

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary

October 4, 2017

10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions & Decisions:

Decision: The LUWG agreed to revise the deadline for submitting comments and feedback on the Current Zoning deadline to October 20, and agreed to maintain all other deadlines outlined in the outcomes from the WQGIT September face-to-face meeting. The workgroup will then review the revised Current Zoning forecast results during their November meeting, where the workgroup will be asked to provide technical approval on the forecast.

Action: The CBP Land Data Team will provide the spatial data for the land use projections to the workgroup. This will include the first iteration of the land use forecast, the suitability surface (what areas can be developed within a county), and a thematic layer by LRSEG of growth.

Decision: The LUWG agreed to rename the “Utopia” Scenario to “Conservation Plus”.

Decision: The LUWG approved of using an interpolated land use between 2013 and the 2025 Current Zoning scenario to assess 2017 Progress.

Action: Peter Claggett will develop a briefing paper on the decision rules and data informing the Current Zoning land use forecast.

Welcome and introductions/Review of meeting minutes – K. Berger, MWCOG

Water Quality GIT Face-to-Face Meeting Outcomes – K. Berger, MWCOG & P. Claggett, USGS Karl Berger, workgroup chair, and Peter Claggett, workgroup coordinator, provided an update on the outcomes and decisions resulting from the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team’s face-to-face meeting on September 25-26.

Discussion:

- Peter Claggett: logistically, it will take us at least 1 week to incorporate suggested changes or comments that reviewers have. I propose we move the deadline for comment to October 20th. That would give us time, if we make any adjustments, to run our models in the last week of October. Then our November 1st call could present results and request finalization from the LUWG before going to the WQGIT. If we set a deadline of October 31, then we’re stuck where we get a bunch of comments, produce final results, and there’s no further discussion.
 - Sebastian Donner expressed support for being able to review the results after comments have been incorporated. Megan Grose agreed.
- Norm Goulet asked if there was any feedback from the PSC during their meeting yesterday.

- Peter Claggett replied that these scheduling changes should not affect the development timeline for the land use forecasts.
- Peter Claggett clarified that changes to the Current Zoning scenario will likely not be able to accommodate additional zoning information from localities, but could accommodate proposed changes to decision-rules.
- Karl Berger asked the workgroup if they felt comfortable submitting all feedback on the Current Zoning Scenario by October 20, and maintaining all other deadlines.

Decision: The LUWG agreed to revise the deadline for submitting comments and feedback on the Current Zoning deadline to October 20, and agreed to maintain all other deadlines outlined in the outcomes from the WQGIT September face-to-face meeting. The workgroup will then review the revised Current Zoning forecast results during their November meeting, where the workgroup will be asked to provide technical approval on the forecast.

- Jonathan Champion requested spatial data for the land use projections.

Action: The CBP Land Data Team will provide the spatial data for the land use projections to the workgroup. This will include the first iteration of the land use forecast, the suitability surface (what areas can be developed within a county), and a thematic layer by LRSEG of growth.

Draft Results from 'Current Zoning' Scenario – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett presented the draft results from the 'Current Zoning' 2025 land use scenario. Land Use Workgroup members will be asked to provide initial feedback on the tabular results that were distributed on September 25th.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger asked if the workgroup agreed to focus on the developing the Utopian scenario for finalization by January, and then working to develop the Current Zoning Plus scenario afterwards.
 - No objections were raised.
- Karl Berger asked if it would be possible to disaggregate the different facets of the Utopian scenario to isolate the effects of certain variables.
 - Peter Claggett explained that the difference between the Current Zoning Plus and Utopian scenarios is local information that the CBP doesn't have; the data collection would take a long time, and is not feasible for the short-term, but is being planned for the 2019 milestones. Our models are currently set up to be able to turn off or on certain components, so in the future we hope to have that functionality included in the Utopian scenario.
- Peter Claggett asked the group if they felt comfortable renaming the Utopia Scenario to Conservation Plus. Jennifer Herzog noted that Utopia translated actually means "no place", and supported the measure.

Decision: The LUWG agreed to rename the "Utopia" Scenario to "Conservation Plus".

- Peter Claggett asked the LUWG if they would be supportive of using an interpolated land use between 2013 and the 2025 Current Zoning scenario to assess 2017 Progress.
 - No concerns were raised.

Decision: The LUWG approved of using an interpolated land use between 2013 and the 2025 Current Zoning scenario to assess 2017 Progress.

- Sebastian Donner noted that he submitted comments on sewer and septic data in the forecasts, citing there was an extra 40% growth versus what was estimated. Peter Claggett replied that he will work on this offline with Sebastian.
- Peter Claggett noted that he will be posting the first iteration of the land use forecast, the suitability surface (what areas can be developed within a county), and a thematic layer by LRSEG of growth.
- Karl Berger asked if a write-up on the decision rules and metadata for the land use forecasts.

Action: Peter Claggett will develop a briefing paper on the decision rules and data informing the Current Zoning land use forecast.

Wrap-up, Next Steps

- The November meeting will include a discussion and decision-making session on what rules should be implemented for the Utopian (“Conservation Plus”) scenario.
- Karl Berger suggested a presentation on the comparison between Maryland’s growth model and the CBP growth model for the November meeting.
- The November meeting will also include a final review and approval of the Current Zoning growth scenario.
- Peter Claggett noted that if/when other jurisdictions develop their own forecasts, the LUWG will need to consider a methodology to evaluate and approve them for use in the CBP.

Next meeting:

Wednesday, November 1, 2017 10:00 – 12:00 PM

Conference call

Participants:

| Name | Affiliation |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Karl Berger | MWCOG |
| Peter Claggett | USGS |
| Lindsey Gordon | CRC |
| Lori Brown | DE DNREC |
| Jonathan Champion | DC DOEE |
| Shannon McKenrick | MDE |
| Erin Goodnough | MDP |
| Denny Puko | PA DCED |
| Greg Evans | VA Dept. of Forestry |
| Megan Grose | WV DEP |
| Sebastian Donner | WV DEP |
| Chad Thompson | WV DEP |
| Pat Gleason | EPA |

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Renee Thompson | USGS |
| Steve Stewart | Baltimore County MD |
| Robert Hirsch | Baltimore County MD |
| Norm Goulet | NVRC |
| KC Filippino | HRPDC |
| Jennifer Herzog | Land Trust Alliance |