

**Tamworth Conservation Commission  
Conservation Lands Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes of January 3, 2007  
7:00 pm, Cook Library  
--- This is a DRAFT copy ---**

Committee members in attendance: Chris Conrod, Chair, Chele Miller, David Little, John Mersfelder, Margaret Rieser, Scott Aspinall.

I. **Committee Meeting Minutes of November 28, 2006** were reviewed and accepted.

II. David produced an ArcView landcover map based on the attributes the committee discussed in previous meeting. It showed the four categories of pine barrens, floodplains, spruce-fir forest and northern hardwoods. Committee agreed that the map represented what was discussed in meeting and should be used in the scoring system.

III. **NRI Mapping and Scoring**; a continuation.

1. **Wildlife:** It was discussed that most of the wildlife considerations were covered in other categories such as open agricultural land, wetlands, land cover and fragmentation. David suggested that the NHFG WAP map highest scores in tiers one and two fairly represented those areas of town where regional connectivity (wildlife corridors) could best be maintained. Agreed to use the WAP tier I and II in the scoring system.
2. **Forest Soils:** Agreed to use the map proposed by David and based on the Carroll County Soils Survey. Scott pointed out that these soils are best classified into three groups indicating the forest types which do best in each group. Agreed to show soils on map using this classification system. Scott will assist David if needed.
3. **Development Potential:** Discussed and agreed that for best planning purposes, soils with high development potential should be where new development is encouraged; therefore, an inverse scoring system should be used when considering land for protection potential. Agreed to use the SOILS003.shp dataset to identify soils of high development potential. These soils will be assigned a negative score.
4. **Level of Human Activity:** It was determined that accurately assessing and scoring the level of human activity would be a daunting task and require an analysis based on subjective logic. Agreed to not use this category in the scoring system but to use it in guidelines for assessing individual candidate parcels (the analogy of 'course filter' vs. 'fine filter' was used).
5. **Access/Fragmentation:** It was discussed that the current access status may not define what the access status would be after protection and also that not all protected land would necessarily need or benefit from public access. It was agreed to not include public access in the scoring system. Various methods of forest



a. Hydric (NRCS)	Y	Y
b. National Wetlands Inventory	Y	Y
c. Prime Wetlands	Y	Y
Surface Water (categories have equal weight)		
a. Streams	Y	Y
b. Lakes/Ponds	Y	Y
Land Cover (categories have equal weight)		
a. Pine Barren	Y	Y
b. Floodplain	Y	Y
c. Spruce-Fir	Y	Y
d. Northern Hardwoods	Y	Y
Wildlife: Based on NHFG WAP map		
a. Tier II highest score	Y	Y
b. Tier I highest score	Y	Y
Rare/Endangered/Exemplary		
Special Features		
Access/Fragmentation: Four-category GMCG system; largest forest blocks get highest scores.	Y	Y
Level of Human Activity	N	N
Development Potential (inverse scoring) SOILS003.shp	Y	Y
Forest Soils (CCSS categories have equal weight) Groups I, II, III	Y	Y