

## CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary  
November 8, 2017  
1:00PM-3:00PM

**Meeting Materials:** [link](#)

### Actions & Decisions:

**DECISION:** The LUWG approved the proposal to exclude ultra-rural areas from near-term growth in the Current Zoning suitability surface layer.

**ACTION:** The CBP Land Data Team will develop and provide a ranked list of counties by total amount of projected development and whether each county has submitted data to the CBP for inclusion in the 2025 forecast.

**ACTION:** Peter Claggett will add a one-page description of the review expectations to the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer website, and will distribute these expectations along with the timeline for production via email.

**DECISION:** The LUWG approved the proposal to extend the review period for the draft Current Zoning scenario results to Friday, December 8.

**ACTION:** All feedback on the Current Zoning data (available as [tables](#) and [spatial](#) data) should be submitted via email directly to Peter Claggett ([pclagget@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:pclagget@chesapeakebay.net)), CC Lindsey Gordon ([gordon.lindsey@epa.gov](mailto:gordon.lindsey@epa.gov)) by December 8, 2017.

**ACTION:** The LUWG will distribute a poll via email soliciting feedback, input, and suggestions regarding the Conservation Plus 2025 scenario.

---

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

- The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Karl Berger and Peter Claggett reviewed the email announcement that was distributed on Monday November 6 to mark the release and review of the draft 2025 Current Zoning scenario.

### Model Refinements – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett briefed the workgroup on refinements made to the model, including enhancement of infill estimates, consolidation of urban areas, and the elimination of the preferential conversion of farmland as opposed to forest. He also proposed a modification to exclude ultra-rural areas from near-term growth in the suitability surface layer.

### *Discussion:*

- Karl Berger: Regarding the infill percentages, I know that your team has been coordinating with Montgomery County on their rates. There is a need for local review, but has anyone else looked at these infill percentages?

- Peter Claggett: I haven't been reviewing these with anyone besides Montgomery County.
- Karl Berger: Then that's certainly something we should all be sure to review. And I want to remind everyone that this model will be estimating land use, and I think we need to remember that we can't go county-by-county to ask for infill numbers. So we want to come up with a set of decision rules that can be applied as appropriate in order to reach agreement on the final model and results.
- Peter Claggett: Right – and for the MWCOG region, we gave each jurisdiction an equal opportunity to have the highest infill possible based on unique data for the whole region. That's how it fits into our transparent, repeatable model. And because data from our model informed that analysis, it's still mostly consistent with the data we're using everywhere else. So we want people to look at these numbers critically, and we're more than happy to answer questions about how they were derived. In most jurisdictions, you'll find that if there is a number, our estimates are most likely higher than what they have because our definition of infill is the under-detection of residential and commercial development from Landsat.
- Peter Claggett asked the workgroup if they would approve the proposal to exclude ultra-rural areas from the probability surface layer of potential development.
  - Sebastian Donner and Lee Epstein supported the proposed change.
  - Lee Epstein: The main driver for doing this is to reduce processing time?
    - Peter Claggett: Yes, but it's primarily because we feel our model is over-estimating rural growth without this change in place.
  - Karl Berger: I think this approach sounds sensible, and I would add that these forecasts are a process. We'll have to provide information for the PSC in December, but there's also the opportunity for tweaks beyond that deadline, and in two years there will be even more opportunities for refinement.
  - Karl Berger asked if anyone had objections to implementing the proposal change for ultra-rural areas.

**DECISION:** The LUWG approved the proposal to exclude ultra-rural areas from near-term growth in the Current Zoning suitability surface layer.

Process, Timeline, and Expectations for Review – K. Berger, MWCOG, & P. Claggett, USGS  
Karl Berger and Peter Claggett briefed the workgroup on the proposed process, timeline, and expectations for the review of the draft Current Zoning scenario data. Workgroup leadership proposed to extend the review deadline to December 8, 2017.

*Discussion:*

- Sebastian Donner supported the review and process.
- Lee Epstein asked how reviewers will be asked to provide feedback.
- Norm Goulet: You need to get someone from VDH onto your mailing list. Getting VA feedback at the local level will also be difficult.

- Peter Claggett noted that he and Karl Berger have discussed and proposed extending the review and comment period on the Current Zoning forecast to December 1.
  - West Virginia supported the proposed timeline.
- Denny Puko: Sometimes erroneous results aren't recognized until a specific county is asked to look at the data. Will there be opportunities when harder decisions are needed, and there are locational mis-representations in the model, for those issues to be discussed and adjusted?
  - Peter Claggett: The planning targets are supposed to be finalized in April 2018, in which case a lot of jurisdictions will have started Phase III WIP planning. During this time and the following year, if any issues like this are identified, and a jurisdiction says that something isn't right (which may extend beyond the 2025 land use), they can be raised at any time, and every 2 years we will make adjustments to the extent possible. We will re-release a new forecast for 2025 every two years with the latest and greatest data. So there's a rolling basis on which jurisdictions can give us zoning data, make changes, etc.
- Karl Berger: Because the CBP is limited in terms of time and resources, we're asking state representatives in the workgroup to help with the communication and outreach to localities here.
  - Greg Evans: VA DEQ is focused on the WIP III process, and we've had a lot of outreach to localities, but it's not pertaining to the specific questions being asked here. I need to talk to James Davis-Martin, and re-iterate this schedule to see if we can get more outreach there.
- Denny Puko: We should wait until the final Current Zoning is produced to network with counties?
  - Peter Claggett: We will hopefully by this Friday have a new set of tables that will reflect the agreed-upon model change from today. That's what you should review – we'll distribute this via email and post online.
- Peter Claggett noted that zoning and supplemental information can be either at the state or county level, but that municipal-level data is not preferred.
- Peter Claggett asked the workgroup if they would prefer to extend the review deadline to December 8, and to push back the regularly scheduled December LUWG meeting.
  - Workgroup members supported the resolution.
- Denny Puko: We can do outreach through our county planning director.
- Greg Evans: If you could contact Joan Salvati from DEQ, who is our local outreach person, that would be great.
- Mary Gattis suggested reminding everyone that this is an on-going process.
- Jeff White: We were discussing already doing some outreach and getting in touch with counties regarding infill rates, so we should be able to handle it.
- Sebastian Donner asked when new information would be due for milestone updates.
  - Karl Berger: Could we keep it fairly general?
  - Peter Claggett: Let's make it the same as the BMP deadline, which is June 2019.
- Peter Claggett: I would encourage all jurisdictions to rank the counties based on the amount of development that we're forecasting in 2025, and of those, the ones we have

zoning data for – that way, folks could see what could be top priority. We can do that, and provide it to the jurisdictions.

- Karl Berger suggested making a webinar on how to use the Phase 6 land use viewer available.

**ACTION:** The CBP Land Data Team will develop and provide a ranked list of counties by total amount of projected development and whether each county has submitted data to the CBP for inclusion in the 2025 forecast.

**ACTION:** Peter Claggett will add a one-page description of the review expectations to the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer website, and will distribute these expectations along with the timeline for production via email.

**DECISION:** The LUWG approved the proposal to extend the review period for the draft Current Zoning scenario results to Friday, December 8.

**ACTION:** All feedback on the Current Zoning data (available as [tables](#) and [spatial](#) data) should be submitted via email directly to Peter Claggett ([pclagget@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:pclagget@chesapeakebay.net)), CC Lindsey Gordon ([gordon.lindsey@epa.gov](mailto:gordon.lindsey@epa.gov)) by December 8, 2017.

#### Discussion of assumptions in “Conservation Plus” Scenario – P. Claggett, USGS; All

- Mary Gattis suggested developing an online poll to solicit feedback on which assumptions to include in the scenario.
- Karl Berger asked if these assumptions would be uniform across the watershed. Peter replied that was correct.
- Renee Thompson: I see a real connection back to the Bay Program missing from this list – some of our larger goals related to land conservation and forests in the outcomes. There’s an opportunity here to ask ourselves “what if we’re successful” in these outcomes, and how would they look on the landscape. This could be an opportunity to connect the land change model with real goals in the CBP and play it out on the landscape, so I’d like to see more of that connection in this scenario.
- Lee Epstein: The annual rate of the addition of either privately conserved properties and/or publicly conserved land – if we could find an annual rate for that, then we could take that forward and potentially increase it by a certain percentage.

**ACTION:** The LUWG will distribute a poll via email soliciting feedback, input, and suggestions regarding the Conservation Plus 2025 scenario.

#### **Next meeting:**

Wednesday, December 13, 2017 1:00 – 3:00 PM  
Conference call

#### Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Alex Reed	Washington County MD
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County MD
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County MD
Krystal Reifer	Montgomery County MD
Dipmani Kumar	Fairfax County VA
Jonathan Champion	DC DOEE
Lori Brown	DE DNREC
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Jeff White	MDE
Ken Choi	MDP
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Travis Stoe	PA DEP
Denny Puko	PA Department of Community & Economic Development
Greg Evans	VA Dept. of Forestry
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Mary Gattis	LGAC
Jacob Czawlytko	USGS
Labeeb Ahmed	USGS
Renee Thompson	USGS
Fred Irani	USGS
Lee Epstein	CBF