

## State Lands Mapping Joint Subcommittee

5/31/23 8:00 AM

Online Meeting via Zoom

Attendees:

RMAC: Mark Hemmerlein, Michele L. Tremblay, John Magee, Larry Spencer, Cory Ritz

LMAC: Mark Hemmerlein

NHDES: Tracie Sales, Nisa Marks

Guest: Shane Bradt

Today's objective: electronic ground truthing of the tool in a selected geographic area.

Shane said one of the selection criteria was whether an impaired waterbody was present on/near the parcel. He asked if that was a good thing, since the other criteria light up when they are good. Mark suggested that development could make impairments worse. Michele said some impaired waterbodies have groups working on watershed plans, so it is useful to flag it. Tracie asked if mercury impairments are included. Mark said they are not, because they are everywhere.

Mark pulled up the tool, showing the town of Warner (21 state parcels within 250' of waterbodies). Mark briefly showed each of the high scoring parcels. They were consistently parcels that are of high potential interest. Larry asked if it is possible to see which agency owns each parcel. Mark said the agency is not displayed in the tool.

Mark mentioned that size of the parcel is not one of the filter criteria right now, but can be relevant. John commented that it might be good to have abutting conserved land as a scoring point. Mark said he would add that. Cory asked if factors are weighted. Mark said committee hadn't decided yet; right now it is presence/absence of each factor. Shane said the weight may be site-specific, or dependent on committee composition, so didn't want to weight. However, the tool can display only parcels with presence of a particular criteria. Michele suggested length of river frontage might be an important criterion. Mark said right now it's an on/off.

Michele reiterated her interest in commenting on changes in land use, regardless of if a land transfer is involved. This is not currently required to be shared with the RMAC/LMAC. Larry asked if there are differences in transfers between agencies vs. to towns vs. to private entities. Michele said that is a policy call for later discussion.

Mark said that there could be numeric cut-offs, where high scoring parcels are recommended for retention, low scoring parcels are recommended for disposal, and mid-ranked ones need site-by-site consideration. Larry said that LACs can use the tool to inform their stance. Michele suggested that there be a note be attached to each parcel with the RMAC suggestion and rationale for it, and the whole RMAC/LMAC would vote on batches of the subcommittee's recommendations. Cory suggested that the middle scoring parcels are the hardest, and recommended weighting to allow the process to be automated. Michele suggested that there will be some surprises but the scores are a guide.

Mark asked about parcel size. What size is large enough to matter? Larry suggested 10 acres to be consistent with current use standard. Michele suggested a half-acre because many parcels of that size help with public access to the river.

Michele asked about river frontage footage. Mark said that is more complex and he would need to look at how to it.

The group agreed to add abutting conservation lands and a size trigger as a score criteria and a comment field. Mark will remove criteria for historical and NHB criteria because he has been unable to get the EMMIT and NHB data. Historical resources will require site-specific consideration. Threatened and endangered species habitat is likely well captured by the SWAP data and other habitat data layers.

Michele asked about how to proceed. The group decided to consider things by county. Mark asked how many parcels to bring to the committee. Mark said he will bring a list of parcels next meeting to look at. There are ~2200 parcels statewide included in the tool.

Next meeting 6/7 at 8:00AM by zoom.