

# CITIZENS FOR A BETTER EASTERN SHORE SHORELINE™

*A Journal of Natural Resources, Public Affairs and  
Culture on the Eastern Shore of Virginia*

Volume 30

November 2017

Number 11

## Up the Creek(s) Becoming a Balancing Act

By Arthur Upshur

It is familiar to anyone who spends time on the water. Entering a bayside creek, you are met with a blizzard of white PVC pipes marking an oyster or clam bed. Where the channel runs is now a maze of pipes. In some creeks, channels often skirt close to the shore. Does the line of PVC mark that channel or the edge of an aquaculture bed? Add a storm or two, a high tide, and sometimes half the markers are missing or underwater. It is frustrating. At the same time, talk to watermen and you will hear stories of losing entire beds of clams because some careless boater ran across their nets.

Increasingly, we are setting up a conflict between recreational boaters and those who need that bottom for successful aquaculture operations. In other areas, like Virginia Beach and the Lynnhaven Inlet, this has become a political battlefield – land-owners versus watermen, recreational boaters versus watermen, tourism versus aquaculture. While we are fortunate that the Shore still has more open space than most areas, our two counties depend on both types of growth. Increased tourism brings its subsequent boat traffic and water use, and successful aquaculture businesses need planting grounds. When will this conflict become a problem for both economic drivers and threaten one or the other’s growth? Are there actions we could take now that would help manage this process before it becomes even more contentious?

Waterfront land in Virginia, and

more specifically in Accomack and Northampton, is generally privately held. That ownership right extends to the mean low water – or the shoreline on an “average” low tide. Beyond that point, the ground is owned by the state and is managed and regulated by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC). The long-standing policy of Virginia is to ensure productivity of this resource, so preference is given to working watermen who use the bottom for shellfish production. The water column itself has no assigned property rights but is owned “in common” by all of us. It is similar to the air we breathe or the airspace above private property. This is the heart of the conflict – the water is owned by all of us and can be used recreationally by all of us. But the bottom is rented by watermen for shellfish production. Obviously, boat or foot traffic is not compatible with the relatively fragile nets that protect clam beds or the cages or floats used in oyster production. Watermen protect their investment by marking their beds, most using PVC piping due to its low cost and durability. Oyster farmers also mark underwater hazards such as oyster cages to warn off boaters.

There are two main factors that stand in the way of better managing this conflict. First, the rental rates on state bottom are not based on anything but history: the current rate is \$1.50/acre, set in the early 1960s. It is set by statute rather than by any market mechanism and has not been adjusted for inflation nor for the value created

by the growing aquaculture industry. It is clearly a low rental for prime, productive bottom. Having such a low rate removes market mechanisms that could help manage this conflict of use. Many clam and oyster rentals are far larger than what is used in production; while some of that can be attributed to a desire to “rotate” bottom by placing production on new ground, most simply reflect the low cost. There is no incentive not to rent larger parcels, to maximize flexibility for the waterman on where best to site beds. So far, discussions of how the rental rate should change have gone nowhere. Watermen are even more independent folks than most. Rent payments are a tax on their businesses, albeit a relatively small one, so there is enormous resistance to changing this policy. Last year, a proposal to raise the rate to \$5000 per acre died in the legislative process. That rate was not really serious; it was intended to limit shellfish production

*See Up the Creek(s), cont’d on p. 3*

Up the Creek(s) Becoming a Balancing Act .....	1
Letter to Our Membership .....	2
Northampton Comprehensive Plan Review .....	4
Cause and Effect .....	5
The Eastern Shore Broadband Authority, Part I .....	6
Open For Business: Periwinkles ...	7
Changes in CAFO Permits? .....	7
Community Calendar .....	8

# Letter to Our Membership

By Arthur Upshur, CBES President

Dear CBES members,

We are entering my favorite time of the year. Fall. My perspective is heavily influenced by the fact that I farm for my living. The days are shorter, our chickens are laying fewer eggs, and we are harvesting kale and turnips again. The cooler weather is a sure sign that the next season is just around the corner. It is time to reflect on the year, what went right and what went wrong, and how we are going to change going forward.

At the risk of taking the analogy of my own lifestyle too far, I think participating in CBES is a lot like farming. We labor hard through the year planting the “seeds” of ideas so our community can start thinking of solutions and plans to move forward. We try to understand how we can support making the Eastern Shore a “better” place.

What might go wrong in our community? What is going well? The list of our challenges runs the gamut from social inequity in education, income and economic opportunity, to short-sighted politics, to the environmental

challenges faced by our fragile peninsula. There are a lot of weeds coming up among those seeds.

It is increasingly common for discussions between those who disagree to be angry, unproductive, and accusatory, but we have real problems to solve and we need to find ways to do that together. Improving our schools takes a community effort. Attracting talented teachers, providing community support and funding, and finding enlightened and talented administrators are complicated and difficult tasks.

Understanding the issues raised by expanding chicken farming, then formulating public policy responses, is surprisingly difficult. Between local farmers, who feel attacked in discussions of their methods of farming, to the potent public relations efforts of large agri-business corporations, it is hard to figure out how best to proceed. Given what is at risk, we have to have meaningful discussions. That is hard. It takes resources. It takes community involvement. And it takes CBES to help make those discussions happen.

This is my plea today to you. CBES needs your support. First, we always need members; our membership is the source of our influence on the Eastern Shore. The more of our community we reach and involve, the more likely we are to have a “better” Eastern Shore for all. You make that happen by being a member and by helping us connect with your friends and family who could (and should) be members of CBES. So please keep your membership current and help us expand in any way you can.

The main purpose of this letter, though, is to ask you to help provide the additional resources to fund CBES work over the coming year. Even though most of our activities are staffed by volunteers, it takes resources

to coordinate their efforts, maintain communication channels, and generally keep our organization viable.

Donna Bozza, our Director, works many hours trying to coordinate CBES varied activities around the Shore. Unlike many organizations, we operate on a shoestring. No national organization backs us up. We are completely locally funded. Our modest endowment and local grants provide only a small portion of our annual budget. Our biggest fundraising activity is the annual Between the Waters Bike Tour, which also brings much-needed tourism dollars to other parts of the Shore economy.

Your tax-deductible donations at the end of the year provide the bulk of the rest of the support for this organization. Would you consider investing in CBES again this year? Please include us as generously as you can. We know there are many demands on your resources – good causes abound – but I believe that CBES work is vitally important in order to protect and support this special place we call home.

Thank you.

Arthur Upshur, President

*SHORELINE* is published monthly by Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore and is distributed to members, public officials, and friends. All material herein is copyrighted © 2017 by Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore.

#### **Editorial Board**

Donna Bozza      Eleanor Gordon  
Gene Hampton      Sue Mastyl  
Mary Miller      John T. Ordeman  
Arthur Upshur

#### **Editorial Advisor Emeritus**

F. Victor Schmidt

#### **Staff Photographer**

Cecil Watts

#### **Editor/Design**

Sarah Morgan, *Savoy Studio*

#### **How to reach CBES**

P.O. Box 882, Eastville, VA 23347  
(757) 678-7157  
info@cbes.org • www.cbes.org

Printed on Sustainably  
Produced Paper



## Ways to Help CBES Help Our Community

Encourage friends and neighbors to join you in being members. Volunteer at CBES events such as Community Unity Day, the Bike Tour and Oyster Roast, Candidate Forums, and Team CBES trash pick-up days. Attend public meetings and contribute photos, notes and/or articles to *ShoreLine*. Attend the Annual Meeting. Oh, and don't forget to donate at cbes.org. Thank you!

## Up the Creek(s), *cont'd from p. 1*

near residential areas such as Virginia Beach. But a higher rate is appropriate. There are leases today being sold by users to other users for over \$300/acre. A modest rental increase to \$10/acre by the state, for example, could be a starting point, with the ability of VMRC to adjust rates in the future. In any case, until that rental rate is closer to an appropriate market rate, it is hard to know how much bottom is required for aquaculture and how much can be “reserved” as open space for other recreational use. Nor is it easy for VMRC to differentiate between bottom that is in high recreational demand – such as the channel in Mattawoman Creek – versus more valuable shellfish land where the bottom is more solid and the water depth makes working the beds more practical. Logically, using rental rates to manage this may be a simpler way to allow watermen to make decisions that could reduce conflict with adjacent landowners and other recreational water users.

The second challenge in making progress on this discussion is VMRC itself. Unfortunately, the portion of VMRC that manages this resource is chronically understaffed and underfunded. Better resource management by VMRC, using increased staffing and expertise funded by market-driven rental rates, would create the rationale for those rates as well as the research to implement a more complex program. Even today, the rules that allow VMRC to ensure that rentals are actually used for production and that signage meets certain standards are largely meaningless and unenforceable due to chronically low staffing. The goal is not to create a burdensome regulatory environment that would threaten the aquaculture industry, but rather a middle ground, where VMRC has enough funding to better manage this resource for the state, plus an expanded VMRC mission to better serve all users, both aquaculture and recreational.

This highlights a third issue: these are local concerns and local conflicts, but the tools to manage these areas are all governed by the state. Any change on the Shore will require legislative action in Richmond. Both tourism and the aquaculture industry are important enough in our area

### Forum: We Can Improve Students' Success in Schools

Eastern Shore Community College

Tuesday, November 14

6:00 – 8:30 p.m.


Attend this community forum to discuss issues that impede students' graduation rates and overall success – how parents, the community, and schools can work together to reduce suspensions, expulsions, and other punishments that harm students.

For more information, please contact Meghan at 847-922-1213 or [Meghan@virginiaorganizing.org](mailto:Meghan@virginiaorganizing.org).

to warrant some effort, but it will take significant pressure on our representatives to effect these changes.

Finally, it is time to begin the debate regarding whether this issue could be better managed locally rather than keeping all these decisions at the state level. For example, the increase in shellfish lease rates could go locally to counties where leases are based. It does seem more like a local property tax and could be appropriate to help provide area services such as schools, etc. for waterfront communities. It would also give those local communities a real stake in the discussion of lease rates. It would be logical, for example, to have lower rates in Northampton County, where the aquaculture industry is an important driver of the economy and has more space available, than in Virginia Beach, where bottom use is so valuable recreationally. Again, this would require new state legislation.

Given the regional nature of the issue, it will be a challenging legislative initiative to shepherd through the system. Strong aquaculture representation will be critical to enable legislation that balances these interests against the larger urban voter groups promoting recreational water use. But that difficulty does not mean it is not an important effort to initiate now. For legislators to agree, people who benefit from the use of commonly held waterways need to help push the issue forward.

**Ed. Note:** *The tension between aquaculture interests and waterfront property owners is similarly palpable. To view leases on a creek near you, go to [webapps.mrc.virginia.gov/public/maps/chesapeakebay\\_map.php](http://webapps.mrc.virginia.gov/public/maps/chesapeakebay_map.php).* 

## A Good Neighbor?



*Although proponents of growing the chicken industry on the Shore tout its economic benefits, there are also environmental costs. From a list of Tyson Food's Temperanceville plant's Surface Water Quality Violations between March and September of 2016: Ammonia (concentration maximum), 1200 % of permitted amount; Fecal coliform (concentration average), 145% of permitted amount; E. coli (concentration average), 1920% of permitted amount.*

# Northampton County Comprehensive Plan Review

Submitted by Andrew Follmer

*Andrew Follmer, B.A., M.S., retired from The World Bank in 2013 after a 19-year career in international development. During the last three years of his career, he taught courses for other senior development professionals on a range of topics, including the crafting of economic development plans. He currently owns two retail stores in Cape Charles, is an investor in other businesses in the County, served as President of the Cape Charles Business Association from October 2014 until May 2017, and is a member of the Board of Directors of CBES.*

The following article lists examples of the Northampton County Planning Commission’s use of inconsistent, obsolete, and/or distorted data, both quantitative and qualitative, to provide an inaccurate assessment of the County’s current conditions in order to justify proposed significant changes to the Comprehensive Plan. Despite the lack of qualified professional planning expertise among Commission members, they chose not to include a certified planner<sup>1</sup> in the process.

**1. Key Poverty Data and the claim of a 33% increase in poverty are incorrectly credited to the U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) and American Community Survey (ACS).**

- **The Planning Commission (PC) claims the Census Bureau poverty figure is up to 75% greater than what is provided in the cited source documents and uses this figure to claim a 33% rise in poverty since 2009.**
- The draft claims a 2014 poverty rate of 24%, exceeding even the document’s own figures provided in the Data & Analysis section.
- Figure 2.5 in Data & Analysis incorrectly cites the U.S. Census Bureau’s SAIPE as the source for its claimed 2015 poverty rate of 20.5% for the County. The Census Bureau’s actual 2015 SAIPE estimates put our poverty rate at 13.7%.<sup>2</sup>
- The SAIPE also reports that poverty has been flat. Poverty did worsen to 14.7% in 2012 but has recovered to 2009’s level (13.6%).
- Figure 2.5 also cites an alternative poverty figure of 23% for the County’s poverty rate, which

it correctly cites as coming from the Census Bureau’s ACS 5-Year Estimates, using a different methodology. The comparable figure for 2009 was 18.8%,<sup>3</sup> which would indicate an increase of 22%.

- The census bureau provides the following guidance on whether the SAIPE or the ACS figures should be used in our case: “For counties and school districts, particularly those with populations below 65,000, the SAIPE program provides the most accurate subnational estimates of poverty. For counties, SAIPE generally provides the best single-year estimates of median household income.”<sup>4</sup>
- **The PC claims a Census Bureau median income figure of nearly 1/3 less than the actual number.**
- Figure 2.5 cites the SAIPE as the source for its claimed 2015 Northampton County median income of \$37,515. The Census Bureau’s actual 2015 SAIPE estimates put median income at \$52,075, up more than 10% from \$47,143 in 2012.<sup>5</sup>
- Figure 2.5 also cites an alternative figure for median income from the Census Bureau’s ACS, but without indicating whether the figures have been adjusted for inflation or the Census Bureau’s recommendation to rely on the SAIPE data for this figure.

**2. Northampton’s unemployment rate is down 40% from 2012, largely ignored by the draft:**

- **The unemployment decrease from 9.2% in 2012 to 5.5% in April 2017 does not support the PC’s pessimistic assertions.**
- The draft draws employment figures from the Virginia Employment Commission’s (VEC) Community Profile, which provides the following employment figures:

	Northampton County	Virginia
2012	9.2%	
2014	7.4%	5.2%
2016	5.7%	
September, 2017	5.2%	3.8%

<sup>1</sup> ShoreLine Oct. 2017, *The “New” Northampton Comprehensive Plan*, by Mary Miller.

<sup>2</sup> The US Census Bureau SAIPE’s 2015 dataset and information on how to read it:  
[www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/saiepe/datasets/2015/2015-state-and-county/est15-va.txt](http://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/saiepe/datasets/2015/2015-state-and-county/est15-va.txt)  
[www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/saiepe/technical-documentation/file-layouts/state-county/2015-estimate-layout.txt](http://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/saiepe/technical-documentation/file-layouts/state-county/2015-estimate-layout.txt)

<sup>3</sup> [factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/product-view.xhtml?pid=ACS\\_09\\_5YR\\_B17001&prodType=table](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/product-view.xhtml?pid=ACS_09_5YR_B17001&prodType=table)

<sup>4</sup> [www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/guidance/surveys-programs.html](http://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/guidance/surveys-programs.html)

<sup>5</sup> [factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/product-view.xhtml?pid=ACS\\_09\\_5YR\\_B17001&prodType=table](http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/product-view.xhtml?pid=ACS_09_5YR_B17001&prodType=table)

**3. Tourism Growth Disregarded by the Planning**

**Commission:** The Shore is the fastest-growing tourism market in all of Virginia, yet the draft treats tourism as relatively insignificant.

- The PC attempts to partially refute data provided by qualified professionals at the Virginia Tourism Commission (VTC) charting the County's tourism growth. Section 3.5.2 of Part II of the draft provides an unqualified critique of VTC's methodology for compiling data that does not support the PC's pessimistic conclusions.
- The PC ignores impressive growth in the tourism sector. The County's 2018 budget predicts an estimated 18.5% increase in Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenues in just one year, from 2017 to 2018. This would mark a 25.5% increase over 2014, and a 41.6% increase from 2012. TOT is arguably the single best indicator of growth in the sector. To fully measure tourism's economic contribution, retail sales tax, meals tax, and others would need to be included in the analysis, particularly given the large proportion of "day-trippers" from Hampton Roads. However, while it captures only a portion of tourists' total contribution to our economy, the TOT is a robust measure for charting growth in the sector over time.


**4. Current and Relevant Public Input Not Permitted:**

- As previously reported, public input was not permitted in the September 13 Stakeholder Review, the only public meeting on the Review since 2012.
- Virginia Code requires Reviews be done every five years, clearly indicating that the validity of such reviews and their underlying data is considered expired after five years. Reasons for this are obvious, as demonstrated by the following:
  - In 2012, the County was suffering the impacts of the worst recession since the 1930s.
  - 2012-2014 marked a low point in most of the demographic and economic indicators referenced in the draft, whereas the past few years have brought economic recovery.
  - Significant anecdotal evidence suggests current public input would reflect both the recovery and increased optimism about the County's future.

**5. Planning Commission Prediction of Population Decline disproven:**

- According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of the County increased by 75 people between 2014 and 2015 and stayed the same in 2016. In other words, in one year, we regained a quarter of the residents lost during the hardship years between 2010 and 2014. Given the positive picture painted by the above economic indicators and the investment evident throughout the County,


qualified professionals would acknowledge positive signs for continued population growth.

**Ed. Note:** *These data point to the need for a thorough revisiting of the current draft Northampton Comprehensive Plan, and are examples of what has led to the strong objections that some Northampton stakeholders have to the Plan – its inconsistencies, pessimistic slant, the omission of some of the stronger segments of the economy such as entrepreneurship and self-employment, and the need for professional assistance. As one member of the current Planning Commission was reported as saying, if it were up to him, he would "throw it [the current draft] out and hire a professional."* 

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

## Draft Regional Economic Development Plan Available for Review and Comment

The Accomack-Northampton Economic Development Committee (EDC) has published a draft of the Eastern Shore of Virginia Regional Economic Development Plan and invites the public to review and comment on the document. This plan merges the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (in place since 2002) and the Stronger Economies Together Economic Development Plan (in place since 2016) into one comprehensive document.

The public is invited and encouraged to review and provide feedback on the draft plan. Review the draft plan online at [www.a-npdc.org/EDplan](http://www.a-npdc.org/EDplan) and provide written comments to Curt Smith, A-NPDC Director of Planning, via email: [csmith@a-npdc.org](mailto:csmith@a-npdc.org) or mail 23372 Front Street, Accomac, VA 23301 Attn: Curt Smith. Questions? Phone Smith at 757-787-2936 x114. There is also a hard copy of the draft plan available for review at six locations throughout the Shore. Directions and opening times are available online. All comments must be submitted no later than 5 PM on Wednesday, November 15. 

### Thanksgiving Weekend

The annual Eastern Shore Artisans Guild Holiday Tour will take place on November 28 and 29. Thirty studios and other venues up and down the Shore will be open. One location, By the Bay Alpacas in Pungoteague, will be featured in the December *ShoreLine's* "Open for Business" column.

More information on the tour is available at [www.esvaartistsguild.org/studio-tour](http://www.esvaartistsguild.org/studio-tour)

# The Eastern Shore of Virginia Broadband Authority, Part I

Submitted by Pat Coady, former Executive Director of the ESVBA

The Eastern Shore of Virginia Broadband Authority (ESVBA) was formed in 2008. Construction began in 2009 and ESVBA started providing service in late 2010. By October 2011, ESVBA was cash flow-positive and by the end of 2012, it was able to self-fund its capital expenditures. Since 2012, ESVBA has repaid the citizens of the Eastern Shore all the local funds advanced to start ESVBA. The Authority has made four substantial price reductions to its initial service rates. Even though existing customers are generally under long-term contracts, the ESVBA grants customers the option of receiving the price reduction immediately by renewing their contracts or offers them increased bandwidth to match their current expenditure for services.

## History

Officials on the Shore spent several unsuccessful years in the early 2000s talking with and encouraging existing communication utilities to improve internet and broadband access on the Shore. In 2008, Accomack and Northampton Counties took advantage of the Commonwealth law known as the “Wireless Service Authorities Act” to form the ESVBA. That moment of cooperation between two counties that seem to operate often at cross-purposes has proven to be a fine example of regional cooperation and success.

In total, the Shore and ESVBA received approximately \$11 million via seven grants. These grants included two special appropriations via the U.S. Senate, administered by NASA, and a joint grant from the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA) with matching funds from a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) of the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development. In addition, four incorporated towns also received CDBG funds, and a final CDBG award went to Northampton County.

The initial grant via the U.S. Senate and administered by NASA was awarded to Mid-Atlantic Broadband Co-op (MBC). MBC subcontracted the design and construction of their portion, which ran from Virginia Beach to a regeneration hut at Cheriton. That construction ran into issues, which ultimately led to the bonding company’s having to take control to finish the contract. The construction eventually ended at the north end of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge/Tunnel (CBBT). The “gap” created by the failure (of MBC) to fulfill that first contract was filled thanks to ESVBA’s strong management of future contracts, allowing a change order to build the missing segment.

The second and largest grant from EDA/CDBG built

the “backbone” from the CBBT to Cape Charles, along the railroad to Bloxom, and then east to NASA Wallops – where it joins Maryland Broadband fiber. That engineering and construction was also subcontracted, but with the oversight of Mr. Pascaretti (Director of Engineering and later Executive Director), the contracts were completed without major issues. For the remaining grants, ESVBA was able to bring the design and construction management in-house. The resultant savings, together with improved bid procedures, enabled ESVBA to ultimately build twice the mileage of fiber originally approved under the final five contracts. For the Northampton grant, ESVBA had to seek permission from CDBG twice, in order to expand the scope of the work, allowing the expenditure of the full grant by building fiber to additional locations.

## Early Results

Even at ESVBA’s initial rates, all the early customers with commercial internet service at least doubled their bandwidth – for half the cost. With four subsequent price reductions, all the customers of ESVBA have continued to benefit. The presence of reliable open-access fiber and internet service on the Shore has enabled two new Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to offer services to businesses and citizens of Accomack and Northampton Counties, and a third ISP to operate beyond Cape Charles.

Without ESVBA, there would be no competition for upstream internet access and no ability for private ISPs to gain access to these advantages without registering with the State Corporation Commission as “competitive local exchange carriers,” i.e., as either a competing telephone company or using a similar FCC registration. The largest advantage to the ISPs is that by providing fiber to customer sites, buildings, and towers, ESVBA is absorbing a significant capital cost, which the ISPs would otherwise bear.

The business plan approved by CDBG for ESVBA defined the open access network model of ESVBA. The business plan called for a combination of fiber and wireless services with fiber continuing to expand outward to serve more and more areas directly, thereby giving wireless service providers the opportunity to service more users.

**Ed. Note:** *The ability of Eastern Shore residents and businesses to access high-quality internet services is important – some would say crucial – to developing and maintaining viable economic strategies for the area. Next month, ShoreLine will continue its exploration of this utility and the challenges it faces in rural areas such as the Eastern Shore of Virginia.*



## Periwinkles

When Suzanne Golibart started exploring what type of business she could start on the Shore, she focused on three areas: what was needed here, what she was passionate about, and what businesses were currently trending. She discovered that some things she was passionate about were also trending: fashion, discounted merchandise, and environmental awareness.

She created her business plan and decided to open a women's consignment boutique in Cape Charles called Periwinkles. She did not have a business degree or any experience in the business world, so it was both an exciting and frightening time for her. She was determined to open a successful boutique and operate it as a professional businesswoman.

She feels Periwinkles is a great business for the Shore for many reasons. Foremost, the options to shop for clothing and accessories often require a trip across the Bridge/Tunnel or a trek to the north. These options seemed inhibitive for many Shore residents due to limited time and expenses such as gas and tolls. Golibart says, "Periwinkles is a good fit for local residents because we offer a convenient, personalized shopping experience, where people can find top quality name-brand merchandise at affordable prices."

Golibart offers another reason Periwinkles is a good fit: it helps us progress from a disposable to a recycling society. "It's important to be more responsible about the amount of clothing we buy and what to do with it when it is no longer needed. Donating to nonprofits here on the Shore is often a good choice, but many women have items that are better suited for resale. Periwinkles now has nearly 700 consignors from all over the country who keep the shop full of clothing, jewelry, purses, shoes and other accessories."

Her biggest challenge every day is time management. Golibart says it is important for her to manage the time between working "on" the business and "in" the business. "One of my favorite things is greeting customers and helping them shop to find something they love." But she must be sure to keep the "behind the scenes" operations running smoothly: marketing, consignor appointments, financial tasks like balancing books, payroll, paying bills and taxes, data analysis, industry research and much more!

To be successful, Golibart suggests the following:


"Take advantage of local resources. We have excellent choices here, such as the Eastern Shore Community College, the Small Business Development Center, the local Chambers of Commerce, and Town Business Associations. Research what the community needs and start a business to meet that need. Most importantly, have a commitment to

**OPEN**  
for Business



*Suzanne Golibart is the owner of Periwinkles on Mason Avenue in Cape Charles, now in its fifth year of operation.*

your dream and be willing to work hard to achieve it.


"The people who live and work on the Shore form a special community and it's humbling and satisfying to be an integral part of it. I am proud to be a longtime member of CBES and especially enjoy that Periwinkles shares in the CBES vision to do its part in making this A BETTER EASTERN SHORE!" 



## Keeping Track

### Changes in CAFO Permits?

Until now, all poultry CAFOs in Virginia have operated under Virginia Pollution Abatement Permits, which assume no discharge into adjacent waters and streams. However, in 2010, EPA found that four of the CAFOs on the Eastern Shore were in fact affecting water quality, and issued an administrative order requiring that these farms obtain a Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit within 90 days. Seven years later, DEQ has just issued these permits for public comment, which ended on October 20. However, there are no specific limits set with these permits, and the only requirement is self-reported monitoring of adjacent waters, by visual and odor inspection.

Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper and CBES have submitted comments to DEQ, asking for a public hearing on these permits, and insisting on more stringent requirements with these permits, including fines for noncompliance and testing of nutrient levels by an independent lab at least quarterly and after significant rain events. We'll keep CBES members informed when this hearing is scheduled. 

Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore  
P. O. Box 882  
Eastville, VA 23347-0882

*Address Service Requested*

**Nonprofit Organization**  
**U. S. Postage Paid**  
**Eastville, VA**  
**Permit No. 8**

**INFORM, ENGAGE, EMPOWER!**

# SHORELINE

## Community Calendar - November 2017

*Note: Please verify times and places prior to attending meetings.*

CBES and Other Activities		Accomack County		Northampton County	
<p><b>Nov 8</b>     <b>VIMS Public Seminar</b> 7:30 PM, Wachapreague</p> <p><b>Nov 9</b>     <b>Shorekeeper Meeting*</b> 3 PM, Barrier Islands Center</p> <p><b>Nov 14</b>    <b>Community Forum on School Discipline</b> 7 PM, ESCC, Melfa</p> <p><b>Nov 21</b>    <b>ES Groundwater Committee</b> 10 AM, Accomac</p> <p><b>Nov 21</b>    <b>CBES Board Meeting</b> 7:00 PM, Eastville</p>	<p><b>Nov 1</b></p> <p><b>Nov 8</b></p> <p><b>Nov 15</b></p> <p><b>Nov 15</b></p> <p><b>Nov 16</b></p> <p><b>Nov 21</b></p> <p><b>Nov 21</b></p> <p><b>Nov 21</b></p>	<p><b>Board of Zoning Appeals</b> 10 AM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Planning Commission (PC)</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Board of Zoning Appeals</b> 10 AM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Board of Supervisors</b> 5 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Wetlands Board</b> 10 AM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>PC Work Session</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>School Board</b> 6:30 PM, Sup. Chambers</p>	<p><b>Nov 7</b></p> <p><b>Nov 7</b></p> <p><b>Nov 14</b></p> <p><b>Nov 15</b></p> <p><b>Nov 15</b></p> <p><b>Nov 15</b></p> <p><b>Nov 27</b></p> <p><b>Nov 28</b></p>	<p><b>Board of Zoning Appeals</b> 1 PM, Conference Room</p> <p><b>Planning Commission (PC)</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Board of Supervisors</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>Wetlands Board</b> TBA, Conference Room</p> <p><b>PC Work Session</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>BOS Work Session</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers</p> <p><b>School Board</b> 5:30 PM, Sup. Chambers</p>	

\* Alternating between the ES Chamber of Commerce and the Barrier Islands Center