

Speaker 1 ([00:00:02](#)):

Okay. I'll call a hearing back to order. We took a short break and we're gonna start back in with testimony. So if Jenny would call the next witness please.

Speaker 2 ([00:00:12](#)):

Aaron Remit.

Speaker 3 ([00:00:24](#)):

Okay. Aaron Romine, 5208 East Victory Road. And just not everything I wanna talk about is redundant, but, you know, the good people that have talked already have covered a lot of items. If I had it within me and didn't think we were so close to the sheriff's office, I would've brought a flashlight in and just every 10 seconds or so just blasted y'all in the eyes because the poor guy across the street, 20 or 30 cars pointing straight at him. Swing to the right, comes right through my living room. It's excessive. The airport's way far away. It's not, you know, we're not a commercial outfit out there. It's quiet at night. You know, I start work like 3:00 AM. I'm up having a cup of coffee. It's quiet. I'm afraid it's not going to be. It's a concern. And we can ... You know, they sit here and told you they didn't have a code violation and they did.

([00:01:21](#)):

I just don't think they're being up and up about how far they're gonna take this operation when they get it set up. And one of the other gentlemen down the street, you know, he mentioned they'll just pay the fines. And they won't care about the people around them. This operation's gonna be bigger than what's currently there. , 20 or 30 cars. And then if he's allowed to, he can just bring in 70 for a parking lot meeting every once in a while. You know, he states he hopes that doesn't happen, but I can damn well guarantee you it's gonna ... Backup beepers, they can't tell us on how many trucks they are and maybe they're out of code violation and they should have on every truck. But the fact is they do have them on vehicles. Everybody's heard them. And I'm not gonna sit here and tell everybody what's right and what's wrong, but the area that he's in, he's, he's gonna have his guys driving through 20 minutes to get to the freeway from there on Garrity.

([00:02:23](#)):

So what all his guys are gonna do is they're gonna sneak around every side road and find every access. So people on victory may be complaining right now, but it'll be all the people on those little back country roads with kids and animals and dogs that, you know, probably get out on the road every once in a while. But wow, it's, it's a big operation to shove in that area. I only been there a few years, but it's a beautiful area. It's quiet. It's fun. And, , other than me begging you not to approve this guy because I just don't think this company is being forthright with everything they planning on doing, that's, that's what I'm here to do. Beg you to not approve something that Bob Wright shouldn't be there. It shouldn't be there. And if he bought it thinking he could do the commercial, yeah, he probably should have done some legwork and that's a little redundant too, but it's true.

([00:03:14](#)):

, Just want to take the time to share with you what I believe everybody around there feels, and that is that they're gonna be put out and this company's gonna get to reap in benefits because maybe he bought a ch- he, there's so many commercial properties he coulda go purchase that gives him a better access to the freeway and everything, and nobody's thinking about that.

Speaker 4 ([00:03:35](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 5 ([00:03:38](#)):

David Eaton.

Speaker 6 ([00:03:49](#)):

Yeah, I'm David Eaton. I live on , Queen Victoria Court, and I wanna talk a little bit about more like the kids and the stuff. We have a lot of kids that ride bikes and stuff on that street, and it's right there where the trucks, if you get them trucks and stuff coming off the road where they, they wanna put that, that big building and stuff, and them guys are gonna be going out and in, and they can't tell me that they won't do nothing because I've been around this stuff before. And they got, got a lot of kids riding bikes all the way down the road. Horses, I got horses right there. And it's not done right now. But if they get them trucks going in there and then backing up at, in that night, it makes so much noise. There's like eight houses there, people, families.

([00:04:52](#)):

And it's just a, a bad place to me. It seems like they could move on out in the country more where it's less noisy and stuff. And then there's a lot more land where they can go and be happier for everybody.

Speaker 4 ([00:05:13](#)):

Mr. Eaton, where are you on the map? Can you point to it.

Speaker 7 ([00:05:22](#)):

Pardon?

Speaker 6 ([00:05:25](#)):

Victoria Court.

Speaker 2 ([00:05:28](#)):

I'm trying to

Speaker 4 ([00:05:28](#)):

See where you're at. So Victoria- Right

Speaker 6 ([00:05:33](#)):

There.

Speaker 4 ([00:05:36](#)):

Right there.

Speaker 6 ([00:05:37](#)):

Yeah, right there. And this road comes, Victoria Road right here. Yeah. And it goes, this is the road I'm talking about where there's about, I don't know, six, eight houses here. And they're always traveling that, and a lot of people. And if they get them trucks in there, and they'll be back in at night and they'll

be coming in, because I've been around a lot of construction and I've seen it. And I- and them kids on bikes, there's probably now, right now, six kids in that court right there that's riding around every day.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:24](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([00:06:25](#)):

Thank you. Chairman, a question for Dan. Dan, I think I read the average lot size for these residential properties and they look like their bigger properties is around three acres, three and a half acres. Is that right?

Speaker 7 ([00:06:39](#)):

Commissioner Badbeek, that is correct.

Speaker 4 ([00:06:41](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:06:44](#)):

Okay,

Speaker 5 ([00:06:45](#)):

Next. Carl Anderson.

Speaker 8 ([00:07:00](#)):

Carl Anderson, 505 7th Avenue in Caldwell. Thank you, commissioners, for hearing this. , I am speaking in favor of the conditional use permit. , In reading the application and the associated documents, I can only conclude that this is a worthy request. The property in question is zoned agriculture. That's key. The, it's nearly three and a half acres in size. I'd like to point out the allowed uses with agricultural zoning without a public hearing is a bed and breakfast, a nursery, a landscape business, outdoor sales and displays, seasonal activities, yard and garage sales. I'd submit that a number of those are far more active than our application. , In reading the FCOs, I was a little surprised at the findings. , There were a recommendation to approve by staff, which should carry significant weight. The, , letters of support from the jurisdictions that have traffic oversight, including City of Nampa, Highway District, and Idaho Transportation Department, all which have professional traffic engineers on staff that if there were issues, they would bring them forward.

([00:08:51](#)):

That's their business. They're good at it. We should listen to them. They said there were no problems. , It's a little frustrating for property owners to work with agencies, in this case, two years that have jurisdiction, obtain approval, and have it ignored by parties making the decisions based on emotion and not fact. Again, the traffic findings are based on engineering traffic principles. , The city was fine with the application. That should carry some weight with the future use of, , industrial adjacent to the airport. , And with ... We're not looking to vote to change the character of an area if all the above uses are already allowed without a public hearing. With that, I'd stand for questions.

Speaker 1 ([00:10:01](#)):

No questions?

Speaker 4 ([00:10:02](#)):

Thank you for being here.

Speaker 1 ([00:10:03](#)):

Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 5 ([00:10:06](#)):

Taryl Jones.

Speaker 9 ([00:10:18](#)):

Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Terrell. I go by TJ Jones. My address is 5011 East Victory Road, nearby Idaho. I am just west of that property, and if I would be so kind, can I step up at the map and show where I live?

Speaker 7 ([00:10:38](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 9 ([00:10:42](#)):

From up here, proposed property, my house is right here. My lane comes right next to the property, and this is where my little oasis is. , As far as he had a wonderful opportunity to speak with Jeff, went up there, talked with him, , and certainly, just like the serpent, he whispered, "Sweet nothing's in my ear and said they were gonna be small." They're, , , employee owned. It's just a small operation, just a few trucks, just a few cars. We're not planning on expanding, but everything I'm hearing from here is that's just the wedge and then they're gonna blow it up. Not maybe tomorrow, that's what their plans are. He took me through a, a shop, showed me the printing press. Man, nice printing press. He said, "We're just gonna be doing a few signs here. It's just gonna be a few trucks. This is not our main place." But when you look at their main place, it's a void of vegetation, it's dirt, it's filled with trucks, cars everywhere, packed.

([00:11:53](#)):

As he mentioned, they're cleaning up the place. They're removing trees. They're sterilizing the environment around it in order to turn it into a big dirt parking lot. With trucks are gonna be coming, the beeps that have been talked about is gonna directly impact me. , As far as when we look at it, quality of life, cars already coming up my lane, trying to get out to victory, not to belabor the point, but it takes a while to get out onto victory currently. , One of the things is they say, , we're trying to be good neighbors, but yet they're trying to bully us through and through this whole process. , They've got their attorneys study and have all the knowledge. We have jobs. We don't have the ability to do that so that they can cite obscure laws, rules, and regulations in order to get this through.

([00:12:56](#)):

Now, my neighbor across the big field to the south, John, , occasionally his cows get into my yard and he comes over and shoes them out talking with him. He's worked with, , Jeff and the company, and if this doesn't go through today, hey, they got a backup plan. They're gonna petition the city with John's help,

which his property borders the city. They will pay his extra taxes in order, coming from John, his extra taxes, in order for their property to butt up against the city property so they could still push this thing through.

(00:13:36):

They are not honest. They are being quite deceitful in this whole process, and it certainly does not belong there in our rural neighborhood. Thank you.

Speaker 4 (00:13:50):

Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Speaker 1 (00:13:51):

Can you give me John's last name, and are you talking with property 3066 on the map?

Speaker 9 (00:13:59):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (00:14:00):

Okay. And what do you know his- You know his last name?

Speaker 6 (00:14:06):

W-A-K-E-L-A-M. Oh, he knows.

Speaker 9 (00:14:09):

Okay. So anyways, that's all and that works. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (00:14:13):

Okay. Next. All right. Is there anyone who entered the gallery before you had the option to sign up to testify today and you would like to testify? Okay. You're gonna have to come up and write your name down.

Speaker 7 (00:15:28):

Okay.

Speaker 1 (00:15:29):

So-

Speaker 5 (00:15:30):

So, Paul Flatt and Bernadette Elway, if I could have you raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help

Speaker 10 (00:15:40):

You

Speaker 5 ([00:15:41](#)):

God? I do. Thank you. All right.

Speaker 10 ([00:15:43](#)):

Thank you. I'm Paul Flatt. I live at, , 12 North Queen Victoria Court, right across the street from this property. And, , interesting listening to the gentleman whose property this is talk. Only a few of us trucks have beepers. And yes, sometimes we do all night work and sometimes we might have up to 70 vehicles. That piece of property is not for that at all. Not even close. At night, the beepers would be really bad. Please respect the, , planning and zoning commission and, , don't reverse their decision. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:16:22](#)):

Okay. Any questions?

Speaker 4 ([00:16:24](#)):

I don't have any-

Speaker 1 ([00:16:24](#)):

Paul, can you point out your property, please? Sure.

Speaker 10 ([00:16:30](#)):

, let's see. Greenbound, this property right here.

Speaker 1 ([00:16:34](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 5 ([00:16:39](#)):

Bernanda Elway.

Speaker 11 ([00:16:48](#)):

Commissioners, thank you for taking the time to listen to us. , I just wanna make a issue on the traffic. I don't know how many studies there's been or whatever, but I live on 6005 East Victory Road in Napa. And three years ago, of course, I have to reiterate that the traffic is horrendous since then. But three years ago, my husband and I were turning into our driveway and, , you know, the garage door's up and we're ready to go in and all of a sudden our car was totaled in our own driveway. That's three years ago on this road that everybody's talking about that has had so much more impact and growth. I can't even believe that a company would ... We already bought Sunrock, and now we've got this one, and the street is just not built for that kind of traffic. So I just wanna say that we were the victims turning into our own driveway and got our car totaled.

([00:17:59](#)):

I don't know how many people can say that, but that's just to show you how dangerous that road is. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([00:18:07](#)):

Bernadette, can you show me where your lot is there?

Speaker 11 ([00:18:12](#)):

Let's see. We are

Speaker 12 ([00:18:17](#)):

60 ... Let's see. I can't find it. Her home ... It's not on the map, Bernie. Okay. It's gonna be on, it's just to the- I'm off of- ... East side of Pitt, which is, like, pretty much the edge of your map. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:18:29](#)):

Okay. The eastboundary-

Speaker 11 ([00:18:31](#)):

Closer to

Speaker 12 ([00:18:31](#)):

Robinson,

Speaker 11 ([00:18:32](#)):

But I mean, we're all.

Speaker 1 ([00:18:35](#)):

Okay. Thank you. Okay. So last call for anyone who has spoke who wanted to ... So there's time now for the rebuttal from the applicant or their representative.

Speaker 13 ([00:19:01](#)):

Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, commissioners. , Arby, do you mind, , talking about the code violation? I'll, I'll have something to add on top of that as well, but, , I believe she has an answer to kind of the situation going on there.

Speaker 7 ([00:19:14](#)):

Chairman, commissioner, is that okay if I touch on some things?

Speaker 1 ([00:19:16](#)):

Sure. Yes.

Speaker 7 ([00:19:17](#)):

, So just kind of going back, so Commissioner Brooks had asked, , about water and sewer, how close those are. I tried to look at City of Nampa's comments that information was not included in their comments. I do not have that information, unfortunately. , Commissioner Van Beek had asked about the width about Victory Road, so it's about 40 feet wide from shoulder to shoulder, , right at the subject property. And then for the code enforcement violation, I believe this was during the time that Big Horn Traffic Services was, , in the transition period of purchasing the property. So on the case file, it is noted that the previous owner was the one that was, , attached to that case file. , And then effective as of

February 20, I wanna say 28th, , Big Horn then bought that property, which then transferred over, , needing the updated application in March 25th of 2025.

(00:20:16):

So during that transition period, , if there were the noticing to be sent out for that code enforcement violation, it could have been gotten lost, , between, you know, the currents and previous owners, but that's kind of the, I guess ... Okay. Some, some <laugh> some determined between those two of whether the applicant received that code enforcement fil- violation or not.

Speaker 1 (00:20:39):

Okay. Did that answer your question?

Speaker 4 (00:20:42):

Yes, thank you. Okay.

Speaker 1 (00:20:44):

Okay.

Speaker 13 (00:20:45):

Hey, thank you, Chairman. , Just kind of a little bit add on top of that. , Yeah, , we as applicants have never received notice of any sort of violation on, on that behalf. , For context, the property owner was under contract at that time, , and we had not closed in on it yet. So, , my assumption on this is that it was the previous owner that was doing some sort of activity, activity that we were not aware of. , And, you know, to be honest with you, , chairman and commissioners, , that's, as their representative, that is one of the things that I hit on immediately is that if you're on that property whatsoever, that there needs to be zero operations and then they have adhered that to us this entire time. So I, we, we are not aware of any code violation, , on, on our behalf.

(00:21:22):

Otherwise, I felt that we would've been sent notice on that. , I would actually, I would then like to go over to Commissioner Brooks' question, , in the very beginning of why we did not go through the city. , To be honest with you, again, two years ago after reviewing, we first came to the county with this because we are, , one parcel away, , from the city limits. , After reviewing with the staff, we had believed that going actually the county approach with this, , would actually offer, , the neighbors and the county an opportunity to have some sort of say with the, with these operations and to be able to have their hand on how, , this piece of property is going to be, , developed, for lack of a better word, on that one. , So if we thought, if we were going to go through the city, that would then open the floodgates of intensive uses that everyone's kind of talking that's going abo- well beyond ours.

(00:22:06):

So we, we wanted to be able to have the neighbors to be able to have some sort of restrictions to what is being voted on today rather than going through the, through the city and having a whole list of, , uses that we could be able to use. , You know, if, if the, , along those lines, , if the, if the CUP says 30 vehicles, we are stuck and we have to adhere to that. , If the commissioners want to add additional conditions regarding the beepers, , beyond normal business hours, we're also open to that. We have been open to any of the conditions that the staff has put forward to us as, again, we want to make sure that the

county has a say in this. , We must be held co- , code to on this and we'll adhere to, , that in every capacity.

[\(00:22:46\)](#):

, Of course, we're going to, you know, to the comment about if we've been, , trying to get avenues to the city, of course, , , we're exploring every avenue possible, , whether that's through, , you know, the county once again, through whatever means that may be, we're going through the, , through the city. I mean, that was, was directed by us through the planning and zoning commission, so it would not make sense for us not to explore any avenues that we can to be able to have this because, again, this is a two year operation and the owner, owners were forced to close on this property, and unfortunately they cannot be able to sit under, under contract for two years. So they have it and they want to be able to, , operate out of the site. , You know, really as a whole, , many of the neighbors concerns, , should be handled at the land use and comprehensive planning level, , not just being put on one particular, , owner.

[\(00:23:32\)](#):

, If this, if they believe that this needs to be a rural residential, they, , they need to, , speak their, , their belief at, and amend the comprehensive planning when that is, , going up to be voted on. , And again, I would like to reiterate, , this is not a commercial use whatsoever. If there was deemed to be commercial, , the staff findings would have found that. , Once again, this is an approved use through the COP, which we are checking every single box. , I ask you to rely on the staff and agencies to determine if we are meeting code, and they have found that we are. , I cannot stress this enough for the board, , but there must be substantial evidence that proves that the staff and agency findings are incorrect and that there has been, and so far there's been nothing introduced that shows, , that the applicant, the staff, and the agencies and all their experts are incorrect on their analysis.

[\(00:24:22\)](#):

This is where the board needs to make their decision in order to protect the property rights of the landowner, despite the popularity. Open to any more questions after.

Speaker 4 [\(00:24:30\)](#):

Chairman, I have, I guess, first question for you. Can you expand on your statement when you said that the applicant was forced to close on the property?

Speaker 13 [\(00:24:41\)](#):

Well, I guess f- force that no one's actually forcing to be able to move it, but, you know, generally with, , whenever you try to go be able to purchase, you know, a house, you're gonna have that due diligence period and you can only extend it for so long on there. And, you know, at the time we, when we had, , reached or talked to the county, , we were thinking a CUP process, , was gonna be roughly around six months or so, , to be able to, you know, get your application in and to be able to be heard. Unfortunately, just out of, , the circumstances, you know, out of the hands of the staff and just kind of how busy everything is right now, that's, we're obviously well beyond six months. So, , the applicant was then at, at their mind had to make a decision whether or not they stay under contract, even though that they've, you know, extended many times to be able to accommodate that two year process.

[\(00:25:26\)](#):

, So eventually they had to make the decision of whether they wanted to close or not. So that, when, when I say force, that's kind of what I mean by

Speaker 4 ([00:25:35](#)):

The- Okay. Right.

Speaker 13 ([00:25:35](#)):

No one actually physically forced them,

Speaker 4 ([00:25:38](#)):

Right? I agree with you. Yeah. Okay. So thank you for that clarification. And then Arbe or Dan, we just went through the AOI process with Nampa and some of those boundaries were drawn back. Everybody was scrambling to figure out, did we confirm that this ... I ... Some of the cities were updating their plans. Is this a confirmed industrial zone for the future for NAMPA? Did we confirm that?

Speaker 7 ([00:26:06](#)):

Chairman, Commissioner Van Beek. , So in regards to the area of impact, this property has always been in the area of impact even after, , the updated change here recently. The zoning is in their NAMPA's future comprehensive plan designated for industrial in that area.

Speaker 4 ([00:26:23](#)):

Okay. Thank you. And thanks for helping restructure my question.

Speaker 1 ([00:26:30](#)):

So Connor, I'm gonna ask you a question, and if you're uncomfortable answering it, that could be your answer. But, , it was represented in testimony earlier that the property immediately adjacent to the south gives you a pathway to annexation if you were so to, so inclined to make an agreement with its current owner. Is that ... Do you s- agree with that presentation or is there a nuance there that I need to know of that that is not a continuous possibility to have this pos- your, your parcel annexed in?

Speaker 13 ([00:27:10](#)):

Chairman, , do you mind kind of elaborating on that a little bit more? I,

Speaker 1 ([00:27:14](#)):

I ... So property R3066, it was represented that that property would make you continuous to the city limits of Nampa to make your property 3067304010 to make your property annexable into the city of Nampa. Is that ... Do you agree with that presentation or is there something there I'm, I'm not aware of?

Speaker 13 ([00:27:46](#)):

, Chairman, , yes, I will answer that. So we, we've been continuously talking to the City of Nampa, not only just, , for the application that we have right now, because they have to provide comment, , as well, but, and again, the Planning Zoning Commission and, , you know, they suggested us for us to, , go to the city to be able to get annexed, so we have to do our due diligence there. , In order for us to be able to be annexed, it's either we've got to go through the three parcels, , I believe it's three, , directly to the west of us or that one, , property to the south of us, , Mr. Wakelum's property. So- Right. Yes, that, that has been brought up and that would make most sense on a planning level for us to be able to do that.

Speaker 7 ([00:28:26](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 13 ([00:28:27](#)):

But again, Chairman, that, if I may add on top of that, that's, that, at that point, that does involve a, a whole nother owner. , You know, that's really not part of this project whatsoever. So there's a lot of nuances that are involved and it's, it's not as easy as, , "Hey, jump in here." <laugh>

Speaker 1 ([00:28:45](#)):

That's why I wanted your response to that. Okay. Do you guys have any other additional questions?

Speaker 4 ([00:28:54](#)):

I do not. Chairman, I move we close public testimony.

Speaker 1 ([00:29:03](#)):

Yeah, I'm done. Do you have any other questions?

Speaker 14 ([00:29:06](#)):

Mr. Chairman, I do not have any other questions, so I will second.

Speaker 1 ([00:29:10](#)):

Okay. Thank you. Motion's been made and seconded to close public testimony. All those in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 4 ([00:29:17](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:29:18](#)):

Aye. Motion carries unanimously. At this time, the board will begin deliberation as a reminder to the audience decisions by the board must be based on information in the record and criteria outlined in the Idaho State Code and Canyon County ordinances. No new information is to presented or discussed. We will not take comments from the au- audience. It's important that we are able to discuss our opinion, make specific findings, and therefore please be respectful as the board discusses this matter.

Speaker 4 ([00:29:50](#)):

Chairman?

Speaker 1 ([00:29:51](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 4 ([00:29:52](#)):

I guess I'll jump in, and this has had good presentation by both the applicant and the people in opposition that are the boots on the ground that live there and, , Mr. Gray is a good presenter. I did not

find that he addressed the safety concerns by the people that actually live there. , And I understand why the planning and zoning would have made a finding that it would be injurious and that traffic patterns would be an issue. It's hard to argue with people who have been involved in traffic accidents. We've asked about the road, which we don't control. , But the ability to access property in an area where we as a board, I think, make good findings for the impact on decisions that we make. This area is predominantly residential. I don't control the city of Nampa. It would be the argument that has been presented that Nampa wants to make this industrial to limit the airport.

(00:31:02):

I didn't hear complaints about Nampa's airport from the people in opposition. I heard complaints about loading and then changing a housing unit that's consistent with other property owners in the area to be something different. I have respect for DASCO. I think that they've been a big player in this area, but as we go through the criteria on this, I would need, I guess, the board's, the other, my fellow commissioner's input on how we're going to overcome the planning and zoning argument that it changes the character of the area to introduce this. , And that the traffic patterns and the concerns, we have some testimony, but from the highway district that's been referenced. But we also have testimony that weighs, I think, equally as important for the people that live there and navigate those roadways day in and day out. So there's, again, good arguments on both sides, but I didn't hear something in my mind that would help me if I decision this to approve it in good conscience for the people that are navigating this.

(00:32:28):

And there's honestly been some conflicting testimony that I appreciate the clarification on the conditional ... I mean, sorry, the code enforcement issues, but there, there are beepers in the area, different things. There's the non-conformance, which we can get around. There's caveats in here that ... And even on the location of the building, that's ... And whichever gentleman it was that has property, , maybe it was Mr. Jones, that his property is bordering the property that the applicant has purchased, but to have people going down that and to have a business with 20 or 30 trucks a day pickups that changes his life for him. And it changes the life for the gentleman that the headlights are in his window, Mr. Reman. Mr. Eaton references kids, bikes, animals. These properties are big enough to hold livestock and hobby farm operations that's different than a staging area.

(00:33:43):

So maybe the juxtaposition of two differing land uses, we continue to try to put these side by side. If this was a planned unit development, and we were talking maybe about a gathering place, , an excavated pond, a coffee shop, that's different than a staging area.

Speaker 1 (00:34:17):

You're next. If you so choose. <Laugh> Yeah,

Speaker 14 (00:34:21):

There you go. Mr. Chairman, this is, , this is a difficult one and from a standpoint of ... And I, and I ... The two of you know I'm very adamant in not even attempting to look at the audience when we deliberate, but I feel like part of this has to, in my, , deliberation here and what I thought when I asked my initial question, and to correct you, sir, , I did not ask if, why he did not go by a different piece of property. I asked why he didn't just go through the city, because I could see that large parcel sitting there, that all he had to do was get an agreement, something that was established right there to make them contiguous because I understand how annexation works.

[\(00:35:37\)](#):

I've lived here my entire life, so will there be undue interference with existing or future traffic patterns? Traffic already sucks. Future, it's gonna get worse. It's just the w- ... I mean, so what I'm trying to say, which I really hate looking at and talking to you guys during deliberation because it's between my fellow commissioners and I ... It's basically the way I look at this is it's being proposed that we either approve it and put conditions on it, or what I think I probably would've done if I was the applicant, is try to get a, get annexed and just do whatever I want. And you guys are trapped in the middle because we're all trapped in an environment where we've lived here 30, 40, 50 years, and ... Go back to traffic. The traffic problem is not because of the people that live in this area.

[\(00:36:42\)](#):

It's the people driving through, to and through this area.

[\(00:36:47\)](#):

So that's the predicament I'm in. If they got annexed into this, there is a whole world of options for this piece of property. So, Mr. Chairman, we have to sit here and determine whether or not we are going to approve it ourselves and put the conditions on it, or do like P&Z suggested, kick the can down the road and let some other jurisdiction take the hit for it. And at that point, I think it's very likely that the people that are going to be most impacted by this are going to be even more upset when they see what happens. So I guess I'm at an indeterminate state of, do I wanna make people mad now or do I wanna let them get mad later? And I could be persuaded either way, but this is, this is a unique one for us and I ...

Speaker 4 [\(00:37:51\)](#):

It's well said.

Speaker 14 [\(00:37:52\)](#):

I don't think that we've seen one like this, but I ... Again, I, I've lived in this en- area my entire life and it's ... Stuff like this is gonna come now or it's gonna come later and strings won't be attached. So I'm interested in your thoughts to help deliberate one way or the other.

Speaker 1 [\(00:38:29\)](#):

I've heard your testimony. I've tried to put myself in your position, also the applicant's position. You know, we re- we pre-read these cases before we come into this room, so we're not fat, dumb, and blind about some of the issues that are going on. , To some extent, m- me personally, I get really sick and tired of people not being good neighbors. So, , here's the facts of the matter. I asked the applicant about the assertion from one of the witnesses that the farmer to the south could be persuaded to make an agreement to annex in, which gave them a clear and easy right of way to annex into the city.

[\(00:39:32\)](#):

I, I been in this business for way too long. I don't really understand your place. You have not a good option and you have a worse option. Your, your not a good option is to negotiate and have the county make a conditional use permit. That's your not good option. Your unattenable option is for them to not find joy at the county and be annexed into the city one way or the other, and that gives that ground a considerably worse use than the CUP would make it. You can shake your head no if you want to, but this is the, this is the reality that is before you.

Speaker 9 ([00:40:23](#)):

But annexing into the-

Speaker 1 ([00:40:24](#)):

Don't, don't start with me in a public hearing or I will invite you out of the room, please. So I'm, I'm, , I'm frustrated with, with the mentality of just fight it and see who wins. That's not how you become good neighbors. That's not how you even start a neighborhood that can be healthy. Would I want this right beside, immediately adjacent to my property? No, I, I wouldn't. I'd be honest with you. I, I wouldn't, I would not ... If I knew that it was inevitable, I would really become proactive and try to negotiate with that person or that business to have the least possible impact to my quality of life as possible. I can't say whether you, people that are, that have testified have done that or, or you haven't done that. I haven't received evidence that you went very far in trying to negotiate.

([00:41:46](#)):

So, man, I'm, I'm, I'm sick and tired of growth, but the state legislature has not given me any kind of control valve or mechanism or a circuit breaker or anything else. So I'm just one of those cogs that are on the wheel that I don't get to choose how fast it goes or which direction it turns. And right now, it feels like it's going the wrong direction. Do we need, do we need the services that this business provides? Yes. Would it, would if it been Simon Simple for the applicant to make a condition that he wouldn't have beepers on his vehicles? Simon Simple would have been a major consideration for your quality of life. I can't deal with their headlights, but I can sure darn well deal with their noise. And at last I knew, an F-150 pickup was not heavy equipment, still isn't, probably won't be tomorrow morning, so we could have conditioned heavy equipment.

([00:43:03](#)):

We possibly could have conditioned beepers, but that wasn't, that wasn't offered and I don't have the statutory authority to do it unless it's a negotiated item. So I'm frustrated because Commissioner Brooks, at the moment, it seems to me that for the applic- applicant to get to the best and highest use of his, their property would most likely be to the process to annex and through the City of Nampa. And it grieves me because they can choose to do that and sell that property later on, and all kinds of stuff that you haven't even worried about yet today will be illegal to be done on it because it's in the industrial zone. Industrial zone is a gulf of difference from commercial, and, and that will affect your quality of life.

([00:44:11](#)):

So I would like a little bit further discussion before we kind of try to deliberate down to a, to a decision, but, , I, I agree with Commissioner Brooks that we're, we're handed a, we're handed a very frustrating thing. You know, if the, if the business ... I could see how we could condition potentially the business. You can, you can put a so- you can put so many conditions on a CUP that they're untenable. There is history in Canyon County of a conditional use permit that has 32 conditions, and I don't think it would shock you that they were never, never able to do that, but it sure made those commissioners happy because they approved it with conditions. I think that's a farce. I'm not interested in doing that. I'm either going to try to do conditions that are acceptable to the community, the neighborhood, and the applicant, or not.

([00:45:21](#)):

So I, I, I handed over to Commissioner Van Beek or Commissioner Brooks, either one.

Speaker 14 ([00:45:34](#)):

, Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would add is, , Nampa's map has that almost the entirety of that half square mile slated to be industrial, and it is directly in line with the airport runway. And based on a different use that we ha- or an application that we had considering an airport runway, I can only presume that's because that runway at some point is probably going to be looked to be made longer, so ...

Speaker 4 ([00:46:09](#)):

Chairman?

Speaker 14 ([00:46:10](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 4 ([00:46:11](#)):

I do really appreciate the comments and the deliberation. This is where we get to think out loud and process externally in front of the public. I think Commissioner Brooks raises good points that, and it was brought out by the applicant for the county to be able to put limiting restrictions on what this looks like might help that process. Like you, I'm frustrated that there wasn't a greater attempt to negotiate or ... I'll say it again for this commissioner in the almost eight years I've been in office, we don't have a comprehensive plan that provides a clear separation of competing interests. We continue to stick those next to each other, and it becomes civil issues, it becomes code enforcement issues. Nobody really wants our job chairman. I, I find it pretty fascinating, actually, but, , to try and mitigate the problems is gonna require a continued concerted effort with our comprehensive plan, which is being looked at right now.

([00:47:27](#)):

That being said, I guess what I might ... , , Here's what I'm thinking about, and you mentioned them, the conditioning of no heavy equipment, the conditioning of no beavers. With that, you have to report code enforce- enforcement violations if there's a violation of that. That's problematic for me. A limitation of 30 vehicles, somebody's gotta stand out their account. I know how this works. , I've seen it offered up on the part of an applicant to put in road improvements that help make it better, even though that's a highway district or a road district. The applicant could have. I, they, I've been here my whole life as well, and they can pony up to do that if they want to, if, if they buy in a resident- rural residential area, and they wanna help mitigate impacts, just like a developer. They can agree to provide certain amenities that help make people happy, but none of those conditions evidently were discussed by the applicant, and there wasn't confidence, and Chairman, I've seen that be a consistent position that there has to be negotiation.

([00:48:42](#)):

I'm not a civil negotiator in this capacity, but to ... Maybe what I would propose is that we extend, continue this hearing and allow the applicant some, ... They feel like they've done their due diligence. I didn't hear that today. I do know another operator that I live directly across the street from who moved the entryway, which was also the exit for the operation that's going so that they would not impact by ha- the neighbors by having headlights in there when they start their hours of operation. There was a proposal to have a fence on part of that, but that's not on the side that would come out with pickups. That might be the best thing, Chairman, is to have them try to work through and come back, and I can say for the record, because it is public record, that in the absence of trying to have those two parties negotiate successfully and come back with a, "Hey, I can get behind this, " it did not go forward.

(00:50:00):

This is an area right now that is inha- inhabited by people who intentionally purchased properties that look like they're, they are, they're bigger than what most people would choose to manage. It looks like it's a well-maintained area where there's opportunities for small hobby farming, as I've already indicated, but to introduce a different use, that to me is problematic. So then I'm back where I started. I really don't like putting incompatible uses where there's a clear no win, and to the point that I made, nobody forced this applicant to buy in this area, and shame on the realtor for not clearly identifying this, even though just because you can doesn't mean you should. And again, where you stand depends on where you sit. And right now, we have people that bother to come out who sit in direct proximity to an impact, that's their impact. We make decisions that people have to live with, and there's, there's not a clear win in this.

Speaker 1 (00:51:22):

Commissioner Brooks?

Speaker 14 (00:51:24):

Mr. Chairman, if this were to move forward, however, it ends up, , I would be interested in the board's opinion on removing the allowance of emergency operations outside of the proposed hours of operation and make this strictly a Monday through Friday.

Speaker 4 (00:51:49):

And are you proposing hours with that or just a-

Speaker 14 (00:51:53):

Right now, it's seven to six, Monday through Friday.

Speaker 4 (00:51:56):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 14 (00:51:57):

I'm just asking about potentially removing the emergency operation portion.

Speaker 1 (00:52:04):

You could, I would, for the sake of argument, I'd, I'd consider that as if, if it could get us to some kind of a conclusion. I think the ... Dan, do we have any authority to put a condition on the backup beepers? Arby?

Speaker 7 (00:52:27):

Chairman, we can. And I believe that is one of the proposed conditions. Okay.

Speaker 4 (00:52:38):

Arbai, can you bring that map up again that's got the U-shaped drive-through? Yes. So I'm assuming, yeah, the, the privacy fence and the landscaping is probably for the benefit of the gentleman that is gonna have to, has that roadway running back to his property. I don't know what that would look like, if

that would help on the headlights coming out on that Drive. If there's a fence there, it looks like there was some kind of chain link or something decorative fencing across that butt.

Speaker 14 ([00:53:25](#)):

So you're suggesting a perimeter fence?

Speaker 7 ([00:53:28](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 14 ([00:53:29](#)):

The entire perimeter?

Speaker 4 ([00:53:35](#)):

Yes. And there's a-

Speaker 1 ([00:53:38](#)):

What page

Speaker 7 ([00:53:39](#)):

Are you on? ,

Speaker 4 ([00:53:40](#)):

Where ... It's on the screen, Chairman. On the- For- Oh, I see.

Speaker 14 ([00:53:44](#)):

, 66. Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([00:53:46](#)):

Dan or Arby, is the asphalt pavement, is that in place now that surrounds the offices?

Speaker 7 ([00:53:54](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, when I did a site visit back in November of 2025, it was not paved. It is added as a condition of approval per, , the highway district.

Speaker 4 ([00:54:10](#)):

Which, Chairman, then I would submit that we include that.

Speaker 1 ([00:54:19](#)):

So I don't have clarity of what you're, you're requiring them to do.

Speaker 4 ([00:54:25](#)):

If we look at that diagram that's on our screen-

Speaker 7 ([00:54:29](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 4 ([00:54:30](#)):

... That U-shaped drive- mm-hmm. ... Goes around the offices is gravel today. The road, highway district, that was a condition of approval for them, and I was ... Maybe it's redundant, but suggesting that that, as we're deliberating on the merits or non-merits of this, that would be something that would be included also from the county.

Speaker 1 ([00:54:54](#)):

Okay. Arbitrator, as you understand it, the highway district is, , requiring that? 'Cause Typically they only do the approach apron.

Speaker 14 ([00:55:12](#)):

I don't see anything on payment.

Speaker 7 ([00:55:18](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, , so I guess the highway district is requiring the approaches to be paved, and based off of the site plan submitted there on screen, , the applicants are gonna be paving the whole, , U-shaped, , driveway. Okay. So if you guys are leaning towards approval, I could, , amend condition seven to, , include for that as well. Okay.

Speaker 4 ([00:55:50](#)):

And Chairman, even with that, as we go back and forth, this doesn't fix the undue interference with existing traffic patterns, and it's ... Those ... To Commissioner Brooks' point, those traffic issues exist everywhere in Canyon County. I live next to one of the deadliest intersections in Canyon County. And Commissioner Brookstein didn't provide feedback and neither did you chairman on ... As we've deliberated on continuing this, we've raised, I think, some good possible points of negotiation between good neighbors.

Speaker 15 ([00:56:58](#)):

Commissioners, I just kinda wanna remind you of the code. So right now, we have a, a conditional use permit in front of you, and it goes back to the purpose. Why is this even in front of you? You know, and a- again, it's for you to determine whether or not the use would cause a damage hazard, nuisance, or other, , detriment to persons or property in the vicinity. You may require higher standards on the site than those, , listed specifically in the chapter in order to assure that the property, the proposed use would be compatible with other property or uses in the vicinity. It goes on to say, May, should, and the reason for that, because sometimes it just doesn't work for this neighbor- neighborhood. And so ideally, when you get a conditional use permit, we try to find conditions that make it work because, , it's a listed use that's allowed on a property zoned a certain way.

([00:57:51](#)):

However, that we have certain questions there because sometimes even, , you know, 30 conditions is not enough and usually it's just not appropriate there. And that's okay. But I wanted to go further and it says in seven, , seven, seven, 17, the commission gets to come up with conditions. The commission, not

the, not the, the prop- not the applicant, but the commission gets to create these and they give you a list of different ways you can create these. You can do this for, to minimize adverse impacts, such as damage, hazard, nuisance to persons, , control the sequence and timing of the development, control the duration, designate the, , exact location and nature of the development, require the provisions for the site or offsite, , public facilities, and much more. It gives you a lot of range to add to this to address potential impacts. And then it goes into it further saying, "If you need studies, you can request a study, table this, and ask for the applicant to do the study." And so we can actually, actually do the study they pay for, it says on there, so we can get the information we need.

[\(00:58:59\)](#):

So it gives you a lot of latitude to get that information there. However, again, it's looking at, can you make those findings? And sometimes there's just way too many conditions to where you have to go with probably a denial on this. So let's go back to that. So comp plan, we talked about comp and you see the difference between our comp plan and the cities. The reason why is the 2020 comp plan showed that all to be residential. This was a residential area, 2030 comp plan pulled it back to Ag, not because necessarily it's ag, because this was a way for us to talk with NAMPA to see how we want to plan that area. So if you notice a lot of our comp plan, some of them went ag because it's truly ag and some of it is a way to make a placeholder to implement other things, to have other con- conversations.

[\(00:59:43\)](#):

You see that in our implementation that unfortunately just hasn't happened yet. So we don't know if this area really is ag or if it's rural residential or should we be talking to the city about meeting their plans. So, but right now, this is what we have. And so the question before you is what your, what is your Those are options, so you have the option to, , agree with the, the planning and zoning commission, say, go to the city. True. They could go to the city, get that, that, , other property. It's not as easy as it sounds though. The city has other codes that we don't have that have a better job of protecting certain things, , like industrial. They have conditions that control the emissions and have infrastructure requirements. , This would require probably dedication to the city to give them a, a bigger roadway for future, , growth, things of that matter.

[\(01:00:35\)](#):

So there's stuff already in their code as part of annexation. So it's not an easy process. There's a lot more to it and a lot more cost. So, , so that, that's one thing to think about. So if they, that's why the PNZ I think maybe denied it is knowing that if they went through that, yes, they can get everything they want, but they probably have to do a lot of improvements as part of it. , We could approve it too. And remember the conditions you can put on it, you can limit the time. So other cases we've done very, very similar, we can say, we, we've done before where like, you only get 20 vehicles, you only get these hours. If you want more, then that's when you go to the city. But this is what we'll grant you right now. It's up to them if they agree to it or not.

[\(01:01:15\)](#):

If not, they won't do it. They have three years to commence, five years to complete. , At least they give them a chance to see if they really want to do it or not. Sometimes they'll do it to that amount. If they grow, they have those conditions. If they grow, then they, they'll go to the city at that point. They'll find a way to expand through the city. They have their marching orders there. And, but if it's, if you do not feel that's appropriate, then you have the other avenue going, there's just not enough conditions and you at that point uphold the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation.

Speaker 4 [\(01:01:45\)](#):

Yeah. And Chairman, I always appreciate our planning supervisor, just a great wealth of information, really knowledgeable on our code. Thank you. You've helped clarify for me with reference to the 2030 comp- or 2020 and 2030 comp plans. If we just looked at what was here and without consideration for the brush stroke of the 2030 to AG, this would not be a conversation probably. So with that, Chairman, then I, I know the corner I'm going to land in. This is a rural residential area. Nampa would have to overcome the county's comp plan trumps the city. So this is still in rural Canyon County and I would move to deny on this because the number of conditions and the mitigating factors, the public testimony, the people that live there, the designation in the 2020 comp plan, , I, I will have a motion ready. Maybe that's-

Speaker 1 ([01:02:54](#)):

I'd like to, I'd like to debate just a

Speaker 4 ([01:02:55](#)):

Little bit

Speaker 1 ([01:02:55](#)):

Longer.

Speaker 4 ([01:02:56](#)):

Okay. Sure.

Speaker 1 ([01:03:07](#)):

I don't ... If you wanna condition it down of existence, I s- suppose we could do that. I, I just see ... I, I hear testimony several times a week, usually, about traffic. I, I hear your concerns, but one event is gonna be a greater traffic flow on one day than this company will ever do on the same day. So 20, 20 vehicles is, is not life changing, and if they're talking about annexing into the city, you're gonna have a, , voluminous amount of traffic that I feel sad about for you. , I, I could agree to condition it to maximum of 20 vehicles and a maximum of, , the, ... Is it five days a week or six days?

Speaker 7 ([01:04:21](#)):

Five.

Speaker 1 ([01:04:22](#)):

I could, I could condition it to five days a week with those business hours, no emergency, anything after hours, no backup beepers. I can see what's gonna happen to the community, and it's sad, and I think this would give them an interim of, I don't know, three to 10 years before it became City of Nampa issue, and all of their options have turned industrial instead of at where it's at with the county. And if this applicant was, was copacetic to do that, I think that staves off the city annexation for the foreseeable future, where if we deny it, the city annexation becomes a viable option for them, either liquidate the property or go get a, go annex it in, which I would feel sad because there's a difference between kicking it down the road and knowing that you did kick it down the road, but that the, the, the residents that were here today would end up with a lot less liberal- livable option compared to the quality of life that they experience right now.

([01:05:53](#)):

So, Commissioner Van Beek, I, I, I, I see what you're saying and I hear what you're saying, and I'm trying to do, instead of what's right in front of my face, , a lot longer term out with that. , Also with the condition, I would say that, , unless it's a , dry storage issue that is just their signage equipment, the un-designated additional land to the south, , if there's any building or anything else, it would have to come back in for, , for, , to amend their CPU. Otherwise, I don't wanna agree to something that's gonna create, yet again, something else that's in the back lot that we forgot to, to deal with. But I'm just trying to get, trying to treat everybody fair as I possibly can, times they are a change in, and that's just where we live. So are you amenable to that, Commissioner Brooks?

Speaker 14 ([01:07:16](#)):

Yeah, Mr. Chairman, , it would need to remove emergency operations, perimeter fence, I would have to add north, because we've done that on a prior CUP where, , we put it out along the road, so I would be in support of that for this one. And number seven would need to be amended for, , for paving of the, the U-shape in the entry, which they already said, but it's not in the conditions to actually make it happen, so.

Speaker 7 ([01:08:03](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 14 ([01:08:07](#)):

And, , I'm okay with the backup alarms too.

Speaker 1 ([01:08:13](#)):

To have them omitted?

Speaker 14 ([01:08:15](#)):

Yeah. So it's-

Speaker 1 ([01:08:16](#)):

No backup alarms?

Speaker 14 ([01:08:17](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([01:08:21](#)):

Ebay that the, , the lighting is already stipulated, correct, that it's inward facing and not ... Okay. -

Speaker 4 ([01:08:33](#)):

Commissioner Brooks, were you going to limit vehicles?

Speaker 14 ([01:08:37](#)):

The 20- It's already suggest- It's already in there at 20.

Speaker 4 ([01:08:40](#)):

Thanks. And the turn lane?

Speaker 14 ([01:08:46](#)):

The you?

Speaker 4 ([01:08:47](#)):

No. So the, we ... As Dan indicated, the board has the option to require that there's latitude in the code for that. We could require a dedicated turn lane to help mitigate the backup and increase traffic, maybe.

Speaker 15 ([01:09:04](#)):

Through the chair, I'm sorry. , We, we have stuff for on the property, but when it's in the jurisdiction of the city, we, we have no says. Okay. We can recommend, but if it doesn't meet their plan or they didn't find it to have a traffic impact that has a nexus to add that turn lane, they, then we have no say so in it.

Speaker 4 ([01:09:21](#)):

Thanks, Dan.

Speaker 15 ([01:09:25](#)):

Yeah. Question, , do you wanna add a condition saying any modifications like an increase in something would at that point they should look at annexing into the city or do you want the ap- , opportunity to come back to ask for more vehicles and employees?

Speaker 14 ([01:09:45](#)):

I would ... The first one.

Speaker 15 ([01:09:47](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([01:10:02](#)):

<Laugh> Another time that I enjoy the 2030 comprehensive plan again. Okay. So he ... I would like to see this all written out, so that I'm, I'm leaning towards the continuance before I make a decision, but I'd like to look at this and weigh it against the, , testimony that I've heard and the concerns and see if, if the conditioning is mitigating that or if it's not. And so I, I guess I'm in a need of a continuance to have staff the time to be able to put that down and delineate it and write out what they've heard.

Speaker 15 ([01:11:02](#)):

Through the chair, I think Arby has written down what they've heard, but if you still need time, that's fine.

Speaker 1 ([01:11:11](#)):

What would you guys like to do?

Speaker 4 ([01:11:12](#)):

And Chairman, I suggested it on two occasions that we continue, and so I know it draws out one more time, but, , this is going to end up not because I don't believe we've done a good job identifying the issues associated with locating these two next to each other, but it is a conflicted decision and representing the interests of the community against the private property rights, , expressed by the applicant. This will be a split vote. It is the way I see this going down with so much respect for the deliberation that's happened.

Speaker 14 ([01:11:53](#)):

Do we need a day, sir?

Speaker 1 ([01:11:54](#)):

Yes, please. Jenning. What do you have? Tomorrow.

Speaker 2 ([01:12:02](#)):

Do next Wednesday morning.

Speaker 1 ([01:12:06](#)):

That'd work. What, what day is that?

Speaker 2 ([01:12:10](#)):

, The 22nd, Wednesday the 22nd.

Speaker 1 ([01:12:16](#)):

Are you guys available 10 o'clock Wednesday morning on the 22nd?

Speaker 15 ([01:12:22](#)):

And through the chair, would this be reopening the public testimony if that's the case? Do you want this to re- re-re-notice so we can send out all the updated co- , conditions, or is this still just deliberation between the board and what conditions you want to, to make a decision on? So again, , this would, , if it doesn't have a, a hearing, , a notification to it, nobody's gonna see it except for us. And, , and then we're just bringing back to you what you, you've changed so you can see that to see if that helps you with the finding number four and seven.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:00](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 4 ([01:13:00](#)):

I think I'm good with that.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:02](#)):

I, I see it just as it's a continuation for our deliberation only.

Speaker 15 ([01:13:06](#)):

So the public testimony would be closed still. Right. Yeah.

Speaker 4 ([01:13:11](#)):

You ready for a motion?

Speaker 1 ([01:13:12](#)):

Agree?

Speaker 4 ([01:13:13](#)):

Yeah, I do.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:14](#)):

Okay. Yeah. I'm ready for a motion.

Speaker 4 ([01:13:16](#)):

Chairman, I move that the board continues case number CU2025-002-APL till a date certain of April 22nd at 10:00 AM to continue deliberation.

Speaker 14 ([01:13:28](#)):

I second.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:29](#)):

All right. Motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor say aye.

Speaker 7 ([01:13:34](#)):

Aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:35](#)):

Aye. All right. I would make a motion that we, , then adjourn for this period and we reconvene on that date.

Speaker 4 ([01:13:45](#)):

I will second.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:46](#)):

Motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

Speaker 4 ([01:13:48](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 7 ([01:13:49](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:13:49](#)):

Aye. We stand adjourned at this point. Thank you.

This transcript was exported on Apr 14, 2026 - view latest version [here](#).