State Land Mapping Joint Subcommittee
February 8, 2022, via Teams

Attending:
RMAC: Mark Hemmerlein, Larry Spencer, Michele Tremblay, John Magee, Victoria Bunker (phone)
LMAC: Shane Bradt
NHDES: Joe Schmidl, Tracie Sales, Nisa Marks

Update on obtaining data of state-owned lands:
NHDES has not received the parcel mosaic data from DRA. However, Joe received a response to a FOIA request for the same data layer and will be processing the data to make it available to LACs and the RMAC and LMAC. The data can be displayed as a map or in an excel table. The layers include all state-owned properties statewide, not just those in river/lake corridors, and shows both contact information and location information for each parcel, as available.

Conservation easements are included in the state conservation lands layer (private and public lands).

Joe will be publishing online as a web viewer, with a user group for people authorized to pull the data. The maps will not be on GRANIT. Joe will not be available to work on populating the dataset with the additional attributes of interest to the subcommittee.

Shane asked about the distance within which the LMAC and RMAC review lands, which is 250' or parcels that provide access. As a first step, Shane will take Joe's published data layers and filter them to lands within 250' of a waterbody. Shane asked how to define waterbody, such as whether to include intermittent streams and lakes less than 10 acres. The group decided to start with all waterbodies and potentially winnow later. For waterbody data, Mark mentioned NHDES's 303(d) list. Joe will check with Geological Survey staff about the available state data.

Shane described that the data are a starting point, and that the group will need to determine definitions and process data. The group decided the final product will be given to NHDES to publish. Mark reminded the group that once the data are processed/manipulated, it becomes a snapshot in time. Shane pointed out that the parcel ID number is a linking element across datasets that could be integrated with updated data.

The group raised the issue that defining additional criteria in light of existing data will be a process, and difficult for criteria like aesthetics. Larry asked if the LACs can help ground truth data. Michele suggested that as a statewide group, data should be statewide. Michele reminded the group that the state is not acquiring much land at the moment, so updating on the order of every 5-10 years might be fine.

Victoria mentioned that DNCR (Division of Historical Resources) has a database called EMMIT that includes national and state registered properties and areas that have undergone prior survey or study for their significance. That database does not include archeological sites, the locations of which are not public in order to ensure their protection. She did not know what their access or confidentiality terms are. Mark mentioned how DOT handles NHB data, where parcels are flagged as of interest or not without stating why, and suggested that parcels would not have to be marked with why they are culturally or biologically significant.

The group listed the criteria brainstormed at the last meeting:

- Adjacency
- Access
- WQ
- Biologic integrity
- Cultural
- Esthetic
- Floodplains

Someone suggested also including the level of present use of each parcel. Michele suggested comparing the list of available data with the SLR checklist, and discussing at next meeting.

Joe aims to have new web map done by the end of the week.

Action Items:

- Joe will publish/share the two layers – conservation lands + mosaic data
- Joe to check with NHDES Geologic staff about the best data to use for waterbodies
- Shane will refine those layers to properties 250' from the edge of a waterbody
- Shane & Mark to then discuss with Michele, to select a real-life exercise for the subcommittee
    - Michele to email them to schedule call.
- Michele and Nisa will compare the list of potential criteria with the SLR checklist, to discuss next meeting

Next meeting: 2/24 at 10:30