

Submit a Public Comment

Public comments are part of the official record and are provided to the appropriate board or commission for consideration.

Are you submitting this on behalf of a public hearing? No

Comment We frequent the Warm Springs Preserve Dog Park quite a bit and I was concerned about the lack of parking the NEW parking lot has. I'm hoping you can put more parking where the vacant dirt is as It seems there is LESS parking than the original parking lot. Please, please put in more parking.

Which board or commission is this for? City Council

- Comments are included in meeting materials based on when they are received:
- Comments received before publication of the meeting packet will be included in the packet.
 - Comments received after publication of the meeting packet up to the noon deadline on the day of the meeting will be added to the packet that day.
 - Comments received after the noon deadline will be included in the meeting packet for the next scheduled meeting.

Your Information

Full Name Libby Huyck

Email [REDACTED]

Public Submission: Recommended Adoption of Ketchum Privacy and Surveillance Ordinance

From James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>

Date Mon 8/10/2026 2:34 PM

To Peter Prekeges <PPrekeges@ketchumidaho.gov>; Spencer Cordovano <SCordovano2@ketchumidaho.gov>;
Tripp Hutchinson <THutchinson@ketchumidaho.gov>; Matthew McGraw <MMcGraw@ketchumidaho.gov>;
Randy Hall <RHall@ketchumidaho.gov>; Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.gov>

August 9, 2026

Public Submission and Recommendation Ketchum City Council

Re: *Proposed* Ketchum Privacy and Surveillance Ordinance

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I recommend that the Ketchum City Council adopt a simple ordinance prohibiting Flock cameras and similar automated license-plate surveillance equipment on property and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the City of Ketchum and prohibiting City participation in generalized automated vehicle-surveillance networks.

The reasons are straightforward.

Ketchum is a small community whose character has long reflected independence, privacy, freedom of movement, access to the outdoors, and a healthy measure of freedom from unnecessary governmental intrusion.

Flock and similar systems fundamentally alter that relationship. They permit the routine photographing and recording of vehicles traveling through the community, together with license-plate, time, and location information, and make those observations electronically searchable. The overwhelming majority of people whose movements are recorded are suspected of no crime.

Nor can an individual realistically opt out. A person traveling lawfully on a public street is subject to observation and recording simply by being there. That makes meaningful public oversight particularly important.

There is an important distinction between **investigating a crime** and **collecting information about everyone in case it becomes useful in investigating a crime later**.

History is filled with examples of surveillance powers adopted for limited or seemingly legitimate purposes and later expanded, misused, or placed in the hands of less responsible officials.

This proposal does not interfere with legitimate law enforcement. Police and sheriffs should have the tools reasonably necessary to investigate crimes, apprehend dangerous individuals, recover stolen property, and locate missing or endangered persons. But the usefulness of a technology does not mean that every community must accept permanent surveillance infrastructure.

Nor should a decision of this importance belong exclusively to a technology company or an individual law-enforcement official. The Sheriff has important independent responsibilities under Idaho law. The Ketchum City Council likewise has responsibilities to the people of Ketchum and authority over City government and property within its lawful control.

Whether Ketchum will permit generalized surveillance infrastructure on its property is properly a matter for Ketchum's elected representatives, acting openly and publicly. The strong sentiment expressed throughout Ketchum and the greater Blaine County community is that generalized Flock surveillance is neither wanted nor consistent with the character and values of our community.

The City need not wait for a court to determine the outermost limits of the Fourth Amendment before choosing a greater measure of privacy.

Local Policing, Authority and Accountability

This question is particularly timely because Ketchum has already determined to return to local municipal policing—a decision reflecting Ketchum's right to determine the character and priorities of law enforcement serving its community.

That model should be local, transparent, accountable, interactive, and responsive to the public. It should be based upon trust between law enforcement and the community—not upon the quiet accumulation of increasingly powerful means of monitoring the public.

The fact that the Blaine County Sheriff is independently elected does not place the Sheriff's Office outside ordinary governmental checks and balances or make it a government unto itself. Idaho law assigns the Board of County Commissioners substantial responsibilities concerning county budgeting, property, acceptance of donated property, and supervision and auditing of county officers.

The Sheriff retains substantial discretion in carrying out legitimate law-enforcement functions, but that independence does not confer unrestricted authority to finance and establish permanent surveillance infrastructure beyond ordinary governmental oversight.

Ketchum can respect the Sheriff's legitimate law-enforcement authority while determining for itself whether City property and resources will support generalized automated surveillance. Permanent generalized surveillance of the public should remain subject to fiscal, property, and democratic oversight.

This decision should be made openly by the community through its elected representatives—not quietly by a technology company or individual governmental official.

A Larger Technological and Democratic Concern

Flock should not be considered in isolation.

Automated license-plate readers can increasingly be combined with networked cameras, artificial intelligence, facial recognition, drones, location information, and centralized real-time crime systems. Individually, each may be presented as a useful law-enforcement tool. Together, they create a surveillance capacity of a scale and continuity unimaginable only a generation ago, potentially enabling government to identify people's movements, associations, and activities, including lawful political activity.

In the wrong hands, such an infrastructure could become a serious threat to individual liberty and ultimately to democratic government itself.

The American tradition does not begin with the proposition that government should know where everyone is going and preserve that information in case it someday becomes useful. It begins with the opposite proposition: **government belongs to the people, derives its authority from the people, and remains accountable to them.**

The issue is not whether today's officials intend to misuse this technology. Constitutional government does not assume that everyone possessing governmental power, now and in the future, will always exercise it wisely.

The prudent course is to establish limits at every step—before technologies become interconnected, surveillance becomes routine, and the infrastructure becomes so established that meaningful public control becomes difficult.

Ketchum has an opportunity to draw that line now.

A Continuing Public Concern: The Sheriff's Oath

In June 2026, I submitted *The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath: Technology May Change, but the Oath Does Not*, addressing the constitutional and civic concerns presented by Flock cameras and the broader expansion of automated surveillance technology in Blaine County. That submission called upon the Sheriff and the Board of County Commissioners to recognize that their first responsibility is to the people they serve and the protection of their constitutional liberties, including protection against unnecessary governmental surveillance and overreach.

The present proposal carries that concern to the municipal level. Whatever course Blaine County or the Sheriff's Office may choose, Ketchum retains its own responsibility to determine whether City property, resources, or participation will support a generalized surveillance network.

The principle remains the same: technological usefulness does not answer the more fundamental question of whether permanent surveillance infrastructure belongs in a free community. That decision should be made openly and deliberately by elected representatives accountable to the people whose movements would be recorded.

Conclusion

This is ultimately a question of what kind of community Ketchum wishes to remain.

The issue is not whether surveillance technology can sometimes be useful. The issue is whether that usefulness justifies routinely recording the movements of thousands of people who are suspected of nothing.

This is a free country. One of the central responsibilities of public officials—including law-enforcement officials—is not merely to exercise governmental power, but to respect the constitutional liberties of the people from whom that power derives.

Ketchum is entitled to determine for itself where that balance should be struck.

I respectfully recommend that the City Council adopt an ordinance embodying these principles and offer the following proposed language for the Council's consideration.

Proposed Ordinance Key Terms

Ketchum Privacy and Surveillance Ordinance

1. Prohibitions

- a. No Flock Safety camera or other automated license-plate recognition or substantially similar vehicle-surveillance equipment shall be installed or maintained upon property or rights-of-way owned or controlled by the City of Ketchum without express approval of the Ketchum City Council at a public meeting.

b. The City of Ketchum shall not purchase, operate, subscribe to, maintain, or routinely participate in a generalized automated license-plate surveillance network without express approval of the City Council.

These prohibitions apply regardless of whether such equipment is owned, financed, installed, or operated by the City, Blaine County, another governmental entity, a private organization, or a commercial provider. Nothing herein shall be construed to regulate property or rights-of-way not lawfully subject to the City's control.

2. Existing Equipment

Any Flock Safety camera or other automated license-plate surveillance equipment presently installed upon property or rights-of-way owned or controlled by the City of Ketchum shall be removed no later than thirty (30) days following the effective date of this ordinance, unless its continued presence is expressly approved by the Ketchum City Council at a public meeting.

Within five (5) days following the effective date of this ordinance, the City shall notify the owner or operator of any such equipment of the requirement for removal and shall take all lawful steps necessary to ensure timely removal.

3. Future Authorization

Before approving any future automated license-plate surveillance system, the City Council shall publicly disclose and consider its proposed locations, purpose, cost, data-retention period, permitted uses, agencies having access to the information, data-sharing arrangements, and procedures for preventing and detecting misuse.

4. Legitimate Law Enforcement Preserved

Nothing in this ordinance prohibits lawful investigation of a particular crime, suspect, vehicle, missing or endangered person, emergency, or the execution of a warrant, court order, or other lawful process.

Respectfully submitted,

James Hungelmann
Ketchum, Idaho

Dawn Hofheimer

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 12:20 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Public Comment for 8/13 Council Meeting on LOT Referendum

To the Council:

This meeting is your final opportunity to fix the LOT referendum set for November. I respectfully request that you reconsider the term of the tax, limit it to 10 years (consistent with a Comp Plan cycle), and raise the tourist tax only on tourists via the lodging tax.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Pat higgins <pathiggins@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2026 4:53 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Proposed height reduction

Dear Mayor Pete and city leaders,

We support Planning and Zoning and the city council reviewing the Proposed Height Reduction plan. We are in favor of lowering the heights of both commercial and residential.

We do not have the resources to continue on the path we have been following.

Preserving Ketchums character is at stake ,hopefully it is not too late.

Thank you,

Pat and Alex Higgins

Sent from my iPhone