

CITIZENS FOR A BETTER EASTERN SHORE

# SHORELINE

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

Volume 27

May 2014

Number 5

## The Town Hall Meeting

*(See page 1)*

## Unanswered Zoning Questions

*(See page 2)*

## TMDL Planning for Mattawoman

*(See page 4)*

## New Generation of Conservation Leadership

*(See page 5)*

## Evolution at CBES

*(See page 6)*

## New Pig Roast Date

*(See page 7)*

## Clean the Bay Day

*(See page 7)*

## Community Calendar

*(See page 8)*

## The Town Hall Meeting

**Host it and they will come**

By Sarah Morgan

**R**on Wolff, longtime member of the Accomack County Board of Supervisors (BOS), has held regular Town Hall-style meetings for his 3500+ constituents for years. Although the venue changes from time to time, most people have come to expect them at a regular time, at the regular place – Wolff’s Sandwich Shop in Atlantic. Wolff says that attendees have numbered from as many as would fit in the restaurant to only one, but that normally between 16 and 18 people show up for the monthly meeting.

Topics vary, but all are directly germane to Wolff’s constituency in upper Accomack County, an area which includes the Wallops area and stretches north to Greenbackville. Recently, one of the hottest topics has been the Atlantic Town Center, a dense development proposal that was highly unpopular with residents. Wolff says he made an effort to inform his constituents on a regular basis so that they could be a part of the public hearings associated with BOS deliberations regarding permits, zoning amendments, and the like. According to Wolff, the project has been scaled down considerably from the original proposal, a result he feels has a direct correlation to the involvement of local citizens during Board deliberations.



*From L-R, Delegate Rob Bloxom and Senator Lynwood Lewis joined Supervisor Ron Wolff for April’s town hall meeting in Greenbackville.*

Wolff says that the meetings serve several functions. He has a genuine desire to hear from his constituents: their concerns, their visions for the community’s future, and whatever else they want to share. Although he does field phone calls from his district’s residents, especially when they are angry about something, he says that his regular visibility and presence in the restaurant gives people opportunities just to come and talk – with each other as well as with him.

Another important function is to bring in state political leaders as well as officials from various other entities. At Wolff’s April meeting, both State Senator Lynwood Lewis and Delegate Rob Bloxom were in attendance. During the County’s negotiations with the US Navy regarding the “touch-and-go” training proposed for Wallops, Wolff brought in four principals from the Navy including the Commander of the Air Wing, who explained to the crowd the necessity for the proposed operation and its parameters. Although several of the 25-30 people who attended were not wholly placated as a result of the discussion,

*See “Town Hall,” Cont’d on page 2*

Renew your CBES membership or **ShoreLine** subscription today! Check your mailing label; if you see a “13” following your name, you need to renew!

“Town Hall,” Cont’d from p. 1

they did have the opportunity to express their opinions, and Wolff reports that the exercise did seem to diffuse their anger.

Wolff recalls a long list of people who have spoken at his meetings: “Over the years that I have been holding these meetings, there have been many people who have been guest speakers: County Administrator Steve Miner, County Attorney Mark Taylor, all [County] department heads, NASA Wallops Director Bill Robell, Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport directors Billie Reed and Dale Nash, all of the [County’s] Constitutional Officers, School Superintendents Bull and Benson, State Senators Northam and Lewis, State Delegates Lewis and Bloxom, Sheriffs Crockett and Godwin, lawyers for the Walmart project, Captains of the U.S. Navy, Congressmen Drake, Ney, Rigell, and Rerras, all the Chairs of the BOS, the developer for Atlantic Town Centre, ES News editor Ted Shockley, Navy Commander Air Wing E-2 and C-2, a representative from The Nature Conservancy, the U.S. Park Service Director, the National Fish and Wildlife Director, and the 911 Director. In addition, there have been pre-launch briefings with NASA prior to all major launches.”

Wolff says that when he first started holding his meetings shortly after he was first elected to the Board, other Supervisors told him it wouldn’t work. “Been there, done that,” was a common refrain. But over the years, Wolff has been determined that the people in his community

have a regular opportunity to let him know what they are thinking and how they are feeling about what is going on at the county level. They also seem to appreciate the ability to talk with the people who are making decisions that affect their lives in more far-reaching ways. Wolff is determined that his monthly meetings continue; it is equally likely that people in his district count on them and will be in attendance for the foreseeable future.



Northampton County Zoning Changes

# Unanswered Questions – in a tangled process

By Mary Miller

The Code of Virginia allows localities to create zoning ordinances – the Code intends that zoning will provide for the implementation of the goals of an adopted Comprehensive Plan. And the Comprehensive Plan, according to the Code of Virginia, “shall” have the purpose of guiding the future development of the locality.

Since the 1980s, the Northampton County’s zoning ordinances have begun with a statement of intent and purpose for the zoning document:

- guiding the orderly growth of the community,
- providing for the health and safety of citizens,
- encouraging economic development and desirable employment,
- protecting surface and ground water,
- providing for schools and recreational opportunities,
- conserving farmland and wetlands,
- protecting historic and natural areas,
- protecting the natural environment,
- allowing for provision of a supply of affordable housing and
- protecting against undue density of population in relation to community facilities or natural resources existing or available.

The proposed 2014 zoning revision eliminates all references to the intent or purposes of the document. Consequently, county residents have been handed a document with no stated, much less clearly identified, purpose – and no explanation has been given for this change. The new proposal contains uses with vague definitions, uses permitted with little regard to existing uses or the character of area where they would be performed, uses with minimal setbacks and with so-called “performance standards” between non-compatible uses, but without the Code-required consideration for the conservation of properties and their values. The result is a seeming disregard for the relationship between density of population and the resources or facilities required to support the increased density. Add to that the elimination of Statements of Intent to describe the character of each zoning district, and the county will have a zoning ordinance with **no** basic guidelines for development – and with no realistic provision for property owners adversely impacted by county zoning to appeal.

## The eleventh hour – and still no answers.

The unanswered questions, questions of both content and process, start with this one: If the proposed zoning ordinance has no stated purpose and no specific intent, is

### Hogg holds town hall meetings

Approximately 45 people attended Northampton Supervisor Granville Hogg’s Town Hall meeting in Cape Charles on April 23. Topics included the hospital move, PSA, and proposed zoning changes. Another Town Hall meeting was held at Kiptopeke school on April 24. The public expressed appreciation for Hogg’s efforts to hear their opinions regarding these controversial topics.

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 © 2014 by Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore.

#### Editorial Board

Gene Hampton     John T. Ordeman  
Mary Miller        Denard Spady  
                          Arthur Upshur

#### Editorial Advisor Emeritus

F. Victor Schmidt

#### Staff Writers

Sue Mastyl            Joyce Mendel  
Hali Plourde-Rogers    Dr. Mike Peirson

#### Managing Editor and Design

Sarah Morgan, Savoy Studio

#### Distribution

Danhof VanDyke

#### How to reach CBES

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

Printed on 20%  
Recycled Paper



See “Zoning,” Cont’d on page 3

there an unstated goal – and if so, what is it? And they continue with many others:

- Why, when the county population has been decreasing for half a century, does the new zoning permit an increase of nearly 100% in housing units – including a 4000% increase in the expanded Waterfront Villages of Oyster and Willis Wharf? And these projections do not include an unknown additional increase from potential Planned Unit Developments.
- Why can a Migrant Labor Camp – proposed as a “by-right use,” although not a use considered “by right” under the Virginia Right to Farm Act – a camp which may include a collection of tents and campers, be set up 15 feet from a Village or Hamlet property line, while an accountant wishing to set up a professional office in the Village would need either a rezoning or a Special Use Permit?
- Why are so many high impact commercial, recreational and institutional uses proposed, “by-right,” in residential neighborhoods with no performance standards, no regard for the character of the area and no attempt to preserve the property values of existing homeowners?
- Why would the Agricultural (AG) zoning district now have so many *non-agricultural* uses permitted, many of them by-right – heavy industrial, waste processing, group homes and prisons, high impact recreational and community service uses? Many of these are heavy industrial or commercial uses and have no performance standards when placed in an AG District.
- Why have concentrated high water consumption uses, large waste-water generating uses, mining and excavating of natural resources (with no aquifer-protecting depth limit) and imported industrial waste processing uses been added to the new ordinance? Why are they even permitted in an area with a sole source aquifer, a vulnerable aquaculture industry and a fragile coastal environment?

**Why “no answer” may be the answer?**

The answer to most of the questions above is: because there is no mechanism in the new proposal to prevent these changes. The legal rationale for the changes may go back to the elimination of a written purpose or intent for the entire zoning ordinance and to the elimination of Statements of Intent for individual zoning districts – each of which would establish reasonable guidelines for development and provide an avenue for home and business owners to protect themselves against adverse impacts and devaluation of their properties. Without those Statements of Intent – for resource protection, for preserving farmland, for protecting existing neighborhood character, for protection against insufficient facilities and services, for affordable housing opportunities – everything from setbacks to density to permitted uses become arbitrary decisions by the writers of the ordinance. No guidelines equals no standards. No standards equals no way for property owners to protect themselves from their own county zoning.

This leads us to another part of the tangled process – the role of the county’s “staff.” For months, the Director of Economic Development has been touting the work of his Planning Depart-

ment in creating the new zoning ordinance. And planning staff members *have* presented various work products at public meetings. But on several occasions, the County Administrator and other staff members appeared to state that the county’s legal staff had drafted the ordinance. The legal staff consists of the County Attorney, who also happens to be the Commonwealth’s Attorney and his Assistant Commonwealth’s Attorney.

So, which staff was it that drafted the revised ordinance? Was it the Development Department, which includes the Planning Department with a combined FY15 budget of almost half a million dollars – or was it the legal staff with a combined FY15 budget of almost \$400,000? Or was it both staffs – which would make it a very expensive undertaking?

The absence of what is described by planning professionals as “good planning practice” would seem to argue that trained planners were not the primary resource in the drafting process. And the apparent systematic removal of most of the legal basis for property owners to challenge county zoning (intent statements, district zoning descriptions, Special Use permits in residential areas) could argue for the County’s legal staff as the authors.

**But wait – there’s more.**

The Planning Commission has stated that even as trained volunteers, the 100-day, Code-required deadline for the Commission’s review would not allow them time to do a creditable job. They asked for more time and outside professional help. Some of Supervisors seemed inclined to agree and inquired about extending the 100-day deadline. County legal staff was consulted; the reply was that the Board had no authority to extend the deadline once the Code-established time clock started ticking. But the legal staff failed to give Supervisors the additional information in the same Code paragraph about stopping the clock by temporarily withdrawing the Board’s zoning ordinance application – thereby providing more time for review. Why withhold that information from the Board? Yet another unanswered question.

As the clock ticks away, and the Planning Commission schedules extra work sessions to review the hundreds of public comments and letters, and the Board waits for the opportunity to act on the proposed zoning changes, there appears to be no attempt by the county to answer the hard questions posed by the public. Since the Board of Supervisors itself is proposing this ordinance revision and is exempt from the requirement of providing a written Statement of Justification for their proposal as private applicants would have to do, seemingly the Board can just ignore the public. Citizens and taxpayers are only now beginning to understand what these changes will mean to them and to their properties. A vote could be taken in a matter of weeks.

The Virginia Code intends that localities use zoning to help create “a convenient, attractive and harmonious community.” Judging by the growing community uproar, Northampton County’s government officials may have missed that memo.

**Author’s Note:** *The Planning Commission will continue to consider written comments submitted before their May 14 work session. Send to: [pstith@co.northampton.va.us](mailto:pstith@co.northampton.va.us)*



**County residents have been handed a document with no identified purpose and no statements of intent.**



# TMDL Planning for Mattawoman Creek Area

By Sue Mastyl

A public meeting was held in February to gain input for the development of a Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation Plan (TMDL IP) for The Gulf, Mattawoman, Jacobus, Hungars and Barlow Creeks in Northampton County. John McLeod, TMDL Watershed Field Coordinator for the Tidewater Regional Office of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) led the discussion.

As McLeod explained, DEQ is required to write a TMDL plan whenever there is a violation of water quality, in this case bacterial. The process begins when an area is identified where the water quality standards have not been met; the sources of pollution are then identified, including calculations of the amounts from each source and estimates of the required reductions from each source. The Implementation Plan (IP) then identifies best management practices (BMPs) to achieve the necessary reductions. Once the plan is implemented, monitoring continues until the water quality standards are met. In addition to BMPs, the IP also identifies improvement projects and other actions to improve water quality, and factors in costs and benefits, timelines for goals and milestones, roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and potential funding opportunities. Public participation throughout this process is critical, as is coordination with other watershed plans and activities.

For the Mattawoman Creek area, the process has included a sanitary shoreline survey to identify suspected sources of bacterial contamination. Although there are many areas in both counties with ongoing water quality problems, DEQ is focusing on this one section for now. This area has had on/off condemnations for shellfish harvest over the past several years and includes a significant aquaculture resource. There have been frequent closures in the headwaters of each of the several creeks in the area.

McLeod outlined the identified sources of bacterial contamination and the targeted reductions for each ranging from 44% to 100% in each creek. The sources for each creek include livestock, wildlife, humans and pets. The first target is to eliminate human sources of bacteria from failed, malfunctioning and non-operational septic systems or sewage treatment facilities (including any remaining outhouses in the area). The second target is livestock, which involves enforcing the BMPs that have already been identified. The third target that McLeod discussed is pet waste, which he pointed out can be an “astronomical” amount; “if this was human feces, we wouldn’t stand for it,” he noted. He noted that contamination from wildlife is the hardest to control, although measures such as buffers and fencing around streams, as well as culling of some populations, can help.

The methods used to estimate the allowable loads and the delivery rate for runoff were described, and McLeod noted that land use has an impact on runoff with higher rates of runoff in urban (developed) areas (85%) than in grassland (20%) or forest (15%).

The IP identifies potential control measures for each of the sources of contamination (through both direct delivery to the stream and runoff into the stream), including:

- **Residential:** septic system pump-outs, septic system repair, replacement with new conventional septic system, or replacement with new alternative on-site sewage disposal system (although some of these systems may not be allowed in the county)

- **Agricultural:**

- **Livestock Exclusion and Pasture:** exclusion fencing, riparian buffers, cross-fencing, use of watering troughs, hardened crossings, and horse pasture management

- **Cropland:** permanent vegetative cover, reforestation of erodible crop- and pastureland, and incorporation of manure/bio-solids into the soil


- **Pets and Stormwater:** pet waste composters, “scoop the poop,” vegetated buffers, rain gardens, and infiltration trenches

The IP then quantifies the impact of these control measures through spatial analysis, modeling, and input from working groups, and it assesses the costs of the implementation, in order to develop a plan with established milestones and monitoring plans. Funding for these control measures is available through a variety of sources, including the Water Quality Improvement Fund, the Virginia Agricultural Best Management Cost Share and Tax Credits, a Community Development Block Grant, the Wetland Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Community Foundation, grants through Planning District Commissions and nonprofit groups.

One of the important functions of the meeting was to form agricultural and residential/business Working Groups with interested citizens to meet at least twice during the IP development process. These Working Groups will be critical in providing input about the perceived sources of pollution and ongoing and needed pollution control activities; providing feedback on possible implementation strategies, including outreach strategies; and discussing alternative funding sources or partnerships. McLeod also asked for suggestions from participants, including outreach for pet waste management and effective means of identifying remaining outhouses in Northampton County.

A final public meeting is scheduled for July, at which time the draft IP will be available. The IP will then be finalized by September. For fact sheets or more information, or to provide additional input, contact John McLeod at 757-518-2196 or e-mail [john.mcleod@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:john.mcleod@deq.virginia.gov).

**ShoreLine Comment.** *We understand the need for development of TMDL plans and approve of DEQ beginning that process. However, it seems unlikely that either pets or livestock are a significant source of bacterial contamination in the Mattawoman Creek area because the population of both is so low. On the other hand, the population of wildlife is quite high – deer, raccoons and others. Consequently, while septic waste may be appropriate as the first target of the TMDL plan, it would seem that wildlife should be elevated to the second target, since livestock and pet waste are relatively low populations.*

*CBES is not without experience in this area either. In the mid-1990s we participated in a program run by Virginia Tech professor, George Simmons. CBES paid a bounty to remove raccoons from the watershed of The Gulf, a small creek in the Mattawoman Creek area. Simmons was able to verify that with a substantial reduction in the raccoon population, the bacterial contamination of The Gulf returned to acceptable levels – and the DNA of the feces being studied could identify the source of the feces. Both results could be of interest to DEQ. Perhaps Mr. McLeod would benefit from looking at that old study.* 

# A New Generation of Conservation Leadership

By Denard Spady

Attendance at the twenty-sixth CBES annual meeting suffered from stiff competition with other community activities and inclement weather – weather was spring-like in the mid-60s as the meeting began but windy, wet and in the mid-40s when the meeting closed. The meeting also served as the tenth annual meeting of the Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper (VES) organization. The faithful who attended were treated to a glimpse of the Shore’s next generation of conservation leadership.

CBES president Arthur Upshur welcomed the crowd and used recent *ShoreLine* coverage to review the highlights of the CBES year. Topics included: the Ag-Forest debate in Northampton County; the status of broadband service on the Shore; sea level rise and its impact on insurance, Wallops Island and coastal villages; domestic violence; affordable health care; elected school boards; zoning and land use management. During the year, CBES also conducted a seminar in Northampton for those who wanted to serve on the county’s first elected school board and a “Meet the Candidates” forum for those seeking School Board and Supervisor seats.

The organization also conducted a community survey that asked a broad spectrum of Eastern Shore citizens, including both CBES members and non-members, to rank their top three community issues from a list of ten. Top-rated issues were similar for both members and non-members and included: economic development / jobs, education / skills training, land use management and social services – followed by local government participation, climate change and sea level rise. The Rev. Charles Kellam was thanked for helping to distribute the survey.

Upshur also discussed the changes taking place in local conservation leadership. Steve Parker, a former CBES board member, has retired as Director of The Nature Conservancy’s Virginia Coast Reserve project, although he remains active with TNC. Sue Rice has retired as manager at the Eastern Shore National Wildlife Refuge. Former Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper, Dave Burden, has left that position, and Denard Spady will retire as the CBES Executive Director by the end of the year after 19 years in that position. Each of these positions will be filled by new, young leadership in the conservation field.

In other CBES business, Upshur noted the availability of the CBES annual report, described how CBES is expected to evolve as it moves to a fulltime Executive Director (please see the article on page 6 for more details). The CBES membership also re-elected eight individuals to serve on the CBES Board of Directors.

Next the Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper president, Jack Ordeman, made a presentation to Dave Burden, who “served for eight years as the Shorekeeper, a job to which he devoted his energy, leadership ability, knowledge of environmental conservation and his dedication to preserve, protect and improve the tidal waters of the Shore.” In appreciation of Burden’s years of service, the Shorekeeper board of directors presented him with a bronze skimmer created especially for the Shorekeeper organization by local sculptor David Turner.

Ordeman introduced newly appointed Shorekeeper, Jay Ford, who has assumed the now full-time “keeper” position. In Ford’s remarks, he referred to VES and CBES as “opinion leaders” and encouraged members to become active with both

organizations saying that “civic responsibility is not a spectator sport.” He expressed his excitement to see where both go as they evolve into more robust organizations. He said that we are blessed to live on the Shore in a “one-of-a-kind region” where “land and sea are intertwined,” and he looks forward to new partnerships and the hope that we can enshrine water quality protections in the Comprehensive Plans and zoning ordinances of both counties.

CBES vice-president, Bo Lusk, introduced Jill Bieri, the new Director of the Virginia Coast Reserve (VCR). Bieri, a native of the Maryland Eastern Shore, has worked in the Bay area for years. She said that she sees VCR as a “rock star” of conservation and gave a list of reasons why: barrier island and land protection, eelgrass propagation, living shoreline projects, oyster reef construction and oyster “castles,” and the development of many conservation partnerships – including NASA.

President Upshur then introduced the featured speaker of the evening, Bruce Underwood, Deputy Director for Strategic Integration & Development at NASA’s Wallops Flight Facility. Underwood reviewed NASA’s programs and emphasized that Wallops tries to keep its programs diversified so that it won’t suffer from the loss of a single program such as the space shuttle at Cape Canaveral. He said that NASA has from 1600 to 2000 employees working at the Wallops Flight Facility and a local budget of \$262 million with a total economic impact on the local economy of \$800 million. Mr. Underwood responded to audience questions. They included:

## Does NASA do any hiring locally?

Underwood: NASA has a preference to hire locally but often has to hire specialists in science and engineering from universities. Most local hiring is in the trades and technicians.

## Tourism and NASA are becoming linked as more people come to watch space shots, but are there any entrepreneurial opportunities other than tourism – and do they extend to Northampton County?

Underwood: NASA is the only science employer within a 100 mile radius, so most direct entrepreneurial opportunity would be for suppliers – and most of that is a “trickle-down” impact. But note that tourism brings people who do many other things too and they may have an ongoing impact on the economy.

## How is NASA addressing sea level rise?

Underwood: “Sea level rise is a big concern.” A recent beach replenishment project evolved in response to public comment and conservation interests. It added seventy yards of beach in front of the launch area on Wallops Island. NASA is also involved with the Mid-Atlantic Coastal Resilience Program.

President Upshur thanked the membership for their support, and the evening ended with a reception.



# Evolution at CBES

By Denard Spady

CBES was formed during the summer of 1988 in a swirl of public controversy over land use management and development. By the fall of that year, the leadership had brought in a wide range of community support – including some who had never had a place at the table of public discussion. The time was right for the issues, leaders and the newly formed organization to become an important contributor to the Eastern Shore community – and it remains so today.

By October of 1988, CBES was incorporated as a Virginia non-profit corporation and was applying for a 501(c)(4) designation from the IRS (later to become a 501(c)(3)). The board of directors was established to be from 15 to 30 members, there was an active core of about 70 volunteers. All the work was done by volunteers under the guidance of President Suzanne Wescoat and a core of experienced leaders. The board of directors was committed to seeing that all parts of the community were included, and consensus was used to ensure that everyone at the table had a voice.

The organization was intended to be “grassroots” and volunteer driven. In the organizational structure, leadership and responsibility rested with the president, but there were active committees working on a wide range of issues. “Nobody ever did anything on their own at CBES,” as later president Norm Nasson used say, and the Executive Committee was on call at a moment’s notice to deal with problems or approve a public statement.

By the mid-1990s some of the original fervor had begun to cool, but the next three presidents after Wescoat (Gordon Putnam, Norm Nasson and Jack Ordeman) were very “hands-on” and the volunteer system continued to work satisfactorily, if somewhat more irregularly.

I was hired in 1995, at the end of Wescoat’s presidency, to act as an assistant to the president and ease the daily burden of running the organization. With absolutely no background in non-profit work and no job description, I was called “executive director” because that was the only title available in the by-laws, and some board members insisted that it was the “term of art” for the person running the office. The presidents and board of directors continued to be the driving force behind the organization, although various tasks began to be shifted to me and a second staff position we now call “event manager.”

The next three presidents (Paul Driscoll, Nancy Holcomb and Arthur Upshur) had less time to devote to CBES because of full time jobs, family commitments and competing volunteer work. The committee structure had gradually become less effective, and it was more and more difficult to find volunteers to take on tasks. More and more responsibility for major elements of work moved to our two part-time staff.

During this time, CBES long-time benefactor, the Mary Flagler Cary Trust dissolved (as directed in its founding documents), and CBES lost the \$25,000 per year in grant support that Cary had been providing. Cary did make a closing grant of \$100,000 to CBES in order to ease the transition to other funding

sources. President Nancy Holcomb advocated the establishment of a CBES endowment at the Hampton Roads Community Foundation, and that was accomplished, but the intervening national economic disaster of 2007 limited additional fundraising, and the endowment, while growing, only provides a small portion of CBES funding.

After several recent years of deficits, which used up most of our reserve funds, our current president, Arthur Upshur, came to office determined to get our financial house in order. So, far in Upshur’s tenure, we have had one year of small surplus and a second with a deficit due primarily to unexpected expenses and lower event revenue.

CBES has survived for a quarter century and been an important contributor to the Eastern Shore community, and I’ve been here much of that time, but, after 19 years at CBES and at 67 years old, it is time for me to retire – and Arthur Upshur is determined to bring CBES into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, revitalize the organization and see that it continues to be an important contributor to the community. He has proposed, and the board has agreed:

- To revise the by-laws to move authority and responsibility for most CBES activities from the president to the Executive Director and design a comprehensive job description for that position.
- To hire a full-time Executive Director with the background and experience to run the organization, under the oversight of the board, and make it once again a vital part of the community.
- To follow the example of the Eastern Shore Land Trust, the Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper and other organizations and hire a relatively young Executive Director with substantial ties to the Shore.
- To mount a special fundraising effort focused on raising enough money to pay a living wage Executive Director’s salary for two years.
- And finally, to expect the new Executive Director to find grant funding for the position and programs that will perpetuate the CBES “philosophy” and be meaningful to the community and its leadership.

The next year will bring these changes to CBES. It will all take substantial effort and support from our members and donors to accomplish this change, but it needs to be done. It will mean something of a change in the character of the organization, too – but it will be the responsibility of the board of directors to see that the CBES philosophy of inclusiveness and consensus is maintained. When this work is accomplished, CBES will be ready to face its second quarter century.

**Author’s Note.** *I’ve enjoyed my time at CBES and the opportunity it has given me to work with the many fine people who have been and are associated with the organization. It’s been a wonderful experience for a “broke” farmer from the 1970s and 80s – an opportunity to make new friends and participate in the*



## Pig Roast – New Date

OK, we give – too much competition on Memorial Day Weekend, and we need the Pig Roast to be a profitable event. So, same place, same time, but we're moving to:

**Saturday, June 7**

**5:00 to 9:00**

**Cherry Grove Shed**

*(Savage Neck west of Eastville)*

**Bring the whole Family for:**

- Barbeque and all the fixin's
- NEW menu items
- Kiddie Games
- Music
- And more!

*Tickets Online now – Usual places by late May*

**See You There on Saturday, June 7!**



“Evolution of CBES,” *Cont'd from page 6*

*community in a way I couldn't have otherwise. But the evolution I describe above has been needed for some time, and I wholeheartedly approve of it. The one caveat is that CBES needs to remain true to its Core Beliefs and philosophy of inclusiveness and participation -- not become the creature of a single person in the Executive Director's position. But with awareness of that need, I have no doubt that it will be accomplished, and I look forward to a bright new CBES to enjoy in my retirement.*



## Clean the Bay

CBES is partnering with the Virginia Eastern Shorekeeper and the Chesapeake Bay Foundation to sponsor a Clean the Bay Day project in the seaside village of Oyster on Saturday, June 14. Those who are interested in volunteering can contact the CBES office at 678-7157 or [info@cbes.org](mailto:info@cbes.org), or the Shorekeeper Jay Ford at [jaycford@gmail.com](mailto:jaycford@gmail.com).

**Saturday, June 14**

**9:00 AM to 12:00 noon**

**Oyster Harbor**

## 2014 ESVA Household Hazardous Waste Collection

**The only local option for Accomack and Northampton County residents to properly dispose of their household hazardous waste**

**Saturday, May 10**

**• In Northern Accomack:**

Makemie Park Convenience Center  
9312 Neal Parker Road, Temperanceville

**• In Central Accomack**

Fisher's Corner Convenience Center  
26213 Parksley Road, Parksley

**• In Northampton**

Birdsnest Convenience Center  
9005 Birdsnest Drive, Birdsnest

For additional information, please contact the Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission at 757-787-2936 or [www.a-npdc.org](http://www.a-npdc.org)

Detach and return to CBES, PO Box 882, Eastville, VA 23347 • Join online at [www.cbes.org](http://www.cbes.org)

### CBES Membership 2014

New

Renewal

For Office Use

I would like to receive *ShoreLine* by email:  Yes  No

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ email \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

My volunteer interests are: \_\_\_\_\_

**Enclosed is \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for the following:**

- \* \_\_\_\_\_ Regular Membership (includes *ShoreLine*) \$ 20
- \* \_\_\_\_\_ Life Membership (includes *ShoreLine*) \$ 200
- \* \_\_\_\_\_ Optional Additional Contribution of \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- \* \_\_\_\_\_ *ShoreLine* subscription without CBES membership \$ 20
- \* \_\_\_\_\_ Gift subscription to *ShoreLine* for a friend (*write name and address on reverse*) \$ 20

For our membership records, tell us how many there are in your home 16 years or older: \_\_\_\_\_

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**

**RENEW YOUR  
MEMBERSHIP NOW!**

# SHORELINE

## Community Calendar - May 2014

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

CBES and Other Activities		Northampton County		Accomack County	
May 7	<b>VIMS Public Seminar</b> 7:30 PM, Wachapreague	May 5	<b>Board of Zoning Appeals</b> 1 PM, Conference Room	May 7	<b>Board of Zoning Appeals</b> 10 AM, Sup. Chambers
May 8	<b>Shorekeeper Meeting</b> 1 PM, ES Chamber of Commerce, Melfa	May 6	<b>Planning Commission</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers	May 14	<b>Planning Commission</b> 7 PM, BOS Chambers
May 13	<b>CBES Exec. Committee</b> 5 PM, CBES Office	May 13	<b>Board of Supervisors</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers	May 15	<b>Wetlands Board</b> 10 AM, Sup. Chambers
May 20	<b>ES Groundwater Committee</b> 10 AM, Accomac	May 14	<b>Wetlands Board</b> TBA, Conference Room	May 20	<b>School Board</b> 7 PM, BOS Chambers
May 20	<b>CBES Board Meeting</b> 7 PM, Nandua HS, Onley	May 27	<b>School Board</b> 5:30 PM, Sup. Chambers	May 21	<b>Board of Supervisors</b> 6 PM, BOS Chambers
May 22	<b>UVA Seminar Series</b> 7 PM, Oyster	May 27	<b>BOS Work Session</b> 7 PM, Sup. Chambers		

[www.cbes.org](http://www.cbes.org)