

## CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2020

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

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

### Summary of Actions/Decisions

**Decision:** The LUWG will approve the meeting minutes from February at our next meeting.

**Action:** P. Claggett will update the 2019 milestones land use and loads slides to be clear as to which model version and Progress years are being compared.

**Action:** P. Claggett can provide an analysis comparing the changes between loads between 2017 and 2019 CAST.

**Decision:** The LUWG recommends the high-res land use classification scheme presented to move on to the WQGIT and Management Board for approval.

**Action:** LUWG members can download the previously released 1m land use data for your state/county and review it. If there are concerns, issues must be brought to the LUWG by June.

**Action:** Claggett can develop a schedule of Phase 6 land use decision rules and explain what is needed and when for all reviews. The schedule will be sent out in an email with links to critique.

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

- **Decision:** The LUWG will approve the meeting minutes from February at our next meeting.

### 2019 Milestone Land Use and Loads - P. Claggett, USGS

- Claggett: The AgWG agreed that using consistent Ag Census error rates from 2012 is the best path forward, which was previously decided by the partnership.
- Claggett: 2019 Milestone land use is now available for review in CAST.
- Berger: In the future will we be shifting toward perhaps not using the Ag Census to calculate agriculture acres by county?
  - Claggett: Anything is possible post 2025. We may get much better at mapping agriculture in the future, which may be an alternative method to calculate that information.
- Lancaster County is an outlier as shown in the graph.
  - Travis Stoe offered to supply more data to help make sense of the numbers seen in Lancaster County.
- Filippino: Does this affect other land uses that are non-agricultural?
  - Claggett: Yes, an overestimate in agriculture from the census may affect other land uses and will be adjusted in the true-up.
- Claggett: The table shown is 2017 CAST from 2018 Progress and 2019 CAST from 2018 Progress N loads. I encourage people to look at this information for yourself on CAST.

- **Action:** P. Claggett will update the 2019 milestones land use and loads slides to be clear as to which model version and Progress years are being compared.
- Berger: Most relevant information is the delta to see how things have changed.
  - **Action:** P. Claggett can provide an analysis comparing the changes between loads between 2017 and 2019 CAST.
  - Montali: I want to see current land use change, future land use change, and change between 2018-2025.
- Claggett: On the March 23 WQGIT conference call, there will be an overview on the loads, CAST, etc. that LUWG members can tune into.
  - We can address any concerns/issues that come up with the WQGIT at a future LUWG meeting.
- Claggett: If anyone wants to investigate this deeper and you've been looking into it using CAST, now is the time to raise issues that may need to be addressed.

#### Final High-res Land Use Classification Scheme – P. Claggett, USGS

- Review final scheme and address questions or concerns
- Claggett did not receive any suggested changes after our last LUWG meeting. This is the last chance to propose changes to these. There will be additional chances to speak up at WQGIT and Management Board levels.
- There are many goal teams and outcomes other than water quality that would benefit from these additional classes.
- Berger asked if there are any objections to the classification as proposed.
  - Montali: No objections. Recommends keeping the presentations separate for the WQGIT. The production category is misleading, recommends keeping consistent with Phase 6 land use categories.
  - **Decision:** The LUWG recommends the high-res land use classification scheme presented to move on to the WQGIT and Management Board for approval.

#### Revising Phase 6 Land Use Decision Rules – J. Czawlytko, Chesapeake Conservancy, and P. Claggett, USGS

- Overview of past and proposed future rules
- Discussion of mapping issues that should be addressed
- Discuss approach and schedule for testing and finalizing rules
- Claggett noted Phase 6 documentation for rules will be finished this summer.
- Previous decision rules with needed changes will be reviewed and new rules for new land uses proposed. The LUWG will review and approve these.
- **Action:** LUWG members can download the previously released 1m land use data for your state/county and review it. If there are concerns, issues must be brought to the LUWG by June.
  - We hope to fix any issues raised in the iteration if it's possible. This will also be used to remap 2013.

- Berger: When will we begin reviewing these decision rules?
  - Claggett: We want them finalized by Jan/Feb next year. It will be a challenging process. For a rule we want to change, we must write the code and show you the effect it will have instead of just talking about it. We must give the Conservancy some time to get up and running before we can start reviewing.
    - We will make sure the group has time to review, based on how everything goes, we can decide when we will start and how much time will be devoted during calls.
    - We will review old rules and old land use between now and the June 3 face-to-face meeting.
- **Action:** Claggett can develop a schedule of Phase 6 land use decision rules and explain what is needed and when for all reviews. The schedule will be sent out in an email with links to critique.

Status update on high-res land cover, use, and hydrography – Rachel Soobitsky, Chesapeake Conservancy

- In terms of a status report, Pennsylvania's high-res data set in the lower Susquehanna is almost finished, Maryland's data set needs more time
- Soobitsky provided a map viewer that shows the timeframe in which data will roll out
- Soobitsky: Should state representatives also review county data?
  - Claggett: Ask if they want to review both and give them access to all counties in their state.
- Lee Epstein: As a non-profit organization, can we review as well?
  - Soobitsky: We can share it more broadly if you would like to review it as well.
  - Thompson: Many interested parties or partners may want to be added: CBF, land trust alliance, Chesapeake conservancy, etc.
  - Stoe: I think state organizations would like to see it as well. PA DEP, every county.
  - Filippino suggested a downloadable link instead of individual emails to streamline the review process.
  - Soobitsky can set up a webpage with the link and password available to the LUWG.

Planning Next Meeting, News, Updates – KC Filippino, HRPDC

- LUWG will review decision rules and updates from Soobitsky as they roll out.
- Report out on any WQGIT issues with the milestone land use topic.
- The April conference call is tentative based on availability of updates and need for more review time prior to meetings by membership.
- Potential June face-to-face meeting joint with the FWG.

**Next meeting: Conference Call on May 6<sup>th</sup> from 1 PM – 3 PM**

Meeting Participants

Peter Claggett, USGS  
Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC  
Nicole Christ, MDE  
John Griffin, Chesapeake Conservation Partnership  
Rachel Soobitsky, CIC  
Jennifer Miller Herzog, Land Trust Alliance  
Ken Choi, MDP  
Deb Sward, MDP  
Jacob Czawlytko, CIC  
Alana Hartman, WV DEP  
Sebastien Donner, WV DEP  
Dave Montali, WV DEP  
George Onyullo, DOEE  
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ  
Renee Thompson, USGS  
Sarah McDonald, USGS  
Karl Berger, MWCOG  
KC Filippino, HRDPC  
Mark Symborski, Montgomery Co. Planning  
Lee Epstein, CBF  
Amy Hruska, SERC  
Shannon McKenrick, MDE  
Travis Stoe, PA DEP  
Lori Brown, DNREC  
Ted Tesler, PA DEP  
Lisa Beatty, PA DEP  
Allie Wagner, CRC  
Labeeb Ahmed, Attain