

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

Okay. It is now 1:34 on the 2nd day of September 2026. Time for today's Canyon County Board of Commissioners public hearing. This would be regarding case number PH2016-61-MOD. I am Chairman Brett 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? Thank

Speaker 2 ([00:01:00](#)):

You, Chairman. No. No, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([00:01:02](#)):

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? Thank

Speaker 2 ([00:01:12](#)):

You, Chairman. No. No,

Speaker 3 ([00:01:13](#)):

Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([00:01:15](#)):

And no for myself. Would it, , please, commission, if I could com- compress this? All right. Usually we go through this long thing and we got a crowd and we got pros and cons and. Anyway. The only thing you need to know is the room electronically records you very, very, very well. So if you're whispering back and forth, it's for public, , to know forever and ever and ever and always. So you might not wanna do that. All right. I'll, as the chair will maintain order, and 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. 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.

([00:02:08](#)):

DSD staff report will be next and the board may have questions for staff. Additional questions by staff to staff by the board can be at any time during today's hearing.

([00:02:22](#)):

After that point, we will have you all come up and testify, , or s - or whatever you need to do, but we're gonna swear you in here first before we get to all of this. Then after you talk, who's ever representing would have the opportunity for rebuttal if there is any. So once public comment is closed, we will deliberate and render a decision. So when you do come up, you're just gonna state your name and address, , pull the microphone up to your, to your lips there. Just be seated. We don't need you to stand up and be official. All right. If that's good, let's do the oath of affirmation then next.

Speaker 4 ([00:03:01](#)):

Carla Nelson, Jay Gibbons, Spencer Koped, Sara Lynn Myers, Tony Myers. If I could 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 2 ([00:03:13](#)):

Do. Yes. Thank

Speaker 1 ([00:03:14](#)):

You. All right. Thank you. All right. So, , let's begin by taking testimony from the applicant or their representative.

Speaker 5 ([00:03:27](#)):

Thank you, Commissioner. Spencer Kofed, PO Box 448, Star, Idaho, 83669. I appreciate your time today. It's good to see you again. , Carla has been wonderful to work with, by the way. She's very professional and thorough and, and she's a good communicator, so I appreciate that. , If you could bring up my. Oh, you do have my slide up. Thanks. So I, you, I know you a little bit, but I grew up in the Treasure Valley. Both sets of my family are farm families and, , I grew up, you know, working for Hamanishi Farms. And I appreciate that the county is trying to protect and, and help farmland. , With that said, we. I bought this property. , Alan Mills brought it to me and it was zoned rural residential. I didn't fully understand the development agreements. I kind of relied on my realtor to help me understand and, , this property.

([00:04:21](#)):

So the property we're specifically talking about is the old, the old Olsen property. There's 133 acres in the center, , and then on the outside is that stadium subdivision that the other Jay Gibbons and Mike Conklin developed, , many years ago. , And so the, the, the subject property today and where the Myers live is the old Olsen property on that center, 133 acres. , So I relied on kind of Alan's information on, on this land. He thought it'd be fairly easy to get a few more lots in the, , the, the non-farmable areas of this property and be able to split off, , the house so that the Myers could buy it and close on it and stuff. And, , I didn't realize the, the full extent of the DA modification in the, in the prior one. So that's why we're going through this process to, to really to try to split off the house for the Myers, but also, , utilize that land.

([00:05:17](#)):

So the Myers moved in in 2022 when I bought it. , They have been wonderful out there. They fixed the house up. It's beautiful. They also, they and all their kids and a lot of my kids and all the teenagers cleaned up the old Stern property across the road, which took about a year and a half. And we appreciate the county working with us on that. I think you guys gave us some discounts on some dump fees, but it has. You can see what it was before and what it is now. And, , so it's, it's been really cleaned up and, and, , Myers have been great, , doing that. You can go to the next slide. Okay. So the stadium subdivision originally in the, the most recent DA allowed 178 lots. There's only 136 platted there. And I think it was topography and I, I don't think they could get the 178 lots.

([00:06:05](#)):

So they did 100, , Jay Gibbons and Mike Conklin did the 136. And in the original DA, that was allowed, the 178, and then the Olsen property had three parcels, the, the, the existing house on the farm fields

and then two more lots for the kids. And what we're asking for is, , a total. So 181 was allowed in the most recent DA, and what we want is 149, which is the 136 in stadium subdivision. And then we're hoping for another 13 buildable lots, , kind of spread. If you can go to the next page. , These are the reasons, I, I. Which is in all the letters. We think small acreage farms are good, houses on less desirable land, and we wanna keep all the farms, the, the two pivots operable forever. Okay, next. So I, I just did a picture recently to show you the cornfields and the two pivots that Mike Wagner farms, and then the dry land that we're trying to turn into some more buildable lots for the Meyers and their kids and, and some friends.

(00:07:12):

, So if you can go to the next one, this is just a clear view of what we're asking for. Okay, next. , So we want to leave the 84 acres. The, the two pivots are about 84 acres and we wanna leave that productive, and I'm willing to put that in a conservation, whatever easement for ag - for long-term agricultural. I'd really like to separate it and sell it to Mike Wagner, a farmer. I have a nephew that farms in Wilder, , Ryan are up that I would love to, you know, sell to him or Mike Wagner or something like that so it can keep going. , I had. I'd originally asked for 14 lots. I now. There's. If you can go to the, the last, go back one. I took off one buildable lot there on the bottom right, that lot number 14. I thought it would be good to make that, , just a, a lot where you could stage the farming equipment to get between the two pivots.

(00:08:11):

So I'm, I, I now have created that as non-buildable so that the, all the farmland is really contiguous, continuous. Yeah, go forward too, if you would. , There's also two access points right now. The two lots that were split off for the Olsen children have access onto Goodson, and then the old existing farmhouse had its own. If I, if this is approved, I'll, I'll get rid of the, , the road that was accessing those two lots and we'll just acce- access everything off the one, the existing farm lane that's always been there.

(00:08:46):

Next. , in the original stadium development agreement, , I think the commissioners or the, in the develop. We have a, a riding pass, a horse riding pass around the whole subdivision for the community, and we've decided we'd like to make a riding arena for everybody. And so at the top of the, the bigger pivot, there's about seven or eight acres that's unusable. You can't get the pivot up to it. And so we're gonna put a riding arena and the pond for the third phase irrigation in that area. I didn't create. I, I didn't. I don't have that in my, , slide deck, but, , it will be in some of Carla's, the pictures Carla shows in her presentation. Okay, next. , So the Olsen family wanted to keep farming. , The circumstances have changed. We wanna keep the farm going, add a few additional lots for the Myers family and their children.

(00:09:40):

, It retains. , We think this retains the original intent of the clustering agreement and the DA. Is there another page or is that in? Oh, yeah. So we're just. We feel like this, , DA modification reflects the changes in circumstances. , It's under the total allocation of lots allowed in the DA. It adds a new community amenity, increases accessibility of the farming activity. It commits to continued con - , agriculture op- operations on the 84 acres. And then I know this is a DA modification, so if first. I don't fully understand what the commissioners, all the things you're trying to balance and the competing interests, but if there's, for some reason, , the DA modifications I presented is untenable for you, I'm willing to kind of back off that and just do enough lots for the Myers and their children, or at least like a, a, a lot for their house that, so they can split that off.

(00:10:41):

That would just require one more. But I, I really want to do what's best for the community. I know you guys have a much higher view than I do, and so I'm willing to listen to your feedback and, , make modifications to our, our request and application if you guys desire that. , And with that, , I'd stand for questions.

Speaker 2 (00:11:05):

Questions? Spencer, can you go back to the slide that you have that was in the, the blue, that's the intent? I guess I just had a clarifying question. Okay. And for this one too, I had to clarify, this is an actual and not a conceptual.

Speaker 5 (00:11:23):

That is an AI conceptual. , We haven't built it yet. Okay.

Speaker 2 (00:11:29):

So,

Speaker 5 (00:11:29):

So it, it would have to, in our third phase of the stadium subdivision, , our engineers would create an easement for this riding arena and the pond that, that will serve as the irrigation source for the third phase. Phase one and two don't have water rights, phase three does, and this, this also. So we could water, we could use the water rights off the pond next to the riding arena for phase, we call this phase four. But this is at the top of the field of the big pivot field. Okay. This is

Speaker 2 (00:11:58):

Where this

Speaker 5 (00:11:58):

Would be.

Speaker 2 (00:11:58):

Thank you. I just think it's important that we all know, because when these are presented, then I, I mean, it's beautiful. That's what it is. Yeah. And so we've had others, and it seems to be from this area, era of approvals and development that you get almost an agrihood of where you get agricultural and a neighborhood with the parcels that surround an active farming operation. So thank you for that. Then if you can go back, Carla, if you don't mind, a little bit more to the numbers - uh-huh. Where she had 181. Okay. So I need you to please walk me through this. The development agreement allowed for 181. And so when we jump over to the table on the right, Spencer, is. It's not 136 plus 149. I'm sorry that I'm not understanding your graph, but -

Speaker 5 (00:12:53):

Okay. The blue, so the 178, which is in stadium subdivision

Speaker 2 ([00:12:58](#)):

Plus

Speaker 5 ([00:12:58](#)):

The three in the blue for the Olsen property adds to the 181.

Speaker 2 ([00:13:01](#)):

Okay. So the. Okay, thank you. Now - I just needed a clarification.

Speaker 5 ([00:13:04](#)):

And then we only platted 136 in the stadium subdivision. Okay. There, because of the topography and everything - Right. They didn't, they weren't able to do the 178 lots. So that dropped by 42 lots. Okay. And then, so we're asking to add another 10 buildable lots on the Olsen property. And so this is just kind of a. The, the D - the 2016 DA allows the 181, and if we add the 136 that's currently platted to the 13 on the Olsen property, it adds up to the 149. I

Speaker 2 ([00:13:35](#)):

Appreciate that. It's, it's kind of self-explanatory - Yeah, no. But I wanted to make sure we were all on the same page. Yeah. Th's

Speaker 5 ([00:13:40](#)):

Fine. Does that make sense?

Speaker 2 ([00:13:41](#)):

Yeah, it does. Thank you so much.

Speaker 1 ([00:13:45](#)):

Okay. Any other questions?

Speaker 2 ([00:13:48](#)):

All right.

Speaker 1 ([00:13:49](#)):

Thank you. We'll have staff go next. All

Speaker 2 ([00:13:53](#)):

Right. Thank you.

Speaker 6 ([00:14:04](#)):

Good afternoon, commissioners. Today I'll present a development agreement modification request associated with the stadium subdivision. The applicant is, is requesting a modification to DA number 17-001, conditions five point B and 3.B. Condition 5B is currently written to allow for a maximum of 178

residential lots with a minimum average lot size of 1.25 acres on property one. The proposed modification will limit the maximum number to 138 residential lots on property one. Condition 3B is currently written to limit property two to no more than three residential lots. The proposed changes will allow for a total of 14 residential lots in this area in substantial conformance with the site plan. And that's as the DA was written as it was submitted, and you heard from the applicant today that he is, , now willing to draw that back, but he would need to rewrite the DA before you would sign that to have that actually be 13 instead of 14.

(00:15:04):

The existing 2017 development agreement can be viewed in exhibit 3A.8 and proposed changes are included in exhibit 3A.6. Again, here's the site plan for the proposed 14 residential lots for property two. The lots would be located in dry land areas and positioned to preserve the existing pivots. , For some background on past approvals, the development was first approved in 2007 with a conditional use permit for 103 residential lots with a minimum lot size of three acres. In 2010, the request was amended with a comprehensive plan map amendment and a conditional rezone to rural residential. The associated development agreement at that time limited development north of Goodson Road to 103 residential lots. In 2012, the DA was modified to cluster development. Additional development beyond the 103 lots was allowed on property one in exchange for more open space and farmland preserved on property two, where only three residential lots were permitted.

(00:16:06):

In 2017, the DA was again modified to delineate specific requirements for each property interest. The stadium subdivision number two preliminary plat was approved by the board of county commissioners in 2022, and then on July, , 2025, the applicant applied for this development agreement modification that's before you today. Here's a lot count summary of the past development agreements. The lime green column shows the approved preliminary plat followed by the current DA modification request.

(00:16:37):

The development agreement evaluation criteria are listed on this slide. The request must come in the form of a revised development agreement and it must be accompanied by a statement demonstrating the necessity for the requested modification. Hearing provisions of Idaho code have been followed, the applicant did provide a revised development agreement, a statement and additional supporting materials. However, the planning and zoning commission did not find that the applicant demonstrated a necessity for the requested modification, and for that reason, they recommended a denial. , The applicant's statement demonstrating the necessity of the request speaks to neighbor concerns about the number of lots in the development. The applicant contends in their initial letter that the modification will, will result in a reduction of 29 residential lots across the entire property, and that development agreement modification would be necessary to make those changes binding. However, the, , the development of 178 lots in property one was never feasible, as it would not have left any land for roads, and it did not consider subdivision ordinance requirements.

(00:17:40):

It was a maximum number strictly based on the total area north of Goodson Road divided by the rural residential two acre minimum lot size. All of that gross development potential north of Goodson Road was written as a lot maximum for property one, while property two was restricted to three residential lots. , The stadium subdivision number two preliminary plat was approved in 2022 with 136 residential lots on property one. The approved preliminary plat incorporates roadways and other needed infrastructure and was approved by all of the applicable agencies, and that likely reflects a more re-

realistic, , build out of that property under the current development agreement. The applicant did provide a potential concept design with 168 lots in property one. However, that design has not been submitted as a preliminary plat and has not been reviewed by applicable agencies, so it's difficult to know if it could be developed to that extent.

(00:18:34):

The original proposal allowed, again, for only 103 lots over the entire development north of Goodson Road. The 2012 and 2017 agreements allowed for increased development with the understanding that it would be clustered and farmland and open space and what is now property two would be preserved. The approved preliminary plat for property one, which conforms to the 2017 DA, , includes 33 more residential lots than were originally approved for the entire development. While the applicant still intends to preserve the existing irrigation pivots, the clustered development intent of the previous agreements would be eroded by the, the proposed modification. Regarding the existing farmhouse, the applicant could utilize the replat process to sell a smaller property to the current tenants while still restricting the development to no more than three residential lots in property two. The planning and zoning commission found that the applicant has not demonstrated a compelling need or necessity to amend the development agreement beyond a desire to increase, , the amount of land available for residential development.

(00:19:34):

Here are photos of the existing farmhouse and property two, the driveway entrance leading to the farmhouse and some of the dry land area that the applicant proposes to develop with a modification. Prior to the planning and zoning commission hearing, four agencies commented and two public comments were received, which can be found in exhibit 3D and 3E of the staff report. No additional comments were received for the board hearing. However, the applicant did provide additional supporting doc- documentation which can be found in exhibit seven. The planning and zoning commission again concluded that a necessity for the requested modification had not been established and therefore they recommended denial. If the board does move to recommend approval, you can choose to change the conditions as proposed by the applicant. Only condition 5B for property one and condition 3B for property two can be modified. Note that the applicant's proposed community riding arena and the farm staging area are not included in the proposed DA modifications, so you would need to add those as conditions if you wanted them to be binding.

(00:20:31):

Here's another aerial view of the property and I'll stand for questions.

Speaker 3 (00:20:35):

Mr. Chairman? Yes. Carla, can you tell me, , because I haven't been able to find it, where necessity is actually defined? Or do we have criteria for determining nec - what a necessity is? ,

Speaker 6 (00:20:49):

Chairman, commissioner, , Brooks, we do not have a definition, so that's what makes it a bit difficult. And I think the board over, from what I understand over time, has viewed that differently.

Speaker 3 (00:20:59):

So it's as ambiguous as I though. It's basically up to whoever the decision makers are at the time.



Speaker 6 ([00:21:05](#)):

Chairman Commissioner Brooks, that's correct. As far as I can tell.

Speaker 3 ([00:21:09](#)):

Okay. Thanks.

Speaker 1 ([00:21:11](#)):

So I need a point of clarification. So we as a board cannot consider other issues or , , topics within the development agreement other than the two.

Speaker 6 ([00:21:24](#)):

, Chairman Holden, commissioner, so those two, those were the two, , points in the agreement that the applicant was proposing to change. So I think you could add on, like, if you wanted to add on the arena, I think you could add onto one of those, , , conditions, but you can't really go into all the other conditions and change those at this point because they haven't requested to modify them.

Speaker 1 ([00:21:49](#)):

That's really different than what I understand. You, you opened a developer's agreement. I was never aware that you could limit it to what you developed. I'm hearing something that I can't, I can't, . I don't wanna be held to it. If I'm opening up the developer's agreement, I'm opening it up. So do we need a legal opinion on this?

Speaker 7 ([00:22:20](#)):

So Mr. Chairman, commissioners, I think that part of the reason that we say that we don't wanna necessarily overhaul the whole set of conditions or because we have an active. They, they have final plat and built the first phase. The second phase is in the final plat. We're. It, it's almost ready to, to go forward, and they haven't final plated the third phase. If we go through and do wholesale changes, that changes what those requirements in phase three would be that we would have to then, even phase two, we'd have. It, it could go potentially back to the drawing board, so we're trying not to do too much that's gonna hamper the first three phases that are previously addressed in the, in the, , development agreement itself.

Speaker 2 ([00:23:19](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 7 ([00:23:22](#)):

That doesn't mean that you can't add other conditions necessarily.

Speaker 1 ([00:23:29](#)):

I guess that's my point. It came to their realization that they want to do something specifically out on lot 14. That would be different than what the proposal went through P&Z and they made a determination on now they're coming before us and they're going, "No, lot 14 would be better served as an ag lot so you can have legal access between both fields." That's a change.



Speaker 6 ([00:23:55](#)):

Chairman, commissioners, I believe you could add that one because it still falls under that, the main point of that condition, which was the number of lots allowed in that area. So instead of 14, we're now saying 13, and it's, , the P&C denied it on 14. I, I don't know that they would approve it on 13. You could certainly remand it back to them. I don't know if that would make much of a difference.

Speaker 1 ([00:24:15](#)):

I'm just trying to figure out the rules. Yeah.

Speaker 6 ([00:24:17](#)):

I think you, , it's my understanding, chairman and commissioners, you could add that change. Okay. It's just, it would be more difficult to go into all the other conditions of the development agreement.

Speaker 1 ([00:24:28](#)):

Okay. So - Under

Speaker 6 ([00:24:30](#)):

That one, 5B or 3B. I

Speaker 1 ([00:24:32](#)):

Was listening to your narrative and it started out at three acre lots. It went to two acre lots. Now we're contemplating 1.5, 1.25 acre lots. Where did that get all changed? ,

Speaker 6 ([00:24:47](#)):

Chairman Holton, commissioner. So the one originally, , it was the three acre lots, and then there was this clustering. So with the clustering where they moved it all to the, the property, , one or. Yeah, property one, they allowed for increased density in property one to say that we're gonna have open space and farmland preserved in property two. So they allowed greater density than what our R zone would typically allow - Right. For that clustering.

Speaker 1 ([00:25:15](#)):

Okay. And I'm a little bit caught up on average lot size, which means you could have a lot way less than an acre, still meet your average lot size for the whole development. Do you see that we have the ability to discuss that or is that outside of the two questions?

Speaker 6 ([00:25:37](#)):

, Chairman Holton, commissioners, I think if you wanted to, , and property, property one has already been approved for a preliminary plat, so that average lot size, they've already, they've already final platted part of it. But if you're wanting to talk about the average lot size for property two, I don't see that being an issue.

Speaker 1 ([00:26:05](#)):

Okay. Other questions?

Speaker 2 ([00:26:10](#)):

And I'm just confirming, Chairman. So on exhibit A10. 3, I see. I'm just restating. It's a reduction in 29 lots overall. You took away from lot one and a - not you, but they took the number of buildable lots off of lot one, increased the number of buildable lots on lot two, but they. Is the number of farmable acres in that still essentially the same on what they dedicated toward continuing with ag?

Speaker 6 ([00:26:44](#)):

, Chairman, Commissioner Van Beek, , so the. Let me try to pull up this slide. Sorry. So this shows the different lots that were allowed in the -

Speaker 2 ([00:27:05](#)):

Yes. Uh-Huh. And

Speaker 6 ([00:27:06](#)):

So with the 178, that was just a maximum. They could never build 178 lots. Right. It's a little hard to answer your question because you could never have built that in that property. It would not have allowed for a road. You need a road to get to your house. Right.

Speaker 2 ([00:27:17](#)):

Hillside

Speaker 6 ([00:27:18](#)):

Development, they could, they just could not have built 178. So they just, they clustered all of the density potential into property one, and they, and for that, they got more lots than what - Yeah. Were originally allowed, which was 103, and they just capped it at 178 because that would have been the max density could, that could have been built in that whole property if you weren't thinking about roads.

Speaker 2 ([00:27:38](#)):

And I would just venture to say, Chairman, that today we would not calculate it that way, that we would take into consideration the roads that are needed to service that. At least I would. But, , looking at exhibit A10. 3, which is the highlighted map, none of those parcels on the proposed increase from three to 13 falls below two acres. So it's still real - rural residential. So maybe what Mr. Kofad could confirm, , I guess just for the edification of the board is that, you know, how you've demonstrated integrity in a rural area of Canyon County to maintain, , the rural character of the area and sustain the farming that. And the Wagoners farm thousands of acres. And so he's saying evidently you've had contact that he can continue to make this a viable farm operation. So.

Speaker 8 ([00:28:35](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 2 ([00:28:36](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 3 ([00:28:39](#)):

Mr. Chairman? Yes.

Speaker 2 ([00:28:40](#)):

Carla,

Speaker 3 ([00:28:41](#)):

Can you go back to that slide where you had the numbers for the parcels, please? What, what is the discrepancy, I guess, or help me clear up the difference between the 136 and the 138?

Speaker 5 ([00:28:58](#)):

I, I think that was a mistake in the first presentation. Sorry.

Speaker 6 ([00:29:04](#)):

, Chairman, Commissioner Brooks, the, the DA modification that we received asked for 138. I don't know why they asked for that instead of the 136 that they platted, but that's what they asked for.

Speaker 3 ([00:29:15](#)):

So the application said that, but the letter of support said 136 or it says 136? The application

Speaker 6 ([00:29:21](#)):

And their DA modification, the actual DA that would be recorded, the language says that it would go from, that would go to a maximum of 138 lots.

Speaker 3 ([00:29:32](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 6 ([00:29:35](#)):

But they had pl - only platted 136 previously on a preliminary plat.

Speaker 1 ([00:29:42](#)):

But we could modify this to, to match the 136. , Chairman

Speaker 6 ([00:29:47](#)):

Holton, commissioners, you could. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:30:04](#)):

Did that answer your question?

Speaker 3 ([00:30:06](#)):

Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I found it in the letter, , from, , at that time, Borton Lakey's office. It does mention 138.

Speaker 1 ([00:30:16](#)):

It does mention 138. But since then, they've, they've done the, the calculations and so they're at 136. Yeah. Okay. Thank

Speaker 3 ([00:30:27](#)):

You.

Speaker 1 ([00:30:29](#)):

Any other questions or staff?

Speaker 2 ([00:30:35](#)):

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

Speaker 1 ([00:30:38](#)):

All right. If there's not, let's hear from our other individuals who'd like to testify.

Speaker 4 ([00:30:45](#)):

Sara Lynn Myers.

Speaker 9 ([00:30:55](#)):

, Sara Lynn Myers, 17506 Goodson Road, Caldwell, Idaho, 83607. Is that all you need? Okay. , so just because I do better reading than talking, I'm gonna go ahead and just read this letter. <Laugh>

Speaker 1 ([00:31:12](#)):

Good. That's fine.

Speaker 9 ([00:31:14](#)):

, This is a letter that my husband and I actually created together, so it. Anyway, you'll understand what I say. , So dear commissioners, we are writing to respectfully request your consideration in allowing a split of the property located at 17506 Goodson Road where we have lived for the past four years. We have lived in the Middleton area for the past 20 years, and my husband. Sorry, my wife, so that would be me, is a long-term, a lifelong native of the Boise area. , Our roots in the community run deep and we have always valued contributing to the long-term stability and character of Canyon County. Over the past four years at this property, we have worked extensively to restore the old farmhouse and reclaim the surrounding land, investing time, labor, and care into making it a functional and well-maintained home. , As a teacher and a nurse, we are committed members of the community and intend to continue contributing positively to the area.

([00:32:17](#)):

However, due to our income limitations, we are unable to purchase the entire parcel at its full acreage. For this reason, we are requesting approval to divide the property so that we may purchase a smaller manageable portion that includes the farmhouse and the immediate land we have been maintaining. We appreciate your time and consideration of this request. This property has become our home, and we hope to find a path forward that allows us to remain here while respecting county procedures and long-

term land use planning. , Thank you for your attention. We welcome any guidance or next steps that you may recommend. All right.

Speaker 1 ([00:32:54](#)):

Any comments or questions?

Speaker 2 ([00:32:56](#)):

Thank you for your testimony.

Speaker 9 ([00:32:57](#)):

Yeah. I'm the nurse. He's the teacher. <Laugh> <laugh> There

Speaker 4 ([00:33:02](#)):

You go. Tony Myers.

Speaker 8 ([00:33:13](#)):

My name's Tony Myers, 17506 Goodson Road, the property in question. I appreciate your county commissioners letting us be here. I don't have much more to add. I feel like everything's been, , spoken very clearly. One thing Spencer has really focused on in this area is making it look good. And I think that's just kind of Spencer's nature is to serve and to try to make areas look nice. And he's done that by, , helping get Bob Sturb's area cleaned up, which was a horrible project. We had a lot of kids crying every day, but we did it. , And it looks beautiful now. And that's. There is a lot of dry land behind the property that's not usable. And it would be nice to let people establish it and use it, , in their own little farm lots. And so I just appreciate Spencer and I appreciate you guys and that's all I have to say.

([00:34:09](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([00:34:11](#)):

Thank you for being here.

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

Any others?

Speaker 2 ([00:34:17](#)):

All right.

Speaker 1 ([00:34:19](#)):

Is there. Spencer, do you have any rebuttal or any, , points that you'd like to bring up?

Speaker 5 ([00:34:23](#)):

Could I just do a few clarifications?

Speaker 1 ([00:34:25](#)):

Oh, absolutely. It's what your time's for.

Speaker 5 ([00:34:28](#)):

Thank you. , Yeah, Todd Lakey and the planning and zoning group had a big discussion on that necessity definition and there was a difference of opinion that I listened to and it would be nice to, , have that clarified. But, , one other thing, I know there's been a lot of discussions about ADUs and, you know, the state requiring that now. We'd be willing to eliminate that on these. And I did keep them all above two acres. Most of them are two to three acres to, to meet that are, are, they're the rural residential thing and I, and I'll keep it as, as described. , The average. There's 133 acres on the, , Olson property and I think there's 200 and. There's. It's, it's over 400 some acres. So I think the total lot density, Commissioner Holton, that you're talking about, I think it still meets that, , you know, over two for the whole property.

([00:35:24](#)):

Okay. , and then the farmable acres should stay the same. It was 84 before and it will be 84 now.

Speaker 2 ([00:35:31](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 5 ([00:35:32](#)):

Yeah. , let's see. That 138, I don't. It was a mistake in Todd Lakey's letter and it got put in there, but it should have been 136.

Speaker 2 ([00:35:41](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:35:41](#)):

, and Tony Myers was my, two of my kids' favorite teacher at Mill Creek Elementary. And he was about ready to move to Eastern Idaho where land was less expensive. I'm like, "Hey, I have an idea for you." <laugh> And so he's, he still teaches. , The kids all love Tony Myers in our school. So this was a way to keep him and his family, their beautiful family, , out there and they've done a great job and become friends with all the farmers. The Kershaws are really close friends of theirs. And anyway, it's, it's, , it's been a beautiful thing to watch it all come together. And, you know, the Sturm property, it is beautiful and it actually has allowed like, , I don't know if you know Amy Woodruff and her daughter both were able to sell and buy land that they wanted because we've cleaned it up out there.

([00:36:27](#)):

And we really have had no opposition. We had the neighborhood meetings, all the agencies are good with it. And so I, I think the community in that area in general are, are happy with this idea and presentation.

Speaker 1 ([00:36:41](#)):

, Spencer, I'd, I'd like to explore your opinion on, I believe it would be lot 14 that would be that agricultural ground. Yeah. , for, for going into the future, , how would you see that we would enumerate that or title it? What would you prefer?

Speaker 5 ([00:37:02](#)):

I guess I'd just say you could do the DA modification the way it's written, but we can designate that as a non-buildable lot for agricultural staging.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:11](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:37:12](#)):

Just that simple.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:13](#)):

I guess the thing that bothers me about non-buildable, say in the future that the ag operation needs some kind of ag building on, on it.

Speaker 5 ([00:37:21](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:37:21](#)):

Would that, that's where I'm getting my little tension going.

Speaker 5 ([00:37:25](#)):

You know, I would ask, maybe ask your advice on what we should do with that, because I do wanna allow it to be a usable place for the farmers.

Speaker 2 ([00:37:32](#)):

Right.

Speaker 5 ([00:37:33](#)):

So.

Speaker 7 ([00:37:34](#)):

So technically, , if it's a non-buildable lot, if it's, if it's an ag only lot per, per se, we still would allow an ag building. An

Speaker 1 ([00:37:45](#)):

Ag structure. Okay. Okay. So I don't wanna use vernacular that's gonna - Right. Cause problems. Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:37:53](#)):



All right. Good point. Thank you. On one of, , Carla's, , one of her slides that showed the area where we were gonna put the riding arena. It's now a big staging area for the excess dirt that's been around, but it was kind of clarified. And, , Mike, it, it's, it's a big enough area where it doesn't affect Mike's farming operations at all.

Speaker 2 ([00:38:22](#)):

Yeah. So. Chairman, I just wanna say for the record, , back up what Mr. Myers has already put on the record. I appreciate I go through Middleton and see what you've done there, and we've had a lot of requests for cleaning up property, which has benefited the entire community of Middleton. So thank you for your efforts and your integrity and development and ensuring you do live up to seeking the best and highest good for. That's what I've seen from your, , perspective. So thank you for that.

Speaker 5 ([00:38:51](#)):

Thank you. That, the roundabout we're building for the city is, it's taken a while, but it's shaping up.

Speaker 2 ([00:38:56](#)):

It is. And we - It looks

Speaker 5 ([00:38:58](#)):

Good. It, it has been really gratifying. Of all the things I do development-wise, cleaning up the Stern property and the Hanson property on Eel Lane, and then I actually cleaned up a third property out the old, , property that was the old, , access to the river behind Star River Ranch. It was a big junkyard and meth heads lived back there. Right. We've cleaned that all up

Speaker 2 ([00:39:17](#)):

And stuff. And that's. Is that Eel Lane that you cleaned up? Is it -

Speaker 5 ([00:39:19](#)):

I cleaned up Eel Lane.

Speaker 2 ([00:39:20](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 5 ([00:39:20](#)):

And then at the end of Bent Lane, and then the Stern property.

Speaker 2 ([00:39:23](#)):

It's made a huge difference. Yep. Nope, thank you. That's a great investment in the community and for one person to go out there and evidently get kids involved, teach them how to work.

Speaker 5 ([00:39:33](#)):

My niece flipped my skid steer, so it wasn't without some pain.

Speaker 2 ([00:39:36](#)):

Okay. Well, hopefully she landed okay. Yeah,

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

She's all right. She

Speaker 2 ([00:39:40](#)):

Got married

Speaker 5 ([00:39:40](#)):

On Friday, so

Speaker 2 ([00:39:41](#)):

She's good. <Laugh> Oh wow. Very nice. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:39:47](#)):

Carla, can you go to , the exhibit four? It shows the page of both the , these 13, 14 lots and then the further pull out in red. And I was wanting to see if Spencer can go up and show us where that extra dirt is being, , where that arena would -

Speaker 2 ([00:40:07](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:40:07](#)):

Would be cited in the future. I'm electronically on page, , 225 where I'm at. So you're very close. Oh, you put in 252. Transposed numbers. There you go.

Speaker 5 ([00:40:45](#)):

Can I approach

Speaker 1 ([00:40:46](#)):

It? Yeah, yeah.

Speaker 5 ([00:40:47](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:40:47](#)):

Go up and point that out.

Speaker 5 ([00:40:49](#)):

This area right here, there's actually a big siphon that runs through there.

Speaker 2 ([00:40:53](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:40:54](#)):

And so we. It's non-farble anyway, but this is where we've staged all the extra dirt that, that came when we cut, did all of our cuts and stuff. , And so that would be where the riding arena and the pond for phase three that serves all, all of phase three.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:08](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:41:09](#)):

Phase two is actually paved and we're, we'll be before you here pretty soon.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:13](#)):

Wow. Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:41:16](#)):

But yeah, so this area right here.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:18](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:41:18](#)):

The pond and the riding arena. Okay. So we wouldn't separate that off. We would create an easement, basically, so the whole stadium subdivision could use that, but it's gonna be an easement on the top of that property.

Speaker 1 ([00:41:34](#)):

Okay. Cool. All right.

Speaker 2 ([00:41:38](#)):

And -

Speaker 1 ([00:41:39](#)):

Anything else?

Speaker 2 ([00:41:40](#)):

Chairman, can I just ask, so for that easement, that. I don't know how we write that or when we. If this is approved, if you make that a non, you're gonna build an arena on it. I don't know what that involves, but - Yeah. Just to dedicate that.

Speaker 5 ([00:41:54](#)):

It's in the ag portion and it would be an easement just for a pond and, and we would actually work with. Our engineers are writing up those, all those easements, because we actually are doing it as, as kind of an amenity to the whole subdivision, but it's gonna sit on this property, so - Okay. I, I think. I mean, I'm, I'm willing to put it as part of this agreement too, but it is, it's currently in process in the easements for

Speaker 2 ([00:42:21](#)):

Phase

Speaker 5 ([00:42:21](#)):

Three of stadium subdivision.

Speaker 2 ([00:42:23](#)):

Okay. And then Chairman, I just wanna recap my notes, which is gonna be a little bit redundant, but if I miss anything, let me know. Eliminate ADUs. You agreed to that?

Speaker 5 ([00:42:32](#)):

I would be willing to do that

Speaker 2 ([00:42:33](#)):

On these. Mm-Hmm. Limit this to 136 maximum out of what that original approval was in 2000.

Speaker 5 ([00:42:39](#)):

And that's what it is. It's the preliminary plat. We, we don't wanna change that. We. In fact, phase three is almost ready to submit two, so.

Speaker 2 ([00:42:46](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 6 ([00:42:47](#)):

Chairman, commissioner Van Beek, , are you saying ADUs on the whole property or just the one that Spencer's developing for the 14 or the

Speaker 2 ([00:42:57](#)):

13 lots? That's what I thought we were talking about today. I don't know that we can make adjustments to the other one. I just wanted to clarify. Yeah. No, thank you, Carla. That a good point - Thank you. Because you've brought that up. But, , I would. I'm not for EDUs. I would think it would be better to have that included in an original platted, preliminary plat if you're gonna wanna build more density on a property, but - Right. If we can't touch that in this, I understand. I was specifically targeting these lots today. And then, , the removal or making it an ag dedicated parcel that's contiguous with the existing ag, and then the riding arena easement. And I, I've heard what you said about dedicating that in a conservation easement. I don't know

Speaker 5 ([00:43:41](#)):

How much - Yeah, and I don't know what the right terminology is, but just, , like P&Z and they made a good point. It's like, how many times are you guys gonna come back and modify this DA agreement? I. Which I didn't realize the whole history of it. Right. I get that, you know? And so whatever, whatever you think is proper for that to maintain those two good pivots and -

Speaker 2 ([00:44:00](#)):

Well, that was a. So let's just have a tiny conversation. That was a state legislature decision. Conservation easements, they're 20 years. They don't have to notice property owners before they re-up it at the end of 20 years. So it does lock it down. There. From where I sit, it looks like there's an interest in this area that continues to come before the board, so it indicates that's changing at some level. Right. So I guess as long as Mike's willing and able to farm it, or if you have people, as you've indicated, it is difficult to find farm ground for young farmers. Mm-Hmm. And so I don't know how the board does that and if we can put time constraints, you can't come back as a part of this where you're willing to put that in there - Yep. For X number of years. Because at that end of that, like, let's say we did 10 years.

([00:44:51](#)):

At the end of 10 years, if it changes, it might be more appropriate rather than making it difficult for somebody to farm on a baling operation out there, whatever. I don't know.

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

Good point. I'll take your recommendation on it.

Speaker 2 ([00:45:02](#)):

And this is. I just wanted to bring it up so that the board can deliberate on the pluses and minuses of that in a rapidly changing Canyon County.

Speaker 5 ([00:45:12](#)):

Makes

Speaker 2 ([00:45:12](#)):

Sense. Yeah. And those are the, what I had -

Speaker 1 ([00:45:16](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 2 ([00:45:16](#)):

Listed on there, Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([00:45:18](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 2 ([00:45:19](#)):

And that these. None of these, to the chairman's point, will be less than two acre lots on this development agreement that we're talking about today. Correct. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:45:35](#)):

Okay. , I'm, I am not clear in my mind's eye how we can, , write in the arena into this. , I suppose we could get really creative, but, , it's not coming to mind. Carla, you have any?

Speaker 6 ([00:45:57](#)):

Hold on, commissioners. I, I would say. So this, I have on the screen the, the DA modification that the applicant submitted. So that's one of the requirements is they have to provide us with the language that would then get recorded. So I would say probably under 1B, you could maybe do, , another bullet under that, that would include the different requirements for property too, which could include this riding arena, an easement for easement and development of a riding, , arena perhaps, something

Speaker 2 ([00:46:26](#)):

To that. Chairman, can I ask, do you know how much ground that's going to be? 'Cause Couldn't we just write in a dedicated amount of ground with the - That's

Speaker 5 ([00:46:34](#)):

A typical riding arena. I think it's, yeah, two or three acres, I think. But we actually have it in our marketing. It's already out on our posters. We are going to do it. , It's, it's being worked on, but if you want to codify that, that's fine, but just know that it is happening.

Speaker 2 ([00:46:50](#)):

Okay. We just say the dedicated easement for two to three acres of a riding arena. I know

Speaker 1 ([00:47:02](#)):

That you would name the, the amount of acres.

Speaker 2 ([00:47:04](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:13](#)):

Do you have any problem with us doing that? Adding, adding to 1B, , maybe it'll be one, 1C. I don't know.

Speaker 5 ([00:47:21](#)):

No problem.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:22](#)):

No

Speaker 5 ([00:47:22](#)):

Problem.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:25](#)):

Okay. Mr. Brooks, do you have anything to say about that?

Speaker 8 ([00:47:29](#)):

Nope. I'm fine with

Speaker 1 ([00:47:30](#)):

It. Okay. All right. I think it would help you and, and, , in your selling, you can just say it's in the DA.

Speaker 5 ([00:47:39](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:40](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([00:47:41](#)):

That's fine. All

Speaker 1 ([00:47:41](#)):

Right. I don't have anything else. Does anyone else?

Speaker 2 ([00:47:48](#)):

Chairman, I move we close public testimony.

Speaker 3 ([00:47:50](#)):

I second.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:50](#)):

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

Speaker 2 ([00:47:54](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:47:55](#)):

Aye. Motion carries unanimously. So at this time, we will, , go into a time of deliberation and I'll read the verbiage. As a reminder to the audience. Thank you. I was gonna try to do it on my own. As a reminder to the audience, decisions by the board must be based on information in the record and criteria outlined in Idaho State Code and Canyon County ordinances. No new information is to be presented or discussed and we will not take comments from the audience. It's important that we're able to discuss our opinion and make specific findings and therefore please be respectful as we, as the board discusses this matter.

(00:48:40):

All right. I, , am thankful that they're interested in, , reducing the number of lots. I, , can't even imagine what the prior commissioners were thinking, but that time too has passed. And so, , I think that, , staff's input about their concern about a ongoing, , preliminary and final plat, or a plat almost ready for final plat process is, , too little too late to be doing anything to what our current understandings of the limitations of drain fields and septic tanks are. But, , that, that higher density would have ev - never been able to be passed in this day and age without a lot of demonstrating that it could have, that it would meet those criteria. , So I'm, I'm, I'm very much interested in the modification, , to 136. , I don't care if we list it as, , as a, as 14 lots.

(00:50:12):

One, , do we. Can we not, can we note the lot number? It is lot 14 if the, on the, on the drawing I saw, and be very specific, , and that lot 14 be utilized as a, , non-residential ag- ag use only lot. We won't even speak of building or not building. <Laugh> Sometimes less is more. , The agreement that there would be, , no possibility for ADUs, and I'm okay with, , with the moving of those lots from the one property to the other. So that's kind of how I see it. How do, how do you do?

Speaker 2 (00:51:15):

Chairman? Yes. I think that this is a reasonable proposal, and I am in favor of modifying with what I went over with Carla, which is part of what you enumerated in there, and including not less than two acre lot size, 136 maximum. Lot 14 is ag only, an easement for a riding arena which is already in progress. And then, , I just wanted to, , say to the county does recognize, , Commissioner Brooks is pointing out it is kind of, , it makes me chuckle. It's a Vambique move to, to wanna define a term and we don't have a definition for it. And so, , that does leave some subjectivity and room for interpretation. So in the absence of a county defined, I want that, I guess, to be noted, and it already is, that without a definition of what necessity is, it appears to me that in a rural area like this, and a reduction of lots where we're just shifting things around, seems to make sense where we meet the rural residential acreage on that.

(00:52:22):

So, , I liked the request. I. If this were a builder without the altruistic nature and the philanthropic development of the community, that would be a different story for this commissioner, but I think this is a good proposal.

Speaker 3 (00:52:45):

Okay. Commissioner Brooks? Mr. Chairman, I'm in favor of everything that's been stated, and I'll, I'll point out again, I, I am troubled that we are, we're making opinions based upon a term that is not defined, nor does it have any criteria to meet the threshold of that term, because it is completely undefined. So I, I don't know what we're trying to do with it, but, , this is, I think, the first DA modification that I have been a part of or that we've been a part of here since we have been, , elected, and so I hadn't seen it before. And this. I think this is problematic <laugh> because I. I mean, we're having somebody state what they think is the necessity for it, and then, like, there's nothing else that gives us, , I guess, permission or authority to do anything with that. So I don't, I don't think it holds a lot of weight when we make determination one way or the other based upon it, so.

Speaker 1 (00:54:09):



You have a, you have a good argument. I got two points. I'm gonna take care of housekeeping first and then get to your point.

Speaker 3 ([00:54:14](#)):

So anyways, I guess, I guess that's just a s - a side note, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 2 ([00:54:18](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([00:54:19](#)):

Like, something for the future for us to address, but as far as the, the proposal and whatnot, what we've discussed, , I, I'm in favor of moving forward with it.

Speaker 1 ([00:54:31](#)):

Okay. , housekeeping note, , Carla, we, we need to have, , on the record during deliberation 1.C or 1C to add the, , to enumerate about the new community. I don't even know if I'd use that terminology. I just put in the writing arena has been mentioned and that we are adding that into the DA, that there, there will be one. , I'm, I'm not familiar enough to add the pond because I. Let's just leave it that there will be, as noted, they, they're, they're gonna be, , building a writing arena, arena, so however we want to put that. I'm, I am, . JD, we have an opinion about. Do you have an opinion about utilizing the term farm staging area or just an ag use only on 14?

Speaker 7 ([00:55:37](#)):

I don't have to, don't have to, to find a new term of farm staging area either, so ag- ag only parcel is recognized and we're updating that, that definition as part of the administrative division ordinance forthcoming, so.

Speaker 1 ([00:55:53](#)):

Okay. Okay. All right. Sounds good. , So, , to me, on the definition, , one of, one of our goals has been to, to, , watch out and moderate as best as we know how the impact of residential on ag, especially an ag, an active ag operation. And to me, , I'm perfectly fine, , by utilizing that definition for this. This is a mod - this is modifying this development concept to, to, to attempt to do less impact on ag than the way it was set up to do. And I think that's, overall, is a win-win for Canyon County. And so, , I can be okay with the problem with unclear definitions. All right. Any other concern? Do we need to, . We don't have to go through the eight criteria on a, on a modification, so - Chairman,

Speaker 6 ([00:57:13](#)):

Commissioner Holton? Yes. , are you comfortable with me. There will be FCOs. Are you comfortable with, comfortable with me rewriting the necessity of the request, request based on Mr. Layke's letter?

Speaker 1 ([00:57:25](#)):

Well, mix - Mr. Layke's letter and also on, on, , what we've discussed in deliberating. Yeah, I'd, I'd homogenize the two together.

Speaker 2 ([00:57:34](#)):

Yeah. And Chairman Carla, you're so good at this, so I just wanna make sure you're gonna completely rewrite subsection B on exhibit A6, correct? Oh, yeah. ,

Speaker 6 ([00:57:47](#)):

, Chairman, Commissioner Van Bee, c- correct, but. And the applicant really will need to. They will need to reproduce the development agreement that will be get recorded, so I'll, I'll have them do that, their lawyers -

Speaker 2 ([00:57:56](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 6 ([00:57:57](#)):

To redraft it based on what we're telling them.

Speaker 2 ([00:58:00](#)):

Thank you, Carla. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([00:58:04](#)):

Okay. , Procedural question. We can go ahead and pass the FCOs regardless of whether the DA has come back with the signatures on it for our signature, right? ,

Speaker 6 ([00:58:19](#)):

Chairman Holton, commissioners, I believe so. , We. I will have to rewrite them, so I could probably bring them at the same time, but. -

Speaker 7 ([00:58:28](#)):

They're two separate documents.

Speaker 1 ([00:58:29](#)):

Well, I know that, but chicken or the egg.

Speaker 7 ([00:58:34](#)):

I would approve the FCOs and then sign it.

Speaker 1 ([00:58:38](#)):

That's, that's how I would do it, but I'd put it in the FCOs that, , it's not a complete decision until the, until the new revised DA is signed. I'd put some kind of verbiage in the FCOs to that effect.

Speaker 3 ([00:58:55](#)):

Sounds like you're making the motion then. <Laugh>

Speaker 1 ([00:59:00](#)):

It's harder to make the motion after you though about it. All right. So, , in consideration of our discussion and s - DSD staff working to, , generate written FCOs, I would move that we, , approve the modification to the DA as, , discussed, that we, , first review and sign the FCOs, and then that will be then followed up and be only by then completed by our signature on the revised DA. That's my motion.

Speaker 2 ([00:59:44](#)):

I will second.

Speaker 1 ([00:59:45](#)):

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

Speaker 2 ([00:59:49](#)):

Aye. Aye.

Speaker 1 ([00:59:50](#)):

Aye. Motion carries unanimously. All right. I have no other business under this agenda item. , Carla, do you know of anything else? Okay. I'd make a motion that we adjourn.

Speaker 2 ([01:00:01](#)):

I second.

Speaker 1 ([01:00:02](#)):

Motion's been made segment for adjournment. All those in favor say aye. Aye.

Speaker 2 ([01:00:05](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([01:00:06](#)):

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