

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary

January 3, 2018

10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: The Land Data Team will make available data and supporting information for the final version of the Current Zoning Land Use Scenario.

ACTION: Land Use Workgroup leadership and interested members will work within the CBP structure to address the issue of verification in relation to the potential use of land conservation practices in WIPS.

ACTION: The Bay Program staff will be available for consultation with state officials to review changing conditions on the landscape in preparation for Phase III WIP development.

ACTION: The LUWG agreed to proceed with developing the forest conservation scenario as presented, 1-2 additional overall future conservation plus land use scenarios, as well as jurisdiction-specific combination scenarios by March 31.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will develop a summary document outlining the future issues relating to land use and conservation, and will follow-through on options for addressing them in coordination with stakeholders currently serving on the LUWG.

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

Minutes from the December and November meetings were approved.

Outcomes from the December 19-20 PSC Meeting – K. Berger, MWCOG, & P. Claggett, USGS

Workgroup leadership reviewed the outcomes from the December 2017 PSC meeting, in regards to accounting for growth. A full list of actions and decisions from the meeting are available [here](#).

Discussion:

- Peter Claggett informed the workgroup that the PSC agreed to all requested decisions put forward regarding future land use, and that updates to the Current Zoning Scenario will be next be made during the 2019 milestone period.

Progress made on the Current Zoning and the Conservation Plus suite of scenarios –P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett reviewed and updated the workgroup on the progress made in developing both the Current Zoning Scenario, and the suite of Conservation Plus scenarios. Members were be asked to prioritize the proposed Conservation Plus scenarios for development by the Land Use Data Team.

Discussion:

- Peter Claggett summarized changes that were made to the Current Zoning Scenario based on feedback received during the review period. Floodways have been excluded for the entire Mid-Atlantic region. Septics were also modified in West Virginia and Maryland. Maryland's priority funding areas were also included in the suitability surface.
- Changes were also made in the regression models, and vacancy and household size rates were fixed at 2013 rates.
- Karl Berger: For the Current Zoning forecast, you're done making changes from this point on? The version that will be released on January 15 will be locked down until 2019.
 - Peter Claggett: Correct. With version controls, we will continually update our model through time. But the Current Zoning scenario used for WIPs won't be changed until 2019.
 - Karl Berger: You'd previously distributed data and supporting documentation for earlier versions of Current Zoning. I assume all of those will be re-run and made available?
 - Peter Claggett: We will have the data available on January 15, and will send that out to the workgroup. With the release of the final Current Zoning Scenario, we'll replace the one iteration on the Land Use Viewer, and ensure all the data that's out there is representative of the final version of the scenario. Regarding version documentation - we're working on this.
- ACTION: The Land Data Team will make available data and supporting information for the final version of the Current Zoning Land Use Scenario.
- Lee Epstein: How will decision-making proceed on the use of land conservation as a BMP? What are the next steps for that?
 - Peter Claggett: These scenarios will be incorporated into CAST, and can be used by jurisdictions to build their WIPs - looking at effects on loads due to programmatic and policy changes in development.
- Greg Evans: I've had questions asking why we've chosen 250 acres for the Forest Conservation scenario - where did that number come from, and is there an opportunity to use other numbers?
 - Peter Claggett: That came from MD's green print program, and forest-dwelling birds, and other conditions. All of these thresholds can change, and I imagine that individual jurisdictions can modify these 3 scenario to suit their individual needs.
- Matt Keefer: It sounds like you're going to need spatially explicit information to run these scenarios, so what scale would this be at?
 - Peter Claggett: We have a lot of flexibility to do it different ways. We've envisioned doing it uniformly across the state, but because it's spatial information, it could be at a finer spatial scale. But we would have to know what the users would like to see.
- Peter Claggett: There's also the possibility to simulate conservation as a land use.
- Lee Epstein: How does this process assure the implementation of those conservation practices? What guarantees are there that a policy will actually be implemented?
 - Peter Claggett: That's a great question, and unfortunately it's more in line with the Verification workgroup. From my perspective, we do plan to have a repeat of the high resolution data - so at that point, we could see what the on-the-ground conditions are.

- ACTION: Land Use Workgroup leadership and interested members will work within the CBP structure to address the issue of verification in relation to the potential use of land conservation practices in WIPS.
- Karl Berger: Can you give me a sense of timeline for completing these scenarios?
- Peter Claggett: We're definitely going to complete the Forest Conservation scenarios, but we need to consider whether to scrap the second two scenarios and instead focus on jurisdiction-specific scenarios.
- ACTION: The Bay Program staff will be available for consultation with state officials to review changing conditions on the landscape in preparation for Phase III WIP development.
- Peter Claggett noted that his team could reasonable be expected to produce jurisdiction-specific scenarios, with a couple of overall scenarios by March 31st.
- ACTION: The LUWG agreed to proceed with developing the forest conservation scenario as presented, 1-2 additional overall future conservation plus land use scenarios, as well as jurisdiction-specific combination scenarios by March 31.

2018 Meeting Dates and Future Agenda Topics – K. Berger, MWCOG, & P. Claggett, USGS Workgroup leadership discussed the proposed meeting dates and topics for workgroup meetings in 2018, and will solicit feedback from the workgroup on how frequently to meet and the long-term status of the workgroup.

Discussion:

- Future issues for the workgroup to discuss include the process for updating the high-res land use, the Bay Agreement outcome for land use metrics and methods, the future of the workgroup post-summer 2018.
- Lee Epstein asked how certain issues such as verification of land use conservation will be handled in the absence of a formal workgroup.
- ACTION: Peter Claggett will develop a summary document outlining the future issues relating to land use and conservation, and will follow-through on options for addressing them in coordination with stakeholders currently serving on the LUWG.

Next meeting:

Wednesday, February 7, 2017 Conference Call 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Participants:

Karl Berger, MWCOG
 Peter Claggett, USGS
 Lindsey Gordon, CRC
 Labeeb Ahmed, USGS
 Rick Fisher
 Shannon McKenrick, MDE
 Steve Stewart, Baltimore County MD
 Travis Stoe, PA DEP
 Norm Goulet, NVRC

Greg Evans, VA Dept. of Forestry
Matt Keefer, PA DCNR
Renee Thompson, USGS
Lee Epstein, CBF
Ken Choi, MDP
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Jennifer Herzog, Land Trust Alliance
Jeff White, MDE
Lori Brown, DE DNREC
Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
Jonathan Champion, DC DOEE
Sebastian Donner, WV DEP
Chad Thompson, WV DEP
Jonathan Doherty, NPS
KC Filipino, HRPDC