

May 3, 2024, 8:30 – 9:30 by Zoom

RMAC/LMAC Joint State Lands Mapping Subcommittee meeting

Attending –

RMAC: Pete Bowman, Brooke Kenline-Nyman, Cory Ritz, Larry Spencer, Michele L. Tremblay (Chair)
LMAC: Steve Wingate
RMAC/LMAC:
NHDES: Tracie Sales, Nisa Marks
GUEST: Shane Bradt

(Mark Hemmerlein, John Magee, Lisa Morin, Garret Graaskamp and Janet Kidder not in attendance.)

Michele opened with the notice that Andrea LaMoreaux, LMAC chair, had emailed her and the LMAC is pausing their participation on the subcommittee until consensus can be reached about how the LMAC should move forward with this effort.

Michele started the meeting's business by reminding the group of the bullets she sent out regarding today's agenda (copied below) and noted her appreciation of the email conversation evaluating the subcommittee's process so far. Today's discussion will focus just on rivers and the RMAC process.

From Michele:

- Moving forward together as LMAC and RMAC or each conducting its own process (the latter option would require votes by the respective committees).
- Options of staying the course, full automation, a hybridized approach: the joint subcommittee has discussed several times the importance of human "touches" when reviewing parcels vs. a desktop analysis and the strength it carries.
- For the latter two above options, will the work on Sullivan, Rockingham, and Grafton be nullified? Will the results from the other seven counties be non-comparable?
- Would "release" be redefined so that it is not implying or stating explicitly that the RMAC/LMAC is recommending its release from state ownership when it really means that it does not have a preference its ownership future?
- Scheduling LMAC session(s) for completing Sullivan County lakes properties.
- Keeping tracking of what to include in final report and executive summary.

The group discussed staying the course of evaluating each parcel. Larry suggested retaining parcels with a score of 6 or higher and focusing meeting time on parcels scoring 5 or less. Michele noted that he is describing a hybrid approach. Michele also brought up the possibility of fully automated process to which Cory responded that he was not in favor of that. The scoring is only so good for evaluation, especially for parcels in the middle range of scores, and there may be factors that are not captured in scores. Are any parcels of 6 or higher released? Tracie pointed out Mark's email from the prior day (Figure 1). Michele noted that released parcels with scores of 6 or 7 may have been DOT salt sheds, etc. Can DOT sheds be overlaid on

the map? Michele points out the value of credibility from having assessed even the higher score parcels. Cory agrees on the added validity to that process. Cory also noted the higher scores for parcels released by the LMAC. Larry is ok looking at every parcel, but feels the group should review quickly on ones that are 6 or higher, but agrees on validity of results from the one-by-one review.

Michele suggests a 6 or higher test as some suggest parcels scoring 6 or higher should be automatically retained but others suggest parcel by parcel. Cory suggests testing his weighted scoring proposal. Michele noted we would have to discuss weights, and then rerun last 3 counties. Shane responds that running the weighted scores would be easy, but deciding on the weights may be a long discussion. Weights, to some degree, have already been determined via the process of evaluating the 3 counties completed so far. Shane asks if this would solve the issue being discussed. Time is not wasted, but past work is used to speed up upcoming work to be more efficient.

Michele notes that problem has been amount of time that the process is taken. Larry brings up the question of new or missing parcels in the database. The group can ask Mark about data updates, but the state is not acquiring many parcels. Pete noted that DNCR was getting some, as was F&G, but not too often. Steve suggests using automation to put things in categories to look at more efficiently, but still look at each parcel (Michele notes this would be a type of hybrid approach). Michele wonders if a report can be run by county.

Cory notes weighted scoring automatically indicates what attributes are most important for future evaluators. Michele asks, do we want to try weighting in double blind trial? Larry thinks we should still look at each one, but just be quick on high scoring ones.

Shane suggests creating a model that incorporates existing work, have members look at parcels that are 6 and higher as homework between meetings, and anyone can bring a parcel up for discussion. That way time in meetings is spent discussing outliers and lower scored parcels and it is unlikely that one that should be released would slip through. Michele likes this idea but notes lack of member meeting preparation in committees such these. Members would have to reliably do homework. Shane notes that as a tangible task it might be more likely that it is done.

Steve likes Shane's proposal as it will save time in end if we do the homework, and he thinks people in this group will do their homework. He also notes that scoring doesn't work as well for LMAC. Michele asks if it will take more time overall if we have work at home. Cory suggests taking 10 minutes at the beginning of each meeting to do homework separately then come together to makes remaining time go faster. Michele asks if we need to do the weighting model first? Cory thinks we can run that quickly and see what data shows. Michele proposes Strafford County or a county already done? Shane says model will be run for whole state. Cory says run model on new county then ground truth quickly in meeting.

Next steps:

- Strafford County will be reviewed next.
- Cory will provide a weighting model for Mark to run.

- Shane will add weighted analysis to the viewer.
- Members will get familiar with the mapping tool before May 17th.
- Members will spend 10 minutes at beginning of the next meeting evaluating parcels based on weighted scores.
- Additional information and instructions will be sent prior to the next meeting.

Next meeting: Friday, May 17, 2024. Larry Spencer unable to attend.

Figure 1. Results of Mark H.'s analysis of state-owned parcels reviewed to date, where regardless of the score, the chance of retaining a parcel is 91% (RMAC) and 85% (LMAC). Analyzed by score, chances to retain any given parcel with a score of 5 or greater is 94%-98% (RMAC and LMAC).

Score	Total Parcels		Total Parcels		Release		Retain		
	Release	Retain	Release	Retain	RMAC	LMAC	RMAC	LMAC	
0	66.67%	33.33%	2	1	2		0	1	0
1	53.85%	46.15%	14	12	12		2	9	3
2	47.17%	52.83%	25	28	22		3	20	8
3	25.42%	74.58%	15	44	13		2	36	8
4	11.93%	88.07%	13	96	12		1	73	23
5	4.67%	95.33%	7	143	2		5	110	33
6	4.38%	95.63%	7	153	1		6	122	31
7	6.32%	93.68%	11	163	1		10	127	36
8	2.29%	97.71%	3	128	0		3	93	35
9	4.23%	95.77%	3	68	0		3	52	16
10	3.85%	96.15%	1	25	0		1	20	5

