

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary

March 7, 2018

10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: Peter Claggett will distribute tabular results of the Historic Trends, Current Zoning, and Forest Conservation (run on both Historic Trends and Current Zoning) scenarios to the workgroup.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide an expanded description of the different options for updating the phase 6 land use database.

ACTION: Over the next few months, the CBP will work to develop a straw-man proposal for guidance on BMP verification as it relates to conservation and land planning.

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

The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the February 7th meeting.

Future Scenario Production & Results – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett updated the workgroup on the status of developing the 2025 future land use scenarios, and presented initial results.

Discussion:

- Peter Claggett updated the workgroup on the status of developing jurisdiction-specific scenarios, and notified NY, DE, and VA that they should contact him if they would like to hold discussions to start the development process. The timeline for development is roughly 1 month from the time a scenario framework is submitted to when it's available on CAST.
- Peter Claggett updated the workgroup on the outcomes from the WQGIT discussion on the Historic Trends and Current Zoning land use scenarios. The WQGIT did not agree to using Historic Trends as the baseline scenario; instead it advocated for jurisdictions' flexibility in selecting their baseline scenario. Both the Historic Trends and Current Zoning scenarios have now been finalized.
- Peter Claggett notified that he has been working with the WWTWG to develop methods to forecast future wastewater treatment conditions. The WWTWG did not pursue moving forward with the proposed methods.
- Karl Berger: When forest conservation is run on current zoning, that could look different than when run on historic trends?

- Peter Claggett: Right. More forested states like NY, PA, and WV show a big impact from forest conservation compared to current zoning. But this change isn't necessarily as big in other states.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will distribute tabular results of the Historic Trends, Current Zoning, and Forest Conservation (run on both Historic Trends and Current Zoning) scenarios to the workgroup.

- Peter Claggett and Karl Berger noted that the statewide results and trends could vary significantly by county.
- Karl Berger reminded the workgroup that the results they see from Peter Claggett will not be the final land uses that are incorporated into CAST because of the need to reconcile land use data with Ag Census ag land data.
- Karl Berger: So officially, there are no load changes in sewer and septic numbers. So the numbers you've presented here are provisional population increases on sewer.
 - Peter Claggett: The WWTWG had concerns on how we associated these numbers with changes on individual plants.

Monitoring Land Use Change and Updating the High-Res Land Use/Land Cover Classification – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett lead a discussion with the workgroup on planned updates to the high-resolution land use/land cover data.

Discussion:

- Options for updating the land use/cover data include: 1) only updating areas of change, 2) remapping watershed counties for 2018-2019 using NAIP and DSM, and retroactively updating the 2013 dataset based on change analysis, and 3) remapping watershed counties for 2019 using specially acquired imagery and DSM, and retroactively updating the 2013 dataset based on change analysis.
- Jennifer Miller Herzog: Do we need to replicate these costs every 4 years, or whenever we do the full check-in into the future? Should we think about the cost of replicating many times?
 - Peter Claggett: It doesn't lock us in to anything. Technology changes so rapidly that the options may be completely different in a few years.
- Karl Berger: In my mind, I would advocate for a very high-quality dataset if this is the last go-around before 2025.
- Matt Keefer: Do any of these options provide more benefit for BMP verification? That's something to consider. And the mapping of streams and flow-paths is something we're particularly interested in. So how does this fit in with generating the best possible streams flow-path?
 - Peter Claggett: I've been talking to the modeling team here, and we're discussing how to be more precise and accurate in our estimate of loads. Gary Shenk told me that characterizing stream channels and corridors is more important from a watershed-modeling perspective than being more temporally precise with land use/cover. So updating the LiDAR should be a priority, but it's outside the scope

of this discussion. For verification, being precise on characterizing 2018-2019 land use conditions would be useful for visual BMPs.

- Dave Montali: What's the ballpark cost of option 2?
 - Peter Claggett: Probably in the realm of \$2 million.
 - Dave Montali: So that would use existing imagery, but it might be temporally inconsistent for jurisdictions?
 - Peter Claggett: Right – NAIP is a year off for some jurisdictions. 2019 for VA and WV, and 2018 for all other states. It also includes a digital surface model, so we wouldn't have to use LiDAR. This option would help us most in NY and PA.
- Lee Epstein: I would ask what you have in the pot currently in terms of budget? What could you afford to do now?
 - Peter Claggett: Ultimately, even if we are flat-funded as a Program, it's still a Partnership decision of our funding priorities. Even if we suffer minor cuts, if the Partnership thinks this is important, Rich Batiuk thinks it's feasible.
- Norm Goulet: I think we should be looking toward the LUWG for a technical recommendation, where the recommendation can then move up the chain for managers to make a recommendation.
 - Peter Claggett: Right, and we have other outcomes in the Bay Agreement that includes monitoring land conversion. If we're going to satisfy that outcome, and help verify the conservation and planning BMPs, then what approach should we take? I'm personally preferable to option #2.
- Peter Claggett: If we could get a recommendation by May, that would be ideal. I'd like to know what the workgroup needs from myself and others to help formulate this decision.
 - Karl Berger requested a fuller, technical description of the 3 options.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide an expanded description of the different options for updating the phase 6 land use database.

Agenda Topics for April Meeting

- Results from 2025 scenarios in CAST
- Expanded discussion of options for updating Phase 6 land use
- Karl Berger: It would be helpful for CBP staff to develop preliminary recommendations on the BMP verification framework, and to put that in front of the workgroup as a straw-man proposal. This could be done in the next few months, I imagine.
 - Jurisdictions agreed that this would be useful.
 - Norm Goulet: We could develop a technical framework, and states could adopt and adjust it as needed.
 - Peter Claggett: There's the technical side of this which is looking at practices with imagery. Partners wouldn't have to do this – the Partnership could manage this. But the lingering question is what the protocol is if there's change where change wasn't expected.

ACTION: Over the next few months, the Land Use Workgroup will work to develop a technical framework for guidance to the Partners as they develop their BMP verification procedures as it relates to conservation and land planning.

Next meeting:

Wednesday, April 4, 2017 Face-to-Face Meeting 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Jonathan Champion	DC DOEE
Lori Brown	DE DNREC
Ken Choi	MDP
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County MD
Krystal Reifer	Montgomery County MD
Paul Patnode	Prince Georges County MD
Rick Fisher	Anne Arundel County MD
Travis Stoe	PA DEP
Matt Keefer	PA DEP
Cassandra Davis	NYSDEC
Lee Epstein	CBF
Jennifer Miller Herzog	Land Trust Alliance
KC Filippino	HRPDC
John Griffin	Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Renee Thompson	USGS
Fred Irani	USGS
Jeff Sweeney	EPA