

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Dina Madsen <madelineandoliver@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2026 11:43 AM
To: Participate; Spencer Cordovano; Peter Prekeges; Matthew McGraw
Subject: Street Closure

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the Honorable Mayor and Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing as a local business owner in Ketchum to formally request an immediate review of the financial impact that the scheduled street maintenance and related street closure will have on my business.

A notice was recently delivered stating that my street is scheduled for chip sealing and fog sealing from **June 15–19**, with vehicles required to be moved by **6:00 AM**, the street cleared, and work beginning early. While I understand and respect the importance of maintaining public streets, the timing, access restrictions, and disruption to customer traffic create a serious concern for the financial health of my business.

This concern is not hypothetical. **The last time the street was closed during the summer months, my business lost significant income.** That prior closure directly reduced customer access, walk-in traffic, visibility, and sales during one of the most important retail seasons in Ketchum. I cannot absorb another similar financial loss without the City reviewing the impact and taking reasonable steps to mitigate the damage.

For a small retail business, even a few days of reduced access, blocked parking, customer confusion, dust, noise, or perceived closure can result in significant lost sales. My business depends on walk-in traffic, visibility, deliveries, appointments, and convenient customer access. A multi-day disruption during the summer season in Ketchum can have a disproportionate impact on revenue, especially when customers may assume the business is closed or inaccessible.

I am therefore requesting that the Mayor, City Council, and appropriate City departments promptly review and address the following:

1. **The projected and actual financial impact on affected businesses**, including lost sales, reduced foot traffic, canceled appointments, delivery interruptions, and customer access limitations.
2. **The financial losses my business previously suffered during a prior summer street closure**, and how the City intends to prevent a repeat of that harm.
3. **Clear written confirmation of the exact work schedule for my street**, including the specific dates, hours, and expected periods of restricted access.
4. **A mitigation plan for affected businesses**, including signage stating that businesses remain open, safe pedestrian access, customer parking alternatives, delivery access, and direct communication updates.

5. **Consideration of compensation, fee relief, tax relief, or other financial accommodation** for businesses that suffer measurable loss as a result of the closure or restricted access.
6. **Advance communication procedures for future street closures**, so local businesses are given adequate time to plan staffing, customer messaging, appointments, deliveries, and sales promotions around construction impacts.

I am not objecting to necessary street maintenance. However, I am requesting that the City recognize that public works decisions can create direct private financial harm when businesses lose access, visibility, parking, and customer confidence. The burden of this disruption should not fall entirely on small businesses without review, mitigation, and accountability.

Please consider this letter a formal request for review and response. I ask that this matter be placed before the appropriate City staff, Mayor, and Council representatives as soon as possible, and that I receive a written response outlining what steps the City will take to reduce the financial damage to my business during the June 15–19 project window.

Sincerely,

Dina Madsen
Owner, **Madeline + Oliver**
Ketchum, Idaho



Dawn Hofheimer

From: Chris Spain <john.chris.spain@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 10:40 AM
To: Participate
Subject: LOT

I wrote earlier about this. The tax should ve on TOURISM not residents. Tax second home owners and tax hotels.

THEN

Use the tax money for real infrastructure that is beat up due to high traffic. To advertise and spend money on promoting air traffic is a bad use. Not right.

Sent from my iPhone

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Trey Lanier <trey.lanier@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 2:13 PM
To: Participate
Subject: LOT paid by locals!

Hello,

I just had my truck repaired at Perfect Appearance. I'm a local, not a visitor. I had to pay 2% LOT on my repair bill. Clearly, for auto repair/work, this is NOT a tax on visitors. Locals get their cars repaired here; visitors will drive into and back out of town or get rental cars.

The LOTs need to be revised immediately to REDUCE taxes on locals:

- No more LOT on retail - we live here 365 days/year; how would we NOT use local retail? And 2% LOT on car repair? That is NOT taxing visitors!!!
- No more LOT on alcohol. We live here 365 days/year and frequent the local restaurants and bars. That is a tax on locals that should NOT be there.
- No more LOT on building materials. I own my primary home here and should NOT have to pay a 'visitor tax' when I'm working on improving / maintaining my home. This is CLEARLY not a tax on visitors...
- Crank up the LOT on hotel rooms and short term rentals.
- Crank up the LOT on rental cars.
- Add the LOT for 'VISITOR services' as long as it will NEVER extend to 'local' services (such as haircuts, shaves, car wash / detail, massages, etc). As has been described, the 'services' LOT is very generic and *could* be stretched to 'services' that it was not originally intended to cover. So, be VERY SPECIFIC about which 'services' would have a new LOT, and specifically EXCLUDE (a list!) such services as I noted.
- No more LOT for Air. There are plenty of airlines using SUN now, and I certainly do NOT see cheap fares. Since most of this money seems to be going to 'Visit Sun Valley' - where it should NOT (businesses should fund their own advertising) - we don't need this LOT any longer.
- Stop the LOT for Housing. This money has NOT been used effectively nor efficiently to date. Until voters see a new, useful, only-for-Ketchum-workers plan, quit taking and wasting our money.

Trey Lanier

Dawn Hofheimer

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 12:38 PM
To: Peter Prekeges; Spencer Cordovano; Matthew McGraw; Randy Hall; Tripp Hutchinson; Participate
Cc: mike@sawtoothsociety.org; icl@idahoconservation.org; Betsy Mizell external; mark.menlove@tnc.org; info@woodriverlandtrust.org; info@lavalakeinstitute.org; info@discoversawtooth.org; SM.FS.SawtoothNF@usda.gov
Subject: Public Record Submission: The Carefully Managed Forest Fire.
Attachments: CAREFULLY_MANAGED_FIRE_June_2026.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Attached for your consideration and inclusion in the public record is a copy of my essay, *The Carefully Managed Forest Fire*.

The essay challenges prevailing assumptions regarding wildfire stewardship, prevention, and inquiry, and encourages renewed examination of the policies, practices, and conditions that may contribute to catastrophic wildfire outcomes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

James Hungelmann
Ketchum

THE CAREFULLY MANAGED FOREST FIRE

How Prevention Was Replaced by Response

How Catastrophe Came to Be Treated as Inevitable

And Why Stewardship Requires Unrestricted Inquiry

James Hungelmann

The White Room LLC

June 2026

Introduction

This essay is not about whether every wildfire can be prevented. No serious person believes that.

It is about whether preventable fires are increasingly being allowed to become catastrophic fires before meaningful intervention occurs.

It is about whether prevention has been displaced by response, stewardship by resignation, and inquiry by explanation.

The central question is not whether forests burn. Forests have always burned. The question is whether policies, practices, and assumptions intended to protect the forest may, in some cases, be contributing to conditions that make catastrophe more likely while discouraging examination of alternative explanations.

A living forest is more than timber. It is a community of watersheds, wildlife, soils, plants, insects, and countless relationships that sustain resilience and life. Stewardship requires more than explaining destruction after it occurs. It requires examining the conditions that make destruction possible in the first place.

The subject of this essay is wildfire.

The larger question is stewardship.

The Old Wisdom

Modern forest policy has achieved a miracle.

It has discovered how to remove lookout towers, reduce practical human observation, discourage early intervention, chemically treat forests, electrify the landscape with towers, transmission infrastructure, radar, and pulsed systems, saturate the sky with official denials, bury common sense beneath process, and then announce — with a straight face — that the resulting inferno is entirely natural, entirely blameless, and merely a warning of worse to be expected.

At some point, repeated failure ceases to look like misfortune. The public is entitled to ask whether what is being presented as inevitability is, in fact, the predictable result of policy choices.

If a society removes practical safeguards, discourages early intervention, ignores accumulating risk factors, and then attributes every resulting disaster to forces beyond human control, responsibility has not disappeared. It has merely been relocated.

There was a time, not very long ago, when a forest fire was considered an emergency. A man in a tower saw smoke. A ranger received word. Crews were sent. The thing was attacked while it was still small enough to be embarrassed by its own ambition.

The old system was imperfect, but its governing assumption was simple: a fire detected early was a fire more likely to be stopped. Prevention was not treated as a romantic relic of the past; it was treated as the first duty of stewardship.

The old system understood a truth modern management sometimes forgets: a small fire and a large fire are not different events. They are often the same event observed at different moments in time.

Often the beginning was not mysterious. In remote country, it might be lightning — one strike, one tree, one column of smoke. Not fifty trees at once, not a mountain instantly converted into a furnace, but one wounded pine announcing itself to anyone still permitted to watch the horizon.

That was the purpose of the lookout. He did not need a climate symposium to understand smoke. He saw the thin gray confession rising from the trees and made the call.

Then came the old practical genius of fire response: get someone there.

By trail, by road, by helicopter, or, when the country was too remote, by smokejumper — men dropped from aircraft into hard country for the outrageous purpose of stopping a fire while it was still a fire, not yet a theory, not yet a policy opportunity, not yet a red polygon crawling across the evening news.

One tree became five only if time was wasted. Five became twenty only if response lagged. Twenty became fifty only if the little fire was allowed to grow a biography.

The whole object was to interrupt the story early — to see the smoke, make the call, put boots on the ground, and snap the thing off before the forest had been promoted from a manageable problem into a regional disaster.

Let it Burn

The modern mind has also discovered that fire, like bad policy, becomes far more difficult to stop once allowed to grow.

This is called “letting it burn,” though naturally it is seldom advertised in such plain English. It appears instead as managed fire, ecological process, resilience strategy, natural disturbance, and the many other soft robes in which surrender disguises itself.

There are circumstances where prescribed fire and careful fire management may be legitimate. But there is a difference between using fire as a tool and allowing fire to become the administrator.

There is a difference between stewardship and resignation. There is a difference between a controlled burn and a governing philosophy that treats catastrophe as unavoidable.

When “let it burn” becomes easier than “get there now,” when theory outruns local judgment, when the first smoke is treated as an ecological essay rather than an emergency, the forest is no longer being protected. It is being managed into catastrophe.

The Policy That Cannot Fail

A troubling feature of some modern policy systems is their apparent inability to fail. Success validates the policy. Failure is said to justify more funding, more authority, more intervention, or more public education. In such systems, outcomes no longer test assumptions. Assumptions reinterpret outcomes.

The public is entitled to ask a simple question: if results continue to deteriorate, at what point do the assumptions themselves deserve re-examination?

Indeed, the modern wildfire often arrives wrapped in official innocence.

No one caused it. No one permitted it. No one failed to prevent it. The fire simply arrived, like an act of God accompanied by a management manual explaining why nothing else could have been done.

When Courage Arrives Too Late

And when prevention fails, the burden does not disappear. It simply moves downstream. The small fire becomes the large fire. The manageable problem becomes the emergency. The responsibility deferred becomes the crisis confronted.

When the chain of prevention breaks, a cruel inversion follows.

The people later called “first responders” are often not first at all. They are last responders to a failure already well advanced — brave men and women arriving after the small fire has been permitted to become an army and a lethal threat to man and beast alike. By then, there may be little left to do except retreat, defend structures, move people out, breathe smoke, watch ridgelines explode, and carry the professional sorrow of public servants placed too late inside the ruins of preventable decisions.

The indictment is not of the firefighter. It is of the policy that makes courage arrive too late.

A young smokejumper can stop one burning tree. A trained crew can cut off five. A coordinated response can contain twenty. But no amount of bravery can politely ask a wind-driven crown fire to reconsider itself after it has been allowed to become a monster.

At that point, the firefighter is no longer fighting merely fire. He is fighting time already lost, fuel already accumulated, and a system that tied his hands before the battle began.

The public is encouraged to worship response while being discouraged from examining prevention. We praise the exhausted firefighter, thank the emergency manager, mourn the losses, and donate to the relief fund. All proper things. But none of these rituals answers the prior question:

Why was the small fire allowed to become the catastrophe before courage, skill, and sacrifice could still make the difference?

Prevention Is Quiet

Prevention has no press conference, no emergency declaration, no heroic footage, no rebuilding fund, and no federal theater. Its success is measured largely by events that never occur. It merely saves the forest, which is apparently the least marketable outcome of all.

Modern management has improved upon this arrangement.

Today we have satellites, climate models, emergency dashboards, interagency frameworks, and vocabulary so sophisticated that by the time the first paragraph of the incident report is complete, the fire has already crossed three drainages and consumed another watershed.

The old lookout tower is gone. The old ranger has been replaced by a process. The old instinct to stop the fire has been replaced by a philosophy. And the forest, after years of neglect, bureaucratic confusion, policy experimentation, and other accumulating stresses, becomes less a living ecosystem than a waiting fuse.

We are then instructed to call the explosion "natural."

The miracle is not that the forest burns. The miracle is that anyone is surprised.

Forbidden Questions

A healthy society does not decide in advance which questions may be asked.

Numerous atmospheric, chemical, technological, and environmental factors now occur across modern landscapes. Many independent researchers and critics have suggested that certain activities

may be contributing to serious forest desiccation, ecological stress, fuel vulnerability, ignition susceptibility, and intensified fire behavior.

Whether those concerns ultimately prove correct, partially correct, or mistaken is a matter for investigation. What is not reasonable is to exclude such possibilities from examination before the investigation begins.

A question is not answered because it has been mocked. Ridicule is not testing. Dismissal is not investigation.

This essay does not presume the correctness of every hypothesis advanced by independent researchers, critics, or citizens. Some claims may ultimately prove well-founded. Others may prove incomplete or mistaken. That is the nature of honest inquiry. The issue is not whether every proposed explanation is correct. The issue is whether potentially relevant explanations are permitted to be examined according to the same standards of evidence, testing, and investigation applied to every other question affecting the public interest.

No serious possibility should be excluded from investigation merely because it is unpopular, inconvenient, or outside prevailing assumptions.

If atmospheric, chemical, technological, or other environmental influences may be affecting forest health, moisture, resilience, ignition susceptibility, or fire behavior, they deserve careful and independent examination. To dismiss such possibilities before investigation begins is not scientific skepticism. It is institutional prejudice masquerading as certainty.

The Living Forest

The consequences do not end with incinerated ridges, destroyed structures, exhausted crews, and emergency declarations. Fire passes through something larger than timber. It passes through a living system.

Too often, public discussion focuses on the spark while avoiding examination of the conditions that make the spark consequential.

A serious investigation examines more than ignition. It examines the conditions that determine what happens after ignition occurs.

Some influences weaken resilience by drying soils, stressing vegetation, reducing moisture, and degrading the health of the living forest. Others increase the likelihood of ignition or intensify the speed, scale, and destructive potential of fire once it begins.

A single spark may be unavoidable. The conditions that determine what follows often are not.

The question is not merely what ignited the fire. The question is what prepared the forest to receive it.

A forest is not simply a collection of trees. It is a living community of soil organisms, fungi, grasses, shrubs, insects, birds, wildlife, wetlands, streams, and countless biological relationships that cycle nutrients, hold moisture, shade the ground, and sustain resilience.

The health of the forest cannot be separated from the health of everything that supports it.

When that living web is weakened, the trees eventually reveal the injury. Needles dull. Crowns thin. Bark dries. Understory conditions change. Insects appear in imbalance. Wildlife declines. Creek systems weaken. The forest begins to look less vigorous and more chronically stressed.

An arborist, forester, rancher, woodsman, or anyone who has watched the same country for decades recognizes the signs long before they appear in any report.

And a chronically stressed forest does not burn like a healthy one.

A healthy forest possesses resilience. A weakened forest possesses vulnerability.

The question is not whether a spark exists. The question is what kind of forest is waiting to receive it.

The Wildfire Two-Step

The official narrative often unfolds in two stages.

The first stage is normalization. As systems are installed, policies expanded, conditions deteriorate, and warning signs accumulate, the public is repeatedly assured that nothing unusual is happening.

The forest is normal. The dead trees are normal. The missing lookouts are normal. The delayed response is normal. The fire behavior is normal.

The ash falling into children's lungs is normal. The damaged watersheds are normal. The blackened hillsides are normal. The insurance withdrawals are normal.

Each development is presented as an isolated occurrence. Each concern is explained away as routine. Each anomaly is treated as unremarkable.

The result is a strange inversion: the conditions themselves rarely become the focus of scrutiny. Instead, the citizen who notices recurring patterns increasingly finds himself cast as the problem.

The more unusual the circumstances appear to many observers, the more emphatically they are assured that nothing unusual is occurring.

Then comes the second stage: explanation.

Once the forest has burned, once the ridgeline is black, once the creek runs ash-gray, once the animals are gone, and once firefighters have been sent into the impossible, the official mind reaches for its final solvent.

Anything visible from the ground is anecdotal. Anything photographed is misunderstood. Anything measured is misinterpreted. Anything questioned is conspiracy. Anything unexplained is complexity. And anything burned is climate change.

The issue is not whether climate influences forests. The issue is whether "climate" has become an explanation so expansive—and so institutionally dominant—that competing explanations are often narrowed before investigation even begins.

A serious investigation asks not merely whether climate matters, but what else matters. It examines management decisions, fuel conditions, infrastructure vulnerabilities, environmental changes, chemical, technological, and atmospheric interventions, and missed opportunities for prevention. It follows evidence wherever it leads rather than directing evidence toward a predetermined conclusion.

Yet climate change increasingly functions as the perfect institutional refuge. It cannot be cross-examined. It cannot be subpoenaed. It cannot be asked why lookout towers were removed, why initial attack was delayed, why fuel conditions accumulated, or why policies persisted despite deteriorating outcomes.

Climate becomes an explanation broad enough to absorb every failure without assigning responsibility for any particular one.

That is the final achievement of the carefully not-prevented wildfire: not merely the burned forest, but the conquered imagination. A people who cannot challenge the story cannot correct the policy.

Forest Trustees, Not Owners

Public agencies do not own the forest. They hold it in trust. Their duty is not to manage citizens into accepting the destruction of the living forest, but to protect the inheritance placed in their care: the trees, watersheds, wildlife, soil, beauty, and wildness that belong not merely to the present, but to future generations as well.

Stewardship is measured not by explanations offered after destruction, but by protection provided before it.

When those entrusted with protection normalize loss, excuse delay, tolerate deteriorating conditions, and rename surrender as resilience, the injury is not merely ecological. It is a breach of trust.

And when public trust fails, responsibility returns to the public to demand accountability and reclaim stewardship.

That breach is compounded by another modern inversion. Across the West, many ranchers, woodsmen, tribes, outfitters, and mountain families have long believed they could help care for the forest through fuel reduction, access maintenance, deadfall removal, and practical stewardship. Yet the people closest to the land frequently find themselves constrained by permits, closures, liability concerns, centralized planning, and distant administration.

A living forest does not need only theories from afar. It needs eyes, hands, memory, access, and care.

The local resident gathering winter fuel is not necessarily the enemy of the forest. The neighbor who knows the drainage, the trail, the wind pattern, the beetle kill, and the dry understory may possess knowledge no management plan can fully replicate. That knowledge is more than information. It is part of the culture, memory, and inheritance of the land itself.

When citizens are excluded from prevention, they are later conscripted into consequence. They are told to evacuate, watch their valleys burn, and pay for suppression after being denied meaningful participation in stewardship before the fire.

This raises a larger question. The familiar debate asks whether forests are being managed or neglected. That is a legitimate question, but it is not sufficient. The deeper question is whether policies intended to protect the forest have instead contributed to the conditions that make catastrophic fire more likely.

A forest can be made less resilient through restricted access, diminished detection capacity, neglected fuels, delayed response, and other policies that increase vulnerability while responsibility is later assigned to climate, funding shortages, or decades-old management decisions.

The public should welcome discussions of fuel reduction and practical forest care. It should reject any framework that narrows inquiry before harder questions are asked.

This is why the renewed focus on the old "10 a.m. policy" deserves caution. The historical doctrine that fires should be controlled by 10 a.m. the day following discovery contains a partial truth: decades of aggressive suppression may have contributed to fuel accumulation in some forests.

But a policy from 1935 cannot explain present conditions, present decisions, present response capabilities, or present outcomes. When historical explanations become the master narrative, they

risk functioning as a decoy—directing attention toward the past while discouraging examination of the present.

The essential question remains unchanged: what conditions prepared the forest to burn, who knew of them, what actions were taken or not taken, and what accountability follows when prevention fails?

Policy Arson

Some critics have gone so far as to describe the situation as a form of policy arson.

They do not mean that officials literally ignite fires. Rather, they argue that when those entrusted with protection repeatedly remove safeguards, tolerate known risks, delay intervention, disregard warning signs, and refuse to examine environmental, chemical, atmospheric, electromagnetic, or other technological contributors to forest vulnerability, responsibility cannot be escaped merely because the immediate ignition source happened to be lightning, equipment failure, or human error. At some point, failure repeated with knowledge begins to resemble method.

Whether one agrees with that conclusion or not, the underlying question remains legitimate: what obligations accompany stewardship, and how should those obligations be measured when outcomes continue to deteriorate?

Perhaps all of this is perfectly innocent. Perhaps lookout towers disappeared by wisdom. Perhaps early fire response was abandoned by enlightenment. Perhaps every warning sign is coincidence. Perhaps the altered sky, the dry canopy, the brittle understory, and increasingly destructive fire behavior are merely unrelated events standing politely in a row.

Perhaps.

To be clear, the objection is not to genuine forest restoration, responsible fuel reduction, defensible space, watershed protection, or honest local stewardship. Those are precisely the measures a serious society would examine openly, debate honestly, and undertake responsibly.

The objection is to allowing terms such as “restoration,” “resilience,” and “adaptation” to become substitutes for accountability—as though catastrophe simply descended from the heavens rather than developing through years of accumulated fuel, restricted access, delayed intervention, bureaucratic inertia, and neglected prevention.

Nor is the objection to scientific inquiry. Quite the opposite. If additional human factors may influence forest health, fuel conditions, ignition risk, or fire behavior, they should be examined openly, tested rigorously, and evaluated according to evidence. Questions should be answered through investigation, not dismissed through ridicule; addressed through analysis, not buried beneath slogans.

A healthy forest requires stewardship. A healthy society requires inquiry.

Neither benefits when difficult questions become unwelcome.

The Larger Fire

A civilization that refuses to ask why its forests burn differently may eventually discover that the answer was visible all along.

Not hidden in some secret archive. Not buried in an inaccessible laboratory. Not concealed beyond human reach.

Visible in policy decisions. Visible in management records. Visible in removed safeguards. Visible in delayed responses. Visible in neglected warnings. Visible in the widening gap between what citizens observe and what they are told to observe or permitted to debate.

The question is not whether evidence exists, but whether society remains willing to examine it honestly.

For the issue before us is larger than wildfire.

A forest can be replanted. A watershed may eventually recover. Wildlife populations can sometimes return. Even burned landscapes may heal with time.

But a society that loses its willingness to question official explanations suffers a deeper injury. When inquiry becomes suspicion, when skepticism becomes pathology, when observation becomes misconduct, and when approved narratives arrive before investigation begins, self-government itself begins to weaken.

The forest is therefore not merely the subject of this discussion. It is the example.

For generations, public institutions derived legitimacy not from authority alone, but from transparency, accountability, evidence, and public trust.

Evidence—not assumption—should decide the question.

For no inheritance is more easily lost than one surrendered a little at a time and then explained away afterward.

Living With Wildfire

Now comes the final slogan: "Living with wildfire."

After the lookout has vanished, after prevention has been bureaucratized, after the small fire has been allowed to become a monster, after the forest has been weakened, and after the public has been told not to ask what changed, we are invited to accept the new doctrine:

Live with it.

Not prevent it. Not investigate it. Not restore the systems that once stopped it early. Not ask whether different policies might produce different outcomes.

Just live with wildfire.

But "living with wildfire" may be only another name for surrender—a soft civic phrase for capitulation to a condition that free people should never have accepted as inevitable.

And who, exactly, is being asked to live with it?

Tell it to the deer, the elk, the birds, the fish, the pollinators, and the countless other creatures whose homes are turned to ash.

A forest is not an empty stage upon which policy performs. It is a home. It is a living world.

And when that world burns, it is not merely acreage lost, timber lost, or carbon released. It is terror inflicted upon creatures that trusted the forest more honestly than we did and whose presence is part of the very fabric of its health.

Nor is the loss limited to the creatures of the forest. It is a loss borne by future generations as well.

Children do not inherit character from screens, slogans, or emergency dashboards. They inherit it from creeks cold enough to wake the blood, trees old enough to humble the ego, and wild places that remind human beings they are not the authors of creation.

Every generation receives such places as an inheritance and holds them in trust for the next.

The forest fire of the old world was a danger. The forest fire of the new world is a system. It is a policy outcome, a budget event, a media product, a climate parable, a land-management philosophy, and ultimately a test of whether free citizens are still permitted to connect visible dots without first being told which conclusions are acceptable.

So let us give this modern miracle its proper name.

Not a wildfire. Not exactly.

Call it the carefully not-prevented wildfire.

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Carol Klick <carolklick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 4:10 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Lot Tax

Dear Mayor Pete and city council members,

I do not support the KBAC lot tax recommendations.
I do not support any tax on retail and building materials.
Please tax only tourists with lodging tax.

This year, it is difficult for small businesses in Ketchum. Last year was difficult as well. Our traffic problems are not likely to get better for a few years.

The next phase south of Hailey and north of Bellevue will cause more traffic problems for employees who are commuting. It is time to consider this group of employees, so much of your decision making policy is focused on Ketchum city housing. The majority of employees do not live in Ketchum and will remain south of Ketchum.

Please review your budgets and cut spending where it is not needed. Tourists should be paying for the Lot. Give the residents of the Wood River Valley a break.

Thank you,
Carol Klick

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Broschofsky Galleries <art@brogallery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 3:23 PM
To: Participate
Subject: LOT

Hi,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed LOT.

As a local business that has operated for 39 years, we have firsthand experience with the impact these taxes can have on consumer behavior. Over the years, we have encountered both local residents and visitors who have expressed frustration with the cumulative tax burden, and on multiple occasions we have lost business as a result.

While we understand the importance of funding community initiatives and recognize the role that a LOT can play, we believe that any increase should be structured in a way that places the primary burden on tourism rather than local businesses and residents.

One solution that has been discussed in the past is to focus revenue generation through lodging and building materials, which would more directly target visitors and development activity while reducing the impact on local commerce.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our perspective.

Sincerely,

John, Minette, and Rudi Broschofsky
Broschofsky Galleries

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Jeanne F. Meyers <jm@jeannemeyers.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 1:55 PM
To: Participate
Subject: conditional use permit support

Dear Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

I am writing in support of the proposed zoning amendment that would allow the Sun Valley museum to be located within the industrial district.

Museums are community anchors — they preserve local history, attract visitors, and enrich the quality of life for residents throughout the Wood River Valley. The industrial district offers the kind of large, flexible space that a museum needs to grow and serve its mission, and many communities across the country have successfully integrated cultural institutions into similar districts with tremendous benefit.

I respectfully urge the Commission to approve this amendment and help bring this valuable cultural resource to our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jeanne F. Meyers
jm@jeannemeyers.com
Jeanne F. Meyers
jm@jeannemeyers.com

Dawn Hofheimer

From: sue woodyard <foresuewood@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 1:46 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Conditional Use permit for the SVMOA building

I encourage the Ketchum City Council to approve the passage of a text amendment allowing a cultural facility to operate within the Light Industrial 2(LI2) District. Cultural facilities have always been important to our Valley. And, the present building in Ketchum just isn't sufficient for the needs and demands of the community. I have an office in the industrial area, and would have no issue with this facility being used by the museum.

I do support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sue Woodyard
(208) 720-4145

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Christopher Lyle <cblyle@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 1:30 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I'm writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use in the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District, which would clear the way for SVMoA to operate at 101 Lewis Street.

This is a sensible use of an existing building. The former Idaho BioScience building at 101 Lewis Street has been sitting empty, and putting the Sun Valley Museum of Art into it is a far better outcome for that corner than waiting for the next light-industrial tenant (which may take many years). SVMoA has been a major contributor to the cultural life of this valley for more than 50 years, admission is free, and the museum partners with the school district and dozens of other community organizations. It has outgrown its space on Fifth Street, and this move allows it to materially increase its incredibly positive impact on the community.

Adaptive reuse of a vacant building is the kind of thing we should be encouraging rather than new construction or sprawl. And a museum on that block brings foot traffic and life to an area that could use both, without displacing the working uses LI2 is meant to protect.

I support this amendment and encourage the Council to approve it.

Sincerely,
Christopher Lyle
Ketchum

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Robin Leavitt <rleavitt44@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 1:05 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am a long time resident in Blaine County in part because of the culture offered. I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing the cultural facility as a conditional use in the light industrial district.

I attended the Ketchum Planning and Zoning meeting last month and was pleased with the positive results from that group.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and we need places and space to gather and learn.

Thank you

Robin Leavitt
150 North Hulen Way for 30 years
Ketchum

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Melissa Abbe <mcabbe@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:50 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Fwd: Please let SVMoA continue to participate in Ketchum cultural landscape, save YMCA parking lot

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District. It will be an addition to the area to have another space for activities for families so close to the YMCA.

And speaking of the YMCA, I do hope wiser heads will prevail in preserving the parking lot so that the area doesn't suffer from the same lack of parking currently putting a stranglehold on downtown Ketchum and stifling local businesses.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,
Melissa Abbe
205 Chocolate Gulch

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Barbara Lehman <barbara@barbaralehman.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:47 PM
To: Participate
Subject: FW: Support for Sun Valley Museum of Art and 101 Lewis Street conditional use of cultural facility in L12

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District. I am a longtime part time resident and a former board member for the Sun Valley Museum of Art for many years beginning in 2007 until two years ago.

The Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued and longstanding organization in the Wood River Valley, providing access to contemporary art, education, and cultural programming. Its founding was in the early days for the city and before the recent growth. For more than 50 years, it has played an essential role that is nowhere duplicated in the Valley's cultural landscape. I believe it is imperative for this community's future that we support the development of this incredible asset.

Many other mountain communities have museums that have excellent facilities supported by their residents and visitors. We in the Wood River Valley should have a facility for arts and education on a par with the best. In many ways, we have a great museum, but the present museum facility does not have the exhibition and community spaces that represent what a world class town, as Ketchum strives to be, should have

Since I first joined the board, the museum has been seeking a home commensurate with its stature as a nationally recognized institution and highly respected resource for the community. The effort to find a better home has always been a priority for SVMoA. The Tom Kundig design for a museum, conceived in 2007, was a beautiful one. Our lot on Second Avenue, (known as the Simplot lot), was a good location but ultimately building on it became impossible because of requirements beyond our control. The owners ultimately repurchased it from us. It is still standing empty.

No other idea or location became a practical solution in all these years.

The Lewis Street lot is a perfect location and has the potential to be adapted relatively easily to the museum needs.

The proposed use of the building on the lot at 101 Lewis Street represents a thoughtful expansion of its work. It will create additional space for exhibitions, educational programs, and community gatherings, contributing to the cultural vitality of Ketchum.

I urge you as council members who care deeply for the community to support this amendment.

Sincerely,

Barbara, (Mrs. John F. Lehman)
105 Fox Creek Road, Ketchum

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Mark Caraluzzi <carrotseed@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:43 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,

Mark Caraluzzi
PO Box 8770
Ketchum, ID 83340

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Ruth Bloom <ruthbloom@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:25 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,
ruth bloom
Sent from my iPhone

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Connie Price <connieprice@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:31 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for SVMOA

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

We hope you approve the permit for SVMOA to move to light industrial area. It will be such a benefit to the community.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Connie
Better Together

Connie Price

Cell 415-722-4464

Dawn Hofheimer

From: David Janeski <davidjaneski@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:32 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities enhance our community and encourage visitors to enjoy our town for reasons other than geography.

-David Janeski
Blaine County Resident

Dawn Hofheimer

From: jmontague9289@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:13 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for SVMOA move to LI2

Members of the Ketchum City Council,

How can you even think of not approving the move of the SVMOA to a much larger space in Ketchum? There should be unanimous support!

John Montague
631 Valley Club Drive
Hailey, ID 83333

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Sharon Twigg-Smith <sharona.twiggsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 12:14 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,

Sharon Twigg-Smith
Eagle Ridge, Ketchum, Idaho

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Sue Gundy <sgundy@wegai.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:37 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,
Sue & Bill Gundy

Sent from my iPhone

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Cory Boydston <coryboydston@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:38 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,
Cory Boydston
405 Fairway Loop
404-915-7024

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Robert Nimmo <nimmo.rob@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 3:45 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District. Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning.

Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

Sincerely,

Robert Nimmo
315 Sage Rd