

**SUMMARY
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
LAND USE WORKGROUP
DECEMBER 18TH, 2012
CONFERENCE CALL**

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19013/>

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS & ACTION ITEMS

DECISION: Members approved October conference call minutes

ACTION: LUWG members from each state will contact Karl, Jenny, and Peter to discuss the strategy for collecting local data from their state

ACTION: Members finalized meeting topics for upcoming meetings

MINUTES

Welcome and Introductions

- Karl Berger noted schedule conflicts for January and February

Review of Minutes

- Berger reviewed [October conference call minutes](#), and asked for any corrections.
- DECISION: Members approved minutes

Final Workplan

- Jenny Tribo reviewed the [draft LUWG workplan](#).
- Tribo explained the sector workgroups will provide their feedback through January and February, so the LUWG can finalize the LULC list in March 2013.
- Berger: explained the subdivision of layers, and issues with loading rates
- Dubin: Among other things, the AgWG is looking at potential datasets that could provide annual or cropland data layers, e.g. NASS, state equine surveys.
 - Berger: Expecting common elements to forecasting and backcasting with urban and agriculture even if using different data sets.
 - Dubin: The LUWG is the ideal coordination point between the different sectors to provide modeling recommendations for land use
- Dubin: The AgWG will discuss land uses in more depth during its January meeting.
- Berger: The workplan is based on the schedule that was approved by the PSC on December 5th

Feedback on Phase 6 Land Uses

- Claggett described some of the [comments received](#) from LUWG members and others
- He noted there were substantive changes to the draft list of agriculture land uses. The urban stormwater workgroup will discuss the LULC at its next meeting
- Sally: the forestry workgroup is still discussing urban tree canopy, so the draft list may need to change to reflect the forestry workgroup's recommendations
- Claggett clarified that if the model included both rural woodland and urban tree canopy classes, they would be spatially and categorically exclusive.

- Sally: UTC is on developed land, though the forestry workgroup is revising that BMP. Residential woodlands are a relatively new category. It is typically a managed forested area in a neighborhood.
- Gattis: what about riparian plantings in urban developed areas? How would that be handled? Not suggesting there needs to be any change, just raising the question.
 - Claggett: There hasn't been a need to distinguish urban riparian forests or areas from riparian forests in agriculture or undisturbed areas.
- Berger: clarified that the LUWG will coordinate with the Wastewater Treatment workgroup
 - Claggett: The WWTWG is already looking at some of these factors and systems for the next version of the model. So they are the lead and the LUWG will support them.
- Claggett: The construction land use represents land under erosion and sediment control permits. Hoping to discuss more at a future meeting about what this permit data represents in terms of on the ground disturbance. Will help to better understand the datasets and to infer years where permit data does not exist.
 - Tesler: we would definitely welcome that opportunity
- Claggett: our options might be more restricted for mining acreage than for construction. Shale gas pads are still on the list, but were moved under construction based on Pennsylvania's comment that these sites are usually temporary.
- If any questions or comments on agriculture land classes, direct them to Mark Dubin.
- Grose: does CAFO refer to the production area?
 - Dubin: Yes, that would be the area occupied by the housing and storage for feed or litter. Before the TMDL the feeding operations were a general category; the regulated and unregulated areas had to be separated under the TMDL.
 - Dubin: the list is an initial draft of categories. There will likely be sub-categories, e.g. at least three sub-categories for nursery that will have individual loading rates.
- Claggett: the goal is to finalize the LULC list by end of February. We have notified the sector workgroups and will need their feedback. The final list will probably be more abbreviated than the current draft version.

Solicitation of Local Data ([found here](#))

- Claggett noted the WQGIT still has to discuss and make a decision on the 2025 land use issue. Regardless what the WQGIT decides, the LUWG will still need methods to backcast and forecast. Based on comments we received, seems to make most sense to go through the states. Perhaps a statewide organization or agency would take the lead in each state. The alternative would be CBPO staff making calls to solicit the data, but this would be much less efficient since the states would have to provide a lot of guidance.
- Quinlan: Virginia does not have a data layer for regulated stormwater areas. Do not have regulatory authority to require something like this.
 - Some of the local jurisdictions may already have this data.
 - Berger: Sense this could be a difficult issue. MS4 regulations seem to vary by state.
 - Claggett: I see this as an issue for the urban stormwater workgroup to take the lead on.

- Tribo: Echo Berger's comment that this is difficult, but feel this is important to do. At the very least, it would be helpful to identify the Phase I and Phase II areas. The biggest problem might be pulling out the VDOT areas from the local areas.
- Claggett: Suggest taking the regulated stormwater issue off the list and pass it to the USWG.
 - Quinlan: I do have the sense that some of the regulated areas have this data mapped, so would be curious to see it. Perhaps keep it on the list.
 - Gattis: What do we mean by regulated? I thought we were just talking about MS4 permits, but there seems to be some confusion.
 - Claggett: initially this was meant to represent combined sewer systems and MS4 permitted areas since these areas are in the model, but we could expand it to include other regulated areas.
 - Gattis: if we mean MS4 we should clarify. Don't necessarily suggest expanding the definition to include other regulated or permitted areas.
 - Dubin: for agriculture, CAFOs includes both state and federal permitted operations.
 - White: what if we tailor the request for each state? Would that be possible, since we want to run the request through the state anyway?
 - Claggett: That would be possible. Does anyone disagree with the approach of going through the state agencies?
 - No comments or objections were heard.
 - Would like to send out the request in February.
 - What if the state does not have a centralized or willing agency to handle this request?
 - If that's the case, then we would need to know. Plan B would be CBPO staff handling the solicitation.
 - Tesler: Expect to discover a variety of data availability and information. Some localities will have a lot of data, while others will have less.
 - Claggett: The more data, the better. This gets at the equity issue that PA has raised on previous calls.
 - ACTION: LUWG members from each state should contact Karl, Jenny, and Peter to discuss the strategy for their state

Proposed meeting schedule and topics for January-March

- A conference call meeting will be held the morning of Tuesday, January 22nd, and a face to face meeting arranged for February.
- Topics:
 - Data request—further discussion of strategy and finalize the request for distribution.
 - 2025 Land Use—the WQGIT will talk about this on its January 14th conference call, so the LUWG can address this issue based on the WQGIT's recommendation

- Start analyzing and comparing some of the state/local data to CBPO land use numbers. Jurisdictions can do their own analyses as well. Begin to determine the issues that will need to be addressed in order to “crosswalk” local information to a different classification.
- Explore issues and start to develop a protocol to incorporate local data
- Berger: if time, may be beneficial to include a more technical discussion during January call.
 - Dubin: Suggests having a sector crosswalk discussion to benefit the sector workgroups in February. Could help identify overlaps between the sectors, so the workgroups could report a more finalized suggestion in February.
 - Claggett: would others be interested in this discussion?
 - Sally: would be useful.
 - Baldwin: crosswalk information would be good to share. We’ve used the Bay Program land uses in the past and worked on how to integrate them in Maryland.
 - Claggett: there will need to be sector-specific meetings or calls in the future, do not think February will be one of those times.
 - Berger: In early January, we will set a date and plan the February meeting.
 - Dubin: may want at least some semi-formal presentations from the workgroup chairs or coordinators on their sector’s land use proposals.
- Tesler: while reaching out the sector workgroups, may be useful to provide background information on how CBPO staff handles and uses land use information.
- Dubin: if asking workgroups for their recommended new LULC list, could also ask them to relate/compare those new classes to existing or current classes
- Gleason: volunteer topic – the draft sector load demonstration principles document from November

Adjourned 11:50am

Next meeting:

Monday, January 22 10:00AM – 12:00PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19130/>

Participants

Name	Affiliation	Email
Karl Berger, Co-Chair	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	kberger@mwkog.org
Jenny Tribo, Co-Chair	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	jtribo@hrpdcva.gov
Peter Claggett, Coordinator	USGS, CBPO	pclagget@chesapeakebay.net
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO	
Bryan Bloch	DNREC	Bryan.Bloch@state.de.us
Mark Dubin	UMD Extension, CBPO	mdubin@chesapeakebay.net
Barry Evans	PSU	bme1@psu.edu
Mary Gattis	Lancaster County Planning Commission	gattism@co.lancaster.pa.us
Pat Gleason	EPA Reg. 3	Gleason.Patricia@epamail.epa.gov
Megan Grose	WV DEP	megan.e.grose@wv.gov
Leslie Grunden	Caroline County	lgrunden@carolinemd.org
Julie Mawhorter	U.S. Forest Service	

David Newburn	UMD	dnewburn@arec.umd.edu
George E. Onyullo	DDOE	george.onyullo@dc.gov
Andra Popa	EPA CBPO	
Beverly Quinlan	VA DCR	Beverly.Quinlan@dcr.virginia.gov
Justin Shafer	DPW, City of Norfolk	Justin.Shafer@norfolk.gov
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County	sstewart@baltimorecountymd.gov
Jeff Sweeney	EPA CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Ted Tesler	PA DEP	thtesler@pa.gov
Jeff White	MDE	jjwhite@mde.state.md.us