

## CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

### Face-to-Face Meeting Agenda

March 6, 2019

10:00AM - 3:00PM

Fish Shack, CBPO

#### **Actions and Decisions**

- **DECISION:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the December call.
- **ACTION:** Send out Thompson's data to the group and add Landscape Chesapeake to the Phase 6 viewer.
- **ACTION:** The LUWG is interested in identifying a way to realistically estimate costs of the benefit of conservation.
- **ACTION:** Check with WQGIT on September 2017 WQGIT approval of alternative land policy BMP scenarios, and if LUWG also needs approval from the PSC.
- **ACTION:** The LUWG will inform the WQGIT that verification is required for land policy BMPs
- **ACTION:** Once the Accounting for Growth document is finalized, it will be sent to the group before it goes to the Management Board in June.
- **ACTION:** LUWG state representatives, please send feedback on the secondary classes to Rachel Soobitsky.
- **ACTION:** Please review the updated Management Strategy and Workplan and send comments to Allie Wagner ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) by COB March 8, 2019.
- 

#### **Welcome, Roll Call, Review of meeting minutes, Action Item Update** – K. Berger, MWCOG

The LUWG was asked to approve the meeting minutes from the December call.

- **DECISION:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the December call.

#### **Custom State Future Land Use Scenarios** – P. Claggett, USGS and State Reps

Update and results on development of jurisdiction-specific 2025 future land-use scenarios. State representatives weighed in on custom state-specific scenarios.

- NY: Follow up with Peter after the call
- DC: Will consider edits to the DC scenario. Major areas targeted are forest area in the 2013 Phase 6 high resolution land use data.
  - Claggett: It's real change that was forest and now is developed.
- WV: Would like farm/forest conservation and there are a few outstanding items.
- Claggett noted that we need more information on phase 6 viewer such as protected lands, VA MS4s, population projections.
- **ACTION:** Send out Thompson's data to the group and add Landscape Chesapeake to the Phase 6 viewer.
- Filipino noted that we need an essential repository where we can grab data for local review.
- Goulet: We have an issue of underestimating consumption of forest and overestimating consumption of agriculture.
- PA: The scenario has changed a lot, it is only conserving wetlands, forest, and farmland conservation. Many are disappointed that conservation does not show a large, but it's only 6 years into the future. In our model, conserving deflects development to another area.
- Berger: Is modeling out to 2025 and 2050, a partnership policy or just a state request?

- Claggett: For climate, I supplied the modeling team with the land cover data to model out to 2050.
- Miller-Herzog: Easements are legally bound to be static for years. We don't have a method of tracking land conservation long term.
  - Claggett: We track what is permanently protected, but not the long-term effect.
  - The group agreed that we need to identify a way to realistically estimate costs of the benefit of conservation.
  - **ACTION:** The LUWG is interested in identifying a way to realistically estimate costs of the benefit of conservation.
- MD: Working to finalize scenario 1. The other MD scenario is for internal use. They have four different types of conservation out to 2040. Protected lands data will be updated before finalizing this scenario.
  - MD would like final review before the scenario goes live on CAST.
- Claggett noted that the best place to get conservation information from is the Conservation Partnership if we don't have the time series of actual conservation
- Berger: Do you have a sense of how significant this conservation BMP scenario is to overall WIP efforts from MD?
  - Cornwell: We're still waiting to see. The preliminary run was not significant.
- Berger: Will these be available on CAST for any user?
  - Claggett: Yes, once they are finalized.

#### **Discussion on Accounting for Growth Loads**– P. Claggett, USGS

Update and discussion on Accounting for Growth Expectations for the Phase III WIPs document.

- Claggett: A comment received was that CBP should provide more information to jurisdictions to understand why loads are changing to empower jurisdictions to choose how they want to account for growth and make that decision at the state level. The Ag Census data explains the change in loads significantly. We are attempting to get acknowledgement that jurisdictions can decide to claim less credit themselves. There will be additional information added to the tables.
  - Miller-Herzog: To clarify, jurisdictions have the option to stick with their own policies and forego this in the model.
- Claggett noted that in 2017 the PSC approved the 2025 planning horizon based on the land change model forecast, updated every 2 years, but did not explicitly approve alternative scenarios and land policy. In September of 2017, the WQGIT approved the alternative land policy BMP scenarios. Does this need another approval explicitly or is it implied?
  - **ACTION:** Check with WQGIT on September 2017 WQGIT approval of alternative land policy BMP scenarios, and if LUWG also needs approval from the PSC.
- Claggett: The verification of land policy BMPs warrants narrative, programmatic, and numeric documentation that they are likely to happen in the future. We need to track this, but we also don't want to impose large accounting burdens leading to states not bothering. We need to strike a balance.
  - Epstein: How would verification work?
  - Claggett: The reviewers of the WIPs (EPA) would need to comment on that.
  - Berger: Verification will vary by state.
  - Goulet: The Verification Committee has not met in a long time. Verification information may be captured in the state QAPPs.
  - Claggett: The high-resolution land cover update next year may be a good way to perform verification.

- **ACTION:** The LUWG will inform the WQGIT that verification is required for land policy BMPs
- Claggett: The LUWG and WQGIT reviewed this document and this version has incorporated final changes. Once we get the final blessing, this will go to the WQGIT and Management Board.
- **ACTION:** Once the Accounting for Growth document is finalized, it will be sent to the group before it goes to the Management Board in June.
- The group noted that the LUWG needs to get to the local level discussions and work with the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, LGAC, and Local Leadership Workgroup to develop a local engagement strategy to make these invaluable connections. The data we generate needs to be useful and easily understandable at the local level.

#### **Update on Geospatial Award** – R. Soobitsky, The Chesapeake Conservancy

Update on geospatial award activity 1 and activity 2.

- Berger: The states, LUWG members, and WQGIT members may be interested in seeing the data you have represented on a map highlighting where you still need data.
- Soobitsky noted that the needed datasets have varying deadlines.
- Goulet: How are vineyards classified?
  - Claggett: Vineyard acres come from census data distributed from county to watershed LRSEs based on proportion of agriculture. The analysis from the Conservancy would allow us to pinpoint them.
- Berger: If we do this again in the future, it may be helpful to go to each source sector workgroup.
- **ACTION:** LUWG state representatives, please send feedback on the secondary classes to Rachel Soobitsky.
- Claggett noted that VA has their own product, and likely no financing to remap.
- Soobitsky received feedback from VA counties, but not statewide. Since VA does not have a planning division, resources are spread out. Perhaps targeting PSC members from VA may help.
- Sally Claggett: How do you see this interfacing with BMP reporting with the grass filter strips?
  - King: We plan to map BMPs capable, including grass filters, that will feed into field doc and be ranked for targeting. To inform at the county and state level.
  - Sally Claggett: Their primary source of data is USGS through an NRCS agreement instead of field tracking.
  - King: That comes down to a confidentiality issue with the data, which is a big obstacle.
- Saavedra gave an update on hydrography in the Bay region by using computer vision algorithms to classify and identify valleys. First optimized for headwater streams, and secondly optimized for identifying channels within valleys.
- Claggett: This stream data network is in the land use.
- Claggett: USGS has a tool called Facet that we may apply to this data to potentially get bank height, bank angle, and flood plain dimensioning.
  - Goulet noted that ground truthing would be helpful.
  - Thomson noted that the Habitat GIT has an upcoming meeting this issue could be discussed at.
- Berger clarified that Objective 3 is geared toward source sector groups with urban and agriculture BMP implementation.
- Claggett: Is there a target audience for the prioritization?
  - King: Soil conservation districts reporting through Field Doc through the states and then to EPA.

- Epstein: I don't know how you could acquire the agriculture data since it's confidential. USDA and NRCS are very strict about sharing data even with parts of our own organization.
  - Claggett: USGS has an agreement and only individuals who signed the contract have access to it. We can aggregate that data to HUC 12 and can only show the most abundant BMPs without disclosing anything else.
  - Berger noted that many of the most suitable BMP sites are on private property.
  - Miller-Herzog: We can't target private property, but if a local government has an existing relationship with a private landowner, they can have a discussion to get that going.

#### **Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome** – P. Claggett & R. Thompson

Update to the Land Use Methods and Metrics Management Strategy and Workplan.

**ACTION:** Please review the updated Management Strategy and Workplan and send comments to Allie Wagner ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)) by COB March 8, 2019.

- Management Approach 1: Claggett pushed to drop monitoring wetland change, but technically we cannot do that.
- Management Approach 2: We need feedback and someone to take the lead on identifying what these impacts really mean. Stream flow, fragmentation of habitat, what is the measure of impact?
  - Thompson: We plan to ask relevant workgroups what metrics they need to identify and make decisions.
  - Claggett noted that the "communities" terminology originates from the outcome creation to frame land change driven by development positively. Departments of planning may have expertise on that. Perhaps if MDP took the lead with some ideas, we could apply it across the watershed.
  - The group discussed a tool assessing impacts to watersheds, perhaps the PHWA tool or the BCG tool.
- Management approach 3: We plan to incorporate into a local engagement strategy and couple with Land Use Options and Evaluation products. Getting this information out to the right subset of people to help work on this will make a difference.

#### **Land Cover Project** – A. Wagner, CRC

Workplan Action 1.2 progress report.

- Wagner noted that hopefully this work will be completed by end of summer. This is the preliminary analysis and will be redone with updated 2016 NLCD data when it is released.
- Sally Claggett noted that many of the top changes were silviculture and the Forestry Workgroup may have feedback from a forestry perspective.
- The group is interested in seeing the updated information capturing 100% of the change instead of only the top 10.
- **ACTION:** Wagner will report back to the LUWG when further progress has been made on the NLCD Land Change project.

Next meeting: **Conference call on June 5, 2019**

#### **Meeting Participants:**

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS

Allie Wagner	CRC
Labeeb Ahmed	Attain
Renee Thompson	USGS
Jessica Trimble	PA DCED
Deb Sward	MDP
George Onyullo	DOEE
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Cassandra Davis	NYSDEC
Jennifer Miller Herzog	Land Trust Alliance
Lee Epstein	CBF
John Griffin	Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Debbie Herr Cornwell	MDP
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Chris Brosch	DDA
David Newbury	UMD
Rachel Soobitsky	Chesapeake Conservancy
LeAnn King	Chesapeake Conservancy
David Saavedra	Chesapeake Conservancy
KC Filipino	HRPDC
Ken Choi	MDP