

Jeannette B. Robinson
909 Little Valley Road
Warm Springs, VA 24484

June 5, 2016

Virginia Outdoors Foundation
Brett Christina Glymph, Executive Director
39 Garrett St., Suite 200
Warrenton, VA 20186

Re: Dominion's request for conversion of easements under 10.1-1704 statute

Dear Ms. Glymph:

I am writing to ask you and the VOF board of trustees to deny Dominion's request to convert easement properties under the 1704 process. I appreciate the difficult position that the VOF finds itself in when making decisions regarding a project of this scope that has the backing of high-ranking state officials. However, it is clear that this request does not meet the criteria listed in the 1704 statute.

VA Statute 10.1-1704 A.(i)(b) states that no property can be converted or diverted unless it is "...in accordance with the official comprehensive plan for the locality in effect at the time of the conversion or diversion..." The majority of the easements in question are in Bath County. At their April 25, 2016, meeting, the Bath County Planning Commission voted 5-0 to ask the Bath Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution in opposition to the ACP because it was in "direct conflict" with many of the goals and objectives of the current comprehensive plan. At the May 10th meeting of the Bath County Board of Supervisors, the Board voted unanimously to support the planning commission and sent a letter to the FERC stating the Board "...opposes any approval of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline". I have included a copy of the board of supervisors' letter dated May 11, 2016, and accompanying planning commission comments that were submitted to FERC.

As a citizen of Bath County, who has participated in the drawing up of every comprehensive plan since 1995, I can affirm that this pipeline route simply ignores the comprehensive plan. It crosses highly erodible mountain ridges at 60%+ grades and drops down into valleys with concentrations of springs, sinkholes and caves. One of the latest route proposals would involve clearing 7/10 of a mile of ridgeline along state route 220, a major tourist corridor. Due to the fact that Bath County's #1 source of revenue is tourism, we have sought through the comprehensive plan to protect ridgelines.

As an easement holder (BAT-03350/02202), I again urge you to do the right thing and deny Dominion's request. In The Recorder newspaper, a VOF staff member stated that VOF easements do not protect property per se, but instead, "The easements protect conservation values.". This well may be true, but the only way that VOF can protect conservation values is through the donations of easements by individual property owners.

These donors have been led to believe that VOF will defend them in just the type of situations that have arisen in regard to the ACP. If the VOF bows to political pressure and makes a decision that is clearly in conflict with the 1704 statute, its credibility would be damaged forever. Why would anyone choose to place an easement with an organization whose decisions could be influenced by politicians and/or their corporate backers.

I have always admired VOF and its goals and have been totally satisfied with my interactions with VOF staff. However, if this decision is made in favor of Dominion, I can only say that I feel my trust has been violated and I will no longer be able to recommend this agency to others I know who are considering conservation easements as a way to protect their land.

Sincerely,

Jeannette B. Robinson

Cc: Attorney General Mark R. Herring
Ms. Kimberly Bose, Secty.,
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (eFiling)
Mr. John Cowden, Chair, Bath Co. Planning Commission (email)
Ms. Claire Collins, Chair, Bath Co. Board of Supervisors (email)
The Recorder (email)