

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

Okay, this is Chairman Brad Holton. I'm gonna bring the meeting back to order. We've been in recess for about 10 minutes and we're getting back on, on this, back on the public hearing. So, , close public testimony. So typically I get to read this part. At this time, the board will begin deliberation 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 is important that we are able to discuss our opinion, make specific findings, and therefore please be respectful as the board discusses the matter.

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

Chairman?

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

Yes.

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

If, , staff may go over a couple things just to -

Speaker 3 ([00:59](#)):

Sure.

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

Clear the record. , So previously the acceleration lane was brought up. The acceleration lane was determined at the time of the onsite visit staff did with Union Pacific Railroad ITD and the highway district. , The applicant asked how they felt about an acceleration lane. , They all agreed that that would be the, , the best route. And in the exhibit 3E6, it does have both crossings. They're speaking about the other one that was approved as well. So both crossings to have an acceleration lane for vehicles turning right onto US 2026. This is to address the short distance between railroad crossings and US 2026. This will provide vehicles with access to additional storage area before merging onto the highway. , That was already, if the board decides to approve it, that was a condition of approval, condition number 16, the staff recommended. , I also wanted to just go over, I know safety was a big concern.

([02:18](#)):

, On that same exhibit, 3E6, I only have the stats from the train from the railroad. I do not have it for the highway or for the, , ITD, but it does specify that there is 21 trains a day, 11 during the. 21 through 24-hour period, excuse me. 11 trains during the day, 10 trains during night. There's what has been four blocked crossings noted from September 2021 to August 2nd, 2024 on Limp Lane. There's been a fire related incident on March 4th, 2022 on Limp Lane. Vehicle traffic accident reported on May 20th, 2021 and September 4th, 2024, both non-train related. , So those are the only things that staff had incident-wise concerning the railroad track. , There is an exhibit 3D photos that I believe would help with today's testimony. Photo four is at the, , subject property's access pointed south? Yes, south. <Laugh> Sorry.

([03:50](#)):

Pointed south and you can see where it goes down Lymph Lane at a slope to the , sub - to the neighborhoods, neighborhood properties. Photo 12 is the water already just on the property that was addressed. It's, it's just right there. , And then photo 16 is pointed towards the railroad at the , from the highway. Those were all ones that have been brought up during today's testimony. And if you have any questions, I'm happy to

Speaker 3 ([04:40](#)):

Answer. Chairman, I do have a question. Amber, you mentioned the right-hand acceleration lane. Yes. Did we prohibit left-hand turns or was there a suggestion to prohibit that in the discussion from last time?

Speaker 2 ([04:53](#)):

There is a suggestion from the railroad, and that is part of condition number 16. So condition number 16 just goes right to all of the railroad's requirements and suggestions.

Speaker 3 ([05:05](#)):

Thank you for that.

Speaker 4 ([05:16](#)):

Amber, , as part of that condition, does, do those lanes have to be built before any mining actually occurs?

Speaker 2 ([05:25](#)):

It does. Okay. Let me

Speaker 4 ([05:26](#)):

Pull

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

Up the condition. Condition number 16 is the applicant shall comply with Union Pacific Railroad requirements prior to gravel pit operations exhibit E6. So it points back to all of the discussions that occurred that the railroad would like.

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

Thank you. You're welcome. Amber, give me an exhibit number on the, if there's more. So E6 is what you're talking about?

Speaker 2 ([06:11](#)):

It'll be on yours 3E6.

Speaker 3 ([06:14](#)):

Thanks.

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

I can also pull it up if you would like. Okay. So chairman, commissioners, , exhibit 3E6 is the diagnostic meetings on the screen. It will have under the, , overall diagnostic team observations, this is showing everything that is recommended or required. , And then it specifically has a couple additional items for the Limp Lane location that we're discussing today.

Speaker 3 ([07:08](#)):

Thank you. And so that, that tagged reference there would attach - Cover all of these. Yeah. Thank you. And because there's, there's no crossings, arm crossings. There is not. Yeah. But I'm anticipating, as there's been a lot of discussion on quiet zones, this is not going to be one, that there will continue to be train horns.

Speaker 2 ([07:58](#)):

There will.

Speaker 3 ([07:58](#)):

Yeah. Amber, on, looking for a page number for the same exhibit, and it has to do with the vegetation overgrowth that was cited out there. Who's responsible for that?

Speaker 2 ([08:58](#)):

The vegetation overgrowth, is that, , Commissioner Rambeek under the private?

Speaker 3 ([09:05](#)):

Oh, yes, it is. That

Speaker 2 ([09:07](#)):

Was the, , other site that was approved. Okay. Not today's.

Speaker 3 ([09:13](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([09:14](#)):

There was a lot more, , concern with the other site, but-

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

But you did not notice that, any site obstruction vegetation at this crossing?

Speaker 2 ([09:22](#)):

There was none on

Speaker 3 ([09:23](#)):

This one. Thank you.

Speaker 2 ([09:23](#)):

There was a lot less concern, , through the ITD highway and the railroad for this site compared to the other.

Speaker 3 ([09:33](#)):

And who would be responsible for maintaining this? Is this a highway district? Is it private ownership? If this, if we were talking about this parcel. This

Speaker 2 ([09:41](#)):

Particular one, I would like to say the applicant would because he owns the property, I couldn't say for certain.

Speaker 3 ([09:54](#)):

Okay. Thank you.

Speaker 1 ([10:14](#)):

Any other comments? Are we ready to lead off in our deliberation?

Speaker 3 ([10:23](#)):

Chairman, I think we're ready for deliberation.

Speaker 1 ([10:25](#)):

Okay. Who would like to go first? I would not.

Speaker 4 ([10:35](#)):

Let's just go through the criteria.

Speaker 1 ([10:38](#)):

Okay. So, , table one on criteria, , is the. Go ahead. Which,

Speaker 4 ([10:45](#)):

Which one are we gonna use, Mr. Chairman? I think there's three in here.

Speaker 1 ([10:50](#)):

Well, I'm currently on, .

Speaker 4 ([10:55](#)):

What was submitted to P&Z?

Speaker 1 ([10:57](#)):

Yeah, on the hearing date, the 19th. March 19th, 2026. Unless you wanna go to it.

This transcript was exported on Sep 04, 2026 - view latest version [here](#).

Speaker 4 ([11:03](#)):

No, that's, that's fine. Just so we're on the same one.

Speaker 1 ([11:06](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([11:06](#)):

They're doing FCOs from P&Z? No. Can you give us a digital or a,

Speaker 4 ([11:13](#)):

Reference? , Page, page 32 on the digital.

Speaker 3 ([11:15](#)):

Thank you.

Speaker 4 ([11:22](#)):

It's exhibit three.

Speaker 3 ([11:24](#)):

Thanks.

Speaker 1 ([11:31](#)):

So question one on the, on this is the proposed use permitted in the zone by conditional use permit?

Speaker 3 ([11:39](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([11:41](#)):

Yes, and I agree. , Do you agree with, , what has been, , presented as the analysis?

Speaker 4 ([11:50](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([11:53](#)):

Okay. You, you good with that, Commissioner Van Bee? I

Speaker 3 ([11:56](#)):

Think so.

Speaker 1 ([11:58](#)):

Okay. Criteria number two, what is the nature of the request? Am I on the right one?

Speaker 4 ([12:06](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([12:06](#)):

Yep. Okay. Analysis?

Speaker 4 ([12:08](#)):

CUP.

Speaker 3 ([12:15](#)):

And Chairman, like, can. I'm sorry, Commissioner Brooks, can we look at still. I'm sorry. I'm. Okay, I jumped to two. I'm on two. Sorry about that. Good. In that process, we'll just stay with that one. I would want to evaluate what's listed in there for proposed hours of operation on the nature of the request.

Speaker 4 ([12:50](#)):

And I will second that.

Speaker 1 ([12:53](#)):

So, Amber, are you following on, , two? Yes. On the analysis?

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

Yes. Hours of operation currently on the analysis is 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, seven days a week. , I believe as con- conditioned, we discussed changing that.

Speaker 1 ([13:17](#)):

Yeah, we dis - we discussed five days a week and, and - Yep. Extraction period not to exceed 10 years.

Speaker 3 ([13:24](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 4 ([13:25](#)):

Mr. Ch - Mr. Chairman, if we're gonna go that route, , I don't. I wouldn't want it to go to 7:00 PM.

Speaker 1 ([13:35](#)):

Okay. You would rather go to five?

Speaker 4 ([13:39](#)):

5:30 at the latest.

Speaker 1 ([13:40](#)):

Okay. So 7:00 AM to 5:30?

Speaker 4 ([13:44](#)):

Yeah.

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

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([13:46](#)):

And then, Chairman, for discussion on the board, we heard testimony from the applicant that there's high demand. It's gonna take, if I understood it correctly, two years with the permitting to get that up and running, and so, and it will be dependent on specific projects. So with. This was a either/or, I though, and maybe I, I just want the board to weigh in. If we go with the reduced hours, which I think is more considerate, I, I don't wanna listen to that for that long, but is, is 10 years long enough?

Speaker 1 ([14:25](#)):

The applicant said that it was, so.

Speaker 3 ([14:27](#)):

Okay. I'm just confirming.

Speaker 1 ([14:29](#)):

Similar size in, in 18 months. Depends on his availability res - to sell the product, but -

Speaker 3 ([14:36](#)):

Correct. Yeah. And I - We,

Speaker 1 ([14:38](#)):

We discussed that in the prior meeting and I made the presentation that he could always do it like other pits have proposed to us is they could take it out of this pit and take it down to the road to a, and stockpile it at another pit that can run twenty four seven, 365 days a week and, and you eliminate this issue. So, I mean, I understand that the ideal is to take it from this pit to the use, but if it's to empty this pit, they could do that that way.

Speaker 3 ([15:10](#)):

Okay. And this is where we get the free space to discuss mitigation, so thank you.

Speaker 1 ([15:20](#)):

Amber, do you see anything else that we discussed that would be prudent to put in?

Speaker 2 ([15:27](#)):

There was discussion on whether, when to begin the timeframe of the 10 years or such, , at the time of approval or at the time of getting a, beginning gravel pit operations. So when does the time clock start?

Speaker 1 ([15:48](#)):

I would say gravel operations, extraction operations. Is that all right?

Speaker 3 ([15:57](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([15:58](#)):

Speaking out loud. Okay. Do you want anything else on analysis of number two?

Speaker 3 ([16:10](#)):

No.

Speaker 1 ([16:10](#)):

Okay. Number three, is the proposed use consistent with a comprehensive plan?

Speaker 4 ([16:22](#)):

I think it is, Mr. Chairman. And part of my problem with this is the discussion around an intensive ag overlay that does not have any ordinance, does not have any specificity, does not have any standards, is a comprehensive plan that was passed. I will not say passed. It was rammed down the throat of this county by two lame duck members, and this is probably, probably the most obvious example of a land use hearing where it has completely confused people that are testifying using that particular overlay. Essentially, that overlay, in my opinion, is absolutely useless without any ordinance or standards. So I, I find no way to use an overlay that is basically nothing more than a statement on a piece of paper, , for justification for or against this. So with that being said, I wholly object to saying that, , it's an approved use in an agricultural area, yet, , you, you can't because you're tearing out agricultural uses or prohibiting the future use, , of some agricultural activity.

([18:10](#)):

Can't have it both ways, in my opinion. So it's an approved use in the zone that currently exists, so I, I find that it does meet criteria three.

Speaker 3 ([18:24](#)):

Chairman, , for me, the applicant testified that he had obtained a soils report. I was with intentionality that I asked what could be grown here. , My. I've been in agriculture. I'm not an expert, but I, I've been in it long enough. I think intensive ag should protect seed production areas and areas that grow higher dollar crops. It's not that grazing is not important, but the report that we discussed during testimony on rebuttal, it does specifically state at the bottom that anyone farming that should consult an agronomist for inputs and how to enhance that soil. , The standing water on there would prohibit certain crops. You could, you could graze that off and the cows would find benefit on that by, particularly if they're gonna contain all that water on site. But to say that this would be. If you had a leaky ditch, it's hard to find, , farm a piece of property.

([19:32](#)):

If you have ground, surface to ground water that's that high, it's hard to get a tractor in there and pull rows. So I would say this does serve agricultural interests and that they're important, but in an intensive ag overlay area, this is neither, , seed crop production nor high dollar crop production.

Speaker 1 ([20:04](#)):

Okay. So are we okay with all of the analysis of three?

Speaker 3 ([20:11](#)):

And Chairman, if you could just. We're combing through here because we're looking at what's been provided or the arguments that planning and zoning had, so I'm just looking at these.

Speaker 4 ([20:37](#)):

Mr. Chairman, I guess I would get on my soapbox again and say I don't even want mention of the intensive ag overlay. It doesn't mean anything. I don't, I don't wanna make an opinion one way or the other s - referring to it. Unless you wanna correct me on, like, what an overlay means without any ordinance or standards to hold a certain area to.

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

I'm good either way. I would defer to Commissioner Van Beek if what her desire was. ,

Speaker 3 ([21:12](#)):

And Chairman, I can't change what the current comprehensive plan says. I understand, Commissioner Brooks, we've argued on interpretation, not, not us, but the, some of the faults of the existing plan that don't have sup - a foundation under them, that's where the argument lies. So, , I think stated for the record that it is a consistent. I don't have anything that defines what that means. That's problematic. It's, it's not the applicant's fault. It's not the opponent's fault. It's, it's a fault of the plan. -

Speaker 4 ([21:50](#)):

I'm fine to move on, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 3 ([21:51](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 4 ([21:51](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([21:52](#)):

And then if I could just say in this, I, I wish the applicant had. I've researched this myself because I've been on the side of the audience where there, there's a changing environment in Canyon County. I met with Army Corps of Engineers on projects that were close to my property. I met with the Idaho Fish and Game, , , Rivers United, all of that. What I can say is that there is support for the statement that in a riparian corridor, which I live next to, that even if that's disturbed, and I have bald eagles, I have a, a mountain lion, I have badgers, I have deer, we have a lot of stuff that with a restoration plan for that, a reclamation plan, they do somehow incredibly reestablish and his, there was no rebuttal to his statement that the projects in Middleton where he has excavated and then put in a reclamation plan that they have repopulated.

([22:58](#)):

That, that is what happens, especially on a river corridor. And so there is extensive mining where I live. That's. I've stated that several times for the record. There's not just one, but probably three. I've got Sunrock, Idaho Sand and Gravel, , Nampa Paving and A- Asphalt, and yet, , last year, I stopped and filmed a ball with the Eagle down in that area, and I have beer coming up to my haystack. So somehow they make it. I, I feel sorry for him. I don't like it, but, , I just wanna say too, I do appreciate the environmentalist that's here. , He was knowledgeable and well-spoken on that, as was the, , the rest of the testimony. So always, long story long, , it's information as we look at natural resources, hazards, goals, and policies, that if it's done right, reclamation efforts do help preserve wildlife in rural areas of the county, so.

(24:02):

And they do help protect. And I, and I also appreciate that I have had neighbors bulldoze over wetland areas and then call, and that's too late. And so there is a recognition here that that does exist and that they are going to try and preserve that for the future, so. Thanks, Chairman.

Speaker 1 (24:28):

Are we good with three then?

Speaker 3 (24:29):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (24:31):

Okay. Number four, what is the proposed. Let me get my glasses on. What is the pro- proposed use to be injurious to other property in the immediate vicinity and/or negatively change the essential character of the area?

Speaker 4 (24:53):

I agree with the analysis provided, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 3 (24:57):

Chairman, this one's a little bit stickier because there is testimony, and if, if I live next to one of which I do, it does change the climate. I, I don't list, just live next to the extraction. There's, , it's crushing operation. There's, there's a lot of things there that are happening. Do I like it? Not necessarily. Can you live with it? Will it, in the long run, will it benefit the character of the area with the proposal, which I understand that there has to be substantive compliance with what's being presented on the application today, and there is proof from the applicant where they can point to sites and say, "Go look at this, go look at this project." , that's more difficult to do. I didn't realize there were gated communities that are, that prohibit people from doing that. .

Speaker 4 (25:53):

Mr. Chairman, , I would like to add, , if we're gonna go forward with four, then if a well goes bad that the, , applicant punches a new one.

Speaker 1 (26:05):

You have to give some kind of criteria, like a thousand feet or what do you wanna do here?

Speaker 3 ([26:13](#)):

And are you saying in proximity? Yeah.

Speaker 4 ([26:15](#)):

And -

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

A

Speaker 4 ([26:17](#)):

Functioning residential well. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([26:20](#)):

And Chairman, I would, I would not. I've never directed that as a sitting board member. , That's one of the reasons this is persuasive. I, I don't know how to quantify that. , I think it, it's a great. It, it is. It's a good faith proposal. I don't know how we incorporate that other than the character of the applicant stating that he will do it, but that I think should be like the other things. He's put it on the record, and if they have an issue, I think that to the point that, , the representative made.

Speaker 1 ([27:04](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([27:04](#)):

Yeah. I'm

Speaker 1 ([27:05](#)):

Comfortable with that. Yeah. Comfortable with that?

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

Yep.

Speaker 1 ([27:08](#)):

Okay. All right. Are we okay then with the criteria under number four?

Speaker 4 ([27:15](#)):

Yes.

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

I'm okay. You okay, Commissioner Van Beek?

Speaker 3 ([27:21](#)):

I think so. I'm, I'm just combing through here, Chairman, to make sure that we don't miss something. Okay. And Chairman, I just wanna say too, I, on the potential impacts, I'm assuming that. And 26 acres is not, it's not huge. It's. I. There's 60 or more that a time, and I don't. We're not bothered really by the dust at all, but I'm, , I want a commitment that if there is dust, there'll be some mitigating efforts with a, yeah, dust mitigation, and that's already in there. So you have a dust control plan and a crusher. And given the berms, , if it's really quiet out, I hear it. If it's o- otherwise, I, I don't know.

Speaker 1 ([28:20](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 4 ([28:22](#)):

Number five.

Speaker 1 ([28:23](#)):

Move on? Yep.

Speaker 4 ([28:24](#)):

Five.

Speaker 1 ([28:25](#)):

Will adequate water, sewer, irrigation, drainage, and stormwater drainage facilities - and utility systems be provided to accommodate the use?

Speaker 4 ([28:36](#)):

Yes. I

Speaker 1 ([28:37](#)):

Think that's - Yes. Yes. That's straightforward. We okay to move on to six? I think

Speaker 3 ([28:44](#)):

So.

Speaker 1 ([28:45](#)):

Does the legal access to the subject property for development exist or will it exist at the time? And that one's yes. And I'm okay with the analysis that is on that one also. We good with that?

Speaker 3 ([29:02](#)):

Yes. Yep.

Speaker 1 ([29:04](#)):

Seven, will there be undue interference with existing or future traffic patterns? Are we okay - As,

Speaker 4 ([29:16](#)):

As conditioned, no.

Speaker 1 ([29:17](#)):

As conditioned, yes. Staff, can we have that, , also added into these, this analysis as, as conditioned? No. I, I see that we, we specifically, , have approval number nine, number 10, and 16. I'm o - I'm okay if we just leave it that way, unless you go through the audio record and it seems that there's an additional one. Yes.

Speaker 2 ([29:52](#)):

, Chairman, it also does state the first sentence, "The proposed conditions of approval will mitigate concern. Concerns that may arise. Okay.

Speaker 3 ([30:03](#)):

And Chairman, I, I referenced this when we were having a discussion before we closed public testimony, but the ability of ITD to help offset some of the traffic infrastructure needs is not high. And so to have someone help in an area, this is a tough stretch of highway. I don't care how you slice it. And so if someone puts that in, there's an argument that people will have to, people should be paying attention on this stretch of road. I'm not saying they're not, but for an extra lane that, that could help mitigate some of those oncoming traffic issues.

Speaker 1 ([30:48](#)):

Okay. So we're good to move on?

Speaker 3 ([30:51](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([30:53](#)):

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

Speaker 3 ([31:17](#)):

Chairman, I don't see that this would have the same level of need potentially as homes. I mean, when, when homes are developed here, then that would be a different consideration for emergency services, but, , that's not what this is.

Speaker 1 ([31:36](#)):

This isn't the typical application, so there's, there's not gonna be an impact that way. So I'm good with, with yes on the, on the analysis. Are you okay to proceed?

Speaker 3 ([31:50](#)):

Yes.

Speaker 1 ([31:52](#)):

Since this has conditions, , recommended conditions, , are, be good with the conditions as stated.

Speaker 4 ([32:07](#)):

As long as they're amended to show five days a week, seven to 5:30 and 10 years from the time of -

Speaker 1 ([32:19](#)):

Beginning operations.

Speaker 4 ([32:19](#)):

Beginning the operation. Yeah.

Speaker 2 ([32:21](#)):

Through the chair, that will be amending condition 2A and 2B.

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

Yes. And Chairman, can we make it any more concrete? I asked about the I- left-hand turns that would be prohibited. There was testimony that weather issues in this area. We tried to make an entrance onto 2026 and it was a good 12 minutes to make a right hand turn and on this highway to turn left would be difficult. And on, , Nampa Paving, they clearly have signs for the drivers prohibiting a left-hand turn out on, from Midland onto Highway 2026. That's not allowed. So I would think that we could impose a condition like that that would be similar. I'm talking about a different -

Speaker 1 ([33:07](#)):

Where would the signing be?

Speaker 3 ([33:08](#)):

It, , you would put that, , on Limp Lane and whatever this, , no- Notice Parma Highway.

Speaker 1 ([33:15](#)):

We wouldn't have any authority to do anything out on the state highway. , You can do it on, you can do it on the county road.

Speaker 3 ([33:24](#)):

Then that would be my proposal.

Speaker 1 ([33:26](#)):

Okay.

Speaker 3 ([33:26](#)):

That the applicant notices his drivers, which he has the jurisdiction to do.

Speaker 4 ([33:32](#)):

Okay. I'm in favor of that, Mr. Chairman.

Speaker 1 ([33:35](#)):

Okay. Is there anything else?

Speaker 3 ([33:47](#)):

Chairman, I guess I just have a question just to shore it up. There's a lot of conditions and a lot of detail. Thanks, Amber. But for the discharge that, that I asked about, the dewatering plan, is that with specificity, it just said, it says it will be contained on site. , So on 1D, discharged in accordance with federal, state, local standards, there, the applicant stated, and there's. I, I just don't know if we're directing that or if it's just with the guidelines that are here.

Speaker 2 ([34:24](#)):

, Through the chair, the condition 14 stormwater drainage shall be retained on site. Does reference back to exhibit B5, which is the reclamation plan that the, , applicant outlined how he was gonna do such.

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

Thanks, Amber. Okay.

Speaker 1 ([34:42](#)):

So it is covered. All right. Any other questions about conditions? Comments? If there's not, I would say that let's deliberate towards a motion.

Speaker 4 ([35:00](#)):

Mr. Chairman, I move that we, the board of county commissioners, approve CU2024-0023 with the audio record, , that we have stated, , our position on each of the criteria and the conditions as presented and amended through the verbal record and for the FCOs to come back, , within the next 21 days for our final approval.

Speaker 3 ([35:37](#)):

I will second.

Speaker 1 ([35:38](#)):

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

Speaker 3 ([35:42](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([35:43](#)):

This transcript was exported on Sep 04, 2026 - view latest version [here](#).

Aye. Aye. Motion carries unanimously. All right. With that, I have no other business under this agenda item. I would make a motion that we adjourn.

Speaker 3 ([35:53](#)):

I second.

Speaker 1 ([35:54](#)):

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

Speaker 3 ([35:57](#)):

Aye.

Speaker 1 ([35:57](#)):

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