

## RMAC/LMAC Joint State-Owned Lands Mapping Subcommittee

1/3/2022

### Online Meeting

From Michele L. Tremblay: The LMAC and RMAC review state-owned land proposed disposals. In some cases, the proposed disposals are not within our respective jurisdictions. In others, they can be excluded categorically. Then, there are those that concern our respective committees. When we have a meeting and time to prepare our reviews and recommendations, this reactive process can work. However, we have all agreed that ideally, we would not be in a reactive mode and would like to inventory the state-owned parcels within our jurisdictions and be able to prioritize them to be more proactive in our review and recommendations. We could develop criteria, e.g., water access, and assign priority levels to each property that would help us review and form recommendation to each property.

Attendees: Michele L. Tremblay - RMAC  
Dave Packard - LMAC  
Shane Bradt - LMAC  
Larry Spencer - RMAC  
Mark Hemmerlein – RMAC & LMAC  
John Magee - RMAC  
Nisa Marks - NHDES  
Tracie Sales - NHDES  
Joe Schmidl - NHDES

### Background:

Michele gave an overview of the basic goal to create a map layer and inventory list of state owned properties, with relevant details like land size, distance to river/lake, access points, etc., in order to inform RMAC review and prioritization of SLR properties.

### Data and Scope:

There was discussion of scope and existing data. Mark mentioned that DOT properties are not currently in a GIS layer. Shane pointed out that all models are wrong, but some are useful, and that it would be possible to create a system that gives more information than is available under status quo. Mark asked whether the group will consider all state-owned land or a subset.

Joe gave an overview of work he has already done to create GIS layers of state lands. He has public layers for conservation lands and the designated rivers. He also has created a derivative layer of most state lands, based on restricted layers that NHDES has internal-only (non-public) access to under an MOU with the Dept. of Revenue Administration. NHDES is waiting for DRA to give permission to release the layer publicly. That layer does not include road rights-of-way, and access points are not identified. John suggested that Fish and Game may have public access layers, and that PWAAB has also worked on identifying access points, including getting confirmation from LACs.

There was discussion over whether to start with identifying parcels, or start with identifying resources in need of protection. Mark pointed out that a map would give context of how isolated or important a parcel is, and parcel mapping is an easier exercise in GIS. Members described the advantages to having a GIS layer, instead of a spreadsheet listing parcels, and that a GIS viewer can present data in map or list form. Tracie pointed out that the LACs are required to do a similar process as part of their river management plans. That effort will not extend to lakes or non-designated rivers under the RMAC's jurisdiction.

Priority criteria development:

Mark described the need to develop the list of attributes that will be associated with each parcel (e.g. access, natural resource values, etc.). Michele and Tracie referenced the SLR checklist, which is more extensive than practical for a statewide exercise. Michele suggested developing approximately six criteria with high/medium/low rankings for each, using thresholds that can be automated and color coded. She provided examples from the [Winnicut River](#). Tracie reminded the group of the resource areas listed in statute, including archeological, water quality, biological, and recreational resources.

The group developed a list of basic criteria, for future elaboration:

**Does the subject property have:**

- **Adjacency/proximity to river or lake**
- **Use/Access** (including location relative to dam, other access, parking, Swimming hole ie. public use, agriculture)
- **Water quality** (303(d) list criteria)
- **Historical/Cultural/Archeological**
- **Biological integrity** (Threatened and protected species (NHB has that info, though more difficult to obtain data) – Cold water, trout and turtles layers (in DES ARM mapper), also connectivity for species, WAP, wetlands)
- **Floodplains, etc.**
- **Scenic/aesthetic** (visual buffer)

The subcommittee aims to create a chart or list that provides back end examples or a non-inclusive list for each of the broad criteria. The group requested that staff prepare a couple of sample properties for group's consideration.

Mark suggested there should be a data dictionary to accompany the database.

The group prepared a draft terms of reference document. There was discussion of what the intended uses of the tool being developed will be, such as public or LAC use. Is there a mechanism for proactive work to protect parcels?

Michele was elected chair of the subcommittee.

Action items:

Joe: follow up with DRA to allow data to be available for RMAC/LMAC use

Mark/Shane/Joe: Meet and pick a couple real-world examples of state-owned parcels to demonstrate what a tool would look like. Suggested potential properties included Livermore Falls and Squam Lake.

Michele & staff: distribute terms of reference and drafted criteria

Everybody: flesh out the criteria more – what does each mean?

Next meeting – Feb 8, 10:00 – 12:00