

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

Conference Call Meeting Summary
December 13, 2017
1:00PM-3:00PM

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Actions & Decisions:

Decision: The LUWG recommended the use of the revised future land use true-up methodology.

Action: The LUWG will send an email to the USWG and AgWG outlining the decision to approve the new land use true-up methodology.

Decision: The LUWG agreed to move forward with developing a forest conservation scenario by January 15th, and developing growth management and agricultural conservation scenarios for implementation into CAST during the March-April 2018 timeframe.

Action: Workgroup leadership will send out a summary of the decisions and recommendations from this meeting to the LUWG, including an explanation of the next steps for developing the suite of alternative conservation scenarios.

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

New True-Up Methodology for Forecasting Period – P. Claggett, USGS

Peter Claggett presented the draft results from the 'Current Zoning' 2025 land use scenario. Land Use Workgroup members were asked to provide initial feedback on the tabular results that were distributed on September 25th.

****Members from the USWG and AgWG were invited to participate during this item***

Discussion:

- Karl Berger: I would assume that using your true up method would result in a smaller delta load than other options?
 - Peter Claggett: This change in true up says that any decline in ag land above and beyond what's associated with urbanization will be converted to open space. That's likely to have a bigger delta in load, than assuming that a lot of that extra land turned into turf grass.
- Matt Keefer: You might want to clarify what the conversion is to when you note land retirement.
 - Greg Evans supported this comment.
 - Peter Claggett agreed to separate out the maps depicting land retirement and conversion to development for agriculture.
- Renee Thompson suggested clarifying what specific land uses are captured in the term 'forest' when presented as a conversion.

- Peter Claggett noted that natural includes forest, upland, and floodplain wetlands.
- Norm Goulet: How did the new true up method results come out for Fairfax?
 - Karl Berger: I can't imagine this affecting their acres very much.
 - Peter Claggett: Another nice thing about this method is that we estimate sewer and septic using the same data to estimate urbanization; so everything is internally consistent.
- Peter Claggett noted that agricultural open space is being captured under the broad 'open space' category in the tables.
- Karl Berger asked the group if they agreed on recommending the revised land use true-up methodology.
- Peter Claggett added that there will be opportunities every 2 years to update this methodology and others – concurrent with the milestone updates.

Decision: The LUWG recommended the use of the revised future land use true-up methodology.

Action: The LUWG will send an email to the USWG and AgWG outlining the decision to approve the new land use true-up methodology.

Timeline for completion of Current Zoning and Conservation Plus scenarios – K. Berger, MWCOG & P. Claggett, USGS

Karl Berger, workgroup chair, and Peter Claggett, workgroup coordinator, discussed the timeline for finalization of the two future land use scenarios.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger: The 1/15/18 delivery of the Conservation Plus scenario doesn't allow us to individually evaluate the components – it's just a composite, right?
 - Claggett: Correct.
- Greg Evans: Forest land components are something we've been trying to make the case for, so I'd like to see it happen.
- Jacob Czawlytko summarized the comments and new data received during the Current Zoning review period.

"Conservation Plus" Scenario Survey Results & Implementation in CAST – P. Claggett, USGS & Renee Thompson, USGS

Peter Claggett and Renee Thompson presented the results of the Conservation Plus survey designed to solicit feedback on elements to be incorporated into the land use scenario. Included was a discussion of how to implement the scenario and its various components in CAST.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger: I would assume that this is a state/local choice as to which components they would want to include in their scenario? I worry that the composite idea may not

be necessary or realistic... I also have concerns on how many of these components we can work through.

- Peter Claggett: I would ask people if it would be valuable to have this scenario that's essentially a conservation E3 scenario? Or whether it would be more valuable to break this out into components, like a forest conservation 'package', for example.
- Norm Goulet: While I appreciate the 'kitchen sink' concept, I concur with Karl and would recommend breaking it out.
 - Greg Evans agreed.
- Peter Claggett suggested keeping the 'forest package' separate, and then having it combined with agricultural preservation as a separate package.
- Peter Claggett: One approach is to do everything in one scenario to serve as a benchmark. This would help us understand how everything behaves from sort of a 'severe' approach. What's been clarified is that if nothing we do is going to get into CAST until March, then this isn't about meeting the goal of picking a conservation scenario and starting her WIP planning in January on that. She's not going to be able to do that regardless of what we could do. We could produce a complete Conservation Plus scenario by January 15, and then include subset scenarios (components) later on, and they would be included essentially as BMPs in CAST. This would take a redesign of the interface, though, and thus could not be implemented as quickly as an initial scenario submitted by 1/15.
- Greg Evans: If we're looking at this scenario for WIPs, and want localities to figure out what they can do, then our list is going to get filtered down through levels of decision making. That said, I don't think we should throw the baby out with the bathwater. We're just trying to get people open to the concept to do some modeling runs.
- Matt Keefer: We want to maintain flexibility to implement a suite of components. So depending on how it's presented, it could be interpreted as regulation, and that will turn people off - that's an initial concern.
- Peter Claggett: I think I'm hearing everyone say that this list that's been presented could come across as regulatory. But if we presented this as a 'growth initiative', 'forest conservation initiative', etc., and acknowledge in the narrative that there are multiple ways of achieving this (leaving the details to the modelers), and building in as much flexibility as possible – does that sound more palatable?
 - Comments from the group that this would make more sense.
- Denny Puko noted that instead of recommendations, these are more options/what-if scenarios.
- Karl Berger asked what could or should be done by January 15.
- Peter Claggett proposed packaging the scenarios up into 3 groups: forest conservation, growth management, and agricultural conservation. He also proposed implementing a forest conservation package by January 15.
- John Griffin asked how states felt about timing of these scenarios to help inform WIP development.

- Matt Keefer noted that forest conservation was of particular interest, but added that the rolling out the scenarios in sequence wouldn't be too much of a problem.
- Peter Claggett proposed doing the scenarios in the following order: forest conservation (by mid-January), growth conservation, and agricultural conservation later.
 - John Griffin suggested doing growth management last because it was likely to be the most controversial. Peter noted that expanding the sewer area by 1 mile is something that many jurisdictions will want to see, and that it was the easiest scenario to do.
- Olivia Devereux noted that once the scenarios go into CAST, people will start developing scenarios with them, and that it may not be a good idea to add versioning.
- Karl Berger asked if the workgroup could have time to review the proposed groupings. Peter Claggett noted that the survey was intended to capture a pre-review, and that he can't implement two different versions of the same parameter (ie narrower versus wider riparian buffer).
- Matt Keefer recommended starting with these scenarios to begin development and discussions of the Phase III WIPs.
- Peter Claggett noted that the Current Zoning scenario was essentially locked down until the 2019 milestone period.

Decision: The LUWG agreed to move forward with developing a forest conservation scenario by January 15th, and developing growth management and agricultural conservation scenarios for implementation into CAST during the March-April timeframe.

Action: Workgroup leadership will send out a summary of the decisions and recommendations from this meeting to the LUWG, including an explanation of the next steps for developing the suite of alternative conservation scenarios.

Next meeting:

(Tentative) Wednesday, January 3, 2017 Conference Call 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Participants:

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Peter Claggett	USGS
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Jacob Czawlytko	USGS Contractor
Labeeb Ahmed	USGS Contractor
Renee Thompson	USGS
Denny Puko	PA DCED
Matt Keefer	PA DCNR
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Megan Grose	WV DEP
Chad Thompson	WV DEP
Shannon McKenrick	MDE

Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Lori Brown	DE DNREC
Jonathan Champion	DC DOEE
Greg Evans	VA Dept. of Forestry
Katherine Wares	CRC
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Bobby Grisso	VT
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Norm Goulet	NVRC
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Jennifer Herzog	Land Trust Alliance