

## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** David Caldwell <david@wcinvestrealty.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 16, 2022 5:31 PM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Harriman Hotel in Ketchum, ID

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

The time has finally come for the Harriman Hotel to be constructed and to open in Ketchum! There have been many pitfalls that have derailed this important project numerous times over the past 18 years, but through all the challenges Jack Bariteau has never lost sight of his original vision to bring a much needed cuisine centric luxury hotel to Ketchum/Sun Valley!

Now more than ever Sun Valley/Ketchum needs this project to round out local lodging offerings, and to increase hotel room count to accommodate the rapidly growing demand in our Valley. The past 2-3 years have proven that more and more visitors are coming to Ketchum/Sun Valley, and the breadth of lodging and dining locales must grow to accommodate the demand.

With the commitment of Andrew Blank and his family to the Harriman Hotel this project will succeed, so I implore the City Council to approve immediate reinstatement of all entitlements to allow the project to move forward.

Sincerely,

David Caldwell, local resident

David G. Caldwell  
President, Broker  
West Coast Investment Realty, Inc.  
PO Box 14001 #208, Ketchum, ID 83340  
220 East Avenue, #208, Ketchum, ID 83340  
Tel. 760-815-5504  
Email: [david@wcinvestrealty.com](mailto:david@wcinvestrealty.com)  
Lic. No. CA: 01222814 OR: 850200042  
ID: BR40234 WA:3392



This message contains information that may be confidential or proprietary, or protected by the client privilege or work product doctrine intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) named above. Any review, disclosure, distribution, copying or use of the information by others is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error or without authorization, please advise the sender by immediate reply and delete the original message.

## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** Nancy <nlinscott@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 20, 2022 2:09 PM  
**To:** Tom Bergin; akennedy@co.blaine.id.us  
**Cc:** Suzanne Frick; Robyn.Davis@HaileyCityHall.org; Paige.Nied@HaileyCityHall.org; kaz.thea@haileycityhall.org; sam.linnet@haileycityhall.org; heidi.husbands@haileycityhall.org; juan.martinez@haileycityhall.org; Participate; martha.burke@haileycityhall.org; dshay@bellevueidaho.us; kgoldman@bellevueidaho.us; dbrown@bellevueidaho.us; smahoney@bellevueidaho.us; cjohnson@bellevueidaho.us; rleahy@bellevueidaho.us; jrangel@bellevueidaho.us; Neil Bradshaw; Courtney Hamilton; Amanda Breen; Michael David; Jim Slanetz  
**Subject:** Letter to Planning and Zoning re: Cumulative Impacts to Natural Resources & Quigley Comment Letter  
**Attachments:** Nancy Linscott Letter to County.odt

Hello there, Tom and Allison (and all other city and county planning staff and elected officials copied herein): While the attached letter refers to Quigley Ranch (and I would like it to be part of the record for that project, so please be sure to forward to the County Planning and Zoning Commission), it is applicable to *all* proposed developments within the valley. It is my hope that you will all take the time to consider the points in it when reviewing projects going forward.

Thank you very much for your time.

Nancy Linscott  
320 Apache Drive  
Hailey, ID 83333  
(208) 721-2558

## Quigley Ranch Comments

**To:** Blaine County Commissioners

**From:** Nancy Linscott

**Date:** June 17, 2022

**Re:**  
TVIV Quigley, LLC, Quigley Ranch Subdivision & Simple Planned Unit  
Development

---

I reviewed many of the comment letters to the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding the proposed Quigley Ranch Subdivision, and concur with pretty much all of them. In my opinion, the most compelling among the comment letters provided for P & Z consideration are the ones offered by a few of our local natural resource experts, namely Dr. Wendy Pabich for her excellent account of the unsustainable nature of water use in our valley and Elizabeth (Lili) Simpson for her discussion of wildlife, which emphasizes and illustrates the facts presented by Idaho Fish & Game regarding the critical nature of Quigley Canyon to wintering elk and deer.

I'd like to weigh in, too, with what I hope will be a thought-provoking case for evaluating "cumulative impacts" when considering this and any other land use proposal going forward. Individually, they may seem relatively insignificant, but together, or *cumulatively*, they are pushing all of us carbon-based life forms to the outer edges, and way faster than you might think.

Let's start with the cumulative impacts to soil: Folks, we've gotta protect soil. The kind of soil inhabited by networks of microscopic critters and their secretions ranging from fungi to nematodes and held in place by plants and their roots. Soil that is distinct from "dirt," which has been stripped of its organic content once turned over and dried out. Dirt is highly susceptible to wind and water erosion and really isn't all that useful when entrained in the air. But the biological universe that exists in undisturbed soils is the very backbone of the terrestrial food web that the animals above, including us, rely on. Further, healthy soil and the associated living plants provide storage for carbon dioxide. When we cover previously undeveloped ground with roads, sidewalks, driveways, and buildings, we are irreversibly eliminating the immensely valuable ecosystem services that soil provides. The Quigley development will compact and destroy at least 50 acres of soil. Fifty acres of forage, 50 acres of carbon storing plants and earth. Fifty acres that could support bugs, birds, deer, elk, and a host of other creatures, all of whom play a vital role in the ecosystem.

But is 50 acres really all that much? Well, maybe not by itself. Unfortunately, this development is not by itself and here's why that's important: According to the USGS groundwater model study prepared in cooperation with the Idaho Department of Water Resources (Fisher et al, 2016), the second largest contributor to the aquifer besides streamflow loss from the Big Wood river, is due to areal recharge of precipitation and applied irrigation. This only works as long as the water droplets, especially from rain and snow melt, can actually make it to the substrate. Another road, plus the new proposed cul-de-sac like "pods" snaking through the valley floor will replace large swaths of soil with a solidified barrier that will no longer allow rain and snow melt to connect to the aquifer below. By itself, this wee little development of only 24 houses seems rather "ho-hum," in terms of soil loss—it's just a short little road, after all, and it's not like there isn't already anthropogenic disturbance on the valley floor. But add that little road to all of the other little roads being built throughout this valley now and in the past—Old Cutters, Sunbeam, Colorado Gulch, Quigley Farms, and so on, (and those are just the ones in Hailey), not to mention all of the older paved roadways throughout the valley, and you're starting to see a real, tangible loss of permeable surfaces that can connect the water in the sky to the aquifer under our feet. It's like fencing out rain. Fifty acres here, 20 there, 100 over yonder. . . It all adds up. It has been adding up with especially high intensity in the past two years.

Circling back to Quigley Ranch: The idea of rerouting the existing road into the valley floor to mitigate the dog walker-future-resident-driver conflict effectively doubles the area of compacted soil along that stretch since the existing road is already too compacted to be of much use to the microcosm of soil-loving creatures—and that would be even before we scoop out the soil, compact the substrate, and lay down more asphalt and driveways to serve these new homes.

Perhaps it would be useful if the County's GIS department wizards could use existing road and development data to calculate just how much of the valley floor is covered in hardscape material. We should know that. We should know the ratio of undeveloped land to modified land and attendant hardscapes and get a handle on what this may mean in terms of aquifer recharge. That would help us know if 50 acres is a lot or a little and if that 50 acres, when combined with all of the other proposed developments and those already under construction is going to leave us with enough land that can capture, hold, and convey water.

Until we have a handle on that, though, instead of adding to the habitat loss by ripping in new roads in the valley floor, how about we simply ask that the proud future home owners of the Quigley Ranch estate lots who want a little slice of "country living," live like they're in the "country" and drive on a gravel road—one with no sidewalks, and ideally amply pocked with pot holes to slow them down. And they can jolly well go slow, so as not to hit the folks that have historically enjoyed that road to walk their dogs. I grew up on such a road in rural Missouri and *we were okay*. People rode their horses on the same road that the dang school buses drove on, and as drivers, one just had to figure it out. We've gotten so far removed from the idea that sometimes, the road we drive on is a little rough. Why does everything have to be so *smooth*?

I've got a lot more to say about soil, but I'll stop there.

Let's move on to water.

Carefully consider what Dr. Pabich had to say in her letter on the topic of Quigley Ranch. Though I do not have the depth of knowledge that she does, I am a former practicing environmental geologist myself who largely studied aquifer systems and I can say quite

confidently that she's absolutely right. The canaries in the coal mine illustrating the crux of the problem she described are already happening locally. Talk to Jeff Allred, who owns one of the last-to-be-annexed in-holding properties in Hailey on North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street about how his well dried up last year. Ask Janet Carter, who lives adjacent to Sunbeam—her well went dry, too. Though these are just the two that I know of because I know these people, there are likely countless others who have had to drill deeper to access the aquifer or abandon their dry wells altogether. Dr. Pabich provided the real hard numbers with respect to water rights in her letter, and prior studies by the USGS in recent years have also revealed that our system is stressed. City and county administrations are well aware—or at least should be—as the results of these studies have been presented at countless annexation meetings and widely broadcast in the media, both locally and statewide. Without a cohesive, valley-wide water resource management plan that examines and accounts for the *cumulative effect* that *all* new developments will have, whether five houses or five hundred, we're in for some rather unsettling outcomes. I'm going to try and paint the picture of what this means we're facing in terms of habitat loss, namely, the river itself.

The Big Wood River is a system fed by snowmelt, rain water, and countless perennial tributaries between here and its headwaters, many of which are also fed by snowmelt and rainwater with contributions from springs. Though these surface waters contribute the most to stream flow in the Big Wood River (again, refer to recent USGS basin-wide aquifer studies like the one mentioned above), they are by no means the only contribution. A significant portion of its flow, most notably the reaches from Hailey north, are fed by spring systems, which is another way of saying its interface with groundwater. Once we succeed in drawing groundwater below the basal level of the river, the river will no longer have that input. In drought years, having that input would be mighty handy, especially if you're a fish. Last year, we actually saw those reaches of the river perilously close to drying up, even in the early part of the summer. Groundwater contribution to the river also provides colder water to the river—again, this is really nice to have if you're a fish adapted to cold water streams in a warming world.

The other thing happening below our feet is that the river itself feeds the aquifer in many places—this is where the river is a “losing” stream. This happens most visibly every year below Bellevue, where in combination with irrigation diversions and loss to the aquifer, the stream does not flow at all. Now imagine seeing that in Hailey and north. The river losing its water to the aquifer in the southern reaches seems to bode well for downstream groundwater users, sort of, except that only works when we have enough surface water to lose. When we have low snowpack and little precipitation there's not a lot of wiggle room in terms of maintaining adequate flow in the river. Combine that with the very, very real reduction in connectivity between the aquifer and the river due to municipal groundwater use and irrigation, and we're looking at no river at all. One of the only reasons it continued to flow in a year as dry as last year's was due to interaction with our aquifer, which as noted, is getting lower and lower and lower. I hope I'm making my point that over-use of our finite water resources is real, is already happening, and is playing out in the drying wells in the main body of the aquifer beneath the valley floor. It will be catastrophic to lose this input if we at all care about the habitat of the river. And we certainly should care because quite frankly, the riparian areas are VITAL to all of the drainage's wildlife.

But Quigley Ranch is over a mile away, and it's only 24 houses that would be situated on just 50 acres, so what's the big deal, right? The developer offered that they are planning to use their existing water rights, or rather, the same surface water source that they formerly used for irrigating the hay field, to supply the irrigation needs of the new households. So no biggie—it's

mostly just the same water, just applied differently. And sure, recognizing that houses may use a lot of water, they'll augment with gray water from Quigley Farms (hey, that's good). But, as printed in the errant Mountain Express article, they know this isn't enough, so they are going to drill "several" wells to provide potable water. How many is "several" and how much demand on the aquifer will result? Singularly, without any other development or groundwater users in the valley, that seems perfectly reasonable, but they are *not* the only ones. Drilling several wells should concern everybody—it's another straw being dipped into the collective milkshake, and it will have an impact, especially a cumulative one when considered in the context of all of the other milkshake drinkers. The attitude and acceptance that these wells may pull out just a "drop in the valley's water bucket," heavily shuns the reality that all of this water, both surface and stored in the diminishing aquifer is part of a system feeding the basin as a whole. The real liquid stuff is over-allocated and there simply is not enough to support development throughout the valley---particularly when we're eliminating the recharge potential of the valley floor by paving so much of it, like I described in the soils part of this memo.

Cumulative Loss of Wildlife Habitat. I already mentioned a couple of the impacts to wildlife habitat in the context of soil and water, both within and removed from the development. But yet another, not insignificant problem is the impact to deer, elk, and other small mammalian and avian species who really need that 50 acres. Lili Simpson did a very nice job of describing the issue, which seems pretty apparent: Installing houses on what the Idaho Fish and Game experts described as ". . . some of the *last* quality winter range in the Wood River Valley" just seems like an inherently poor idea if we care at all about wildlife. And subsequently pushing all of the dog walkers further out the canyon to where the road wouldn't be paved will increase pressure, especially in winter, on all of the large herbivores, feathered critters, and rodentia that quite frankly could use a little less dog. Again, it's easy to shrug it off with a "well, that's always happened, they'll be fine," but the fact is that with the *cumulative* loss of habitat—not just out Quigley but elsewhere in the valley—we will lose these animals. The June 17<sup>th</sup> Mountain Express article quoted the Idaho Fish and Game review as stating, "If current trends of development and associated recreational and residential use in the vicinity persist, these areas are not expected to continue supporting winter populations of big game."

I've gotta dog, we all seem to have a dog, most of us know each other by our dogs, but the closer we stay to town, the less us and our animals encroach on the wild world around us. I'm betting the new homeowners will have at least one dog or more, plus some bird-killing domestic cats, and these disturbances to necessary winter range will contribute to the valley-wide loss of habitat.

With the increased pressure on wildlife due to habitat loss, pronghorn, deer, elk, and a host of other creatures need the ability to move without getting entangled in the miles and miles of obsolete barbed wire fences festooning both private and public lands not only in our valley but all across their migration routes. I propose that developers should be required to move all surrounding and intersecting barbed wire from their properties as a condition of receiving a final plat (assuming they should ever get a final plat in light of all of the other stressors). In fact, as a general mitigation, they should have to remove obsolete barbed wire on public lands elsewhere if they don't have any on their own properties. By "obsolete," I'm referring to those stretches of fences that are not and have not been used to contain livestock in years. There's enough here in our valley to go to the moon and back, I would guess.

In the big picture, the biggest threats to biodiversity globally *and locally* are 1) climate change; and 2) habitat loss. The latter occurs in part due to the former (obviously), but the largest factor affecting habitat loss is due to human encroachment into natural systems. Bottom line is that natural resources in a given area and indeed worldwide are finite. Quigley may seem like small potatoes by itself, and if it *were* by itself, it would be. But it's not by itself: Quigley Ranch is happening in conjunction with many similar developments throughout the valley, few of which seem to be helping us solve our real housing problem, and altogether the impact is real, is happening, and will absolutely result in a much worsening state of affairs here in the valley.

I'm mostly imploring you to consider all development proposals in terms of their cumulative impacts, and if the outcome contributes to further loss of our necessary natural resources, consider imposing strong mitigations or limiting the proposed project to only that which can be sustained. Maybe chat with the folks in Oakley, Utah, a town of about 1,500 people located in the Greater Salt Lake statistical area. Last year, they were the first community to stop issuing building permits for any project requiring water connection due to the projected and actual limitations on their water supply. I'm sure that wasn't popular. I'm sure there was backlash from developers. But it was the right thing to do. Our society—and Idaho especially—puts an emphasis on *rights* (particularly private property rights) when perhaps the focus should be on *responsibility*. In this case, there is no reason for these 24 houses to exist at all, especially given that none will help us with the affordable housing issue. If it must happen, it should happen just outside the Quigley Farms boundary, no further west than The Sage School, and require no further modifications to the valley floor. I do not believe that the Nordic trails would necessarily have to move further west. They shouldn't even be as far west as they are right now (well into the more natural parts of the drainage beyond the pond), and as a nordic skier, I'd rather have more wildlife habitat than skiing habitat. This development is not "preserving open space," as the project spokesperson suggested. By definition, it is a development, and as such it would encroach into important habitat, diminish critical resources, and add to the bigger valley-wide problem we already have.

Thank you for your time.

Nancy Linscott

## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** City of Ketchum Idaho <participate@ketchumidaho.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 22, 2022 10:18 AM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Wednesday, June 22, 2022 - 10:17am

Submitted by anonymous user: 184.183.121.243

Submitted values are:

First Name Trish

Last Name Klahr

Email tklahr@cox.net

Question/Comment

I just read the story about "Big changes coming to Main Street" in order to enhance vehicle and pedestrian efficiency. A timely topic. Another idea I would like you all to consider is an approach commonly used in many urban areas, but is somewhat the opposite of a dedicated turn lane. That is the notion of prohibiting left turns during peak commuting hours such as from 4-6 p.m. when everyone is trying to head south out of town. The left turn at 5th street backs up traffic for blocks and blocks. There is no need to have a left turn here. There is a dedicated left turn at SV Road so that left turn would always be available and cars would proceed to that intersection to turn left. Same for the problematic left turn at First Street: prohibit it between 4-6 p.m. and keep traffic flowing south to prevent complete gridlock as we have now at rush hour. Thanks for your consideration!

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.ketchumidaho.org/node/7/submission/10582>



## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** Daren Pennell <daren@darenpennell.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 23, 2022 12:38 PM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** Harriman Hotel settlement

Hello Mayor and Council Members,

For a variety of reasons I am in support of the Harriman Hotel settlement agreement. Will be great to have the saga of the hole behind us and move forward in a win / win manner with the City, the developer and the community.

Respectfully,

Daren

### **Daren Pennell**

 **SUN VALLEY**  
REAL ESTATE | **CHRISTIE'S**  
INTERNATIONAL REAL ESTATE

208.720.2619 cell  
[daren@darenpennell.com](mailto:daren@darenpennell.com)

***Your Referrals Fuel My Business and  
Are Greatly Appreciated!***



June 22, 2022

Mayor Neil Bradshaw  
City of Ketchum  
161 Fifth Street West  
Ketchum, Idaho 83340

RE: Proposed Settlement Agreement – Harriman Hotel, LLC and the City of Ketchum

Dear Mayor Bradshaw:

We have been reading with great interest about the proposed Settlement Agreement that the City Council will consider on Thursday night, June 23<sup>rd</sup>. We are longtime residents of Ketchum and both operate our independent businesses in Ketchum. We are delighted that Jack has finally found a very reliable, local and well-funded private family to bring the necessary capital investment to build this exceptional hotel project. Andy Blank, and his father, Jerry have maintained a family home in Sun Valley since 1975 and are passionate about the Wood River Valley

There is no doubt that the project has had a long journey but memories are short and most people forget that this project went through an extensive public hearing process culminating in its approval in November of 2008. The Great Recession was in full swing and lasted here in our part of the intermountain west for almost nearly a decade. Prior to the project approvals, Jack Bariteau had successfully developed two significant mixed use projects, The Shops and Residences at the Colonnade and the Christiania Building between 1998 and 2001. These buildings are now considered landmarks in our town and are representative of what we can expect in quality of design and overall aesthetics. His town home project at 600 Second Street, completed in 2009, today stands as amongst the finest town home developments with the downtown.

Contrary to what most people think, Mr. Bariteau was able to secure a construction loan in late 2019 and was preparing to begin full construction in April, 2020. But in the middle of March, 2020, the pandemic national emergency was declared by then President Trump and one of the key equity partners froze its investments in multiple projects nationwide, halting the project. While what we see today is the excavation that was required to commence after the building permit was issued in May of 2016, City mandated building impact, building permit and affordable in lieu housing fees were paid in excess of \$1.8 M to the City. Previously, the City had also provided an extension of the project approvals that were conditioned on the undergrounding of the power poles and power lines that stretched from River Street to Gem Street along the westside of Highway 75 at a cost of nearly \$1,000,000. This work was completed in 2016-2017. And sticking to Mr. Bariteau's commitment to provide an in town site for 18 hotel employee beds as part of his approvals, while working to replace the equity funding for the hotel, Jack and a separate group of investors received approval for the mixed use project, now nearly 65% complete at the southwest corner of First Avenue North and Fourth

Street. This building will contain 15 community housing apartments, with 12 of these apartments dedicated to the meeting the 18 bed requirement when the hotel is completed. Until that time, these apartments will be offered to our local workforce with deed restrictions in place for qualified applicants in Blaine County Housing Categories 4 and 5. No other development in town, including the Limelight Hotel, has ever produced this magnitude of affordable housing.

The Blank family and Mr. Bariteau, we believe, are committed to finally bringing to Ketchum the luxury level of lodging and for sale residences that will finally provide the community with a full service hotel of the highest quality and amenities. Please let this much needed hotel project proceed to construction and approve the Settlement Agreement. We will all benefit for years to come from its being completed and opened.

Sincerely,

Sharon and Liam Grant  
540 4th Ave.  
Ketchum, ID 83340

## **Lisa Enourato**

---

**From:** Preston Sargent <psargent@bailard.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 23, 2022 1:26 PM  
**To:** Participate; Neil Bradshaw  
**Cc:** Julie Sargent  
**Subject:** Supporting the Harriman Hotel

To whom it may concern:

I know that today is a big day in the life of the Five-Star Hotel and Condominium project now known as the Harriman Hotel and Residences.

I have written and voiced my support for this project several times in the past, and my feelings have not changed.

My wife and I are homeowners in Ketchum (since 2006)... and have lived here in town full time since 2012.

I first came to Sun Valley in the summer of 1970 for tennis camp.

I then skied here in Spring of '76 (loved it), worked in the Duchin Room (now Gretchen's) that summer, and lived in the SV Co. dorms behind the Moritz Hospital.

I introduced my wife to SV in '89... and two of our three kids learned to ski here in the 90's.

So we've had a long association with this lovely valley and this wonderful little town of Ketchum.

It would be easy to look back at the long and torturous road of this hotel project and find fault with some of the mis-steps here and there along the way.

I think, at this stage, that would be both unproductive and unfair.

We are where we are and should look forward not back.

And I still believe that this project would be great for Ketchum and great for the broader Wood River Valley.

Jack Bariteau builds and runs high quality real estate.

The Harriman Hotel and Residences will be a very special addition to the offerings here in the Sun Valley area and will, I believe, raise the profile of our fabulous town and area in a very positive way.

I have been in the real estate investment business for ~38 years and know how difficult it can be to get complicated hotel projects capitalized.

The Harriman Hotel and residences has had more than its share of bad luck over the past decade... but it seems Jack is "there" on getting the necessary financing for the project, and I do hope that the city grants him and his team the necessary permits and entitlements to get the project underway.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Preston

**Preston R. Sargent**  
**Executive Vice President, Bailard, Inc.**

Office Address: 180 Sutter Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA

Mailing Address: 950 Tower Lane, Suite 1900, Foster City, CA 94404

T: [650 571 5800](tel:6505715800)

M: [206 999 8295](tel:2069998295)

[www.bailard.com](http://www.bailard.com)

Bailard, Inc. may review and archive incoming and outgoing email communications, copies of which may be produced at the request of Bailard's regulators. In addition, copies may be produced in response to subpoenas or otherwise as permitted or required by law. This message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipients named above. If you have received this e-mail in error, kindly notify the sender immediately by return email and permanently delete the copy you received.

## **Lisa Enourato**

---

**From:** Janet Nathanail <jnathanail@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 24, 2022 4:07 AM  
**To:** Participate  
**Subject:** comments for today's meeting

There are many of us who own homes here in Ketchum, spend holidays here with our families, who contribute to the economy by employing tradespeople, caretakers and who frequent the restaurants and shops and yet because we can not vote here, our voices are not heard.

We came to Ketchum 22 years ago and were attracted by the spectacular natural beauty, the friendly and active community and the slow charm of this small town where art and sports and nature reign supreme. Over the past few years, it has been difficult to watch the changes creeping in that could put all that in jeopardy.

Now we have/will have FOUR hotels concentrated at the gateway to our town. While the long existing Best Western is in keeping with the style of Ketchum, the Limelight stretches with its additional height and encroaching sidewalks, the plans for the new Marriott indicate a massive modern building and who knows why the 'hole' has been tolerated for so many years, despite continuously missing deadlines and presenting a potentially dangerous, and until recently, unfenced eyesore. Why would the city believe that this time the project will go ahead, despite past promises otherwise, when it has failed for so many years? Why, in fact, do we even want a fourth hotel there?

Not only will we have is a massive traffic jam during and after the new buildings are completed but there will be an uncharacteristic modern skyline as you enter our town with possibly more hotel rooms than the town and its visitors need.

When what we all recognize and agree on is that affordable workforce housing must be the priority! Instead, what we have is a meager number of apartments sandwiched between ground floor commercial space and expensive penthouse apartments all being built in prime downtown lots. Is that really where workers want to live? Wouldn't they be happier outside the town center, closer to the school and the Y with ample parking areas, close to open green spaces? Wouldn't it have made more sense to purchase the empty Stock Lumber Supply Yard and develop that into real community housing to encourage workers to make Ketchum their home?

It goes without saying, that without proper housing, we can not recruit the essential workers needed to sustain the growing population and number of new businesses and hotels.

While I don't doubt the concern and motivation of the city councilors, I do worry about and do not agree with some of the decisions being made.

I feel we are at risk of losing what makes Ketchum special !!

Sincerely,  
J Nathanail

Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this email or any other documents.

**Lisa Enourato**

---

**From:** Kevin Livingston <klivingston@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2022 9:41 AM  
**To:** Courtney Hamilton; Amanda Breen; Michael David; Jim Slanetz; Participate  
**Subject:** Bariteau Project

Dear Council,

I attended last week's meeting to reinstate the Bariteau entitlements. I am clearly not in favor, but at this point it passed. I have no doubt, that they will come back with changes that include height increases and that rooftop bar.

I can tell you, that almost all of the residents within the 5 block radius are clearly opposed. I really hope you can see through that and we start standing up for the resident rights. If you have ever been to a party or heard one near South Leadville, noise travels for blocks. Also, the traffic will become a nightmare.

The new Partner said there will be no material changes. If that's the case we will live with last week's decision. If there are major changes, please do the right thing and not allow Ketchum to be ruined.

Kevin Livingston 415-596-4336

## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** H Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2022 4:12 PM  
**To:** Participate  
**Cc:** Mark Dee; Greg Foley; Andrew Guckes  
**Subject:** For City Council members: public comment on the budget

### LACK OF RIGOR

As I observed the budget planning session on June 27, I was struck by how there was no criteria employed in generating the budget. The department head presentations were perfunctory, uninformative and pro forma. The two biggest expenses, police and fire, went unchallenged. In no situation was the fundamental question asked: how does this money benefit quality of life for residents of Ketchum.

In only one presentation was the question asked "how can we recover more of this cost?"

Perhaps this is how Ketchum has gotten into the situation where its per capita budget is 3.5x that of Hailey.

### STRUCTURAL BUDGET CHALLENGE

Ketchum has a structural budget challenge. Many of our costs are driven by non-residents, and the LOT doesn't fully offset their burden. This really short shrifts the Ketchum taxpayer. This is going to get worse with the two new hotels. For example, both will house less than 25% of their low-paid workers, and the taxpayer is likely to end up subsidizing housing for their employees through the new 5B Housing entity.

How do we structurally and permanently shift more costs off of residents and on to hotels, STRs, and tourists?

### LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS

Our Fire dept is a similar size as that of Hailey, yet the number of calls is about half. This bears investigation. As the department communicated, fire dept and EMS calls are largely driven by tourists. How can we recoup more of that expense from tourists? Backcountry rescue should be billed back, as it is in other areas. Likewise ambulance runs, fire calls to AirBNBs, etc.

As the BSCO communicated, police activity is also driven by tourism. If bar activity drives costs can their license and franchise fees reflect that? Can we impose a special police/EMS cost recovery fee on STRs? There was no metrics provided in the presentation. Nothing on the cruiser replacement cycle. They want a new car and Ketchum just buys it for them. Why is Ketchum paying for increased policing for BCSD? Outsourcing to BCSO was supposed to save us money, but we seem to pay a premium. The solve rate for crimes is the lowest in Blaine County. Should police be localized again?

As Councillor Hamilton alluded, the Planning department should largely pay for itself shouldn't it? Shouldn't developers be paying the full cost of the 77% of department expenses allocated to development? Why is there no annual adjustment to its fees? Can we save money and variabalize the cost by outsourcing the permit processing as we do for building inspection?

It is great that we will update our zoning code. However, no one mentioned that the Comprehensive Plan is due for updating in 2024, and that the zoning code is supposed to reflect the Comp Plan. These are basic functions of City Government. We should be anticipating this and budgeting for this.

Is the Council aware that Ms. Frick proposed an almost 3x increase in her bill out to KURA? That she allocates 25% of her time to KURA and that KURA recompenses the City for that? If 77% of her cost is supposed to be recovered by user fees, doesn't this seem a bit...unseemly? The two City Council appointees to KURA sat through their budget presentation and this seems to have escaped them. Is there any wonder the Planning department is so back up?



Can we save money by eliminating the Historic Preservation Commission once it gets its guide done? It is just more bureaucracy that cannot stop demolition or invest in preservation. There is nothing it does beyond the guide that the Council can't do. It does not need to be constituted more than one year in 5 to update its guide. Yet this is 4% of the annual Planning Department cost (per Ms. Frick).

The Recreation department benefits quality of life for current residents. If we have to raise fees, can cost recovery be raised from the 40% of non-WRV residents who enroll in its programs? Why is the Ketchum taxpayer funding summer camp for tourists? Asking SV to contribute based on its resident usage seems...obvious. Returning the pond hockey tournament as a fundraiser for kids camp seems like a great idea.

As the City moves to increase density in the core while simultaneously reducing the absolute number of parking spaces, eventually the tipping point will be reached. When you move to charge for parking in the downtown core, perhaps you might give free parking permits to residents and just charge non-residents.

#### SHIFTING REVENUE BURDEN TO TOURISTS

Instead of trying to get around the 3% tax increase cap by raising revenue with a constant expansion of tax base in a way that residents do not support (e.g., Marriott), can we look to other areas?

For example, can we charge even more than what was proposed for large water users like hotels. The \$ increment seemed pretty low. Hotels and STR owners command a premium price for peak weeks. Why can't Ketchum share in that windfall and charge more for water usage above the average for non-peak weeks at that time?

Can we do the exact same thing for wastewater? When is the sewer deal up with SV? What can we do to raise revenue from them (largely a second homeowner community)?

#### OTHER REVENUE/COST ENHANCEMENTS

Can we substantially raise the LOT on short term rentals in the next attempt? The legislative intent of LOT is to help tourist burdened cities offset the cost of tourism. The lodging tax could go way up. Can we shift 1% for Air from promoting tourism to offsetting the costs of tourism? It is millions of dollars.

Why not just sell the Starbucks building, given how much work it needs, its negative rate of return for the City, and the incredible value that could be unlocked for the taxpayer.

Why don't we ask the businesses that benefit from Wagon Days to financially support it?—especially the hotel companies.

Given our lobbying in Boise, can we work with state reps to get property tax increase indexed to something other than 3%? Like CPI or 10yr bond? Wouldn't all Idaho municipalities benefit from that?

On the expense side it doesn't seem like we are looking for much in the way of savings or efficiencies. For example, what is Ketchum getting for its \$80k to the county sustainability manager? Does it improve quality of life? Raise revenue? Save money? Hailey refuses to fund this. Why?

On the county housing department that Ketchum will bear the bulk of the cost, can we ask for transparency on how the money will be spent in terms of how many people will be helped in what way. Sending Ketchum taxpayer money to the County seems to warrant a high degree of transparency and accountability. When we find that occupiers of deed restricted units have been abusing that privilege, can we find them the full amount of their windfall?

Another quality of life expense we could look at MTR. It is a great service and we are fortunate to have it. But it is not optimized to get cars off of streets. For example, perhaps given that Ketchum is the largest funder of MTR, we could ask them for airport service. It doesn't stop at right place, requires a connection in Hailey, and is not matched up to flight schedules. This seems a better use of experimental funding than St Luke's WR to St Luke's Twin.

#### CAPEX

Employee attraction and retention mention by all departments except public works In terms of capex and personnel expense and retention, what about building city employee housing on city land in the industrial park or near the wastewater plant using the tax exempt structure being developed by a local resident? This could provide housing for 1/3 of market rate.

Also on capex, should we be looking at assessing depreciation and putting at least some of that money aside every year so we don't get caught short for big expenditures? Most people are surprised to hear we have no capital budget process for roads.

In sum, there are a myriad of ways to reduce the burden on Ketchum taxpayers.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle  
Ketchum