

Lisa Enourato

From: Alexandra Babalis <alexandrababalis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 6:50 PM
To: Participate
Subject: No Idling...my favorite subject

Dear City Council,

As always, thank you for your service. I appreciate the work you do.

I had a thought for the electronic signs used at our city entrances. Please consider using the signs to educate people about not idling in the city.

“Welcome to Ketchum. Please do not idle your vehicle.”

Sincerely,

Alex Babalis

--

Alex Babalis
PO Box 2661
Ketchum, ID 83340



Lisa Enourato

From: Suzanne Frick
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 11:32 AM
To: Lisa Enourato
Subject: FW: Public Comments for Council meeting today July 8 2022

FYI—public comment for council.

SUZANNE FRICK | CITY OF KETCHUM

PLANNING AND BUILDING | KURA DIRECTOR
P.O. Box 2315 | 191 5th Street W | Ketchum, ID 83340
o: 208.727.5086 | m: 208.721.2765
sfrick@ketchumidaho.org | www.ketchumidaho.org

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 11:12 AM
To: Neil Bradshaw <NBradshaw@ketchumidaho.org>; Jim Slanetz <jslanetz@ketchumidaho.org>; Amanda Breen <ABreen@ketchumidaho.org>; Courtney Hamilton <CHamilton@ketchumidaho.org>; Michael David <mdavid@ketchumidaho.org>
Cc: Suzanne Frick <sfrick@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: Public Comments for Council meeting today July 8 2022

Ketchum City Council Meeting July 18, 2022

Public Comment re Agenda item 14 –
Recommendation to hold a public hearing and approve the 108-110 Ritchie Lot Line Shift Final Plat & Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision – Director of Planning & Building Suzanne Frick

Dear Mayor Bradshaw and Councillors:

I make my comments as president on behalf of the Warm Springs Vilas condominium association. We are adjoining neighbors to Lots 108 and 110.

We and other adjoining neighbors are concerned that lot consolidation might facilitate approval by the city and construction of a building or buildings that would impair views and or open space beyond what would be allowed if the two lots were developed separately, i.e., where there would be considerable setback and open space between both lots.

We have not been informed as to the plans of the developer.

If the developer has progressed with city officials, e.g., Planning, toward a building or buildings that would so impair views or open space, I respectfully submit that this Council must not consider this lot consolidation under Municipal Code subdivision regulations until all neighbors are given notice of those specific plans and the opportunity to make appropriate comment to the Council before decision. I do point out that in the P&H “Findings”, the following is indicated: “No development plans for the lots have been submitted or discussed with city staff as of this date.”

We ask the City to respect that the existing lot sizes reflect the integrity of the neighborhood as platted long ago.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Hungelmsnn

Lisa Enourato

From: Amanda Breen
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 9:28 AM
To: Lisa Enourato
Subject: Fw: Ketchum Budget comments

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: Harry Griffith <harry@sunvalleyeconomy.org>
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 1:50 PM
To: Amanda Breen <ABreen@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: Ketchum Budget comments

I wanted to share some observations with you to consider/raise during your upcoming budget discussions.

1. Housing Budget. I have been looking at this closely as a member of the Housing Committee but I have to say I am totally confused by what they are asking and the way it is presented. It remains unclear who is managing what. Who reports to who. Salary spend too high, especially as so much of the program spend is outsourced (~80%); also high vs BC Sustainability Manager who has decades more experience. Matching funds from County suspect. etc
2. Water Rates. This would be a perfect opportunity to increase base rates at lower categories. Why not start with modest increases across the board.
3. SVED Ask. \$15k from the city gets an effective full time economic development expert. WAY cheaper than any of the other services (eg sustainability, housing) you contract for. With recession coming, now is not the time to cut back on ED. No one else in community working to expand childcare and vocational training opportunities.

Hope this helps.

Harry Griffith

Executive Director, Sun Valley Economic Development

www.SunValleyEconomy.org

Lisa Enourato

From: Yahoo! <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Participate
Cc: Andrew Guckes
Subject: Public comment on Waste Treatment Plan 7/18/22

There are multiple issues with the Sewer Report the City will adopt today. My suggestions would be to:

a. Have this plan reviewed by both sustainability bodies before City Council adoption
b. More clarity on the variety of options (e.g., composting) and their costs/benefits
c. A clear understanding of the impact of City planning decisions (e.g. Housing Plan, potential rezoning of LI zone) on the plant
d. More work on how to shift the cost burden to tourists who drive a significant part of the costs.

1. Sustainability. The report has not been run by either of the two sustainability bodies that Ketchum has set up. This is a plan for the next 20 years and projects a doubling of population. The section on sustainability is cursory. There is no estimate of how much GHG is off-gassed today or a forecast for the future and what options exist for capturing or minimizing this.

Also, as noted in 2.3.2, this report dismisses climate change impact on water flows in the WRV as transitory—is that the policy of Ketchum?.

There also appear to be either a typo or error in the WWF—that table says 175 and the text says 75.

Section 2.5 dodges a flow and load analysis because the permanent residents of K/SV are under 10,000. Yet the study states that the population equivalent load is a minimum of 12.146 and a seasonal peak of almost 17,000 (table 1-4). Indeed, 2.5 in its entirety is pretty much just filler out of a text book with no specifically applicability to our situation (as is much of the report).

Today, much of the treated water is used as free irrigation water for Weyyakin and Elkhorn (3.7). But given the growth in population driven volume, excess above that need will be put into the Big Wood River. There is no information on how that will effect the river as those volumes grow over time. It may be great for agricultural, but depending on the volume, quality and temperature, what impact will it have on the biome?

There is a reference to the opportunity for composting rather than landfilling in 3.8.6 but no recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: at the very least, have this report reviewed by the Blaine County Sustainability Director and see what suggestions she has.

2, Forecast/Estimation errors. For demand, the study estimates residential uses per a 2014 text book, that may or may not have relevance to our particular situation. In 2.3.3 the study says it is ignoring the data for usage and using estimates from a textbook. There is nothing in the plan that identifies where the numbers might be wrong, and what the risk is of underbuilding the plant over the horizon period. The forecasts also just straight-line a single population growth rate estimate, and do not take into account City decisions around increasing density and increasing tourism hotels. What if this forecast rate is too low?

3. Land use/Housing

If the Housing Plan adopted by the City of Ketchum is successful, this Wastewater Plan may prove inadequate. It does not take into account the goal of shifting Ketchum workers from 7% to the 40% housed in Ketchum, nor the Housing Plan's goals of increasing permanent residents as percentage of households in Ketchum. There is no scenario analysis for increased residential density in the community for or Industrial zones. This could have a material impact on the estimates of TP per capita per 2.4.1 and overall flows.

There is no provision for extending the system south into McHanville and other areas of City impact. Those areas could be material to our housing crisis and a scenario for their incorporation should be provided.

The layout of the plant is taken for granted (figure 3-1). Yet by moving just a few building, significant land could be freed up, and that land could go to workforce housing.

4. Charges

There is significant data on relative charges of the various cities. But no information on how more money could be recaptured for the plant—for example, Weyakkin and Sun Valley Co are getting free irrigation water from the plant. There is no analysis of the potential differential for pricing for resident versus commercial vs tourist usages that could reduce the burden on locals. It is also not clear how costs are allocated between SV and Ketchum. The cost forecasts in the plan are not related to all of the options in the plan. There appear to be discussion of several options that are not included in the budget (e.g., screw de-watering for compost).

I know there is a deadline for the bond referendum for this project, but we should avoid the same mistake we just made in rushing through the LOT referendum and ensure that we have a well-thought out plan that generates the plant we need for the next 20 years at the most reasonable burden on permanent residents of Ketchum. Given the failure of the last referendum, we should have a fall back option in case this referendum also fails.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum