



Land Use Workgroup - July Meeting

July 22nd, 2026

1-3 pm

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: This meeting will present a draft of the Management Strategy to the workgroup, and present updated changes to the CBLCM for feedback.

Minutes

I. Introductions and Announcements

Announcements:

- **Requested Decision: Approval of June [meeting minutes](#).**
- Jurisdictions - please submit official members to Jackie (jpickford@usgs.gov) and Julia (fuccij@chesapeake.org) by the end of July!
- Healthy Landscapes Goal Team Meeting: Thursday, July 30th, 1 - 4 PM
- Next LUWG meeting will be on Thursday, Aug 27th – not the third Wednesday of the month.

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS, LUWG Coordinator

Materials: n/a

Decisions:

LUWG approved June Minutes

Actions:

States/Jurisdictions - Please confirm your voting members via email by COB July 30th.

II. Coordinator Updates

Jackie will review workgroup updates.

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS, LUWG Coordinator

Materials: [GMF document](#).

Decisions:

N/A

Actions:

N/A

Discussion Notes:

- The linked GMF covers topics from how work groups are organized to decision making, newly released by the Bay Program.

- States submit official members to the Healthy Landscapes Goal Team, not the workgroup. Signatory snapshots and statutory information should be sent to Sarah Brzezinski by the end of August. November is when signatories will identify what outcomes they will be signing on to, which also goes to Sarah Brzezinski. If you have already sent the information to Jackie, you do not have to re-send it.
- CBLCM webviewer will have an update the first week of August that we will share.

III. Land Use Forecasting: Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM)

Peter will present updated results from the Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model, as well as a web viewer for LUWG members to review model results. There will be time for discussion and feedback following the presentation. In August, the LUWG will be responsible for reviewing and approving the CBLCM land use forecasts.

Lead: Peter Claggett, USGS

Materials: CBLCM presentation; [web viewer](#); [FAQ document](#).

Decisions:

N/A

Actions:

Requested Action: Please review the CBLCM web viewer and provide feedback to Peter (pclaggett@usgs.gov).

Discussion Notes:

- **Dave Montali:** The idea of population projections, is that information that might be good for county stats? I don't understand so much- I know it comes from the jurisdictions, but when they project a certain rate of population change per decade, it is done now-ish and held constant over 30 years. Or is this projection more detailed than that?
 - o **Peter Claggett:** It is more detailed than that. I think the West Virginia forecast is on a five year basis, I have that information in the FAQ. They look at age structure, so they aren't looking at migration, they are looking at birth rates and death rates within each county. It is a bit more complex than what you are alluding to, but it is not perfect.
- **KC Filippino:** We did ask the other MPO's in Virginia if they could share their TAZ;s because what we are learning is that the transportation folks project statewide, so most of them should have 2050 long range transportation plans. That data should be available. While VDOT might not have it, it is not the most current. But the data that is there is local and reliable, I am trying to get people to provide something by the end of the week, so you can get a little beyond just what Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia has. We are trying to get you the most up-to-date stuff.
 - o **Peter Claggett:** One thing I will say about the forecasts, is that I have worked with state forecasts in the past and I feel fairly comfortable incorporating cooperative TAZ forecasts because they're kind of a part of the transportation model, with local vetting and feedback. Not all TAZ forecasts have a lot of local vetting, however. In general, I am willing to accommodate the data you provide, but I am a little hesitant not knowing the level of local participation- so if they are recent and good then yes, we can use them.
 - o **KC Filippino:** I think that is fair, and I know our data has improved over the years in terms of how it's being used and vetted. Hopefully they can provide you something more recent.

- **Peter Claggett:** I want to put in a plug for information on solar permits, like planned solar locations, if you guys have that or you know if it exists in your state. I have it for Virginia, but outside of that I do not. That data would be very useful for our solar forecasts, understanding what kind of near term development trajectory is on a county by county basis.
 - o **Rosa Hance:** If you have seen the PJM interconnection queue, that could be one area. You can sort by energy type and state and a bunch of other factors.
 - o **Peter Claggett:** Thank you, I will email you if I have any questions.

IV. **Land Use Decision Support: Update on Management Strategy**

Jackie will present updates made from the initial draft of Management Strategy based on feedback from the LUWG June meeting. There will be time for discussion and questions following the presentation. Please come ready to share your ideas!

Lead: Jackie Pickford, USGS, LUWG Coordinator

Materials: Management Strategy Draft

Decisions:

N/A

Actions:

Requested Action: Please review the draft Management Strategy and provide feedback to LUWG leadership.

Discussion Notes:

- **Cassandra Davis:** For the indicators that were capturing the land use change, if we would have the land use that it changed into as part of the indicator, would it just be an overall ‘this is how many ag acres have changed?’ Or were we going to have a breakdown of what changed into developed forest, etc.
 - o **Jackie Pickford:** I am not sure how the previous indicator was set up, but that is feasible if there is interest in that.
 - o **Rosa Hance:** I think that is a great idea. Building off of that, Katie Brownson recently presented on the state of the forest report and was able to show us forest to solar vs. farmland to solar. I think it is a great point because it is important to know what does conversion mean for what? I like your idea of a report because it gives context to the data that people can use to create more ideas of what questions they would like the data to answer.
 - o **KC Filippino:** I agree that it definitely should be there. Are we able to tell what has been considered infill redevelopment to have a better idea of the impervious footprint? That would be helpful. I am also torn about the state of land use report only because it is such a local issue. It could be misinterpreted, and I am concerned about the lift that would be for you guys. It would take a lot more vetting to make it relevant to people. So undecided on that one, but yes to the other indicators.
- **Peter Claggett:** There are many important ways you need to contextualize and characterize what is going on, for example is it new poultry houses, or are we seeing changes in impervious cover because they are widening a highway? So if not the report, how do we add that context? Maybe there are some other means to get the information across, like collecting use cases. But we have a lot of information to give people that we aren't giving them.
- **Rosa Hance:** That is a good point. One of the things we will talk about today is our management approaches, and how do we communicate the use of our data to local decision makers. So maybe this is a question we can ask our partners.

- **Jackie Pickford:** So what I am getting from this is that, even if we don't do a formal report, we definitely need an additional narrative to explain the nuances of the indicators.
- **KC Filippino:** I will say that collecting this data should be valuable. If you are finding that you are pulling teeth to get it, it might be worth revisiting why or how. We don't want to create more work for people. I think a story map will be helpful to actually visualize how it is being used and you might see more interest in it then.
 - **Jackie Pickford:** I had this thought too, even just suggesting we do a follow-up survey, is that too much to ask people to do? That is definitely in the back of my mind, I am hoping that we won't have too many hurdles with that. Another option would be to work with the conservancy to update their survey and add a few questions that could be of value to use, so that way people can just knock it all out in one survey.
 - **Elliot Kurtz:** From the conservancies perspective, we would love to follow-up, it has been exciting to see the use cases for the data.
- **KC Filippino:** I am on the fence about the pilot areas. I see it more effective for smaller localities that might not have the infrastructure to do the work themselves. I know that the alliance is working with towns right now, they have a grant to do this type of work with them on a very small level for BMP implementation, but might be considered tacking on to the work they are doing with towns for future planning as well. I would be surprised if a state would be able to say who a pilot area could be, that information might be better communicated bottom up, not top down.
 - **Jackie Pickford:** That is good to know, my hope was that we weren't overstepping the states, I don't want to leave them out of the conversation for picking sub-watersheds. If capacity is a better way to evaluate what areas we focus on, that is definitely doable.
 - **KC Filippino:** I just think you are going to find that at least in Virginia local land use and decision making is a hot topic, and we can't mess with that.
 - **Rosa Hance:** I like the idea of drilling down on areas that might be higher growth and low capacity, because it is going to give us a better and more useful outcome than attempting to come about this and not know if it is duplicating things. Definitely working with the alliance could be a great collaboration so we don't feel this management strategy is too much to handle.
- **Normand Goulet:** I am a little dubious of this one. The only thing Virginia local governments have control over is land use planning, I think for this to have any success in Virginia, it would have to target small localities that probably don't have the staffing. I just don't see many localities buying into this.
- **Thomas Butler:** I might be off base but I am curious about how this might be biased towards urban settings rather than agricultural ones? You are talking about a lot of solar development in places like Maryland where a lot of farmland is converted. You could be running into some biases there.
- **Peter Claggett:** I want to emphasize that this is not about air dropping into a location and offering our assistance. We want to have conversations with people in places we think could be helped by tools and information and talk about what their issues are and see if there is a role for us or not. I think we need to let that conversation go where it needs to go and see how we can help.
 - **KC Filippino:** I agree, and if the bay program can do anything, it is to help incentivize or find ways to do so. Finding ways to incentivize decisions and tools is the missing piece, not saying 'by the way, these tools exist.'
- **Jackie Pickford:** Okay, I am calling for a temperature check on the management approaches.
 - Normand Goulet: 2
 - Arianna Johns: 2

- o KC Filippino: 3
- o Thomas Butler: 3
- o Marel King: 3
- o Lori Brown: 2.5

V. Adjourn

Next Meeting: August 27th, 1-3pm.

Attendees:

- Julia Fucci, CRC
- Jacqueline Pickford, USGS
- Rosa Hance, CCWC
- Normand Goulet, NVRC
- Lori Brown, DNREC
- Michaela Kuykendall, MDA
- Jason Vogl, OMB
- Deborah Sward, MDP
- Arianna Johns, DEQ
- Richard Turcotte, FS, WV
- John Lancaster, PA DEP
- Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA-
- Elliott Kurtz, Chesapeake Conservancy
- Cass Klingaman, DEC
- Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
- Thomas Butler, EPA
- Bruce Naylor, PA DEP
- Kristy Woodall, VA DEQ
- Michel Sheffer, MDSHA
- Megan Beever, CBC
- Sarah McDonald, USGS
- Scott Heidel, PADEP
- Ashley Hullinger, PADEP
- Emily Heller
- Peter Claggett, USGS
- Christopher Hayes, FS, WV
- Marel King, CBC
- Sarah Brzezinski, EPA
- KC Filippino, HRPDC
- Cassandra Davis, DEC
- Alisha Mulkey, MDA
- Mark Symborski, MCPD