



Mathews County Wetland Board

Wednesday, August 6, 2025 at 7:00 PM

MINUTES

1. ROLL CALL

Board Members Present:

Chair Katy Walden
Vice Chair Richard Marshall
Member Melody Goodwin
Member Nicholas Koch
Alternate David Rowland

Board Members Absent:

Dan Desmond

Team Members Present:

Teresa Sanger
Mike Johnson - VMRC, Sherry Ashe

2. CALL TO ORDER

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.A. Approval of July 2, 2025 Wetlands Board Minutes

Approved

3.B. Approval of May 7, 2025 Wetlands Board Minutes

Approved

4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS

Katy Walden, Chairman, read Public Comment Guidelines

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

5.A. **Charles Ingram, 99 Stutts Creek, VMRC #25-1070, TM #16-4-1** - Request to install Class II riprap revetment 60'x3'x4.5' over filter cloth in front of an existing bulkhead with approximately 42 cubic ft. of fill dirt behind existing wall along a portion of Stutts Creek shoreline.

Katy Walden read the CBPA report, which stated: Request to install Class II riprap revetment 60'x3'x4.5' over filter cloth in front of an existing bulkhead with approximately 42 cubic feet of fill dirt behind the existing wall along a portion of Stutts Creek shoreline.

Richard Marshall: Pointed out an error on Page 17. However, said the board will proceed with the hearing provided the correct information/revisions are submitted.

Laura Morgan, R&W Marine Construction, Agent, addressed the Board in favor of the application and discussed the need for the project. We did consider a living shoreline on this project, but with the steepness and height, the grading would go to far back. The revetment was the best option.

Katy Walden: Does the board have any questions or questions about the revision? Did you understand she is extending the bulkhead from 60' to 65'? She's also going to cover a few feet of marsh grass. I have consulted with VMRC, and we have the option of not charging a mitigation fee, because this extension of the riprap can also be considered a kind of opportunity for vegetation, considered conversion. Even though we are going from 60' to 65' and taking some marsh grass, VMRC will not consider that a wasted impact. A lot of the time, it's considered a given that you can repair a deteriorating bulkhead, although I realize, in this day and age, everybody wants to say living shoreline automatically, in cases that you have plain and simple, short backyard and a lot of docks and piers. Even a garage on the edge of the water just would not make it feasible. The rationale being that this is the right answer; we have to vote on it.

Nicholas Koch: Do you know when the bulkhead was built?

Laura Morgan: I am not sure when it was built, but that it had been there for a long time.

Katy Walden: Is there anyone else to speak in favor of this application? Is there anyone opposed? Is there anyone either for or against this application? With no one else to speak on the application, the public comment period was closed. The Board discussed the application and made a motion.

Nicholas Koch: I feel we justified why a living shoreline will not work here. This is the best option.

Motion: On motion of Nicholas Koch, seconded by David Rowland, the Mathews County Wetlands Board voted 5-0-0 as follows: Nicholas Koch, David Rowland, Melody Goodwin, Katy Walden, Richard Marshall - aye, None - nay; to approve the application. The rationale being "A living shoreline will not work here, and this revetment is the best option."

- 5.B. **Terry K. Wilson, 192 Moon Haven Lane, VMRC #25-1076, TM #22-7-2** - Request to install two (2) 28' vinyl bulkheads and two (2) 3' vinyl wing walls in the same footprint of existing cement bulkhead, along a portion of Billups Creek shoreline.

Katy Walden read the CBPA report, which stated: Request to install two (2) 28' vinyl bulkheads and two (2) 3' vinyl wing walls in the same footprint of existing cement bulkhead, along a portion of Billups Creek shoreline. I would like to add that we have a revision to the two (2) 3' vinyl wing walls. Does the Board consider this application complete?

Richard Marshall: Once again on page 17, there is 0 sq ft of encroachment over non-vegetated wetlands. There is a drawing showing channelward - indicates 3' between uplands and MHW. Is that information correct?

Laura Morgan: R&W Marine Construction, Agent, I did submit a new revision tonight that I will send to VMRC when I get home this evening. One wing wall is longer than the other, one is 5.4' and one is 3' and I extended the one to the right side looking at the water to 5.4'. I guess the reason I put 0, we are going back in the same footprint, and we are taking the concrete out so the encroachment is the same as what's there. That was my rationale and I can correct that on page 17. I corrected the drawing with the correct feet on it, Mike Johnson and I spoke about his concerns he had about the height of the wall and allowing water to come up and how we were going to disturb that. So I did put that in my revisions that we are going to do it very delicately, dig up the top only about 4" where we have to put the rods in.

Katy Walden: Does that answer your question, Mr. Marshall?

Richard Marshall: Yes.

Katy Walden: Do we have any other questions from the Board?

David Rowland: I just have a comment on the Plan View drawing. I think it's important it's shown and to see the high watermark of the boat ramp.

Laura Morgan: Yes, on the first JPA I submitted, I did show that. I will make that change in the revision being sent in tonight.

Katy Walden: Any more questions?

With no one else to speak on the application, the public comment period was closed. The Board discussed the application and made a motion.

Katy Walden: Note the recent revisions correcting the Plan View lengths of the wing walls. I would like perhaps to say at this time, I don't know if it's appropriate. There's been a lot of back and forth and confusion about which papers are which, what, when. It's just by coincidence that this afternoon, Miss Morgan came into the office, and myself and Teresa in the Wetlands office had a nice conversation about maybe some ways there could be less confusion in her applications. I think going forward we'll see an improvement and more clarity, and I think that will be a good thing. Do we have any more discussion about this or are we ready to make a motion?

Richard Marshall: I move that it be accepted with the revisions that will be made and submitted. The rationale is it's a good project, and it needs to be done.

Motion: On motion of Richard Marshall, seconded by Melody Goodwin, the Mathews County Wetlands Board voted 5-0-0 as follows: Richard Marshall, Melody Goodwin, Nicholas Koch, Katy Walden, David Rowland - aye, none - nay; to approve the application. Rationale being "This is a good project, and it needs to be done. With revisions/corrections being sent in to VMRC."

- 6. NEW BUSINESS**
- 7. OLD BUSINESS**
- 8. VIOLATIONS**
- 9. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**
- 10. ADJOURNMENT**

Katy J. Walden, Chairman
Mathews County Wetlands Board

Teresa Sanger, Marine & Wetlands
Projects Coordinator