

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT: Council Meeting 6/12 Agenda Item 20 should be discussed
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 1:16:05 PM

Council Members,

Item 20 warrants your consideration on several fronts:

1. Why is this \$28,700 coming from Ketchum taxpayers rather than from BCHA funding?
2. As a matter of process, this item highlights the potential for the BCHA activities of the City housing director/staff to get commingled with City funded activities.

There should be a process in place for highlighting when that staff is working for the City vs BCHA.

3. As this item was not in the Housing Action Plan, it highlights mission creep potential.

While amendments to the HAP are to be expected, they should be fully vetted by the Council, not pushed through in the consent agenda.

This seems to be part of a larger trend of Ketchum taxpayer money being diverted to funding housing activities outside of Ketchum. If that is the will of the Council, it should be made transparent to Ketchum voters via the City project website and the Mayor's missive rather than hidden in consent agendas like this.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: Public Comment Council Meeting 6/12 Agenda Item 22
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 1:22:09 PM

Council Members,

This item was put in the consent agenda by a person who is not a City of Ketchum employee.
Ms Frick no longer works for the City, she works for KURA, which is supposed to be an independent agency.
Ms. Frick the processor for the Marriott is bad process. Particularly given Ms Fricks's inherent conflict of interest.
All items like this should be going through the City Planning staff.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT Council Meeting 6/12 Agenda Item 31
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 1:25:56 PM

This seems like bad process. HDR writes the Master Transportation Plan. HDR is the company that gets hired to implement the plan that they wrote.
That is an inherent conflict of interest. Any work they perform on the plan they write should be bid.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#); [Carissa Connelly](#)
Cc: editorialboard@mtexpress.com; [Andrew Guckes](#)
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT Housing Action Plan update at Council Meeting 6/12
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 2:12:00 PM

I continue to urge the Council to rethink the basic underlying premise of the Housing Action Plan. The current HAP is designed to satisfy the demand for housing, not the need for housing, and is confused about prioritizing scarce resources for housing.

Remedy: A better alternative would be to identify the need for housing for various workforce categories, and then prioritize allocating taxpayer resources based on that.

We are already seeing the results of the current approach. The Housing staff has shifted its time and taxpayer resources to non-Ketchum housing issues. The Housing staff is unaccountable for delivering results for Ketchum workforce housing.

1. While Lease to Locals can be a useful tool, at least some portion of it has been provided to non-locals and as a corporate welfare type subsidy.

Remedy: clarify that the program's purpose is to provide workforce housing for people who work in the City of Ketchum and create a prioritization chart for who is eligible based on hours worked (full-time preference over part-time) and occupation (essential workers prioritized over corporate workers).

2. The HAP has already been shifted from its stated goal of workforce housing to non-workforce housing. Bluebird's housing preference prioritizes retirees. We have plenty of retirees in Ketchum. We don't have enough workers.

Remedy: Workforce should be prioritized. Ketchum should not make the same mistakes similar towns have made where residents looking for taxpayer-subsidized retirement get prioritized over workers the community needs to function. The Housing staff should maintain a report of its Key Performance metrics. Specifically, how many Ketchum workers it has helped to house, in which employment categories, and at what cost to Ketchum taxpayers.

3. The Plan will expand short-term rental units in Ketchum. We don't need more ADUs going into the AirBNB market. The HAP should not be encouraging that.

Remedy: the City should take a risk and use the neighborhood protection clause of the STR statute to limit ADUs to long-term. It is worth getting judicial clarity on this, and any suits on that would take a long time, thus letting ADUs be absorbed first in the LTR market. And, if Ketchum wins, the benefit to the City and the State is large.

4. The HAP is unclear on the line between the City and BCHA activities of the Housing staff. Worse, there are multiple instances of Ketchum taxpayer money going to non-Ketchum housing situations, which is not transparent to Ketchum voters. Examples include

- money to BCCA for non-Ketchum use,
- the update's proposal for BCHA directors to help direct the City's housing plan
- the reported \$250k spent on tiny homes for Lewis Street that is unaccounted for,
- some of the money being spent on the mediation program, and

- this meeting's consent agenda item is to fund a BCHA action.

Indeed, the entire Goal 3 section of the staff report indicates a desire for Ketchum taxpayers to fund the entire county housing challenge.

Remedy: procedures must be documented to separate staff time between their two employers. Staff timesheets with time allocation need to be maintained. Expenditures of monies should be delineated between City and BCHA activities. The Housing Strategist is inherently conflicted on this, and seems to be shifting BCHA expenses onto the City. Thus the City Administrator should sign off on all housing expenditures before they get to the Council.

5. While the HAP calls for "leverage," its action items are non-inclusive of other efforts to create workforce housing. The housing staff still has no plan for a valid survey of the non-profit business community on their unmet employment needs, what they are doing in response, and how the City could be helpful. There is no recognition of the housing being created by non-City entities.

Remedy: The City should immediately commence a workforce planning survey and institute a process to update it annually. The Housing staff should regularly coordinate with other entities like the WRHT, WRLT, BCSD, KURA, and ARCH (and now the Forest Service) on their plans to house Ketchum workers. The staff should maintain an inventory of existing and planned workforce housing and make it accessible to the public.

In summary, the HAP should be significantly revised to address our need for workforce housing, transparency, and accountability.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#); [Carissa Connelly](#)
Subject: Public Comment Council Meeting 6/12 Agenda Item 34
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 2:29:20 PM

Most of the program revision suggestions for the inDEED type program are well-conceived to maximize the potential for units to be provided to local workers. The approach is informed by the experiences of other resort communities, but adapted to Ketchum's unique circumstances.

The appreciation cap option 2 seems like the best approach, in that it allows the City to review which path delivers the best results. Then the program can be adjusted over time based on those learnings. I would suggest that any cap be not on the nominal dollar appreciation, but on the real rate of appreciation (net of inflation).

The geography question points out a flaw in the overall approach of the HAP. Is the goal to house workers? Or to house workers in Ketchum? Geography is irrelevant if the goal is to house the most workers. As with the appreciation cap, it might make sense for the City to pursue both paths for a set period and revisit based on outcomes.

Eligibility is not addressed in this beyond the 30hr/week work requirement. This creates the potential for the program to be suborned into corporate welfare. For example, if this program provides housing for employees of large corporations like Marriott, or Sun Valley, it will delegitimize the City's housing efforts. Some additional work should be done on how the system could be gamed.

I look forward to seeing the next iteration of this program.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: [Andrew Guckes](#)
Subject: Public Comment Council Meeting 6/12 Budget preparations
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 2:58:52 PM

The Council has an opportunity to take the City's budgeting process up a notch. In particular, two principles could be added to the process:

1. Full cost recovery where available
2. A capital budgeting process

Cost Recovery

As the presentation notes, Planning fees have not been adjusted since the current Mayor and Council were elected seven years ago. Planning fees only recover 47% of costs. I urge the Council to reject the staff proposal for 75% recovery. There is no reason for Ketchum taxpayers to continue subsidizing developers' costs. The cost recovery should be 100%. By my calculations (using data from the presentation), Ketchum taxpayers have gifted at least \$750k to developers throughout this Administration.

Capital Budgeting

The proposal does not go far enough. The City should be doing depreciation accounting on all of its assets and budgeting at least that amount to go into a capital replacement budget. The City should forecast its capital needs on a rolling two-year basis and budget for that on top of the replacement fund. This won't necessarily change how much the City spends overall, but it will make it more transparent what needs to be addressed over what time frame. This Administration came into power when the City of Ketchum had little debt. The City now has over \$25mm in debt and will need to issue more for the WTF. Ketchum has been this indebted since...perhaps ever.

Additionally, the City should consider housing a core component of its wage and benefit package for City employees, including first responders. This should be a high-priority workforce category for the Housing Actions Plan (above corporate welfare and retiree housing).

Finally, the Council should ask department heads for over/under funding options when they make their budget requests. What would the department do with 20% more money? What would they do with 20% less? This process helps the Council and Staff better understand how department heads think about the ROI of the spending allocated to them. It prepares the Council and Staff for variabilities in City revenues rather than being caught flat-footed when a recession comes.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle

From: [HP Boyle](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Historical Preservation Commission meeting 6/14
Date: Saturday, June 10, 2023 3:16:06 PM

HPC members,

As you review the Handbook, it could use some work.

"The HPC will continue its work to maintain the Historic Building/Site List by updating surveys of historic buildings and sites in areas of high growth pressures to ensure the preservation of Ketchum's history."

How and when will the HPC do this? For example, if 50 years is a trigger, then shouldn't there be additions to your review process every year based on age? What is the process for people to make suggestions for additions? Where are applications found? Who does an owner contact?

To assist the HPC with its work, the HPC might join with some of the P&Z members in calling for the City to create a representative model of the City with development projections, so the HPC can assess where development is occurring and how it might impact the historical tourism benefit of preservation.

Also, the Chapter 6 on Alteration/Demolition provides no useful information beyond you need to apply for a permit and go through an HPC review. The "circumstances" alluded to regarding demolition is not helpful. You might want to include a flow chart of the process.

As for Q&A, that section should be easy to populate with what the HPC has experienced to date.

Finally, you should have a process to do an annual review of the Handbook to ensure it is updated and keep that revision number on the pages of the book.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

From: [julian tyo](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: [Carissa Connelly](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Ownership and Preservation Program
Date: Monday, June 12, 2023 9:58:45 AM

Good Morning,

I am writing in support of the Ownership and Preservation pilot program.

Specifically, I support higher financial incentives with appreciation caps, and proposed Option 2 restricting use of the program to properties located within Ketchum or Ketchum's Area of City Impact.

Kind Regards,

Julian Tyo

Sun Valley Resident