

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM  
LAND USE WORKGROUP  
Conference Call Minutes  
April 15, 2013  
10:00am-12:00pm**

**ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS:**

**DECISION:** LUWG will meet in person on a quarterly basis, with conference calls scheduled in between. The next two in person meetings will be in June and September.

**DECISION:** Low density residential and septic mapping will be on the June agenda.

**MINUTES:**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- a. Karl Berger and Jenny Tribo (co-chairs) welcomed everyone to the call and confirmed call participants

**2. Federal Lands/Land Uses Update**

- a. Peter Claggett (USGS) provided an update on Federal Lands and Land Uses following his discussion with the Federal Facilities Team.
- b. Concern from the call was how better information about their facilities would help the Federal Facilities themselves (e.g. could they be provided a MAST/CAST/VAST type of tool?)
- c. Karl Berger: Question for state or local government representatives: Do the Phase 5.3.2 acres of Federal lands match what is in local databases?
  - i. Steve Stewart (Baltimore County): No issue with Federal lands within Baltimore County.
  - ii. Jeff White (MDE): Majority of federal lands in MD accounted for in 5.3.2
  - iii. Corinna Eddy (CTC): Have compared installation boundaries at DoD facilities across the watershed against the Federal Facility segmentation GIS layer obtained from CBPO, and found that total acreage within boundary polygons is fairly comparable. In some cases, when DoD properties have gained or lost acres due to property transfers, found inaccurate demarcations (perhaps due to timing). Comparing installation data to MDE's reduction calculator, noticed larger discrepancies with pervious/impervious land uses.
    - Laura Muhs (navy): Noted that there were gaps in the original 2010 land use data collection.
    - Eddy: Property boundaries from installations do not always line up with the existing segmentation layer, however total acreage is generally accurate.
  - iv. Ted Tesler (PA): Clarify discrepancies between pervious/impervious?

- Eddy: Satellite imagery originally used may have been evaluated at a broader scale. Federal facilities tended to have more urban acreage than was recognized in segmentation layer.

### 3. Local Data Collection Status

- Jurisdictions reported on the current status of their local land use/cover data collection efforts
- DE: Land use data for several years collected, in process of collecting 2012 data. Public lands and Ag information, MS4, forest cover, urban tree canopy.
- Jeff White (MDE): MD has received data from half of the counties. When data is provided, will include all related notes. Some jurisdictions have not yet submitted, but expecting them soon. Data sets include: impervious cover, tree cover, storm drains.
- Ted Tesler (PA): Peter Claggett presenting to county planning directors in May.
- Barry Evans (PSU): High level land use data sets should be available from localities, may need to adjust for compatibility.
- Beverly Quinlan (VA): Some concerns from Planning District Commissions about the lack of funding with this request. The local governments will be interested in seeing the final product of this data collection effort. Have received data from Virginia Beach, VDOT, VADCR AFO, and City of Richmond; everything has been uploaded to ftp site.
- Darold Burdick: Fairfax county planning to upload directly as well. Is storm network data requested?
  - Claggett: Storm water was left off the original data call for simplicity, but Bay Program Partnership model will need storm water data eventually (whether coming through this group or the USWG).
- Burdick: Data request for MS4 polygons or the network?
  - Claggett: MS4 Polygons.
- Burdick: Was not able to locate much historic data.
  - Claggett: Clarified that recent data is the most useful, in order to have the most current representation of land use possible. (Historic data is not required).
- Megan Grose: WV expecting Jefferson County land use dataset this summer.
- David Bubniak (NY): Provided some data to the ftp site, will need to review the data request list to see what else is needed.
- Berger: Note that the end result of the data collection will be a 'patchwork' with some gaps, using a combination of local, state level data and the default Bay Program data
- Mary Gattis: How many variations are there to the census urbanized area designation? Is it possible to use that as the default for MS4 coverage and make adjustments as needed?
  - Claggett: Each jurisdiction has their own method for delineating MS4s. For modeling purposes, is best to use the state standards.
  - Gattis: New permits issued now are based on 2000 urbanized data.

### 4. Agricultural Modeling Workshop Update

- a. Peter Claggett provided an overview of an upcoming Agricultural Modeling Workshop to be held May 22-23 in College Park, MD. The workshop will feature multiple sessions. One session will focus on agricultural forecasting, with discussions of short and long term forecasting for both livestock and crops.
- b. Mary Gattis: Who are the workshop invitees?
  - i. Claggett: Agricultural economists, academics, industry, ag associations, state agencies.
  - ii. Matt Johnston: The invitees represent a group of people with technical expertise and knowledge of data that could be used in the model.
  - iii. Claggett: Will provide the invitee list.

#### **5. Joint Meeting with Forestry**

- a. Sally Claggett (USFS) gave an overview of the agenda and topics for the May 1st face to face joint meeting with the Forestry Workgroup and Land Use Workgroup in Annapolis.
- b. Sally will be distributing a draft agenda soon. The goal of the joint meeting to discuss possible new categories for tree cover, which is ~65% of the watershed, as well as distinctions between separate true forest, wooded open, riparian and urban tree canopy. Soliciting for presentations from local government. USGS will present on flood plain areas.
  - i. Andrew Brenner (Photo Science): Willing to present on land cover mapping, urban canopy both at high and moderate resolution.

#### **6. Upcoming LUWG Topics and Priorities**

- a. Karl Berger led a discussion of workgroup topics and schedule for the coming months.
  - i. LUWG has been alternating between face to face meetings and conference calls every other month. Suggestion is to have face to face meetings on a quarterly basis with conference calls in between. The third Monday of the month will continue to be the LUWG timeslot.
  - ii. May 1<sup>st</sup> joint with Forestry Workgroup 10:00AM in Annapolis
  - iii. May 20<sup>th</sup> meeting: cancelled
  - iv. Face to face meeting June 17<sup>th</sup>
  - v. Data collection initial deadline June 30<sup>th</sup>
  - vi. Conference calls July 15<sup>th</sup> and Aug 19<sup>th</sup>
  - vii. Face to face meeting September 16<sup>th</sup>: Lessons learned from local data OR forecasting and backcasting procedures on the agenda.
- b. Gattis: Recommend June/September for quarterly schedule, to avoid busy October.
- c. Grose: WV interested in low density and septic issue, recommend this meeting topic for June.
- d. Claggett: Recommend discussing lessons learned from local data in September. Could also begin the forecasting discussion or move that to December.
- e. Tribo: What is the status of the USWG STAC workshop proposal?
  - i. Emma Giese (CRC): Presenters should be hearing back from STAC this week.

**DECISION:** LUWG will meet in person on a quarterly basis, with conference calls scheduled in between. The next two in person meetings will be in June and September.

**DECISION:** Low density residential and septic mapping will be on the June agenda.

**Adjourned**

**Participants**

Jenny Tribo, HRPDC  
Jeff White, MDE  
Steve Stewart, Baltimore County  
Erik Fisher, CBF  
Ted Tesler, PA DEP  
Barry Evans, PSU  
Brian Bloch, DNREC  
Beverly Quinlan, VA DCR  
Megan Grose, WVDEP  
Laura Muhs, DoD/DoN  
Sally Claggett, USFS  
Melissa Merritt, WVCA  
Mary Gattis, Lancaster County  
Darold Burdick, Fairfax County  
George Onyullo, DDOE  
Jeff Sweeney, EPA  
Matt Johnston, UMD  
Corinna Eddy, Concurrent Technologies Corporation  
Andrew Brenner, PhotoScience  
Peter Claggett, USGS  
Karl Berger, MWCOG  
Emma Giese, CRC