Speaker 1 (00:01):

All right, so it's 2:18. Call the meeting back to order. , Mr. Jones, what did you and your client come up with?

Speaker 2 (00:10):

Thank you, commissioners. So in speaking with, , one for sure, your question on the batch plant, that is an important operation for the highway district itself. So it, it is needed. They do their own, like, very micro-sized, you know, concrete asphalt work, that kind of thing, just because they are one of the smallest districts. It saves them a lot of money to do it onsite and it's used immediately. So they would like to keep that. They were open to the idea of just making it only permitted for the Notice Parma Highway District use. So -

Speaker 3 (00:41):

Oh.

Speaker 2 (00:42):

Only, so any other sites? No. And another, , topic we want to talk about is that if this were to be split in the future, most of these parcels, if it'd probably be less than five acres for the next industrial use. So things like the reducing or rendering or fertilizer plants probably would not have enough land area to even operate on that size of parcel. But we understand the concern. So if you wanted to get rid of the other uses you listed minus the batch plant, we would be open to that.

Speaker 3 (01:15):

I love negotiation. I appreciate the condition. So Emily, we would just be able to, and you indicated you needed both just the batch and the asphalt and restricted just to the use for the highway district. That does make sense where you have materials in and out of there. I appreciate you being willing to discuss that with your climate. What do you think of that?

Speaker 1 (01:34):

Works for me.

Speaker 3 (01:35):

Okay. Thank you for that. And then, Chairman, can I ask another question?

Speaker 1 (01:41):

Yep.

Speaker 3 (01:41):

Under number C, , director's decision, permits, mineral extraction, do you anticipate mining anything on that site yourself?

Speaker 2 (01:50):

There might be when they do the grade work that they might store the gravel from the grade work on there. , If there is just gravel on site that is ready to be used, they might utilize it. We did look at that,

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

you know, as well, and it doesn't really meet the definition, what the, what they would use the gravel onsite for doesn't meet the batch plant. They wouldn't be collecting it to sell it. They would be collecting it to use for their own facility. So there may be a potential, but if that would, it'd be an accessory use to the site that only Notice Parma Highway District that would be able to do.

Speaker 3 (02:23):

So you'd be willing to put that in there like that as a condition that this...

Speaker 2 (02:28):

, The way to, if, , Emily can correct me, but I believe the way that code is written that we would have to still, you know, come in for, approve that as an accessory use, get approval. , It would still be administrative, but would still get approval from planning and zoning.

Speaker 4 (02:43):

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Van Beek.

Speaker 3 (02:45):

Can you come up? Sorry, Chairman.

Speaker 1 (02:49):

No, it's okay. And then state your name and address for the record, please.

Speaker 4 (02:55):

, Lynn Troxell, Director of Highways, North Palmel Highway District. , Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Van Beek, , just to speak to that, , we don't know if there, you know, you look at the parcel, it's split in half and it goes down to basically river bottom down to the pasture. You know, is there gravel underneath there? We don't know. Is that a possibility in the future to try to extract that gravel if it exists for use on county roads? That is a possibility, you know, but it would be us doing the work. It wouldn't be a commercial gravel pit, you know?

Speaker 5 (03:27):

Yeah.

Speaker 4 (03:27):

But I mean, with, you guys see all the applications for the gravel pits come across your desk on a routine basis, gravel's gonna get tough to get down in our area. The whole river bottom's getting mined. And we are partners with two of the highway districts on a gravel pit, but that is gonna be depleted in the future. And so that lower section of the parcel, it's a possibility if it was viable that we could try to extract it, but that could be a conditional use permit. You know, we come back in and say, "Hey, we did some digging, we found gravel, but we haven't done any geotech. We haven't done extensive digging down there to verify that." But I'd hate to rule that out as a possibility because that would be an inexpensive way to get gravel on our county roads.

Speaker 3 (04:13):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Chairman, can I expand on that? Just my concern on some of these gravel pits where they don't put restrictions on depth, which I understand sometimes that's not in the best interest of, , mining and extraction, but just that for reclamation and all of those things that would go into making sure that we're caretakers of the land and would be in place. And there's no definition on what this means for short term. I understand that resources are in short supply. That mining in Canyon County is, has exceeded what they anticipated that the demand would be. And so we understand that that is a concern. And I, I can appreciate your wanting to take that riverbed and, you know, if you have to crush or whatever on site there. , But I just didn't know if you had any more guidelines that you can offer on what short term mineral extraction looks like for that.

(05:11):

Maybe you don't know at this stage.

Speaker 4 (05:13):

We don't know at this stage because -

Speaker 3 (05:15):

Okay.

Speaker 4 (05:15):

We haven't done any geotech, like I said. , And so like, , Mr. Jones explained, this is basically our first step to try to get the zoning before we start putting money into getting access and then paying an architect and everything else.

Speaker 3 (05:28):

Yeah.

Speaker 4 (05:28):

So truly this is our first step and, , just trying to, , save costing where we can.

Speaker 3 (05:35):

Okay. Mr. Troxell, what I heard you say earlier, maybe you could confirm that, that this is not a commercial operation for extraction. This is for the benefit of Notice Parma Highway.

Speaker 4 (05:45):

Notice Parma Highway and the county roads it serves.

Speaker 3 (05:47):

Yeah. Okay. So that is now a statement for the record that will be there in perpetuity, so. Thank you.

Speaker 4 (05:56):

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Speaker 3 (05:58):

Yeah.

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Speaker 1 (05:58):
Thank you. Anything else, Mr. Jones, you'd like to add?

Speaker 2 (06:07):
, Commissioners, not at this time. Thank you for all your questions.

Speaker 1 (06:10):
Okay.

Speaker 3 (06:17):
Chairman, I move we close public testimony.

Speaker 1 (06:19):
I second. All in favor?

Speaker 3 (06:20):
Aye.

Speaker 1 (06:21):
Aye. Public testimony is now closed and we will enter into deliberation.

Speaker 3 (06:33):
Chairman, I would propose that we start just like we always do with going through the criteria.

Speaker 1 (06:43):
All right. So P&Z recommended approval. Would you like to use theirs or would you like to use what staff provided to P&Z?

Speaker 3 (06:51):
I just wanna use whatever it is that can put us on the same page. There's a lot of different iterations.

Speaker 1 (06:56):
Okay. So page 28 is the, the beginning of the criteria breakdown for what P&Z sent us. Okay. While you're looking, I'll read the first one. Is the requested type of growth generally in conformance with the comprehensive plan?

Speaker 3 (07:19):
Yes.

Speaker 1 (07:20):
I agree, yes. Do you have anything that you would like to change from what, , was sent in the analysis?

Speaker 3 (07:29):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

, Hold on for just a second, Chairman. I, we... And Chairman, the only thing I might wanna add in this is it's already been stated. I see that it's in, , Canyon County's 2030 comprehensive plan, but it's also in the city of Parma and the, I put that on the record early for Notice Parma Highway. It is in their planning documents as well. So there would be three documents then that support this. ,

Speaker 1 (08:12):

I think it's in the second paragraph here.

Speaker 3 (08:14):

Okay.

Speaker 1 (08:14):

Additionally, Parma's, , future land use map designates the subject property as commercial industrial. Is that what you're referring to?

Speaker 3 (08:22):

I missed it. Thank you.

Speaker 1 (08:23):

Okay. All right. So we're good on one?

Speaker 3 (08:26):

Yes. And do you want to add because this, I, I understood this was also known as Parma Highways in their plan. May- maybe that's, maybe I misunderstood that. No. Okay. We're ready to go to two.

Speaker 1 (08:38):

Okay. B. When considering the surrounding land uses, is the proposed land use more appropriate than the current comprehensive plan designation?

Speaker 3 (08:46):

Chairman, I would say yes because of the land use maps by the city that are already in place. And this is a good move for the highway district because highway 95 acts as a natural barrier, , between the residential development to the southeast and then this development where it's located.

Speaker 1 (09:12):

I agree the criteria is met.

Speaker 3 (09:14):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 (09:15):

, C, is the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, , compatible with surrounding land uses?

Speaker 3 (09:24):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Yes.

Speaker 1 (09:25):

I agree. So we are good on C. D. Do development trends in the general area indicate that the current designation and circumstances have changed since the comprehensive plan was adopted?

Speaker 3 (09:40):

Yes. And I appreciate the inclusion of the TAS traffic analysis, , report. That's not, it's not like it's a document with teeth, but it does show projected growth within the area on jobs, so.

Speaker 1 (09:54):

Okay.

Speaker 3 (09:55):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (09:56):

We agree on D. E, will the proposed comprehensive plan amendment impact public services and facilities? What measures will be implemented to mitigate impacts? And I agree with the analysis. It's not anticipated to impact anything.

Speaker 3 (10:15):

Yes, agreed.

Speaker 1 (10:16):

In fact, it could actually definitely help the change in location. , Criteria when considering amending, repealing or adopting a comprehensive plan, the local governing board shall consider the effects the proposed amendment repeal or adoption of the comprehensive plan would have on the source quantity, quality of groundwater in the area. , I believe this criteria is met as well and the health district will be held, heavily involved in it.

Speaker 3 (10:54):

Yes. Agreed.

Speaker 1 (10:55):

Okay. Rezone's, conditional rezone standards of evaluation, , code section one. Is the proposed conditional rezone generally consistent with the comprehensive plan?

Speaker 3 (11:10):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (11:17):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

I agree as well. I feel like some of these are almost duplicative. , Let's see. Number two, when considering the surrounding land uses is the proposed... Are we, are we repeating ourselves or is it because we also have the...

Speaker 5 (11:44):

Mr. Chair, it's because you also have the comprehensive plan map amendment. There's just similar questions.

Speaker 1 (11:48):

Okay. Making sure I wasn't going crazy here. Criteria two, when considering the surrounding land uses, is the proposed conditional rezone more appropriate than the current zoning designation?

Speaker 3 (12:02):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (12:03):

I agree. And I am fine with the analysis that has been presented.

Speaker 3 (12:07):

Yes. And Chairman, I'll just say that table that's been included with that clearly shows that there are like uses in the area and how this area is trending.

Speaker 1 (12:17):

That's a good point. Number three, is the proposed conditional rezone compatible with land, surrounding land uses?

Speaker 3 (12:24):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (12:26):

I agree. , Number four, will the proposed conditional rezone negatively affect the character of the area? What measures will be implemented to mitigate impacts?

Speaker 3 (12:41):

Chairman, I don't think that... Given the fact that there's been some request to have this look nice and, , I think highway districts have an interest in... I mean, they're a government agency, so presenting well to the public is what the right thing to do is. So I think that the mitigating factors that have been proposed, this question is yes.

Speaker 1 (13:06):

And I agree. Number five, will adequate facilities services, including sewer water drainage, irrigation, and utilities be provided to accommodate proposed conditional rezone?

Speaker 3 (13:19):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Yes. And as you've stated, Chairman Southwest District Health is going to be involved in this nitrate priority area to help guide that process. So it's septic and a well site on the property.

Speaker 1 (13:34):

And I will agree with you agreeing with me, so. Number six, does the proposed conditional zo - rezone require public street improvements in order to provide adequate access to and from the subject property to minimize undue interference with existing or future traffic patterns? What measures have been taken to mitigate traffic impacts?

Speaker 3 (13:54):

Chairman, I appreciate Emily already being in contact. Those two, , ingress-egress sites on the northern border of the property will be addressed by highway district and ITD, whoever's got jurisdiction, and they'll ensure that that access meets their code. That's a little bit outside of what we do, but it does have... And that's the next question, legal access, but, , whatever they're going to do to that, it's already that process, in my mind, has already been started to ensure it's in compliance.

Speaker 1 (14:26):

I agree. So six is met. Number seven, does legal access to the subject property for the conditional rezone exist or will it exist at time of development?

Speaker 3 (14:38):

Yes. And again, the argument that I just made applies to this one.

Speaker 1 (14:43):

I agree. Number eight. Will the proposed conditional rezone amendment impact essential public services and facilities such as school, police, fire, and emergency medical services? What measures will be implemented to mitigate impacts?

Speaker 3 (14:58):

And Chairman, this is not anticipated to impact those essential services. So even though... And there's been some, , fire protection that it's the response time is a little bit, , longer, but I... With the nature of their business, , if this was a residential subdivision, that would be different than a highway district building in that operation.

Speaker 1 (15:26):

Which one did you say was fire, was, -

Speaker 3 (15:28):

I though that they said...

Speaker 1 (15:29):

Increased zone. Fire stations are across the street, so I mean...

Speaker 3 (15:32):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Yep. I heard something wrong.

Speaker 1 (15:34):

Okay.

Speaker 3 (15:34):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 (15:35):

Yep. , area of city impact. I am not going to read all of that. , At least not on the record. Criteria has been met, in my opinion.

Speaker 3 (15:54):

Agreed.

Speaker 1 (15:56):

And it complies with Parma's future land use map.

Speaker 3 (15:59):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (16:01):

Okay. So now on the conditions.

Speaker 5 (16:06):

And Mr. Chair, I think you're reviewing the draft FCOs I sent to the P&Z commission. The ones on the screen are the ones that they actually approved, if you wanted to go through those. -

Speaker 3 (16:16):

It's attachment A, correct?

Speaker 5 (16:18):

, Yeah, it would be attachment A, , but at the... I think you were on the draft ones, the signed ones are on a different part of the document. Those are a little different.

Speaker 3 (16:27):

Okay.

Speaker 5 (16:29):

Most of the findings are the same except the conditions. So on the digital copy... Sorry, I gotta go over there.

Speaker 3 (16:40):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

What page should we be looking at, Emily, or maybe you're getting there?

Speaker 1 (16:43):
, She was on 18.

Speaker 5 (16:49):
Yeah, 18.

Speaker 3 (16:51):
Thank you.

Speaker 1 (16:55):
Okay. And so for these, , we wanna remove fertilizer, whatever that one was.

Speaker 3 (17:02):
The fertilizing, fertilizing processing facility, the rendering plant, and the sale of salvage goods.

Speaker 1 (17:08):
Okay.

Speaker 3 (17:08):
And then on the batch plants with that discussion, it would include, , for raw materials and asphalt that is... Functions only for the Notice Parma Highway District.

Speaker 1 (17:22):
For the entity's use, essentially? Yes.

Speaker 3 (17:24):
Yeah.

Speaker 1 (17:24):
Okay. Mm-hmm.

Speaker 3 (17:26):
And then on the mineral extraction under number C, that would also be for Nota - Notice Parma Highway to maintain county roads.

Speaker 1 (17:36):
For the entity's use?

Speaker 3 (17:37):
Yep.

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Speaker 1 (17:38):
Okay.

Speaker 3 (17:39):
And it doesn't say that, so that's why I have specificity.

Speaker 1 (17:42):
I gotcha.

Speaker 3 (17:42):
Yeah.

Speaker 1 (18:15):
We gotta talk about number four?

Speaker 3 (18:17):
We can. And what would you, what are your discussion points for -

Speaker 1 (18:29):
Well, again, , this is PNZ's suggestion. It was not in the... It's not... It was not in what staff sent to PNZ for the fence, correct?

Speaker 5 (18:39):
, Mr. Chair, I did suggest the fence just on the eastern boundary, just for -

Speaker 1 (18:44):
So that's along the road?

Speaker 5 (18:46):
Yeah, just along US 95, , because of the residential uses nearby, but that was just a suggestion.

Speaker 1 (18:53):
Okay.

Speaker 5 (18:53):
, and then the landscaping I added to the staff report just as like a consideration that could be considered if we're looking at any buffering conditions, but of course it's up to the hearing about it.

Speaker 1 (19:03):
But we don't have this in here as a requirement for the landscaping.

Speaker 5 (19:07):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

, Mr. Chair, it, the Planning and Zoning Commission did make it a requirement, but it's not in code as required.

Speaker 3 (19:14):

And Chairman, can I, can we, , have some expanded discussion on that? , We don't have any renderings of what this is going to look like, but I believe the integrity of the applicant and the highway district, if we look at what we've done historically, and this predates you as a commissioner, but we don't have to put a million dollars in this, but I think a fence and something that makes it look nice, particularly where we've allowed a batch plant and there could be some extraction things on that property, some bulk fuel, I think it saves the applicant some heartache in the long run to have some kind of site obscuring for those operations, and I'm in favor of leaving that in as a condition.

Speaker 1 (19:59):

The fence.

Speaker 3 (20:00):

And, and some landscaping. I don't know how to define that yet, but there... Some trees, some bushes, it's, it's basically distraction from extraction of batch plants and their asphalt by operation. I think it benefits both this business and the public, especially where they're that close to city services.

Speaker 1 (20:19):

So let's, let's negotiate this then. Number five. I, I think when we at this level get into determining the percentage mix of trees and what types of trees those are, I think that is terribly inappropriate for us to entertain.

Speaker 3 (20:38):

And we typically do not do that. I agree with you.

Speaker 1 (20:41):

Okay.

Speaker 3 (20:41):

And so can the applicant at the next stage bring back a landscape plan that helps with some kind of, , what's that compliance?

Speaker 1 (20:57):

Is that... Don't we have something like a, like a f - the fire landscape where it's pretty much like rock and...

Speaker 3 (21:05):

I would want some kind of...

Speaker 5 (21:06):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Yeah, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Mamek, you could do like zero scaping is, I think what that's called or Firewise landscaping plan or

Speaker 1 (21:13):

Something. Firewise, there you go.

Speaker 5 (21:14):

Yeah. , and then we could have that, , our development service director has la- landscaping background, so that's why it could be approved by him or we could require it to be like prepared by a landscape ar- architect, but I know it's more expensive, so whatever you prefer.

Speaker 3 (21:30):

And Chairman, I would submit that having them present a landscape plan and work with the director that, and so they can come up with it. I don't... I agree with you. We don't have to have this percentage that's outlined here. I would... I'm okay to take that out.

Speaker 5 (21:48):

Okay.

Speaker 3 (21:48):

But I do want them to present some kind of a landscape plan that's approved by the director to help make this gateway into Parma look nice.

Speaker 1 (21:57):

So, so what are we gonna do here for -

Speaker 3 (21:59):

Okay.

Speaker 1 (21:59):

Because this says within two years they've gotta have it planted. So do we, we wanna wholesale scrap this and rewrite, , for the next stage in this process, they have to present a landscaping plan to the director of development services?

Speaker 3 (22:18):

Mm-Hmm. That would be fine.

Speaker 1 (22:19):

Okay.

Speaker 3 (22:21):

If that works for them. So it's fencing along the frontage and then a landscape plan of something that looks aesthetically pleasing. And then that's... We can hold them to be substantially compliant. So bring

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

something in, , we can hold you to. They'll be looked at when you put that in place and you'll have to meet whatever standard and, and working with the director, if that is good.

Speaker 1 (22:49):

Go ahead.

Speaker 2 (22:50):

And commissioners, just for clarification, you mean that time of like building permit or grading permit, that kind of thing? Or is this at a, needs to be done in a couple days? I just wanna know the timeline for when you would like this landscape plan.

Speaker 1 (23:06):

What's the next step in this process for them?

Speaker 5 (23:09):

, Potentially a building permit or they could just commence their operations by like putting some of their, you know, stor- storing their trucks and equipment and things on site. , I was thinking we... For the condition, you could just do a timeframe that they could, they have to submit this within two years and then so many... And then after that they have to then plant it within a certain timeframe. , Whatever you... I think timeframes kind of work better when they might be not necessarily pulling building permits right away, but up to you.

Speaker 3 (23:39):

And say that last part again. When they're, the, it works better.

Speaker 5 (23:42):

So in this case, they might not necessarily be pulling any building permits for commercial structures right away. They could be down the road potentially. And so if we tie it to a building permit, it could be not put in place for like so many years. So it's nicer sometimes to have like a timeframe attached to the conditions so that, you know, within two years they submit a landscaping plan to the development services director and then within so many, you know, they have to plant it within so many years, months, whatever.

Speaker 3 (24:06):

Yeah. And that is the same, that, to your point of fairness, the commencement of something within two years is just standard to what we do in our code.

Speaker 5 (24:17):

, Yeah. Mr. Chair, commissioner, maybe we, I think it varies between conditional use permits and conditional rezones. I think rezones, we tend to give them a longer timeframe, , just generally. So that's why the two years was attached to it. So -

Speaker 3 (24:31):

Okay.

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Speaker 5 (24:31):

And - They, they might get it done ahead of time.

Speaker 3 (24:33):

Okay. Does that work for you?

Speaker 1 (24:34):

Yep.

Speaker 3 (24:35):

Does that work for you?

Speaker 5 (24:36):

Yes. And with the landscaping plan, do you want me to say like a landscaping plan, , with Firewise landscaping consideration, something like that? Is, or do you want it just to be kind of a landscaping plan, kind of more up for them to just kind of show us how they're gonna obscure it?

Speaker 3 (24:54):

And Chairman, I would like them to have, be in the driver's seat and work with our director. That feels, to your point, like we're not dictating what the plan

Speaker 1 (25:03):

Is. I

Speaker 3 (25:03):

Appreciate

Speaker 1 (25:03):

It.

Speaker 3 (25:04):

Thank you.

Speaker 1 (25:04):

Yeah.

Speaker 3 (25:04):

And so I want them to work with Director Gibbons and hopefully he's still in place, he's got the expertise, but if you choose to hire an outside landscape person, whatever it is, I would like also that to be tied to substantial compliance to the plan that you submit. So you can't submit one thing and then do a bare minimum. This doesn't even look like that. That, that's not okay.

Speaker 1 (25:27):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

So submit what you want.

Speaker 3 (25:28):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (25:29):

First. Okay. If there's nothing else, I would, , entertain you attempting a motion.

Speaker 3 (25:41):

Okay. And then, , okay. Chairman, based on the findings of facts and conclusions of law and order contained herein, I move that the Board of County Commissioners approves case number CR2025-0018, which is a conditional rezone of approximately 38 acres, parcel R38701 from single family residence to the conditional rezone light industrial CRM1 zone subject to the conditions of the development agreement. And is that the one... Are we okay to do it in that order, Emily, or do we need to back up to the...

Speaker 5 (26:18):

Oh, whatever order, whatever... So you did the rezone first and just do the comp plan amendment next.

Speaker 1 (26:22):

With, with the changes to the -

Speaker 3 (26:24):

Yes.

Speaker 1 (26:25):

Development agreement that we've enumerated on the record.

Speaker 3 (26:27):

Yes. And I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't out of order on the comprehensive plan versus the rezone. So yes, including the changes to attachment A, which are conditions of approval as we've discussed.

Speaker 1 (26:41):

Okay. I will second the motion. All in favor?

Speaker 3 (26:44):

Aye.

Speaker 1 (26:44):

Aye. Motion carries. So now the map amendment.

Speaker 3 (26:51):

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE

Okay. Based on the findings of facts and the conclusions of law and order contained herein, I move that the Board of County Commissioners rec - , approves case number OR2025 - 0027, which is a comprehensive map amendment from agricultural future land use designation to the industrial future land use designation as presented.

Speaker 1 (27:12):

I will second. I'm pretty sure we were supposed to do this one first, but -

Speaker 3 (27:15):

That's what I was asking.

Speaker 1 (27:16):

That's, that's all right. <Laugh> , all in favor?

Speaker 3 (27:19):

Aye.

Speaker 1 (27:20):

Aye. Motion carries. Bottom line is we approved them both. So, , staff will come back later at some point in time with FCOs for us to approve and sign. And thank you very much and good luck to you.

Speaker 2 (27:41):

All right. Thank you, commissioners.

Speaker 3 (27:42):

Thank you for your presentation. Anything else? Y- you're welcome. Thank you for being here today at this matter.

Speaker 1 (27:47):

Okay. It is, , 2:46. This hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

Speaker 3 (27:51):

Thank you.

AI Generated Transcript - NOT FOR OFFICIAL USE