

From: [Suzanne Frick](#)
To: [Participate](#); [Maureen Puddicombe](#)
Subject: RE: For distribution to HPC Commissioners and the City Counsel (not a typo) and for public comment posting on city website under the rubric Historic Preservation Ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 09, 2021 6:54:07 PM

Maureen--we'll provide this to the commission when their next packet goes out.

SUZANNE FRICK | CITY OF KETCHUM
PLANNING AND BUILDING I KURA DIRECTOR
P.O. Box 2315 | 480 East Ave. N. | Ketchum, ID 83340
o: 208.727.5086 | m: 208.721.2765
sfrick@ketchumidaho.org | www.ketchumidaho.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2021 5:32 PM
To: Maureen Puddicombe <mpuddicombe@ketchumidaho.org>
Cc: Suzanne Frick <sfrick@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: FW: For distribution to HPC Commissioners and the City Counsel (not a typo) and for public comment posting on city website under the rubric Historic Preservation Ordinance

Public comment.

LISA ENOURATO | CITY OF KETCHUM
Public Affairs & Administrative Services Manager P.O. Box 2315 | 480 East Ave. N. | Ketchum, ID 83340
o: 208.726.7803 | f: 208.726.7812
lenourato@ketchumidaho.org | www.ketchumidaho.org

-----Original Message-----

From: H Boyle <Boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>
Cc: gfoley@mtexpress.com
Subject: For distribution to HPC Commissioners and the City Counsel (not a typo) and for public comment posting on city website under the rubric Historic Preservation Ordinance

I am concerned that the HPC is not in compliance with open meeting requirements.

I ask that the HPC fully open its meetings to the public. As currently conducted, it is not possible for the public to follow what is going in the meetings. The public is not allowed in the room and can only access the meeting via zoom. It is not possible to understand which commissioner is speaking, as they don't identify themselves. There is no way for a member of the public to make a comment during the meeting. Perhaps these meetings can at least be run like a City Council meeting?

For an example, I reference the video recording of the September 8th meeting.

I have previously publicly commented on the illegitimacy of the constitution of the committee. As a specific example, at 5:29pm one of the commissioners was chided by another for acting in the interests in the P&Z rather than a member of HPC. P&Z members on the HPC is an inherent and unreconcilable conflict of interest. And I reiterate it is illegitimate for people who are not residents of the City of Ketchum to get to decide what happens in the City of Ketchum and bind City of Ketchum residents. They should not get to vote on the HPC.

I question why the Mayor and Council set up the HPC as non-representative of the people of the City of Ketchum,

and why the public has been excluded by the HPC. Is this intentional? Indeed, in one of its first meetings, one of P&Z members of the commission stated that the HPC should not share too much with the public lest the public object. The promised community consultation on criteria for historic preservation never occurred. Why not?

As another concern, there is no way for member of the public to participate in the HPC process. Only members of the HPC can propose buildings for consideration. The Commissioner making the recommendation is not identified, and their reasoning is not disclosed. This is not consistent with public transparency.

As another concern, why aren't the owners of the buildings being discussed noticed that their building is being discussed and invited to address the HPC BEFORE their building goes on/off the list? Yes, now the property owners will be noticed of the HPC decisions and get a chance to comment—after the fact—and after a vote to put it on the list has been taken when the HPC openly states it doesn't have sufficient information about the buildings. At the very least, this does not seem consistent with the small town Ketchum ethos of transparency and inclusiveness.

What makes this particularly troublesome is that, at the 9/8 meeting, for building after building, the commissioners acknowledged their lack of information, yet they came to conclusions about whether it should be on the list. At 5:56 one of the commissioners noted they had only gotten information on some of the buildings voted on on the same day as the meeting. How can they have adequate time to assess the information? One of the commissioners at 5:58 voted yes on a building he said he had never seen. It seems inconsistent with the criteria and ranking process to make these decisions on such an ill-informed and arbitrary basis.

As another data on the arbitrary approach, at 5:34, one Commissioner said she put Business as Usual on the list for the sole purpose of giving a history lesson on its use to the Commission, and was not serious about preserving it. What is with that?

I also object to how Ms. Frick participates in these meetings as exceeding the role of City Staff support to a commission. As a specific example, at 4:55 Ms Frick told them to continue a vote on a building until Chair Mead could be present. Is she a member of the Commission? Is she supposed to be directing the Commission how to proceed?

Per Ms. Frick, the process of the the list will continue into October when those who own a building on it will be noticed and get their one chance to address the HPC. Yet, prior to concluding the HPC process, Ms. Frick told the HPC that on 9/28 they will need to opine on demolition permits on some (unspecified) buildings. Is there an actual process? Should not actions on buildings be held until after the process is completed?

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum