

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

All right. It is now 1:31 on the 16th day of September 2026, and time for today's Canyon County Board of Commissioners public hearing. This is w - be regarding case AD2025-0133-APL. I'm Chairman Brad Holton. To my left is Commissioner Zach Brooks. Commissioner Leslie Van Beek is- is absent today. 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. 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 ([00:50](#)):

No, Mr. Chairman.

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

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 ([01:00](#)):

No, Mr. Chairman.

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

And no for myself. Testimony guidelines and orders of process. So if you would, please be sure to silence your phones. , The commissioner's room is electronically records all public hearings and the system is very sensitive, sensitive enough to pick up your conversations in the audience. To ensure that we have a clear audio recording of the testimony, please step outside today from the commissioner's room if you need to discuss matters while you're in the audience. As chairman, I will maintain order by restricting an appropriate discussion or disorderly conduct, and if necessary, we'll ask you to step outside in event that you are disruptive or inappropriate. At this time, we'll explain the rules of the procedures for today's hearing consistent with Canyon County Ordinances Chapter one and Article 17 and Chapter seven, Article one. The applicant has the burden of proof. The applicant or the representative will go first today with their testimony limited to 10 minutes.

([01:58](#)):

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 to, by the board to the staff can happen at any time during today's hearing.

([02:15](#)):

Then at that point, the individuals who have been signed up and sworn in will each 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 by the board. Once the public comment is closed, we will deliberate and render a decision. So this is what I'm gonna ask of you if you're gonna testify today. So you just come up and take a seat in front of the microphone. Please don't stand. It's too formal for me. , If you have to stand, you have to stand, but we still need you to have the microphone close to your lips so we can have it on the

audio recording. So when your name is called, I'll ask you to come up, or actually Jennin is gonna call your name and, and you can come up from then.

(03:05):

And if you would have a seat, then start first by stating your name and your address for the record. So we're asking you to adhere to the three-minute limit and make sure that your testimony is non-repetitive. If someone had gone before you that's saying the same thing, just say, "I agree with the previous participant." And then if there's any specificity that you wanna add above that, then state that. 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. 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 into the staff report packet, hearing body review, and full transparency and access for the public.

(04:01):

The submissions of late documents or other materials does not allow all parties time to address the material or allow sufficient time for public review. All right. If you refer to something as an exhibit in your testimony, would you please use, , verbal descriptions of what you're referring to audibly so w - if we have to make a transcript, we can get an example of what you're referring to. All right. So everybody that's come into the gallery who chose to address the commission today has signed up? Okay. I'll take that as a yes. All right. So with that, let's have the clerk do this off, swear the oath of affirmation, please.

Speaker 3 (04:44):

Josh Johnson, Jay Givens, Dean Adams, Mark Fivey, Sid Freeman. If I could already 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 do.

Speaker 4 (04:56):

Yes. Thank

Speaker 3 (04:57):

You.

Speaker 1 (04:58):

All right. So if the applicant or their representative would come up and state your name and address and then we'll have 10 minutes for your opening.

Speaker 5 (05:11):

My name is Sid Freeman, 27406 Farmway Road, Caldwell, Idaho, 83607. Before I start my testimony, commissioners, I got a couple of apologies to make to you guys. , I, , apologize for my son not being able to be here. He is in harvest and it is terribly a busy time.

Speaker 1 (05:35):

No apology

Speaker 5 ([05:36](#)):

Needed. So I'm, I'm here, , representing him. And then I would also like to apologize for when the original application came out and the deadline date for input in opposition came, I was one day late. And I apologize because the Department of, , Planning and Zoning, they, they just don't know what they don't know. And so here we are today.

Speaker 1 ([06:02](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 5 ([06:03](#)):

So, , as, , Ronald Reagan said, , trust but verify, and I just wanna make sure everybody has had a chance to, . I got a checklist. I, I got pictures that I provided of the head gate, the power line. , I got a, a certified public, , agricultural advisor's letter with soil samples. , Richard Jevreau, who is here, his letter, , the granddaughter of the original property owners, Trina Jevreau, her letter. , I just wanna make sure that everybody had the opportunity to go through that. And, , in my opening remarks, I'm pretty much gonna read down Wesley's letter, , if that's okay with the commissioners.

Speaker 1 ([06:49](#)):

So procedurally, let me, let me interrupt for a minute. Josh, you have something that you have concern to say or.

Speaker 4 ([06:57](#)):

No. , the documents Mr. Meyer is referring to, those are the ones you got a little later than you normally would've got. And I explained that we had somebody out at a training conference. They were date stamped and put on their desk and nobody caught it. And so you got those a little later than you normally would've, but it's exactly what Mr. Meyer is talking about and the board has those now.

Speaker 1 ([07:21](#)):

Okay. So they, they did not meet the, the 10-day procedure?

Speaker 4 ([07:26](#)):

No, they did.

Speaker 1 ([07:27](#)):

They did meet the pre-date.

Speaker 4 ([07:28](#)):

Yeah. They're, they're legit.

Speaker 5 ([07:29](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([07:30](#)):

All right. Sounds good. Okay.

Speaker 5 ([07:32](#)):

Yeah. So, so you said Mr. Myers. You talking about me?

Speaker 4 ([07:35](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 5 ([07:35](#)):

Mr. Freeman. Oh,

Speaker 4 ([07:37](#)):

Got

Speaker 5 ([07:37](#)):

It. <Laugh> You knew that.

Speaker 4 ([07:39](#)):

Mr. Meyer, somebody else. Okay. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([07:41](#)):

It's been a long day already, right?

Speaker 4 ([07:43](#)):

Long week already. <Laugh>

Speaker 1 ([07:45](#)):

Okay. I wondered who Myers, how he got involved with all of this since I don't even know who he is. So anyway. All right. So - I've

Speaker 5 ([07:53](#)):

Been

Speaker 1 ([07:53](#)):

Called,

Speaker 5 ([07:53](#)):

I've been called worse.

Speaker 1 ([07:54](#)):

All right. So we have those and they're within the legal timeframe and we have seen those and reviewed those.

Speaker 5 ([08:00](#)):

Okay. So, , thank you, Mr. Chairman. , commissioners, , this, this letter is from Wes. I'll read it as he would be reading it. , My name is Wesley Freeman. , I'm a fourth generation Canyon County farmer, and as you know, these days is extremely difficult for young people to get into farming and be able to actually buy farmland. I was extremely fortunate and blessed to have had the opportunity to purchase my farmland from Gayla Javeau back in 2026. After I owned it for a while, I felt it'd be a good business decision to split the, the subject property off of the big main part of the field, , with the building permit back in 2021. For me and many other farmers in the area, farming is our priority. Agriculture is established, is the established zoning and character of the area, so farming should be the priority making any land - use decisions.

([08:54](#)):

I never would've split it off had I known that it could be split again and have two houses on it. In weighing my decision, I felt that having one household to deal with would be manageable, but with the proposed two houses, the risks are much higher and it will have a huge negative impact, not only on the farming operations at the intersection, but also the future values of the surrounding farmland. The more contiguous neighbors, the less value our farm property is for agriculture uses because of conflicts. The proposed homes are directly in the pathway of aerial applications, which, , cause a no-fly zone and is problematic for all four farms at the intersection. Adding another home increases the size of the no-fly zone and makes it more difficult to apply the necessary insecticides. All four farms on that intersection grow onions. Onions are without a doubt the most heavily applied crop in Canyon County with up to eight to 10 applications per season.

([09:52](#)):

We have experienced through the decades that the more houses you have in an area, the much higher degree of probability garbage will get away from them and over onto surrounding farm fields. These homes result. These homes result in a much higher degree of people trespassing on our property and other farmers in the area. People think our farm and irrigation roadways are pathways to jog, ride bikes, and, and walk their dogs. By federal law, our fields are inspected for food safety purposes, and if an inspector finds garbage, pet feces in our fields, we can actually lose our contracts costing us hundreds of thousands of dollars with just in one crop. When, and when it comes to trespassing, even though we post our fields, there have been cases where people have trespassed onto farms and were exposed to insecticides. This can cause huge unnecessary liabilities for us and our neighbors.

([10:45](#)):

The more houses, the more people, the more trespass. My neighbors and I have worked extremely hard to be able to improve our farmland by spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on property improvements to make our land more viable than it was when we first bought it. Most of our rural residential neighbors have also done the same thing and invested in the agriculture use of their property. We have many of them within a mile radius of subject property. The owner of subject property can easily do the same thing. I sold the property with water rights and it has an existing head gate, and those are in the pictures. Water can easily be accessible by simply digging a ditch out from behind the head gate located on the southern end of the property. It is in fact there. After digging a ditch, an irrigation pump can easily be installed.

([11:32](#)):

There is a picture of a power line already installed on the property that can be converted for that use. Just like the majority of the agriculture landers in Canyon County have done on their land to improve

viability. I understand this is not a large parcel, but instead of dividing the property further and making it less viable for agriculture, the property owner should keep one building permit and use their water rights for beneficial agriculture use on the remainder of their property. As far as soil types go, as per the soil maps, the area. As far as soil, as per the soil maps, the area all, in the area, all of the farm fields surrounding subject property are of similar type soil. These are very difficult soils to deal with, but farmers in the area are farming these land with soil types and there's tens of thousands of acres of land in Canyon County with these types of soil.

(12:28):

As responsible landowners, we use many different types of soil amendments to enhance the existing soil composition. This too can easily be done on the subject property. We also, and, and as far as soil types go, I got that letter from the CPA or CCA and, and soil test to prove they're like in kind. We also keep re - our weeds under control with herbicides so that whatever crop we do plant does not have an unfair, , competition with weeds. This is not being done on the subject property. As far as shape and size of the parcel is very similar situation to many of the properties farmland in the Black Canyon Irrigation District, the way it looked before farmers invested heavily into land leveling, concrete ditches, gated pipe, many of them chose to go to pressurized irrigation systems and now we have, , irrigation drip, , readily available.

(13:20):

There are many options available that can enhance the viability of the subject property. There also needs to be a discussion about the harvest traffic in the area. There is a hop harvesting facility just a little over a mile from this intersection on 10 Davis Road, which has dozens of hop harvesting trucks running in the immediate area. Galloway Road is a major east-west corridor for transportation of many different types of crops grown here in Canyon County. There have been several accidents at this intersection over the decades, one of them being fatal. More residents use, uses, increases the conflicts with the existing agricultural traffic in the area. In conclusion, the Jeveau family has owned that property since 1940, and that's in Richard Jeveau's letter. It was used as irrigated pasture land for 30 years, over 30 years, up until mid - 70s. When, when, , Grandpa Javeau retired from dairying, Mike Jeveau farmed it and then ended up buying it, and it was.

(14:21):

And it's been viable agricultural loun - land and is still viable agricultural land, which is a scientific fact. Overall viability of anyone's property is the responsibility of the landowners themselves. If this decision stands, it will have a large negative impact on the surrounding farming operations. If we want to lay the decision solely on economic values, we need to consider the value of crops being grown in the area. They will far exceed any economic value of one more house on that corner. As our former county county clerk, Rick Hogeman, bless his heart, man, his soul, expertly pointed out there are many studies across the nation that show after a rural residence is constructed, the taxes collected on them do not cover 100% of the cost of public services that they receive. The rest is paid from taxes received from sources such as agricultural lands. The property owners have the benefit of the one building permit that exists on the subject property from the previous land division.

(15:24):

One building permit is an acceptable balance. Doubling the risk, , is not an accepting, acceptable balance. This is a, this is a, a high priority agricultural area and, , I've been involved with, , , , comprehensive plans for over 30 years, three comprehensive plans. I've been involved with two of them identify the area from Notice, West Pa- Parma, South to Roswell, and up under Wild- Wilder Bench as

high priority for agriculture. We, we, we understand if this was in an impact area, maybe this would be a decision that might, might fit, but not where it's at. And, , Wesley goes on to say, , , he, he apologizes again for not being able to be there, and he says, "I respectfully urge you to reverse this decision and deny this application. Thank you for your time and consideration." And, , you know, the applicant, , , the original applicant, , falsified.

(16:24):

Well, I don't know if she falsified, but she, , was very, , not honest in her application when she said she didn't know. She said it didn't have, , water rights. And, , I got proof, well, number one, the, the listing states it has water rights, , six times. And, , we got a letter. It's exhibit G1, , Black Canyon Irrigation dated December 1st. , It says it's got water right. , Her application was November 3rd. She. And then I got a bill on October 15th of 2025 to the applicant, original applicant, for the water rights on that property. So, you know, , viability can scientifically be proven. There's no question about it. , Does it fit in the area? It really doesn't. One house maybe, but not two. , You know, gentlemen, , it, it will have a huge impact. I mean, one crop of onions on a 40 acre field will be worth more than that extra building permit ever will be on that property.

(17:34):

I'll stand for questions. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (17:37):

Mr. Chairman?

Speaker 5 (17:38):

Yes.

Speaker 2 (17:40):

Sid, Wes purchased the property in 2016?

Speaker 5 (17:44):

Yes, sir.

Speaker 2 (17:45):

, According to the aerials, he didn't even farm it himself. Can you speak to why he did not?

Speaker 5 (17:53):

Yes. We, as, as farming operations grew, so did our resources, our pipe, our equipment. , We, that area had been used for transloading potatoes for a decade and a half that I know of. You're fine. And, , we, we stacked sprinkler pipe on it. We parked equipment on it, and Wes put a pivot on the big field up above. And, and it, it didn't, , you know, it was convenient to park our stuff over there, our hand line, because we had to put hand lines on the corners of the pivots and, and, , and then Mike Javeau, same way, he parked equipment on it after he quit farming it.

Speaker 2 (18:37):

Okay. , are, do you know, maybe this question's for staff, is there an ADU allowed currently with the building permit that's on it already?

Speaker 6 ([18:51](#)):

Through the chair, if. Yes, as it is right now, there would be a primary and a secondary residence allowed on this parcel.

Speaker 2 ([19:01](#)):

Okay, so we can already have two. , So I guess this is another question maybe for staff. So when we have a small parcel like this under three acres that already has a building permit, can have a secondary residence, how much of that property do we assume will be consumed by those two buildings before we, , determine the viability of whatever's left over? Does that make sense?

Speaker 4 ([19:40](#)):

Your question makes sense. , I don't think we can answer it because you could do a gigantic one-story house and take up more room or you could go three stories up in a small footprint. There's just a lot of unknowns there, so I think it would be hard to say, just assume what's gonna make it non-viable with that. We would just be playing a guessing game - Okay. In my opinion.

Speaker 2 ([19:59](#)):

All right. Thank you. That's all I have for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([20:07](#)):

So Sid, let me clarify. There is power available at the lot and there, the irrigation structure is in place for irrigation surface water delivery.

Speaker 5 ([20:17](#)):

Yes, sir. Okay. All I gotta do is open the head gate and dig a ditch and there's, there's a power line right there to the property that we used for, , many different purposes, primarily for the, the, the transloading of, of potatoes.

Speaker 1 ([20:30](#)):

Okay. Okay. All right. I don't have any other questions. Thank you.

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

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([20:42](#)):

All right. We'll hear from staff. Presentation next, please.

Speaker 6 ([20:49](#)):

Good afternoon, chairman and commissioner. My name is Dan, and I'll present the Freeman Appeal case number AD2025-0133-APL. The appellant said Freeman is appealing the director's approval of a non-

viable land division. The result of the request would deny AD 2025-0133, leaving the approximately 2.65 acres with a single building permit available. The appellant requests that the board of county commissioners approve the appeal and not allow for the requested divisions. In 2006, the original parcel was divided via LS2006-48, creating the blue parcel and then what is now the orange and red parcel. In 2021, the original land division was amended, and this created the orange parcel with the building permit available and the red parcel, which was designated as agricultural only. In 2025, a non-viable land division was applied for for the subject property, and this is the orange parcel. On July 10th, 2026, the non-viable land division was approved, which divided the orange parcel once creating two parcels.

(22:01):

On July 27th, 2026, this appeal was applied for.

(22:07):

On July 10th, 2026, a director's decision approving the request was issued. The application was approved, finding that the lot size configuration and uneven geometry made productive agriculture use extremely difficult. Staff also analyzed Google Earth imagery from 2004 and did not find evidence that the subject property had been used for agricultural purposes. Additionally, no public comments were received by the comment deadline for AD 2025-0133. Staff found that access will be directly off of Hop Road, and Black Canyon Irrigation District requested a lot split application, and this was conditioned on the approval to be done prior to building permit submittal, and the canal located to the east of the subject property would adequately buffer the requested division from the farm to the east.

(22:57):

According to the appellant's application, the subject parcel has historically been used for agriculture in the appellant's reason statement, this is exhibit 1C, it is stated that since the late 1940s, the property has produced seed crops, wheat, hay, and pasture. The subject property has water rights amounting to one acre, and this can be. And can be irrigated. The subject property has additionally been used for the storage and handling of potatoes, sprinkler irrigation pipe, fertilizer, and wheat, and the soil classification map found in exhibit 2C should not solely be used in determining agriculture viability. The letter of intent and clarification email submitted for the original director's decision should not be used as they cite commercial agriculture and not being able to support a economically viable farming operation and adding a residential parcel to the area conflicts with the residential. With the agriculture operators and the residents.

(23:52):

The director's approval was based on the evidence and findings that met Kin County Code Section 071809. The appellant was aggrieved by the decision and submitted an appeal. The administrative appeal procedures outlined in Kinon County Code have been followed. Notice Parma Highway District number two, , submitted a comment stating that new approaches shall meet highway district standards and conditions. Caldwell Fire Department had no concerns and Black Canyon Irrigation District requested the lot split application through their office, and then this was addressed in conditions five, 5A, six, 6A, and 6B of the director's decision. Four comments were received in favor of the appellant's request along with additional information submitted by the appellant, and this was received by the comment deadline, and the property owner's representative submitted a comment prior to the comment deadline, and this is in exhibit 3A. Staff recommends that the board of county commissioners deny the appeal, upholding the director's decision.

(24:55):

And thank you all, Sam, for any questions.

Speaker 1 ([25:04](#)):

, Dane, since we're talking about ADUs, , the. Under the director's decision, there is no available ADUs on either the two lots, is that correct?

Speaker 6 ([25:18](#)):

Through the chair, correct. A condition was placed on the director's decision that prohibited secondary residences, and the primary idea behind this was the shared driveway with a secondary residence with setbacks would not be able to be met off that due to lot size, but there was that condition placed on the director's decision.

Speaker 1 ([25:37](#)):

I just wanted that put on the public records, not like I didn't know the answer, so. Okay. All right.

Speaker 2 ([25:45](#)):

Mr. Chairman?

Speaker 5 ([25:46](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 2 ([25:46](#)):

Is there a requirement for how close the ADU has to be to the primary residence?

Speaker 6 ([25:53](#)):

Through the chair, no. The only two code requirements for secondary residences at this time is that the property owner lives on site and that the secondary residence is addressed.

Speaker 1 ([26:11](#)):

Anything else from staff?

Speaker 7 ([26:14](#)):

No. Can I ask a question real

Speaker 1 ([26:17](#)):

Quick?

Speaker 7 ([26:18](#)):

Yes. Is property 38456 in your diagram, it's like just south of the red area, is that a residence that just shops, machine shops, do we know what's on that property?

Speaker 6 ([26:34](#)):

, Through the chair, I believe it's a, just a single family residence.

Speaker 4 ([26:45](#)):

For the crowd, that's Aaron Bazzoli, he's an attorney with the county.

Speaker 1 ([26:52](#)):

We typically don't swear him in, so there you

Speaker 7 ([26:54](#)):

Go. That'll testify. <Laugh>

Speaker 5 ([26:58](#)):

I'm good. You

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

Good? Yep. All right. So at this time, Jenna was gonna be calling out the names that have signed up, and as she calls you, you can come up and state your name and address and, , provide us three minutes of your testimony, please.

Speaker 3 ([27:13](#)):

Mark.

Speaker 8 ([27:23](#)):

, before my time commences, can I ask a few clarifying questions?

Speaker 1 ([27:28](#)):

It's not how it typically works, but would you exhibits? It's about the exhibits or

Speaker 8 ([27:34](#)):

What? I thought staff was gonna raise it, so I'm kinda confused it wasn't raised. Like I've been in an email exchange where they were gonna point out that we didn't receive these, this, this new package of, , exhibits until Monday, , was the first that we saw it, so I haven't had time to prepare much of a response of any to the new things submitted. And the other, I was gonna see if I can have 10 minutes because I am appearing on behalf of the original applicant who's the property owner at interest in this.

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

We've traditionally have not allowed other people to be representative of other people without documentation, so that first, that last question is no. Second question is, if you feel that there's been a procedural error, you can give what you have today and we can continue this and give you the two weeks or the 10 days to do that and come back and testify. What would you like to do?

Speaker 8 ([28:24](#)):

, And I can offer my testimony today, but I'd like the, the possibility to at least submit some kind of written response to the, the later submittals. And it, for clarity, I am an attorney appearing on behalf of M&M Properties. I believe it's appropriate for an attorney to appear in a representative capacity.

Speaker 4 ([28:42](#)):

We, we have email exchanges and evidence that Mr. Beebe is representing the property owner.

Speaker 1 ([28:48](#)):

Well, that's refreshing. That's new. Not to be derogatory to you whatsoever. It's other, , self-proclaimed individuals before you. , How would you like to proceed?

Speaker 2 ([29:04](#)):

I don't know. This is kind of a new one. Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([29:08](#)):

Procedurally, Aaron interrupted me if I'm incorrect. Procedurally, I would always do a continuance and give the person that time limit so everybody's on the same playing field, that there isn't any speciality. So I would say -

Speaker 2 ([29:24](#)):

That

Speaker 1 ([29:24](#)):

I'm on board

Speaker 2 ([29:25](#)):

With.

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

We would stop. We'll give, we'll give a 10 day to two week lead time, whatever we can get on our calendar and reconvene. You wanna

Speaker 2 ([29:34](#)):

Do that now?

Speaker 1 ([29:35](#)):

I wanna do that now. What do you say?

Speaker 7 ([29:39](#)):

Chairman, I believe when Mr. Weiby is an attorney in the state of Idaho too, is, , I think it's appropriate if he's the respondent to the appeal process and the applicant that if the appellant has provided written material that wasn't received by or available to the public by all parties, that it's proper for the applicant to at least have an opportunity to review that, respond in kind, especially to comments that were made

potentially that are in contradiction to what was previously submitted. So I think it's proper for the board to, , give that, give the appli - the, I guess it would really be the appellant or the applicant in this case time to review the submitted materials and respond in kind.

Speaker 2 ([30:25](#)):

Okay, Mr. Chairman, it was the applicant that turned in the material that needs time to be reviewed.

Speaker 7 ([30:30](#)):

My understanding was Mr. Freeman who submitted the information. He's the appellant - Yeah, okay. Versus Mr. Mivy represents the applicant. The

Speaker 2 ([30:39](#)):

Applicant, the original applicant.

Speaker 7 ([30:40](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 1 ([30:41](#)):

Correct. <Laugh> Josh, do you have a point of view?

Speaker 4 ([30:49](#)):

I do. I think, , Jenna already has a hearing date available and I think it would be better, as you say, to put it on a level playing field, just cross our T's and dot our I's.

Speaker 1 ([30:58](#)):

Yes, I, I do. I, I like this to be as fair as we can possibly make it.

Speaker 8 ([31:03](#)):

I appreciate that.

Speaker 1 ([31:05](#)):

Jenna, do you have a date? ,

Speaker 5 ([31:06](#)):

Wednesday the 30th.

Speaker 1 ([31:09](#)):

Wednesday the 30th is two weeks. , At 1:30 at this hearing room.

Speaker 8 ([31:19](#)):

Jump into my calendar real quick.

Speaker 1 ([31:21](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 8 ([31:25](#)):

Wrong calendar.

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

And, and you're wanting to continue before he gives any testimony? Mm-Hmm. Okay.

Speaker 8 ([31:37](#)):

That's available.

Speaker 1 ([31:37](#)):

That's available. It is. All right. If that's the case, , I would make a motion that we, , suspend this public hearing at this point. , We continue this at a time and date certain of September 30th at 1:30 PM in this hearing room and continue from this point in the hearing on. That means public testimony will still be completely open, , and that'll give us time to, for everybody's review of these documents.

Speaker 2 ([32:10](#)):

I second.

Speaker 1 ([32:11](#)):

Okay. Motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Aye. I

Speaker 8 ([32:17](#)):

Was just saying thank you. <Laugh> That's all.

Speaker 5 ([32:21](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([32:21](#)):

Okay. Motion carries. All right. So let's consider ourselves adjourned then until we can reconvene, , with refreshed information. Thank you.