

ACCOMACK COUNTY WETLANDS MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 17, 2022

At a meeting of the Accomack County Wetlands Board held on the 17TH day of NOVEMBER 2022 in the Accomack County Administration Building Board Chambers, Room #104, in Accomac, Virginia.

1. CALL TO ORDER

MEMBERS PRESENT AND ABSENT

Wetland Board Members Present

Mr. T. Lee Byrd, Chairman

Mr. George Ward, Vice Chairman

Mr. Gene Wayne Taylor

Mr. Timothy Getek

Mr. George H. Badger

Others Present:

Ms. Chontese Ridley, Environmental Programs Permit Specialist

Mrs. Beth Nunnally, Environmental Planner II

Mr. Benjamin Nettleton, Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC)

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

There being a quorum, Chairman Byrd called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

On a motion made by Mr. Badger and seconded by Mr. Ward, the Wetlands Board voted to approve the agenda.

3. MINUTES

A. October 20, 2022

On a motion made by Mr. Getek and seconded by Mr. Badger, the Wetlands Board voted to approve the October 2022 minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. Harold & Carroll Cherrix, Sr. - VMRC# 2022- 1734

Demolishing and replacement of an existing gear storage building and support pilings.

Ms. Beth Nunnally, (Environmental Programs), stood before the Wetlands Board and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Ms. Nunnally said Mr. Charles Ward, agent of the applicant, asked that this be continued to next month, (December meeting). She said Mr. Ward was getting the ownership information straightened out.

Mr. Byrd asked, to confirm, that this was the second month that a continuance had been requested. That was correct.

Mr. Taylor said he believed that the issue was trying to get VDOT to commit. The engineer wanted to go higher up.

On a motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Getek, the Wetlands Board voted to issue a continuance for (1) month, for Harold & Carroll Cherrix, Sr.- VMRC# 2022- 1734, to demolishing and replacement of an existing gear storage building and support pilings. The property is located on Chincoteague Island, VA 23336, tax map#(s) 30-A-3D.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Blue Marina VA., LLC- VMRC# 2022- 2293

Proposed repair and resurfacing of an existing rip rap, replacement of the existing bulkhead 15 inches channelward to construct a new bulkhead, replacement of (2) timber/vinyl jetties with stone jetties, dredge, fill, and installation of (2) new stormwater outfall pipes

Ms. Nunnally stated that the application had been revised from the version that the board had received. It was revised and sent the previous day, Wednesday, November 16, 2022.

Ms. Nunnally said there was substantial changes made to the plan from the original and more than what they had asked for. The rip rap that was previously proposed was now being proposed as a bulkhead.

Ms. Nunnally also stated that there were some wetlands behind the bulkhead that were identified and not on the drawings. The drawings would need to be revised.

Ms. Nunnally said the staff's recommendation was to continue this application to allow more time to review and verify what was in the drawings.

Ms. Nunnally said that Ms. Ridley, Environmental Permit Specialist, pointed out that if the scope of the project had changed that it would need to be re-advertised. Ms. Nunnally said that she also ran it by the Accomack County, County Attorney and she agreed.

Mr. Badger asked if the project was advertised as rip rap and Ms. Nunnally said yes.

CHAIRMAN BYRD OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Byrd asked if there was anyone who wanted to comment on application 2022-2293.

Mr. Chis McCabe, (Coastal Compliance Solutions, LLC), stood before the Wetlands Board on behalf of the applicant and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Mr. McCabe said they had a significant change in material going from the proposed 970 square feet of rip rap along the Chincoteague Channel to a total bulkhead replacement in kind of the original bulkhead location.

Mr. McCabe said he reconvened with the owner after receiving the first site comments. He said the mitigation fee for non-vegetative wetlands would have been almost \$180,000.00. In that regard, and comments from [Accomack County] staff and others, they went back to the drawing board to revise the application.

Mr. McCabe then gave some insight on the project. He stated the property used to be Captain Bob's Marina. The current owners, (the applicant), purchased it and want to redevelop it. The redevelopment consist of park model units, reconfiguration of the marina, and the sewage was going to be pumped back up to the Inlet View Campground where it will be treated/disposed of.

Mr. McCabe said in order to make the site work shoreline stabilization had to take place due how eroded it was.

Mr. McCabe said he calculated 67 square feet of vegetated tidal wetlands on the north side, not included in the proposed vegetated impacts of 796 square feet inside the marina. He also said, on the southern side of the marina, there was a section of vegetated tidal wetlands that needed to be impacted to make the marina stabilization work.

Mr. McCabe said non-vegetated tidal wetlands, that he calculated based on the high water line, was just about 687 square feet, (plus or minus). Bringing the impact fee to about \$30,000.00, [\$27,900.00].

Mr. McCabe asked if they could split the permit. He said they would like authorization to just approve the bulkhead, and that there would be a total of 1,850 of bulkhead replacement.

Mr. McCabe added that they needed to get the contractor started as soon as possible to get a piece of it going, as soon as possible, over the winter to protect the shoreline. He said they would work on amending/getting authorization for the additional impacts, (dredging, stone jetties at the entrance channel and the docks), as part of the second phase of the permit.

Mr. Byrd said they, (the Board), had been asked to ask Mr. McCabe for a new permit. He asked Mr. McCabe if he was suggesting that the 1,850 square feet of bulkhead go with the existing permit, and Mr. McCabe said yes.

Mr. McCabe said they were going to eliminate the rest of the request as part of this JPA and a subsequent JPA for the rest. He added that an addendum would be submitted next week for that.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. McCabe if the applicants were okay with the impacts of about \$30,000.00. Mr. McCabe said yes, considering it went from about \$180,000.00 to \$30,000.00.

Mr. McCabe asked to call Mr. John Salm up to talk about the sewer situation so that everyone would understand.

Mr. John Salm, (J.W. Salm Engineering, Inc.), appeared before the Wetlands Board and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Mr. Salm said the bulkhead, in the revision they were asked to make, would be replaced exactly where the existing bulkhead used to be instead of channelward.

Mr. Salm said this particular facility would generate sewage in a couple different locations. The Park Models, (trailers), would have hose connections and they will generate sewer. Sewer would also generate in the bathhouse and the pool house. They also had to have a bathhouse for the marina.

Mr. Salm said the marina would be generating sewer in two fashions. It was going to have transient slips and dedicated slips where they were going to have tidal vessels. The tidal vessels were going to be evacuated with sewer as well. The marina would also have a vacuum sewer system like many other marinas in the Commonwealth were they would have a gravity sewer system and a grinder pump system in the rest of the facility.

Mr. Salm said all of that would be taken to Inlet View where there will be a very advanced waste water treatment plant that was currently permitted by VDH. He added that it currently had the capacity to handle all of the sewage.

Mr. Byrd asked if it was currently in place. Mr. Salm said no, but that it was under construction.

CHAIRMAN BYRD CLOSED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Benjamin Nettleton, Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), appeared before the Wetlands Board and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Mr. Getek said if they were going to have a new permit for next month, and more questions were going to be asked, what the proper formality was in terms of what they should consider.

Mr. Nettleton said, in terms of a public hearing, if they continue an application it would essentially be one big public hearing that would be continued from this month to next month.

Mr. Nettleton said if they choose to have concrete action today, and they wanted to close it and then see something else next month, they would have to vote either approve or deny the application today. If they denied it, they would have to reconsider their amendment at the next meeting.

Short discussion ensued on whether or not a new application needed to be submitted.

Mr. Nettleton said right now the application before them was incomplete and that they did not have all the Intel.

Mr. Byrd asked, to confirm, if the original application was for a rip rap and not a bulkhead.

Mr. McCabe stated the original application was for stone revetment on the Chincoteague Chanel and new bulkhead on the inside of the marina. In in order to stabilize the shoreline, they wanted to amend the application for the Chincoteague Chanel 970 feet to be replacement bulkhead. They also wanted include the replacement bulkhead inside the marina.

Mr. McCabe added that they would submit an amended JPA, (Joint Permit Application), for the dredging, the piers and the jetties associated with the construction that did not include shoreline stabilization.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Badger if he would weigh in on this.

Mr. Badger asked if the reasoning for changing from stone to a bulkhead on the channel side was due to the amount of money. Mr. McCabe said yes and the non-vegetated wetlands determination between where mean low water and mean high water was.

Mr. Badger asked Mr. Nettleton how VMRC looked at compensation for non-vegetated wetlands when it came to stone.

Mr. Nettleton stated VMRC considered rip rap in a non-vegetated wetland, or still within that tidal range, a conversion. It was not a loss that required compensation.

Mr. Nettleton said a bulkhead fill was a loss and triggered reviews.

Mr. Nettleton said the revised application with the 700 square feet would be a non-vegetated wetland lost as a fill. He added that the board should look at alternatives to minimize that loss.

Mr. Badger, asked to confirm, that VMRC seen the entire stone revetment a change and not a loss.

Mr. Nettleton said that was correct and that he believed it was all in the intertidal area. The board would need those impact numbers that were not provided.

Mr. Getek asked Mr. Nettleton, to confirm, that the tow of the revetment that may cover non-vegetated wetlands, (within the board's jurisdiction), did not count towards any loss of non-vegetated wetlands.

Mr. Nettleton said yes, they would not require compensation. He added that the board could charge, but VMRC would not require it.

Mr. McCabe said that changed the whole situation. If the board was not going to require compensation for the rip rap, for the conversion of the non-vegetated wetlands area, then the board could hear the original JPA.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. McCabe if the board was not going to charge if he would be willing to back on the new JPA, and the board would vote on what they see now. Mr. McCabe said that was correct.

Mr. McCabe apologized for the confusion and said he thought compensation was required.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Nettleton if he could clarify his statement one more time.

Mr. Nettleton said they, (VMRC), were only requiring charging for net losses of vegetated wetlands. When a vegetated wetland is changed to an upland habitat it is out of the tidal range and longer letting in habitants. Rip rap and rock is now under the new guidance considered parts of a Living Shoreline. If the rock is in the intertidal habitat it is still providing habitat.

Mr. Nettleton said, for the record, that they would be more supportive of the original rip rap application than the bulkhead.

Ms. Nunnally said she was wondering, since the numbers were not available yet, should they still continue this and be more prepared next month.

Mr. Ward asked Ms. Nunnally what numbers.

Mr. Byrd asked Ms. Nunnally was her question if they could amend the JPA on the table right now or should they extend a month and re-quantify everything that was in the JPA.

Ms. Nunnally said those numbers were still necessary.

Mr. Badger asked Mr. McCabe if he had the numbers for the impact of the stone rip rap, and Mr. McCabe said yes.

Mr. Badger said if they had those numbers and the numbers for what would be filled behind the rip rap, and Ms. Nunnally cut in to say that they did not have those numbers.

Mr. McCabe said it would be 67 square feet of tidal and 697 of non-tidal.

Ms. Nunnally said that she needed to verify those numbers and Mr. Taylor said they could do that.

Mr. Byrd told Mr. McCabe, that if he agreed, Ms. Nunnally could verify and Mr. McCabe agreed.

Mr. McCabe said if there was a disagreement they could work it out and thanked everyone for having patience with them.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. McCabe what were the new numbers for impact compensation.

Mr. McCabe said there was 697 square feet of non-vegetated wetlands and 67 square feet of vegetated. Total would be \$28,104.34.00.

Mr. McCabe said that was for the rip rap, not the bulkhead conversion within the marina. That number was 796 square feet.

Mr. McCabe said the total vegetated tidal wetlands impact between the south side of the marina and the face of the rip rap along Chincoteague was Channel 863 square feet. The area of non-vegetated tidal wetlands impact was 697 square feet.

Mr. Badger asked if the 687 [697] feet of non-vegetated wetlands, area on the north side behind the old bulkhead, seem appropriate.

Ms. Nunnally said she needed to verify it.

Mr. Byrd said at this point, what they should do, (with numbers that were questionable), was to allow the owner's representative to suggest and if they were wrong they were wrong. It was going to vary by degree and the money would vary by degree. Mr. McCabe agreed.

Mr. Byrd said if not then this would be off the table for another month.

Mr. Taylor suggested just going with the 1,560. He said he did not think he had to be continued for another month, and that the verification could be done.

Mr. McCabe said it could be a condition for approval.

Mr. Byrd said he agreed if everyone around the table agreed.

Mr. Badger said he did not have a problem as long as the understanding was the impacts were far greater, and Mr. Byrd added, that if that was the case they would come back next month.

Mr. McCabe said they were fully committed to comply totally with the requirement of paying for the compensation of vegetated and non-vegetated wetlands that were behind the existing bulkhead as agreed to and quantified by staff.

Mr. McCabe said they would have the elevation staked so there would be no question.

Mr. Getek said when walking around he seen a lot of shellfish and asked Mr. McCabe to do his best to relocate them. Mr. McCabe said he would.

Mr. Badger suggested they were ready to hear the original project now.

Mr. McCabe said he would like to withdraw their revised request for the conversion of rip rap to a bulkhead.

Mr. McCabe said the project was for the installation of 970 square feet of rip rap to stabilize an eroding shoreline along Chincoteague Channel, replacement of existing bulkhead inside the former Captain Bob's Marina area, installation of a new bulkhead on the south side of the marina that would impact a total of 863 square feet of vegetated tidal wetlands. The total impact for non-vegetated tidal wetlands was 697 square feet.

Mr. McCabe said if those numbers were to increase, or decrease, they were fully committed to compensate the mitigation fund to the equivalent to what that increase or decrease would be.

Mr. McCabe said the other proposals were the reinstallation of a floating dock, performance of maintenance dredging within the marina channel and basin, and the installation of two stone breakwater jetties along the entrance channel into the marina.

Mr. Getek said he was good with the north side, but was curious about the south side and asked if there would be a bulkhead there, and if it would be in front or behind the wetland's grasses.

Mr. McCabe said it would be in front. I would be on the water side of the vegetated wetlands. He added that they would be converting that from tidal wetlands to uplands.

Mr. Getek asked Mr. McCabe if that was in his calculations and Mr. McCabe said yes.

Mr. Badger asked if the calculations included the non-vegetated impacts behind the bulkhead.

Mr. McCabe said there was a significant drop there so they did not calculate non-vegetated. They did not confirm it or add it into their calculations. He added that the board could make that a condition.

Mr. Badger then asked Mr. McCabe why a bulkhead was needed there.

Mr. McCabe said he would defer that question to Mr. Salm. Mr. McCabe said, from his understanding, in order to get the travel way around from the property line to the row of travel park models it was needed to make it work.

Mr. Getek asked if maybe a low profile bulkhead could be used in order to preserve some of the wetlands.

Mr. Badger said it looked to him like their biggest problem was access to the point. He asked Mr. McCabe, to confirm, that the rationale for putting in a bulkhead versus leaving it alone was for access. Mr. McCabe confirmed that was correct along with three major utilities, (water, sewage and electricity).

Mr. Badger stated that in part of making their decision on the destruction of wetlands, (vegetated and non-vegetated), on the south side he thought it was in their purview to evaluate why they needed it.

Mr. Badger said in the board's jurisdiction they were looking was the rip rap along the channel ward side, the bulkhead on the southern side and the fill behind it, the refreshing of the rip rap (statement addition by Mr. McCabe), and the fill on the north side behind rip rap.

Mr. McCabe confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Byrd asked if there were any more questions from the board.

Mr. Getek said he wanted to ask Mr. Nettleton, after what he had heard, if everything they had said so far seemed logical. Mr. Nettleton said yes and he thought they were on track.

Mr. Badger asked Mr. Nettleton if he had any comments about the access to the marina to get to the front of it. He wanted to know if Mr. Nettleton had any issues with their, (the applicant/agent), rationale for wanting to fill that area.

Mr. Nettleton said he did not want to comment at that time, but felt that the board had received justification and that they had done their investigation properly on that.

Mr. Badger asked if the application should be opened back up to the public.

CHAIRMAN BYRD OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Byrd asked if there was anyone who wanted to comment on application 2022-2293.

No one made a request to communicate.

CHAIRMAN BYRD CLOSED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

On a motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Badger, the Wetlands Board voted to issue a permit (valid for (1) year, for Blue Marina VA., LLC- VMRC# 2022- 2293, for the proposed repair and resurfacing of an existing rip rap, replacement of the existing bulkhead 15 inches channelward to construct a new bulkhead, replacement of (2)

timber/vinyl jetties with stone jetties, dredge, fill, and installation of (2) new stormwater outfall pipes with the following conditions:

- 1. Pay into the mitigation fund for 863 square feet of impacts to vegetated wetlands*
- 2. Staff has to verify the 697 square feet of non-vegetated wetlands and compensation will be required*
- 3. Shellfish relocation*

The property is located on Chincoteague Island, VA 23336, tax map# (s) 45-A-20, 30A1-1-20, 42, 44, 46, 48, and 52.

*****On a motion made by Mr. George Badger and seconded by Mr. George Ward the Wetlands Board voted to take a minute recess. *****

*****Meeting reconvened at 11:00AM*****

B. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service VMRC# 2022- 2305

Creation of a marsh platform to restore salt marsh wetlands

Mr. Kevin Holcomb appeared before the Wetlands Board, on behalf of the applicant, and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Mr. Holcomb said the project location was a tidal restoration enhancement of a living shoreline that began where the Board had previously approved their oyster castle reef restoration in 2016.

Mr. Holcomb said the area, of former salt marsh, had eroded over time.

Mr. Holcomb said all the areas of their barrier island system had fringe marsh, tidal salt marsh that extended around the island which was a very poor and de-pleasurable component to the system.

Mr. Holcomb said the project was to bring the elevation [up] by bringing in fill material, (using Army Corps of Engineers dredge material), to create a high and low marsh mosaic on the site.

Mr. Holcomb then showed pictures of what the site currently looked like and gave some background on the living shoreline project completed in 2016.

Mr. Holcomb spoke on and showed how the marsh had been heavy degraded by Chincoteague Ponies grazing. The spartina marsh was never able to grow tall enough to seed and regrow vegetation on that platform.

Mr. Holcomb pointed out the fetch that crossed the Chincoteague Bay into Assateague Channel hitting the marsh at an extraordinary rate.

Mr. Holcomb said that added fencing for the horses on a separate project in conjunction with the Chincoteague Vol. Fire Department. They were working on a rotational grazing schedule for them and said the ponies would have grass to feed on for many generations to come.

Mr. Holcomb thank the board for listening and for their support.

Mr. Ward asked if the dark grass was how high they were going to bring up the existing marsh. That was correct.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Holcomb if the castles worked. Mr. Holcomb said yes, they were working better, in a way, for more oysters at the Tom's Cove site. The site in question, which was farther up the channel between the islands, has less aquaculture.

Mr. Ward asked if the oysters were harvested off the castles and Mr. Holcomb said no.

Mr. Badger asked if the fill for the project as coming from the Town's disposal site.

Mr. Holcomb said some of the fill had been identified from the disposal site, but right now they did not have the funding or the material to get this project done within 1-year. That led to Mr. Holcomb asking for a 5-year permit.

CHAIRMAN BYRD OPENED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Byrd asked if there was anyone who wanted to comment on application 2022-2305.

No one made a request to communicate.

CHAIRMAN BYRD CLOSED THE FLOOR TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Holcomb, to confirm, that he was asking for a 5-year permit. Mr. Holcomb confirmed that to be correct.

Mr. Byrd also asked Mr. Holcomb if there was a monitoring program and in place and Mr. Holcomb said yes, a long term monitoring program.

Mr. Getek, asked to confirm, that they were going to take dredge material and mix it with sand to make sure it was the right composition. They not only had to get the dredge material, but also had the expense of getting the sand as well. Mr. Holcomb said that was correct.

Mr. Holcomb said the dredge material that was available to use now, from the current location, was just a very small amount.

Mr. Badger said it appeared, from the cross section drawings, that the intent was to stop at the ½ times so that there was no loss.

Mr. Byrd said that was correct and that was what made this a good project.

Mr. Getek asked if a calculation had been on how much more vegetated wetlands would be approximated by this, and Mr. Holcomb said over 20 acres.

Mr. Badger said he wanted to ask Mr. Nettleton about the 5-year request.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Nettleton if the Board was capable of issuing a permit for 5 years.

Mr. Nettleton said he did not have the ordinance in front of him and did not believe that it set a limit. He thought it was subject to the same 10-year maximum.

Mr. Nettleton had seen board's issue 3-years, but did not think there was a particular restriction. It was the board's discretion.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Ward how long he had been on the board and if he had ever issued a permit for that long of a term. Mr. Ward said no, but he did not see a problem with it.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Nettleton, to confirm, that he was suggesting that they could do what they see fit. Mr. Nettleton said yes, and that he knew for a fact that the code did not allow more than 10 years.

Mr. Nettleton said starting January 1, [2023], VMRC would be issuing 5-year permits.

Mr. Byrd asked Mr. Nettleton if they, (VMRC), could only issue a 3-year permit on this JPA what would happen at the end of 3 years.

Mr. Nettleton said VMRC processed permit extension the same as they, (the Wetlands Board), does. He added that they, (the applicant), could request 5-years from VMRC and VMRC would probably grant it.

Mr. Nettleton said the concern with issuing an extension that long would be projects where the amount of compensation could change, but they were not in that situation. It was a case by case situation.

Mr. Taylor said this project was the poster child for living shorelines.

Mr. Holcomb said to his recollection the federal government was not paying county fees for the application.

Mr. Byrd said they were not in position to answer that question and asked if he would like that answered.

There was a short discussion on fees and Ms. Ridley informed the board that there was no requirement that the application and advertisement fees had to be paid before a JPA was brought before the board. However, the permit could not be issued until the fees were received.

Ms. Ridley said they would have to check with the County Attorney, Ms. Proctor.

On a motion made by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Badger, the Wetlands Board voted to issue a permit (valid for (5) years) with a long term monitoring program, for U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service VMRC# 2022- 2305, for the proposed creation of a marsh platform to restore salt marsh wetlands. The property is located on Chincoteague Island, VA 23336, tax map# (s) 46-A-2.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Randolph & Susan E. Lieberum - Extension Request– VMRC# 2020-1856

Installation of approximately 155 linear feet of quarry stone sills, 80 linear feet of quarry stone rip rap revetment, and 3000 square feet, (150 cubic yards), of beach nourishment material

Ms. Chontese Ridley appeared before the Wetlands Board and was sworn in by Chairman Byrd.

Ms. Ridley stated that Mrs. Lieberum asked for a second extension.

Ms. Lieberum, (via email), said the living shoreline was complete, but they had not been able to put the dock in.

Ms. Ridley said the second portion of the project had not been completed and that was what this extension was for.

Ms. Ridley added that the Lieberum's current permit was set to expire November 19, 2022. The extension was requested ahead of time, however, it was too late to get it on last month's agenda.

Ms. Ridley also said that Ms. Lieberum did mention that this would be their second extension. The first extension request was granted at the November 2021 meeting.

Mr. Byrd, asked to confirm, that the Lieberums' were asking for an extension 1-year from November 2022. That was correct.

Mr. Byrd said he had visited the site and confirmed that part of it had been completed. He said he knew this was coming and that there was no way they applicant would be able to get the work done without the permit expiring.

Mr. Byrd said he did not see anything wrong with this except seeing the precedent of an extension. He said they were not in the business of that, but that they, (the board), had done it many times.

On a motion made by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Getek, the Wetlands Board voted extend the permit for 1 year from the initial permit date, for Randolph & Susan E. Lieberum - Extension Request– VMRC# 2020-1856

7. NEXT MEETING

The next Wetlands Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. in the Accomack County Board Chambers, Room 104, in Accomac, VA.

8. ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Mr. Getek and seconded by Mr. Ward, the Wetlands Board voted to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

T. Lee Byrd, Chairman

Chontese Ridley, Environmental Permit Specialist