My backyard is directly alongside the ROW in question. I have lived here for 29 years. I have seen neighbors change at the properties on all sides of me and through the changes and improvements of these properties; they have followed the permitting guidelines set by our residential platting.

This ROW was planned into the design of the neighborhoods years and years ago and we must all honor that design as it was a factor in all of our decisions to purchase our residences.

Mr. Miller's property is far larger than the properties that border the ROW. His property has room for development of residential needs (such as a garage or fencing) adhering to existing property permitting guidelines.

Over the years we have experienced several power outages or utility equipment failures/replacements that have been efficiently resolved due to the ease of access via the ROW. Alternative routes through any of our smaller properties have proved to be difficult and destructive with the recent example at the Zwissler property. If the commission vacates the county's interest in the ROW, I see this quickly followed by a utilities petition to vacate as the various utilities have already stated no objection (as they will do the work regardless but with longer timelines and more destruction of property).

This petition to vacate has brought forth clear opposition from 3 of the 4 directly impacted neighbors whose backyards are along the west side of the ROW. The opposition of these tax-paying residents, who will live daily with the decisions made by this commission tonight, should have a very strong weight in that decision.

This is the second time within 6 months that Mr. Miller is challenging platting guidelines. Why the commission's first decision has been challenged again is disrespectful of the commission's time and to the neighbors who are directly impacted. I hope that this issue can be clearly resolved tonight.