

**NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
WETLANDS BOARD**
Minutes
January 19, 2010

This was the regular meeting of the Northampton County Wetlands Board held on Wednesday, January 19, 2011 in the former Northampton Middle School located at 7247 Young Street in Machipongo, Va., for the purpose of conducting regular business.

Those members present were Chair Marshall Cox, Vice-Chair Bowdoin Lusk, Mark Gates, Dot Field, Nancy Wells Drury, John Chubb and Robert Meyers.

Also attending were Hank Badger with the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), Melissa Kellam, Zoning Administrator; and Katrina Hickman, Zoning Inspector.

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., a quorum established and those wishing to speak at today's meeting were sworn in.

It is noted for the record that Ms. Hickman, Zoning Inspector, had left the county office today at 9:00 a.m. with the Board to conduct scheduled field visits.

Public hearings:

The first hearing was called to order by the Chair.

A. **VMRC 2010-1946:** Bruce & Susan Jones have applied to replace a bulkhead approximately 260 feet long and to add a return wall. Removal of the existing groin as well as trees behind the bulkhead is planned and a rip rap toe scour approximately 30 feet long will then be installed. The property is located at 7019 Wild Flower Lane with frontage on Nassawadox Creek and is described as being Tax Map 14, double circle 1, Parcel B.

Ms. Kellam then presented her staff decision tree report as follows.

Re: VMRC 10-1946

As of the writing of this memorandum: (1) no VIMS report was available. When this report is received, it will be forwarded to immediately for your review; and (2) no adjacent property owners have commented on the proposed project.

Below you will find a decision tree completed by County staff. During your site visit on January 19, 2011, Katrina Hickman, Zoning Inspector, will have the file copy of the decision tree available if the Board wishes to revise the decision tree path based on their finding on-site.

DECISION TREE FOR UNDEFENDED SHORELINE AND THOSE WITH FAILED STRUCTURED

1. What type of bank erosion is present?

- Low → proceed to 1a.
- High and / or undercut → proceed to 2.

1a. Is the shoreline forested?

- Yes → ~~1a. (1). VEGETAION MANAGEMENT: FOREST STEWARDSHIP~~
- No → ~~1a. (2). VEGETAION MANAGEMENT OF MARSH AND / OR RIPARIAN AREA~~

2. Is the shoreline forested?

- Yes → proceed to 2a.
- No → proceed to 3.

2a. What is the bank height?

- 0 - 30 ft. - **2a (1). MANAGE THE FOREST TO PREVENT TREE FALL AND PROCEED TO 5.**
- Greater than 30 ft. - **2a. (2). - GRADE THE BANK AND USE GOOF UPLAND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TO PREVENT FURTHER EROSION AND PROCEDD TO 5.**

~~3. Does the structure or other improvement location prohibit grading?~~

- Yes → ~~3a. MOVE THE IMPROVEMENT, IF POSSIBLE; CONSULT WITH AN EXPERT~~
- No → Proceed to 4.

~~4. GRADE BANK AND VEGETATE AND → Proceed to 5.~~

5. Is there marsh present?

- Yes, 15 ft. wide → Proceed to 5a.
- Yes, or to 15 ft. wide → Proceed to 5b.
- No → Proceed to 6.

5a. How long is the fetch?

- Low (— mile) — ~~5a. (1). EXPAND THE MARSH, USE A FIBER LOG FOR TOE PROTECTION~~
- Moderate or High (or to mile) — ~~5a. (2). EXPAND THE MARSH, USE A SILL FOR MARSH TOE- PROTECTION~~

5b. How long is the fetch?

- Low (— mile) — ~~5b. (1). MANAGE RIPARIAN BUFFER AND MARSH VEGETATION TO PREVENT — FURTURE EROSION~~
- Moderate or High (or to mile) — ~~5b. (2). BUILD A ROCK SILL FOR TOE PROTECTION~~

6. Is there a beach?

Yes → 6a. **NOURISH THE BEACH WITH SAND; ADD SILL OR BREAKWATER WHERE NECESSARY**

No → Proceed to 7.

7. How long is the fetch?

Low (1 mile) → Proceed to 7a.

Moderate (between ½ mile and 2 miles) → Proceed to 7b.

High (> 2 mile) → Proceed to 7c.

7a. ~~What is the near shore water depth?~~

~~Shallow (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is 1 or 2 to 3 ft.) – 7a. (1). **CREATE A MARSH, PROTECT THE TOE WITH FIBER LOG**~~

~~Deep (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is > 3 ft.) – 7a. (2). **CONSTRUCT A REVETMENT, PLACE IT ONSHORE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE**~~

7b. What is the near shore water depth?

Shallow (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is 1 or 2 to 3 ft.) – 7b. (1). **CREATE A MARSH, PROTECT THE TOE WITH A SILL**

Deep (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is > 3 ft.) – 7b. (2). **CONSTRUCT A REVETMENT, PLACE IT ONSHORE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE**

7c. ~~CONSTRUCT A BREAKWATER AND ADD BEACH NOURISHMENT~~

The VIMS report received was provided to the Board as follows with recommendations read by Ms. Kellam for the record.

BRUCE D JONES

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Nassawadox Creek

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS AND PROPOSED ACTIONS:

A 260-ft bulkhead replacement with a 30-ft toe scour revetment are proposed at a shoreline located on Nassawadox Creek. This shoreline has an existing failing bulkhead and a small marsh area near the pier. The riparian area contains several trees. The upland is developed with residential use.

The proposed bulkhead is located 2 ft channelward from the existing alignment. The application estimates that 70 sq ft of vegetated wetlands will be impacted by the new bulkhead and 30-ft riprap toe. At least 290 sq ft of non-vegetated wetlands between the groin and pier will also be permanently lost if mean high water is on the existing bulkhead, as shown.

THE PREFERRED APPROACH FROM AN INTEGRATED MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL VIEWPOINT:

The preferred alternative for replacing a deteriorated bulkhead is replacement with a revetment aligned landward of the existing bulkhead. This option generally avoids wetland and shallow

water impacts. Although revetments may cover more square footage than bulkheads, they have less adverse effect on nearshore wave dynamics because they dissipate wave energy as opposed to bulkheads that reflect energy. Also, revetments are less environmentally intrusive, can trap sediment and support vegetation in certain settings and provide some habitat opportunities. Revetments are also less likely than bulkheads to be adversely affected by tree roots. The removal of several trees is proposed to prevent damage to the new bulkhead and to increase sunlight for marsh expansion into non-vegetated areas. However, the lack of wetland vegetation is likely due to a combination of excessive shading and water depth if the mean high water elevation is located on the existing bulkhead as shown.

If the new bulkhead is placed 2 feet channelward from the existing bulkhead as proposed, then there will be even less area for marsh expansion between the new bulkhead and the mid-tide level, regardless of increased sunlight from tree removal. Converting wetland type from nonvegetated to vegetated also does not provide new wetland area for compensation purposes. If the proposed bulkhead is permitted with permanent loss of wetland areas, then other considerations for wetland compensation should be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY:

VIMS Shoreline Permit Application Report # 10-1946

** Construct revetment instead of bulkhead replacement*

** Consider other compensation options*

It is noted for the record that Susie Jones was present for the hearing.

Ellen Grimes with Coastal Resource Management and agent for the applicants gave a brief summary of the project. She noted that some rather large holes have developed behind the bulkhead due to seepage and some trees along the upland will need to be removed. A small addition to the southeast will be constructed to the existing bulkhead and tied back to the upland with a return wall. It was her understanding that no objections have been filed concerning the project. She noted that Mr. Steve Bunce, the contractor, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Bunce stated his opinion that removing the bulkhead and installing a toe scour would be too lengthy a process and cost prohibitive given the access, existing topography and vegetation.

Given some concerns from the Board, Ms. Hickman noted that she would advise the applicant and agent before any trees are removed from the property if the project is approved.

The Chair called for public comments. There being none the public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

When asked, Ms. Grimes stated that "Shore Guard" is a brand name for vinyl or plastic corrugated sheathing. Mr. Gates expressed his concern that such sheathing may not be strong

enough. Ms. Grimes noted that there are various grades of sheathing and the one preferred for this project would be “mid-grade” often used in industrial type projects.

Mr. Chubb stated that the applicants should be able to protect their house and property and are basically replacing what is already there. However, he noted that some marsh grass is growing in the area and asked if there was any way to plant additional grass.

Ms. Field noted that the area may have a water depth too deep to actually accommodate additional plantings channelward.

Mr. Meyers voiced his support of the VIMS recommendation to install a rip rap project as a better solution instead of a hardened structure. He also stated his opinion that caution be used when operating excavating equipment whether a bobcat or regular excavator since they both have the potential to greatly damage the project area.

Concern was noted over how the project area would be accessed. Ms. Grimes stated that there is no access to the area next to the garage and shed.

Ms. Grimes stated her opinion that the increased encroachment of the new bulkhead is 2 feet channelward but if a rip rap toe scour was installed it would encroach even more and then there are problems with transferring so much rock to the location.

Mr. Lusk agreed with Ms. Grimes that impacts created by installing a replacement bulkhead would be less compared to installing an entire rip rap scour toe and removing the existing bulkhead.

Mr. Meyers was of the opinion that a rip rap scour toe would be preferable since the wave energy from the bulkhead is causing its own scouring effects. The rip rap would create more marsh for grasses to grow in lieu of the bulkhead project.

Mr. Chubb stated his opinion that the rip rap project would increase costs and create something that would not be protected.

Action

Motion was made by Mr. Lusk to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Chubb stated that staff should address all issues related to tree removal and the upland areas since it is outside the Board’s jurisdiction. He then seconded the motion. The motion carried with a 5 to 2 vote with Mr. Meyers and Ms. Drury opposed.

Mr. Badger stated that wetlands mitigation must be addressed as well by the applicants due to the loss of wetlands.

Mr. Meyers suggested that an area on Horse Island be used since it is in the same watershed area. Mr. Badger stated that one habitat cannot be exchanged for another.

Ms. Grimes noted that approximately 70 square feet of wetlands would be impacted and there is no place on the property to mitigate or establish a new habitat area. She suggested that the applicants pay a fee into the county's wetlands compensation fund. Mr. Badger noted that until a new habitat is found or the applicants pay into the county's fund the permit cannot be issued.

Ms. Grimes suggested that the applicants be given 30 days to either find an alternative habitat site or pay into the fund. Mr. Badger stated that to his knowledge there was no time restriction on finding an alternative site; however the permit cannot be issued until the matter is resolved.

The second hearing was then called to order.

B. VMRC 2010-1947: Sugar Run, LLC, has applied to construct a bulkhead approximately 150 feet long with two return walls to afford protection from bank erosion. The property, located at 20031 Oakland Farm Lane, has frontage on Eyrehall Creek and is described as being Tax Map 76-4-B.

Ms. Kellam then presented her decision tree report as follows.

As of the writing of this memorandum: (1) no VIMS report was available. When this report is received, it will be forwarded to immediately for your review; and (2) no adjacent property owners have commented on the proposed project.

Below you will find a decision tree completed by County staff. During your site visit on January 19, 2011, Katrina Hickman, Zoning Inspector, will have the file copy of the decision tree available if the Board wishes to revise the decision tree path based on their finding on-site.

DECISION TREE FOR UNDEFENDED SHORELINE AND THOSE WITH FAILED STRUCTURED

4. What type of bank erosion is present?

- Low → proceed to 1a.
- High and / or undercut → proceed to 2.

1a. Is the shoreline forested?

- Yes → ~~1a. (1). VEGETAION MANAGEMENT: FOREST STEWARDSHIP~~
- No → ~~1a. (2). VEGETAION MANAGEMENT OF MARSH AND / OR RIPARIAN AREA~~

5. Is the shoreline forested?

- Yes → proceed to 2a.
- No → proceed to 3.

2a. What is the bank height?

0 - 30 ft. - **2a (1). MANAGE THE FOREST TO PREVENT TREE FALL AND PROCEED TO 5.**

Greater than 30 ft. - **2a. (2). - GRADE THE BANK AND USE GOOF UPLAND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TO PREVENT FURTHER EROSION AND PROCEED TO 5.**

6. ~~Does the structure or other improvement location prohibit grading?~~

Yes ~~→ 3a. MOVE THE IMPROVEMENT, IF POSSIBLE; CONSULT WITH AN EXPERT~~

No ~~→ Proceed to 4.~~

4. ~~GRADE BANK AND VEGETATE AND~~ → Proceed to 5.

5. Is there marsh present?

Yes, 15 ft. wide → Proceed to 5a.

Yes, or to 15 ft. wide → Proceed to 5b.

No → Proceed to 6.

5a. How long is the fetch?

Low (mile) - **5a. (1). EXPAND THE MARSH, USE A FIBER LOG FOR TOE PROTECTION**

Moderate or High (or to mile) - **5a. (2). EXPAND THE MARSH, USE A SILL FOR MARSH TOE PROTECTION**

5b. ~~How long is the fetch?~~

Low (mile) ~~→ 5b. (1). MANAGE RIPARIAN BUFFER AND MARSH VEGETATION TO PREVENT FUTURE EROSION~~

Moderate or High (or to mile) ~~→ 5b. (2). BUILD A ROCK SILL FOR TOE PROTECTION~~

6. ~~Is there a beach?~~

Yes ~~→ 6a. NOURISH THE BEACH WITH SAND; ADD SILL OR BREAKWATER WHERE NECESSARY~~

No ~~→ Proceed to 7.~~

7. ~~How long is the fetch?~~

Low (mile) ~~→ Proceed to 7a.~~

Moderate (between ½ mile and 2 miles) ~~→ Proceed to 7b.~~

High (2 mile) ~~→ Proceed to 7c.~~

7a. ~~What is the near shore water depth?~~

Shallow (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is or to 3 ft.) ~~→ 7a. (1). CREATE A MARSH, PROTECT THE TOE WITH FIBER LOG~~

Deep (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is 3 ft.) ~~→ 7a. (2). CONSTRUCT A REVETMENT, PLACE IT ONSHORE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE~~

7b. ~~What is the near shore water depth?~~

~~☐ Shallow (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is or to 3 ft.) — 7b. (1). CREATE A MARSH, PROTECT THE TOE WITH A SILL~~

~~☐ Deep (at 30 ft. channel ward for MLW, water depth is 3 ft.) — 7b. (2). CONSTRUCT A REVETMENT, PLACE IT ONSHORE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE~~

~~7c. CONSTRUCT A BREAKWATER AND ADD BEACH NOURISHMENT~~

The VIMS report was provided to the Board as follows and recommendations were read by Ms. Kellam for the record.

VIMS Shoreline Permit Application Report # 10-1947

SUGAR RUN, LLC

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Eyrehall Creek

1/13/11

Center for Coastal Resources Management

P.O. Box 1346

Gloucester Point, VA 23062-1346

(804)684-7792, fax: (804)684-7179, <http://wetlands@vims.edu> ccrm.vims.edu/

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS AND PROPOSED ACTIONS:

A 120-ft bulkhead is proposed at a shoreline located on Eyrehall Creek. This shoreline contains a wide, fringing tidal marsh. The riparian buffer is forested. There is an historic barn located less than 50 feet from the top of bank that is being restored. The upland has agriculture and residential uses.

The bulkhead location is 0-2 ft channelward from the bank at the landward edge of the tidal marsh. This will sever the vegetation, wildlife and tidal inundation connections between the wetland and upland where the bulkhead is located.

THE PREFERRED APPROACH FROM AN INTEGRATED MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL VIEWPOINT:

Bank grading and vegetative stabilization are the preferred approach for reducing erosion at this low-energy location. Revetments are typically preferred instead of bulkheads where structures are considered necessary. The proposed bulkhead is reasonable only if the historic barn cannot be relocated further away from the shoreline as part of its restoration, and if the bank slope must be raised and retained as shown to improve structural integrity for the barn. The bulkhead should be located as close to the bank as possible or entirely in the upland area. If construction access will require work in the tidal marsh, then measures should be taken to prevent permanent damage to marsh vegetation as proposed. This should include staging all materials and equipment in the upland area. Unavoidable or unforeseen construction impacts in the wetland should be restored as needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY:

- * Consider revetment instead of bulkhead
- * If bulkhead permitted, locate in upland area

- * Minimize construction impacts in tidal marsh*
- * Restore construction impacts as needed*

Ms. Grimes, agent for the applicants, stated that no objections had been received from adjacent property owners including Mary Peacock who lives across the creek. She then gave a brief summary of the project and noted that the existing historic barn located on the property is being restored. Unfortunately, one corner of the barn is located approximately 5 feet from the top of the bank. The owners would like to extend the buffer, slope and vegetate the area. She noted that the applicants will need an approved water quality impact assessment (WQIA) from the county to mitigate the buffer area and added that some dead trees had already been removed from the shoreline area. She noted that there is an escarpment at the bottom behind the marsh grass; therefore, she recommended that a taller wall be installed tucked up to the bank to allow a more gradual impervious slope to the barn area. It was her understanding that there are plans to install gutters on the barn to direct stormwater runoff away from the shoreline. The retaining wall is for landscaping purposes and to add some protection to the existing upland structure. It was her opinion that the marsh area would not be impacted during construction, but if limited access was needed then mats would be used to preserve the grasses.

Mr. Chubb asked what the distance would be from the barn to the bulkhead. Ms. Grimes replied approximately 20 feet.

Discussion followed concerning the stormwater runoff created by the barn's large roof area and its impact to the buffer area. Ms. Hickman noted that french drains are generally recommended for such large structures to direct stormwater underground. Ms. Grimes added that she could not actually speak for the owners but was told that the barn would have new gutters installed.

Mr. Lusk questioned the design of the barn's roofline as not being original but augmented. Mr. Carroll Jones, an adjacent property owner, was present and stated that his grandfather had built the barn to have a long sloping roofline. To the best of his knowledge it was his opinion that the new owner had replaced old metal with new and had remained true to the original design and aesthetics.

Ms. Hickman was asked if the barn renovations had been approved and permitted. She thought that they had been but could not readily verify. Mr. Meyers added that until documentation is provided the barn should not be considered a true "historic" structure.

The Chair called for public comments.

Mr. Carroll Jones stated that he had no objections to the bulkhead being proposed but he was concerned about the amount of vegetation that has been removed near the shoreline. He stated that runoff was not a problem until the former vegetation was stripped from the upland. To his knowledge, there was never a problem with stormwater runoff on that property in the

past since his family had owned the property for decades. It was his opinion that the vegetation should be re-established in order to restore the area and prevent future runoff.

Ms. Hickman stated that she has no documentation of what was removed, when it was removed and by whom, nor who owned the property at the time. She did state that a lot of ivy had been removed. She added that the new owner would be encouraged to replant and he has stated that he did not do all of the removal.

Mr. Meyers asked if it has been determined that the bulkhead is within the jurisdiction of the Board. It was Ms. Kellam's opinion that it was within the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Meyers then suggested that the bulkhead could be moved another foot or two landward beyond the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Jones stated that a few years ago the vegetation was stripped, stockpiled and burned. He stated that he could provide photos to document this. He added that after the new owners purchased the property vegetation was stripped. Before that time the buffer area was intact with plenty of established vegetation.

There being no other remarks the public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

Motion was made by Mr. Meyers that the bulkhead be moved farther landward beyond the Board's jurisdiction. Ms. Field stated her opposition since there is no existing bulkhead and such a structure would harm the marshland. It was her opinion that no such structure is needed at this time. Mr. Lusk voiced his concern over the source of erosion. Mr. Chubb asked if the structure was moved landward by 2 feet what other approvals would be needed. Ms. Kellam stated that a WQIA and mitigation plan would be required along with a best management practice (BMP) for stormwater runoff measures. There was no second to Mr. Meyers's motion.

Action:

Motion was then made by Mr. Meyers that the application be denied as presented. Second was made by Mr. Gates and carried unanimously with a 7 to 0 vote.

Motion was made by Mr. Meyers that the Board suggests that the project be moved landward beyond the Board's jurisdiction and outside the tidal range and that the area be re-vegetated to prevent sediment from being washed down the bank along with a plan of development (POD) with a WQIA that includes a mitigation plan and BMP. Ms. Kellam added that any project over 2,500 square feet in area would require a POD. As a point of order, Mr. Badger stated that the Board may be making a motion that pertains to an area beyond its jurisdiction. Mr. Meyers then withdrew his motion without prejudice.

The Chair called for a 5 minute recess at this time.

Old Business

The Board then discussed the status of the Raccoon Island/Holly Bluff violation. Ms. Hickman reported that a letter issuing a response deadline of January 18th had been sent to Ms. Hehl. She did receive a phone call from Ms. Hehl who informed staff that she was looking for a consultant or agent to help with this violation matter. Ms. Kellam noted that one agent, Ben Mears, had decided very recently to decline the offer from Ms. Hehl. She noted that two opportunities are usually given to the landowner. This is the first deadline she has missed and will be given one other opportunity. If the second deadline is not met then staff will file with the court. Ms. Kellam added that a second letter will be sent by certified return-receipt mail along with an electronic copy forwarded by e-mail and a fax as well. She assured the Board that all letters, phone calls, communications and steps taken are thoroughly documented by staff in the official file.

The Chair asked if the Board should recommend the next deadline.

During discussion Mr. Badger and Ms. Hickman noted that the violation is beyond the jurisdiction of the Army Corp of Engineer.

Ms. Kellam noted that the landowner is under a stop work order at the present time. Mr. Badger stated that he would communicate with Tony Watkinson, Chief of Habitat at VMRC, to ensure that the area is being properly monitored by air and sea.

The Chair then asked if the Board's Chair and Vice-Chair have the authority to issue stop work orders when discovered. It was Ms. Kellam's opinion that the Board does have such authority and staff should be immediately notified with supporting documentation provided.

Ms. Kellam noted that if the landowner does not respond to the second notice then staff would follow standard procedures to file with the court. At that point, documentation will be provided, witnesses called and the court would make its determination.

Ms. Hickman stated that the second letter would state that an after-the-fact joint permit application must be filed by a certain date in order for the Board to consider the matter at a regular monthly hearing or a civil complaint will be filed with county's magistrate's office.

Motion was made by Mr. Meyers that staff send a second notice to the property owner with a stated deadline of March 21 to submit the required after-the-fact joint permit application in order for the matter to be heard at the regular Board meeting scheduled April 20, 2011. Second was made by Mr. Lusk and carried unanimously 7 to 0.

The Board then discussed the existing Wetlands Board By-Laws as revised on October 20, 2010. Motion to approve with highlighted additions was made by Mr. Meyers and seconded by Ms. Drury. The motion carried unanimously with a 7 to 0 vote. The Board asked that the by-laws as adopted be e-mailed by staff and hard copies provided to each member.

New Business

Ms. Kellam reported that one new application has been filed for the February meeting.

Ms. Hickman had nothing new to report as Zoning Inspector.

Statements from the Public: None.

Consideration of Minutes

The minutes of December 15, 2010 were unanimously approved with the following corrections: a typographical error was noted on page 3 in the fourth line; and on page 9 in the middle of the last paragraph another typographical error was noted. Motion to approve as corrected was made by Mr. Meyers and seconded by Ms. Field.

Prior to adjourning Mr. Gates informed the Board that he and Mr. Chubb had attended a workshop at VIMS on November 4, 2010 which proved to be very helpful with background, new tools and living shoreline information.

Mr. Badger stated that new legislation has been adopted concerning fast tracking living shoreline joint permit applications.

Mr. Meyers stated that the small stipend paid to Board members does not actually cover expenses when members attend workshops and other related events. Many Board members attend such activities without any compensation or direction from the Board of Supervisors but on their own volition to stay informed.

The Board then briefly discussed the decision tree tool currently used by staff as directed by the Board. Mr. Meyers suggested that this tool should be refined by the people who put it together. It was his opinion that conclusions drawn by staff and VIMS should be compatible which was not the case today. Mr. Badger added that many localities are not taking the VIMS reports seriously now since VIMS staff no longer conducts field inspections to individual properties. Ms. Kellam suggested that the Board direct applicants to complete the decision tree as well before filing a joint permit application. Ms. Hickman stated that Karen Duhring has informed her that VIMS may not be doing desktop reviews in the future. Mr. Meyers stated that contractors and agents should be notified by staff that the decision tree tool will be required as part of the application process in the future.

Ms. Field noted that she would be unable to attend the regular February meeting.

Adjournment

There being no other business the meeting was adjourned.

Chairman

Secretary