



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

LUWG Office Hours August 2026: Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM)

August 12, 2026

1:00 pm - 2:00 pm

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

Purpose: Discuss and provide feedback on Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM) updated results.

Minutes

I. Introduction and Announcements

- The Land Use Workgroup will still hold our regular meeting on August 27th
- September 16th are our next CBLCM office hours
- September 23rd we have a joint meeting with the USWG

Requested Action: Non-decisional

Lead: Jackie Pickford, Land Use Workgroup Coordinator

Materials: N/A

Decisions:

N/A

Actions:

N/A

II. Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model (CBLCM) Updates and questions

Peter will provide an overview of the CBLCM web viewer, review results from CBLCM run #2, and review initial results for future solar field development in Virginia. There will be plenty of time for discussion and questions.

Requested Action: Non-decisional

Lead: Peter Claggett, Healthy Landscapes Goal Team Coordinator

Materials: Presentation, FAQ Document.

Decisions:

N/A

Actions:

Any feedback, ideas, or data sets for Peter you want him to have before the third run are due August 21st.

Discussion Notes:

- **Normand Goulet:** I have a question about work you are still planning to do, incorporating proposed data center data. Specifically, how are you going to determine that it's a data center based off of the spectral information? It would look like any other commercial or industrial.
 - **Peter Claggett:** We aren't determining that. The data set is from the US Energy Information Agency for Data Centers. We aren't using spectral data at all, we are using those points and assuming an average amount of impervious center per impervious cover per data center, and putting that in the location of the point.
 - **Normand Goulet:** How are you going to eliminate double counting for what already exists?
 - **Peter Claggett:** Because we are going to basically expand. The average data center according to the staffers analysis is about 11 acres impervious cover. So we are going to blow the points up to 11 acres. If those points are close together and they overlap, then the polygons will show that and it won't be an additional add.
 - **Normand Goulet:** There is a lot of political pressure to reduce the number of data centers, so I am not sure how the projection you are getting is going to be reflective of the political pressure that is being applied now. We are running into issues with water, electricity, etc.
 - **Peter Claggett:** I don't have the amount of extra impervious from data centers by county yet. It is the partnership's decision on whether or not to include them. If you all thought it made more sense to include a percentage of what is being permitted and not all of them, or just drop it completely, we can do that if that is what everyone decides. It has come up as a concern so much I thought we should investigate on our end.
- **Normand Goulet:** Can you zoom into the Dallas airport area for Solar? I didn't see anything when you ran by it, and there is a huge plan for Dallas airport. I wonder if it is because it is not private commercial?
 - **Peter Claggett:** I will look into the data that was in and get back to you, maybe it was attributed differently and not planned or permitted, but a different attribute I did not use.
- **Cassandra Davis:** There are some large rooftop arrays in the US Solar Voltaic database and I want to make sure we want to be capturing these systems if they are going to be on a roof vs. taking up a different land use.
 - **Peter Claggett:** Yes, I excluded the rooftops from the data I used, there is an attribute in that data set that lets you sort through ground, canopy, rooftop, some combination, and I just used ground. Canopy just means for example shade covering a parking lot.
- **Deborah Sward:** I wanted to check on the solar methodology. It sounds like Virginia is mainly where future permitted locations are being included. I was curious if any of the data that Alicia from MD had sent over was going to come in handy looking at MD? And in terms of the methodology itself for suitability, we had some questions come up about MD whether past trends are a predictor of future growth.
 - **Peter Claggett:** Yes, I just received the data yesterday so I have not had a chance to look at it, but it is definitely on my list. Second, our methodology is a two step process where we first have the state demand and then how we allocate it to counties. I think you are asking about the county level attribution. Right now we are using what has been done to date by county as the weighing factor when we look at state demand, which implies a level of stagnation which is probably not realistic. But I

don't know what else we would do. One alternative would be to take the total demand for the state and randomly allocate it, but I don't think that would be any more accurate. We are open to ideas. The best option is to have some sort of plan or permitted information like we have in Virginia, so at least we know where it's anticipated. We have a lot of flexibility, we just don't have a lot of time.

- o **Deborah Sward:** When you separate the solar probability surface for solar from the other ones, are there specific factors being considered besides what is protected lands? We are interested in learning more about what goes into that probability surface in terms of solar suitability criteria that is different from residential and commercial.
- o **Peter Claggett:** I will get a write-up from Mike Evans at the Conservancy, because they produce that. They use Sentinel satellite imagery and map where solar panel arrays are, and they have used a time series of 2017 to 2022 and created a machine learning model to interpret the patterns and extrapolate. It is highly influenced by slope. If it is not protected, if it is not developed, if it is a gentle slope, then it is probable for solar use. They don't exclude a lot of land from eligibility because it is basically just looking, is my interpretation.
- **Deborah Sward:** In terms of comments, is it correct to say that anything that would adjust the maximum density based on zoning or something like that would require a custom state policy scenario, like the land policy BMP that was done a few years ago, versus things where we could just mask out where development can occur because it is federal land. Masking being what is acceptable policy type to include in the historic trends, whereas anything that more reduces density based on policy is more of a state land BMP.
 - o **Peter Claggett:** I would think that is correct. If we start adjusting densities and infill rates and stuff, that would be more like a custom scenario versus the trend. As I mentioned, we incorporated the traffic analysis zone forecast data, just the no growth areas, and we have said they are not going to grow. In spirit with that, if you had areas that, because of zoning, where you think there is no growth going to happen here, you can provide those data to us spatially and we can incorporate them into the suitability layer as an exclusion. I think it would be fair to all the jurisdictions to do it that way. But in terms of using zoning and the densities associated with that, and fine-tuning our density layers, even doing that is probably not going to have a huge effect, what would have a greater effect is excluding areas.
 - o **Deborah Sward:** Along those same lines, I am curious what involvement local governments have had in reviewing this.
 - o **Jackie Pickford:** We have not specifically sent out notice to local governments, we have been relying on the Land Use Workgroup and Urban Storm Water/Clean Water Goal team to reach out to their representatives respectively.
- **Peter Claggett:** Dave, to your question last time, the table was reported in state-wide numbers. It is then allocated to the counties based on the proportion of what is happening in the counties relative to the state. So it won't all be allocated to the panhandle, only a fraction of it will.
 - o **Dave Montali:** Is there any way I can easily see what is going on in the bay watershed? State numbers are irrelevant.
 - o **Peter Claggett:** Yea, I can correct the table so it just provides bay watershed numbers and provide that. At this time, I can't do the division between inside and outside the watershed because that requires the simulation- we simulate within the county at a 30 meter resolution, and we determine what is in and out of the watershed if the watershed bifurcates a county. But I can at least tell you how much of the utility demand for a state is going into bay watershed adjacent counties.

- **Jackie Pickford:** Our team will have to start the pre-processing of data for run number 3 on August 24th. The due date for any ideas is Friday the 21st.

III. Adjourn

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

Attendees:

- Julia Fucci, CRC
- Jacqueline Pickford, USGS
- Lee McDonnell, EPA
- Lori Brown, DNREC
- Maura Christian, DEQ
- Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
- Thomas Butler, EPA
- Normand Goulet, NVRC
- Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
- Joe Parfitt, VDOT
- Martin Hurd, VA
- Auston Smith, EPA
- Helen Smith, Devereux Consulting
- Deborah Sward, MDP
- Rebecca Ransom
- Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
- Kelly Gable, EPA
- Denise Uzupis
- Petra Baldwin, CTR
- Douglas Bell, EPA
- Peter Claggett, USGS
- Michaela Kuykendall, MDA
- Young Tsuei, DOEE
- Ho-Ching Fong,
- Kevin Mclean, DEQ
- Cassandra Davis, NY DEC
- Kristen Saacke Blunk, Headwaters LLC