

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Minutes

November 7, 2018

10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions and Decisions:

- **DECISION:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the September conference call.
- **DECISION:** Based on input from last meeting, the LUWG will stay housed under the WQGIT with stronger coordination with relevant GITs.
- **ACTION:** Check in with Peter regarding data updates outlined above and report back to the LUWG.
- **ACTION:** Provide an updated LiDAR status map via email to the LUWG and update map in the Management Board presentation.
- **ACTION:** Reach out to the Chesapeake Conservancy for a presentation to the LUWG regarding hot spot analysis and invite them to become more involved on the LUWG conference calls.
- **ACTION:** The group would like information regarding what factors comprise the different quality levels of LiDAR data (as noted in the status map noted under the second action item). If the Bay Program has a standard or recommendation for the LiDAR specifications most useful to the Bay Program's land use work, that should be made clear to counties acquiring data.
- **ACTION:** Check on status of Phase 6 land use model change documentation and circulate existing FAQ document to help the workgroup and send information to LUWG.
- **ACTION:** Create a reference document summarizing PSC, EPA, and WQGIT decisions specifically related to conservation plus and state custom scenarios, how these scenarios can be used in the Phase III WIP process, and EPA expectations for tracking over time.
- **ACTION:** The 2019 quarterly meeting schedule will be sent out to the LUWG in the next couple weeks.
- **ACTION:** Comments or suggestions on whether the Partners' current LUWG membership is working, or if there are others better suited to be on the workgroup as its work focus shifts to more work on the land use metrics will be solicited via email.

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

- **DECISION:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the September conference call.
- **DECISION:** Based on input from last meeting, the LUWG will stay housed under the WQGIT.

Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome – A. Wagner, CRC

Update on land use methods and metrics outcome including SRS materials and quarterly progress presentation prior to Management Board presentation on November 15th.

Discussion:

- Berger: This presentation highlights the workgroup's pivot to become more Land Use Metric Outcome-focused moving forward. We are looking for feedback on the specific Management Board asks in the presentation.
- Epstein: Given full funding, we can expect updated land cover data every 4-5 years in the watershed?

- Berger noted that the Chesapeake Conservancy has been awarded the RFP to complete that work.
- Epstein: We have a baseline 2013 dataset, when will the next data update be and how long will that take?
 - Thompson: We currently have 2013, and the next baseline will be 2017-2018 data. I believe Peter included the 2021 deadline, in order to leave adequate time to develop all methods and metrics and analyze change.
- **ACTION:** Check in with Peter regarding data updates outlined above and report back to the LUWG.
- Epstein: For the hot spot analysis, will that be every 4-5 years as well?
 - Ahmed: We met with The Chesapeake Conservancy this week, and they are currently developing the methodology for hotspot analysis, hopefully by early 2019. Yes, hotspots will be updated as we move forward year after year.
 - Epstein noted that the best method for hot spot analysis may be to focus on several counties, chosen on the edge of growth for example, and revisit those same counties for a number of years.
- **ACTION:** Provide an updated LiDAR status map via email to the LUWG and update map in the Management Board presentation.
- Berger noted that due to interest on the LUWG, presenting in depth plans for hot spot analysis and getting feedback from the group may be a topic for next meeting.
- **ACTION:** Reach out to the Chesapeake Conservancy for a presentation to the LUWG regarding hot spot analysis and invite them to become more involved on the LUWG conference calls.
- Berger asked for thoughts on moving forward with Management Board Asks presented.
 - Donner: For WV, it's a potential concern because county data in GIS format does not really exist. This ask seems unreasonable in WV, I'd like to review and give comments on Monday.
 - Griffin: These asks are reasonable to me.
 - Berger noted that the LUWG did not completely endorse, but not many comments were raised on the call.
- Symbolski: The slide that shows the map with lidar data status by county, what makes MD a yellow county classified as low quality?
 - Ahmed: If you can send a point of contact for your county to Peter Claggett or myself, we can reach out and be sure the Bay Program has access to your data and update that.
- **ACTION:** The group would like information regarding what factors comprise the different quality levels of LiDAR data (as noted in the status map noted under the second action item). If the Bay Program has a standard or recommendation for the LIDAR specifications most useful to the Bay Program's land use work, that should be made clear to counties acquiring data.

Results of Custom State Land Use Scenarios – L. Ahmed, Attain

Update and results on development of jurisdiction-specific 2025 future land-use scenarios.

Discussion:

- Dubow: Do you have tables showing the baseline vs. custom scenario and differences in loads?
 - Ahmed: We had to take those out of this presentation because MD's data has not yet gone through CAST.

- Berger: To outline the statuses, VA, DE, PA, and DC are all finished. The first MD scenario is finished, and the two others are in progress. You're close to completing all custom scenarios states have requested?
 - Ahmed: Yes, WV and NY don't have custom scenarios and I believe all states are already in CAST, except MD which will be in CAST shortly.
- Epstein: Will there be a good explanation of how these 2025 scenarios are used in WIP III and how states are credited or perhaps later on discredited?
 - Berger: This is a question for Peter. Is there a write up in Phase 6 model of how states would use these for WIP III, an explanation of calculations, and tracking over time?
- **ACTION:** Check on status of Phase 6 land use model change documentation and circulate existing FAQ document to help the workgroup and send information to LUWG.
- Dubow: The states would love to have a document referring to PSC and EPA decisions on how states can get credit through conservation plus scenarios. The states would like documentation and security that states will get credit toward this.
- **ACTION:** Create a reference document summarizing PSC, EPA, and WQGIT decisions specifically related to conservation plus and state custom scenarios, how these scenarios can be used in the Phase III WIP process, and EPA expectations for tracking over time.
- Berger: The Conservancy is doing outreach to states on the technical side specifically. Norm Goulet has raised the idea of a "lessons learned" presentation from the first go around. Is there interest in having a future discussion on reviewing methods, contributing suggestions on new approaches?
 - LUWG agreed that would be useful.

Planning Next Meeting, News, Updates – K. Berger, MWCOG
2019 meeting schedule, and meeting wrap up.

- Moving forward we will have mostly calls with occasional face-to-face meetings on a quarterly schedule in 2019 with the option of additional calls in between. We can figure out the specific months for quarterly meetings in the next few weeks.
- **ACTION:** The 2019 quarterly meeting schedule will be sent out to the LUWG in the next couple weeks.
- Berger noted that membership on this workgroup should be reevaluated based on the LUWG pivoting to a focus more on our Land Use Metrics Outcome than WIPs.
- **ACTION:** Comments or suggestions on whether current LUWG membership is working, or if there are others better suited to be on the workgroup will be solicited via email.

Next meeting: **December 5th conference call at 10:00 AM**

Meeting Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Allie Wagner	CRC
Labeeb Ahmed	Attain
Renee Thompson	USGS
Erik Fisher	CBF
Jessica Trimble	PA DCED
Clare Sevcik for Lori Brown	DNREC

Deb Sward	MDP
Jason Dubow	MDP
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Pat Gleason	EPA
Lee Epstein	CBF
John Griffin	Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County
Fred Irani	USGS
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County Planning
Krystal Reifer	Montgomery County
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Matt Keefer	PA DCNR
Ken Choi	MDP