



## **Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency**

---

**P.O. Box 2315 | 480 East Ave. N. | Ketchum, ID 83340**

July 18, 2022

Chair and Commissioners  
Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency  
Ketchum, Idaho

### **Recommendation to Hold Public Hearing and Approve FY 2022-23 Budget and Adopt Resolution No. 22-URA07 The FY 2022-23 Annual Appropriation Resolution**

#### Introduction/History

Per Idaho Code 50-2006 the Urban Renewal Agency (URA) is required to pass an annual appropriation resolution and submit the resolution to the City Clerk of the City of Ketchum.

On June 27, 2022, the Board reviewed the proposed budget for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2022, and ending September 30, 2023, containing the proposed revenues and expenditures necessary for all purposes for said fiscal year to be raised and appropriated within Ketchum, Idaho. Notice of the public hearing on the proposed budget was published in the Idaho Mountain Express on July 6, 2022 and July 13, 2022.

#### Analysis

The Board will hold a Public Hearing on July 18, 2022, at 2:00 PM for the purpose of considering and adopting a final budget and making appropriations to each fund for the forthcoming fiscal year 2022-23 at which time the public may appear and be heard upon any part or parts of said budget.

The Board will consider adopting Resolution Number 22-URA07, entitled the Annual Appropriation Resolution for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2022, appropriating sums of money authorized by law and deemed necessary to defray all expenses and liabilities of the Urban Renewal Agency and providing an effective date.

One written public comment has been received and is attached.

#### Financial Requirement/Impact

The Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Urban Renewal Agency Budget provides budget authority for the services and projects the Agency anticipates providing during the new fiscal year.

#### Recommendation and Motions

1. I move to approve the proposed 2022-23 FY Ketchum Urban Renewal Budget
2. I MOVE TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 22-URA07, The Annual Appropriation Resolution appropriating sums of money authorized by law and deemed necessary to defray all expenses and liabilities of the Urban Renewal Agency, for the Fiscal Year commencing October 1, 2022, and ending September 30, 2023, for all general, special and corporate purposes; directing the Executive Director to submit said budget; and providing an effective date.

#### Attachments:

Proposed FY22-23 Budget  
Resolution 22-URA07  
Public Comment



## **Fiscal Year 2022-23 Proposed Budget**

**Chair:** *Susan Scovell*

**Vice-Chair:** Casey Dove

**Commissioners:** *Amanda Breen, Casey Burke,  
Gary Lipton, Jim Slanetz*

**Executive Director:** *Suzanne Frick*

**Treasurer:** *Shellie Gallagher*

**Secretary:** *Tara Fenwick*



## Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency Fund

The purpose of the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency Fund is to provide the financial authority to facilitate urban renewal activities within the boundaries of the Ketchum Urban Renewal District. Resolution 06-33, establishing the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency, was adopted by the City Council on April 3, 2006. Resolution 06-34, establishing the revenue allocation area wherein urban renewal activities may occur, was subsequently adopted by the City Council on April 3, 2006. Finally, the Ketchum Urban Renewal Plan was adopted by the City Council with passage of Ordinance 992 on November 15, 2006. The Urban Renewal Plan was amended in 2010 with passage of Ordinance 1077.

### FY 2022-23 Highlights

**Summary:** The objective of the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency Fund is to support the projects to be undertaken during the fiscal year and to provide budget authority to make required principal and interest payments on the 2010 Urban Renewal Bonds.

For Fiscal Year 2022-23, the KURA will focus efforts on development of the First Street and Washington Avenue for deed restricted workforce housing and city infrastructure as funds permit.



## Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency Fund

### FY 2022-23 Highlights

Capital:	\$ 2,000,000
Owner Participation Agreements	\$ 215,000
Economic Development	\$ 25,000



## FY 22/23 Proposed Revenue and Expenditures

		2019	9/30/2019	2020	9/30/2020	2021	9/30/2021	2022	9/30/2022	2023
		Budget	Actuals	Budget	Actuals	Budget	Actuals	Budget	Projected	Budget Proposed
	<b>Revenue</b>									
98-3100-1000	TAX INCREMENT REVENUE	\$ 1,437,890	\$ 1,639,850	\$ 1,481,027	\$ 1,746,178	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 2,205,533	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,982,000	\$ 2,101,905
98-3100-1050	PROPERTY TAX REPLACEMENT	\$ -	\$ 13,627	\$ -	\$ 13,627	\$ -	\$ 6,813	\$ -	\$ 6,813	\$ 6,813
98-3100-9000	PENALTY & INTEREST ON TAXES	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,899	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,693	\$ 2,500	\$ 3,342	\$ 2,500	\$ 3,836	\$ 3,800
98-3700-____	OTHER REVENUE (Rent)	\$ 50,000	\$ 59,864	\$ 38,500	\$ 54,022	\$ 38,500	\$ 116,390	\$ 36,000	\$ 21,698	\$ 36,000
98-3800-9__	FUND BALANCE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 520,000	\$ -	\$ 1,078,883	\$ -	\$ 896,501
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,488,890</b>	<b>\$ 1,716,239</b>	<b>\$ 1,522,027</b>	<b>\$ 1,816,520</b>	<b>\$ 2,211,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,332,078</b>	<b>\$ 2,867,383</b>	<b>\$ 2,014,347</b>	<b>\$ 3,045,019</b>
	<b>Expenditure</b>									
98-4410-3100	OFFICE SUPPLIES & POSTAGE	\$ 500	\$ 128	\$ 500	\$ 53	\$ 500	\$ 88	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500
98-4410-4200	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	\$ 56,000	\$ 62,804	\$ 56,000	\$ 58,241	\$ 56,000	\$ 94,589	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 70,000
98-4410-4400	ADVERTISING & LEGAL PUBLICATIO	\$ 1,000	\$ 398	\$ 1,000	\$ 456	\$ 1,000	\$ 339	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
98-4410-4600	LIABILITY INSURANCE	\$ 2,740	\$ 2,734	\$ 2,740	\$ 2,789	\$ 2,928	\$ 5,756	\$ 3,074	\$ 3,074	\$ 3,074
98-4410-4800	DUES, SUBSCRIPTIONS, & MEMBERS	\$ -	\$ 1,402	\$ -	\$ 1,550	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600
98-4410-4900	PERSONNEL TRAINING/TRAVEL/MTG	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000
98-4410-5000	ADMINISTRATIVE EXPNS-CITY GEN	\$ 31,911	\$ 31,911	\$ 32,868	\$ 32,868	\$ 32,869	\$ 32,869	\$ 34,547	\$ 34,547	\$ 43,790
98-4410-6100	REPAIR & MAINT-MACHINERY & EQ	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 509	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500
98-4410-8801	REIMBURSE CITY GENERAL FUND	\$ 105,394	\$ 105,394	\$ 108,556	\$ 87,048	\$ 84,001	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,184	\$ 70,000	\$ 100,000
98-4410-8852	REIMBURSE IN-LIEU HOUSING FUND	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
98-4410-9930	URA FUND OP. CONTINGENCY	\$ 124,290	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 55,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$ 413,835</b>	<b>\$ 204,771</b>	<b>\$ 328,664</b>	<b>\$ 183,005</b>	<b>\$ 295,798</b>	<b>\$ 211,749</b>	<b>\$ 200,405</b>	<b>\$ 186,221</b>	<b>\$ 278,464</b>
	<b>Capital Improvements</b>									
98-4410-7100	INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS	\$ 400,000	\$ 296,773	\$ 485,758	\$ 13,545	\$ 1,196,147	\$ 187,833	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,000,000
98-4410-7101	LIMELIGHT OPA	\$ 150,000	\$ 134,924	\$ 150,000	\$ 140,670	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 130,000
98-4410-7103	MISCELLANEOUS OPA	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 14,052	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 22,126	\$ 35,000
98-4410-7104	COMMUNITY LIBRARY OPA	\$ -	\$ 263,180	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
98-4410-7110	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	\$ 25,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 25,000	\$ 32,500	\$ 25,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
98-4410-7112	311 FIRST (WILSON)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -
98-4410-7900	DEPRECIATION EXPENSE	\$ -	\$ 5,855	\$ -	\$ 15,885	\$ -	\$ 15,885	\$ 16,000	\$ -	\$ -
98-4410-7950	AMORTIZATION COSTS	\$ -	\$ 10,188	\$ -	\$ 10,188	\$ -	\$ 108,146	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ -
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$ 615,000</b>	<b>\$ 718,420</b>	<b>\$ 720,758</b>	<b>\$ 276,840</b>	<b>\$ 1,431,147</b>	<b>\$ 375,865</b>	<b>\$ 2,288,000</b>	<b>\$ 597,126</b>	<b>\$ 2,240,000</b>
	<b>Debt Service</b>									
98-4800-4200	PROF.SERVICES-PAYING AGENT	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,750	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
98-4800-8100	DEBT SERVICE ACCT PRIN-2010	\$ 160,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
98-4800-8200	BOND DEBT SRVCE RESRV-INT EXP	\$ -	\$ (3,117)	\$ -	\$ (3,712)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
98-4800-8300	DEBT SRVC ACCT INTRST-2010	\$ 298,455	\$ 297,739	\$ 291,005	\$ 281,081	\$ 282,455	\$ 282,412	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
98-4800-8400	DEBT SERVICE ACCT PRIN-2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000	\$ 393,278
98-4800-8450	DEBT SRVC ACCT INTRST-2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 138,978	\$ 138,978	\$ 133,278
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$ 460,055</b>	<b>\$ 456,372</b>	<b>\$ 472,605</b>	<b>\$ 459,120</b>	<b>\$ 484,055</b>	<b>\$ 284,162</b>	<b>\$ 378,978</b>	<b>\$ 378,978</b>	<b>\$ 526,555</b>
	<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 1,488,890</b>	<b>\$ 1,379,563</b>	<b>\$ 1,522,027</b>	<b>\$ 918,964</b>	<b>\$ 2,211,000</b>	<b>\$ 871,777</b>	<b>\$ 2,867,383</b>	<b>\$ 1,162,325</b>	<b>\$ 3,045,019</b>
	<b>Net Income</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 336,677</b>	<b>\$ (0)</b>	<b>\$ 897,556</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,460,301</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 852,023</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

## Materials and Services Detail FY 22/23



Description		FY 20/21 Actuals	FY 21/22 Projected	FY 22/23 Budget
Professional Services		\$ 94,589	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000
	Attorney	\$ 45,000		
	Auditor	\$ 2,000		
	SVED	\$ 15,000		
	Misc. Services	\$ 4,000		
Dues, Subscriptions, Memberships		\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,600
	Redevelopment Association of Idaho	\$ 2,600		
Personnel Training / Travel / Meetings		\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
	Meetings	\$ 2,000		

# Capital Outlay FY 22/23



Description	FY 20/21 Actual	FY 21/22 Projected	FY 21/22 Budget
Infrastructure Projects:	\$ 13,545	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,000,000
Economic Development Projects:	\$25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000



## Staffing Analysis FY 22/23



Position	FY 20/21 Actual	FY 21/22 Projected	FY 22/23 Budget
Chairman	1	1	1
Vice-Chair	1	1	1
Commissioners	5	5	5
Executive Director	0.10	0.10	0.25
Treasurer	0.10	0.10	0.10
Secretary	0.10	0.10	0.10
AP & Payroll	0.05	0.05	0.05
<b>TOTAL</b>	7.6	7.6	7.5

RESOLUTION NO. 22-URA07

BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE KETCHUM URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF KETCHUM, IDAHO:

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE KETCHUM URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF KETCHUM, IDAHO, TO BE TERMED “THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION”, APPROPRIATING SUMS OF MONEY AUTHORIZED BY LAW AND DEEMED NECESSARY TO DEFRAY ALL EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES OF THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2022, AND ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2023, FOR ALL GENERAL, SPECIAL AND CORPORATE PURPOSES; DIRECTING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SUBMIT SAID BUDGET; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

THIS RESOLUTION, made on the date hereinafter set forth by the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency of Ketchum, Idaho, an independent public body corporate and politic, authorized under the authority of the Idaho Urban Renewal Law of 1965, as amended, Chapter 20, Title 50, Idaho Code, a duly created and functioning urban renewal agency for Ketchum, Idaho, hereinafter referred to as the Agency.

WHEREAS, the Agency, an independent public body, corporate and politic, is an urban renewal agency created by and existing under the authority of and pursuant to the Idaho Urban Renewal Law of 1965, being Idaho Code, Title 50, Chapter 20, as amended and supplemented;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Ketchum, Idaho (the City), on October 30, 2006, after notice duly published, conducted a public hearing on the Ketchum Urban Renewal Plan (the Urban Renewal Plan);

WHEREAS, following said public hearing the City adopted its Ordinance No. 992 on November 15, 2006, approving the Urban Renewal Plan and making certain findings;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Ketchum, Idaho (the City), on November 15, 2010, after notice duly published, conducted a public hearing and adopted its Ordinance No. 1077, approving a revised Urban Renewal Area Plan with a revised revenue allocation area;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Idaho Code Sections 50-2006, 50-2903(5) and 50-1002, Agency staff has prepared a budget and the Agency has tentatively approved estimated revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year commencing October 1, 2022, and ending September 30, 2023, by virtue of its action at the Agency’s Board meeting of June 27, 2022;

WHEREAS, Agency has previously published notice on July 6, 2022 and July 13, 2022, of a public hearing to be conducted on July 18, 2022 at 2:00 p.m., at the Ketchum City Council Chambers, located at 191 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Ketchum, Idaho;

WHEREAS, on July 18, 2022, pursuant to Section 50-1002, Idaho Code, the Agency held a public hearing at the Ketchum City Council Chambers, located at 191 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Ketchum, Idaho, on the proposed budget and considered public comment on services, expenditures, and revenues planned for Fiscal Year 2023;

WHEREAS, the Board at its July 18, 2022, meeting did acknowledge receipt of written comment concerning the proposed FY 2023 budget and noted its inclusion in the record concerning consideration of the FY 2023 budget;

WHEREAS, the Board also allowed any public testimony to be taken at the July 18, 2022, board meeting;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 50-2006, Idaho Code, the Agency is required to pass an annual appropriation resolution and submit the resolution to the City Clerk of the City of Ketchum.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE KETCHUM URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF KETCHUM, IDAHO, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1: That the sums of money, or as much thereof as may be authorized by law, needed, or deemed necessary to defray all expenses and liabilities of the Agency, as set forth in Exhibit A, which is annexed hereto and by reference made a part of this Resolution, are hereby appropriated for the general, special and corporate purposes and objectives of the Agency for the fiscal year commencing October 1, 2022, and ending September 30, 2023.

Section 2: That the Chairman shall submit said budget to the City of Ketchum upon adoption of this Resolution.

Section 3: That this Resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its adoption and approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Ketchum Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Ketchum, Idaho, on July 18, 2022. Signed by the Chairwoman of the Board of Commissioners, and attested by the Secretary to the Board of Commissioners, on this \_\_\_\_ day of July 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan Scovell  
Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Enourato

## EXHIBIT A

### URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY FUND

	Actual FY 20-21	Budgeted FY 21-22	Proposed FY 22-23
<u>EXPENDITURES:</u>			
URA Expenditures	512,614	2,488,405	2,518,464
URA Debt Service Expenditures	292,987	378,978	526,555
TOTAL URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY EXPENDITURES	805,602	2,867,383	3,005,019
<u>REVENUE:</u>			
Tax Increment Revenue	1,860,533	1,750,000	2,101,905
Other Revenue	126,544	38,500	46,613
Fund Balance	0	1,078,883	896,501
TOTAL URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY REVENUE	1,987,077	2,867,383	3,045,019

**From:** [Participate](#)  
**To:** [Suzanne Frick](#)  
**Subject:** FW: For public comment and distribution to KURA Commissioners  
**Date:** Thursday, June 30, 2022 3:58:50 PM

---

Public comment for KURA commissioners.

## **LISA ENOURATO | CITY OF KETCHUM**

**Public Affairs & Administrative Services Manager**

P.O. Box 2315 | 191 Fifth St. W. | Ketchum, ID 83340

o: 208.726.7803 | f: 208.726.7812

[lenourato@ketchumidaho.org](mailto:lenourato@ketchumidaho.org) | [www.ketchumidaho.org](http://www.ketchumidaho.org)

---

**From:** H Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2022 3:35 PM  
**To:** Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>  
**Cc:** Andrew Guckes <aguckes@mtexpress.com>; Mark Dee <mdee@mtexpress.com>; Greg Foley <gfoley@mtexpress.com>  
**Subject:** For public comment and distribution to KURA Commissioners

In listening to the 6/22/27 meeting, a couple of things stood out to me:

At a prior KURA meeting, Commissioner Scofield took me to task for stating that KURA is indeed independent of the City of Ketchum. Today's meeting really makes me question her position. KURA is clearly a tool of the City, especially the City Planning department.

One commissioner seemed confused by where the funds for SVED are in the budget. Based on a statement by the ED, he seems to think they are in 7110 - Economic Development. Per the documents provided by the staff, that money is in 4200, Professional Fees. KURA should only be funding consultants in highly limited circumstances on specific KURA projects (e.g. Agnew::Beck to help evaluation proposals).

The ED did not inform you that the City was likely to approve \$15k for SVED and that Mr Griffith's ask was a total of \$25k from City/KURA. Do you feel you are getting the whole story when funding requests are presented to you? KURA should not be paying anything to SVED. **KURA should not be a piggy bank for the City Council to fund its consultants.**

Also in the budget, it slid through, without comment, that **the City is planning to raise its charge to KURA for the ED by almost 3x.** How that was not discussed seems due to the inherent and unresolvable conflict of having a City employee as the ED of KURA. The budget increased her apportionment from .10 to .25, which is 2.5x the existing allocation. On top of that, her compensation is likely to go up 9% under the current City budget thinking. **For a cost like that, with such a material conflict of interest, to pass undiscussed, seems like a dereliction on part of KURA.**

This is made more egregious since that at the City budget meeting this morning, the Planning Department plans to raise its fees to recover 70% of its costs. That would include 70% of the City'

Planner's compensation. **This seems like double dipping by the City into KURA's piggy bank**, and if blessed by KURA, seems like a lack of independence.

The adoption of RESOLUTION 22-URA09 seems inconsistent with the budget you approved today, That budget has funding for many things other than Washington (to the exclusion of funding sidewalks per Chair Scoville). What is the point of the policy? To deny KURA funds to the two new hotels?

As for Bluebird, no questions were asked about the status of the project other than the intended start date. To wit:

- why has no building permit been issued despite the original March start time.
- what is the likelihood of litigation that could delay or stop the project?
- what is the likelihood of the developer asking for more KURA money?
- what is the outside date for which the tax credits are valid and what could delay construction past that date.
- what is the status of the local resident preference and why a draft of it has never been circulated.

**If Bluebird gets built with KURA funds and turns into housing for the Marriott and retirees, KURA is going to look...**well you can imagine. The City seems to use KURA as a source of dumb money for Bluebird.

You have gotten no information on the novel low-income housing proposal from a local Ketchum resident that could provide housing restricted to working people, at as low as 1/3 of market rates, which will make Bluebird look like a colossal misuse of taxpayer funds. Why not?

Having an ED from the City and two City Councillors as commissioners seems to put KURA in an awkward position. They only tell you what they want you to know (they were all at the City budget meeting this morning), so unless you ask the hard questions, you aren't making decisions on a fully-informed basis.

Respectfully,

Perry Boyle  
Ketchum

**From:** [Participate](#)  
**To:** [H Boyle](#); [Participate](#)  
**Cc:** [Andrew Guckes](#); [Mark Dee](#); [Greg Foley](#); [Suzanne Frick](#)  
**Subject:** RE: For public comment and distribution to KURA Commissioners  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:16:44 PM

---

Perry—

In response to your comments to the KURA, please note the following information:

- No KURA funding has been allocated for SVED. The KURA budget includes the ability to provide funding if the KURA agrees to enter into a contract for services. SVED would first need to formally request funding from the KURA in FY 23 and KURA would decide if they wanted to enter into a contract with SVED for a specific scope of work.
- Funding provided by the City is through a separate contract and scope of work with SVED. The City and KURA on occasion have separate contracts with the same consultants (Agnew Beck for example) however, the scope of work for the city and KURA differ and are unrelated.
- You are incorrect that the increase in KURA staffing costs is for the Executive Director. A variety of staff support the KURA, including the City Clerk, City Treasurer, Senior Planner, Assistant Planner and the Planning and Building Director. The proposed increased staffing cost is to support the additional staff resources necessary to support the KURA in the development of the 1<sup>st</sup> and Washington property and other initiatives. This increase is not targeted for the Executive Director.
- During the Council budget presentation, a breakdown was provided illustrating the percent of time the Planning and Building Department staff spend on the different functions. P&B staff spend 77% of their time processing development applications and building permits, 6% on long range planning and code updates and 7% on KURA staffing. To provide additional staffing capacity for KURA and long-range planning initiatives, such as updating the zoning ordinance, without impacting the development permitting timeframes, additional staff resources are necessary. The additional staff would be funded by increased planning permit fees and KURA funding. The increase in fees is NOT to recover 70% of the department costs, it is to fund an additional staff position.
- Similar to the Community Library, the Limelight Hotel, and other development projects in Ketchum, the KURA has agreed to fund public improvements related to Bluebird. The concerns and issues you raise are best directed to the City Council since these issues are not within the jurisdiction of the KURA.
- No information has been provided from anyone on a new novel low-income housing proposal you mentioned. If there is information, I would be happy to share it with the Board.
- When the KURA was first formed, the entire City Council served as the KURA Board. That changed in 2011 and the Board consisted of 3 Councilmembers and 4 at large

members. That changed again in 2015 to the present configuration of 2 Councilmembers and 5 at large members. In establishing the make-up of the Board 2015, it was important to the Council and KURA Board that the majority of members were not Councilmembers and that at least 2 Councilmembers were on the Board for continuity and collaboration.

Should you have any further questions, please let me know.

Suzanne

**SUZANNE FRICK | CITY OF KETCHUM**

PLANNING AND BUILDING | KURA DIRECTOR

P.O. Box 2315 | 191 5<sup>th</sup> Street W | Ketchum, ID 83340

o: 208.727.5086 | m: 208.721.2765

[sfrick@ketchumidaho.org](mailto:sfrick@ketchumidaho.org) | [www.ketchumidaho.org](http://www.ketchumidaho.org)

---

**From:** H Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2022 3:35 PM

**To:** Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>

**Cc:** Andrew Guckes <aguckes@mtexpress.com>; Mark Dee <mdee@mtexpress.com>; Greg Foley <gfoley@mtexpress.com>

**Subject:** For public comment and distribution to KURA Commissioners

In listening to the 6/22/27 meeting, a couple of things stood out to me:

At a prior KURA meeting, Commissioner Scofield took me to task for stating that KURA is indeed independent of the City of Ketchum. Today's meeting really makes me question her position. KURA is clearly a tool of the City, especially the City Planning department.

One commissioner seemed confused by where the funds for SVED are in the budget. Based on a statement by the ED, he seems to think they are in 7110 - Economic Development. Per the documents provided by the staff, that money is in 4200, Professional Fees. KURA should only be funding consultants in highly limited circumstances on specific KURA projects (e.g. Agnew::Beck to help evaluation proposals).

The ED did not inform you that the City was likely to approve \$15k for SVED and that Mr Griffith's ask was a total of \$25k from City/KURA. Do you feel you are getting the whole story when funding requests are presented to you? KURA should not be paying anything to SVED. **KURA should not be a piggy bank for the City Council to fund its consultants.**

Also in the budget, it slid through, without comment, that **the City is planning to raise its charge to KURA for the ED by almost 3x**. How that was not discussed seems due to the inherent and unresolvable conflict of having a City employee as the ED of KURA. The budget increased her



apportionment from .10 to .25, which is 2.5x the existing allocation. On top of that, her compensation is likely to go up 9% under the current City budget thinking. **For a cost like that, with such a material conflict of interest, to pass undiscussed, seems like a dereliction on part of KURA.**

This is made more egregious since that at the City budget meeting this morning, the Planning Department plans to raise its fees to recover 70% of its costs. That would include 70% of the City Planner's compensation. **This seems like double dipping by the City into KURA's piggy bank**, and if blessed by KURA, seems like a lack of independence.

The adoption of RESOLUTION 22-URA09 seems inconsistent with the budget you approved today, That budget has funding for many things other than Washington (to the exclusion of funding sidewalks per Chair Scoville). What is the point of the policy? To deny KURA funds to the two new hotels?

As for Bluebird, no questions were asked about the status of the project other than the intended start date. To wit:

- why has no building permit been issued despite the original March start time.
- what is the likelihood of litigation that could delay or stop the project?
- what is the likelihood of the developer asking for more KURA money?
- what is the outside date for which the tax credits are valid and what could delay construction past that date.
- what is the status of the local resident preference and why a draft of it has never been circulated.

**If Bluebird gets built with KURA funds and turns into housing for the Marriott and retirees, KURA is going to look...**well you can imagine. The City seems to use KURA as a source of dumb money for Bluebird.

You have gotten no information on the novel low-income housing proposal from a local Ketchum resident that could provide housing restricted to working people, at as low as 1/3 of market rates, which will make Bluebird look like a colossal misuse of taxpayer funds. Why not?

Having an ED from the City and two City Councillors as commissioners seems to put KURA in an awkward position. They only tell you what they want you to know (they were all at the City budget meeting this morning), so unless you ask the hard questions, you aren't making decisions on a fully-informed basis.

Respectfully,

Perry Boyle  
Ketchum