

Lisa Enourato

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 05, 2022 6:22 PM
To: Participate
Cc: Mark Dee; Greg Foley
Subject: City Council Meeting 3/7/22 Item 11 Water Management Plan

Please share with the Sustainability Committee, as well.

To the Council:

Before you vote to approve this agreement, I ask that you get the analysis to see if it makes sense.

I have been told by senior City Hall people that there are no water constraints on development in Ketchum. If that is true, then why does the City need to enter into a Water Management Plan?

The sole benefit to the City seems to be that if we are in such a plan, senior water rights holders cannot impinge on our water draws. But they would only do that if there was not enough water, and the City's public position is that we have plenty of water. Indeed, Item 10 on this agenda has the potential to dramatically increase Ketchum's water needs.

Which is it? Do we have enough water or don't we? Given we have had no precipitation in the past 2 months and climate change has increased our fire propensity, this seems like a natural question. Last summer the City asked people to curtail water usage. Why, if there is plenty of water?

We have a water treatment facility that was built to handle the needs as if all city properties were built out. **Shouldn't we have the same analysis for the water demand from Ketchum if all properties are built out to their maximum zoning designation?**

Does the Council know which water rights are senior to Ketchum's and who will compete with Ketchum if there isn't enough water?

Seems like the answers to these questions are required for the Council as fiduciaries for the City.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Lisa Enourato

From: Harry Griffith <harry@sunvalleyeconomy.org>
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2022 11:43 AM
To: Participate
Subject: SVED Comment on LOT for Housing

SVED supports an increase in LOT for Housing that will be discussed in tonight's council meeting.

Any % increases in the current LOT allocations should:

- be targeted to raise a minimum of \$2m per year
- be equitable spread across the various categories
- not significantly impair the competitive position of a particular category
- include the retail category to some extent

Any increased \$ LOT receipts should:

- be ring fenced to housing only expenditures (e.g. not allocated to the General Fund)
- used to match developer in lieu contributions
- be subject to disbursal on decision of the Ketchum council

This approach above would ensure fairness and transparency for the voting public and the businesses impacted. It will also be an easier lift with the voters who will ultimately decide.

Respectfully

Harry Griffith

Executive Director, Sun Valley Economic Development

www.SunValleyEconomy.org