CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
LAND USE WORKGROUP MEETING

Conference Call Minutes
November 19, 2013
1:00-2:30PM

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   - Jenny Tribo (Co-chair): Welcomed everyone to the call and confirmed meeting participants.

2. **Emma Giese, Land Use Workgroup Staffer, presented the current local data inventory and gaps, and the current and proposed land use classification schemes.**
   - Peter Claggett (Coordinator): Clarified that the proposed classification scheme for Phase 6.0 is the same as what was put together by the workgroup last year.
   - With the local data being so scarce, how is it possible to get data this detailed?
     - o Claggett: The gaps will have to be filled in with overlays (connected vs. disconnected etc.).
   - PA noted a concern with using expert panels to collect local data.
     - o Claggett: There have been many requests for LUWG to make these land use classification distinctions. Third party datasets may be available in some cases.
     - o Karl Berger (Co-chair): Clarified that the expert panels will be used to determine if there are differential loading rates to land use classes (not to actually collect the data).
   - PA: What does the land use class 'farmstead' include?
     - o Claggett: Farms and outbuildings.
     - o PA: Will farmsteads replace CAFO/AFO?
     - o Claggett: CAFO will probably still be included because it is a regulatory class.
   - Is there a way to show forest acres that are a part of farms?
     - o Claggett: Likely not. It would require county land use data to include farms, then overlay with land cover to determine forests within farms. It could, however, be something that happens as a compliment to the model. This workgroup is focusing on the suite of land uses that have a unique loading situation.
   - Why is MD's land use data not included?
     - o Claggett: This graphic is highlighting what was received from individual counties. MD does have general statewide land use data; however the county level data is more detailed.

- Note that some counties not shown here do have data, but may not have responded to the request.
    - PA counties may have not been able to fulfill the full request because it was very detailed.
    - As we approach how to fill the gaps, may have to try a more targeted and specific approach. Asking for too much data may have deterred participation.

3. **Discussion and ideas of an approach to fill data gaps**
    - One option is to request tax parcel boundaries from certain counties. The tax parcel boundaries could be overlaid on national landcover to separate agriculture from developed land uses.
    - Recommend individual calls with jurisdictions to answer their questions and concerns.
    - Recommend talking to a key informant group, to determine their reaction and shape approach of any future requests.
    - Recommend clearly articulating the benefits, i.e. why it benefits local jurisdictions to have better data in the model.
    - LGAC coordinator: Important to explain why data is needed, particularly explaining how it will address things local governments are concerned with. Biggest local government concern is that someone else will try to regulate their land use. Local Government Advisory Committee may have useful advice. Carin Bisland is invited to give an update to LGAC at every meeting, next meeting is December 6th.
        - PA noted that LGAC's Pennsylvania members would not be individuals who have access to the land use data.
        - LGAC can at least help strategize about how to get a better response.
    - Claggett: Recommend a triage approach, targeting the I-95 corridor counties, which likely have the most urbanized areas. For the rural counties, target tax parcel information or other data they may be more likely to have.
        - Baltimore County: Note that tax parcel county data often held and managed by the IT people (GIS).
        - PA lacks staff support to reach out to localities.
    - Fairfax County: What is a reasonable amount of data to expect? Are the primarily agricultural counties' data needed?
        - Claggett: The suburban, exurban, rural residential land use is what is most needed, because it is difficult to get those just from landcover data. The Cropland Data Layer and Census of Agriculture contribute most of

the agricultural data needed; therefore agriculture was not targeted in the original data request.

4. **Discussion of data comparisons/analyses needed for review in December**
    - The Phase 6.0 proposed land use classification list was based on the workgroups' wish lists for land use classes.
    - Claggett: Request to have some counties volunteer to condense their land use data to correspond with the classes proposed for Phase 6.0.
        - The next step would be to discuss what information is being lost when condensing classes.
    - Baltimore County: Important to understand if there is a differential loading rate in determining the number of land use classes. Have not found much difference between commercial, industrial, residential, except for the difference in perviousness. Recommend adding a riparian corridor land use.
    - Is there scientific data to back up differential land use loading rates?
        - Claggett: The loading rates will likely be defined before everything is mapped.

5. **Solicitation of presenters for December meeting**
    - Baltimore County will present their land use classification and potential ways to collapse it in December.
    - Peter Claggett will ask Glenn Mohler or Steve in Lancaster, PA.
    - Fairfax County has done watershed management for local watersheds. Ran into this issue of collecting data and needing to distill down the various land use types to about 10 types. Darold Burdick can present this process.
    - DE: May be preoccupied with progress run submissions. (Bryan Bloch may be able to present.)
    - PA: Please clarify the specific request of the counties.
        - Claggett: How would you recommend breaking down your own land use classifications into these proposed Phase 6.0 classifications? No one has all the data on this list, but going through this process can help the workgroup figure out an approach to classification.
    - Claggett: Also worth discussing what datasets are on the list that localities don't have, or isn't worth pursuing.
    - The goal will be to come out of the December meeting with a refined list of land uses classes.
    - Should the December meeting focus on urban land use classes only?
        - Claggett: Agriculture land use data is needed in order to determine

residential. Recommend that the counties look at agriculture in their presentations too.

- Request that Urban Stormwater Workgroup members be invited to call in or attend the December meeting.

6. **Announcements**
   - STAC Workshop on Pervious Surfaces will be held in February 2014, to define, measure and model nutrient characteristics of pervious lands.
   - Tetra Tech is completing a literature review on urban loading rates.
   - Land Use Outcome to be included in new Bay Agreement
     - Land Use Methods and Metrics Development Outcome: By 2015, develop a Chesapeake Bay watershed-wide methodology and metrics for measuring the rate of land conversions of agricultural and forest lands, and for measuring the extent and rate of change in impervious surface coverage.
     - LUWG will be providing technical support for that outcome.
   - Milestones Workgroup will be involved in the review of short-term forecasts and septic issues.

Adjourned

Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 10th 10:00AM-3:00PM
Maryland, Delaware and D.C. Water Science Center Office in Catonsville, MD

Participants
Karl Berger (Co-chair), MWCOG
Jenny Tribo (Co-chair), HRPDC
Peter Clagget (Coordinator), USGS/CBPO
Megan Grose, WV DEP
Emma Giese, CRC
Pat Buckley, PA DEP
Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Jeff White, MDE
Brian Bloch, DE
Steve Stewart, Baltimore County
Lee Epstein, CBF
Darold Burdick, Fairfax County
Mary Gattis, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
Taura Huxley, DoD
Dana York, Green Earth Connection
Robert Hirsch, Baltimore County
Andrew Brennan, Photo Science