

Nov. 20, 2004



Hampton Conservation Commission
100 Winnacunnet Road
Hampton, NH 03842
(603) 929-5808

Hello all,

I just wanted to send you all a note about an issue that I believe may affect your towns adversely. DES is putting together an addendum to the mitigation rules that passed recently. They are finishing the wording now. It pertains to any wetlands disturbance of less than 10,000 sq ft. If the applicant cannot find a mitigation project on their land then they will be able to put a set amount into a mitigation fund which will then be utilized to do restoration projects within the watershed. This is where it gets sticky. The coastal watershed, which is all of you, has been lumped in with the Salmon Falls Watershed and Portsmouth. That means that those of us on the coast who will be detrimentally affected by the wetlands disturbance must compete with the cities of Portsmouth, Dover and Rochester, etc. for the funds. I believe that this will put us all at a severe disadvantage and have stated that in my letter to DES which is attached. If you have any questions please call me at 929-5808.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ellen Goethel".

Ellen Goethel
Chairman
Hampton Conservation Commission



**Hampton Conservation Commission
100 Winnacunnet Road
Hampton, NH 03842
(603) 929-5808**

Ms. Lori Sommer
Department of Environmental Services
PO Box 95
Concord, NH 03302-0095

Dear Ms. Sommer,

I attended your seminar at the annual meeting of NH Conservation Commissions. I would like to thank you for forwarding the copy of your presentation. At the time I had several questions about the monetary contributions in lieu of on site mitigation for less than 10,000 sq feet of disturbance. You will probably remember that I asked which watershed Hampton was in and your response was, "Salmon Falls". I have since discovered that the coastal watershed (which is Hampton) was lumped in with Salmon Falls (Rochester, Dover).

I am writing to offer up my concerns in writing and to offer a solution. First, this plan puts the Town's of Hampton, Hampton Falls, Seabrook, North Hampton and Rye in a very precarious position. In Hampton we are at a very high build out percentage. Therefore most projects that come up have some wetland impact usually to the salt marsh. As I see it, the seacoast Communities would become donor towns, we would be allowing degradation to our salt marshes and putting funds into the watershed account. We would then compete with the cities of Dover, Rochester and Portsmouth, etc., to get funding back to protect or restore our marshes. I find this highly unfair.

I have considered the problem for a week and believe that if you allowed the funds to remain in an account for a year or two and allow the town that paid into it first dibs on the money, we could support this: *If in that time frame the town could not come up with a mitigation project within their town, the funds would be made available to the rest of the watershed.*

If the proposed legislation does not take our concerns into account I will be forced to ask our legislators to vote against it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ellen Goethel".

Ellen Goethel
Chairman
Conservation Commission

cc N. Hampton CC
Seabrook CC
Hampton Falls CC
Rye CC
Collis Adams