

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Minutes
April 4, 2018
10:00AM-12:00PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: Peter Claggett will distribute the summarized results of the 8 thematic future land use scenarios to the WQGIT source-sector workgroups.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will make available a summary of the types of lands ineligible for development in the probability surface across all scenarios.

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

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

- Karl Berger and Peter Claggett reviewed the status of action items from the previous meeting. Peter noted that his team has been busy producing the forecasted land use scenarios, but will work on outstanding items during the spring and summer.

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 results from the 8 preliminary thematic scenarios.

Discussion:

- Jason Dubow: For all scenarios, it looks like septic systems are increasing by what seems like a lot.
 - Peter Claggett: Yes, it does – you're right, and I will double check those numbers.
- Karl Berger: How do you determine whether new growth goes into septic versus wastewater?
 - Peter Claggett: When we're simulating growth, we have the sewer service areas mapped. To the extent that there's undevelopable, but suitable land within the sewer service area for growth, then if we simulate growth there it's applied to sewer. If development falls outside of that mapped sewer service area, then it's growth on septic.
 - Karl Berger: And sewer service areas don't really change between now and 2025.
 - Peter Claggett: Correct, but the growth management scenario adds new sewer service areas.

- Karl Berger: This would also be influenced by the amount of infill/redevelopment?
 - Peter Claggett: Right – by definition, they go onto sewer.
 - Erik Fisher: When you talk about zoning ‘failing’, would a failure be an area being zoned for resource conservation that’s rezoned more akin to a development area?
 - Peter Claggett: That would be a failure in zoning controlling growth as zoning exists today. Whether or not any of these ‘fail’ depends on the trajectory of land use change varying significantly than what we’re forecasting. If an area is zoned for development and that development doesn’t happen, then that’s all we care about.
 - Karl Berger: Someone should document how this methodology is working, specifically in regards to assumptions that were made. And for impervious, are we baking in BMP implementation to urban development? You could be reducing loads in developed area because requirements have a baseline for what that development can look like.
 - Peter Claggett: New stormwater BMPs can be accounted for in the Phase III WIPs using the BMPs. But the main takeaways are that the septic numbers would give you the highest increase numbers; that’s countered by the decrease in agriculture. So that’s where the attention should be, because if agriculture doesn’t decrease then total loads will go up.
 - John Griffin: I think we could all use some time to digest what’s been provided before giving feedback on data needs.
 - Karl Berger: Do we want to present this information to other groups and ask them the same questions? IE - would it be valuable for them if the CBP developed CAST load numbers for these scenario results on a state-wide basis.
 - Dave Montali: I think there will be value in the No Action assessments.
- ACTION: Peter Claggett will distribute the summarized results of the 8 thematic future land use scenarios to the WQGIT source-sector workgroups.

Updates on Jurisdiction-Specific Future Scenarios – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett updated the workgroup on development of jurisdiction-specific 2025 future land use scenarios.

Discussion:

- Jason Dubow: Wouldn’t DE removing development from wetlands already be captured in the Current Zoning scenario, since it’s part of their regulation?
 - Peter Claggett: Only indirectly – if there hasn’t been any development on wetlands in the past, it’s unlikely we will simulate development on it in the future. This is more concrete.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will make available a summary of the types of lands ineligible for development in the probability surface across all scenarios.

- Peter Claggett: Stochastically simulating rates of conversion will be really powerful moving forward, because you can eventually vary the rate of conservation and see what

effect that has over a time period. Then you can assess whether you need to increase the rate of conservation in certain places.

- Jim Baird: And it might even bring into play policy issues surrounding funding.
- Karl Berger: In all these scenarios, you can run the same kind of loading data, but you can't do it incrementally? IE what's the loading of elements A and B of the growth management scenario, and then add element C? You can't isolate individual aspects?
 - Peter Claggett: That's correct, unless we have individual aspects as separate scenarios. States can provide us with more than one scenario, but we're going to work on their first scenario first.
- Karl Berger: I think that in a future meeting, it would be useful for states to share their results from the state-specific scenarios.
- Jason Dubow: One thing MD is hoping to do is to include rates of development within growth areas. If we provide you with historic rates of growth in sewered areas, could you stochastically simulate that into the future?
- Dave Montali: So is PA going to provide county-specific conserved acres per year?
 - Peter Claggett: Right – and that will essentially be a demand for land. We're working on that currently, but an option is to use the Chesapeake Conservation Partnership's priority maps or to weight conservation so that it occurs closer to previously conserved land.
- Erik Fisher: What is the schedule for getting these projections out?
 - Peter Claggett: The 8 scenarios we've done so far are final and in CAST. They can be used as-is. The state scenarios will be produced over the next couple of months, and before they go into CAST we will share with the state that developed them. So it'll be an iterative process.

Next meeting:

Wednesday, May 2, 2018 10:00 – 12:00 PM Conference call

Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Lori Brown	DE DNREC
Clint Gill	DDA
Alex Reed	Washington County MD
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County MD
Robert Hirsch	Baltimore County MD
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Shannon McKenrick	MDE
Jason Dubow	MDP
Ken Choi	MDP

Jonathan Champion	DC DOEE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Chad Thompson	WV DEP
Gopal Bhatt	Penn State
Jennifer Herzog	Land Trust Alliance
Lee Epstein	CBF
Erik Fisher	CBF
John Griffin	Chesapeake Conservation Partnership
Jim Baird	American Farmland Trust
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Renee Thompson	USGS