State Land Mapping Joint Subcommittee

March 22, 2022, via Teams

Attending:
RMAC: Mark Hemmerlein, Michele Tremblay
LMAC: Shane Bradt, David Packard
NHDES: Nisa Marks

The subcommittee opened with discussion of the crosswalk between the priority areas previously discussed by the group, and the RMAC's existing SLR checklist. The subcommittee's goal is to decide what factors about a parcel make it important to the public trust – e.g. access, public water supply protection, other reasons for the state to hold on to a property - and keep checklist elements that are relevant to those. Mark is working on whittling down the checklist.

Mark expressed that the subcommittee also needs to look at what information is available to make determinations about the factors of interest. For example, with aesthetics, "are there structures on the property" may be useful, while other elements of aesthetic won't have GIS information available.

Mark said a late-in-the process step will be to decide how information will be presented in a web-viewer accessible to non-GIS specialists.

So far, the group's work on the map has considered adjacency. For use and access, the group is comfortable assuming that if a parcel is on the waterbody, it probably has access. For biological integrity, the group plans to consider overlap with data available in the State Wildlife Action Plan, as well as sending the parcel map to NHB and having them cross-reference with threatened and endangered species occurrences. Similarly, the maps will be sent to cultural and historical resources folks to cross-reference with their data. Each step will need to be documented.

Michele asked if it is possible to assess the presence of structures for each parcel and how they contribute to aesthetics. Mark said you potentially can use remote sensing data to determine if there are any rooftops; Shane mentioned it may be difficult to distinguish between these and parking lots. Mark also said that some of the parcel mosaic data may list if there are structures contributing to the parcel's value.

Shane reminded the group that the aim is to determine what data are available to be used systematically and well. If there are 30 variables of interest, and 25 can be captured systematically, that allows a parcel-by-parcel review to focus on the remaining five. Mark described the next step is to do some data mining and see what is available for use.

Michele asked if the group will still be looking at example parcels. Shane said that everything relative to data availability has to be decided before looking at sample parcels.

Shane: has been working on cleaning up the state lands layer. It seems to be mostly good data, but some things need to be looked at to ensure the parcel layer is reliable. Shane showed the data for surface water + conservation public lands + state lands + in/out 250' buffer. Approximately 89% of the state owned conservation lands are within 250' of surface water, with 66% of all state-owned lands within 250' of surface water. This is approximately 2600 parcels. There is significant overlap between

the state lands data and the conservation lands data that needs to be cleaned up (~800 parcels). There are about 145 conservation lands that are not in the state-lands layer.

There was some discussion of ranking properties. Michele described that one desired end product is to have a list of properties the RMAC and LMAC recommend that the state retain. Mark suggested the ranking be something like definitely retain, maybe retain, do not retain.

Dave asked about the percent of parcels that are lake-adjacent versus river adjacent. Mark and Shane will prepare an estimate of that.

Shane described that approximately 150 parcels (2733 versus 2557) drop out when only perennial streams are included in the dataset. Based on that and statute, the group decided to keep other stream types in the dataset.

Checklist review

Mark and Michele expressed a desire for each person to whittle the evaluation criteria/RMAC SLR checklist document down to the criteria that reflect the priorities of this group. Each person will do so and send to Nisa, who will combine. Mark will use this to form a GIS data dictionary.

RMAC/LMAC briefing

The group described the information that will be brought to the RMAC and LMAC at their upcoming meetings: a summary of past meetings, description of the checklist work, and a summary from Mark and Shane. Mark will develop a powerpoint to guide the presentation to the RMAC and LMAC. The goal is to have a high-level summary of the work and the assumptions behind it, not to have a work session. It has 20 minutes on the RMAC agenda.

Action Items before next meeting:

- Mark will develop a powerpoint with a few examples that can be shared at the RMAC and LMAC meetings and guide the overview discussion among the committees.
- Each member of the group will whittle the checklist to reflect the data they know to be available and/or items they consider applicable to the subcommittee's priorities, and send their suggested checklist to Nisa **by 3/29**.
- Nisa will compile the results of the checklist work.
- Mark will look at what data sources are available for checklist factors of interest to the group, and start to draft a data dictionary in support of the checklist elements.
- Mark and Shane will look into the feasibility of using remote sensing data to determine if structures are present.
- Mark and Shane will prepare a rough estimate of the percentage of parcels that are river-adjacent versus lake-adjacent.
- Next meeting will be sometime the week of April 18 or 25.