

## Lisa Enourato

---

**From:** HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 08, 2022 12:42 PM  
**To:** Participate  
**Cc:** Mark Dee; Greg Foley; Carissa Connelly  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT for 5/9 City Council Meeting

The City has begun an important process to create a housing strategy for Ketchum. But much work remains to be done before this document can be called a "plan."

I urge the City Council not to adopt this version of the Ketchum Housing Action Plan, and, instead, to send it back to the Housing Task Force so that it can be finished, and then budgeted for in the appropriate process.

In particular:

1. The Plan is inconsistent with the Findings of the proposed Resolution. The Plan is not a Ketchum workforce housing plan—it is focused on income levels rather than occupations, and provides Ketchum housing to workers throughout Blaine County.
  0. Per page 7, it explicitly provides Ketchum taxpayer funded housing benefits to people who don't work in Ketchum—the Ketchum taxpayer will pay for housing for people who work in Blaine County.
  1. It specifically targets retirees who did no work in Ketchum for taxpayer subsidized housing in Ketchum, which is clearly not Ketchum workforce housing.
2. There are no criteria in the Plan for how to prioritize the allocation of scarce taxpayer resources. This is a violation of best practices and can lead to arbitrary decisions and costly mistakes.
3. As proposed, it violates the Council's fiduciary duty and is an extra-budgetary action. It commits the City to actions for spending money without appropriating the money. The estimated total cost of \$5.5-7.5mm per year has no clarity on how it will be paid for. There is no budget for the first year of the plan for which the Resolution would cover.
4. In incorporates certain targets that will significantly and unnecessarily raise the cost of the Plan. In particularly, the arbitrary goal of housing 40% of Ketchum's workforce in Ketchum and the arbitrary limitation of 20% on county-wide solutions.

[NB: Specific comments on issues within the document are below.]

This process has been rushed to meet the LOT referendum date. Can each Council member put hand on heart that they have carefully read this document and understand its implication? Even more importantly, do they believe the public has had the chance to digest it?

This is bad process. It would have been wiser to give the Task Force several more months to finish the Plan (see priority #1 on page 33) and to have delayed the LOT referendum until the Plan was finished so that the electorate would know what it was voting for. This process has the appearance of public input without the substance of it, as there has been no time for the public to absorb the Plan prior to voting for the LOT referendum. Indeed, early voting started last week.

The Council is the last stop to hold the Mayor and Staff accountable for transparency and appropriate process. Please do not rubber stamp a document just because it sounds good. It can actually be good, but only if you hold it to that standard.

Sincerely,  
Perry Boyle

Page 6 Common Terms — several create new definitions for words in the English language

- Community Housing definition explicitly only includes residential and income level status. Nothing about work or requirement to work. Yet this plan is being sold by the City to the community as a workforce housing plan.
- A short-term rental is defined as 30 days or less. Yet a long-term rental is only defined as 6 or 12 months (depending on the source). What about seasonal rentals? These definitions are incomplete and confusing
- A house is defined as “vacant” if the occupant on enumeration day has another residence. How can a building with a part-time resident be “vacant?”
- Year-round resident definition requires “continuous” physical residence. This penalizes locals who rent their primary residences for short-term periods of time.

Page 7 Common Terms

- To be defined as a member of the Workforce, one only has to work 20 hrs a week—and not in Ketchum, but in Blaine County..
  - Why is the City providing housing subsidies to people who are not legally disabled but simply choose not to work full-time?
  - Why are Ketchum taxpayers being asked to subsidize housing for people who don’t work in Ketchum?
  - Why such a low threshold for work?
- Why is the mere applying for a job a criteria for receiving taxpayer subsidized housing?
- This plan also includes people who have chose to no work, e.g., “retire,” in the definition of “workforce.” This is, on its face, not English language. Beyond that, providing Ketchum taxpayer subsidized housing for retirees who haven’t worked in Ketchum for the last five years seems contrary to the goal of providing workforce housing for people who work in Ketchum.

Page 8 Housing Context:

- The statement that Ketchum is "losing its workforce because most locals, people cannot to afford to live here" is a blatant falsehood.
  - Ketchum’s workforce may be shifting, but the facts are that, per the Census, the population of Ketchum has substantially increased, as has the number of residents in Ketchum who are employed.
  - Indeed, Ketchum has almost no unemployment. They are just employed at better paying situations than what many categories of work currently pay.
  - Whoever wrote this part of the Plan is confusing the workforce shortages in specific labor categories with an overall loss of workers.
  - We are short workers in teaching, non-profit, health care, first responders and service/seasonal industries. Thus our housing plan should be targeted to address those specific needs.
- The “tenets” are naive at best and not necessarily true and have no metrics to keep the plan accountable to. And they miss fundamental tenets that, while everyone deserves to be housed, there are limits to that right, while a community is responsible for taking care of its members who cannot take care of themselves.

Page 9 Community Need

This section is riddled with logic flaws and assertions not supported by analysis or the data.

- The better way to come up with this analysis would have been to survey businesses to find out how many workers they are short and of what type (seasonal, full-time, part-time) and create a housing plan that does not meet “demand” but which meets “need.”
- “Demand” to live in Ketchum is likely to approach the infinite. It should not drive taxpayer subsidies.

Page 10. "Ketchum is losing its workforce and year round residents because most local people cannot afford to live here" is not a true statement

- Ketchum's year-round population has exploded, not shrunk (see page 25 that cites 25% increase in two years). Just look at the trailers at Hemingway.
- The number of people employed in Ketchum has gone up, not down—just look at the minimal un-employment rate.
- We have a significant labor crisis in specific occupations. That is what should be driving our housing plan.
- 
- The key point that is accurate on this page is that Ketchum doesn't have enough long-term rental units to meet the demand for low and middle income workers. But what is the fastest and most cost effective way to provide long-term rentals? Nothing in this Plan comprehensively addresses this fundamental issue.

Page 15 Our Process

The process was flawed, in that it focused on demand rather than need. The process never included a bottoms up assessment of need by employers. The survey process is not statistically valid, in that it was selectively targeted and included many respondents who don't live and/or work in Ketchum.

Page 16 asserts the incorporation of best practices, but the plan does not include key best practices like criteria for allocation and prioritization.

Page 18

Annual iteration makes good sense as circumstances change. Yet the public is excluded in the first sentence and comes last in the table. This is telling.

Page 19 Housing Action Plan

- The Vision has nothing to do with workers—it is 100% focused on income levels.
- The first Guiding Principle is unqualified. Perhaps it should be limited to Ketchum residents and workers?
- The last Guiding Principle is unmeasured in the plan.
- 10 Year targets are arbitrary and not necessarily conducive to achieving a balanced year-round community.
  - 60% of housing owner-occupied or long-term rented is arbitrary has no relation to the workforce housing need.
  - 100 household target is arbitrary and only meaningful in how it would relate to the workforce housing need.
  - \$60mm might be the right number, but it is only relevant in how it relates to meeting the workforce housing need.
  - 20% of funds allocated outside of Ketchum is arbitrary. All projects in/out of Ketchum should be measured against the criteria (probably something around speed and cost).
  - Survey of who? It should be at least two surveys. One of Ketchum legal residents and one of Ketchum employers.

There is nothing that brings this plan's priorities into a work plan. It needs a Gantt chart of timing and responsibility and some way to prioritize all the priorities.

Page 23 Priorities

- #1 Priority is Bluebird. Yet that project is massively over budget and costs and financing are not yet locked in. Developer has already come back for more taxpayer funds. At what point are there better and faster uses for

the City's resources? Is this why there are no criteria (because reasonable criteria would dictate that Bluebird is not the best use of resources)?

- does not include all City owned parcels and a plan to evaluate them for highest and best use. For example, where are the parcels next to the fire station in the LI zone? Or around the water treatment facility?

#### Page 24 Priorities

- ADUs may be part of the solution, but if they cannot be kept out of the STR rental market, they will become more part of the problem than part of the solution. As STRs they will increase property values even further.
- The timeline and benefit have no basis in criteria anywhere in the document. For example, per the developer, Bluebird will not be finished for at least two more years, not the 6 months shown in this chart.

#### Page 27

The 1% number of locals residents does not define their residence.

The 436 at risk of displacement warrants more analysis. Is there a histogram by % of income spent on housing? That could be helpful in determining appropriate mitigants and contribute to housing criteria.

The Countywide data seems more appropriate for a County Plan than Ketchum city plan. Clearly work needs to be done at the County level and Ketchum should contribute to that.

#### Page 28/29

This seems like Ketchum will be taking responsibility for the entire County. While the County needs a plan, should Ketchum taking on the County be a first year priority? Why are Hailey, Bellevue and Sun Valley resistant to working with Ketchum on regional housing?

#### Page 31

A lot of good stuff on this page. How do you prioritize them for expected bang for the buck?

#### Page 33

A lot of good stuff on this page. Particularly Priority #1: Finishing the Plan!

**Lisa Enourato**

---

**From:** Bridget Bagley <bridget.bagley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 08, 2022 3:13 PM  
**To:** Bridget Bagley  
**Subject:** Authorities have passed a law banning the cultivation of their own food and large fines for violators  
– World-Signals News

>  
> THAT IS JUST INSANE ITS TIME FOR A NEW ORDER BASED ON LIFE PRINCIPLES TO RE EMERGE  
> WHO PASSED THIS LAW? LOVERS OF STARVING PEOPLE TO DEATH ??  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>>  
>>  
>> <https://world-signals.com/news/2022/05/08/authorities-have-passed-a-law-banning-the-cultivation-of-their-own-food-and-large-fines-for-violators/>  
>>  
>