

1 Current Use Board
2 Regular Board Meeting

3
4 **Draft**

5
6 **DATE:** August 26, 2022

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

7
8 **LOCATION:** Department of Revenue - Training Room, 109 Pleasant Street, Concord NH

9
10 **BOARD MEMBERS:**

11
12 Senator Ruth Ward ~ *Excused*

13 Representative Tony Piemonte

14 Anton Bekkerman, Dean's Designee, UNH College of Life Sciences and Agriculture

15 Shawn Jasper, Commissioner, NH Department of Agriculture, Markets and Food

16 Rick Evans, NHDRA Commissioner Designee, NH DRA

17 Jonathan Horton, Commissioner Designee, NH DNCR, Division of Forests and Lands

18 Barbara Richter, NH Conservation Commission

19 Mark Beauchesne, Commissioner Designee, NH Fish & Game

20 Jonathan Rice, Assessing Official, City

21 *Vacant*, Assessing Official, Population <5,000

22 Norm Bernaiche, Assessing Official, Population >5,000

23 Susan Bryant-Kimball, Forest Landowner

24 Tom Thomson, Public Member

25 Chuck Souther, Chair, Public Member, Agriculture

26
27 **MEMBERS of the PUBLIC:**

28 Jasen Stock, NHTOA

Matt Leahy, Forest Society

29 Robert Johnson, NH Farm Bureau

Ben Lafond, DRA

30 Kris Fowler, DRA

Lisa Mudge, DRA

31 Vicky Ayer, DRA

Sam Greene, DRA

32 Phil Bodwell, DRA

33
34 Chair Souther convened the regular meeting of the Current Use Board at 1:03 p.m. Introductions of the
35 Board followed.

36 **Minutes**

37
38 Commissioner Jasper *motioned to accept the minutes of the April 18, 2022, regular board meeting;*
39 Mr. Evans *seconded the motion*. No discussion. Chair Souther called the motion to approve the
40 minutes of the April 18, 2022, regular board meeting as written. Mr. Bekkerman abstained; all others
41 approved. *Motion passed with majority vote.*

42
43 **Agricultural Land Assessment Model**

44
45 Mr. Bekkerman was asked to review the current agricultural land assessment model and provide the
46 Board with a proposal of how to move forward with updating the information used to determine the
47 values for the farmland category.

48 He explained his review included a comparison of New Hampshire’s process of developing values to
49 other states and regions between the northeast and west and found that the land capitalization approach
50 is most often used by current use boards or equivalents among other states. This is because a lot of the
51 information and data is available to focus on developing land values based on the productivity of the
52 land excluding other property attributes that may influence land value.

53
54 Two characteristics of the model he would recommend be included going forward is the use of public
55 data to allow for consistent updates to minimize the time and effort needed to compile information and
56 that it provides transparency to the public of the development of these values.

57

58 Approach #1

59

60 The first approach would be to bring the current assessment range of \$25-\$425 up to current values.
61 This would involve looking at the percentage land increase using the U.S. Department of Agriculture
62 (USDA) data that includes published land values in dollar per acre for states and regions. Using
63 today’s New Hampshire land value relative to when the assessment range was established, a
64 percentage change can be calculated and then applied, scaling up the existing range of values to a
65 current range of values.

66

67 Example 1:

68

- 69 • \$25-\$425 established in 1995
 - 70 ○ Original year values were established was unknown at this time
- 71 • Between 1995 and 2021, agricultural land value increased by 124% on average
- 72 • Apply the 124% to both the low value of \$25 and the high end of \$425
- 73 • $\$25 + \$25 * 1.24 = \$56$
- 74 • $\$425 + \$425 * 1.24 = \$954$
- 75 • The range would increase from \$25-\$425 up to a range of \$56-\$954

76 This would be the same process for the actual year the values were established. To update going
77 forward, the average land values in New Hampshire today relative to the prior year would be inserted;
78 the percentage change calculated and then applied to the prior year range of values. This process is
79 transparent, the information is publicly available, and the changes can be applied consistently at the
80 frequency the Board determines.

81 Approach #2

82 The second approach models the current income-based model that considers the productivity of the
83 land (in terms of the production value of the crops that were produced on that land), determining the
84 net return for an acre and then capitalizing using a capitalization rate.

85 The previous process for collecting the necessary data for this assessment model included phone calls
86 to farmers requesting their income costs and value of their product and survey mailing. This
87 information was then combined and calculated to an average rate to provide land values. This type of
88 detailed method can be time-consuming and expensive, on-line surveys have overwhelmed the farming
89 community, and the likelihood of getting a high enough response rate becomes potentially problematic.

90 Minimum, maximum and average production for both hay and corn silage can be calculated using
91 historical data available from the USDA. Hay prices are also available through the USDA however

92 corn silage prices are not as there is just not enough of that market in New Hampshire. Other ways to
93 get the prices for corn silage are using a regression economic model provided by Cornell that estimates
94 the price of corn silage using the price of hay and corn for grain, contacting Farm Credit East or
95 performing a survey of farmers to see what prices they are seeing. Any of these would be a minimal
96 effort compared to getting costs from producers.

97 The most important consideration is how to make this process consistent and transparent. Typically,
98 there is a relatively consistent relationship between costs and revenues where average costs will be
99 some proportion of total revenue. The current proportions of costs relative to revenues for both silage
100 and hay were calculated using the data from 2006-2017 and this same method could be used going
101 forward.

102 The capitalization rate typically has two components, the effective interest rate and effective tax rate.
103 The effective interest rate is the rate applied to agricultural loans for farm ownership purposes and is
104 updated frequently by the USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA). This is transparent, publicly available
105 and may be updated on demand. The effective tax rate is calculated by the DRA and is updated
106 annually.

107 Example 2:

- 108 • The USDA FSA average rate for 2021 was 6.9%
- 109 • The effective tax rate for NH in 2021 was 2.15%
- 110 • The cap rate would be 8.94%

111 Using the existing model production:

- 112 • 100 acres of corn silage production
- 113 • 120 of hay production

114 Net Income Minimum = \$22 | Net Income Maximum - \$48

115 Divide Each by the Cap Rate

116 New Range = \$250-\$545 per acre

117 Pros and Cons

- 118 • Approach #1
 - 119 ○ Easy to use
 - 120 ○ Easy to understand
 - 121 ○ Uses an established rate
 - 122 ○ Applies a multiplier based on the average increase in agricultural land value in New
 - 123 Hampshire
 - 124
- 125 • Approach #2
 - 126 ○ More in-depth
 - 127 ○ Consistent with how land values were calculated in the past
 - 128 ○ Uses more assumptions
 - 129 ○ Requires more work to update
 - 130 ○ More consistent

131 Appreciation was expressed to Mr. Bekkerman for the time, effort and thought he put into the
132 presentation. Both approaches are transparent and understandable, and the information and explanation
133 are more than the Board has been provided with in the past.

134 A subcommittee was established to review and analyze the two approaches and to implement a 5-year
135 phase-in and rolling average, similar to the forest land assessment model. Mr. Bekkerman,
136 Commissioner Jasper, Mr. Souther, Mr. Horton and Mr. Bernaiche volunteered to be on the
137 subcommittee. Mr. Johnson was requested to attend as well.

138 Proposed Forest Land Assessment Ranges

139 Mr. Evans reported that the Forestry Subcommittee met on August 4, 2022, to review the information
140 that went into the forest land assessment ranges. The subcommittee is recommending the following
141 proposed rates for 2023-2024:

Forest Land		Forest Land w/Documented Stewardship	
White Pine	\$123 - \$185	White Pine	\$74 - \$111
Hardwood	\$65 - \$98	Hardwood	\$39 - 59
All Other	\$40 - \$60	All Other	\$24 - \$36

Wetland	\$24
Unproductive	\$24

142
143 The white pine with stewardship category and the hardwood categories, with and without stewardship,
144 increased slightly from the prior year; the all other categories did not change.

145 Mr. Horton ***motioned to accept the proposed 2023-2024 forest land assessment ranges and bring to***
146 ***the public forums***; Ms. Bryant-Kimball ***seconded the motion***. Mr. Thomson questioned whether the
147 motion included the unproductive and wetland categories. Mr. Horton confirmed that it did, the
148 wetland and unproductive categories did not change from the prior year and remain at \$24 per acre.
149 Chair Souther called the motion to accept the proposed 2023-2024 forest land assessment ranges and
150 bring to the 2022 public forums. ***Motion passed unanimously.***

151 Forest Land Assessment Model Explanation

152 Mr. Evans gave a presentation and explanation of the forest land assessment model used to develop the
153 forest land assessment ranges.

154 A brief history. The original forest land assessment formula was originally developed by the UNH
155 Forestry Department. That formula included values for both the land and its income-producing
156 capabilities. In 2009, the Current Use Board requested Scott Dickman, from the DRA, to develop a
157 new model to measure only the income-producing capabilities of the land. Once completed, that model
158 was phased in over a 5-year period.

159 The current forest land assessment model is a 30-year discounted cash flow that averages the net
160 operating income of the annual growth for each of the three forest land category types: white pine,
161 hardwood and other. The presentation will go through the actual calculation for the proposed white
162 pine category assessment range for the 2023 tax year.

163 The procedure for developing the assessment range for the white pine category is the same for the
164 hardwood and all other categories using variables unique to each applicable category.

165 The model includes the following data:

- 166 ➤ Total acreage for the timber type
- 167 ➤ Growth rate expressed in cords per acre, per year
- 168 ➤ Sawlog to cord conversion
- 169 ➤ Annual management expenses
- 170 ➤ Harvest administration fees
- 171 ➤ Timber tax rate
- 172 ➤ Final discount rate

173

174 The final discount rate is the sum of:

- 175 ➤ National Council of Real Estate Investment Fiduciaries (NCREIF) income method preliminary
176 discount rate (rolling 5-year average)
 - 177 ○ Uses very large timberland investment organizations and real estate investment trusts
178 that deal with hundreds of thousands to millions of acres of properties
- 179 ➤ Risk adjustment to account for smaller tract size (rolling 5-year average)
 - 180 ○ Accounts for the tract size difference between NCREIF and NH
 - 181 ■ The average size of the forest land enrolled in current use in New Hampshire is
182 30-acres
- 183 ➤ NH statewide equalized property tax rate for the most recent year

184

185 The DRA also generates statewide average stumpage values for all species and products obtained from
186 surveys sent to and received from loggers and foresters twice a year. The stumpage value is what the
187 landowner is paid for their timber, not the mill price.

188

189 These ranges are then sent to Mr. Horton at DNCR, who combines the average stumpage values with
190 the U.S. Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data to calculate the annual value of the
191 annual growth of each specie and product.

192

193 FIA data provides the:

- 194 ➤ Total acres of each forest land category (white pine, hardwood and other)
- 195 ➤ Total volume in thousand board feet (MBF) for all sawlog species
- 196 ➤ Total volume in cords for all low-grade products (pulpwood)
- 197 ➤ Average annual growth rate for each product

198

199 Forest Land Assessment Model Inputs for the 2023-2024 White Pine Assessment Range

200

201 Administrative Inputs

- 202 ✓ **Forest “Type” Category:** White Pine
- 203 ✓ **Forest “Class” (Forest or Stewardship):** Forestland
- 204 ✓ **Date of Model:** 7/6/2022
- 205 ✓ **Current Year:** 2022
- 206 ✓ **For Use in Tax Year:** 2023

207 Property-Related Inputs (FIA Data)

- 208 ✓ **Total Acres:** 779,808
- 209 ✓ **Forested Acres:** 779,808
- 210 ✓ **Annual Growth Rate (Cords/Acre):** 0.707
- 211 ✓ **Sawlog to Cord Conversion Factor:** 2.0

212

213 Financial Inputs

- 214 ✓ **Annual Management Costs per Acre:** \$2.15
 - 215 ○ Boundary Line Maintenance: \$0.60
 - 216 ○ Property Tax (Added to “Rate Adjustment): \$0.00
 - 217 ○ Road Maintenance and Construction: \$1.20
 - 218 ○ Land Admin / Forest Stewardship: \$0.35
- 219 ✓ **Harvest Administration Fee:** 5%
- 220 ✓ **NH Timber Yield Tax Rate %:** 10%
- 221 ✓ **Preliminary Discount Rate (NCREIF: Income):** 2.77%
- 222 ✓ **Rate Adjustment (Tract Size Risk):** 1.70%
- 223 ✓ **Rate Adjustment (Property Taxes):** 1.56%
- 224 ✓ **Final Discount Rate %:** 7.03%

225

226 Once this data was entered into the discounted cash flow, it resulted in a midpoint of \$154.26. The
227 minimum-maximum ranges are calculated using 20% above and below the midpoint resulting in a
228 range of \$123.41 - \$185.11. The stewardship adjustment is 40%.

229 There are not many variables that the DRA inputs into the model. The acreage, growth rate, discount
230 rate, annual property tax adjustment, the management costs are consistent. The management costs were
231 developed by data that was provided by a number of private landowners 15-years ago.

232 The model calculates the net operating income, puts it into the 30-year discounted cash flow and then
233 calculates the average. For the white pine category, the total revenue from the growth on the white pine
234 acres was \$13,411,347, expenses \$3,688,289 and net operating income \$9,723,057. These figures
235 were entered into the 30-year discounted cash flow that calculated an average of \$154.26. The income
236 and expenses remain constant through the 30-years.

237 It was noted that the current gas prices have not impacted the management costs because the
238 information used to create the current costs are from a survey of timberland owners conducted 15 years
239 ago and have not been updated since due to the difficulty of getting this information.

240 Mr. Evans suggested a couple ways this could be accomplished without having to go back to owners to
241 get updated expense and management information:

- 242 ➤ Using information from the consumer price index (CPI) for agriculture and localizing it to the
243 Northeast
- 244 ➤ Using the information collected in 2007, calculate a rolling 5-year average for every year
245 through 2023
- 246 ➤ Apply that same calculation annually, like we do the preliminary discount rate and the track
247 size adjustment

248 There are a couple of issues such as smaller properties not having this information due to not
249 harvesting for long periods of time and it being a small pool of data to begin with. Costs could be
250 requested from owners and/or loggers as most loggers have their own construction equipment. The
251 stumpage values do not include maintenance costs that owners would have before a sale however other
252 costs may be included. However, that information would be variable and could be used to develop an
253 average.

254 Mr. Stock suggested a couple ways to obtain this information. One is an on-line or mail survey or
255 questionnaire that would get a limited response but may provide some good data. He agreed using the
256 CPI method would give a straight escalation or provide good sampling data for the north, central and
257 south regions and property sizes. Another way might be to determine an appropriate sample size and
258 create sample points throughout the state to gather information.

259 Relating to who has the data, Mr. Stock stated having learned from the last survey, timber investment
260 organizations and real estate investment trusts have the data because that is their business; land
261 managers, foresters and loggers because they work for various landowner sizes could provide average
262 costs. He assured the Board that costs have gone up since 2007, in forester fees in general. Then there
263 is stewardship, which is currently a straight 40% for the stewardship assessment ranges to reflect the
264 initial costs for stewardship. He believes this is an exercise that is due; to look at it in terms of the
265 model and also stewardship. He offered the assistance of the NHTOA to help gather information.

266 Mr. Evans added that regardless of the method used to determine the new expenses, from the year of
267 implementation going forward, a 5-year rolling average of the CPI should be applied to maintain prices
268 to avoid having to come back periodically to figure it out.

269 Proposed Stewardship Plan Rule Change

270 Proposed rule changes are being proposed in Cub 304 and Cub 309 to reflect deficiencies.

271 Mr. Evans explained that a question has been raised as to what a town can do to hold a new owner
272 accountable to remain in or be removed from stewardship. There are three ways to receive documented
273 stewardship:

- 274 ➤ Certified Tree Farm
- 275 ➤ Qualifying Forest Stewardship Plan
- 276 ➤ Qualifying CU-12

277 If land ownership changes on a certified tree farm, that property is automatically removed as a tree
278 farm. That is not a Cub rule but a tree farm rule. To remain in stewardship, the new owner would have
279 to provide a qualifying stewardship plan or CU-12.

280 This rule proposal will allow the town to notify the new landowner that they have six months to
281 provide them with a qualifying stewardship plan or a CU-12 to remain in stewardship otherwise the
282 property will be removed from stewardship and placed in the applicable forestland category.

283 There have been questions received from the assessing community and municipalities about when a
284 plan expires or when is it no longer applicable. The other rule change addresses this by adding a field
285 for effective dates to the cover page of a plan or CU-12 or on the last page of the form or plan having a
286 schedule of operations with the last entry representing the final year of the plan, similar to a tree farm
287 plan. From that year, you either update your timber inventory, timber type map and forest stewardship
288 plan or it expires that year. That change would be both for a stewardship plan and CU-12, which
289 requires the same information as a stewardship plan except the CU-12 is written by the landowner and

290 a stewardship plan is written by a licensed forester for the landowner. One other point, the forester that
291 writes the stewardship plan is not required to carry out that plan; the landowner can have any forester
292 carry out the plan.

293 Mr. Evans *motioned to accept the proposed draft rules in Cub 304 and Cub 309 and bring to the*
294 *public forums*; Ms. Bryant-Kimball *seconded the motion*. The proposed draft rules were read into the
295 record and are attached as an addendum to these minutes. It was explained that these changes do not
296 create a new rule, rather provides the municipality authority to make sure plans are current by
297 verifying and updating records when appropriate. It was agreed the word “shall” was more appropriate
298 in Cub 304.07 (d), than “may”. It was also suggested that a copy of the CU-12 with proposed changes
299 be provided with the rules to provide clarification. Chair Souther called the motion to bring the
300 proposed rules as amended relating to forest stewardship plans to the public forums. *Motion passed*
301 *unanimously*.

302 Public Forum Dates

303 October 19-21, 2022

- 304 • Lancaster
- 305 • Hanover
- 306 • Concord

307 Final dates, times and locations will be determined once facility availability is known.

308 Other Business

309 Mr. Evans provided a list of questions to the Board that the DRA has received covering several topics.
310 The DRA would like to generate answers and bring back to the Board for review and approval. Once
311 approved, they will be posted on the DRA’s Current Use website. The plan had been to place the
312 questions in a separate section of the Current Use Booklet however whether in the booklet or on the
313 website, it was agreed as long as they are easily accessible, either place would be sufficient. It was also
314 noted that some towns are creating their own current use material and that would not be as helpful to a
315 state program if there was different information being distributed by individual towns rather than in
316 one central location. Mr. Evans stated the DRA would work on the answers to the questions and bring
317 back to the full Board for review and approval. Mr. Bernaiche requested a copy of the questions to
318 bring to the NHA AO for discussion as it would be helpful to see and understand the assessing
319 communities’ responses.

320 A discussion ensued about whether multiple lots connected by a common point would be considered
321 contiguous. There were opinions for yes and no however the only way this might be decided for
322 certainty is by a court decision. Cub rule 301.04, definition of “contiguous” – as more than one parcel
323 of land having identical ownership which is linked disregarding whether it is divided by a highway,
324 railbed, river or waterbody or the boundary of a political subdivision. There was suggestion to clarify
325 the rule but there were no proposals to move forward with.

326 50th Year Celebration

327 Mr. Thomson expressed expectation that the organizations that participated in the creation of the
328 current use program, including this Board, would participate in the 50th celebration in 2023. He noted
329 that he has contacted Fish and Game about their participation and the Governor’s Office to issue a
330 proclamation. He feels it is important this Board do something to recognize the current use law that has
331 preserved the green space and encouraged the various recreational activities that continue to bring

332 revenue to New Hampshire every year. There is an upcoming organizational meeting with SPACE on
333 this however the specific date and time were not known.

334 Public Comment

335 Mr. Johnson, representing the Farm Bureau, noted that he believes the farmland assessment range has
336 never changed . He also clarified that landowners do not have to use the SPI and he believes it is a
337 minority of landowners who do use it.

338 He also expressed some concern with the timeline the Board has laid out with the public forums. With
339 the first increase of the farmland rates in 50 years, whatever the increase, it will make a difference.
340 With the forums scheduled for mid-October and a subcommittee meeting in mid-September, that is not
341 enough time to properly notify the farming community and their members of this upcoming change.
342 He requested the forums be moved to mid-November to provide ample time for notice.

343 Mr. Stock stated the NHTOA is supportive of the proposed forest land assessment ranges that the
344 Board has voted to bring to the public forums. He added his appreciation for the work on the Cub rule
345 relating to the stewardship plan and believes it provides a good road map for both landowners and
346 assessors.

347 Due to the work the subcommittee will need to complete for the farmland assessment model, it was
348 suggested it not be rushed and that enough time be provided to review and analyze the practical effects
349 of both approaches. It is important that whichever approach is selected to move forward with, that it is
350 correct and ready to be presented to the public.

351 Commissioner Jasper *motioned for the farmland assessment range to remain at \$25-\$425 per acre*
352 *for the 2023-2024 tax year*; Mr. Thomson *seconded the motion*. There was a suggestion that the Board
353 inform the public the farmland rates remained the same and that the farmland assessment model will be
354 reviewed and updated over the next year. Chair Souther called the motion to bring the farmland
355 assessment range of \$25-\$425 to the public forums. *Motion passed unanimously*.

356 Mr. Bernaiche *motioned to adjourn*; Mr. Evans *seconded the motion*. Chair Souther called the motion.
357 *Motion passed unanimously*.

358 Chair Souther adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

359
360 Respectfully Submitted, Stephanie Martel
361 NH Department of Revenue Administration – Municipal and Property Division

362 Documentation relative to the Current Use Board may be submitted, requested or reviewed by:

363
364

365 Telephone: (603) 230-5096
366 Facsimile: (603) 230-5947
367 E-mail: cub@dra.nh.gov
368 Web: <http://revenue.nh.gov/current-use>

In person at 109 Pleasant Street, Concord
In writing to:
Current Use Board
c/o NH Dept. of Revenue Administration
PO Box 487
Concord, NH 03302-0487

369
370

371

Cub 304.07 Documented Forest Stewardship Assessment.

(a) At the time of application for current use assessment, or at any time after enrollment into current use, landowners requesting documented forest stewardship assessment shall submit the following supporting documentation:

(1) A statement of current and past forestry accomplishments, including an explanation of deviations from the objectives of the past plans;

(2) A map as defined in Cub 301.11; and

(3) One of the following:

a. A letter from the New Hampshire Tree Farm Committee confirming certified tree farm status;

b. A current certificate documenting the land's conformance with the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard (SFI) or Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)-US Forest Management Standard;

c. A forest stewardship plan that includes:

1. *A title page with the following information:*

(i) First and last name; or

(ii) Corporation; or

(iii) Trust;

(iv) Complete mailing address;

2. Date plan is being submitted;

3. Term of plan:

(i) Effective dates; or

(ii) Expiration date;

[1]4. A statement of forest stewardship objectives;

[2]5. Current forest stand type descriptions;

[3]6. Current management prescriptions that address the following:

(i) Timber;

(ii) Fish and wildlife habitat;

- (iii) Soil;
- (iv) Water quality;
- (v) Recreational resources;
- (vi) Aesthetic values;
- (vii) Cultural features;
- (viii) Forest protection;
- (ix) Wetlands; and
- (x) Threatened and endangered species and unique natural communities;

[4]Z. A boundary maintenance schedule;

[5]8. An access development and road maintenance plan, if applicable;

~~6. Title page containing landowner information and plan expiration date;~~

[6]9. The signature of:

(i) A New Hampshire licensed forester; or

(ii) A person exempted from licensure under RSA 310-A:98 II, if the person meets the qualifications for licensure in RSA 310-A:104; or

d. A completed Form CU-12 “Summary of Forest Stewardship Plan for Current Use Assessment” as described in Cub 309.06.

(b) A landowner receiving documented forest stewardship assessment shall, periodically, at intervals of 5 or more years after the initial documented stewardship assessment, provide to the municipal assessing officials upon their request [~~An update on the information contained in 304.07(a) (1) through (3) -~~]; or

(1) An update of the information contained in Cub 304.07 (a) (1) through (3); or

(2) A statement that either the current forest stewardship plan satisfying Cub 304.07 (a) (1) through (3), or the current CU-12 form has not expired.

(c) When the ownership changes for land enrolled in current use receiving the documented forest stewardship assessment, the new landowner has 6 months from the date of the ownership change to:

(1) Remove the documented forest stewardship assessment by filing a CU-18 Notice of Change in Current Use Assessment; or

(2) Continue the documented forest stewardship assessment by providing the municipal assessing official evidence of continued stewardship by submitting:

a. Supporting documentation satisfying Cub 304.07(a) (1) through (3); or

b. A statement that either the current forest stewardship plan satisfying Cub 304.07 (a)(1) through (3) or the current CU-12 form has not expired and an updated title page containing the new landowner's information and expiration date.

(d) If the landowner fails to provide the documentation sought under Cub 304.07 (b) or (c) the municipal assessing official or their designee shall remove the documented forest stewardship assessment by completing and filing a Form CU-18 Notice of Change in Current Use Assessment.

Cub 309.06 Form CU-12 Summary of Forest Stewardship Plan for Current Use Assessment.

(a) A landowner without a NH tree farm confirmation letter, documentation of a certified tree farm, or a forest stewardship plan that meets the requirements of Cub 304.07(a)(3)c, but who is applying for documented forest stewardship assessment, shall complete and file the landowner's portion of Form CU-12 "Summary of Forest Stewardship Plan for Current Use Assessment" as approved by the board, with the municipal assessing officials in the municipality where the land is located.

(b) A landowner requesting forest stewardship assessment [~~may~~]**shall** complete the Form CU-12 and provide in:

(1) STEP 1 of Form CU-12:

- a. The tax year for which the forest stewardship summary has been submitted;
- b. An indication by checking the appropriate box if the landowner is enrolling the land into forest stewardship or is providing an update to the existing forest stewardship information;
- c. The name of the current property owner(s) of record for the parcel or tract of land for which the forest stewardship current use assessment applies;
- d. The owner's current mailing address; and
- e. If there are more than 2 owners, submit a supplemental list of names and signatures;

(2) STEP 2 of Form CU-12, the term of the plan providing either:

a. The effective dates; or

b. An expiration date;

(2) STEP 2 (a) of Form CU-12, the physical property location of the parcel or tract of land for which the forest stewardship current use assessment applies by specifying:

- a. The nearest street from which the parcel or tract of land may be accessed; and
- b. The municipality and the county in which the parcel or tract of land is located;

~~(34)~~ STEP 2 (b) of Form CU-12:

- a. The total number of acres in the parcel or the tract of land as referenced by deed, survey, or the municipal property assessment record(s);
- b. The total number of acres of a portion of the parcel or tract of land that is presently being assessed as current use land;
- c. The total number of acres of the parcel or tract of land that the landowner(s) request to be classified as forest land with documented stewardship; and
- d. The total number of acres not in current use;

~~(45)~~ STEP 2 (c) of Form CU-12, the current municipal tax map and lot number for the parcel, or for each contiguous parcel in the tract of land;

~~(56)~~ STEP 3 (a) of Form CU-12, a check in the box acknowledging compliance with Cub 304.07(a)(1) that the required statement of current and past forestry accomplishments has been included with the submitted Form CU-12;

~~(67)~~ STEP 3 (b) of Form CU-12, a check in the box acknowledging compliance with Cub 304.07(a)(2) that the required map has been included with the submitted Form CU-12;

~~(78)~~ STEP 3 (c) of Form CU-12, a check in the box acknowledging compliance with Cub 304.07(a)(3)(c) by including a written summary of the forest stewardship plan as described in Cub 304.07(a)(3)(c) 1 through 6;

~~(89)~~ STEP 4 of Form CU-12, acknowledgement that the current use documented forest stewardship assessment requires compliance with New Hampshire State Statute RSA 79-A and Cub 304.07 and, that failure to comply with the requirements may result in reclassification of the forest land assessment by providing:

- a. Landowner(s) listed in application STEP 1 printed name(s), signature(s), and date of their signature or the printed name, signature, and date of signature by an agent with power of attorney including a copy of the agent's executed power of attorney; and
- b. The forester's printed name, signature, license number, and date of signature; or
- c. An indication that the person is exempt from licensure pursuant to RSA 310-A:98, II.