

Commissioner Minutes

November 19, 2025 – 10:00 a.m. to 3:08 p.m.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AREA OF IMPACT ORDINANCES - CITY OF STAR (OR2025-0014) AND CITY OF NAMPA (OR2025-0011)**

Commissioners Leslie Van Beek, Brad Holton and Zach Brooks

Deputy P.A. Zach Wesley

DSD Associate Planner Amber Lewter

DSD Associate Planner Arbay Mberwa

Principal Planner Michelle Barron

DSD Director Jay Gibbons

Director of Constituent Services Aaron Williams

City of Star Mayor Trevor Chadwick, Todd Lakey, Cody Swander, Rodney Ashby, Mike Williams, Preston Rutter, Christine Williams, Helen Cooper, Daniel Badger, Mark Steuer, City of Nampa Mayor Debbie Kling, Tom Points, Rita Devlin, Doris Phillips, Cheryl Higley, David Thaene, Kim Erb, Patti Evans, Barry Dubkowski, Richard Jewell, Crystal Craig, Vicki Kersten, Kam Wheeler, Douglas Shinn, Leigh Salisbury, Jill Hallows, Becky Schlegel, Jon Hanson, Larry Olmstead, Katie Triesniewski, and other interested citizens

Deputy Clerk Jenen Ross\_\_\_\_\_

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AREA OF IMPACT ORDINANCES - CITY OF STAR (OR2025-0014) AND CITY OF NAMPA (OR2025-0011)

The Board met today at 10:00 a.m. for continued public hearings to consider area of impact ordinances for the cities of Star and Nampa. Present were: Commissioners Leslie Van Beek, Brad Holton and Zach Brooks, Deputy P.A. Zach Wesley, DSD Associate Planner Amber Lewter, DSD Associate Planner Arbay Mberwa, Principal Planner Michelle Barron, DSD Director Jay Gibbons, Director of Constituent Services Aaron Williams, City of Star Mayor Trevor Chadwick, Todd Lakey, Cody Swander, Rodney Ashby, Mike Williams, Preston Rutter, Christine Williams, Helen Cooper, Daniel Badger, Mark Steuer, City of Nampa Mayor Debbie Kling, Tom Points, Rita Devlin, Doris Phillips, Cheryl Higley, David Thaene, Kim Erb, Patti Evans, Barry Dubkowski, Richard Jewell, Crystal Craig, Vicki Kersten, Cam Wheeler, Douglas Shinn, Leigh Salisbury, Jill Hallows, Becky Schlegel, Jon Hanson, Larry Olmstead, Katie Triesniewski, other interested citizens, and Deputy Clerk Jenen Ross.

Michelle Barron gave a background/history regarding the City of Star as follows: The county is working with the City of Star to modify their area of impact map per Idaho State Code 67-6526. The full code can be seen in Exhibit D1 of the staff report. The initial proposed area of impact map that extended north based on an annexation of parcels into the city on the Ada County side. The proposal also expands the area of impact to the south, below the Boise River and east to meet the Middleton AOI boundary. The proposal also increases the north boundary. Since the annexation was not completed, the City of Star has brought back a map which removes a portion of the requested area to the north. The green in the image shown on the map to within the PowerPoint presentation indicates the requested overlap with the City of Nampa. The City of Star is requesting that the area just south of the Boise River be added to their area of impact. The area south of the Boise River is currently located in the City of Nampa's impact area boundary, which the city wishes to retain as part of their boundary confirmation request. The City of Star's request would create an overlap inconsistent with state law 67-6526. As a reminder, there are five criteria for the city to meet to modify the area of impact proposal per Idaho State statute 67-6526 (4)(a). Also, that same code, in addition to the five criteria for the cities to establish an area of impact, there are three additional requirements. The Board's decision options are to approve, deny, or table the request.

Mr. Wesley addressed Commissioner Van Beek's question regarding overlapping areas of impact. He stated that the new state law does not allow for areas to overlap. The law now requires that cities negotiate and talk, they can then present their proposals to the Board of Commissioners, and it is then the Board's responsibility to make that decision.

Mayor Chadwick spoke on behalf of the City of Star. He explained that an updated map has been provided because they still have not been able to annex the BLM land. Mayor Chadwick believes Star meets the five required criteria on the property south of the river. He feels that the highway should serve as a geographical boundary and that the City of Star has no desire to go anywhere south of Hwy 20/26. He spoke about how transportation infrastructure is in place, municipal and public water and sewer are in place, and Star Fire District currently serves the area. Although staff has recommended pulling the boundary back to city limits he hopes the Board will allow those that voted to be in Star's vs. Nampa's area of impact several years ago will be included today.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brooks, Mayor Chadwick spoke about how law enforcement and prosecution is handled on both the Canyon County side and the Ada County side.

Ms. Barron clarified that staff's recommendation is not to change the boundary back to city limits but to keep the current area of impact.

Board discussion ensued as to where they felt the boundaries should be, but a decision was delayed until after information is received on the City of Nampa's request.

Michelle Barron gave a background/history on regarding the City of Nampa. The county has been working with the City of Nampa to modify the area of impact map per Idaho State Code 67-6526. The full code can be seen in Exhibit B1 of the staff report. The City of Nampa requests to confirm their existing area of impact as seen in Exhibit A2 of the staff report. Since the last hearing on November 5<sup>th</sup>, the City of Nampa provided some additional information in support of their area of impact map request which they will go over during their presentation. They have not brought forward a new map. There are five criteria for the city to meet to modify the area of impact proposal per Idaho state statute 67-6526(4)(a) and per state law 67-6526. In addition to the five criteria for the cities to establish an area of impact, there are three additional requirements. The Board's decision options are to approve, deny, or table the request.

Preston Rutter spoke on behalf of the City of Nampa. He explained that the county planning staff found that the City of Nampa's proposal meets the criteria and recommend confirming the boundary. He reviewed the notification and responses received from neighboring cities, with the exception of Star. He spoke about the required deadlines and how Nampa satisfied all the requirements, but Star did not seem to follow procedure as set out in state code.

Cody Swander is the Recreation Planner for the City of Nampa and part of the FACTS committee (Foundation for Ada and Canyon Trail Systems). He offered comments on the parks and trail systems within the City of Nampa and how it's always been part of Nampa's long-range plan to have a portion of the Boise River Green Belt planned, specifically on the south side of the Boise River.

Mr. Rutter referenced a map with properties highlighted in yellow in the southwest portion which indicates there has been an inquiry or pre-application about development. And, like

Mayor Chadwick requested, Nampa would also like to see property owners have the option to choose whether to annex but feel the area of impact should still be in place as a planning tool. He noted that although this is not the hearing to discuss land use, the city has since modified their 2035 comprehensive plan developed in 2012 to reduce density.

Mark Steuer spoke about the sewer system in the north Nampa area. He said that based on the information he has, the existing pump station that has been constructed by Star Sewer and Water would need to be upgraded, they would need an additional pump in order to get any flows from the west to handle the capacity and pump it up to their wastewater treatment plant in the north. Additionally, he said that the trunk line that goes over the Boise River along Star Road would need to be upgraded and would be a part of the bridge replacement program that is currently in their CIP. He reiterated that the City of Nampa already has a sewer system planned up Madison to the intersection with Joplin; they are currently at 30% designed with plans to be at 100% within 6-8 months.

Daniel Badger spoke about the infrastructure in the southwest Nampa area stating that the reason they've not seen development in this area is because the lift station has not yet been installed. He addressed the gravity sewer along Madison, a pre-application that has happened related to the property to the north of Ridgevue High School which will help with development moving toward Hwy 20/26.

The Board asked several clarifying questions and discussion ensued regarding an easement for the sewer trunk lines, discussions with property owners and pre-application meetings, and the preservation of ag ground as it interfaces with the consumption of prime farm ground.

Todd Lakey stated that he doesn't feel the city has met the burden under the new code to show the areas west of his (referencing his PowerPoint) indicated yellow line [Midway] are likely to be annexed in the next 5 years. Mr. Lakey believes that conversations the city had with landowners in the southwest area were part of their Southwest Area Plan and not specific to annexation within the next 5 years as required by the new code. He stated that the city has no intention to bring sewer and water to this area; there are no existing services or agreements to extend. Mr. Lakey reviewed several properties in the area that he knows are not likely to annex within the next 5 years. He asked that the Board utilize the indicated yellow line [Midway] to establish the west boundary.

Rodney Ashby is the Planning and Zoning Director for the City of Nampa and wanted to address the term “very likely to annex”. He said the difficulty with codes that say things that are so subjective is that they’re left to interpretation and each person can interpret them differently. Over his years with the city, he’s heard farmers say time and time again that there is no way they will ever annex, however, as development moves closer, a property owner sells, or there are no future generations to farm the land they will change their mind and development then becomes okay. An impact area is not, as stated in code, intended to stop or prevent growth from happening. It is a planning tool for the city to coordinate with the county on what happens in those areas. The city is providing services out to those locations. They are providing transportation, sewer, and land use and the subdivision opportunities – these are the things they feel make “very likely to annex” tangible.

Michael Williams lives in the southwest portion and agrees with Mr. Lakey’s position. He spoke about why his family moved to this area and how growth and sprawl has affected them. He feels that even though the City of Nampa has conducted surveys about growth in the area, and the citizens have continually indicated they don’t want growth, that the city has ignored the input. He has concerns about traffic and public safety – he doesn’t feel the city is already handling what they have. He would like to see the city focus on infill and not take away valuable resources out by the lake. He agrees that Midway is a good stopping point.

Christine Williams said she also agrees with Mr. Lakey’s suggestion, and everything stated previously by her husband (Michael Williams). She reiterated that she feels the City of Nampa is largely ignoring citizen survey information – that people don’t want further growth, particularly toward the lake which is mainly farmland. There is also concern about the wildlife preserve.

Rita Devlin lives on Happy Valley Rd near Dye Lane and stated that although she is in the “yellow area” no one from the city ever spoke with her. She spoke with her neighbors, who all farm parcels between 6 and 18 acres, and no one indicated they’d be interested in selling in the next 5 years. She expressed her concerns about emergency service response times and the struggle the ambulance district has keeping funding comparable with growth.

Doris Phillips said she also agrees with Todd Lakey. She expressed concerns with properties not selling or annexing in the next 5 years, and the issues with public safety and roads.

Cheryl Higley made the following statement: *Southwest Nampa is a very special and unique area that should be treated as such. Nampa's plan for handling the commercial and residential growth in the Southwest area seems like a cookie cutter concept that could be plopped down in any town anywhere. It isn't unique or special. Both city and county residents voiced their opposition, but the plan for up to 10,000 dwelling units and 30,000 new residents was approved anyways. Here are several reasons why commercial and residential development should be limited in this special area - First, this area has unique geographic factors and infrastructure challenges. It is lake locked on two sides to the south and to the west. Therefore, traffic will have to go north and east to highway 84 where most jobs, goods, and services are located. The traffic will funnel directly onto one of the most problematic interchanges in the Treasure Valley at Karcher Caldwell Boulevard and Highway 84. Even though the road is being widened, the traffic will never flow well with six signals in the 1.5 miles from Middleton Road to Costco; it will remain a tangled knot of congestion. Based on Collier's website, the freeway overpass already handles 47,500 vehicles per day, and if 30,000 people are added to the southwest Nampa's area of impact, that number would become significantly worse. To avoid the congestion on Karcher, residents will seek alternate routes and head east all the way through Nampa to get to the freeway. This will cause increased traffic congestion throughout the city due to the insufficient road capacity of the two lane roads to handle the volume of vehicles. Second, regarding the anticipated residential growth, there are many new developments that have been already approved on or near Karcher, which will add thousands of homes such as The Charles at Karcher with 1,258 dwelling units and Verbena Ranch with 1019 dwelling units to name only a few. None of these will have easier direct access to the freeway either and will exacerbate the traffic problem. Third, regarding the anticipated commercial growth. According to the current comp plan, approximately 77 acres of commercial is projected for the community mixed use hub at Lone Star and Midway. But will commercial be viable there? Several parcels on Middleton Road were allowed to be rezoned from commercial to residential using the premise that businesses didn't think it was a viable location; Midway and Lone Star would be even less viable. During the public hearing for the specific area plan the staff kept repeating that we need the density to support the commercial, but is commercial really necessary? Within one and a half miles, 34 acres of commercial has already been approved in the new developments of Adera and The Charles at Karcher, and that's not even taking into account that the neighborhood Walmart is one and a half miles away too. The truth is that if there was ever an area in Nampa that needs to be kept rural and very low density, this is it. I agree with Attorney Lakey's recommendation of predominantly making Midway the western boundary of the area of impact. I would also like to*

*see an overlay to the future land use map so that there would be no stretch exceptions or increase of the density due to other caveats in the code.*

David Thaene is the president and speaking on behalf of the Red Hawk Ridge Homeowners Association. They agree with Mr. Lakey's recommendation that the area of impact be stopped at Midway Road for two reasons. One, there is no more tolerance for the traffic that comes with the southwest Nampa specific plan; that plan adds approximately 60,000 vehicle trips per day. And what's not commonly appreciated is that Midway Road doesn't end at Karcher, it ends at ends in his neighborhood. It ends at West Mateo Drive which is a block past Iowa. The other issue is that he doesn't believe there's any way this is going to be built out past Midway in the next five years. Recently the city council approved a project called Lakeview at the intersection of Midway and Iowa. The party who owned that land and the party that acted as developer were asked specifically by one of the city council members, how long the build out would take and were told 7 years. There's plenty of work for the city to do to the east of Midway, they don't need to extend past Midway Road. They'll have an opportunity to come back year after year when they need more property to develop.

Patty Evans has lived in Nampa for 8 years and according to Mayor Kling, that is not long enough for her to have an opinion. She supports and agrees with Senator Lakey's position on the limitations of the area of impact. She also sees that the trail system is a collaboration with many different entities and could be developed at any time by any city; it does not have to be the City of Nampa. Nampa needs to focus on taking care of what it already has. Roads no longer handle the traffic loads. On social media the dominant theme is a community unhappy about overgrowth and overdevelopment of Nampa. She feels that losing Nampa is losing its identity of what makes it Nampa, a small community. Taxpayers don't like money being spent to make areas they don't live in nice and new with new roads and sewer and new water lines. She lives south of the airport and is on septic with no sewer opportunity anytime soon. And if it did, it would cost a lot more to hook into the city sewer than to continue maintaining their current septic system. In her opinion, sewer is not king. They're going to have an increase in water bills because there needs to be replacement and maintenance of what is already in place. Instead of spending money to build new, she feels the city needs to look and focus on what already exists. The more you build, the more it's going to cost you to maintain. She spoke about how ag is extremely important to Canyon County. She asked the Board to restrict the area of impact the city is trying to expand into.

Barry Dubkowski lives on Happy Valley Road and borders the south Nampa city impact line and is less than ½ mile from a dairy on Deer Flat Rd. He feels that putting a subdivision less than ½ mile from a dairy is impractical causing conflicts on both sides. He also spoke about how this entire area is agricultural. He feels there are numerous parcels of land available from Garrity to Locust that would have full city services. He expressed his concerns about traffic and safety on Happy Valley Rd. especially in regard to speed, farm equipment, and the intersections at Locust and Lewis. He feels the city impact area should be reduced for both safety and common sense development and develop in an orderly manner.

Richard Jewel would like to see development restricted to the undeveloped properties within existing city limits where existing infrastructure services already exist, then expand contiguously where services can easily extend logistically and economically. He would like to see the area of impact reduced to the existing area of impact to a realistic and focused five year projected growth plan to preserve the agricultural community for as long as possible.

Crystal Craig is the Director of Transportation for the City of Nampa. She said that during the last hearing there was some discrepancy between her testimony and testimony by the City of Star regarding the north Nampa area. She has been in contact with Hwy District No. 4, who maintains this area, and it seems to be under debate. She read a letter from Bruce Bayne with the highway district specifically regarding the impact area south of the Boise River and west of Can Ada into the record as follows: *The Highway District currently has an agreement with the City of Star to maintain roadways in Canyon County that are within the city's boundary. The Highway District has previously been approached by the City of Nampa about having the area south of the Boise River and west of Can Ada annexed into the City of Nampa at some future date. Because the City of Nampa provided this information to the highway district, we have never anticipated needing additional staff or equipment to service this area. If this area were to be included in the City of Star, the highway district would need to hire additional staff and purchase additional equipment to cover the area in question. Highway District 4 currently includes all of the roadways, lane miles specifically, in Canyon County, except those in the cities of Nampa, Caldwell, and Middleton within our jurisdictional boundaries into our yearly report covering lane miles within our jurisdiction. Highway District 4 accounts for all lane miles within the City of Star in Canyon County that we currently maintain. If you have any questions, please reach out for clarifications. Thanks, Bruce Bayne.* Ms. Craig noted that the last portion of the letter is in reference to the funding mechanism that Highway District 4 receives from the state, there has been some discontinuity as to whether they are receiving funds to maintain those miles in the

City of Star, and according to the letter they are. They are also receiving funding to maintain the miles in the north Nampa area, which if it stays within Nampa's current area of impact will come to the City of Nampa at some future date.

In response to a question from Commissioner Holton regarding improvements to Midway Rd. in the southwest corner, Ms. Craig said that the city has prioritized Middleton and Midland roads as they are larger arterials to move traffic. Additionally, she addressed the north/south Franklin Blvd which has been one of their priority corridors. The city has applied for a grant under the Protect Program and is anticipating an answer soon. With that grant they will start looking at environmental clearances and conceptual alignments of a future river crossing at Franklin Blvd. to the south. When looking at the road holistically, over the past 5 years the City of Nampa has invested approximately \$35M into the Franklin Blvd widening from the south at I-84 up toward the Boise River crossing.

Vicki Kirsten stated she agrees with Todd Lakey and the others who've testified before her.

Kam Wheeler had the following statement: *Both sides of my family have lived in Canyon County for over a hundred years. My roots in this community are deep. This is not an abstract policy for me. This is my family's history, my children's future, and the land the generations before me have worked protected and passed down. Over the last five years, Idaho has lost more than 2100 farms and one 144,000 acres of farmland according to the 2022 USDA census of agriculture. Much of that loss is happening right here in the Treasure Valley, where areas of impact are drawn on the edges of cities where development pressures are the strongest. Once farmland is turned into subdivisions, it has gone forever along with the agricultural heritage and the economic base that built Canyon County. This 1600 acre area in Southwest Nampa represents more than acreage. It represents identity, values and a way of life. Families like mine have worked and farmed here for multiple generations. Preserving this area protects not only soil, but open space, the character principles, and rural heritage that define west Nampa. This also includes the lands around the Deer Flat National Wildlife Refuge, one of the oldest refuges in the country. The refuge is part of our regional story, our ecology, our agriculture and our culture, allowing dense urban growth to push toward it threatens wildlife corridors, the environmental quality of the refuge and the agricultural character that has historically been surrounded by it. We often hear that density is the best way to preserve farmland. That is true only when density is directed inside of a city's existing footprint through infill and redevelopment where infrastructure already exists. National planning studies are consistent, infill protects farmland, expanding city*

*boundaries destroys it. You cannot preserve farmland by annexing it and paving it. That is not preservation, that is conversion. Another critical point, when farmland is placed inside a city's area of impact, families are pressured to sell. Land values rise based on speculation, not on agriculture, not on heritage. When a parent passes away, heirs often cannot afford to purchase the land due to taxes or state obligations. Many families who want to continue farming are simply priced out of their own heritage. City area of impact decisions frequently accelerate this loss. County designations allow farm families to maintain their land. City areas of impact designations often force them off of it. We're also told that growth pays for itself, but decades of national and Idaho experience shows that greenfield development is far more expensive per household than infill growth. Even with impact fees, taxpayers and up funding wider roads, larger sewer lines, new school bonds, and heavier congestion. Existing residents bear the cost. By contrast, rural county development, small acreage homes, and ag support uses does not erase an entire square mile of farmland as it turns into a subdivision. Finally, as highlighted on the Grow Idaho podcast, growth planning should not be determined by which developer bought which farmland or who is willing to sell today. Growth should be guided by what is in the long-term best interest of the county, the city, and the people who already live here. So today I respectfully ask this Board to limit Nampa's area of impact, prioritize infill projects, protecting the agricultural families who have lived in this area for generations - families like mine and yours. Protect the land around the Deer Flat National Wildlife refuge and preserve the character, values, and rural heritage that makes Canyon County what it is. Please allow this area to stop the development at Midway Road. I, respectfully, would submit to you one last point that I thought was worth noting. An estimated development within the City of Nampa, not area of impact, but existing city limits, is approximately 22,250 acres. The 2020 census shows approximately 36,221 housing units. The proposed area west of Midway Road would add for another approximately 25% increase of that on 5% of the land.*

Douglas Shinn lives off Tio Lane in the northeast corner of the Deer Flat National Wildlife Refuge and had the following comments: *I support Mr. Lakey's position regarding the placement of the area of impact boundary in the southwest section. The Lake Lowell section extending the AOI to the border of the Deer Flat Refuge is inadvisable given this resource of farmland, wildlife habitats, and recreational areas near the Kingfisher Trail. The ongoing reduction in farmland remains a significant issue in Canyon County. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game has maintained a decades long prohibition on goose hunting on private lands adjacent to the refuge on the north side. Consulting these and other experts is essential for assessing the potential impacts on wildlife migratory patterns and habitat stability. The AOI proposal map on page 27*

*does not clearly reflect the conditional rezone property located to the south of the Deer Flat Ranch on the west side of Tio Lane, which was enacted 22 years ago, which will noticeably decrease the amount of available farmland and wildlife habitat for geese. The proposed AOI's designation is low density residential along the Kingfisher Trail permitting one unit per acre up to two and a half units per acre in clusters does not align with the current policy guidelines, particularly P40101, P50101, P100103, P120103. I recommend not approving the AOI due to the unresolved boundary issues and a possible federal land exchange with the Deer Flat Refuge and the Deer Flat Ranch. I think it would be wiser to wait until the land exchange is finalized and the updated boundary officially recorded. We want to ensure that for the future our personal farmland is not annexed into the city. I do not plan on developing my 31 acres that borders the refuge. The comprehensive impact assessment and solicitation of community input should be concluded, which may have already been done prior to approving the AOI for the Lake Lowell section. The area needs to be protected for wildlife, agriculture and recreational resources for the benefit of the community and along those using the Kingfisher Trail. I'd also like to request that the following parcels be removed and rezoned as agriculture in the Lake Lowell sector - parcel nos. R29335010, 29336010, 29336010A. As a final note, the comprehensive plan, current and previous, state that moderate and best suited soil should be saved for agricultural production.*

Lee Salisbury agrees with Mr. Lakey's suggestion of keeping the boarder at Midway. He wondered if every square inch of land must be developed in order for people to move here; he feels they can move other places. He expressed concerns about the water table if new houses were to be built, and builders that are not local or using local resources to build houses which will not produce income for residents.

Commissioner Brooks motioned to recess the hearing for a lunch break as noticed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Van Beek and carried unanimously. The Board recessed from 12:10 p.m. to 1:31 p.m.

Jill Hallows stated she is very concerned about Canyon County and that she agrees with all the points made by Todd Lakey and Kam Wheeler. She had the following comments for the Board: *Most of us who live in Canyon County are concerned about growth vs. cost of services, traffic impacts, property owners' rights to sell vs. rights of existing and longtime residents, protection of wildlife habitat in the vicinity of Lake Lowell, and the fragmenting and loss of agricultural land. Today, I want to speak about protecting farmland because food and water are our most basic needs. "No farms, no food", I believe this should be your highest priority to keep in mind moving*

*forward. Since protecting farmland is a global issue, maybe we tend to think it will be addressed in general, but like the "everybody, somebody, anybody, nobody" saying this type of thinking can take us down the road to desperation and dependence on other states and countries for the very things we need to sustain life. According to Idaho Matters, there was a 7% decline in the number of farms in America from 2017 to 2022. In Idaho alone, more than 2000 farms disappeared, and many of those were right here in Canyon County. We, the people elected you as leaders to protect us, and I feel that you have a responsibility to proactively protect the lands in Canyon County that feed us and our rural economy and culture. According to Canyon Soil Conservation District, 94% of the land north of Lake Lowell, land that the southwest area specific plan would cover, is some of the richest and most productive soil in Canyon County. Common sense tells us it must be preserved for farming. If owners of this prime farmland want to sell, it shouldn't be to developers, it should be to other farmers who are seeking great soil. Please consider leading by creating incentives for agriculture landowners to continue farming and to especially encourage the next generation of potential farmers. Quoting Rick Hogaboam regarding the true cost of growth 'conversion from productive agricultural land to residential use creates a service cost in excess of the increased tax revenue'. In other words, the conversion of agricultural land to residential development is not effective. Please take these things into consideration as you plan the future of land in Canyon County. After all, it's not Idaho without agriculture. Thank you.*

Becky Schlegel lives on Smith Ave and stated that one of the ½ mile connectors will go right through her property. She is very concerned about the roads and doesn't feel that they've been properly addressed. They own a 1905 farmhouse which they bought as their forever place with the intention of preserving it. She agrees with statements made by Mr. Lakey and Mr. Wheeler.

Jon Hanson lives in southwest Nampa specifically because of the uniqueness of the area. He believes it is the responsibility of the community to preserve farmers and ranchers, wildlife, and homes of the residents. He agrees with Mr. Lakey and requested that the Board follow his suggestion.

Larry Olmstead spoke about his longevity in the City of Nampa and how he's seen it changing over the years. He agrees with Mr. Lakey.

Katie Triesniewski said she agrees with everyone who has spoken before her in opposition to the City of Nampa's plan. She expressed her concern about infrastructure and water.

Mayor Debbie Kling addressed some of the testimony that has been provided. She explained how important ag ground is to her and fully agrees that it needs to be protected. She noted that 1-acre subdivisions still take up ag ground and there needs to be a cooperative effort to preserve this ground. No one chose the growth that has come over the past 5-8 years but it's happening and changing the tenure of the community. In regard to a comment about developers funding growth, she explained that is what should be happening – growth funding growth. There have been many discussions over the previous years with the landowner about the trail in the north Nampa area along the river, it's over 600 acres, and they're working on a way to preserve it into a park. This particular landowner submitted a letter requesting to be annexed into Nampa as they did not want to go to Star. Ms. Kling explained they are not trying to rush development; they are just trying to protect their area of impact. She wants to ensure that, although a lot of land use type issues have been brought up today, this is not a land use hearing, and they really need to be kept separate. In regard to the north Nampa area, that land is already owned by a developer. It could be being farmed, but it is not currently being worked. With the work being done by ITD in the Hwy 16 and 20/26 area, this area is going to develop. The wastewater treatment plant was built with anticipation of that growth, and a police station substation is being planned for that area. Additionally, Nampa Fire District has the capacity to handle this area. She said the City of Nampa has the capability, the staff, and the planning to handle this. She asked the Board to respect the 20 years that Nampa has had that impact area in north Nampa and allow them to continue to have that as their impact area. In southwest and southeast Nampa, if the focus is ag land preservation she wants to see a partnership working on how to do that. Ms. Kling addressed a comment about the planning for a new high school, she explained it doesn't have anything to do with capacity, it's due to aging infrastructure and security.

In response to a question from Commissioner Van Beek, Mayor Kling requested that the Board respect the county line and not allow Star to go south of the river, crossing over into Canyon County and Nampa's impact area.

Mayor Trevor Chadwick offered rebuttal testimony on behalf of the City of Star as follows:

- Highway District 4 will no longer be servicing the City of Star in the future; Star will be taking care of their roadways.
- ITD confirmed they are not sending funds to Highway District 4; all of those funds go to ACHD.

- The sewer pipe located under the bridge is sized correctly to handle to current flow, however, when Star Rd is widened and the bridge is removed starting in 2029, that pipe will be bigger with a couple of additional lines for future growth.
- The sewer and water lift station at Joplin Rd. is a 45-foot deep lift station and can allow gravity flow back regardless of ground elevation.
- In regard to following the process, Mayor Chadwick nor city staff are able to find communication from the City of Nampa in June.
- When looking at the comprehensive maps for both cities, the City of Star specifically created the area on Joplin where Syngenta Seed and Nurseries are located as an agribusiness area.
- There is a pathway plan south of the river that will be similar to the San Antonio Riverwalk. The City of Star has a masterplan that includes pathways, trailways, etc. that will run along the Boise River up to Joplin for interconnectivity in that area. They anticipate their greenbelt connecting the City of Star/Star Rd. in about 2028.
- A city crossing county lines is not unique to the City of Star, this happens in about 5 cities across Idaho.

The Board recessed from 2:12 p.m. to 2:18 p.m.

Preston Rutter offered rebuttal testimony on behalf of the City of Nampa as follows:

- By scaling back the area of impact to city boundaries they would lose continuity of planning. The area of impact is necessary so there can be collaboration as growth organically happens.
- Even when annexation happens, the growth likely won't happen for another 2 years for phase 1 and then another 2-7 years for phase 2.
- He disagrees with Star's assertion that the city will begin maintaining roadways and that Highway District No. 4 will no longer be maintaining them. He doesn't feel they have the budget capacity to take this on.
- In regard to the sewer, Nampa reviewed the masterplan and to them it appears they are pressurized lines vs. gravity flow.

Commissioner Brooks motion to close public testimony. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Van Beek and carried unanimously.

Board discussion ensued with a general consensus that the boundary should be as follows for the City of Nampa:

- Western boundary at Midway Rd.
- South to Lake Shore
- Across Hwy 45 then north to Lewis Lane
- East on Lewis Lane to Robinson Rd.
- North on Robinson Rd. to Airport Rd.
- East on Airport Rd to the county line (McDermott Rd)
- North on McDermott Rd to Ustick Rd.
- West on Ustick Rd. to Can Ada Rd
- North on Can Ada Rd. to Chinden/Hwy 20/26
- East on Hwy 20/26 to Franklin Rd.
- North on Franklin Rd. to the river and staff will need to ensure no parcels are divided

Commissioner Brooks made a motion to approve case no. 2025-0011, the City of Nampa's area of impact, finding the application does meet the required criteria for approval under state law 67-6256 with the hand drawn map and verbal direction given to staff for those boundaries to be drawn up officially with Canyon County's GIS department. A secondary motion was made to replace Canyon County Code of Ordinance 09-11-06 with the approved area of impact map. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Van Beek and carried unanimously.

Board discussion ensued with a general consensus that the boundary should be as follows for the City of Star:

- South along Can Ada Rd to the Boise River
- Follow the Boise River west to Kingsbury Rd.
- Everything north of Hwy 44 will remain as the same

Commissioner Brooks made a motion to approve case no. 2025-0014, the City of Star's area of impact, finding that the application does meet the required criteria for approval under state law 67-6526 with the map that has been proposed, but only that area north of the Boise River as discussed on the record today. A secondary motion was made to replace Canyon County Code of Ordinance 09-19-06 with the approved AOI map referenced. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Van Beek and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Holton made a motion to close the hearings for OR2025-0014 and OR2025-0011. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brooks and carried unanimously.

Upon the motion of Commissioner Holton and second by Commissioner Van Beek the Board voted unanimously to adjourn. The hearing concluded at 3:08 p.m. and an audio recording is on file in the Commissioners' Office.