

April 12, 2024, 8:30 – 9:30 by Zoom

### **RMAC/LMAC Joint State Lands Mapping Subcommittee meeting**

#### *Attending –*

RMAC: Pete Bowman, Brooke Kenline-Nyman, John Magee, Cory Ritz, Larry Spencer, Michele L. Tremblay (Chair)  
LMAC: Garret Graaskamp, Janet Kidder, Lisa Morin, Steve Wingate  
RMAC/LMAC: Mark Hemmerlein  
NHDES: Nisa Marks  
GUEST: Shane Bradt

Michele opened the meeting by reviewing the committee's charge from the RMAC and LMAC to review all state-owned lands to facilitate review when a disposal comes before the groups and to make proactive recommendations about the transfer of lands out of state management or from one state use to another. She said the questions for today are: 1) whether to score every parcel manually or not; and 2) whether decisions are time-limited or not. She said it is up to the full committees to decide whether to take high-level recommendations to G&C.

Michele asked if the subcommittee will review each parcel or use an automatically-generated score to guide recommendation. John asked if there is any reason not to do both. He suggested the group look at correlations between decisions to date and the criteria, and where there is high correlation, automate that type of decision. Larry said he feels that the high scoring ones have generally been retained, so perhaps 6 or 7 and above can be automatically retained. Michele said it would be good to do an analysis to see if these impressions are true. She said that she remembers some exceptions that reflect site-specific conditions, such as surrounding development. Garret asked if it is possible to do an analysis by score and see what the recommendations were. Mark said it is.

Mark said all categories are equally weighted in the tool at the moment, but looking at the correlations between scores and recommendations would be helpful to guide any potential changes. Michele expressed concern about changing the SOP after having done three counties. Garret agreed. Larry suggested expediting the way the group looked at parcels with 7 and above. Mark suggested the next step is to pull the statistics to more robustly detect trends in the group's recommendations. Cory said that if there is a ruleset that holds up against the three counties already done, there is no reason not to apply that to the remaining parcels.

Shane pointed out that most of these questions can be answered by the dashboard. There are 69 properties that RMAC has recommended for release. Of those, one scored a 7, two scored a 6, and the rest are 5 and below. The parcel that scored a 7 was highly developed. The parcels that have been voted to retain have a broader distribution of scores. John said there is more nuance to the parcels with low scores because some have an attribute of outsized importance.

Mark and John suggested retaining all higher scoring parcels, and only look at lower scoring parcels. Cory suggested looking at public access as a potential variable for weighting. Larry said the group should be more conservative about “dispose” recommendations than “retain” recommendations because once disposed of it generally cannot be re-obtained.

Michele asked about parcels proximate to lakes. Garret suggested retaining any parcel within 250’ of lakes. He said that getting public access on lakes is increasingly difficult, so potential opportunities should be retained for a future look. Lisa asked to limit the analysis to great ponds. Mark reminded the group that there is not a good GIS layer of great ponds. Mark asked whether to keep reviewing rivers and lakes together, or to separate them. Michele said that would be a decision for the LMAC representatives on the subcommittee. This discussion was not resolved.

Mark said he heard the group as in agreement to keep reviewing individual parcels. Others agreed. Mar said that if the underlying data is updated in the future but the criteria are well-defined, it would be easy to update recommendations for the whole state quickly. Cory said he liked that approach and volunteered to work with Mark to figure out trends in what has underlain the group’s recommendations to date.

Michele said if the methodology changes, the group should run the model on the parcels that have already been done and compare model results to the manual work to date. Differences between the two can inform the approach to take for the rest of the state. She suggested Mark, Cory, and her work on this and bring results back to the subcommittee as a sensitivity test. John summarized the group’s decision by saying there is no planned methodology change, but there is a step to assess what has been learned to date.

Shane reminded the group that the dashboard already easily does the type of analysis the group is seeking. John said he does not understand the dashboard well enough to follow. Michele suggested that Shane give a refresher course on the dashboard at the group’s next meeting. She said the other part of the meeting could be to describe what type(s) of statistics the group would like Mark to run, or on the results Mark has found from doing that analysis.

Next steps:

- Michele, Cory, and Mark will do an analysis of correlations between factors considered and recommendations to date.
- Michele will send an email to invite comment on the types of analysis for Mark to do.
- Shane will give a presentation about the dashboard at the next meeting.

Next meeting: Thursday, April 18, 2024