From: Gay Fruehling <gayf@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:17 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Trail creek bridge

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

I support the 4 lanes over the Trail Creek Bridge. Please do what 92%,of the voters want-4 lanes Thanks! Sent from my iPhone

From: William Fruehling <billf@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 7:14 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Trail Creek Bridge

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Please support the four lane solution to the bridge. 92% of the people poled want four lanes. Your voters have spoken. Sent from my iPhone

From: Peter Smith <petersmithsv@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:31 PM

To: Participate Subject: Ketchum Entry

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Four (4) Lanes NOT two (2) Lanes, with the Speed Limit 25mph from Serenade Thru Main Street in BOTH directions.

From:	Thad Farnham < thadfarnha	ım@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, August 28, 2025	1:32 PM
То:	Participate	
Subject:	Lane Striping at South end	of town
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up	
Flag Status:	Flagged	
	1.09900	
I would like to express my support for creating 4 lanes on the highway. Somewhere around 90% of respondents want 4 lanes for some very obvious reasons. I have lived in Ketchum since 1989 and been a building contractor building single family homes in Ketchum and Hailey for over 35 years		
1) One way or another all the laborers and delivery people have to get paid for their time so all that bumper to bumper traffic creeping up the valley is costing millions of dollars and tons of hydrocarbon pollution.		
think it would be more dangerous		2) I ride my bike thousands of miles a year in the valley and I St than to leave the north south bike traffic as it currently is.
create gaps in the traffic flow for t	he Gem St residents to turn	3) The new stop light at Serenade Lane will a South so they won't have to wait as long.
Thank you for your attention;		Thad Farnham

From: Lori Williams <loriwilliamssv@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 1:49 PM

To: Participate

Subject: 2 or 4 line striping

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

To the Mayor and City Council -

you have delayed and tabled, yet asked for survey after survey. The data speaks loudly and you are not listening to those results by indicating you are leaning to 2 lanes. Why not have left the bottleneck at Base Camp grocery? Why all this road construction? You are simply back in the same mistake that decades have shown. The bridge work is being done, now adhere to it. KBAC had it right when they say this affects the entire valley of commuters vs. a small pocket of neighborhood. That neighborhood is no different than the one across from Weyyakin, who decades ago had to endure a raised speed limit to 35 back in the day. It seemed horrible at the time, but it all worked out Times change. The west side of the highway neighborhood south of the grocery store learned to cope with the new speed. The Gem street neighborhood cannot rule the road. They have their cake too, as they have 6 feet sidewalks to come and go on. The speed can be reduced to 25 for entrance onto the highway. So make us CRAWL into town. ANYTHING, but don't put us back to a bottleneck. The public has made their preference clear. Listen to those who elected you.

Robert & Lori Williams

--

LORI WILLIAMS
freelance writer
208-720-2494
loriwilliamssv@gmail.com

From: Jed Gray <jed@svassociates.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 3:13 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** Trail Creek Bridge

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed

I think if the speed limit from Serenade to River Street is 25 MPH along with the stop lights, it will solve highway access issues for the residents and businesses along that stretch of highway. The other question to ask is how many residents along the highway between Serenade and River Street are there compared to the number a workforce and visitors coming into town daily.

Jed Gray

From: Karen Wonnell kmwonnell@icloud.com

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 10:41 AM

To: Participate **Subject:** 4 versus 2

I can't believe that you're even considering moving the bottleneck further up the road rather than trying to alleviate the problem. Surely you can't be that obtuse. Your desire to have everyone walk, ride bikes, or take the bus (while admirable) is way not feasible. Ketchum residences will surely be upset when cars continue to run through their neighborhoods, and those of us who reside in the county or Hailey or Bellevue or beyond won't appreciate the longer ride into town where we work or shop or dine. Rethink this stupid idea.

Karen Wonnell Sent from my iPad

From: Chuck Rumpf <svelkhorn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 10:46 AM

To: Neil Bradshaw; Courtney Hamilton; Amanda Breen; Tripp Hutchinson; Spencer

Cordovano; Participate

Subject: Update on Four versus Two Lanes

Attachments: Ketchum leaders delay highway lane striping decision Ketchum mtexpress.com.pdf

Below is my initial email, along with some additional thoughts and responses to items/comments covered in the IME August 20th article (PDF below).

Reiterating that my wife & I have owned and/or leased various office spaces in Ketchum for the last 25 years. Additionally, I served on the Marketing Alliance Board for several years. We have both been active in various Blaine County non-profit organizations.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of supporting the tourist economy, not only to Ketchum but also to Sun Valley and all of Blaine County.

Highway 75 is vital to Blaine County, as it is the only thorofare supporting the cities, residents, visitors, and commerce. While there is a backup at the entrance and exit at Ketchum, this would be lessened by four lanes. It has always been a choke point, with an unaddressed concern becoming a problem in the event of a natural disaster, such as a wildfire or an earthquake. Having volunteered during both the Castle Rock and Beaver Creek fires, I can attest to the importance of evacuating and our reliance on Highway 75.

IME article - issues raised about the highway from Serenade Lane to River Street.

- 1. Two lanes with a turn lane. A turn lane is overstated as an issue for this short distance compared to the backups and choke point concerns. Who are the "many Ketchum residents who were in favor" of the need for a turn lane configuration? Approximately 87% of the survey respondents favored four lanes.
- 2. Speed is not a concern and should be monitored by the police. Consider a slower speed limit from Serenade Lane to River Street. The speed limit issue is the same for both two and four lanes. Is there now an issue in town which has four lanes?
- 3. The concern about limiting biking into town with four lanes "could jeopardize" the ability to bike into town is not appropriate. The comment was "could" versus "would". There are bike paths surrounding the city, as well as designated lanes throughout the city. Lastly, why not walk into town on the new proposed sidewalks?
- 4. The concern about the rush hour traffic being a result of a housing shortage is unfounded. There may be some impact, but it is not substantial, given the makeup of the traffic coming into and through Ketchum. Two or four lanes will not have a significant effect on housing and shouldn't even be considered as part of the decision process.
- 5. Those who live in the Serenade Lane to River Street section do not appear to be "raising concerns." They have had opportunities, via City Council meetings and the questionnaire, to indicate if the two-lane or four-lane option is desirable. It is therefore not fitting to assume what the "best decision" is for them.

Please note that your decision will impact not only Ketchum but also a significant portion of Blaine County.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Chuck Rumpf

Chuck Rumpf 208.309.1625

Begin forwarded message:

From: Chuck Rumpf <svelkhorn@gmail.com>

Subject: Four versus Two Lanes

Date: August 15, 2025 at 12:44:25 PM MDT

To: nbradshaw@ketchumidaho.org, chamilton@ketchumidaho.org, abreen@ketchumidaho.org, thutchinson@ketchumidaho.org, scordovano@ketchumidaho.org, participate@ketchumidaho.org

My wife & I have owned and/or leased various office spaces in Ketchum for the last 25 years. In addition I served on the Marketing Alliance Board for several years. These expiriences have enlightened me about the importance of tourism to Ketchum.

The question for having a two or four lane entrance to Ketchum is whether the City recognizes the importance of traffic for commerce. Visitors and those with businesses in Ketchum should have the best possible access to the City. Visitors drive the local economy and owners of business including their employees depend on this traffic.

Four lanes makes the most sense to ensure Ketchum is easily accessible. Backups waste time and result in unwanted air pollution from vehicles.

Additionally there is no need for bike lanes since there are miles of bike paths surrounding the city. Also having bike lanes will encourage bike traffic in the main city corridor. This will also spur on the use of e-bikes in the city.

Chuck Rumpf 208.309.1625

}

https://www.mtexpress.com/news/ketchum/ketchum-leaders-delay-highway-lane-striping-decision/article_cb36ae03-9d5c-4611-b186-1173dabc214e.html

FEATURED

Ketchum leaders delay highway lane striping decision

City Council members leaned toward two-lane plan Monday

By ANDREW THEOPHILUS Express Staff Writer Aug 20, 2025



Pedestrians and vehicles travel over Trail Creek Bridge amid its reconstruction.

Express photo by Roland Lane

Ketchum City Council members during their Monday meeting leaned toward a two-lane traffic configuration for the stretch of state Highway 75 running from Serenade Lane over Trail Creek Bridge, a reversal from an Aug. 4 meeting during which the majority of council members leaned in favor of the four-lane option, with the exception of Councilman Tripp Hutchinson.

A SurveyMonkey survey conducted by the city ahead of the meeting garnered 2,094 responses, with 86.64% of responses favoring the four-lane configuration.

During Monday's meeting, Hutchinson continued his push for the two-lane configuration.

Hutchinson said in the meeting that he had heard from many Ketchum residents who were in favor of a two-lane configuration with a turn lane.

Ketchum City Council members decided in 2008 to direct the Idaho Transportation Department to implement the two-lane option, the Express previously reported. The plan calls for one northbound vehicle lane, one southbound vehicle lane, a center turn lane, and a bike lane on both sides.

The four-lane option, proposed amid heavy daily traffic congestion caused by highway construction, would see two lanes of travel going north and south over the same stretch of highway. There would no longer be a center turn lane or bike lanes.

Both the two- and four-lane configurations allow for sidewalks on the east and west sides of the highway.

The city stated in its survey that a drawback of the two-lane option is that it would create a vehicular bottleneck by funneling vehicles into single northbound and southbound lanes in the stretch between Serenade Lane and River Street, down from two lanes in each direction outside that stretch. Another drawback is that cyclists using the bike lanes would still need to divert off Main Street once they reach town.

Drawbacks of the four-lane option, the city said, include the loss of bike lanes and the possibility of faster travel speeds leading into town.

"It is a reality that cars are moving faster and it is less safe for pedestrians and bikers on our Main Street," Hutchinson said Monday. "Now, changing this portion of the road to four lanes will further allow for cars to move faster through our town, and make our town and our Main Street less safe." The council heard from four public commenters during the meeting, all in favor of a two-lane option.

Otis and Waylon Harrigan, young residents of the gem streets area south of downtown Ketchum, both shared a preference for the two-lane configuration during public comment.

"I would not want there to be four lanes," Waylon said, saying that could jeopardize his ability to bike into town with his friends.

Former Ketchum councilman Michael David said during public comment that he preferred the two-lane option because it would slow the speed of rush-hour traffic. He blamed the housing shortage for increasing the number of commuters coming into Ketchum.

Mayor Neil Bradshaw said the survey was not restricted to Ketchum residents and likely included commuters.

Councilwoman Amanda Breen said she would have liked to see a question on the survey regarding residency, to help provide a more accurate picture of constituent views.

Councilwoman Courtney Hamilton, speaking in favor of two lanes, said, "I think for the people of Ketchum, especially the ones who live in this section of the community, it's just not the best decision.

"I understand that that is frustrating to a lot of people who commute every day," she said. "And I am grateful for the people who work in this community."

Hamilton said she hoped to see more comprehensive outreach before making a final decision.

Breen said that she needed more time to think on the topic before voting, but she was leaning toward a two-lane option.

Hutchinson tried twice to make a motion to deny a four-lane configuration, but no council member seconded his motions. Councilman Spencer Cordovano was absent.

atheophilus@mtexpress.com

Andrew Theophilus

From: Pierce Scranton <piercescranton@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 8:28 AM

To: Participate

Subject: Warm Springs Zoning change

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed

City Council and the mayor have heard overwhelming opposition to the proposed zoning changes for the Warms Springs neighborhood. They have **not** listened. They appear determined to change the zoning to fit their perceptions of what they want, despite this overwhelming opposition. Why did we meet repeatedly? Time after time, standing room only in opposition. And now they're scheduled to vote on the **same** increased density we residents of Warm Springs opposed. Even the vocal Irene St. residents were ignored; they';ve been singled out to be "high density," despite being completely built out.

Voting in favor of this will create traffic hazards, parking hazards, affect wild life, create more urban pollution for Warm Springs Creek, and create a traffic and fire-trap for residents with only one way in, one way out. It will produce litigation to overturn to new zoning because City Council ignored their own electorate, instead, they did what they wanted.

City Council is no longer reflecting the will of its electorate. There has been an even greater overwhelming opposition to the two-lane plan from Serenade to the bridge. ITD is constructing a four-lane entry. But despite over 86% of the surveyed residents being opposed to this, someone decided they needed "for our own good" to chop the lanes, add bike paths that are not necessary (there's already a bike path that runs from Ketchum to Hailey) because they're going to create a bottle neck and force people to slow down. Ignoring their own survey is rationalized by the unfounded statement, "There were probably lots of non-Ketchum residents who voted." What proof? It was your own survey.

For God's sake, listen to your electorate.

Pierce Scranton

From: Kim Nalen <kim.nalen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:44 PM

To: Participate

Subject: 4 lane stripping - the numbers don't lie

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed

I can believe this is even up for debate.

The community has spoken.

1. KBAC survey: 92% respondents favor 4 lanes 2. City of Ketchum survey 86.64% of 2094 respondents favor 4 lanes

This isn't just a Ketchum issue. As stated in the mountain express KBAC ad, 8400 cars travel into Ketchum each day and I am one of those cars! How could you make a decision based solely of people who live in Ketchum and don't commute from the south? Any decision other than the 4 lane option would be irresponsible to the entire county and beyond. Just look at the numbers! PLEASE!

Kim Nalen

From: Bette Gower <bgower2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:36 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** 4 lanes or 2

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Ketchum government keeps forgetting that "Ketchum is the GATEWAY to a very large playground".

Most people want to drive safely through your town. They simple want to take their boats, large & small RV's, motor homes towing trailers with all their toys, mountain bike riders with large trailers & dirt bike trailers AND GO PLAY IN THE GREAT Sawtooth Natural Forest.

You are a GATEWAY, make the main road easy to negotiate not an obstacle course. For a town that survives on tourism you sure are rude to tourist just trying to travel safely through your town.

Sent from my iPad

From: kristopher gergen < kristopher.gergen@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 6:09 PM

To: Participate

Subject: 4 lane/2 lane comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

We absolutely need 4 lanes without a doubt. Realize, this area has grown and will only continue to grow. To bottleneck the road to 2 lanes is outrageous. Look at the traffic now, and it's not even that busy right now. The fact that the workforce has to add 1 or 2 hours more commuting on top of their 30 minute plus day to day is unacceptable. This harms free time with families and add frustrations in an already stressful environment. It's easy for the Ketchum residents and retirees to not worry about it, but with work and school families it is so stressful. People are starting to lose their cool, and are starting to drive recklessly due to frustration. I don't blame them. Some of us have to make multiple trips north and south. If you're worried about the environmental impact, just think about all the idling vehicles sitting there for hours....4 lanes is NEEDED and wanted. What about emergency situations when there is a bad crash north or south? Bad road conditions in winter? We have a multimillion dollar bike path right next to the highway to use. 4 lanes are needed from Bellevue though Ketchum without a doubt. We are not living in the 1950's anymore. Thank you!

From: Watson, Victor (CCI-Central Region) <Victor.Watson@cox.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 6:39 PM

To: martha.burke@haileycityhall.org; kaz.thea@haileycityhall.org;

heidi.husbands@haileycityhall.org; dustin.stone@haileycityhall.org;

juan.martinez@haileycityhall.org; Neil Bradshaw; Amanda Breen; Participate; Tripp

Hutchinson; Spencer Cordovano; phendricks@sunvalleyidaho.gov;

mgriffith@sunvalleyidaho.gov; ksaks@sunvalleyidaho.gov;

dmadaras@sunvalleyidaho.gov; mburchmore@sunvalleyidaho.gov;

cgiordani@bellevueidaho.us; dshay@bellevueidaho.us; tdavis@bellevueidaho.us;

jobenauf@bellevueidaho.us; swrede@bellevueidaho.us

Cc: Cherp, Guy (CCI-Central Region)

Subject: Invitation: 2025 Cox Charities Grant Awards Luncheon – September 4, 2025

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mayors and Council Members,

On behalf of **Guy Cherp, Market Vice President of Cox Communications**, and our Cox employees, I am honored to invite you to the **2025 Cox Charities Grant Awards Luncheon**.

On **Thursday, September 4, 2025**, Cox Charities will host a luncheon at our Cox Communications office in Ketchum to celebrate and award **five Wood River Valley nonprofit organizations** with our 2025 Community Investment Grants. In total, **\$15,000** will be distributed by Cox Charities—our employee-funded foundation that has proudly invested in local communities since 2006.

Each year, these Community Investment Grants support organizations whose programs strengthen our valley in the areas of STEM in K-12, environmental sustainability, and local housing needs. What makes this program unique is that it is entirely **funded and guided by Cox employees**, who give their own money and determine where the dollars go.

Event Details

What: 2025 Community Investment Grant Awards Luncheon When: Thursday, September 4, 2025, | 12:00–2:00 p.m. Where: Cox Communications, 340 Lewis Street, Ketchum

We would be honored by your presence as we recognize this year's recipients and celebrate the collective impact of our employees and the nonprofits who make our valley stronger.

Please RSVP by Tuesday, September 2 to Victor Watson at victor.watson@cox.com.

Since 2006, Cox Charities has awarded more than **\$8.6 million** in grants across the markets we serve. Last year's recipients included the Blaine County Education Foundation, The Space, The Spot, Higher Ground, and the Senior Connection. This year's awardees continue that legacy of service and dedication to the well-being of our community.

We hope you will join us for this celebration.

Warm regards,

Victor W Watson
Sales and Marketing Manager Sun Valley, ID

wictor, watson @cox, com

"Most folks are about as happy as they make up their minds to be."

Abraham Lincoln



From: muffy ritz <muffyritz@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 12:14 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** 4 lane striping

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Hello City Council...

I advocate for 4 lane striping across the Trail Creek bridge. It makes the most sense and most people I've talked to would agree!

Thank you, Muffy Ritz

Sent from Muffy

From: Kim Nalen <kim.nalen@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 12:18 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Fwd: 4 lane stripping - the numbers don't lie

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

There was a typo in my first email that has been corrected below. Can you please resubmit? The first line should've stated "I CAN'T believe this is even open for debate." Thank you,

Kim Nalen

From: Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>

Date: August 29, 2025 at 11:11:04 AM MDT **To:** Kim Nalen < Kim.nalen@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: 4 lane stripping - the numbers don't lie

Thank you for your email Kim,

Your public comment will go to City Council for their next meeting on 09/02/25.

Regards,

CITY OF KETCHUM COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TEAM P.O. Box 2315 | 191 Fifth St. W. | Ketchum, ID 83340 o: 208.726.3841 | f: 208.726.7812 participate@ketchumidaho.org | ketchumidaho.org

----Original Message-----

From: Kim Nalen < kim.nalen@gmail.com > Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 9:44 PM

To: Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org> Subject: 4 lane stripping - the numbers don't lie

I can't believe this is even up for debate.

The community has spoken.

1. KBAC survey: 92% respondents favor 4 lanes 2. City of Ketchum survey 86.64% of 2094 respondents favor 4 lanes

This isn't just a Ketchum issue. As stated in the mountain express KBAC ad, 8400 cars travel into Ketchum each day and I am one of those cars! How

could you make a decision based solely of people who live in Ketchum and don't commute from the south? Any decision other than the 4 lane option would be irresponsible to the entire county and beyond.

Just look at the numbers! PLEASE!

Kim Nalen

From: Joel Jarolimek <joelskisv@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 12:21 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** 4 lanes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to support 4 traffic lanes over the trail creek bridge. For the reasons outlined by the KBAC. Also, living here for 40 years I've never really seen a speeding problem coming into Ketchum. I imagine the bikers during the summer months who really want to go that way could get off their bikes and walk the couple hundred feet with their bikes and remount on the other side. Also of course there are many more desirable routes already to bike into town. Hailey and Bellevue with much wider main streets seem to control their speed just fine with traffic lights, speed limit signs and enforcement. The workers who have to come and go everyday deserve to have their work drive be as smooth as possible. It seems that zippering the lanes from 4 to 2 each direction causes more aggravation and aggressive driving problems than it's worth. Joel Jarolimek Sent from my iPad

From: Sue Toeniskoetter <suetoe1@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:31 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** 4 Lane Striping

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Dear City of Ketchum:

I would like to urge you to go ahead with the planned 4 lane striping for Highway 75 through the Ketchum downtown area. I believe that the 2 lane option would only create a bottleneck and encourage cars to seek shortcuts through residential neighborhoods.

Calming of traffic can be accomplished by having a reduced speed limit of 25 MPH north of Serenade Lane. This seems to work exceptionally well for the town of Hailey which has a much larger downtown area than Ketchum, yet at all times of the day traffic moves in a calm and controlled manner through town.

Respectfully, Sue Toeniskoetter W Ketchum resident

Sent from my iPad

To: Participate@ketchum.idaho.gov

Dear Members of the City Council,

RE: Authorize Stripping of Trail Creek Bridge to Four Lanes

SVED would strongly encourage the City to support the striping of the Trail Creek Bridge to four lanes with ITD. The rationale for this recommendation is as follows:

Reducing Commuter Delays

Nearly every day, five days a week all year long, in excess of 9,000 people cross this bridge to get to and from Ketchum along Highway 75. They rely on the Trail Creek Bridge to get to work, bring their children to school, access recreational opportunities and essential business services. A two-lane configuration would simply be inadequate for the volume of traffic that utilizes this route. As demonstrated by the current ongoing construction project, long lines of cars during peak hours have become a common frustration, resulting in wasted time, increased stress, and, most concerningly, missed opportunities.

A four-lane bridge will significantly reduce congestion and commuter delays. With two lanes in each direction, the natural flow of traffic will improve, reducing bottlenecks and allowing workers and residents to move more efficiently across our city. This improvement is not just a matter of convenience—it is essential for ensuring that our city remains a desirable place to live and work.

Increasing Worker Productivity

Nearly 4,000 of these bridge users are commuters to/from Ketchum. SVED estimates that the loss in productivity for this segment of users exceeds \$50 million on an annual basis based on current delays of 61 minutes each way. However, the impact of these daily delays extends well beyond personal inconvenience for commuters. Lost time on the road translates directly into lost productivity, which, in turn, affects economic output and competitiveness.

Maintaining Reasonable Costs of Goods and Services

The free and efficient movement of goods is just as important as that of people. Delivery trucks and service vehicles would also be subject to delays caused by the narrower bridge. These delays would drive up fuel costs, increase vehicle wear and tear, and reduce the efficiency of logistics operations.

Local businesses would be left with little choice but to pass these increased costs on to consumers, resulting in higher prices for goods and services throughout the city. By optimizing the Trail Creek Bridge, we will help limit inflationary cost increases for our residents.

Supporting the Needs of the Business Community

Our city's business community has voiced its concerns about potential limitations imposed by the current bridge configuration. Based on a SVED survey of 60+ business owners representing 600 employees, the current

road construction project is causing a bottom line profit reduction of between 10 and 30% for the majority of those surveyed. A Ketchum Business Advisory Committee survey found in excess of 90% in favor of a 4 lane vs a 2 lane reconfiguration. From retail and tourism to logistics and services, companies depend on reliable infrastructure to move goods, people and customers quickly and efficiently. The Trail Creek Bridge if stripped to 2 lanes would be a choke point that hinders growth and deters investment.

Safeguarding Public Safety and Quality of Life

Traffic congestion is not only a matter of economics and convenience but also of public safety. Emergency response times are compromised when vehicles are stuck on a narrow bridge, putting lives at unnecessary risk. A wider bridge will ensure that first responders can reach those in need quickly and efficiently, no matter the time of day.

The safety of the Gem Street neighborhoods has been raised as a rational for 2 lane configuration. There are many workarounds for this including reduced speeds coming into the Trail Creek Bridge, and possible alternative walking/bike route connections directly with Leadville Ave. Council also has to weigh the concerns of a relatively small number of homeowners against the much larger Ketchum resident population and businesses that generate employment and substantial tax payments.

Finally, less time spent in traffic means more time at home with family, greater participation in community events, and a higher overall quality of life for all our residents.

Maintaining Fiscal Responsibility

The costs of doing nothing and retaining the 2 lane only capacity at Trail Creek are likely to be far higher in the long run. Ongoing congestion, lost productivity, and increased costs for businesses and consumers will exact a heavy toll if not addressed proactively.

Advocating now for a four-lane Trail Creek Bridge is a prudent measure that will yield immediate dividends. There is no need to prevaricate any further on this issue.

Respectfully

Harry

Harry Griffith, ED Sun Valley Economic Development

August 28, 2025

From: esinnott49@gmail.com

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 4:17 PM

To: Participate

Subject: 4 lanes vs 2 lanes over Trail Creek

To: The Ketchum City Council and His Honor the Mayor.

Re: 2 lanes vs 4 lanes entrance to Ketchum

I have been a resident of our community since 1973 and a Ketchum property owner since the mid 80's. I have lived in Ketchum and started and operated several businesses. I now live in the county and commute to Ketchum most days. While not residents, we commuters are part of the Ketchum community and contribute to its vitality. I do feel that our opinion needs to be heard and considered.

Please consider the following.

- 1. I have many friends in the community who are business owners. They are losing employees because of the frustration and cost of long commutes. Replacing them has proven very difficult.
- 2. Contractors who support the Ketchum community plumbers, landscapers, builders, roofers, electricians etc., ... who travel to Ketchum are incurring millions of dollars in travel expenses. Some are now adding a Ketchum tariff to their bills to offset their costs.
- 3. The argument that we need to slow traffic down as it passes through town with 2 lanes is weak. Ketchum has 3 stop lights

on Main St and a speed limit of 25 mph to slow people down. On the other hand, the congestion increases the anxiety of commuters, residents and visitors and hastens their drive through town.

- 4. I know of a lot of people who live south of Ketchum, are now avoiding shopping, exercising and dining in Ketchum because of the traffic. Additionally, Tourists visiting the Sawtooth Valley are now choosing to bypass Ketchum because of the traffic.
- 5. The latest batch of data on Wood River Valley tourism shows that lodging occupancy in July and August has fallen short of early expectations. Are tourists avoiding Ketchum because of the traffic????
- 6. Some businesses have embraced a remote office model rather than have their employees face the long commute and others have moved their offices to Hailey. This may have an impact on service in Ketchum.
- 7. The residents of the Gem Streets concerns should certainly be considered as they are part of our community. There is a sidewalk planned regardless of the number of lanes which will safely allow them access Ketchum. (assuming it the sidewalk is plowed in the winter.) Perhaps a crosswalk with flashing lights on Gem Street and Highway 75 should be

considered. It would allow children and skiers to safely cross and have access to the lifts and the bike path.

- 8. I have witnessed the anxiety, road rage, frustration, and anger of 8400 drivers that spend hours each day stuck in traffic, which is not good for our community psyche.
- 9. Finally, there are the environmental and health considerations of hundreds of cars and trucks stalled in traffic for hours emitting carbon dioxide.

In conclusion, the environmental concerns, the increased costs to the community, the frustration, and the impact on employment and services should lead you to the conclusion that what is best for Ketchum is a 4 lane bridge over Trail Creek and maybe some subtle tweaks to help the Gem Streets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ed Sinnott

From: Donn Wonnell <dtwonnell@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 6:11 PM

To: Participate
Subject: 4 - Lane Striping

Constricting traffic on the only State Highway and major thoroughfare north and south from Ketchum requires balancing the hardships imposed on those impacted by such an action.

The hardship imposed on workers is obvious and substantial. Two decades of efforts at affordable housing have made no discernible dent in providing an alternative to commuting for the many employees who daily commute to jobs in and around Ketchum.

The hardship imposed on motorists generally -- not just employees, but tourists, commercial vehicles, and local residents -- is palpable. Broadway Run has become a congested on-ramp for cars seeking to circumvent (unsuccessfully) the traffic backups on Highway 75.

The hardship imposed on businesses in Ketchum is demonstrable. Throttling access by customers to the restaurants and stores in Ketchum has demonstrably caused harm to those businesses, without which the quality of life in this community would degrade.,

What is the comparable hardship to a bicyclist? The many marked streets in downtown Ketchum, the Wood River Trail system, the Harriman Trail, the Galena Lodge system (37 trails), and many others offer scores if not hundreds of miles of readily available cycling. What is the overpowering need for these three blocks of cycling access that will inconvenience thousands of motorists daily? The KBAC asserts that 8,400 cars travel the path of Highway 75 each day. What is the comparable number of bicyclists who will be inconvenienced by having to go a few blocks to transit north and south, from Galena to Bellevue?

Where does the balance of the public interest -- <u>ALL</u> of the public --actually lie? Not with creating this bottleneck to satisfy the very few at the expense of the overwhelming majority of residents in and travelers to the Wood River Valley.

Donn T. Wonnell 110 Comfort Circle Ketchum, ID 83340

From: Sam Solie <solie.sam@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 8:36 AM

To: Participate

Subject: In support of 4 lanes on the bridge

Hey there. I'm Sam Solie. I live in East Fork with my wife and two kids, age 4 and 6. They both go to school in Ketchum. While the traffic has been hard to stomach this summer, I keep reminding myself of how important this work is for long term well-being of our community. Yet when I read about the bridge into town potentially being painted as 3 lanes, my blood boils. It makes me feel like all this short term pain will be for no long term gain, as the bottleneck into town will remain. Please please please keep in mind the thousands of people who make our town run coming from down south. They far outweigh the tens or hundreds of people that may use the bike and walk lanes into town. Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to email me back to talk more.

Sam Solie

C: 919-215-3345

From: Michelle Stennett <stennett.michelle@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:41 AM

To: Participate; Spencer Cordovano; Tripp Hutchinson; Amanda Breen; Morgan Landers;

Abby Rivin; Allison Kennedy

Subject: Idaho Water Law, Blaine and Basin 37 Municipal Water Right

Attachments: Idaho Water, Oldest Municipal Water Rights by City, County Basin 37.docx; Idaho Water

Law2.docx

Happy Labor Day weekend,

During the August 12, 2025 Planning & Zoning meeting, my name was referenced in regards to Idaho water law and the commission was informed that I was incorrect in my knowledge of water rights. A commissioner also requested that accurate information be provided to verify my statements. No one has contacted me, so you are receiving these documents to educate the city of Ketchum and the public.

A summary is below and attachments with facts/proof accompany this email.

These are the directors in the Idaho Department of Water Resources with whom I spoke to give you definitively accurate information:

IDWR Discussions:

August 18, 2025 Justin Scherer-Water Rights, Idaho Office of Emergency Mgmt in IDWR

August 18, 2025 Steve Vozosky-Compliance Bureau, Water Distribution, Succession & Order

August 18, 2025 Shelley Keene-IDWR Deputy Director, Headed the Basin 37 Groundwater Management Plan Agreement

August 19, 2025 Mat Weaver-IDWR Director & Director of Idaho Office of Emergency Mgmt

Cory Skinner-Water monitoring, Conservation efficiencies, Meters, Annexations

In essence, Idaho's priority water rights system is a structured hierarchy based on who started using water first (appropriation and beneficial use). The priority date is your ticket in line—a ticket that carries weight during shortages, must be actively used to retain it, and is formalized through adjudication. The law balances individual rights with public policy, supported deeply by Idaho's constitution.

According to the Idaho Department of Water Resources, in a water crisis (emergencies, drought, shortages, water calls, curtailments, lawsuits), municipalities can be restricted because delivery is based on municipal priority water rights. This is already happening in other parts of the state and Ketchum is not immune.

If asked "which towns have the most senior (earliest) city supply rights," Hailey is the clear winner among the counties in our basin due to its 1880 municipal spring right. The rest are generally 1900s, with some (like Bliss) much later.

City of Hailey has one of the most senior municipal rights in the basin: Indian Creek Springs (Water Right 37-296A), **2.62 cfs, priority April 1, 1880—making Hailey unusually senior for municipal supply.

Next in the watershed basin, Shoshone: Historical records indicate that in 1882, Shoshone laid claim to 60 inches of Little Wood River water for domestic purposes, which became its municipal water supply. This diversion was managed by the Idaho & Oregon Land Improvement Co.

Therefore, it's reasonable to infer that circa 1882 is likely the earliest municipal priority date for Shoshone.

Ketchum & Sun Valley Water & Sewer District (SVWSD): municipal supplies are primarily groundwater rights with mid- to late-20th-century (and newer) priorities (e.g., permits like 37-21465 with a 2005 priority). These are junior to the 19th- and early-20th-century surface rights and to Hailey's 1880 spring right.

Blaine County — Hailey is the standout (1880 spring right). Other Blaine towns (Ketchum, Sun Valley Water & Sewer District, Bellevue, Carey) mainly have municipal groundwater/spring rights established later (predominantly 20th century), though the basin contains many very old irrigation/surface rights (especially on Silver Creek) dating 1883 or earlier—those are largely agricultural, not municipal.

Again, according to IDWR:

Taxpayers pay for groundwater management plans to get water to senior surface users. Municipalities in the agreement area are bound to the plan.

Cities and counties should require that new ownership of water rights be part of the closing documents/titles when properties are sold.

Idaho Statute/Water Law Title 42, Chapter 6 is the foundation in the Constitution.

- Communities should be aware of priority dates, not use
- Idaho Law: First in Time, First in Right regardless of user
- Municipalities in Basin 37 are obligated to the terms under the Groundwater Management Plan Agreement.
- Eminent Domain has consequences, is expensive, and ripe for lawsuits (ie Eastern Idaho, Snake River lawsuits)
- Hailey has senior municipal water rights, all others in Blaine County are junior.

Ketchum should take water efficiencies seriously in any future planning, including the Comprehensive Plan. Ironically, Hailey, which has the most senior municipal right in all of Basin 37, has already made conservation water measures and has the smart foresight to include this in their Comprehensive Plan.

It would be appropriate that further questions or confusion be directed to the Idaho Department of Water Resources before dismissing the data.

Respectfully,

Michelle Stennett

Key Elements of Idaho's Priority Water Rights

1. **Appropriation Doctrine** — "First in Time, First in Right"

In Idaho, water rights are governed by the appropriation doctrine. To secure a right, an individual must divert public water and apply it to a beneficial use (e.g., irrigation, domestic use, livestock, hydropower, recreation).

The priority date—when water was first put to beneficial use—determines who gets water during shortages: those with older (senior) rights are served first; junior rights only receive water if enough remains.

2. Beneficial Use & Diversion

Without both diversion (infrastructure like ditches or pumps) and beneficial use, no water right exists.

"Beneficial use" includes a wide range of uses—from domestic and agricultural to fish and wildlife.

3. No Riparian Rights

Unlike some states, Idaho does not recognize riparian rights (rights based solely on land adjoining water). All rights must be acquired through appropriation.

4. Forfeiture & Resumption

Water rights can be forfeited if unused for five consecutive years, unless exceptions apply (e.g., use in the water bank, conservation efforts, mining activities, or circumstances beyond the owner's control).

A resumption doctrine allows a lapsed right to be reinstated with its original priority date—provided no third party has claimed it in the meantime.

5. Surface vs. Groundwater & Conjunctive Management

Idaho manages both surface water and groundwater under the same appropriation system. If junior groundwater use injures senior surface rights, the senior rights holder may issue a delivery call to demand restriction or mitigation.

6. Adjudication

The state uses water rights adjudication, a court process that determines and defines each water right's elements—such as priority date and volume—in an official decree.

7. Constitutional Foundation

Idaho's Constitution (Article XV) affirms that:

Water use is a public use regulated by the state.

Appropriation of unappropriated natural waters for beneficial use must be allowed, with priority given based on date. It also sets preferences—e.g., domestic use over agricultural, agricultural over manufacturing, and so on.

It guarantees protection of continued use once established, under reasonable conditions prescribed by law.

Summary: How Priority Works in Practice

Securing a Water Right

You must legally divert water and put it to a recognized beneficial use. This assigns you a priority date, which places you in line during water shortages.

Benefiting from Seniority

During drought or low flow, those with the oldest priority dates get water first. Newer (junior) users only receive water after seniors have filled their allocations.

Maintaining Rights

Use your right consistently. If left unused for five years without exception, it may be forfeited—unless you can prove continuous use or fit under legal exceptions.

Handling Groundwater Disputes

If junior groundwater use reduces supply for senior rights, the senior holder can submit a delivery call, prompting required mitigation or curtailment.

• Official Recognition via Adjudication

Courts, via adjudication, determine each water right's scope—including priority, quantity, and uses—and issue a decree formalizing it.

Final Thought

In essence, Idaho's priority water rights system is a structured hierarchy based on who started using water first (appropriation and beneficial use). The priority date is your ticket in line—a ticket that carries weight during shortages, must be actively used to retain it, and is formalized through adjudication. The law balances individual rights with public policy, supported deeply by Idaho's constitution.

Here's the short version for Basin 37 (Big & Little Wood + Silver Creek)—who's "first in line" when there isn't enough water:

Oldest surface-water rights on the rivers/creeks are senior. Administration in Basin 37 has long followed pure "first-in-time" priority—separately for (a) Big Wood above Magic, (b) Big Wood below Magic, and (c) Little Wood/Silver Creek. Seniors in the Little Wood system trace back to the 1880s; priority cuts are made within each sub-area.

Big Wood Canal Company (BWCC) holds the dominant storage rights in Magic Reservoir—storage priorities 1905–1920, plus natural-flow rights (e.g., 1897 and 1908). In dry years, these storage rights outrank junior groundwater and later municipal pumping.

City of Hailey has one of the most senior municipal rights in the basin: Indian Creek Springs (Water Right 37-296A), **2.62 cfs, priority April 1, 1880—making Hailey unusually senior for municipal supply.

Ketchum & Sun Valley Water & Sewer District (SVWSD): municipal supplies are primarily groundwater rights with mid- to late-20th-century (and newer) priorities (e.g., permits like 37-21465 with a 2005 priority). These are junior to the 19th- and early-20th-century surface rights and to Hailey's 1880 spring right.

Bellevue: operates a municipal system with mixed spring/groundwater rights; available records for the basin modeling and recent moratorium proceedings confirm Bellevue's municipal pumping is administered with the rest of WD37 and is junior to older surface priorities. (Exact right-by-right priorities vary by right.)

Carey (and other small towns/companies): municipal/communal rights exist but are generally younger than the 1880s surface seniors; individual right priorities differ by source. (Example Basin-37 records show Carey-area spring/groundwater filings with 20th-century+ dates.)

Shoshone: Historical records indicate that in 1882, Shoshone laid claim to 60 inches of Little Wood River water for domestic purposes, which became its municipal water supply. This diversion was managed by the Idaho & Oregon Land Improvement Co.

Therefore, it's reasonable to infer that circa 1882 is likely the earliest municipal priority date for Shoshone..

Gooding: September 28, 1928 — Water Right No. 37-4080 (municipal) is the City of Gooding's oldest municipal right. Short answer first: among towns in those five counties, the clearest, oldest documented municipal priority I can find is Hailey (Blaine County)—its Indian Creek Spring right (No. 37-296A) carries a priority date of April 1, 1880, which is extremely senior for a city supply in the region. City of Hailey, ID

Here's the quick county-by-county picture based on publicly available records:

Blaine County — Hailey is the standout (1880 spring right). Other Blaine towns (Ketchum, Sun Valley Water & Sewer District, Bellevue, Carey) mainly have municipal groundwater/spring rights established later (predominantly 20th century), though the basin contains many very old irrigation/surface rights (especially on Silver Creek) dating 1883 or earlier—those are largely agricultural, not municipal.

Lincoln County — Town systems (Shoshone, Richfield, Dietrich) generally have municipal rights from the early 1900s (i.e., not as old as Hailey's 1880 spring right). (General priority framework from IDWR.)

Gooding County — Municipal rights for Gooding, Wendell, Hagerman, Bliss are mostly 1900s; for a concrete example, Bliss has a decreed municipal groundwater right 37-4305 with priority 8/1/1960 (junior compared to the 1800s).

Camas County — Fairfield's municipal rights are early-to-mid-1900s (no indication of 1800s municipal priorities like Hailey's).

Jerome County — Jerome, Eden, Hazelton municipal systems are typically early 1900s vintage; again, nothing showing an 1800s municipal date here. (City and IDWR materials reference municipal administration by priority but don't show 1800s-era city rights.)

Bottom line

If you're asking "which towns have the most senior (earliest) city supply rights," Hailey is the clear winner among the listed counties due to its 1880 municipal spring right. The rest are generally 1900s, with some (like Bliss) much later.

From: Valerie Thomson <val.gregthom1@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:46 AM

To: Participate

Subject: Trail Creek Bridge

After all the construction related traffic headaches we have endured over the last several years we find it hard to believe that anyone could straight faced advocate for bike lanes on the new Trail Creek bridge. Absolutely absurd! Four lanes for vehicle traffic please.

Greg and Val Thomson Hailey

From: Alex Macdonald <alexmacdonald.home@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:59 AM

To: Participate

Subject: Highway 75 Bridge entering Ketchum from the south

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this as a request to continue developing a 4-lane bridge on highway 75 over the bridge entering Ketchum from the south. I have lived in the wood river valley since November 1979. Mostly living in Bellevue and Hailey, but also just south of Ketchum. I've attended school over the years in Ketchum, worked in Ketchum, and accessed the areas to the north of Ketchum and beyond via highway 75, aka the scenic byway, for many decades. Like many who are true locals to this valley, I've seen a lot of change. Whether you're an advocate for this change, against it, or ambivalent, there is no question traffic has become a central issue. To the point I have spent much of the last 5 years avoiding driving north to Ketchum because of it. Primary reason being the bottleneck that is the bridge leading into Ketchum from the south. We've endured years of painfully slow-paced construction that has exacerbated this issue (I'm a shift worker and for the life of me can't figure out why road construction in this valley can't do that too like the rest of the world), but...the pot at the end of the previable rainbow is that the bridge leading into Ketchum will FINALLY be made into 4 lanes. Now I am hearing that there are a select few elitists who would rather see bike lanes (umm there's already a bike path ya know) and can't help but to think these few must either be transplants who've moved here recently from some other posh place, part time residents, someone who never has to work or drive for work, or lives under a rock. Regardless...the fact that we as longtime residents and people who must work and drive to work for a living, and must live south of Ketchum due to our smaller bank accounts, but still want to drive THROUGH Ketchum to enjoy all this valley has to offer in the way of outdoor recreation (yes I'm a lifelong skier, hiker, climber and advocate of nature); must be forced to our knees to beg the upper echelons of Ketchum to keep the promise of 4 lanes into Ketchum, is asinine.

So in short...wake up and get off your high horse. This valley and the scenic byway isn't yours, its ours, all of us. Keep that bridge 4 lanes and share the convenience of having the north valley at your fingertips with the entire valley. It's neither sunny nor admirable to be pretentious with our valley assets.

Alex

From: Donna Shahbaz <shahbazdmp@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:56 AM

To: Participate

Subject: Comprehensive plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

Hi, Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to comment on the Comprehensive plan draft. I appreciate all the time and effort that has gone into the drafts. However, I don't think it should be voted on yet. I believe there are still concerns to address.

Page 3. employment trends. It would be nice to know what percentage of Ketchum's employees live in the Wood River Valley.

Page 18. Vibrant downtown. Downtown should also be a place people can reach easily by car (unless you want us to drive to get our groceries and other heavy items in Hailey).

Page 24. Transportation Goals. There should be a goal to address severe weather conditions. It is not enough to require/educate property owners to clear ice and snow. Energy efficient snow removal options should be developed and incentivized.

Page 29. I strongly support the goals to protect the features of the City's built and natural environment.

Page 30. I strongly support policy BNE 1.5. Context sensitive development.

Page 32. BNE 2.1 Utility lines. For aesthetic, fire-safety, and resiliency reasons, I strongly support burying utility lines—Not just in new development but throughout the City. This should be a priority for KURA funds.

- BNE 2.2. For both fire safety and view corridor reasons, I strongly support hillside protections.
- BNE 2.3. Dark Sky ordinances need to be expanded to address covering huge windows at night. I hope this (as well as enforcement) is included in Action BNE.2.b

Page 35. I support policies that ensure we do not develop beyond our infrastructure capacity and that increased capacity costs are borne by the developer.

Page 39

We need more discussion on the enforcement aspects of community housing and greater transparency with regards to the demographics that occupy community housing and how that supports our workforce needs. While workforce is mentioned in the goal, neither prioritizing the Ketchum workforce nor enforcement is addressed in the listed policies. Although enforcement of policies is always expected, enforcement of deed restrictions directly impacts housing inventory and deserves extra emphasis Additionally, while the plan later mentions the need to house firefighters, it does not acknowledge other vital workforce priorities such as police, healthcare providers, and public servants. Additionally, Policy H-2.7 should include an annual survey of the salaries of key workforce personnel to ensure that they are eligible for the housing we develop.

H 1.4. Permitting ADUs should be, at a minimum, deed restricted Local (or require a community housing contribution) if our intent is to allow this increase in density to support housing.

Page 55. Resilient energy sources should include burying utility lines to the greatest extent possible. Additionally, our lobbying efforts should include seeking additional State/Federal opportunities to fund resilient infrastructure.

Page 60. Public safety. This section should also address how the tourism industry impacts the demand for public safety services and how the City will ensure that the costs of this impact are paid by tourists going forward.

Page 60. While not our only community housing goal, providing housing for first responders and other essential personnel should be a community housing policy/goal.

Page 61. I strongly support SHC 2.2 and encouraging the use of resilient building materials.

Page 68. E 1.4 Quality of life infrastructure should include parking. Additionally, given that we have both construction incentives and a specific LOT to address the housing shortage, KURA funds should focus on other infrastructure needs given our backlog.

I strongly support policy E 1.8 ensuring that ground floor areas of mixed use neighborhoods are reserved for commercial purposes.

Page 70. Transparent and Collaborative government. I appreciate the City's quick response time and the ability to provide feedback through participate.

Page 72. TCG 1.2. Do not permit topics to be discussed at council meetings that were not included on the agenda.

Ensuring that both surveys and public comment identifies whether the input is from a resident or industry stakeholder should be a transparency goal.

TCG 1.3. Expand the use of technology (such as 3D mapping) when making land use decisions.

Page 73

Improving the enforcement and transparency with regards to community housing and the prioritization of workforce housing should be a transparency policy.

Improving the budget transparency of partnerships with KURA, Air Service, and Visit Sun Valley should be a transparent budget policy.

Providing a total cost summary of all levies - both City and County - to voters prior to elections should be a budget policy.

Improving the transparency of utility costs, particularly to demonstrate that multi-family units are not paying more for water than single family homes should be addressed.

Page 75. While the Comprehensive plan acknowledges the impact of future growth on most infrastructure demands, it needs to do this with parking as well.

Page 80. I strongly support adaptive reuse and local preference.

Page 89. I support preserving opportunities for industrial uses as long as the industries are not hazardous or impact the local quality of life (ie overly loud or smelly)

Thank you for limiting building heights within LDR, MDR, HDR, and RC.

I am strongly concerned by the height and lot size possibilities associated with MUAC, MUI, RC and CMU. I would support this if the regulations made it expressly clear to developers, lawyers, etc that exceeding 2 or 3 stories, or increasing lot or density sizes is at the complete discretion of planning and zoning and the town council after a review of the building design, public comment that clearly distinguishes between residents and industry stakeholders, the building's integration into the surrounding area (to include 3D mapping available for public review), infrastructure impact, and the value of the building to the community. It should be the City's choice (on behalf of residents) to permit these increases, not the developer's right. Land owners have a right to a clear understanding of what is a permitted/certain size building for their property and what is merely a possibility given the above factors.

Page 119.

Goal T3 While I support the expansion of EV charging capacity, policies should ensure that the cost of EV charging is paid by the EV owner.

Action T-3 a. should also update the parking plan to forecast and address future parking needs (addressing projected growth) to include a parking facility.

Page 122. Action H-1i. If our intent is permitting ADUs is to increase community housing, deed restrictions should include all ADUs going forward.

Action H-2 a Should expand the possible, not guaranteed, use of density incentives.

An action should be included to review deed restrictions to eliminate loopholes and misuse.

Diverse community housing options should include an action item for enforcement and one for transparency.

Diverse community housing options should include an annual survey of key workforce salaries to ensure essential workers are eligible for planned housing.

Diverse community housing options should specifically address prioritizing workforce, first responder, and healthcare provider housing.

Page 123.

Change action H-2 e to workforce housing.

Page 128.

Goal SHC-3 should include workforce housing for health services.

Page 132

Goal TCG 3

Improve the enforcement and transparency of community housing.

Goal TCG 4

Improve budget transparency of City partners such as KURA, Air Service and Visit Sun Valley

Providing a total cost summary of all levies - both City and County - to voters prior to elections should be a budget policy.

Page 134

DT-2c. Thank you for addressing this. However, I strongly urge you to require any under 750 sq foot unit without parking to be deed restricted.

Action DT-2e. Thank you

Best regards, Donna Shahbaz.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Robert Siri <rpsiri5@gmail.com> **Sent:** Tuesday, September 2, 2025 9:41 AM

To: Participate

Subject: Com Plan Zone Changes For Warm Springs

Hello,

Warm Springs is still a special place in this valley and should not be degraded by allowing higher density zone changes. Please study the impacts on traffic, wild life, watershed, tax paying neighbors. You will find that there are locations that are better suited for affordable housing. These locations may or may not be right in town and may require some commuting but that is ok. That's how much of the world lives and works. Please work with the county as well as Bellevue and Hailey to solve housing issues in an equitable manner. It has been noted that both P&Z and city council have been tone deaf throughout this process. We don't want to hear Neil Bradshaw misquoting the opposition to up zoning in warm springs again. Please start to think outside the box and don't let your ideology get in the way of practicality.

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 2:23 AM

To: Neil Bradshaw; Spencer Cordovano; Amanda Breen; Courtney Hamilton; Tripp

Hutchinson; Participate

Subject: Public Comment KCC Meeting Sept 2 2025 - IDAHO MOUNTAIN THIEVERY

Public Comment, KCC Meeting September 2, 2025

Re:

IDAHO MOUNTAIN THIEVERY

1. On Tripp Hutchinson's Presence on Council

I object to the presence of Tripp Hutchinson on the Ketchum City Council and at its meetings. His continued role is a disgraceful affront to the rule of law, a contaminant to honest governance, and an insult to all Ketchum residents entitled to integrity in public service.

I further call out Mayor Bradshaw and Council members Cordovano, Breen, and Hamilton for their abject silence, which amounts to cowardice in the face of misconduct. Suborning corruption cannot be the hallmark of Ketchum's leadership.

I call for the immediate suspension of all Council proceedings until Mr. Hutchinson departs and the integrity of this body is restored.

2. On White Gigray Law Firm and Fire District Transfer

I call for the immediate review of the City's contract with the Canyon County law firm White Gigray and its provisions allowing for termination of the relationship due to grave, unconsented conflicts of interest.

The firm has been representing both sides of a transaction that would strip Ketchum of its entire \$10 million in fire protection assets, gifting them to a so-called "regional fire district" that no other cities are willing to join—and under terms that offer Ketchum no binding assurances in return.

Now that we know the true facts, the people of Ketchum overwhelmingly oppose this scheme as an unlawful and unconstitutional gift of public assets. Competent, unconflicted legal representation is essential, and until this transaction is dead, public opposition will not cease.

If this conflict is not addressed immediately, the public will have no choice but to bring the matter to the Idaho State Bar's Ethics Committee.

3. On Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency (KURA)

I call for the immediate dissolution of the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency (KURA), which has unlawfully deprived the public of its constitutional right to vote on capital projects requiring debt financing.

No conditions in Ketchum have ever risen to the level of "public nuisance" or "blight" as required under urban renewal law. KURA has therefore operated in violation of law since inception, enabling city leadership to avoid proper fiscal and managerial accountability.

The public demands the collapse of KURA and the return of budgetary and borrowing authority to where it belongs—with the people of Ketchum.
Sincerely,
Jim Hungelmann
Ketchum

From: Becky Smith <konasv@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 1:26 PM

To: Participate

Subject: New Trail Creek Bridge

The number of lanes should be FOUR over the new bridge along with a speed limit of 25 miles an hour from Rheinheimer Ranch through Main Street in Ketchum.

Why "bottle neck" the traffic to two lanes entering Main Street, when the flow of traffic is reaching its final destination?! Thank you for your consideration.

From: chas mangham <chasmangham21@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 2:34 PM **To:** Participate; cdmaloney21@gmail.com

Subject: 2 lanes or 4 lanes

In my opinion, the Ketchum City Council might reconsider their decision to recommend two lanes across the Trail Creek Bridge instead of four lanes to create a bottleneck south of the bridge for the benefit of stakeholders in Ketchum (slower traffic coming north into town in the morning). The cost of this benefit is the expense of adding 15 to 30 minutes to the commute of the 90% of workers in Ketchum who come from Hailey, Bellevue, Richfield and Shoshone (source: video at shoshoneproject.org). The employers pay for the extra travel time and employees pay in lost time with their families.

One employee of Mountain Rides who commutes from Richfield ID commented in the video that during the current Highway 75 construction project that their commute to Ketchum takes 3 hours. As a long-time citizen in the Valley, I have observed that a bottleneck may permanently decrease travel from south of Ketchum for shopping at Ketchum businesses as well.

The Covic pandemic was a time when the politicians in all the towns of the Valley worked cooperatively for the benefit of all. Thank you for prioritizing the entire Valley community during that difficult time. Optimizing travel along the only north-south highway will benefit all Valley residents and businesses. I recognize that the Ketchum City Council's primary constituency is the citizens of Ketchum; however, in this case I hope that the Council considers the larger community and recommends 4-lanes across the Trail Creek Bridge. We all want what's best for the Valley. Please contact me with any questions.

Chas Mangham Hailey ID

Sent from Outlook

From: Malie Kopplin, MD <mkopplin@co.blaine.id.us>

Sent: Monday, September 1, 2025 10:53 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** Bridge Lanes

Ketchum City Council:

I am writing to voice my support for four lanes over the bridge into Ketchum. As a citizen who drives up and down the valley, the congestion during this construction has been unbearable. To only then have two lanes over the bridge simply moves the bottle neck north and makes all of this suffering for nothing.

As a county official, I am here to say I have serious public safety concerns about having a continued bottleneck at the bridge. We have already seen ambulances having significant delays getting to the hospital or returning to service - and this will only continue as this county grows. There will also inevitably be people peeling off in the gem streets or to the west, increasing congestion in residential areas and having more potential for accidents with pedestrians. Keep in mind that this bottle neck and congestion will not just affect the commuters that come from the south each day - the afternoon congestion backs up into the city of Ketchum, causing severe traffic and delays for all.

We already have a bike path. The four lane plan includes a sidewalk which would allow any cyclists to hop off and walk their bikes across if they choose to ride a bike.

I urge you to make the decision that deals with the reality of the growth of this county and looks forward, not backward.

Sincerely,

Malie Kopplin, MD Blaine County EMS Medical Director mkopplin@co.blaine.id.us

From: Edith Iler-Wiedemann <edithilerwiedemann@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 1, 2025 12:17 PM

To: Participate

Subject: 3rd Draft Comp Plan - Pls leave Short Swing & mid Warm Springs in existing LDR

Dear City,

After attending meetings since March, it seems obvious that you would have *heard* in multiple forums an overwhelming request from ALL CITIZENS of KETCHUM to leave the density OUT of our oldest neighborhoods.

Are you listening?

You have been charged to represent your constituents, *not* tell us how to invest and where to live. We want to preserve the character and charm of our neighborhood in Warm Springs.

PLEASE LISTEN.

If you leave our neighborhood as *low density residential* as we have asked via lawyers and in countless letters and public comment, you can still work on creation of PUDs to help ease housing. You KNOW this.

Get out of the housing business. It is being better managed by philanthropic and caring private citizens who are working hard to create more units for essential workers, and are being successful. Your BCHA should be disbanded and the money allotted to grants that the <u>non-profits</u> who are being successful can use.

Again, I strongly encourage your Council & P&Z to remove the medium density designation from our residential streets of Short Swing, Belmont and Hillside. It is obvious where you "drew the line" how you look upon our neighborhood. Keep the density where it belongs, at the base of the mountain for tourism (River Run has huge potential here) and in the City Core. Or start real negotiations with south valley cities and work together.

It would be irresponsible and disingenuous to continue blindly promoting such high density in our neighborhood when you have not provided any traffic, fire safety, water and infrastructure studies. You have heard wise citizens request this, and 3-D representations, but not delivered.

It would be better to RE-start this entire process after the election and genuinely involve our community in discussion, outreach, working meetings over a longer expanse of time and NOT scheduled after holidays or during major busy times (World Cup, Christmas vacation, summer vacation).

You know what you need to do, and what is right. Time to acknowledge the citizens, please.

Edith ILER 108 Short Swing Ln

From: Rob Freeman <robsfitnesstraining@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 1, 2025 9:38 AM

To: Participate Subject: 4 lanes

Serenade to River to unquestionably be 4 lanes! 2 lanes makes no sense at all?

From: Pat higgins <pathiggins@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 31, 2025 7:20 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Fwd: FLUM Comp plan public comment

Dear Mayor and Ketchum City Council,

I googled Chat GPT about infrastructure and overdevelopment in a Ski Town. Pretty much everything I have been harping on in the majority of my public comments.

1. Transportation & Roads

- Limited mountain highways and passes = congestion during peak weekends.
- o Parking demand far exceeds capacity.
- Wear-and-tear from snow/ice maintenance is costly.

2. Water & Sewer

- Ski resorts and growing neighborhoods require huge water volumes (especially for snowmaking).
- Wastewater treatment plants often undersized for peak tourist surges.
- Risk of pollution into streams and aquifers.

3. Energy Systems

- Seasonal spikes in heating and resort operations strain grids.
- o Remote locations mean limited redundancy in power supply.

4. Housing & Services

- Hospitals, schools, and emergency services designed for small populations struggle with seasonal visitors.
- Housing shortages for essential workers (nurses, teachers, firefighters).

5. Environmental Infrastructure

- Stormwater management is often outdated runoff damages rivers and habitats.
- o Ski slope grading, roads, and new subdivisions can fragment ecosystems.

🔀 Risks of Overdevelopment

1. Loss of Local Character

 "Aspenization": towns lose affordability, authenticity, and become playgrounds for the wealthy.

2. Sprawl & Habitat Loss

Development creeps into forests, wetlands, and wildlife corridors.

3. Car Dependency

 Scattered vacation homes outside town centers increase traffic and emissions.

4. Economic Fragility

 Too much reliance on luxury tourism and real estate → less resilience in downturns or bad snow years.

5. Climate Vulnerability

o Overbuilt ski areas may become stranded assets if snowpack declines.

Strategies to Manage Infrastructure & Overdevelopment

1. Smarter Growth Boundaries

- Define **urban growth limits** to concentrate development in village/town cores.
- Cluster development to preserve open space and reduce road/water/sewer expansion costs.

2. Infrastructure Investment with Sustainability

- Upgrade wastewater plants with **peak-season capacity buffers**.
- Incentivize energy-efficient buildings and renewable energy to reduce grid demand
- Expand transit systems (shuttles, gondolas, park-and-ride) instead of adding parking lots.

3. Development Controls

- Cap or phase new luxury/second-home projects to pace growth with infrastructure upgrades.
- Require impact fees on new development to fund water, sewer, housing, and transit.
- Use transfer of development rights (TDRs) to shift growth away from fragile lands.

4. Housing Balance

- Prioritize workforce housing projects over speculative second homes.
- Implement short-term rental limits to prevent hollowed-out neighborhoods.

5. Environmental Safeguards

- Require **low-impact stormwater systems** (permeable pavement, green roofs, wetlands).
- Enforce wildlife corridor protections in zoning and subdivision approvals.
- Cap water-intensive development (e.g., snowmaking quotas tied to watershed health).

In short: Infrastructure must be **planned for peak loads**, and growth must be **paced and channeled** to avoid undermining the very environment and community fabric that make ski towns special.

I am very concerned about the water table. I'm repeating myself when I say "Just because we live at the source, doesn't mean we can use it all up for the folks in the south valley!

I am also very concerned about wildfires and the evacuation route out of Warm Springs Canyon. We had been dropped by our insurance company two years ago because of the extreme fire risk factor in Blaine County.

The Ketchum Post Office is substandard and needs an upgrade, it can't keep up with the population we have now.

The hospital is 20 years old and does not have the capacity for more growth.

The Multi -use / bike Path on Warm Springs is dangerous. I was nearly wiped out by a woman who whizzed past me on her super duper - moped / e-bikeno ringing of a bell or her wearing a helmet. I was going 13 and she was at least 20! This problem will only get worse.

We support the 2014 comp. Manage our population that we currently have.

Respectfully,

Pat Higgins

Sent from my iPad

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 31, 2025 11:30 AM

To: Participate

Subject: This is a tool we should consider adding to the housing quiver..

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Completed



Perry Boyle Ketchum

From: Steve Kearns <steve@svcustombuilders.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 31, 2025 10:09 AM

To: Participate Cc: Cynthia Woolley

Subject: 2 lanes

Dear Members of the City Council,

For years, many of us have endured daily traffic bottlenecks driving into Ketchum, believing relief would finally come when the highway expanded to four lanes from Hailey to Ketchum. That's why I was stunned to learn that some of you are considering reducing the highway to two lanes at Serenade Lane—essentially creating a permanent bottleneck.

This proposal directly contradicts the clear wishes of the community: 86% of respondents to your own survey favored four lanes all the way. Instead, it seems more weight is being given to a small number of cyclists leaving from the Gem Streets than to the thousands of commuters who rely on this route every day. (And let's not forget: bicycles are already allowed on the highway.) Forcing working people to sit in traffic an extra half hour each day is a serious disservice.

Some of you have suggested that a two-lane bottleneck would help regulate traffic speed. But traffic jams are not a traffic management tool. Speed limits and enforcement are the proper solutions—not artificially constraining capacity.

I urge you to respect the overwhelming majority of your constituents. Do the right thing for our workforce, our community, and everyone's peace of mind: complete the highway as four lanes all the way into Ketchum.

Respectfully,

Steve Kearns Blaine County Resident Ketchum Business Owner

From: Eric Davis <davis@retailwest.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 9:44 PM

To: Participate **Subject:** Trail Creek Bridge

My wife and I have a residence on Broadford Road in Hailey. We go to Ketchum often for business, shopping, entertainment. PLEASE, note our STRONG support for four traffic lanes over the Trail Creek Bridge. Two in each direction.

It is very surprising to learn that only one lane in each direction is being considered. Why choke off efficient thoroughfare?

The new road investment would look wasteful with traffic backing up as is sure to occur.

Hopefully City Council will come to this realization.

Eric and Nancy Davis 291 Broadford Rd. Hailey

From: Linda Parsons < lindainktown@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 4:54 PM

To: Participate

Subject: NO High Density in Warm Springs

I have been a permanent resident in the Warm Springs area since 1980. I am against high density residential designation in this area. Please listen to what the residents are saying. We are saying NO. We voted for you once because we thought you would listen, you said you would listen. You're not listening. But we are. Please, let's pause on the over -development of Ketchum and our residential areas.

Thank you, Linda Parsons 100 Dollar Drive Ketchum

From: Karoline Droege <karoline.droege@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 3:53 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Entrance to Ketchum Road Striping

I am writing to state my support for 4 lanes of traffic entering/exiting the south side of Ketchum. To reduce the flow of traffic to two lanes makes no sense. The local neighborhoods will still be served by sidewalks and a traffic signal that will manage flow. A reasonably slow speed limit can make this option safe and viable.

Karoline Droege

From: Karoline Droege <karoline.droege@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 3:49 PM

To: Participate

Subject: Comp Plan - DO NOT PASS

I have reviewed the comp plan, draft #3 and no changes have been made to the housing density in Warm Springs.

I am writing to say that I DO NOT support changing the 2014 Comp Plan in regards to housing density in Warm Springs. I live in a wildlife corridor with heavy traffic patterns on Warm Springs Rd and in our neighborhood as it is. I cannot fathom adding more people to an already bustling neighborhood. Your increased housing density plan makes ZERO sense, will not solve our town's housing issue (it will create more VRBO's though) and it will detract from the character of our neighborhood and our city.

Please DO NOT MOVE FORWARD with the COMP PLAN.

Karoline Droege 128 A Short Swing Lane