CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary
August 2, 2017
10:00AM-12:00PM
Meeting Materials: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24796/

Actions & Decisions:
ACTION: Bill Keeling and Norm Goulet will provide Peter Claggett with VDH information on septic systems, broken out by county/city in Virginia before the deadline for revised inputs to the Phase 6 model, which is Aug. 31
ACTION: Maryland will provide their land use acreages through the historical period, with construction acres explicitly accounted for.
DECISION: The LUWG agreed to move forward with the proposed revised methodology for conducting the land use 'true-up' for inputs to the Phase 6 model as presented. This revised process addresses the fatal flaw comment from Maryland and one of those from Virginia.

Phase 6 Fatal Flaw Review – All
The Land Use Workgroup discussed any issues or comments related to the review of the Phase 6 land use.

Discussion:

- Comments from Virginia include a concern over developed land use acres changing through the historical period, and the use of mapped land use accuracies for crop and pasture for Virginia data. In addition, there is a concern about MS4 overlays not being accurate in some jurisdictions, particularly James City County and the Hampton Roads area. Peter Claggett replied that he will look into the MS4 overlay for Hampton Roads and fix.
- Comments from Maryland include the weighting of accuracies for impervious land cover.
- Comments from West Virginia include the potential overestimation of turf grass in some areas.
    - Sebastian Donner suggested that turf grass may be 30-40% overestimated in West Virginia, particularly along roadways.
    - West Virginia noted that they would not consider this comment a fatal flaw if it requires significant processing that would interfere with the current MPA schedule.
- Norm Goulet: I know Peter is working on septic numbers, but some areas have no septics in the jurisdiction, even though Phase 6 numbers indicate that there are some. How would we correct some of this information that is incorrect? It's not a fatal flaw, but it should be fixed ideally. This is occurring in the City of Alexandria, VA.

    - Peter Claggett: If people have any septic numbers for the ~2013 timeframe for jurisdictions, they can provide us that information and we can scale our data accordingly.
    - Bill Keeling: I have VDH data for 2016 non-point source data for 111 jurisdictions in VA, and Alexandria is not on the list. So I could have to agree with Norm – from VDH's point of view, they have no records of any system in that city. I can send the total number of systems that they have, state-wide broken out by small county/city.

ACTION: Bill Keeling and Norm Goulet will provide Peter Claggett with VDH information on septic systems, broken out by county/city in Virginia.

- Peter Claggett noted that if comments are not deemed to be fatal flaws, but would require any significant post-processing, then the group needs to consider whether fixes need to be implemented based on scheduling, time, and labor constraints.
- Peter Claggett presented a 'true-up' methodology for incorporating the census of agriculture, construction, and harvested forest acreages into the Phase 6 mapped land uses. This revised methodology addresses concerns from Virginia in implementing their mapped accuracy values for crop and pasture acres.
    - Bill Keeling proposed that any agriculture in a Virginia city be moved to the surrounding county.
    - Peter asked the LUWG if they were comfortable with the proposed methodology for adjusting crop and pasture acres. Revised tabular data would be available in August.
    - Bill Keeling requested that Peter coordinate with Matt Johnston to reconcile cities with agriculture, but otherwise supported the proposed methodology.
    - Jeff White requested there could be a 1-2 day timeframe to review the revised tabular data. He also suggested taking construction acres out of mixed open, or adjusting based on an error rate, for MD.
    - Peter Claggett: MD could provide the complete suite of land uses through time, with construction added, and then in the true-up, we can make an exception and not incorporate construction on addition of what you've submitted.

ACTION: Maryland will provide their land use acreages through the historical period, with construction acres explicitly accounted for.

- Karl asked if the LUWG should establish a rule whether developed acres should never decline over time. Peter suggested that if after review, the anomalies become significant, then the LUWG could consider a rule.

DECISION: The LUWG agreed to move forward with the proposed revised methodology for conducting the land use 'true-up' for inputs to the Phase 6 model as presented.

Presentation of Recommendations From Local Government Land Use Forum – P. Claggett, USGS
Peter Claggett presented the outcomes from the local government land use forum on alternative future scenarios that was held on June 7th. Included was a summary of the proposed alternative future scenarios as suggested during the forum.

Updated Historic Trends Land Use Scenario – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett, USGS, presented updated results for the Historic Trends land use forecasting scenario.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger noted that only the first two scenarios (Historic Trends & Current Policy Lite) would be done in the early September, by the next LUWG meeting – and for the WQGIT consideration in late September of what basis to use for the Phase III WIPs.
- Darold Burdick noted that the historic trends scenario did not account for the down-zoning taking place in the Occoquan Reservoir, but that hopefully this would be captured in the Current Policy Lite scenario.
- Karl Berger asked if the other future scenarios would be do-able by the time the WIPs are being developed. Peter Claggett replied that he will try to make that information available.

<u>Update on Local Zoning Data in Current Policy Land Use Scenario</u> – J. Czawlytko, USGS
Jacob Czawlytko, USGS contractor, presented on the status of incorporating zoning data into the Current Policy land use scenario.

Discussion:

- Lee Epstein asked how this method of classifying zoning data was preserving information on low-density development. Peter Claggett replied that the model incorporates density information in zoning to develop the suitability layer.
- Mark Symborski noted that they have an ag reserve patch, and the underlying zoning is 1-25 acres. However, the goal of the zoning is to keep a maximum amount of agriculture preserved. Peter Claggett replied that not simulating development on that patch would make more sense than projecting a 1-25 residential zoning.
- Darold Burdick asked how to go about evaluating whether policies worked through the historical period? Peter Claggett replied that it could include an analysis of patterns of encroachment, but that it's not an analysis being planned currently. Peter also noted that regressions are conducted statewide, because there typically isn't enough growth data per county by decade to constitute a suitable number of data points for a regression. This means that patterns of sprawling counties are therefore mixed with patterns of a developed/high growth county.
- Renee Thompson: Is there a way to overlay ag preservation areas with transferrable development rights (TDR) data to get a sense of the rate of ag land taken out of development? That could help us understand historically how ag land has been preserved through time.
    - Peter Claggett: Good suggestion, and we did bounce around the idea of simulating conservation as a land use. The Bay Program has rates of land conservation, but for 2025 it's not that big of a deal. Another way to deal with this is to simulate removing land from eligibility for development through time – this could be targeted towards agricultural preservation districts or TDR areas.

- Peter Claggett noted that ag preservation districts could be removed from eligibility from the beginning, or that conservation could be spatially simulated. The second option introduces a more random, potentially more realistic, factor. Given timelines, the CBP GIS team will work to incorporate zoning before September, and then will work to simulate conservation as a land use and segment the regression models.

Next meeting:
Wednesday, September 6th – Face-to-Face 10:00 – 3:00 PM
Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room ('Fish Shack')
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
410 Severn Avenue Annapolis MD 21403

Participants

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Jacob Czawlytko	USGS Contractor
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County VA
George Onyullo	DC DOEE
Lee Epstein	CBF
Luke Cole	DC DOEE
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Jeff White	MDE
Stephanie Martins	MDP
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County MD
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County MD
Lori Brown	DE DNREC
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County MD
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Renee Thompson	USGS
Fred Irani	USGS
Krystal Reifer	Montgomery County MD