

## CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM LAND USE WORKGROUP

### Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2019

10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

#### Summary of Actions and Decisions:

**Decision:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the March meeting.

**Action:** Update the MS4, sewer service, and protected lands data on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer.

**Action:** Send out county tabular land use and loading data to LUWG members that documents the deltas between the 2025 Current Zoning and the 2025 Land Policy BMP scenarios.

**Action:** Produce county maps with two examples each of the probability iterations for the 2025 Current Zoning baseline and the relevant Land Policy BMP 2025 forecasts and make these available on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer.

**Action:** Develop a more formal process for the way in which local land use data is collected and incorporated into future updates to Bay Program land use that can be adopted by the Water Quality GIT and Management Board.

**Action:** Reach out to the LGAC and Local Leadership Workgroup to continue dialogue on how to improve the collection of local land use data, which will continue throughout the course of the TMDL.

**Action:** At the next LUWG meeting, we will discuss the hot spot analysis data for land use change and revisit the item on the future of the land change model that was postponed from the June 5 meeting.

**Action:** Please send any feedback on the Land Use Options and Evaluation Workplan to Renee Thompson ([rthompso@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:rthompso@chesapeakebay.net)) in the next month.

**Action:** Please send any discussion topics for the next LUWG meeting to Karl Berger ([kberger@mwkog.org](mailto:kberger@mwkog.org)), Peter Claggett ([Pclaggett@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:Pclaggett@chesapeakebay.net)), and or Allie Wagner ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)).

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

**Decision:** The LUWG approved the meeting minutes from the March meeting.

#### Clarification of Accounting for Growth Expectations – P. Claggett, USGS

- Presentation of “Clarification of Accounting for Growth Expectations” to WQGIT at their June 10<sup>th</sup> conference call.
- The document going to the WQGIT has one small change from when it was sent out in April.
- **Action:** Update the MS4, sewer service, and protected lands data on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer.
- **Action:** Send out county tabular land use and loading data to LUWG members that documents the deltas between the 2025 Current Zoning and the 2025 Land Policy BMP scenarios.

- This document was created in response to questions/concerns regarding accounting for growth expressed by workgroup members. Members expressed that EPA's guidance was not adequate and clarification was needed.
- This document has been reviewed by all appropriate parties. If approved at the WQGIT, it will go to the Management Board for approval next.
- At the December 2017 PSC meeting, it was decided to use 2025 land use for Phase III WIPs and TMDL. It was implied that the reason is to quantify growth with land policy BMPs. It was not explicitly approved by the PSC that land policy BMPs would be credited to reduce nutrients. Everyone agrees that they should count, and we expect this to be approved.
- Berger noted that land policy BMPs are not required, they are voluntary. To meet planning targets for 2025, you could decide not to use land policy BMPs and increase other BMPs.
- Claggett noted that land policy BMPs and verification of them does not affect input deck for annual progress.
- Claggett noted that statistical extrapolation based on 2012 Ag Census data may change with new 2017 Ag Census data for milestones and 2019 progress as well as affect 2025 current zoning and land policy BMPs.
- Claggett noted that the TMDL focuses on state basin scale and there is no state requirement to do analysis at a smaller scale. If states want to do this, they can look at LRSEG or county level.

#### Status and Timetable for Refining Land Policy BMPs – P. Claggett, USGS

- Clarification of 2019 deadlines are in the document.
- The Chesapeake Conservancy has been collecting data directly from jurisdictions which will be passed on to us.
- Berger asked if local data collection must be collected from a state level contact or local government contact. That has been an issue in VA.
  - Goulet: I highly suggest a get together with state data managers. This data submission issue needs to be ironed out at the highest level so we can all be on the same page.
  - Claggett: Technically, all state data was due April 30, so the door is shut until 2021. The Conservancy has been collecting all this data over the past year and I plan to use all data they pass on to me.
  - Goulet: I have a problem with data that did not get in due to a problem with the CBP, EPA, and the states. We need a formal process.
- **Action:** Develop a more formal process for the way in which local land use data is collected and incorporated into future updates to Bay Program land use that can be adopted by the Water Quality GIT and Management Board.
- Miller-Herzog: We should touch base with LGAC on this issue. Are local jurisdictions aware of their ability to provide data through these means? I'm wondering if at some point the GIT or MB will take this issue seriously with local government reps to work out these issues.

- Thompson: There is an LGAC meeting tomorrow. We could send an email announcement that we are interested in getting feedback on local data collection and need to improve the process.
- **Action:** Reach out to the LGAC and Local Leadership Workgroup to continue dialogue on how to improve the collection of local land use data, which will continue throughout the course of the TMDL.
- Mark Symborski: Are jurisdictional land policy BMPs available?
  - Peter Claggett: They are available in CAST for all jurisdictions.
- **Action:** Produce county maps with two examples each of the probability iterations for the 2025 Current Zoning baseline and the relevant Land Policy BMP 2025 forecasts and make these available on the Phase 6 Land Use Viewer.

Update on Local Data Collection, High-res Land Use, and Stream Mapping – R. Soobitsky and D. Saavedra, The Chesapeake Conservancy

- Expected full wall-to-wall 2013 land cover with the hotspots and boundaries where the update is between June and August. We still do not have 2018 NAIP data that is causing a delay.
  - Berger: This is hotspots only?
  - Soobitsky: It will be all new land cover only in the hotspot boundary where the most change occurred.
  - Berger: If we will get 4-year interval high resolution land use, in the meantime for every 2 years, could we have a less accurate quick and dirty way to update land use?
  - Claggett: This workgroup will get to evaluate how much we care about small amounts of change and whether or not change in hotspots captures the majority.
- Symborski: Were these hotspots determined by actual land cover change?
  - Soobitsky: Yes, we used 30 m landsat imagery and identified where pixels changed dramatically from one year to the next. Filtering out noise, we pulled out these polygons.

Objective 2:

- Berger: Do you think by the deadline that you'll have updated DEM across the watershed? Or will there be gaps?
  - Saavedra: I think the majority of PA has new lidar collection underway and the remainder of VA. There may be gaps in southwestern VA and NY.
  - Berger: We should let LGAC know about the counties we don't have.
  - Claggett: USGS is prioritizing Chesapeake Bay lidar requests from states or counties where we have no or poor-quality data. USGS wants to fill it out.

Update on Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome – R. Thompson, USGS

- **Action:** Please send any feedback on the Land Use Options and Evaluation Workplan to Renee Thompson ([rthomps@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:rthomps@chesapeakebay.net)) in the next month.
- Berger: What is the role of Healthy Watersheds GIT and others?

- Thompson: We need metrics and review from all the GITs. We need a method for locals to see change with high forest loss and strategies to reduce that loss. The Watershed Data dashboard is under development, but we need expertise and input on valuable information and how it will be used. Local Leadership Workgroup and LGAC will then share that information.
- Claggett: This will be an iterative process and the role won't end after we look at the data. GITs could come back and ask us for secondary classes, etc.

Planning Next Meeting, News, Updates – K. Berger, MWCOG

Topics for next meeting, and meeting wrap up.

**Action:** Please send any discussion topics for the next LUWG meeting to Karl Berger ([kberger@mwkog.org](mailto:kberger@mwkog.org)), Peter Claggett ([Pclaggett@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:Pclaggett@chesapeakebay.net)), and or Allie Wagner ([wagner.alexandra@epa.gov](mailto:wagner.alexandra@epa.gov)).

**Next meeting:** Face-to-face meeting on Wednesday, September 4 from 10 AM – 3 PM in Annapolis, MD.

Meeting Participants:

Karl Berger, MWCOG  
Rachel Soobitsky, CIC  
Jennifer Miller-Herzog  
Travis Stoe, PA DEP  
Peter Claggett, USGS  
Renee Thompson, USGS  
Deb Sward, MDP  
Shannon McKenrick, MDE  
Allie Wagner, CRC  
Sarah McDonald, USGS  
David Saavedra, CIC  
Fred Irani, USGS  
Mark Symborski