

From: [Evan Stelma](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Subject: RE: Housing Matters Updates | October 2022
Date: Monday, October 3, 2022 1:12:49 PM

Dear City of Ketchum,

If you want to make a difference, and provide for decent long term housing for the employees who matter, there needs to be deed restricted housing mandated. There also need to be 3 bedroom units for families. A town is not a community without full time families. As well, a predominant number of the service industry workers are Hispanic, a core group who generationally has larger families. As our school district is 40 percent Spanish speaking, you might want to think about this before creating traffic changes which help nothing. Bluebird will help nothing as it is set up and will drastically hurt the core downtown businesses with the associated traffic/parking problems.

Yes, I was born and raised in Ketchum and am very sad at the fact that “everyone” is no longer a valued member of our community. The service industry is being decimated and at what point will the CoK realize that they have a huge part to play and a responsibility to help with housing the workers who cook your meals, clean the rooms for the hotels and big houses, provide your medical care, teach your children and respond to your emergencies? When the mayor can no longer find a place to go have lunch or coffee?

Evan Stelma

From: City of Ketchum <participate@ketchumidaho.org>
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2022 11:50 AM
To: Evan Stelma <elstelma@ctshelp.net>
Subject: Housing Matters Updates | October 2022

[View this email in your browser](#)

Housing Matters Update - October 2022

Welcome to the 'Housing Matters' monthly newsletter.
Please forward it along to other housing advocates!

Lisa Enourato

From: Yahoo! <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2022 2:21 PM
To: Participate
Cc: Mark Dee; Greg Foley; Andrew Guckes
Subject: Public Comment to City Council on Bluebird

Have all Council Members seen the photos of the buried oil tanks at the Bluebird site?
Are all Council Members confident that this has been appropriately mitigated?
Are Council Members aware that Mr. Dunfield stated at a neighbors meeting that he is under and NDA and cannot discuss environment concerns about the site?
Is this NDA with the City of Ketchum? If so, why would the City need that NDA?

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Lisa Enourato

From: Gerri Pesch <gerrip2749@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Participate
Subject: 10th & Lewis St roundabout

I can't participate in person because I'm in Mexico getting dental work done. However, I would like to include my comments. This intersection has been very dangerous & we've been talking about making changes for quite some time now. I'm happy to see some action being taken. It makes absolute sense to have a roundabout there and I prefer the second option as the flow from all 4 arteries seems better.

Please add my 2 cents to the mix.

Thanks, Gerri Pesch

Lisa Enourato

From: Yahoo! <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 2:32 PM
To: Participate
Cc: Mark Dee; Greg Foley; Andrew Guckes
Subject: Public Comment: Traffic vs Retail in the commercial core

I listened with interest to the October 3 City Council meeting.

Kudos to City Administrator Jade Riley for tackling the traffic issue in Ketchum—he has taken on a literally unsolvable task (see below) given how this Council is driving the citification of Ketchum. The Master Transportation Plan adopted March of 2020 predicted traffic failure at several intersections, particularly at the southern entrance to town, with no solutions offered to address this.

More than two years later, the City is now examining the options. They are limited, and involve significant trade-offs. To some extent, it is unsolvable due to the way the Mayor/Council has pushed increased density in the commercial district in the name of “vibrancy.” As the consultant noted at the meeting—no matter how we configure the intersections in Ketchum, **“there is not enough pipe for the water to go through”** given the path this Administration is pursuing.

Following through on the consultant recommendations will improve automobile flow to some degree, and perhaps make a few intersections safer for pedestrians, but at the expense of parking along Main Street. The Council has recently pushed for more commercial space and more residential occupancy in the core with its “Interim Ordinance.” At the same time, the City has been reducing the absolute number of parking spaces in the core. The economics of that will be challenging to merchants: you reduce parking near their locations while simultaneously taking away parking elsewhere in the core, and increase the demand for residential parking in the core. Amazon thanks you.

Confronting the unbalanced development of Ketchum is a key responsibility of our elected officials. A usual approach to this would be to update the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the aspirations of the people who live in Ketchum, and then amend the zoning code appropriately. Instead, the Mayor and Council have decided that they know best for Ketchum and will do what they want, regardless of public concerns. (To wit: Councillor Breen’s comment in the last public meeting on the Marriott that it doesn’t matter what people want.)

As Councilmember Breen noted in her interchange with Planner Morgan, the Planning Dept is not tracking what is happening with commercial space in the core other than, as Ms. Morgan said, “anecdotally.” This is the Planning Dept. This is gross negligence. How can they plan when they have no idea what is there and in the pipeline. How did Ms Breen let her get away with that answer. Who works for whom? Since the Mayor won’t do it, the Council must hold the Planning Dept accountable.

As a speaker on the “vibrancy” (sic) ordinance noted, the Council is, either from intention or in ignorance, creating a downtown design mandate for large boxes, without parking (even when the project wants to incorporate it), thus destroying the primary mandate of our current Comprehensive Plan.

Councilperson Hamilton’s proposal of “getting the cars out of town” is an intriguing one. What is her plan for that? How will people get to shopping? What will that mean for retailers? What does that mean for quality of life for the people who live and work in Ketchum? I also note her comment that the City should communicate that there should be no bicycles on Main Street. Just like in any big city.

Councilmember David said we need to encourage fewer cars and invest in more affordable housing in the core. "We need to find other ways to reduce the number of cars in our city." He offered no ideas to do this. He thinks the consultant's traffic models aren't fully valid, that they don't take into account the noise from cars. As the four-story boxes the Council is promoting line the streets of Ketchum, that noise will only echo louder. As Mr. David noted, we already have cars that are moving off of Main to the side streets.

Mountain Rides was never mentioned as an alternative, despite the Mayor being on its Board of Directors.

Through its poor processes on planning, development, traffic, parking, housing, zoning, etc., this Administration will leave a big mess for the next one. Given that three out of five of them already have a foot out of the Ketchum door, maybe we shouldn't be surprised.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Lisa Enourato

From: Lisa Enourato
Sent: Friday, October 7, 2022 9:27 AM
To: Participate
Subject: FW: PO Box fees

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 | www.ketchumidaho.org

From: Amanda Breen <ABreen@ketchumidaho.org>
Sent: Friday, October 7, 2022 9:05 AM
To: Lisa Enourato <LEnourato@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: Fw: PO Box fees

Public comment.

Regards,

Amanda Breen
Ketchum City Council
P.O. Box 2315
480 East Avenue North
Ketchum, Idaho 83340-2315
Mobile: (208) 721-1760
Email: ABreen@ketchumidaho.org

From: Joel Jarolimek <joelskisv@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 6, 2022 7:26 PM
To: Michael David <mdavid@ketchumidaho.org>
Cc: Amanda Breen <ABreen@ketchumidaho.org>; Courtney Hamilton <CHamilton@ketchumidaho.org>; Jim Slanetz <jslanetz@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: PO Box fees

Thanks for your personal support in standing up to the exorbitant Box fees. I want to give you some personal examples of my own that will highlight the absurdity of their position. I enjoyed your letter and was inspired to write Congressman Mike Simpson. When writing the congressman they require the usual fields, name, address etc.. Street address. I filled in 416 W Warm Springs Rd. My home address. Not far out of town, Board Ranch, still on the pavement. I went to submit my letter and it was rejected. Not a valid address. So I put in my Ketchum PO Box, hit resubmit and rejected again. I was familiar with this runaround so went back and typed in 151 4th St. West, Unit 10044, Ketchum. It was accepted. That's the address for the post office with the unit 10044 being my P.O. Box. Another example, bear with me. Got a new cell provider a year ago. Tried to hook up to Wi-Fi service from my house as cell service is sketchy out here. They wouldn't allow it unless I gave them a physical address because that is required for medical emergencies to send emergency personnel to your home. Again, my home address "not a valid address". Called 911 and asked the if they could tell what address I was calling from. No problem, 416 W Warm Springs Rd.. Contacted the cell provider told them EMS knew where I was, still nothing they could do, not a valid address. Finally I just put in post office address with

my unit (po box) and no problem, Wi-Fi cell service. Ok one more. I had a chiropractic office in Ketchum, now retired, Sun Valley Chiropractic on 2nd avenue. I contracted with Medicare to receive payment for Medicare patients. They always wanted my physical address to deliver mail and would not accept the 660 2nd Avenue N. Unit 1b. It was not valid, undeliverable. Wouldn't accept a P.O. Box. Even though I was sending my correspondence to the in Fargo North Dakota to a P.O. Box. They couldn't seem to grasp the absurdity of the situation. I got it resolved, but that was before I learned the Ketchum post office address trick. I sure many of you ordered products online and they either don't deliver to P.O. Box's or the physical address comes back as not valid. Just last week a private seller through Amazon cancelled an order of mine because of not a deliverable address. The reality is that the Postal Service has a book of deliverable addresses and many probably the majority of businesses use it to determine postage rates and who they can deliver their products to. Their argument about valid, invalid, deliverable, none deliverable on its face is absurd. I knew if I lived long enough I'd find somebody I could complain to about this! Yippee! Joel Jarolimek

Sent from my iPad

Lisa Enourato

From: H Boyle <Boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 9, 2022 6:58 PM
To: Participate; Carissa Connelly
Subject: Public comment for City Council on Housing

It sends an interesting message that the City is raising money via naming rights for objects in a dog park.

It's telling that the Mayor and Council see leash hooks in a dog park as more important to their vision for the "vibrancy" of Ketchum than workforce housing.

Your approach to raising money for housing is limited to raise the LOT on the citizenry. Where is the vision in that? Selling naming rights looks like it is a far more effective technique.

You could sell the naming rights to Main Street, (every street!) or City Hall (every municipal property!). Why not the bike trail? If a Nordic trail is a dog park is worth \$1mm, 19 miles of bike path has a lot of potential.

But why stop there? You could sell parking spots downtown instead of just giving them away for free. I hear they are worth \$70,000 each. You could charge a premium to plow certain streets before others. And doesn't it seem quaint to just give away spots in the Wagon Days or Trailing of the Sheep parade? Those could be worth a lot of money. The possibilities are endless.

For a lot of money, you could even auction off the right to name the town. Given how you are selling out the town, why not? By the time you are out of office Ketchum will be unrecognizable.

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Lisa Enourato

From: Bridget Bagley <bridget.bagley@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2022 10:15 PM
To: Participate
Subject: #No5GNearSchools — Keep Cell Towers Away From Schools and Demand 5G Safety Studies • Children's Health Defense

We must update our knowledge regularly.

Dr. Bridget Bagley

https://childrenshealthdefense.org/child-health-topics/action/no-5g-near-schools/?utm_source=salsa&eType=EmailBlastContent&eid=0ddbdd63-8b73-4ae1-9640-62df2d883a48

#No5GNearSchools — Keep Cell Towers Away From Schools and Demand 5G Safety Studies

Subject: Our Children Are Not Guinea Pigs for Big Tech! #No5GNearSchools

I urge you to introduce and support legislation that prohibits the installation and operation of cell towers and small cells on or near school grounds and to mandate the recommended minimum distance of 1640 feet between installations and school grounds.

The New Hampshire Commission, a panel of experts convened to assess this issue, determined this distance provides much-needed protection for human beings while still allowing wireless networks to operate.

The Problem:

In return for monetary gains, school districts around the U.S. have partnered with telecom giants Verizon, T-Mobile and AT&T to install cell towers directly on school grounds, despite not having done a single long-term study to ensure this is safe for our children. On the contrary, research shows that exposure to these technologies carries significant health risks — particularly for children. But, schools are being incentivized to add towers to their school sites. In true Big Tech fashion, corporate profits take priority over the health of our children.

Scientific evidence of harm and no long-term safety studies:

There is an extensive collection of scientific literature on the adverse health effects of radiofrequency (RF) exposure, including:

- Delayed development of fine and gross motor skills, memory and attention deficits and increased risk of type 2 diabetes in school adolescents
- An increase in the incidence of tumors of the brain and heart in rats
- A statistically significant increase in blood biomarkers predictive of cancer in those residing closer to cell towers
- Increased risk of developing neuropsychiatric problems such as headaches, memory changes, dizziness, tremors, depressive symptoms and sleep disturbance for residents near cell towers

Cell towers and small cells pose considerable fire safety threats, compounding the existing risks to children when placed near schools.

In addition to this overwhelming body of scientific literature demonstrating the impact of RF radiation on children's health, no long-term studies exist demonstrating the safety of 5G. During a 2019 congressional hearing, senior telecom executives admitted, under oath, there were no active studies being backed by the industry.

To this, Senator Blumenthal, member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, responded, "So there really is no research ongoing. We're kind of flying blind here, as far as health and safety is concerned."

Therefore, I urge you to speak out on this very important issue for our children's safety. Please introduce and support legislation that prohibits the installation and operation of cell towers and small cells on or near school grounds, mandating a minimum distance of 1640 feet between cell towers or small cells and school grounds.

Our children are not guinea pigs and until independent long-term safety studies are done, I demand you do everything in your power to protect our children from the known and unknown risks of wireless exposure.