CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Face-to-Face Meeting Minutes
September 5, 2018
10:00AM - 3:00PM
Fish Shack, CBPO
Meeting Materials: link

Actions and Decisions:

- **Decision:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the June 6th meeting.
- **Action:** Peter Claggett will post the updated land use changes including conservation plus scenarios down to county and LRSEG level on the FTP site and send a link to the group.
- **Decision:** The LUWG will remain under the WQGIT.

Welcome, Roll Call, Review of meeting minutes, Action Item Update, Decision on Workgroup Oversight – K. Berger, MWCOG

- **Decision:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the June 6th meeting.
- **Action:** Peter Claggett will post the updated land use changes including conservation plus scenarios down to county and LRSEG level on the FTP site and send a link to the group.
- Future meeting schedule includes monthly conference calls and potential for quarterly face-to-face meetings.
- Oversight of LUWG through WQGIT vs. Healthy Watersheds GIT
    - Claggett noted we are working on custom state scenarios between now and April which is WQGIT focused. After that, we will transition to focusing on the land use methods and metrics outcome. Pros to being housed under the WQGIT include higher clout, brings many resources, and jurisdictional response is high compared to other non-regulatory GITs.
    - The general input from the group is that it may be best to stay under WQGIT, however there is a need to address better integration with other workgroups and GITs.
- **Decision:** The LUWG will remain under the WQGIT.

Custom State Future Land Use Scenarios and Accounting for Growth Loads – P. Claggett, USGS
Update and results on development of jurisdiction-specific 2025 future land-use scenarios. State representatives presented on their custom state-specific scenarios.

- Berger: If states have new development under a rigorous requirement for practices, does that mean that BMP level of reduction and theoretically loads are not in these numbers?

    - Claggett: This does not include any of the WIPs. It's isolating the land use column and showing effects from the land change model in the third column. Ultimately, we are all responsible for the NET changes.
    - Johnston: The way I look at columns 3 and 4 is you would put in your potential BMPs and then see how close that number is to zero and adjust based on that.
- Newburn: Is there risk of states double counting land retirement for agricultural land? Is that taken into consideration here?
    - Johnston: There is a small chance, we only calculate land retirement after 2013, which is a very small amount. When we get new high-resolution data, we will recalculate that land retirement from the satellite to avoid double counting.
- Keefer: Can you explain what these acronyms mean?
    - Clagget:
        - NET: Overall net change
        - Next column: Change without agriculture
        - Next column: Change removing construction from the picture
        - IMP: Impervious
        - PRV: Pervious, turf grass, trees over turf
        - NAT: Forest and wetlands
        - CNS: Construction
        - PAS: Pasture and hay
        - FDS: Feeding lots
        - Other: Stream bed and bank
- Berger: New growth that occurs within existing sewer service boundaries, is new growth that does not have load consequences. Looking at 2017 progress, almost every geography wastewater load is well below the cap loads. That cap load is a permit requirement, so they can document that in their WIPs.
    - Johnston: None of these numbers include wastewater, and all of these numbers will increase with that additional data.
    - Goulet: A lot of things must be taken into account during WIP development. There is a big loading change in conversion of forest to agriculture. We are chewing up forest instead of agriculture, and the numbers out of the land change model are showing the opposite of that.
    - Claggett: That is why we will update the model every two years. From USGS and The Chesapeake Conservancy, we will have updated data and probability surfaces to give us 2025. That will change every two years with the best information, an example of adaptive management.
- Berger: Another big factor is the infill percentage. In DC, their impact will essentially be 0. The higher your infill rate, the lower your deltas are.
- Herzog: Would you recommend that we reserve judgement until we understand where we are, develop options in CAST, and complete the state scenario?
    - Claggett: Yes, sort of. This is an iterative process, we are always trying to make the best decision with current information. When the state specific scenario comes out, we should compare the options in state custom scenario vs. ideas from CAST.

- Goulet: The problem with that is we need final input decks by November. There isn't enough time to continually develop scenarios as new information comes out that will work best for localities. I've heard from many in VA the question of "why can I only choose one of the three scenarios instead of a combination?"
    - Claggett: All of these are custom scenarios run as a package, you can't separate out each individual item because they are run as a set of scenarios.
- Dubow: We have 4 different conservation land programs, and we want to make sure we get credit for all the land we can conserve by 2025. We are in the process of gathering land conservation data from local land trusts and government agencies, so we can provide more data to run local conservation as well. The land policy scenarios go further into protecting farmlands at a local level.
- Donner: We are happy with our current data.
- Keefer: We vetted this scenario through our forestry workgroup here in PA. Peter gave us a presentation on conservation plus, to have a balanced approach that did not skew the scenario one way or the other.

Update on Geospatial Award – J. Allenby and R. Soobitsky, Chesapeake Conservancy
Update on geospatial award including Activity 1, and Activity 2.

- Soobitsky outlined the 6-year timeline moving forward.
- Claggett: Are deciduous and evergreen something that would be considered for the land cover product?
    - Allenby: There would be a lot of time and money going into differentiating those tree types to get that level of accuracy versus combined tree canopy.
    - Claggett: Using the data, you could do layer differentiating but you wouldn't be able to guarantee a high level of accuracy.
    - Allenby: There will be ground truthing as a part of the QA/QC portion of the project. We also will be focused on identifying the more intermittent streams.
- Thompson: We had a USGS conversation to identify additional land use classes that would be helpful to look back at.
    - Claggett: The question of "what classes would be helpful" was asked to us and several groups. The list on this slide is a preliminary list of ideas. Agriculture lands are a wild card for modeling the future, made up of only 10-20% of the landscape. Knowing where BMPs are on the ground would be very helpful.
- Reed: Is the geomorphon product going to include ditches?
    - Allenby: The goal is to be able to extract part of the ditch network (small manmade streams, straight ditches along roads in agricultural land). Most of the watershed does not have an inventory of their ditches, and some counties are better than others.
    - Reed: Is there going to be a high level of detail?
    - Allenby: We have been doing this in DE, developing from high resolution streams and MS4 data.

- Claggett: Even if data doesn't improve, technology to analyze it does. Over the course of this project we want to make sure we don't have three incomparable products. So, we will go back and rerun those.
- Herzog: Wetlands would be huge for the habitat GIT, I think most of these would be very helpful to several groups and managers.
- Allenby: Another one of our goals is to have this data available to the most people and with the easiest access. A big question is finding a scale at which most people work may inform this decision.
    - Claggett: This group could also be helpful for local data acquisition.

Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome – R. Thompson, USGS

Update on land use methods and metrics outcome including timeline and path forward.

- We will send out draft materials to the LUWG for review and appreciate any feedback from the LUWG on all materials at the next meeting.
- Claggett: In December, USGS is releasing 30 m data for the entire U.S. The Chesapeake Conservancy hot spot analysis will identify hot spots of change. After that, a high-resolution update in a couple years giving us county relevant change. The membership can help us develop this with existing land change products from states or counties that can be used to help validate more regional data. The partners can also help by giving feedback about how relevant certain data sets are for development.
    - Thompson: The challenge we will have is lack of general understanding, so we need to frame it in a broad digestible way. We have to address why we haven't made significant progress, and how we can get back on track.
    - Claggett: We are basically waiting for the USGS data which has not been released yet. And we are also waiting for work that the Chesapeake Conservancy has been awarded.
- Thompson: This part of the SRS process is mainly focusing on what we have done already, then after this November meeting, we will focus on actions moving forward.
- Drescher: I would agree, the opportunity is to look at areas that you have not progressed as far as you would like, and how you can address issues moving forward.
- Claggett: This will be the underpinnings for tree canopy, healthy watersheds, and will also be used for other primary outcomes.

Planning Next Meeting, News, Updates – P. Claggett, USGS

Update on CBLCM version 4, future meeting schedule, and meeting wrap up.

- Back to monthly conference calls first Wednesday of every month.

Next meeting: **November 7th Conference Call**

Meeting Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Allie Wagner	CRC
Labeeb Ahmed	Attain

Laura Drescher	EPA
Erik Fisher	CBF
Travis Stoe	PA DEP
Lori Brown	DNREC
Deb Sward	MDP
Jason Dubow	MDP
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Jennifer Miller Herzog	Land Trust Alliance
Jonathan Champion	DOEE
Clint Gill	DDA
John Griffin	Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Alex Reed	Washington County DEM
KC Filipino	HRPDC
Fred Irani	USGS
David Newburn	UMD
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County Planning
George Onyullo	DOEE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Matt Johnston	UMD
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Denny Puko	PA DCED
Matt Keefer	PA DCNR
Jeff Allenby	The Chesapeake Conservancy
Rachel Soobitsky	The Chesapeake Conservancy
LeeAnn King	The Chesapeake Conservancy
Jacob Czawlytko	The Chesapeake Conservancy
Ken Choi	MDP
Carin Bisland	EPA
Jessica Trimble	PA DCED
Renee Thompson	USGS