

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary
May 3, 2017
10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24793/>

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: Peter Claggett and his team will work to make available land use forecasting data for preliminary review by LUWG members and interested parties. The data will be available on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer website (<https://chesapeake.usgs.gov/phase6/map/>). Notice will be distributed via email when the data is available.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will raise the idea of convening a team to develop evaluation metrics, including nutrient/sediment loading coefficients to the WQGIT during their conference call on May 8th.

ACTION: LUWG members should review the list of key participants for the joint LGAC forum, and provide feedback to Mary Gattis.

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

- Minutes from the April 5th face-to-face were approved.

2025 Land Use Growth Projections – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett presented [results](#) for the “Historical Trends” land use growth scenario, and the workgroup will be asked to provide feedback.

Discussion:

- Question about where the density data is sourced – whether it is actualized or based on zoning information.
 - Peter Claggett replied that his team looked at census blocks and developed land within each census block, combined that information with a set of decision rules, and derived development densities from that information.
- Karl Berger: When you ask the LUWG to provide feedback, would that include the historical trends as well as the other forecast scenarios that we develop?
 - Peter Claggett: Potentially – when we implement these tweaks, we’re adding flexibility into the model.
 - Karl Berger: So what is the best way of getting you feedback on these model runs?

- George Onyullo: I think it will be difficult to identify mechanisms when the model is in flux.
- Peter Claggett: The model framework and structure is established, but other aspects are flexible.
- Karl Berger asked how interested the group would be in assessing the fine details of these analyses.
- Sebastian Donner: I don't know how much time I could commit, but would be happy to provide feedback when I can.
- George Onyullo: I would be willing to do the same. But it's Peter and his team that understand the inner workings of the model, so I think it's better if they narrow the model aspects which really require our review.
- Peter Claggett: I feel like this group's input would be very useful in assessing the patterns of development that we've projected. So it would be good to know whether our projections look plausible and realistic for these different areas.
- Darold Burdick: I think the viewer approach is a good idea, potentially with a slider that goes through each year.
- Mary Gattis: Would you take the feedback that you get from folks in one county and adapt your model based on feedback in one location? Or would individual counties be adjusted?
- Peter Claggett: We would be making adjustments by state, so if issues are discovered in one area, then we will look to see if it's pervasive across all states. Once adjustments are made, we can send out notice updating the reviewers. We can also maintain versions of the land use on the viewer.
- Mary Gattis: I wonder if through the contacts you've made from developing the land use data, if we could recruit people to be the reviewers of this.
- Peter Claggett noted that the forecasts should be assessed for plausibility at a coarser spatial scale.
- Sebastian Donner asked if it would be possible to make comments instantaneously on the website, and suggested that comments only be accepted on the latest version of the forecasts. He also supported aggregating the data.
- Lee Epstein asked about visualizing the data, noting that the maps may not be useful to review at small scales.
 - Peter Claggett replied that he could post an example to see whether it would be useful for reviewers, and noted that NHD catchment-scale might be most effective. The data that will be posted for review will constitute median values of change across 101 simulations.

ACTION: Peter Claggett and his team will work to make available land use forecasting data for preliminary review by LUWG members and interested parties. The data will be available on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer website (<https://chesapeake.usgs.gov/phase6/map/>). Notice will be distributed via email when the data is available.

- Karl Berger: I don't think people need to see every year of the forecasts... perhaps every 5 years? Or some larger time interval. But in terms of the review, it would be great to get people to volunteer -- I see this as more of a state obligation.

- Mary Gattis: My concern is that we're not going to get local government input from the approach you've laid out. I wonder if we could do an email to the people who you already have contact with at the local level through the data collection process? Then you could ask for volunteers to sign up and do this. I think it's important that we be deliberate on who we ask to help review this. We also need clear guidance on what they'll be asked to do.
 - Peter Claggett suggested that his team collect LUWG feedback on how best to communicate to local governments on reviewing this type of information. Essentially, the LUWG will be a trail case of soliciting feedback.
 - Karl Berger asked when the review process would have to start. Peter replied that ideally it would start in the next 2 weeks. There is going to be an extended review throughout the summer, with the other scenarios that have yet to be reviewed. Peter suggested waiting to engage the local government contacts until after the June 7th forum, and over the next month nailing down how feedback will be collected, how the data will be displayed, and the types of feedback that would be useful. During the June 7th workshop, the LUWG will propose a plan of gathering feedback.
- Peter Claggett elaborated on what evaluation metrics are: variables that would help to evaluate the efficacy of the forecasts. Karl Berger that the proposed team to develop these metrics should include representatives from various workgroups.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will raise the idea of convening a team to develop evaluation metrics, including nutrient/sediment loading coefficients to the WQGIT during their conference call on May 8th.

- Discussion on coordinating the local zoning data collection effort.
 - West Virginia expressed support.
 - Virginia and Pennsylvania were not present on the LUWG conference call, but Karl noted they will need more significant coordination with their localities.
 - Karl Berger suggested sending out the email announcement to the distribution list of local contacts.
 - George Onyullo suggested including that the expectation of coordinating the data collection was on the shoulders of the state representatives.
- Mary Gattis asked what comp plan data included. Peter replied that he needed polygons of where growth is likely to occur in the future. Mary offered to review the email before it is sent out to the distribution list.

Model Review Tools– O. Devereux, Devereux Consulting, and J. Wolf, USGS

Olivia Devereux and John Wolf reviewed the data and tools available online to facilitate review of the draft Phase 6 Model inputs and outputs.

-Transition to Phase 6 Website: <https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6FAQ.html>

-Phase 6 Draft Final Input Data: <https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6DataVisualization.html>

-Using CAST-2017 for nutrient and sediment reduction planning: <http://cast-beta.chesapeakebay.net/>

Discussion:

- Mary Gattis asked if Olivia would be doing trainings on using the visualizations and using CAST.

June 7 Joint LGAC Forum Planning/Review of action and decision items – All, L. Gordon, CRC The workgroup chair and coordinator, and Mary Gattis (LGAC), briefed the workgroup on the upcoming June 7th joint LGAC [forum](#) focusing on the 2025 land use forecasts.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger cautioned against producing too many alternative scenarios, considering time and labor constraints.
- The forum will be held at the Crowne Plaza Hotel. Maximum headcount will be roughly 40-60 people. Peter asked if there will be any facilitators for the meeting; Mary replied that she had served as facilitator in the past and has money to hire an external facilitator.
- ACTION: LUWG members should review the list of key participants for the joint LGAC forum, and provide feedback to Mary Gattis.
- Lee Epstein suggested asking the WQGIT, AgWG, and FWG for suggestions for participants from the agriculture and forestry sectors.

Next meeting: Wednesday, June 7th - Joint LGAC Forum 10:00 – 3:00 PM; Crowne Plaza Hotel in Annapolis MD

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Lori Brown	DNREC
Clint Gill	DDA
George Onyullo	DC DOEE
Diane Davis	DC DOEE
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Stephanie Martins	MDP
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Chad Thompson	WV DEP
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Darold Burdick	Fairfax County VA
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County MD
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Jon Wolf	USGS
Renee Thompson	USGS
Quentin Stubbs	USGS
Fred Irani	USGS

Labeeb Ahmed	CBPO
Mary Gattis	LGAC
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Lee Epstein	CBF
Norm Goulet	NVRC