



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSION OF LAW AND ORDER

In the matter of the application of:

City of Homedale
Area of Impact Boundary
OR2025-0008

Record and Procedural History

- A. City of Homedale submitted a boundary confirmation request and supporting documents, and maps on August 11, 2025. Marked as Exhibit A1 to the staff report.
- B. Notice of the public hearing was provided to the City of Homedale on August 22, 2025. Full political notice of the public hearing for the City of Homedale was sent out on August 19, 2025. Newspaper notice published on August 27, 2025, and September 30, 2025, in the Idaho Press.
- C. The staff report, exhibits, and public comments dated October 16, 2025, and including Exhibits A through D in the record.
- D. A public hearing was held before the Board of County Commissioners on October 16, 2025. Testimony was offered at the public hearing from the City of Homedale officials and members of the public.
- E. On October 16, 2025, the Board moved to deny the proposed area of impact labeled as Exhibit A2 in the staff report and to repeal Chapter 9, Article 5, Areas of City Impact, Homedale, of the Canyon County Code of Ordinance.

Area of Impact Hearing Criteria

The City of Homedale has requested that the Board of Canyon County Commissioners confirm the existing area of impact boundary as it has existed since it was last adopted in 2010. The request, OR2025-0008, was presented at a public hearing before the Canyon County Board of County Commissioners on October 16, 2025. Having considered the evidence presented in the public hearings, including the staff report, City of Homedale submitted materials, written public comments described in the Record and Procedural History, and the testimony offered at the public hearings, the Board finds as follows:

Areas of Impact Criteria

HEARING CRITERIA (Idaho Code §67-6526(3) - Modification or confirmation of area of impact boundaries: Any modifications to or confirmation of an area of impact boundary must be adopted by an ordinance approved by the board of county commissioners of the applicable county, following the notice and hearing procedures provided in section 67-6509, Idaho Code, and in accordance with the requirements for defining an area of impact as set forth in subsection (4) of this section.

Provisions applicable to areas of impact (Idaho Code §67-6526(4))

- (a) In defining an initial area of impact or in modifying or confirming an existing area of impact, the criteria set forth in this subsection shall be considered:

67-6526(4)(a)(i) Anticipated commercial and residential growth.

The City's letter of intent states (Staff Report Exhibit A1), "The City of Homedale's current AOI is reflective of the areas where growth and development are currently happening and where growth and development is expected to continue over the next 5 years." The City of Homedale's existing city limits are all within Owyhee County where the City also has a designated area of impact. In Canyon County, several subdivisions have developed along the Canyon county-side of the Snake River but are not within the City limits. At the hearing, City officials identified several businesses operating on the Canyon-side of the Snake River near the City.

This area is zoned by Canyon County as primarily "R-R" (Rural Residential), ending approximately 0.60 miles from the City of Homedale's current City Limits (Staff Report Exhibits B2.2 and B2.3). The County's Future Land Use Map projects residential growth north to Ustick Road and east to Hwy 95, with Commercial growth along Hwy 95 (Staff Report Exhibit B2.8). At the hearing, City officials expressed their belief that the City would annex into Canyon County in the future.

The Board does not doubt the potential for commercial and residential development in the City's desired area of impact area in the County. The question does remain whether commercial and development come to the area if they will be city scale or will continue to be rural development in line with the County's projections. The Board would agree that city scale development requires city services and should be developed within city limits. The Board does not believe that the City's anticipated commercial and residential growth is unreasonable, however, it was not ultimately a significant factor in the board's determination.

67-6526(4)(a)(ii) Geographic factors.

As noted above, the City is located completely within Owyhee County. The Snake River divides Owyhee County from Canyon County and the City limits from its requested proposed area of impact in Canyon County. A bridge on Highway 95 crosses the Snake River into the City making direct access from Canyon County available; however, as will be discussed elsewhere herein the Snake River is a significant hurdle in the prospect of extending City utilities into Canyon County. For this reason, the Snake River as a geographic factor will be significant to the Board's decision.

67-6526(4)(a)(iii) Transportation infrastructure and systems, including connectivity.

In the proposed area of impact, the roads are maintained and controlled by Golden Gate Highway District and the Idaho Transportation Department. Highway 95 is the only road that provides connectivity to the City of Homedale from the proposed area of impact in Canyon County (Staff Report Exhibit B7). Highway 95 is maintained by ITD. Golden Gate Highway District did not provide any comments by the materials deadline of September 26, 2025. ITD commented on August 25, 2025, stating ITD has no comments or concerns at this time (Staff Report Exhibit C3).

The City does not currently contribute to the transportation infrastructure and systems on the Canyon County-side of the Snake River. The City's letter of intent states that it could provide street maintenance for city transportation infrastructure that would be provided by a developer in the area of impact. There are several established subdivisions in the proposed area of impact and a few parcels with access to city wells, but it was not stated at the hearing or in the materials if the city currently provides transportation infrastructure maintenance on the Canyon County-side.

It's clear that Highway 95 provides the connectivity needed to make the proposed area of impact feasible. However, the Board believes that more information about how the City's roadways would interface with those maintained by the Golden Gate Highway District should be provided with future area of impact boundary requests. Connectivity of Highway 95 to the city limits is a significant factor in favor of the City having an area of impact in Canyon County.

67-6526(4)(a)(iv) Areas where municipal or public sewer and water are expected to be provided within five (5) years.

(1) Water:

The City officials testified that the City of Homedale currently provides limited water service in the area of impact, with the ability to add more (Staff Report Exhibit A1). City maintains a well at Ustick Road and west of Batt Corner Road in Canyon County (Staff Report Exhibit A1.1) and the City is in the process of drilling a second well at this location. The City currently provides water to three parcels in Canyon County along Highway 95 and at the corner of Ustick Road and Batt Corner Road (Staff Report Exhibit B8). The Board finds that the City can provide water service to the proposed area of impact.

(2) Sewer:

The City does not currently provide sewer services in Canyon County. The letter of intent (Staff Report Exhibit A1) states that the City of Homedale would be able to provide sewer services if a developer were to develop in the proposed area of impact. At the hearing, City officials were less confident in this assertion. City officials testified that a sewer line could not be permitted to extend to Canyon County across the Highway 95 bridge. City officials testified that the likely path to provide the City's sewer service in Canyon County would be to bore under the Snake River. City officials testified that the extension under the Snake River would be costly and that there was no active plan or funding source for the project. City officials testified that a developer would likely have to bear this cost.

The Board does not find that the evidence supports the City's assertion that sewer services could be provided to the proposed area of impact within 5 years. The inability to provide sewer services to the proposed area of impact in the immediate 5 years is a significant factor in the Board's determination.

67-6526(4)(a)(v) Other public service district boundaries.

(1) School Facilities:

According to Canyon County's School District Map, Homedale School District currently serves the proposed area of impact (Staff Report Exhibit B4.2). The Homedale School District was notified on August 19, 2025, no comments were received by the comment deadline of September 26, 2025.

(2) Fire/Emergency:

The applicant's letter of intent (Staff Report Exhibit A1) states that the Homedale Rural Fire District and Homedale Ambulance District extend into the proposed area of impact.

Canyon County's Fire District's current Service Map (Staff Report Exhibit B4.1) locates the Homedale Rural Fire District services north to Ustick Road, and the Wilder Rural Fire District services the remaining portion of the proposed area of impact for the City of Homedale.

The City of Homedale's website, located under the ambulance service, states that the City of Homedale's Ambulance Service shares dual jurisdiction with Canyon County Paramedics in southwestern Canyon County and that the City of Homedale's Ambulance District relies on volunteers (Staff Report Exhibit B3). County staff was not able to locate a reliable map of where the Homedale Ambulance District services.

The Board would ask that the City consider working with these Fire and Emergency service districts to provide clarity on what Fire and Emergency service would have jurisdiction should a Canyon County parcel annex into the City in the future. However, the Board believes these issues can and will be resolved in the future and does not consider public service district boundaries to be a significant factor in its determination at this time.

67-6526(4)(b) Other requirements.

In addition to the criteria set forth in paragraph (a) of this subsection, an area of impact shall not exceed the areas that are very likely to be annexed to the city within the next five (5) years.

Although the City has made extended water service into the area of impact in Canyon County those properties that are provided water by the City do not have a clear annexation path. The area between the city limits and those parcels is either already developed into rural subdivisions or is in active agricultural production. Those parcels do not have a path for voluntary annexation.

Furthermore, because there is no active or immediate plans for sewer services on the Canyon County side of the Snake River there does not appear to be a current prospect to have city density residential subdivisions. The Board, after hearing and reviewing the materials provided by the City of Homedale cannot find that the city is very likely to annex any of the proposed area of impact in the next five years.

Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, an area of impact shall not extend more than two (2) miles from existing city limits. An area of impact boundary shall not divide county recognized parcels of land. If only a portion of a recognized parcel falls within the two (2) mile limit, then the boundary may extend beyond two (2) miles on that parcel so that it encompasses the entire parcel.

The requested confirmation does exceed the two-mile distances from the city jurisdiction for parcel R37262 (Staff Report Exhibits A2 and B2.9). This parcel would be required to be excluded from the area of impact boundary.

67-6526(4)(d) Areas of impact shall not overlap.

The City of Homedale's proposed area of impact does not overlap with a neighboring city's area of impact. (Staff Report Exhibit A2).

Conclusion.

Homedale's current area of impact has been in place since 2010. In that time the city has not annexed any parcels in the area of impact. While the Board believes that cooperative planning in this area is appropriate should commercial development and city density residential subdivisions be proposed, the Board cannot, given the mandate by the legislature to apply these new criteria to the area of impact, confirm Homedale's currently existing area of impact boundary. Specifically, the Board finds that the geographic factor of the Snake River dividing the city limits from the area of impact prevents the city from extending its sewer services to the area of impact and that there is no active plan or funding to have that sewer service extended in the next five years. For that reason, the Board cannot find that it is very likely that the city will annex any parcels within the area of impact in the next five years. This has been the case for at least the last 15 years.

The Board shares the City's vision that should commercial or City density residential growth occur on the Canyon County side of the Snake River that City should be an active participant in the planning of those developments with an eye towards annexation in the future should that be appropriate. However, the legislative changes to the criteria have resulted in the area of impact boundary no longer being a tool available for that planning. The Board would encourage the city to continue to develop its plans for water and sewer service extension to the area and to revisit its' area of impact request when definitive sewer and annexation plan is in place.

Order

Based upon the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law contained herein, the Board of County Commissioners denies Case #OR2025-0008, The Board is denying the request to confirm the City's area of impact boundary and the Board will not adopt a City area of impact boundary for the City of Homedale.

The decision includes the following Board actions:

1. Signing of an Ordinance repealing the County's Homedale area of impact boundary and ordinance.

DATED this 30th day of December, 2025.

CANYON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

- ☒ Motion Carried Unanimously
☐ Motion Carried/Split Vote Below
☐ Motion Defeated/Split Vote Below

	Yes	No	Did Not Vote
 _____ Commissioner Leslie Van Beek	☒	_____	_____
 _____ Commissioner Brad Holton	☒	_____	_____
 _____ Commissioner Zach Brooks	☒	_____	_____

Attest: Rick Hogaboam, Clerk

By: JROS8
Deputy

Date: 12.30.25