

Speaker 1 ([00:04](#)):

Okay. It is now 1:33 on this 14th day of April, 2026 in time for today's Canyon County Board of Commissioners public hearing. This will be regarding case number CU2025-002-APL. I'm Chairman Brad Holton. To my left is Commissioner Zach Brooks and Commissioner Leslie Van Beek. The DSD staff report and any additional exhibits received by the established materials deadline have been posted on the county's website on the land use hearing page for anyone to review. Potential conflicts of interest. Before we begin testimony, are there any declarations pertaining to this application, such as conversations or meetings outside of this hearing received by any commissioner?

Speaker 2 ([00:54](#)):

Thank you, Chairman. No.

Speaker 3 ([00:55](#)):

No, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([00:57](#)):

And no for myself. Is there any commissioner who for reasons of a conflict of interest request to be excused from participating in this specific decision?

Speaker 2 ([01:06](#)):

Thank you, Chairman, no.

Speaker 3 ([01:08](#)):

No, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([01:09](#)):

And no for myself. So testimony, guidelines, orders, and process. So please silence your, your cell phones and, , turn the ringers off. The commission room is electronically records all of the public hearings and the system is very sensitive. We can pick up your conversations side to side, so just don't do it. If you need to tell your person beside you something, both of you get up and walk out of the room and do it in the hallway. , That's less conflict than having it forever on the public record. So with that said, , as chairman, I will maintain order by restricting inappropriate discussion or disorderly conduct. And if necessary, we'll ask you to step outside in the event you are disruptive or inappropriate. At this time, I'll explain the rules and procedures for today's hearing, consistent with Canyon County Ordinances chapter one, Article 17, and Chapter seven, Article one.

([02:11](#)):

The applicant has the burden of proof. The applicant or their representative will go first today with their testimony limited to 10 minutes. The board may have questions for the applicant, which will not count against their time. The DSD staff report will be next, and the board may have questions for staff. Additional questions by the board to staff can happen at any time during today's hearing.

([02:37](#)):

After that, the individuals who have signed up to testify, and they will already be sworn in at this point, will be allowed up to three minutes of testimony. We ask that this testimony be non-repetitive. Since the applicant has the burden of proof, they will go last and are permitted five minutes of rebuttal

testimony, or to answer additional questions from the board. Once the public comment is closed, we will deliberate and render a decision. So request for those who have signed up and who are going to be testifying. You're gonna come up, and if you would, please just be seated in the chair in front of the microphone and pull the microphone up to your lips pretty close. That's for us to have on the record, but more importantly, it's for the people that are in the gallery to be able to hear you. So what you're gonna need to do is when you sit down, you need to state your name and address, and then you can start with your testimony of what you want to share.

[\(03:42\)](#):

Please adhere to the three-minute time rule. There will be a timer up here that will turn red at the end of the three minutes so you don't have to, like, stop talking at the moment that goes off, but f- finish your train of thought. So if anyone goes before you that gave the same testimony that you planned to give, you can just come up and simply state that the person before you has pretty much said everything that I was gonna say, but if there's some nuance that you need to make a point of, then make the point of that. Just don't repeat everything over. All right. We will now begin. We will not be accepting any documents or other written materials at this hearing. All materials to be relied upon as part of the record were required to be submitted by the advertised deadline, which was a minimum of 10 days ago.

[\(04:34\)](#):

Materials received by that deadline have automatically been included in the record and we have received them. This deadline is to provide ample time for inclusion in the staff report packet, hearing body review, and full transparency and access for the public. The submission of late documents or other materials does not allow all parties time to address the material or allow for sufficient time of the public to review. If your testimony today, you're going to refer to an exhibit, an exhibit that we have received use specific verbal descriptions of what you're referring to, for example, an exhibit number or a page location or a description of the written materials. So has everybody that's in the gallery, somebody came in while I just started this. Were you intending to, , talk? Okay, we need you to come up, and if you would sign in, please. Just off here to the side.

[\(05:46\)](#):

And as soon as he's done and seated, then Jennin will, , ask you to raise your hand and, and do the oath of af- affirmation. What was the next thing? You go be seated, and then she'll ask you to take an oath to, as well as everyone else.

Speaker 4 [\(06:19\)](#):

, All right Dan Lister, John McLean, Jeff Dancer, Renee Kelly, Sean Kelly Tina DeBoer, David Eaton, Carl Anderson, Connor Gray, TJ Jones, Aaron Mine. If I could have everybody raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help you God? I

Speaker 1 [\(06:41\)](#):

Do. All right. Thank you. All right. We will now begin taking testimony from the applicant or their representative, so you'll have up to 10 minutes to share what your concerns are.

Speaker 5 [\(06:59\)](#):

, Yes. Connor Gray, 505 South 7th Avenue, Caldwell, Idaho, , 83605. All right. Good afternoon, chairman and commissioners. , Again, my name is Connor Gray, and I've been working as the project manager and representative, , for the applicant, Big Horn Traffic Services. , We are h- here today to respectfully

request that you reverse, , the planning and zoning commission's decision from December 18th, which denied our application for a conditional use permit, , for a contractor shop in a staging area located at 5023 East Victory Road. , As outlined in our appeal letter, it is our position that the commission's decision directly impacts the property rights of this landowner, as it was made in disregard to the county's planning staff analysis and findings, and as well as agency review comments that support approval of this application. I wanna start by making, , framing this very clearly.

[\(07:49\)](#):

This is not about a contractor shop or staging area. This is fundament- fundamentally a property rights issue. This is, , this is about whether a property owner who's proposing a use that is expressly allowed under the county's code can rely on that code, follow the process, meet the criteria, accept the conditions, and still be denied based on speculation rather than evidence. Because if that is the outcome, then the code no longer provides predictability and property rights become uncertain at that point. , With that said, , I will keep the project over- overview a little brief and would just like to ask you to refer, , to the staff report, which reme- recommends approval, but I'm happy to ask any operational questions after or if need be. , So again, briefly for context, Bitcoin Traffic Services is a local, , employee-owned company that provides traffic control and roadway safety services for construction, emergency response and public infrastructure projects throughout the area.

[\(08:38\)](#):

, The proposed use is a contractor shop and a staging area where the employees report to work, store equipment, and vehicles, and deploy to offsite job locations. , Again, this is not a customer facing or high traffic commercial use whatsoever. The site will utilize existing structures that are already there, including a shop building for sign engine decal work, a primary structure for limited office use, and a staging area for your standard duty work vehicles. Over the course of nearly two years, the applicant has worked closely with the county staff and reviewing agencies to address the concerns, revise the site plan, and incorporate con- conditions specifically aimed at mitigating impacts related to the noise, traffic, and visibility. The only area in which we request to go outside of this purview is allowing up to 30 vehicles in the staging area. The reason behind this request is that the two years ago, when we did, , when we did file this application, we did not take in account the time it would take to be able to get this project approved and up to this point.

[\(09:29\)](#):

, So based on that timeline, we believe it'd be smart for us to, , provide a buffer of four vehicles for future growth rather than coming here in the, in upcoming years, , requesting that change. , This long drawn out process resulted in the staff, , recommendation for approval with conditions funding that the use meets the applicable criteria. Despite that, the application was ultimately denied on generalized concerns rather than evidence demonstrating that those impacts cannot be mitigated. As indicated in the staff report, the Planning and Zoning Commission denied this request based on two criteria. Whether the use negatively changes the central character of the area and whether the use, , creates undue in- interference with existing or future traffic patterns. Turning to the first, , element, the commission, , with character, the commission concluded that this would, , this use would negatively change the area.

[\(10:14\)](#):

However, the conclusion is not supported by the record and is completely contradictory to their recommendation to, , obtain approval. First, despite the posing testimony, this property is not designated as an isolated rural residential setting whatsoever. The property sits just one parcel away from the Nampa City limits. Additionally, as evidenced by the record, the property, , has an industrial

land use ex- designation in their future land use plan. I, I again ask you to look at the city of Nampa's comment and support for this project. It is also near the airport where the city would like to see less residential development and more industrial use. This is also evidenced by them already annexing property just a little over a football field away from an, , with an industrial designation. More importantly, this parcel is designated as agricultural under the county's comprehensive plan, not residential. What the commission, what the commission failed to recognize is that the pros use is not only consistent with allowed uses in the county when conditioned, but also serves as a reasonable transition, , use between agricultural land and future industrial development within the city.

[\(11:10\)](#):

As reflected in the record, the area, this area is planned to transition, not remain agriculture, , agricultural and perpetuity. Despite the posing testimony, the south side of Victor Road in the area is not and will not be intended for residential, nor, , rural residential development. It is meant to be industrial once the city is ready for the property to be annexed, as outlined in their comments. The area's already transitioning. The use doesn't, this use is, is not going to be introducing something new. It fits within what's already occurring as evidenced by the city already jumping over to the east side of Happy Valley Road with industrial, , designations. One of the most concerning parts about the planning and zoning commission decision is their inconsistency and conflicting suggestion for how to obtain approval. This applicant was told that a path forward for this project was to go get annexed in the city of Nampa.

[\(11:55\)](#):

Again, I ask for you to go back to my appeal letter for, , a much more detailed analysis of this, but at, at the very most basic level, this suggestion is in complete contradiction to their findings and is willfully trying to push the problem to another day into another jurisdiction. We ... Let's take a, , closer look at this recommendation. If we were to move towards recommend, or to, towards annexation, it will be designated as an industrial use as per the city's plan and recommendation. Where then an array of industrial uses will be permitted and that will make this project today look like a pebble and a gravel pit. And more importantly, where fewer conditions can be applied, and the county will have little to say on how to mitigate those uses. So the logic here is that this use here today is deemed to, is, is deemed to be too, , impactful under county jurisdiction, yet they're telling us to go over to the city where more intensive uses would be allowed and have less restriction.

[\(12:42\)](#):

Anne- annexation does not reduce impact. It removes the ability of the county to condition it. This is not a logical or protective land use, , outcome, and it directly undermines the purpose of the conditional use process, which allows, , uses with, like this with enforceable conditions. Now let's take a look at if we were to remain in the county, , with the current zoning of agricultural. Well, there are uses allowed under the same z- , zoning designation, , of the ag- of ag that permit extensively more intrusive uses, , than what is being proposed to you today. For an example, a landscaping company, which is an approved use may involve outdoor storage, large industrial, , like equipment, unregulated vehicle traffic, customers pulling in all, all throughout the day, and more importantly, it will not require, , the same level of discretionary review that we've had to go through for the past 24 months.

[\(13:28\)](#):

If we were to move, , towards one of these approved plans, I can guarantee you that they will create more impact on the area, but now without the safeguards that our CUP provides. Yet here we are, after nearly two years being denied for a use that is conditioned, reviewed, and supported by staff. That inconsistency matters because the code is intended to be applied uniformly and predictability.

[\(13:49\)](#):

Turning over to the traffic issue. The code uses the term un- undue interference and underlying law that standard must be supported by, , substantial and competent evidence in the record. Here, there is no engineering evidence, no traffic study, and no agency finding indicating that 20 to 30 vehicles per day creates, , any undue interference. In fact, the record shows the opposite. County staff concluded that the traffic impacts are minimal. The Idaho Transportation Department determined that, , TIS is not required, nor does it, , meet their minimal thresholds for any sort of concern. The highway district also had no concern with the impact of increased traffic and only asked us to pave the aprons, as we have no issue doing that either. And there has been no agency identified ... , No agency has identified a safety or capacity issue with what we're proposing. Without that evidentiary support, a finding of undue interference cannot be sustained.

[\(14:34\)](#):

From a practical standpoint, when agencies such as ITD or highway district have even the slightest of concern about traffic impacts, they will require the applicant to provide further analysis and possible, , mitigation measures. However, that did not occur here because the project does not even come close to their concerns after their independent analysis and study. And this is exactly the type of evidence that the board should be re- relying upon. Remember, staff re- reviewed the same concerns and still recommended approval. That is something that is not supposed to be overlooked. I also want to acknowledge the concerns raised by, , raised by the neighbors and the property owners. , Those concerns are real and they are, , they deserve to be heard. As someone who grew up on Victory Road over in Ada County, I understand that the need for overall, overall traffic mitigation in the area.

[\(15:17\)](#):

However, ITD and highway districts are aware of these circumstances, and we must rely on their findings for the best possible way forward, not hold the property owner in handcuffs because they will create the mere presence of additional traffic. If this level of traffic created an issue, it would have triggered further review, and it did not. But the role of this board is not to determine whether a use is popular. It is determined whether the criteria and the code are, are met based on the evidence in the record. Much of the op- opposition focuses on what could happen, potential noise, , traffic or impacts the property values. But the, the code requires evidence of undue impact, not the possibility of impact. This isn't about whether there are going to be any impacts. Every use that you have is going to have an impact. It's about whether those impacts can be mitigated, and staffing agencies have already, already shown that they can be.

[\(16:02\)](#):

If we move away from the staff and agency analysis and rely on anecdotal concerns, it becomes very difficult to apply the code consistently. Here, those concerns were evaluated by staffing agencies and mitigation measures were incorporated to address those exact ones. Evidently, there has not been one piece of engineering, legal, or data analysis used by opposing side to support their claims. If the project was truly out of character of the area, a, a land use map showing the designation whether a city or county would have been introduced, yet it has not because there is not one to support that claim. So the question before you is not to whether your concerns exist. It's whether those concerns are supported by evidence showing that this use cannot be mitigated, and the record does not support that conclusion.

[\(16:43\)](#):

When you stick, , step back and take a look at the full record, , this is, this is a use that is going to be allowed under code with conditions. The application checks, , every box that the code requires, has gone through nearly two years of rigorous agency and staff review, and is supported by staff and agency

analysis, and it includes conditions to address any impacts of concern, yet it was denied based on generalized concerns rather than substantial evidence. At this point, this becomes a property rights issue because a property owner should be able to rely on the code, the process, and the evidence. I'll be 20 seconds. If, if those are satisfied, or if those are satisfied and they are here, then the application should be approved. Otherwise, there must be substantial evidence to prove that myself, the staff, the agencies, and all of the engineering, planning, and traffic experts who reviewed this application are all incorrect in their conclusions.

[\(17:31\)](#):

For those reasons, we respectfully request that you reverse the planning zoning, , commission's decision and approve the conditional use permit with appropriate conditions. Thank you.

Speaker 1 [\(17:42\)](#):

Can answer questions?

Speaker 3 [\(17:48\)](#):

I don't have any, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Speaker 2 [\(17:50\)](#):

I don't think I have any. Thank you, Mr. Connor.

Speaker 1 [\(17:53\)](#):

Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you. DSD staff.

Speaker 6 [\(18:14\)](#):

Good afternoon, commissioners and members of the public. My name is Arbai, and today I'll be presenting the Big Horn Traffic Services Appeal, case number CU2025-002-APL. For some background, the applicant submitted a conditional use permit on January 27th, 2025, and the case went before the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 18th, 2025, where the Planning and Zoning Commission denied the applicant's request. The applicant submitted an appeal of the decision on January 28th, 2026, which brings us to today. The applicant is requesting that the Board of County Commissioners overturn the denial of KCU 2025-002, a conditional use permit for a staging area and contractor shop for Big Horn, Big Horn to operate from. The appellant wishes to establish a contractor shop and staging area on parcel R30673010, the subject parcel, which is located at 5023 East Victory Road, Nampa, Idaho. The request is for approximately the north half of the 3.42 acre parcel, which is zoned agricultural.

[\(19:24\)](#):

Per the Canyon County Code 07- 07-05, there are eight hearing criteria for conditional use permits. Each question must be answered with adequate evidence to approve or deny the conditional use permit. In the next few slides, I will focus on criteria four and seven, which the Planning and Zoning Commission found the proposed use did not meet the criterion, but before I do that, I will quickly go through the criteria that was meant by the proposed use. The requested use of a staging area and contractor shop is allowed in the agricultural zone with a conditional use permit. The nature of the request is in line with a staging area and contractor shop. The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan and services will be available for the proposed use. The property has legal access and essential services will be provided to accommodate the use. Now for the criteria that did not meet, according to the Planning

and Zoning Commission, the Planning and Zoning Commissioners found that the proposed use would be injurious to other properties in the immediate vicinity and would negatively change the agricultural character of the area based on oral testimony heard during the December 18th hearing.

[\(20:32\)](#):

The Planning and Zoning Commission found that the proposed use is commercial in nature and the surrounding land uses are agricultural and residential, and that the - use would not be compatible with the surrounding land uses. All public testimony can be found in the minutes in Exhibit three.

[\(20:51\)](#):

The appellant is stating that the proposed use will not be injurious to other property in the immediate vicinity or negatively change the essential character of the area with the mitigating conditions that were proposed. The appellant states that the area is not exclusively agricultural or residential, but rather there are other contractor type activities within the surrounding area of the proposed site. The appellant argues that a staging area and contractor shop that is allowed in the agricultural zone with a conditional use permit with conditions would not change the essential character of the area. The Planning and Zoning Commission found that the proposed use will have undue interference with the existing and future patterns based on public testimony. Testimony included that the roundabout at East Victory and Happy Valley intersection has a blind spot when driving east to west, therefore the additional traffic Big Horn will generate will continue to make that area unsafe for travelers and residents of that area.

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

The approximately 20 to 30 average daily trips between the 40 employees with potentially unlimited hours of operation will negatively impact traffic patterns. The appellant believes that the proposed use will not cause undue interference with the existing or future traffic patterns as evidenced by Idaho Transportation Department's comments received. The public nor the Planning and Zoning Commission did not provide adequate evidence to deny the request based on the criteria according to the applicant. Here are four photos taken from the parcel east approach on East Victory Road during the site visit on November 5th, 2025. Additional photos can be found in the staff report in Exhibit D. The proposed use also meets the criterion for a staging area and a contractor shop as well. The City of Nampa did not have any concerns regarding the proposed use. Today, the Board of County ... The Board of Canyon County commissioners can make one of the three decisions to either approve the appeal, deny the appeal, or table the hearing to request additional information.

[\(22:57\)](#):

With that, thank you for your attention. I can go over the proposed 13 conditions in the previous application or answer any questions.

Speaker 1 [\(23:07\)](#):

I'd like to hear the 13 conditions again.

Speaker 2 [\(23:10\)](#):

Yeah. And then I have a couple of questions, Chairman.

Speaker 1 [\(23:13\)](#):

Okay.

Speaker 6 ([23:17](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, what's on screen is the recommendations of conditions that were proposed to the planning and zoning commissioners. , There's a few number of them, so I'll just quickly run through the ones that kind of stuck out. So of course, the , , general timeline of the three to five years that the , , the applicant would have to complete all of the necessary conditions or any improvements needed to that, , it would be tied down to the parcel and the applicant's Big Horn Traffic Services. The hours of operation for the contractor shop would be 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Friday, and the staging area hours of operation, 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, but potentially also have, , unlimited hours of operation due to emergency services that they would have to respond to. They're also requesting 40 employees, so be tying that down to the 40 employees.

([24:16](#)):

, For 4D, the applicant originally had stated they wanted 20 business vehicles during the Planning and Zoning Commissioner, commission hearing. They did request that it be bumped up to 30. As the applicant stated earlier, you know, this is in due if the business were to grow, that they have that leeway to grow into that. Other conditions is that, , the structure on the ... I believe it's on the west side of the property is not meeting setbacks, so they would have to bring that into compliance by either getting a variance from the city of Nampa or moving the structure five feet over to meet the 10-foot side setback with the county. They should also s- install a six-foot site obscuring fence, , so it's not visible to the public. , Any lighting should be downward facing to, , you know, not disturb neighbors. And then if they do meet a 600 gallons of more of wastewater generated by the proposed use that they get a nutrient pathogen study completed per Southwest District Health.

([25:25](#)):

Let's see. And then a drainage and ... Sorry. A drainage system shall be installed as well to help with the, , stormwater runoff. Those are the main ones that were proposed to the Planning and Zoning Commission. , Another one that the Board of County Commissioners can consider is potentially just having the contractor shop in that area, and then, , the applicants do have other sites that they use as that service as well, so potentially having the staging area portion within those other locations. , As you may hear today, that traffic is one of the big concerns as was heard during that planning and zoning commission. , So potentially just having the contractor shop on that, just an idea to throw out, , but you guys may consider that.

Speaker 2 ([26:22](#)):

Chairman?

Speaker 1 ([26:22](#)):

Commissioner Venvy.

Speaker 2 ([26:23](#)):

Thank you. So our buyer, Dan, I saw in one of the slides, maybe the second slide when you started the presentation that the suggestion was made because it's a twenty four seven operation, that this should be reclassified as an industrial. Is there anything in county code that drives that?

Speaker 6 ([26:42](#)):

Chairman, commissioner Van Beek, there is not. , The two criteria that the Planning and Zoning Commission found that did not meet was due to the character of the area, and that one, because there

is some industrial zoning within Nampa city limits, that's kind of where they're getting that from. , Within the county, you do see a lot of that agricultural and residential zoning. I don't think that unlimited hours of operation, , were the factor from the planning and zoning commissioners, but it was within public testimony that, you know, that could cause a disturbance.

Speaker 2 ([27:19](#)):

Okay. Thank you. And then with the 600 gallons of water and potentially needing the study, what is going to be on site that would potentially either in danger or are there chemicals? There's not supposed to be from the staff report that I read any manufacturing happening on that location. So can you tell me more about that?

Speaker 6 ([27:42](#)):

Yeah. So Commissioner Van Beek, so the contractor shop is going to have eight to 10 employees, , so they'll be using the restroom facilities as needed. , There is a septic system on sites. Southwest District Health did mention that it would be adequate for their proposed use, , but if and when they were to reach that 600 gallon amount count, then at that point, , they would have to get a nutrient pathogen study completed. Okay.

Speaker 2 ([28:06](#)):

So this isn't because the operation is a high water use operation, this is strictly the septic services that they're talking about.

Speaker 6 ([28:14](#)):

Okay? That is correct.

Speaker 2 ([28:15](#)):

All right. I appreciate that. And then on the setback, the distance from that where there's a building, was there a conversation with the applicant on what they wanted to do? It seems like there's a crossover that I, we don't normally see to gas permission to waive and use a city standard in a county decision. Help me out.

Speaker 6 ([28:40](#)):

Yeah. So Dan can jump in if I get the code section wrong, but I believe, , in the setback, , code section, there is a leeway for property owners to use, , city standards rather than county standards. So in this case, , City of Nampa's side setback is gonna be five feet, which that structure would then meet if they were to get a waiver from the city of Nampa to use that five foot step back, setback instead of the counties, which is 10 feet.

Speaker 2 ([29:09](#)):

Okay. And refresh my memory, is it the shop portion or the house portion that is then within that area?

Speaker 6 ([29:15](#)):

It's gonna be the shop.

Speaker 2 ([29:16](#)):

Okay. Thank you for that. And then Mr. Dancer, in his testimony who supports this application saying that he works with Big Horn said that they could potentially have 70 vehicles in the staging area, was that satisfied at a level or is that a number that they're willing to restrict? What more do we know about that?

Speaker 6 ([29:37](#)):

Commissioners, I would have to defer that to the applicant, per the conditions of approval that were proposed. Originally, it was 20, they did request the 30. So if we lock it down to that number, then I, we could restrict it so it doesn't get to the 70, but I would defer to the applicant if that's something that they would be willing to do.

Speaker 2 ([29:56](#)):

Okay. And would that require code enforcement or how would that

Speaker 6 ([30:00](#)):

So if there were 70 and it was conditioned that there can't be no more than 20 or the 30, they could get a code enforcement violation open.

Speaker 2 ([30:10](#)):

Okay. And Arba, you were obviously on site taking photos and when you looked at the ingress egress on that property, what did it look like for blind spots or hillside with that?

Speaker 6 ([30:25](#)):

Great question, Commissioner Van Veen. The access itself is quite wide. So they do have ample amount of space to get in and out of it. It does slightly slope downwards. So kind of the house on, towards the beginning towards east victory kind of sits on top of the property and then it slopes, downwards where the shop is and the proposed staging area.

Speaker 2 ([30:49](#)):

Okay. And there was also mention at the planning and zoning about, I think it was public testimony on constructing a turn lane. I think Dan responded that we don't have conditions over that, jurisdiction over those conditions. It refreshed my memory and for the public record, Dan, can we require that or not?

Speaker 7 ([31:09](#)):

Sorry, I was looking at something. What was it?

Speaker 2 ([31:11](#)):

No, that's fine. I'm asking if the board can require a turn lane, a dedicated turn lane on that, or if that's a highway district.

Speaker 7 ([31:22](#)):

So through the chair, it's a highway district or fire district requirement. So all our code says is the access. If it's a private use, like a driveway or something like that, that they, if it's over 150 feet from the public road to the back of the building, if it is longer than that, then fire district gets, review of that.

So they, , in this case, it wouldn't be what we call a shared driveway. So it'll just be between them and the fire district and the fire district will determine if the roundabout that they already have on the property that goes, that loops is good enough or if they need to put something else in. And that would be something they reviewed at the time of re-looking at that shop, , and the certificate of occupancy for that shop.

Speaker 2 ([32:00](#)):

Okay. Chairman, another question on the roadway, Dan. Is that a reduced roadway or is it a standard roadway? And I, my original question was, even though we don't have jurisdiction, it's highway jurisdiction, can the county require a dedicated turn lane for the ingress egress and the site restrictions that are on that section?

Speaker 7 ([32:20](#)):

Yeah. And at the end, I think this is in the jurisdiction of the City of Nampa. So they're gonna look at their requirements for access on this, in this location to see if it needs a variance or if it's appropriate. And I think, , Arby can probably re- , summarize, , what the NAMPA has stated on this. , I, I'm not quite familiar.

Speaker 6 ([32:41](#)):

I can answer your first question. So Commissioner Van Beek, I guess they can submit a parking and circulation plan and then, , be held to that standard, whether they'd have to do a turnaround or something that might be better suited for a fire district or highway district to answer, just because that's kind of their, , field of expertise, but we can have the applicant submit that. , And then if you can repeat your second question, please.

Speaker 2 ([33:10](#)):

I'm not sure. I had so much information in there, I'd have to think of it, but, , I think my questions were answered- Okay. ... With the information that's provided. I want to have confirmation in that because of the proximity to the Nampa Airport, this piece of property is not scheduled to be a part of the airport, or is it?

Speaker 6 ([33:31](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, not that I'm aware of. It is in Nampa's area of impact, so they might, , expand in the near future, but I'm not sure if it'll be in the airport. Yeah.

Speaker 7 ([33:40](#)):

And so it's in their influence area of the airport, so they usually have a master plan for that airport. Mm-
Hmm.

([33:46](#)):

They identify the area where the plans would land and, and the area, , the actual term is not in, in my mouth right now. It's, it's their overlay. And what they determine is sometimes when they do land use to make sure it's compatible with that airport, so there, there's I- less liability. Right now, there's a lot of houses and old subdivisions there. So what NAMPA's planning is that industrial area, which is more compatible with that airport, which is less people, less, , uses that would cause destruction to the, the airport and, , and a- aircraft. Okay.

Speaker 2 ([34:20](#)):

So what I heard you say saying that back is this is not a physical part of the airport, but an impact area around the airport that they are trying to mitigate potential negative effects by limiting residential construction? That's

Speaker 6 ([34:32](#)):

Correct.

Speaker 2 ([34:33](#)):

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

Speaker 3 ([34:38](#)):

We'll do it.

Speaker 1 ([34:39](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([34:40](#)):

Mr. Chairman?

Speaker 1 ([34:41](#)):

Yes. I

Speaker 3 ([34:41](#)):

Have a question. Arbay, how far is water and sewer from this parcel?

Speaker 6 ([34:51](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, that's a good question. I don't think I have the answer to that right now, but I can try to look that up. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([34:59](#)):

Okay. Anything else before we go on?

Speaker 2 ([35:06](#)):

Not at this time, Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([35:08](#)):

Okay. So this will be the time that y- you're gonna be allowed the, your opportunity to address the board. And again, Jennon's gonna call your name. There's not any specified order in which she's going to do that. Just come up and have a chair in front of us, relax. We don't bite. We're just interested in what you have to say. So try to adhere to the three minute rule and, and we're interested in what you have to say.

Speaker 6 ([35:35](#)):

So ...

Speaker 4 ([35:36](#)):

John McLean.

Speaker 8 ([35:47](#)):

Good afternoon.

Speaker 3 ([35:48](#)):

Afternoon. ,

Speaker 8 ([35:50](#)):

John McLean, 5016 East Victory Road, Napa. I'm directly across from the proposed site. , I've been there 30, 30 plus years, and the commissioners, the county planning and zoning has done an extremely good job of mapping out what the area's gonna be used for and giving all of us as residents, , a good, very high quality, , place to raise our families and live our lives. , This is the first time that we've had to kind of, so to speak, defend ourselves from, , a business coming in and upsetting that way of life that, that we were used to and plan on continuing to have or hope, hope to have, , without, , having to relocate, you know, being pushed out of our, our environment, so to speak. , The traffic, , on that road is, is extremely dangerous, so I don't, I don't agree with the study or lack of study that has happened or not happened in front of that property.

([37:09](#)):

, Without a turning lane or a merge lane or whatever, it, it's just a disaster. Every day, almost, there's an accident right there. , It's, it's just a bad situation. The roundabout has created that situation, but I don't know that they could have done any better designing it. It, it, it was kind of an oddball deal. , Noise, these vehicles are commercial, so they are required to have backup, , beepers, and that's what we're gonna be hearing all day long. As they move these vehicles around, back them in, maneuver them, , load, unload, it's just gonna be beep, beep, beep, beep, beep all day long and possibly into the night because of their situation where they're trying to get the rights to, to twenty four seven business. , Light pollution, right, the way it is right now is it's, it's just pitch black out there.

([38:09](#)):

And as all my neighbors and I have stated, that is the way we like it. We can go out, we don't have all this light pollution to deal with lights glaring in, into our property. , It ... I don't ... I know it's an agricultural area, but this is in my mind and common sense tells me that this is a commercial business and is gonna evolve into a bigger commercial business that is not suited for that area and the people that are involved in that area. , Right now, it's nothing but residential area, farmland, , ag- you know, , cows, game, , and then ... It, it's just kind of a common sense deal. , And, and I, another thing I'm worried about real quick is just that the, that's going to attract crime. That's gonna be an area where people are gonna see all this equipment and stuff out there, and it's just the criminal activity out there is gonna start to increase as people see that as an opportunity to get something out of it, which is gonna lead right to our backyard.

([39:27](#)):

So anyway, thank you. And again, I, I appreciate so far how everything has been planned out back there. We have it great, and I hope that we can continue to have it that way.

Speaker 2 ([39:38](#)):

Thank you. Chairman, I remembered what my question was for Arby. On the ... With the victory road, is that a standard ... Is it a 60 foot road? What is that out there?

Speaker 6 ([40:12](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, East of Victory Road is classified as a minor arterial roadway. As far as the width, I'm not sure what the foot is.

Speaker 2 ([40:23](#)):

Okay. And then while you're, if you're looking for more information, did the applicant provide any crash site or any of the, , in opposition provide any data from the sheriff's office or any information from police?

Speaker 6 ([40:41](#)):

I did not receive any, no.

Speaker 2 ([40:43](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([40:48](#)):

Can we move on?

Speaker 6 ([40:49](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([40:50](#)):

Okay. Next.

Speaker 4 ([40:51](#)):

Jeff Dancer.

Speaker 9 ([41:02](#)):

Hi. Hi, my name is, , Jeff Dancer, 24245 Boise River Road in Parma. , I'm, , the president of Bighorn Traffic Services. , So we started Bighorn Traffic Services back in 2019 as a support for our, , our parent company, DASCO of Idaho, and that's where we currently are, are, , running out of. , With the growth of, of DASCO and the departments and stuff, we're off of, , Karcher Road, , there in Nampa by the Sugarbee Factory. , We just need more room for this traffic control service. It's kind of ... Originally, we'd started it as a support company for DASCO, and it's kind of, , kind of blossomed into providing services for Idaho Power, Intermountain Gas, the highway districts, , during their chipstill processes and all that. , We are an employee-owned company. In 2019, we become 100% employee owned as an ESOP company, so I sit here and state that all of our employees are owners of the company, so, , every representative is an

owner, so hopefully they, , they, they have more values and create more, , , as far as take a little more integrity and values and stuff and what we instill into the society.

(42:16):

, We, , the, there's a couple things that was brought up. The 70 vehicles, , on the question that the, , Planning and Zoning Commission had presented was, is there any chance that you would ever have, , more vehicles than, than the 30 vehicles? And, , you know, and that was answered in, just to be in all honesty, if there was, like, a company stand down where there was a, a bad accident or something, we may call a company-wide, , stand-down with the employees where all the employees' vehicles and then all the vehicles would be sitting there at the same time. , Hopefully that never happens, but I'm not gonna sit here and say, , that, , like I said, so that's, that's where that one was taken and where that was taken out of, a little bit out of context, I guess. , But, you know, our intent is to come in and be a good neighbor.

(43:06):

, We've go through, , like I say, a, a twenty four seven operation is not, , you know, if we get called for a, a storm damage for Idaho Power or something, somebody may come in and have to grab a pickup. When they say about equipment and all this equipment, we have F-150 pickups. , F-150 pickups, most of them, I would say there may be one or two that have backup alarms on them, but the rest of the trucks don't have backup alarms. They're F-150 pickups that we send out to the job sites, , and, , and then we have message boards, arrow boards, stuff like that, signage, , and, and that's what's running out of there. All of our vehicles have GPS monitoring, so we can monitor our safe, if, if our drivers are safe, speeding, all that, , they throw alerts up if they're speeding and that.

(43:54):

, And, , as far as, , like I said, we're, we're not coming in to rock the boat. We just need a conven- I mean, a good location, conveniently located with our other operations, , , to operate out of. And, , you know, when we found this property, , it was listed as commercial development opportunities, and that's what led us to it. So, , I appreciate you guys hearing our case on this, , and, , hopefully, , I'm open to any other questions,

Speaker 3 (44:25):

So ... Questions? Mr. Chairman? Yes. Why would you choose to go through the county when you could go through the city and get a green light without all of the conditions attached to it?

Speaker 9 (44:37):

, Because currently in order for annexation, , the, there's about 300 feet to the west of us is, is annexed, , and we have to be touching, , touching other annex properties. , And, , there, there are some opportunities to, you know, we're, we're, we're pursuing to, to look at those opportunities, but, , , rightfully, like I said, , right now, I mean, we've filed for this two years ago, , figuring this was our, the, the best plan, , to get operational and, and, , , it fit the uses that, that were presented to us and what we, what we applied for. And, and, , so like I said, so we've been pursuing this, this route.

Speaker 6 (45:23):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 (45:25):

Chairman, just a quick question. There was reference in the public testimony to a code enforcement issue. Was that related to the building or what can you tell me about that?

Speaker 9 ([45:35](#)):

We've never been cited or never ... I, honestly, I've never been contacted. , At the planning and zoning meeting when a neighbor brought it up, <laugh> that's the first I've heard.

Speaker 6 ([45:46](#)):

Okay. The only

Speaker 9 ([45:46](#)):

Thing I've heard about it. , , Mr. Gray has contacted the city to see if there was anything and they have no records of any violation or ever even being contacted. We have done a lot of work on the property. The basement flooded, , because we haven't been operating out of there and, and, , one of the sprinkler lines stuck on and, and it flooded the basement out, so we had to redo the basement. , We put a new roof on the place. , We've cleaned up all the weeds around there, , put a new irrigation control box up on the front corner, , to make it easier for irrigation for the area, , and, , taking some trees down and stuff like that just to clean it up.

Speaker 2 ([46:24](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 6 ([46:27](#)):

Anything

Speaker 1 ([46:27](#)):

Else?

Speaker 2 ([46:28](#)):

Thank you for your testimony. Thank

Speaker 9 ([46:30](#)):

You. Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([46:31](#)):

Renee Kelly.

Speaker 10 ([46:50](#)):

Renee Kelly. I live at 5416 East Victory Road. Good afternoon, and thank you for your time, commissioners. I'm asking you to deny Big Horn Traffic Services for the requested CUP just as your planning and zoning has. It's actually three parcels, at least, from city limits. My main concerns are traffic, location, noise, pollution, property values, the current zoning being agricultural, and there's absolutely no benefit to the neighborhood or county to approve it. Traffic has already increased significantly since we've lived there in five years. Sometimes it's extremely difficult to even enter or exit

our roadway. , Adding more commu- commercial vehicles and , coming and going from Bighorn would make it even more difficult. The location is right after a blind corner. Residents have been rear-ended just trying to turn onto that dead-end street. Last fall, a FedEx truck rear-ended an elderly lady. , With the amount of vehicles they want entering and exiting the road rage, or the road, it would be , dangerous with limited visibility.

[\(47:56\)](#):

This is also a residential and small acreage farming area, as you can see from the map. There are residential properties all around the requested CUP. They mentioned they would be operating twenty four seven due to responding to emergency calls. Doesn't matter how quiet they think they can be. It will still be a burden to neighbors when they are trying to sleep. At the planning and zoning meeting, they claim they do not have backup beepers. The very next morning after they were denied, they were out there at 70 AM with backup beepers running for hours. It was frustrating to say the least, not something we as neighbors want to listen to all day long. The emissions that they had talked about painting last time at the last meeting are concerning. I would think the DEQ would need to be involved to make sure neighbors are not going to be affected by the off-gassing.

[\(48:38\)](#):

This will affect property values. No one wants to live by a business like Bighorn. They're industrial and there are areas that are better suited for that. The neighbors were here first. We've put a lot of blood, sweat, and tears into our properties. It's not our fault or the counties that they rolled the dice on purchasing this property. They have come off as dishonest. Their property used proposal changed significantly from the neighborhood meetings. Looking back, they were complete waste of time. Their representation was rude, talking down to neighbors, saying things like, "This is coming whether you like it or not. They spent much of their time at the planning and zoning meeting, claiming that they were Idaho owned when in fact their parent company is Utah owned. They are owned by Whitaker Holdings out of Brigham City.

[\(49:23\)](#):

They act like they are being neighborly by allowing the neighbor who already runs his cows on his 30 plus acres to run his cow when they're two. This, this neighbor doesn't even live on victory and won't feel the brunt of the native impact Big Horn will have on the area. They have also already actually had violations with the Canyon County Code Enforcement. The planner had spoke about it at the last one, so that was incorrect. This is not who we as a neighborhood want as a neighbor. Fighting this has been exhausting mentally and physically. The land should have never been allowed to be sold as commercial, but that's on Big Horn and their representation for purchasing it without doing their due diligence. Honestly, I'd like to see a moratorium put on this to not allow this industrial stuff to come in here and tell the city annexes it.

[\(50:11\)](#):

We've worked so hard on our properties and we love where we live, but it is getting exhausting fighting stuff like this, just like the Sunrock. So I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Speaker 2 [\(50:24\)](#):

Chairman, yep. Arbay, can you talk about the reference to the code enforcement?

Speaker 6 [\(50:30\)](#):

Chairman, commissioners, I can. So a code enforcement violation was placed on the property due to operating the business prior to gaining approval of the conditional use permit in March of 2025. The violation was later closed in May of 2025 when they ceased operations.

Speaker 1 ([50:54](#)):

Did that answer your question?

Speaker 2 ([50:55](#)):

I ... Well, I guess I'll have to get the one-on-one clarification. They did get approval.

Speaker 6 ([51:03](#)):

Sorry, just for clarification, they did receive the code enforcement violation- Right. ... Due to operating the business without the conditional use permit. They later submitted the application to obtain the conditional use permit, , while they're going through this process. , Because they stopped operating out of that location, the code enforcement violation was closed as they proceeded with this application process, , which kind of brings us to now.

Speaker 2 ([51:30](#)):

Okay. So they're not currently operating at this site?

Speaker 6 ([51:32](#)):

That is correct.

Speaker 2 ([51:33](#)):

That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([51:37](#)):

Okay. Can we move on?

Speaker 2 ([51:38](#)):

Yep.

Speaker 1 ([51:39](#)):

All right. Thanks.

Speaker 4 ([51:40](#)):

Sean Kelly.

Speaker 11 ([51:51](#)):

Sean Kelly, 5416 East Victory Road, Napa. Chairman, commissioners, good afternoon. Thank you for your time today. I live just adjacent to this property, and I agree this is not the place, , in a couple details I'd like to share that haven't been mentioned so far. If you look at Victory Road as a whole from Happy Valley all the way to Meridian Road, six miles stretch, there's only one today commercial business operating on that six mile stretch, and it's actually under construction, on the roundabout, and in

Nampa City limits. So that equation out, there are zero commercial businesses operating in six miles from Canada County to the Ada County, past the Ada County line to Meridian Road. Another thing to consider, the code enforcement discussion's a, a great place to kind of tangent into. There's currently five to s- five or seven home-based businesses operating in our area on the map who have code enforcement actions against them open.

(52:51):

And unfortunately, because of the way the code is written and things like that, the county is stuck essentially, basically, , you know, charging essentially a fine to them right now. What's happening, one of those is an auto body shop. What's happening is it's cheaper for the gentleman to pay the \$250 a, a year or whatever the fee is versus CSIS business. So my point is with this, if for some reason you would agree and Bitcoin goes in with a CUP and they violated due to number of vehicles, et cetera, your hands essentially are tied by charging them a fine, that's about it. They will continue to operate as they have shown, like, they'll pay the fine, they'll continue to do what they want to do, but my point is all of these businesses still operating in the neighborhood are not gonna get shut down. They're gonna continue just to do their thing because it's cheaper that way than finding an actual commercial business.

(53:43):

Chairman Brooks, to your point about would it be easier to buy a commercially zoned property? Absolutely. But they've chosen to run us all through this gamut, rolling the dice, thinking, oh, we'll try in the county, probably will be easier versus, to your point, buying a commercially zoned property in the city with a green light right ahead. So that's my two cents. Thank you all.

Speaker 2 (54:07):

Would you walk to the map and point where you live, please?

Speaker 11 (54:11):

Where's Decor right here? So it's out my window, basically.

Speaker 2 (54:16):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 4 (54:22):

Gar Debor.

Speaker 12 (54:30):

Hi.

Speaker 6 (54:32):

Mr. Dick.

Speaker 12 (54:33):

I'm Gary Dubois, and I live at 5925 East Victory Road, and, , I'm gonna, , say that I'm supportive of declining this, , , CUP. , I feel what I have to say is gonna be repetitive, so I'd just like to say, say that, , I don't have anything else to say but, but that.

Speaker 1 ([54:59](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([55:05](#)):

Tina Debor.

Speaker 13 ([55:19](#)):

Tina DeBoer, I live at 5925 East Victory Road in Nampa. , Good afternoon, chairman and commissioners. Thank you so much for your time. My husband and I live on East Victory between Happy Valley and Robinson. We chose this area and invested our lives here because it is a rural residential community. I'm asking you to protect that. For us, this isn't theoretical, it's daily life. East Victory is already beyond capacity. What was once a quiet two lane road has become a high speed bypass around Garrity and the freeway. Despite reduced speed limits and signage, we experience excessive speeding, illegal passing, and constant safety risks, just trying to enter and exit our driveways, not to mention the hazardous conditions we experience when we try to ride our bikes or walk our dogs. This is not a solved problem. It is an existing safety issue impacting our daily quality of life, and that matters because under Canyon County Code, a conditional use must not create undue interference with traffic or be injurious to surrounding properties.

([56:19](#)):

The PNC Commission already found that this proposal fails those standards. This w- request would intensify activity on a road that is already unsafe. Big Horn argues the impact is minimal, pointing to 20 to 30 trips per day and the lack of a required traffic study. But the absence of a traffic study does not mean there is no impact. What matters is real world conditions, and those have been clearly established. The proposal includes up to 40 employees, a staging area for up to 20 vehicles, extended emergency hours, not to mention backup beeper noise. This is not incidental use. That is operational intensity. And intensity is exactly what changes the character of a rural residential area. Bighorn also suggests this area's transitional or mixed use, but the surrounding properties are rural, residential, and agricultural with a longstanding pattern of that use. This is not an industrial corridor.

([57:11](#)):

Compatibility is not defined by the most intense use nearby. It's whether a use fits the existing character without harming it. The commission determined that it does not, and that matters because approving this sets a precedent. This is how communities are slowly lost, one exception at a time. This property was approved for a small scale residential use. Converting it into a contractor yard with staging fleet vehicles and operational traffic is a fundamental shift, not a minor change. Bighorn made a business decision to purchase property that was not zoned for their use. The previous owner had it listed as potential commercial. That risk should not be transferred to the residents who live here. Your role is not to make a project work. Your role is to determine whether it meets the law, and in this case, it does not. We're asking to uphold the planning and zoning decision to please protect public safety, protect our community, and to prevent a president that cannot be undone.

([58:11](#)):

Please deny this appeal. Thank you so much for your time and service.

Speaker 2 ([58:17](#)):

Thank you.

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

Speaker 1 ([58:22](#)):

I need a 10-minute break. You guys wanna ...

Speaker 2 ([58:25](#)):

Yeah, Chairman, I move we adjourn for ... Even if we- Recess. I'm sorry, til 2:45, whatever.

Speaker 3 ([58:33](#)):

I'll second.

Speaker 1 ([58:34](#)):

Okay. Let's, let's be in recess then to 2:45. We'll, we'll start anew. Thank you.