy would be forest if it met the minimum size threshold, which is yet to be determined.
- Grose: Will states have an opportunity weigh in on their fertilization rules or will the rules be applied Bay wide?
  - Berger: We don't currently have the data to differentiate fertilized from un-fertilized on individual lots. There will be a discussion of fertilizer sales tracking methods next week.

- Keeling: Concern that abandoned agricultural land is combined within open space. Don't remember LUWG/USWG agreeing to tree canopy as a land use because it would be difficult to track through the calibration period. The model will be calibrated from 1985, and each land use will have to be calibrated over this time period.
  - Claggett: LUWG/USWG agreed to continue exploring tree canopy at the last meeting.
  - MDA would prefer to see idle/fallow land captured under the agricultural land uses.
  - WV is also concerned with idle agricultural land being included in the urban class.
    - The recommendation to capture idle/fallow agricultural land under the agricultural land uses rather than in mixed open will be shared with the AMS.
- Lee Epstein (CBF): If the stream corridor land use is going to be a modifier to impervious sediment loads, how will those loads ultimately be allocated? Who gets the load?
  - Claggett: It would probably be a combination of treating the loads as originating from the streams, and attributing them to the upland impervious surfaces.
  - Epstein: This is CBF's concern. Need to plan for how the loads will be handled and which entity will be responsible for the load. Not yet clear how this will be handled.
- Keeling: Concern with adding stream corridor in terms of model capability.
- Neely Law (CWP): CWP plans to work on accounting for the connection to upland in streams moving forward.
  - Keeling: What is the projected time of delivery for this additional information needed for the model?
    - Law: Working on the same time frame with providing information in October.
  - Keeling: Interactions with agricultural land uses and with forest will be needed too.
    - Law: Research indicates that some loads are coming from in stream sources.
  - Claggett: We are trying to inform the model with finer scale information that has been aggregated up.
- Mulkey: Will degraded riparian BMPs be applied to the riparian forest land use, or to the rural stream corridor?
  - Brosch: Hoping to work on this question with the AMS.
- Claggett: The goal is to create a comprehensive list of potential land uses to be explored for Phase 6.0 by October 2014. The WQGIT will be asked to agree to this comprehensive list. As the expert panels, CWP, USGS and others continue their work on the land uses; the list may be condensed.
  - Berger: Note that LUWG/USWG did not formally vote on tree canopy at the 7/15 joint meeting, however the group wished to keep both urban tree canopy and stream corridor on the list for now, so that the CWP and CBP efforts to explore how to model them could continue.
  - Tribo: This land use list is more comprehensive than what was decided at the joint meeting. For urban tree canopy, we discussed that the loading rate and modeling considerations were not determined yet, however the consensus was that at this stage it should be included, and there was more work to be done.
  - Keeling: Recommend that there be science to support each of the land uses by April 2015, and that any land uses without support be dropped off at that point.
  - Epstein: Support that deadline. Recommend not losing sight of the policy and implementation connection of the modeling. We have to be able to allocate the

loads to specific sectors. Whatever we come up with, we have to figure out how it applies in the real world.

- Claggett: Agree with the April (April 30) deadline for dropping land uses off this list.
- Berger: Recommend sending out the joint meeting minutes and today's minutes to LUWG for comment. The meeting minutes can then be shared with the Modeling Workgroup along with the current list of land uses. If the Modeling Workgroup makes modifications, the LUWG will meet later in September to discuss what to pass along to the WQGIT in October. The WQGIT will make the final decision based on input from Land Use and Modeling Workgroups.
  - Keeling: If the Modeling Workgroup cannot simulate the land uses they may take some off the list.
  - Berger: There are three questions that will determine whether the land uses stay on the list 1) If the land use can be quantified (LUWG's responsibility) 2) Whether we can document a unique loading rate 3) Whether or not it can be simulated in Phase 6.0 modeling framework (Modeling Workgroup can weigh in on this).
- Claggett: Are there any objections to moving forward with this approach?
  - There were no objections.
- Claggett: LUWG will brief the modeling workgroup on Sept. 4<sup>th</sup>, LUWG will meet in September with some feedback from the Modeling Workgroup, the Modeling Workgroup will review again on Sept 30 before going to the WQGIT in October.

**DECISION:** LUWG members agreed to process and next steps for adopting the land use classification:

- Emma will distribute the 7/15 and 8/11 meeting minutes for LUWG members to comment on
- LUWG will share the comprehensive proposed land use list and the meeting minutes with the Modeling Workgroup to discuss on 9/4 and 9/30-10/1
- LUWG will meet in September with feedback from the Modeling Workgroup
- WQGIT will finalize the comprehensive list on 10/7-10/8
- April 2015 will be the deadline for science to support each of the proposed land uses in order to keep them on the list

### **3. Land Use Metrics and Measures Outcome in Bay Agreement**

- Peter Claggett: In the Bay Watershed Agreement, which was signed earlier this year, there is a land use metrics and measures outcome to quantify the change in impervious surface. The Land Use Workgroup has the opportunity to take the lead on this outcome, and can explore this in more detail at future meetings.
- Keeling: Recommend that the LUWG focus on the Phase 6.0 land use classification development before working on agreement goals and outcomes.
  - Ted Tesler (PA DEP): Agree. Ok with the Land Use Workgroup supporting this effort to some extent.
  - Berger: If the quantification of land uses will be done by early 2015, then there would still be time to explore this issue after that point.
  - Claggett: Agree with focusing on land uses for Phase 6.0 until April 2015. Then the Land Use Workgroup can begin to work on this new outcome.
- Clarification: We're just talking about the methods and metrics land use outcome.

- Mary Gattis (LGAC Coordinator): Concern regarding the last sentence for “launching public awareness campaign”. Recommend partnering with another GIT or the Communications Workgroup when developing the management strategy to address this piece of the outcome.
  - Claggett: The Healthy Watersheds GIT may be one option for LUWG to partner with.

#### 4. Local Data Collection Status

- Peter Claggett: TetraTech has been contracted to collect data from jurisdictions directly. To date they have collected data from multiple counties in NY, VA and WV.
- Peter will share maps of what data we have in September.
- Berger: Recommend also showing what kind of data was collected, and how that will be incorporated in the Phase 6.0 land uses.
- Berger: Are there updates on the Virginia high res mapping project?
  - Tribo: VA is working to develop a statewide high res land use land cover layer with DEQ. This layer is planned to be provided to the Bay Program before May 2016.
  - Keeling: The mapping may have to be done in stages, based on funding limitations.

#### 5. Next Steps

- LUWG will present Phase 6.0 land use classes to the Modeling Workgroup on 9/4 and 9/30-10/1, and to the Water Quality GIT on 10/7-10/8.
- LUWG members selected September 25<sup>th</sup> for the next conference call.
  - Claggett: On September 25<sup>th</sup> we will provide feedback from the Modeling Workgroup 9/4, and discuss preparation for the Oct WQGIT.
  - Tribo: We will distribute the minutes from 7/15 joint meeting and today’s conference call, as well as provide email feedback after the 9/4 modeling meeting, allowing LUWG members time to submit additional comments over email. These comments will help set discussion points for the 9/25 conference call.

#### Adjourned

#### Upcoming LUWG Meeting Dates

- Conference call: Thursday, September 25th 10:00AM-12:00PM

Jenny Tribo, Co-Chair	Hampton Roads PDC
Karl Berger, Co-Chair	MWCOG
Peter Claggett, Coordinator	USGS
George E. Onyullo	DDOE
Bryan Bloch	DNREC
Jeff White	MDE
Melissa Oguamanam	MDP
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County
Ted Tesler	DEP
Mary Gattis-Schell	LGAC Coordinator
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Sally Claggett	USFS
Chris Brosch	VT-VADCR

Lee Epstein	CBF
Lindsay Dodd	MASCD
Bill Keeling	VA-DEQ
Greg Evans	VA Department of Forestry
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County
Melissa Appler	MDP
Neely Law	CWP
Olivia Devereux	DEC
Emma Giese	CRC