

State Land Mapping Joint Subcommittee

February 24, 2022, via Teams

Attending:

RMAC: Mark Hemmerlein, Larry Spencer, Michele Tremblay, John Magee

LMAC: Shane Bradt, David Packard

NHDES: Tracie Sales, Nisa Marks

Mapping update:

Shane described having made significant progress with the state-owned lands layers, and described the work that has been to date cleaning up the data. Both the state-owned lands and public/conservation lands layers have been set up. Michele raised that the conservation lands list also includes public lands, which may include impervious surfaces and be used for purposes other than resource conservation. Shane described that the dataset associated with the conservation lands is very rich.

The next step is to determine what is within 250' of water, which requires determining what qualifies as a waterbody. There are two types of water data layers: one set of features that are small enough they appear as arcs (lines) on the map. These are usually <40' across. The other contains features that are >40', such as reservoirs, lakes and other larger features. The arc dataset is more straightforward. The data are from the National Hydrological Dataset (NHD), from which Shane hopes to track down source data. There is still data cleanup to do, such as removing ice dams, tunnels, etc. NHD is hosted by USGS, with input from local people and organizations.

The group discussed what data to include. The arc data include perennial streams, intermittent streams, ephemeral streams, flow lines, and other information. Shane will look at the metadata to determine how these are defined. Michele asked what is in RMAC jurisdiction. Tracie said SLRs come from two agencies. CORD sends all of their SLRs, and it is up to the committees to decide whether the parcels are near a lake or river. DOT sends parcels within 250' of a river or lake, with disposals near lakes being very rare. The statute requires review of parcels adjacent to or providing access to a river or river segment. The group decided to include at least perennial streams, and to see how many additional parcels would be included if ephemeral and intermittent streams are also included. Shane was tasked with determining the number of parcels that would be included in each of these scenarios.

From the polygon data, the group decided to include: stream/river; lake/pond; reservoir. The group decided to exclude: submerged area, swamp/marsh, and marine-related categories. Shane and Mark will do further investigation of what is included in the rapids polygons, and whether they overlap with stream/river polygons. Polygons will not be screened by size.

There was discussion of how to handle waterbodies in neighboring states within different distances of the state border. Tracie pointed out that New Hampshire owns railroad lands in Vermont, mostly within ¼ mile of the Connecticut River but some a little beyond, and that LACs have jurisdiction on both sides of the Connecticut River within ¼ mile of the river. Shane proposed a mile buffer, and said it is easier to ignore things later than to add them in. Tracie sent Shane an example of an SLR property in Vermont, so he could check if such properties are included in the parcel mosaic layer.

Michele asked Shane to bring to the next meeting the number of parcels that would be included under different criteria. She would like to be able to include that in the report to the RMAC and LMAC at their meetings next month. Michele also asked the mapping team to have two case studies for ground

truthing the process at a future meeting – one lake case and one river case. Larry suggested using Livermore Falls on the Pemigewasset River for the River case. Dave tasked Mark with selecting a lake case from DOT lands.

Criteria list

Michele shared a crosswalk between the subcommittee's draft criteria and the RMAC's SLR checklist, with the goal of showing whether the criteria capture the items of the SLR checklist. Dave will add LMAC checklist items to the crosswalk. Michele asked each member of the subcommittee to review the crosswalk ahead of the next meeting to see if the criteria capture the needed information. She envisions a later step of determining whether to add/remove/keep each of the draft priority criteria. There was discussion of whether to add floodplains as a criterion or not; it was decided to see how they are represented in the checklist first.

Criteria:

- Adjacency
- Access
- Water quality (WQ)
- Biologic integrity
- Cultural
- Esthetic
- Floodplains – provisionally – going to look at the crosswalk? Put under WQ and biologic?

Mark asked how each of these will be rated, which will be discussed next meeting. He also volunteered to prepare a data dictionary for the criteria, once finalized. John pointed out it would be helpful to put the checklist items into the same order as criteria.

Michele mentioned that the group may want to weight the priorities in some way, which would need to be done in a consistent way.

Access was used as an example of the different types of ranking that could be used, such as easy/medium/hard for access versus essential/neutral/unimportant for access.

Other business: Joe is not planning to attend future meetings, but invited group members to reach out with specific asks.

Action Items:

- Mapping group will work on Livermore Falls as a river example to workshop at next meeting
- Mark to select a lake example to workshop at next meeting
- Shane will clean up data from the NHD dataset, defining what waterbodies are in
- Shane to investigate whether rapids is truly all overlapping with rivers polygons.
- Shane to determine how many state-owned and public/conservation parcels are within 250' of waterbodies, in two scenarios: perennial waterbodies only, and perennial + intermittent and ephemeral
- Dave to add LMAC checklist to the draft crosswalk, send to Michele. Michele will distribute
- Mark will draft data dictionary after checklist crosswalk has been compiled

- Group to review the crosswalk and assign each checklist item to a specific priority area, as applicable.
- The mapping subgroup and Michele will schedule a brief call a couple days before the subcommittee's next meeting. Michele will initiate a scheduling email.

Decisions:

- Conservation lands to be defined in data dictionary.
- Using National Hydrologic Dataset (NHD) to define what surface waterbodies are.
- Will use a minimum of perennial streams from arc NHD data.
- From polygon NHD data, will use stream/river, lake/pond, and reservoir. Still investigating rapids. Will exclude submerged area, swamp/marsh, and all marine-related polygons.
- Will include ¼ mile buffer into surrounding states.
- Will include parcels 250' from each included waterbody.

Next meeting: March 9, 2022 at 1:00

- Focus on ranking/weighting criteria
- Deciding what will be reported out to RMAC/LMAC