

Speaker 1 ([00:05](#)):

Good afternoon. This is Chairman Brad Holden. I'm gonna bring the meeting to order. , We, this should be considered a continued public hearing, and this is to consider case number CU2025-0002-APL. And so, , this is a hearing, continued hearing from eight / 12 / 26, and public testimony is closed. A- and Arbai, do you want to do a quick review of where we're at, where we find ourselves at today?

Speaker 2 ([00:42](#)):

Yes, one second. I'm just gonna upload it to the screen so you can all see. I grabbed the courtroom table too. You want me to do this one?

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

Yes, please.

Speaker 2 ([01:35](#)):

All right. I'll just try to speak loud enough so the -

Speaker 3 ([01:38](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 2 ([01:39](#)):

So good afternoon, commissioners and members of the public. My name's Arvi. I'll be presenting the Big Horn Traffic Services KCU 2025 - 0002-APL. We are here today to discuss the conditions of approval, the, for Big Horn Traffic Services appeal. The applicant submitted a conditional use permit and was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission. So the applicant appealed that decision. The case was heard by the Board of County Commissioners twice in April and in August. In the last hearing, there was a comment related to the conditions entered into the record as Exhibit 10. The board continued the case to today to analyze the proposed conditions provided by the public. After reviewing the proposed conditions provided by the member of the public, staff believes the proposed conditions outlined in Exhibit nine addresses the comments and concerns of the neighbors. Condition eight of exhibits 10 falls under the highway jurisdictions and cannot be addressed by the Board of County Commissioners.

([02:39](#)):

Condition numbers 4A, 4H, nine, and 13 of Exhibit nine can be more detailed, , to be consistent with Exhibit 10 if the commissioners wish to go that route. I'll just quickly highlight some of the conditions that kind of match up with the, , public's comments as well as what was already proposed here. So in exhibit nine, it outlines all of those conditions that were, , directed by the board on April 14th. The hours of operations were originally requested for 826, , as seen in exhibit 4A2. It was later updated to 7:00 AM on July 31st, 2025 by the applicant. The board may condition the hours of operations as appropriate to mitigate any concerns.

([03:31](#)):

With the ingress, so them just using the east side to, for ingress so it doesn't, , shine the lights on the neighboring properties. A fence shall be installed to obscure the staging area and contractor shop on all sides. , That's can see in exhibit seven. During the last hearing, there is mention of a seven foot vinyl fence, and if that's approved, it will require a building permit. Exhibit 10 also proposes the lighting to be

minimal and not use commercial or flood lights. So that could be some additions that can be added if the commissioners wish. The applicant does not have a proposed sign. , However, if larger than 32 square feet, a permit is required. Exhibit 10 proposes the signage be less than eight square feet with the prohibition of eliminated billboard style signage. So today before you, there are three options to approve, deny, or table re - the request, and I'll stand for any questions.

(04:30):

Okay.

Speaker 1 (04:32):

Questions?

Speaker 3 (04:37):

Chairman, I'll just restate that. Arbe, what you said on number nine for ingress, egress, there was a little bit of discussion after that, but the mitigation on this is to have the east driveway serve where they exit so that it does not shine into the residence property. That is

Speaker 2 (04:54):

Commissioner Vambeek.

Speaker 3 (04:58):

Thank you. Chairman? Yes. Was there any consideration given to DSD staff on the enforcement priority that was the late exhibit we accepted?

Speaker 1 (05:18):

There was concern. , She wanna address that or not? It's a general wide open question, so I

Speaker 3 (05:27):

Think - Well, it's outlined in the letter that was submitted by the neighborhood that specifically calls out that a tripping point. So a single tripping point in the mitigation efforts, if they're violated, would trigger a revocation of the CUP. That's what I'm addressing, Chairman.

Speaker 1 (05:46):

So in 15, is that what you're -

Speaker 3 (05:49):

, let me. I've got three different documents, ours, theirs, and theirs.

Speaker 1 (05:53):

This would be the neighbor's requested conditions.

Speaker 4 (05:57):

, Chairman, Commissioner Van Beek. Yes. If I'm hearing

Speaker 3 ([06:00](#)):

You

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

Right, there wouldn't be. If we follow that, it wouldn't be Code Enforcement reaches out and says, "Hey, you're violating this condition. Fix it." None of that. We just go straight to revocation. Is that what you're saying?

Speaker 3 ([06:12](#)):

That's the way I'm interpreting the request in their ask.

Speaker 2 ([06:18](#)):

Chairman, Commissioner Van Beek. So in regards to condition 15 of exhibit 10, typically what we do have in state is if there is a code enforcement violation, so say the applicants get approved for their operations and they're not, , operating in conformance with the conditions that have been in place. The neighbors can submit a code enforcement violation and then we'll have an officer go out and check it, make sure that they're, you know, if they are complying with the conditions, if not, they can, , send a notice of violation to them. I think what he was kind of getting at is, you know, we're not gonna go out and look for it, but if we do get complaints from neighbors, then in that case, also with condition number one outlined in exhibit nine, I believe, , the general rule is that if you're not complying with the conditions or don't meet them, it can be revoked.

([07:17](#)):

There is a process that we do have to go through to do that

Speaker 3 ([07:21](#)):

Though. Right. And so I would just wanna make sure that that's clear. The public doesn't deal on this all the time like we do. So the process of going through that can take a couple of years. There is site visits and notice of violations, maybe a lien on the property, something that goes along with that. So we, I just wanted to eliminate that question that was asked that it does not jump straight to a revocation. There has to, it will follow the same process as every other notice of violation.

Speaker 4 ([07:54](#)):

Correct.

Speaker 3 ([07:55](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([08:11](#)):

So you.

Speaker 5 ([08:13](#)):

I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([08:17](#)):

When, when looking back and comparing the two, I'm still comfortable with, , I think it's exhibit nine, , the proposed draft conditions. I think it addresses in a legally defensible manner, , everything that the neighbors have requested, again, in a legally defensible manner for the county to not treat this person or this applicant different than another applicant and put us in a very difficult position to defend ourselves legally.

Speaker 3 ([09:01](#)):

Chairman, is this our deliberation time?

Speaker 1 ([09:05](#)):

Well, let's, so that's a very important point. , I think that we had closed public testimony. I was just assuming that it is. Do we all three agree that this is our deliberation time?

Speaker 3 ([09:19](#)):

I think so.

Speaker 1 ([09:19](#)):

I do. Okay. All right. So yes, it is.

Speaker 3 ([09:25](#)):

Well, thank you, Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([09:26](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([09:26](#)):

So I, I guess I'll jump in with comments. I do appreciate the efforts on the part of the neighbors to at least come to the table with some agreement. And that has been a very good effort on the part of our development services staff, which is just status quo for them. And then the draft conditions from the development services and Big Horn mirror almost point for point how they plan to mitigate the concerns by the neighbors. So long story long, I, I, I think that they've done the best job that they can in an agriculturally zoned area that's highly residential. My problem is this, Chairman, that I still have a problem with number four. Does it change the character of the area? I understand that this is slated for industrial. This action will help at some effort push that forward. It could create a domino effect.

([10:24](#)):

I don't know. What I know is, , I don't have a problem with the applicant. What I have a problem with is locating a, a staging and contractor shop in an area that's bordered by neighbors with, that's in a nice neighborhood. There are industrial properties available throughout the city of Nampa where this zoning would not be a question. And they could go right in with that designation. I am a little bit frustrated with the genesis of this where it was purchased and then hoping to go back and retrofit this into an area where people are clustered. I, again, I wanna say that I think that this has been a best effort to help mitigate that. I don't feel like as a district one commissioner that it's my job to catapult this area toward

Nampa's industrial zone or not. Nampa has a lot of irons in the fire and, , fronts open where they have to mitigate traffic everywhere.

(11:27):

So that being said, , to put two, , opposing things side by side to me doesn't make sense at this time. This might be where the neighbors at some point get approached by the city of Nampa. I didn't hear that in there. I didn't hear a buyout. I heard nothing. I heard that there's going to be a change and that people have to live with that landscape change that is squarely on the shoulders of the Board of County Commissioners. So as good as the efforts are, number four fails for me, which in our guidelines means that this application fails to move forward for this commissioner. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (12:11):

Commissioner Brooks.

Speaker 5 (12:12):

Mr. Chairman, I'm in favor of moving forward with the conditions that have been provided. This is an approved use in the zoned area. I am not in agreement with what Commissioner Vambeek just put on the record. This is not pushing anything forward when it is an approved use.

Speaker 1 (12:44):

Okay. I think I find myself in the same position as Commissioner Brooks. , I find that the conditions mitigate, , my concern. , I would not be in favor if the applicant was wanting all approved things for this, but with the conditioning, I, I think that the current traffic level and the expected increase in traffic level on this road, these 20 cars are going to be, , very difficult to quantitatively measure. I think with the conditioning, it gives the, , neighbors and the neighborhood the ability to bring to the attention of the county something that isn't happening that is not being good neighbors with the area. And so I think I'm comfortable with going ahead with, with the way it's conditioned. So would we like to proceed and go through the criteria or, .

Speaker 3 (14:06):

That's fine, Chairman.

Speaker 1 (14:08):

Okay. Are we, are I, are you, . I have the, . What page is the proposed? See the P and Z?

Speaker 3 (14:25):

Chairman, I'm on exhibit two in your paper binder.

Speaker 1 (14:29):

Okay. All right. Okay. So, , criteria. So code section one is the proposed use permitted in the zone by conditional use permit?

Speaker 3 (14:48):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([14:50](#)):

Yes. The analysis. Yes, it is. Okay. Number two. Let me see where the question is. What is the nature of the request? That does not make sense.

Speaker 5 ([15:09](#)):

Staff stated it accurately. Excuse

Speaker 1 ([15:12](#)):

Me. On the analysis.

Speaker 5 ([15:13](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([15:14](#)):

Okay. So you agree with two. Do you agree with two, Commissionerman Beek?

Speaker 5 ([15:21](#)):

For the record, Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at what staff presented to P&Z.

Speaker 1 ([15:29](#)):

What electronic page are you on?

Speaker 5 ([15:31](#)):

57. Okay.

Speaker 2 ([15:36](#)):

Chairman, Commissioner Brooks, is that, , the draft FCOs to Planning and Zoning Commission? Okay.

Speaker 3 ([15:43](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([16:02](#)):

Let me get there. 57?

Speaker 3 ([16:04](#)):

Yep.

Speaker 1 ([16:14](#)):

Maybe if I'll open up the right file, it'll work.

Speaker 4 ([16:28](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([16:50](#)):

Okay, what's the next question, John? Zach? Is it permitted to the request?

Speaker 5 ([17:03](#)):

The

Speaker 1 ([17:03](#)):

Next

Speaker 5 ([17:03](#)):

One, Mr. Chesser. Yeah. You found it.

Speaker 1 ([17:07](#)):

I keep flying by it, so sorry about that.

Speaker 5 ([17:13](#)):

Is the proposed use consistent with the comprehensive plan and -

Speaker 1 ([17:16](#)):

Thank you. Yeah. Just got it on the screen as you were reading it.

Speaker 5 ([17:21](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([17:24](#)):

Review it.

Speaker 5 ([17:27](#)):

And I agree with staff's assessment that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Speaker 1 ([17:34](#)):

Okay. Commissioner Van Beek?

Speaker 3 ([17:37](#)):

I don't have a reason to disagree, and this was not a point where the Planning and Zoning Commission took issue. So I guess I will agree with that criteria.

Speaker 1 ([17:51](#)):

On three. Okay. I agree on three. So let me go to four.

Speaker 3 ([17:57](#)):

And Chairman, did we skip num- number three? There's that, but number two, you, you had a question and so do I on the question, which is what is the nature of the request? Is that, is that a, one of the eight questions that is, should be in there, Arby?

Speaker 2 ([18:14](#)):

It should be Company Chair Van Beef.

Speaker 3 ([18:16](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([18:27](#)):

Rolling up to number four. Hold on heaven sakes.

Speaker 3 ([18:42](#)):

And Chairman, this is probably where I will take issue with the planning and zoning findings. The primary zone in here, north, east, south, and west, as stated, is rural residential, agricultural, agricultural, agricultural. The joint powers agreement that we used to have dictated that Canyon County has the presiding jurisdiction over that if there's a conflict. So on this area, I under - I see that on the west side of that, that it's limit zoned industrial, which would include the Nampa Airport. But that's where I would stake my claim that this area is still under county jurisdiction. And county commissioners have the ability to decision this in a way that either maintains the status quo of this until such time as Nampa would deem that industrial and move forward with the proper, , noticing to neighbors and how, what that could potentially look like. But I struggle with, and this is not the fault of the people living in this area, but with the city and county zoning designations, mapping areas, overlays, definitions.

([20:03](#)):

Those are not consistent. So if you move to an area and you are expecting outcome A, it's not the resident's fault that a city comprehensive plan or a county comprehensive plan changes. And so people are then at the mercy of, I did find merit in the letter that Mr. Borer submitted stating that these governing bodies are the policymakers that help drive long range planning. And I, that is my position that this is driving that early, that there are areas of industrial loose within the city of Nampa where this could slide right in without a rezone request right in the middle of residential. So I can't, I still can't get past number four. Even though I've indicated that there are good conditions to help mitigate that, I don't see a need to because there's other areas where they could locate this traffic mitigation service that don't interrupt what's currently happening there.

([21:03](#)):

And nobody, that's the variable. We don't know what will happen and how soon it will come. , That area west of them is changing. I agree. There's a lot of kind of unsightly stuff there, but this on the west, or I'm sorry, on the east side of that roundabout is still very nice residential properties.

Speaker 5 ([21:29](#)):

Mr. Chairman, it is zoned agricultural. This is an agr - this is an approved use in an agricultural zone. I have no idea what Commissioner Van Beek is referring to as far as comprehensive plans changing or being in conflict between the county and the city. The city has no issue with this. As stated in the staff



report, it is an approved use. It is not injury. And therefore I agree with what staff has said. Proposed use is not anticipated to directly or indirectly exclude or diminish another's use of public and/or private services. And I will also agree, having traveled, I mean, I either travel to the east of this or to the west of this on a daily basis. The traffic with the proposed use in place will be, , you, you will not be able to discern what, where that traffic is coming from because of the amount of traffic going down airport today without this in place.

(22:46):

It is a east-west thoroughfare and it will continue to be so throughout the history of this area. So again, it is, it is zoned to agriculture. It is a residential area to the north, but it's an approved use. P&Z approved a CUP a mile to the east in a very similar area. So.

Speaker 1 (23:30):

Done.

Speaker 3 (23:30):

Yep.

Speaker 1 (23:33):

So I find that the proposed use will not be injurious under the proposed conditions of use and restrictions that are, that we're being placed upon the applicant. So it's two, four and one against on four. On five, will adequate water, sewer, irrigation, drainage and storm water drainage facilities and utility systems be provided to accommodate the use?

Speaker 3 (24:03):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (24:04):

Yes, I find that. Yes. Do you?

Speaker 3 (24:06):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (24:08):

Six. Does legal access to the subject property for the development exist or will it exist at the time of development?

Speaker 3 (24:15):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (24:16):

Yes. Yes. Yes. Okay. Seven, will there be undue interference with existing or future traffic patterns?

Speaker 3 (24:24):

And Chairman, I would submit that if this is limited as requested to just what's been applied for, Commissioner Brooks probably has merit to his, , argument that the, this would be a de minimis addition of traffic, but, you know, I, I don't know because there is discussions on heavy equipment and different things. So I, I guess that's been prohibited on this. Yes. I don't know.

Speaker 1 ([25:01](#)):

Okay. That's a, that's an I don't know. , I see that it, it won't be a significant or measurable difference in the traffic patterns. Let's say you.

Speaker 5 ([25:18](#)):

I agree with staff's finding. There will not be undue interference. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([25:24](#)):

Number eight. Will essential services be provided to accommodate for the use including but not limited to school, facilities, fire and police protection, emergency medical services, irrigation facilities, and will the services be negatively impacted by such use or require additional public funding in order to meet the needs created by the requested use?

Speaker 3 ([25:45](#)):

Chairman, I support staff's findings.

Speaker 1 ([25:47](#)):

Okay. I, I agree with that. Yes. I find what they have written to be, , adequate. Okay. So those are the eight criteria. And we do agree upon, , exhibit nine. Is that correct for the record? We do agree upon exhibit nine. Is that correct? Commissioner Brooks?

Speaker 5 ([26:14](#)):

, Staff's amended proposed - Conditions,

Speaker 1 ([26:19](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 5 ([26:20](#)):

Conditions, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 3 ([26:21](#)):

Chairman, there's a question. Yes.

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

7:00 AM start time?

Speaker 3 ([26:26](#)):

Yes.

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

Okay. Just making sure. ,

Speaker 2 ([26:29](#)):

Another one. The fencing, six or seven feet. Do we want it to be vinyl or it's just sign obscuring enough?

Speaker 4 ([26:43](#)):

Seven foot fence requires a building permit.

Speaker 1 ([26:53](#)):

If you're gonna stay neighborhood friendly, it would be six. If you're gonna go commercial, it'll need to be seven. I don't find that this is. I find, I find it permitted in an agricultural use, so I don't, I don't have the burning need to go to seven foot.

Speaker 3 ([27:07](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([27:09](#)):

The second question is, do you want it completely blocking or the slats? I don't like the slat things. So vinyl. It has to be blocking whether it's whatever material it needs to be. So

Speaker 5 ([27:22](#)):

Six foot and solid vinyl?

Speaker 1 ([27:24](#)):

Or six foot solid. Whatever.

Speaker 5 ([27:26](#)):

Just solid.

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

Just solid. However they wanna make it.

Speaker 3 ([27:32](#)):

I mean, I'm just saying, I mean, they both require maintenance, but a wood fence deteriorates, I think, faster than vinyl fence. Maybe that's debatable.

Speaker 1 ([27:39](#)):

I, I concur with that. Yeah. It's just vinyl. Okay. Just make it vinyl. Yeah. Arby. Arby, do you have any other specifics that you would. That we have discussed that you just want us to review?

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

No, Chairman, I do not.

Speaker 1 ([28:03](#)):

Okay. All right. Is there any other further discussion?

Speaker 3 ([28:11](#)):

I don't think I have any, chairman.

Speaker 1 ([28:12](#)):

Okay. If there isn't, I would, , entertain a motion.

Speaker 2 ([28:18](#)):

Chairman, if I may interrupt. For the FCOs, there are a couple more criteria related to the staging area and contractor shop. Do you guys also wanna go through those ones?

Speaker 1 ([28:30](#)):

I'm sorry, I forgot about that. Yes. Can you put us to that page, please?

Speaker 5 ([28:34](#)):

63. So Arby, is this, is this site obscuring fence a second fence?

Speaker 2 ([28:55](#)):

Commissioner? No, it'd just be the one fence around the perimeter of the staging area and contractor shop.

Speaker 3 ([29:01](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([29:20](#)):

You said 63, correct?

Speaker 5 ([29:24](#)):

Yeah, it looks like you're on it.

Speaker 1 ([29:25](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([29:26](#)):

So the one at the, the one at the top there is the -

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

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([29:30](#)):

The one I just asked about, the fence.

Speaker 1 ([29:32](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 2 ([29:37](#)):

So on screen is what we had came up with, , during one of the later hearings. , So that would just be fencing around that perimeter that's highlighted in yellow. Correct.

Speaker 1 ([29:54](#)):

I agree that's what, that's what I, when I reviewed, that's what it was.

Speaker 5 ([30:02](#)):

So I'd be in favor of just making it, the language state the same vinyl fence all the way around.

Speaker 3 ([30:09](#)):

Okay.

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

And the 20 parking areas, correct? Mm-Hmm. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([30:31](#)):

And Chairman, just for clarification, the area that's not proposed to be fenced that are by reference, that's where those 20 vehicles will be parked? Thank you.

Speaker 5 ([30:51](#)):

What did you say?

Speaker 3 ([30:53](#)):

That they, the area that's not fenced will be the parking area for the 20 vehicles.

Speaker 5 ([30:58](#)):

No, that's not what this says. There will be approximately 20 parking spaces behind the shop -

Speaker 3 ([31:03](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([31:03](#)):

Enclosed within a privacy fence.

Speaker 3 ([31:06](#)):

Okay, thank you. So is the open space then, like I'm reading the conditions for the staging area, is that the proposed area for the picking up of equipment and materials, which includes trucks offloading or transferring equipment?

Speaker 2 ([31:25](#)):

Chairman, Commissioner Vadpees, can you point to the condition number?

Speaker 3 ([31:29](#)):

, I'm on seven / 14 / 29. It's condition number three. This is on page 67. And my question, and I don't know what's involved with this, but will there be semi-trucks and lowboys that are. Is the equipment that big? What are we talking about?

Speaker 2 ([31:52](#)):

Chairman Commissioner Van Beeks, from what I'm remembering, they mostly had like F-150 trucks that would be on the property. , To my knowledge, there wasn't any heavy equipment associated with the -

Speaker 3 ([32:04](#)):

Okay. And that would be prohibited, and I'm assuming that a semi-truck and a lowboy would not, would qualify as heavy equipment. Okay. I just wanna make sure that we're all on the same page.

Speaker 1 ([32:26](#)):

Okay. Do you see anything else? Mm-Mm <negative>. Okay. Arby, do you see anything else we need to review for clarity?

Speaker 2 ([32:42](#)):

, So I just wanna clarify you guys are in agreeance with both the staging area and contractor shop, , criteria. And then there, the last one is the area of city impact for Nampa. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([33:03](#)):

And I didn't see any problem I had with that when I looked at that earlier. Do you have any trouble with the shop or the city impact?

Speaker 5 ([33:21](#)):

No, it just basically says if it's in the area of impact, it's still our jurisdiction.

Speaker 1 ([33:25](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 5 ([33:34](#)):

And if a recommendation is received by the county from the city of Nampa, it shall be given consideration by the county.

Speaker 1 ([33:41](#)):

The

Speaker 5 ([33:41](#)):

City said they didn't have a problem with it.

Speaker 1 ([33:43](#)):

Okay. Okay.

Speaker 2 ([33:54](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, that's all I have.

Speaker 3 ([33:56](#)):

Okay. All

Speaker 1 ([33:57](#)):

Right.

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

Thanks, Rbai. Good job.

Speaker 1 ([34:03](#)):

What'd you say?

Speaker 3 ([34:03](#)):

I just thanked Arby for her presentation.

Speaker 1 ([34:06](#)):

Yes, thank you. All right. If we've covered everything you need to write a, a full FCOs, then I'm good.

Speaker 5 ([34:20](#)):

Mr. Chairman, I move that we, the Board of County Commissioners, approve CU2025-0002-APL with the conditions that have been, , discussed on the record and for staff to come back at a later date with FCOs to be approved.

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

All right. Is that your motion?

Speaker 5 ([34:43](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([34:44](#)):

All right. Any discussion? There's none. I would second the motion. So motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor say aye.

Speaker 3 ([34:53](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([34:53](#)):

Aye. All those opposed?

Speaker 3 ([34:55](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([34:56](#)):

One opposed? All right. Motion carries. All right. I don't have any other business for this item. Does anyone else?

Speaker 3 ([35:04](#)):

I do not, Chairman. I move we adjourn.

Speaker 1 ([35:06](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([35:06](#)):

Second.

Speaker 1 ([35:07](#)):

Motion's been made and segmented for adjournment. All those in favor say aye.

Speaker 3 ([35:10](#)):

Aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([35:11](#)):

Aye. Motion carries. Let's consider ourselves adjourned. Thank you.