

## Michael Draper

---

**From:** Helen Thomson Armas <helenbackranch@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:19 PM  
**To:** Michael Draper; John Peters; dritchie@douglasnv.us; mgardner@douglasnv.us; topaz472; Cynthia & Rod Vickers  
**Subject:** Sierra High Farms Cannabis Cultivation and additional properties

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** cannabis

### [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Greetings again Michael,

It was brought to our attention that Sierra High Farms owns an additional 55 acres on the east side of Eastside Lane. I am sure you were aware of this. Is there something planned for this area that we should know? If this cannabis farm is approved can they expand into that area?

Additionally I pray the board has done their due diligence in researching what is going on in other counties in California. The legal market cannot compete with the illegal market.

The Los Angeles Times published an extensive article, "The reality of legal weed in California: Huge illegal grows, violence, worker exploitation and deaths". The staff writer is Paige St. John and Photography by Brian Van Der Burg. It was published on Sept, 8, 2022.

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-09-08/reality-of-legal-weed-in-california-illegal-grows-deaths>

This article is worth the read.

I hope your weekend is uneventful,

Helen Armas  
AVOICE - Antelope Valley Organization to Interrupt Cannabis Enterprise

**From:** [topaz472](#)  
**To:** [Michael Draper](#)  
**Cc:** [Helen Thomson Armas](#); [Valanda Corbett](#); [Patrick Rogers](#); [rodvickers@yahoo.com](#); [Stephanie COONS](#); [Debbie Corona](#); [Kerry And Cynthia Novak](#); [concretefx1@yahoo.com](#); [Sarah Sparks](#); [Darcie Johnson- Coleville](#); [russbacon@gmail.com](#); [Gardner, Mark](#); [dritchie@douglas.nv.us](#); [teresa.young@youngconst.net](#); [Jeanette Tillman](#); [boatnuttahoe@gmail.com](#); [Cynthia Vickers](#)  
**Subject:** Additional questions regarding Sierra High Farms MND report and upcoming meeting.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 5:30:49 PM

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Michael,

Just a few more questions:

Why is Labor housing needed if hiring locally?

If allowed how many additional homes or housing facilities will be allowed at maximum.

Where on property will they be located?

Will they require extra wells?

How will they be powered?

Where will power come from?

What other housing associated buildings will be allowed?

How much more traffic and effects will this have is entire families move into housing? Traffic?

It was mentioned at the Zoom meeting by SHF that the plant material that will not be processed will be allowed to be composted and tilled into existing on site soils. What about the hazardous materials? How will this effect soils, wildlife, ground water and water run off? How will effects be monitored?

How can Mono planning assure local residents that local law enforcement, fire and paramedics (that will be responding) have reviewed, approved and can provide services for the health and safety of our valley?

The North Bay Business Journal published a report that odor can travel 1500yd at least. How is no mitigation required for odor for residents down wind (Douglas County). Should project be approved, can we request a odor reader at the Vickers property for a year instead of waiting for the Odor? I'm requesting a year due to wind and inversion layers that may increase odors at certain times throughout the year.

Respectfully

Terri Dikes

AVOICE- Antelope Valley Organization to Interrupt Cannabis Enterprise

**From:** [Michael Draper](#)  
**To:** [Heidi Willson](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Concerns Regarding The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration For Sierra High Cannabis Cultivation  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 4:25:42 PM

---

**From:** Cynthia & Rod Vickers <[vickers4040@yahoo.com](mailto:vickers4040@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:58 PM  
**To:** Michael Draper <[mdraper@mono.ca.gov](mailto:mdraper@mono.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** John Peters <[jpeters@mono.ca.gov](mailto:jpeters@mono.ca.gov)>; mgardner@douglasnv.us; Derrick Hug <[dhug@mono.ca.gov](mailto:dhug@mono.ca.gov)>; Nick Criss <[ncriss@mono.ca.gov](mailto:ncriss@mono.ca.gov)>; dritchie@douglasnv.us  
**Subject:** Re: Concerns Regarding The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration For Sierra High Cannabis Cultivation

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Good afternoon Michael, I would like to add some additional concerns to my original comments.

Everyone keeps stating that the proposed site is 1,700 feet from from the nearest home, which is my families, but what is the distance from the proposed structure for Sierra High Cannabis farm to my property line? We intend to use all of our acreage, which directly abuts the South West edge of the proposed cannabis farm and this needs to be considered. I am very concerned that our current home and any structures added to our land which would be even closer to the proposed site will be misidentified as housing or keeper of the grow for the Sierra high cannabis farm. Security for the grow is to protect the grow not the residents who live in the area which is very concerning. I think it should be required that the security plan be filed BEFORE the permit is granted not after, that makes no sense.

Also, Sierra High cannabis farm has already illegally graded without a permit and it feels like no immediate action was taken in regards to the illegal activity. Is this the kind of behavior we can expect moving forward from the farm and Mono County if the project is approved??

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cynthia Vickers

**VOICE**-Antelope Valley Organization to Interrupt Cannabis Enterprise

On Thursday, October 27, 2022 at 09:18:29 AM PDT, Michael Draper <[mdraper@mono.ca.gov](mailto:mdraper@mono.ca.gov)> wrote:

Hello Cynthia,

Your comment has been received and will be filed apart of the project's record.

Thank you,

Michael Draper

---

**From:** Cynthia & Rod Vickers <[vickers4040@yahoo.com](mailto:vickers4040@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 26, 2022 8:07 PM  
**To:** Michael Draper <[mdraper@mono.ca.gov](mailto:mdraper@mono.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** John Peters <[jpeters@mono.ca.gov](mailto:jpeters@mono.ca.gov)>; [dritchie@douglas.nv.us](mailto:dritchie@douglas.nv.us); [mgardner@douglasnv.us](mailto:mgardner@douglasnv.us); Derrick Hug <[dhug@mono.ca.gov](mailto:dhug@mono.ca.gov)>; Nick Criss <[ncriss@mono.ca.gov](mailto:ncriss@mono.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Concerns Regarding The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration For Sierra High Cannabis Cultivation

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Hi Michael,

This email is in strong opposition to the Sierra High Cannabis Farm, with a proposed location in Walker/Topaz, CA parcel APN 001-150-004-000. (Parks Ranch)

First of all, as residents/property owners in Topaz Heights, it came as quite a surprise to my family, extended family and neighbors to hear that the location on Eastside Lane was the proposed site. The proposed farm would be 1,700 feet from our property.

Although the whole report is very concerning and feels very dismissive to the community and the place we call home, it also fails to truly address many concerns. I have a few I will comment on in this opposition statement.

My first major concern goes back to the proximity of the farm to my home that has

been in our family since 1985. It is located just 1,700 feet from the proposed location. Per section 4.15 Public Services, it clearly states that the farm site presents an increased risk for criminal activity. My understanding is when criminal activity occurs Bridgeport Sheriff will be contacted which could be any where from 45 minutes to an hour and a half for response time, this is unacceptable. Also Mono county code 5.60 requires review and approval of a security plan by the sheriff's office as a condition of the cannabis operation permit. My understanding is this does not have to occur until the cannabis permit is granted which is again completely unacceptable, the community should be able to view such report which is a complete disregard for the safety and security of the people.

Another concern is hydrology and water quality. The amount of water that is going to be used to facilitate the needs of this farm is extremely concerning to the resources of the valley. On page 28 and 29 the water usage implied is dismissible and fails to address concerns due to contradictions of information.

In 4.10 of the report it clearly states that long-term cultivation operation and maintenance has the potential to discharge fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals to surface waters and groundwater. Everyone East and North of the proposed site is off grid by choice and relies on their water well for drinking, bathing and watering. The report once again does not come close to providing enough information for the consideration of the health and safety of the surrounding community.

Moving on to Transportation in 4.17 on page 36. The proposed project is estimated to generate up to 100 vehicle/truck trips per day!!!! This increase in traffic will dramatically change the character, landscape, erosion on the roads and the air quality from dust. And do we know if these numbers just pertain to phase one, and will the numbers increase phase 2 and 3? So many unanswered questions.

One of the most disturbing things about this proposed project and report is that so many people knew nothing about it including water districts and the air quality control board.

In conclusion, this all does not feel like an agriculture 10 zoning, it feels more industrial. I hope you understand that if this is permitted it will have so many negative health and safety impacts on Antelope Valley, the place WE call home.

Thank you for your consideration in the opposition of the Sierra High Cannabis farm next to Park's ranch.

Cynthia Vickers

AVOICE -Antelope Valley Organization to Interrupt Cannabis Enterprise

## Michael Draper

---

**From:** sierralight@schat.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:16 PM  
**To:** sbush@mono.ca.gov  
**Cc:** Patricia Robertson; rlagomarsin@mono.ca.gov; Jora Fogg; Chris Lizza; Michael Draper; wsugamura@mono.ca.gov; John Peters  
**Subject:** Opposition to cannabis permit for Sierra High Farm  
**Categories:** cannabis

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Mono County Planning Commission  
Attn: Scott Bush

This letter is written in opposition to the proposed cannabis Sierra High Farm near Topaz in the Antelope Valley, CA. We are very concerned about the following issues.

1. EIR/EIS- Has the appropriate environmental protection review been accomplished to insure the protection of the resources of the Antelope Valley?
2. Toxicity to Wild and Domestic Animals- How will this large industrial cannabis development affect surrounding wildlife including Mule Deer and domestic animals?
3. Hazardous Wastes- How will hazardous wastes be dealt with? Hauled where?
4. Greatly Increased Road Traffic- How will the greatly increased road traffic on the country lanes of Topaz and Eastside affect the wildlife and domestic animals, residences along the lanes, bicyclers and ATVer's enjoying the advertised scenic routes? Will Mono Co. sheriffs patrol the lanes to monitor vehicle speeds?
5. Water Table & Walker River Watershed- How will the high demand of water usage affect the water table and existing wells for ranching and food farming (animal and human food) and residences? How will any runoff affect the water quality of the Walker River Watershed?
6. Outdoor Grow- Are there plans for outdoor cannabis growing which would have a much greater effect on toxic water runoff, toxicity to animals, and highly increased odor?
7. Viable Market- Is there a current and future viable and profitable market, or is the market saturated?
8. Safety and Protection- Is the Mono Co. Sheriff Dept. adequately staffed and prepared for any safety and protection that could arise at the very northern end of Mono Co.?
9. Douglas Co. Neighbors- As border neighbors to Douglas Co., does Douglas Co. support this development which borders its residents? It is my understanding and belief that Douglas Co. does not support this proposed cannabis farm.
10. Land Use- Is this cannabis farm development in keeping with rural Antelope Valley and the traditional agriculture use long established here? Doesn't cattle and hay ranching, and food farming have greater value for our current and future needs?

In closing, we believe that the proposed large commercial cannabis farm will diminish the quality of our lives in this beautiful rural valley for our residents and our visiting tourists. Our local communities will be directly affected. The visual blight of the farm will also detract from the scenic value of the valley for all.

How does this large cannabis development specifically benefit our valley for the greater number of residents and tourists?

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Kerry Roeser and Michael Elam  
The Roeser Family

## Michael Draper

---

**From:** packerslm.52@schat.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:25 PM  
**To:** J. Scott Bush; Michael Draper; wsigimura@mono.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Fwd: cannabis operation permit

[You don't often get email from packerslm.52@schat.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

----- Original Message -----

Subject: cannabis operation permit  
Date: 2022-12-10 1:57 pm  
From: packerslm.52@schat.net  
To: mdraper@mono.ca.gov, jpeters@mono.ca.gov, sbush@mono.ca.gov  
Cc: wsugimura@mono.ca.gov, hwillson@mono.ca.gov

Dear Planning Committee, and Land Tack Commission:

We are writing this letter in opposition to a permit application for a comprehensive commercial cannabis facility creation on property bordering the Nevada border in northern Mono County calling themselves Sierra High Farm. We are aware of 2 unsuccessful operations permitted in the valley one of which did not get off the ground and a person from that permit is now one of the applicants for this new one. The neighboring County of Douglas in Nevada is opposed to the facility and operation.

The infrastructure of this valley does not support such a commercial enterprise. This large industrial facility is not a benefit to the citizens of Mono County.

The issues are many and have not been addressed accurately or adequately and effect the valley, its residents and also across the state line into Nevada. Below are outlined only some of these concerning issues.

1. Water issues are many. The water resource that is now available here is used for the production of domestic food. A large amount of this water is under judicial decree to go to Nevada's Paiute Indian Reservation and Weber dam. The water is transported through Topaz Lake and the West Walker River. We have 3 water ditches passing through our ranch and they are all currently dry. Pollution of this watershed is of great concern.
2. Cannabis is toxic and poisonous to both the wildlife resource and domestic animals.
3. The Hazardous waste issue is huge and the by products of this waste must be transported and deposited to certified dump. The Antelope Valley dump did not permit the disposal of burned debris waste remains from the devastating Mountain View Wildfire Nov. 17, 2020.
4. Contaminated soil is a serious concern also. This was demonstrated after the devastating Mountain View Wildfire of Nov. 17, 2020. The debris waste removal was done by Mono County and the companies doing the removal had to transport this waste to distant dumps by truck as it was not permitted at local dumps. Quite an expense for the county of Mono.

5. The security problems generated by such an industry are a serious concern for citizens as we are aware of the shortage of local Sheriff deputies in this large expanse of northern Mono Co.

Thank you for your attention,

Sincerely,

Marye and Lou Roeser  
746 N. River Lane  
Coleville, CA 96107  
530-721-7925

Susan and Ron Barnes  
124 Hare Court  
Coleville, CA  
707-451-2783

December 13, 2022

ATTN: Michael Draper

After my initial email sent to you on 11/9/22 regarding my opposition to Sierra High Farms, I have spent more time looking into this proposed business that will be addressed by the Planning Commission on 12/15/22. I have read through Mono County Planning Commission Special Meeting Agenda Packet, Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration 9/28/22, and information available within the Sierra High Farms website.

After my research what most caught my attention is the Resident Letters within the Planning Commission Packet. I wholeheartedly agree with the residents and have the same concerns noted in these letters. So, no need for me to repeat what they have effectively covered.

Sierra High Farms is not a small operation and **does not fit in with the existing landscape and culture here within Antelope Valley**. I live in the southern part of the valley but utilize the northern part of the valley for:

- Recreational purposes. The area is a popular destination for off-road enthusiasts. There are featured off-road trails that are accessed from Eastside Ln where High Sierra Farms proposed location is. Per X-off Road description, "Holy Climber is a busy trail with...". The trails accessed from Eastside Rd, going past the proposed site, link up with trails that go to areas such as Bodie, Lobell Lake, Mt Patterson, and into Nevada. The off-road scenic experience will be changed with Sierra High Farms operations.
- Regular use of Eastside Ln in the vicinity of the proposed cannabis farm when driving over the Nevada state line for shopping, doctors appt, visit family in Carson City, etc. In other words, in the area a lot.

Like Colitas Farms, N River Rd, Walker CA back in 2020, it appears I along with others in Antelope Valley including our Nevada neighbors, still have community opposition to having cannabis farms in this valley. For all the reasons noted in the resident letters submitted to date, Sierra High Farms is not the type of agricultural business we feel best suited for Antelope Valley.

Specifically addressing fire concerns, I am victim of the Mountain View fire as well as my parents home lost in the fire, and my sister's property damaged by the fire. Although I greatly appreciate our local fire department, they were unable to manage the Nov 2020 Mountain View Fire. The same can happen again. The risk can increase with a large sized cannabis farm in the area.

Regarding the concerns for a higher crime rate, we can say that valley currently has a low crime rate; however, it only takes one big event that will impact this valley for a very long time. No one can predict the impact of crime until it happens. Security systems in place or not. The nature of the cannabis business increases the risk.

Within the Planning Commission Packet, there were a high number of “less than significant”. Less than significant to who? Even though we are a small population here in Antelope Valley each one of us counts. Our opinions and concerns count the most since we do live and invest in this valley. A lot of us bought and committed to staying here until we no longer walk this earth.

Both my husband and myself are opposed to the Sierra High Project.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron and Susan Barnes

cc. Supervisor John Peters

**From:** [topaz472](#)  
**To:** [CDD Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Sierra High Farm MND meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, December 8, 2022 8:25:29 PM

---

You don't often get email from topaz472@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Just a few more questions:

Why is Labor housing needed if hiring locally?

If allowed how many additional homes or housing facilities will be allowed at maximum.

Where on property will they be located?

Will they require extra wells?

How will they be powered?

Where will power come from?

What other housing associated buildings will be allowed?

How much more traffic and effects will this have is entire families move into housing? Traffic?

It was mentioned at the Zoom meeting by SHF that the plant material that will not be processed will be allowed to be composted and tilled into existing on site soils. What about the hazardous materials? How will this effect soils, wildlife, ground water and water run off? How will effects be monitored?

How can Mono planning assure local residents that local law enforcement, fire and paramedics (that will be responding) have reviewed, approved and can provide services for the health and safety of our valley?

The North Bay Business Journal published a report that odor can travel 1500yd at least. How is no mitigation required for odor for residents down wind (Douglas County). Should project be approved, can we request a odor reader at the Vickers property for a year instead of waiting for the Odor? I'm requesting a year due to wind and inversion layers that may increase odors at certain times throughout the year.

Respectfully

Terri Dikes

AVOICE- Antelope Valley Organization to Interrupt Cannibas Enterprise

**From:** [packerslm.52@schat.net](mailto:packerslm.52@schat.net)  
**To:** [Michael Draper](#); [John Peters](#); [sbush@mono.ca.gov](mailto:sbush@mono.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** [Wendy Sugimura](#); [Heidi Willson](#)  
**Subject:** cannabis operation permit  
**Date:** Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:57:21 PM

---

[You don't often get email from [packerslm.52@schat.net](mailto:packerslm.52@schat.net). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Planning Committee, and Land Tack Commission:

We are writing this letter in opposition to a permit application for a comprehensive commercial cannabis facility creation on property bordering the Nevada border in northern Mono County calling themselves Sierra High Farm. We are aware of 2 unsuccessful operations permitted in the valley one of which did not get off the ground and a person from that permit is now one of the applicants for this new one. The neighboring County of Douglas in Nevada is opposed to the facility and operation.

The infrastructure of this valley does not support such a commercial enterprise. This large industrial facility is not a benefit to the citizens of Mono County.

The issues are many and have not been addressed accurately or adequately and effect the valley, its residents and also across the state line into Nevada. Below are outlined only some of these concerning issues.

1. Water issues are many. The water resource that is now available here is used for the production of domestic food. A large amount of this water is under judicial decree to go to Nevada's Paiute Indian Reservation and Weber dam. The water is transported through Topaz Lake and the West Walker River. We have 3 water ditches passing through our ranch and they are all currently dry. Pollution of this watershed is of great concern.
2. Cannabis is toxic and poisonous to both the wildlife resource and domestic animals.
3. The Hazardous waste issue is huge and the by products of this waste must be transported and deposited to certified dump. The Antelope Valley dump did not permit the disposal of burned debris waste remains from the devastating Mountain View Wildfire Nov. 17, 2020.
4. Contaminated soil is a serious concern also. This was demonstrated after the devastating Mountain View Wildfire of Nov. 17, 2020. The debris waste removal was done by Mono County and the companies doing the removal had to transport this waste to distant dumps by truck as it was not permitted at local dumps. Quite an expense for the county of Mono.
5. The security problems generated by such an industry are a serious concern for citizens as we are aware of the shortage of local Sheriff

deputies in this large expanse of northern Mono Co.

Thank you for your attention,

Sincerely,

Marye and Lou Roeser  
746 N. River Lane  
Coleville, CA 96107  
530-721-7925

**From:** [Dean Hemminger](#)  
**To:** [CDD Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on Use Permit 22-010/Olson  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 2:03:41 PM

---

You don't often get email from deanhemminger@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

To the Mono County Planning Commission,

We are the nearest neighbors to Angela Olson, and would like to express our unconditional support for the issuance of a Use Permit allowing her to keep the 2 power poles and overhead power lines currently installed on her property. The 2 power poles and overhead lines are visible from our house and we do not find them to be a visual nuisance.

In March of 2020, we were ordered to remove the 2 power poles and overhead power lines on our property. We have been in contact with Liberty since the order, but have yet to receive ANY proposal from Liberty to do the work, despite our constant efforts. They keep telling us they are busy and will get to it. Liberty does not seem to care if we are in violation of Mono County's order. In 15 months we might be in violation of the order. We do not wish this anguish on anyone else, therefore we would like Angela Olson to be allowed to keep her overhead power lines.

Thank you for your consideration of our opinion.

Sincerely,

Dean and Lynne Hemminger  
194 Wunderlich Way  
Coleville, CA

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

**From:** [April Sall](#)  
**To:** [Heidi Willson](#)  
**Cc:** [Wendy Sugimura](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments to Planning Commission concerning use permit 22-010  
**Date:** Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:44:28 PM

---

**From:** lynn or mark <lynnimarkl@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:00 PM  
**To:** April Sall <asall@mono.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments to Planning Commission concerning use permit 22-010

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Hello April,

Here are my comments to the PC, Can you please see that they receive them.

Thanks,

Mark

I submit the following comments to the Planning Commission concerning Use Permit 22-010/Olson.

Overhead power lines create a negative visual impact and increase the risk of wildfire. Overhead lines have been, or are being, phased out in most areas of the county for these and other reasons. When the property owners obtained their building permit they agreed to install the utilities underground. The overhead lines were placed at the owners request in violation of both the permit and the intent of the General Plan and Antelope Valley Area Plan. This is a correctable situation and the burial of these lines can be accomplished without harming the environment or breaking the bank.

While overhead lines can be approved (under certain conditions) the intent seems to be that these exemptions be approved early on in the process and not after the project is completed. Granting these late exemptions is unfair to those who play by the rules. For most folks, the building of a house is an 'economic hardship', but suppling power is a normal and expected part of the construction costs and it is reasonable to think that a person would budget for it.

The estimate submitted for the the cost to underground does not reflect the actual work that would be required and is astronomically inflated. More than one estimate should have been obtained,

there was ample time to get additional estimates; at the very least an estimate by Liberty Utilities should have been included. At last month's PC meeting the Paiva permit staff report stated that Liberty Utilities related that under grounding 600 feet of those lines could reasonably cost \$32,000. The lines under consideration here are half that distance so it follows that that cost could be half that amount. A quick internet search indicates that the cost for underground power lines is around \$10 per foot: 330 feet would cost \$3300. If the under grounding were to start at an existing (and permitted) power pole that is located at the start of the property owners's driveway and ran along the unpaved driveway the cost could be significantly reduced. Maintaining the required defensible space under the overhead lines will incur a constant and long term expense that would be avoided with underground lines.

While there are other power lines in the area (some which serve this project and were illegally placed but recently retroactively approved by the PC), the poles being considered present a unique and significant impact on the visual character of the area. They are located on a ridge top and break the skyline - something that occurs at few, if any, other places through Antelope Valley along Highway 395. Fig. 6 in the staff report demonstrates the impact the poles have on a neighboring property. Comparing this immediate area to the whole of Antelope Valley, as the staff report does, is not a fair or an accurate depiction of the visual impact.

The ultimate responsibility for compliance rests on the owner who drew the permits and had Liberty do the installation but both the County and Liberty share some responsibility for the mess. That the relationship between Liberty and the County is so poor that a simple phone call or letter can't correct the continued practice of putting poles where they don't belong is something that needs to be corrected. The way that the inspection and compliance system is set up pits neighbors against neighbors and that is upsetting.

Since these poles should have been placed underground in the first place, they should be required to be placed underground now. It is unfortunate that this will create extra expense for the property owner but this is a result of their own decisions. The actual cost is likely to be very well below the estimate they submitted.

Mark Langner  
Coleville