

LUWG Votes on the Back-Cast Methods Approval

To what extent do you agree with the following: Approval of the back-cast methods described in the workplan for representing historical land use conditions from 1985-2012 in the Phase 7 suite of models.

Role	Name	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory	Cassie Davis	NYSDEC	4	NY is a 4 on the decisional item for developing the back-cast methods. I'm curious about [the] comments on the vote notes if there was any discussion on how this would affect the critical period? If it all? I thought that the critical period was for the water quality monitoring and modeling load data. New York centroid tax parcels available on our clearinghouse have a year built "YR_BLT" field if it is helpful for the back-cast validation.
	Samuel Canfield	WV DEP	4	We have reviewed the back-cast process. The process seems to provide a more detailed, technically sound system compared to Phase 6. We will vote for "Agreement with Reservations" as there does not seem to be any obvious issues with the process.
	Lori Brown	DNREC	4	Based on your first slide, I agree with using the proposed higher resolution method in place of the methodology used in Phase 6, but I agree with the sentiments brought up regarding timing and reviewing.
	Deborah Sward	MDP	4	Overall, we are excited about this project and the proposed method, which will maintain the high-quality wall-to-wall LULC data for 2013 until a change is detected. The reservation from MDP's GIS team's is the uncertainty we discussed regarding how effectively the approach will capture rural and very low-density residential development at the 30-meter resolution without overstating runoff from development. We are also curious how sensitive the results will be to the methodology decisions that are still being tested. Your offer to let us review the validation and provide feedback on the results before the product is finalized helps to address the reservation.
	Arianna Johns	VA DEQ	4	I am going to go ahead and vote a 4, the accept with reservations. The methods are sound, it's just the other TMDL related concern right now that I think needs addressing.
	Scott Heidel	PA DEP	3	

08/08/25

	George Onyullo	DOEE	4	
	Tom Butler	EPA	3	
	Marel King	CBC	4	
At-Large	KC Filippino	HRPDC	4	Just make sure we can do this before it gets too far along. My analogy is the critical period, we can't change that so how can we change the land use? How we changed between Phase 5 and 6 wasn't quite as drastic (i.e. more accurate) as this appears to be.
	Norm Goulet	NVRC	4	Agree with reservations, with the caveat that I think you need to talk with lawyers [regarding the potential conflict between the changed land use data since 1985 and the way the TMDL was developed]. I don't want you to hold up the work, but I think this needs to be confirmed with the lawyers.