

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Daniel Hubbard <danielhubbard@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 1:02 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Parking on Saddle Road Issue

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To: City Council and City Administration

I am writing to express concerns regarding the increasing issues caused by inadequate parking at Bigwood Golf Course and Zenergy.

Overflow parking has spread onto nearby residential streets (Stirrup and Spur Lanes) and along Saddle Road, creating congestion. Visitors regularly park on streets that were never intended to accommodate this volume of traffic, impacting residents and creating additional hazards.

I respectfully request that the City evaluate this area and consider the following actions:

Require the golf course and Zenergy to provide adequate on-site parking or implement effective overflow parking management.

Evaluate parking restrictions on residential side streets and along Saddle Road to improve visibility and emergency access.

Conduct a comprehensive traffic and pedestrian safety study.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Daniel D. Hubbard
danielhubbard@gmail.com

Dawn Hofheimer

From: HP Boyle <boylehp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2026 9:24 AM
To: Participate
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT on Guyer Springs application for P&Z (but Council should look at this!)

To the Commissioners,

As you refine the application, I would like to highlight a couple of opportunities to improve the P&Z process for the City of Ketchum.

1. The applicant makes a comment at the bottom of packet page 8. I would encourage the Commission to incorporate this as a matter of policy on all applications. Fix the code. Reduce ad hoc approaches to development.

"If the City wishes to require greater setbacks or additional limitations on decks and patios, the applicant believes such requirements should be incorporated into the Ketchum Municipal Code and applied consistently to all comparable developments, rather than imposed solely as a condition of this application."

2. There is a conflict in the Community Housing Plan that you could get the Council to fix (I think this is beyond your remit, so not sure why you are the ones being asked to approve this in the first place).

"The framework is designed to create more than attainable housing; it is intended to foster longterm [sic] community participation by allowing local workers to establish roots, build equity, and invest in Ketchum, a place they can proudly call home." (packet page 10).

"The maximum resale price shall be limited to an annual appreciation of three percent (3%), compounded annually, or the consumer price index (CPI) at time of sale, not to exceed 6% year over year, whichever is greater."

That second clause is designed to limit the equity a homeowner can generate from owning a community housing unit. If that is the intent, this is a suboptimal way to go about it. Rather than limiting price appreciation, it would be much more efficient and far less confusing to just have the owner divide the gain with the KHA. In other words, 50% of any gain would go to the City's KHA, and the owner can retain half. I used 50/50 as an example. This is much easier to describe and implement. The KHA could use its portion of the gain to buy down the price of the unit for the subsequent purchaser (or use it for a different unit). It is fairer, easier, and more flexible than what is in the plan.

3. The CHP does not address the HOA fee problem for community housing units. HOAs increase their fees as a method of taking their units out of the community housing pool by making the HOA fees unaffordable. See the Evergreen situation that exists today. The CHP needs to anticipate and mitigate this rather than kicking the can down the road.

Thank you,

Perry Boyle
Ketchum

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? Yes

Comment

For years, I enjoyed feeding carrots to beautiful giant draft horses (including Blueberry, Strawberry, Cap, Chalk, Brittany and Claude, among others we named ourselves, such as Carrot Boss!) on the western field of the Reinheimer Ranch. A couple summers back, I noticed the fencing being torn down. I knew this would mean horses would not be returning. It is my understanding the IFPL removed the fencing. Why? The horses provided a natural, historic gateway to Ketchum. Fencing must be returned to this section of the Reinheimer Ranch field. Due to extreme heat on summer days, please plant a few trees as well. Let's bring back the horses!

Attach supplemental information











Which board or commission is this City Council
for?

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 Colleen Kelley Reali

Email kellanor@gmail.com

Phone Number



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?

I'm not sure.

Comment

Please help restore the Reinheimer ranch historic look and feel by supporting the replacement of the fences.

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

Linda Parsons

Email

lindaintown@gmail.com

Phone Number

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? Yes

Comment The IFPL should immediately restore the fences on the Reinheimer Ranch property. It is supposed to be a Stuart of. It has always housed cows and horses, and Ben an iconic place kept up in beautiful condition. This has fallen into dis repair due to the negligence of the IFPL Brenda Powell

Which board or commission is this for? Planning & Zoning Commission

- 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 Brenda Powell

Email fitnesswithbrenda@gmail.com

Phone Number [REDACTED]

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Claire Gadd <clairemgadd@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 3:59 PM
To: Participate
Cc: cityclerk@sunvalleyidaho.gov; city.clerk@haileycityhall.org; CountyClerk@co.blaine.id.us
Subject: Re: Public Record Comment: Regional Flock ALPR Safeguards

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thank you!

Given the proximity of a high flock camera count per capita as compared to the rest of the country, it means a lot to me to have my comments on record. I believe this is a current issue that the entire Wood River Valley is facing and Ketchum is not exempt from that, despite the fact that they don't have flock cameras today. I suspect this issue will be an ongoing discussion point and I greatly appreciate your time in reading my comments, even if we do not have a flock camera in Ketchum specifically as of today's date.

Best,
Claire

On Jul 27, 2026, at 3:26 PM, Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org> wrote:

Thank you for your email Claire,

The City of Ketchum does not have any Flock Cameras.

Regards,

CITY OF KETCHUM COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TEAM
P.O. Box 2315 | 191 Fifth St. W. | Ketchum, ID 83340
o: 208.726.3841 | f: 208.726.7812
participate@ketchumidaho.org | ketchumidaho.org

From: Claire Gadd <clairemgadd@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2026 12:52 PM
To: cityclerk@sunvalleyidaho.gov; city.clerk@haileycityhall.org; CountyClerk@co.blaine.id.us; Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>
Subject: Public Record Comment: Regional Flock ALPR Safeguards

I am copying clerks valley-wide to advocate for regional consistency, noting that Bellevue has already taken steps to [cancel their contract](#).

To the County and City Clerks:

I am a resident of Blaine County, and I am asking our county and city governments to 1) end their respective contracts with Flock Safety, 2) remove the automated license-plate-reader (ALPR) cameras now operating on our roads, and 3) not to renew or expand these programs valley-wide.

I want to be clear that I care about public safety, and I take seriously the cases in which these cameras have helped. I do not doubt local law enforcement acts in good faith. My objection is not that surveillance is never useful - it is that a permanent, county-wide record of where residents drive is the wrong trade for a community like ours, and the evidence that it actually makes us safer is thin. I want to make four points.

1. This is a moving benchmark, and it only moves one direction.

An ALPR network does not watch suspects; it photographs and logs every vehicle that passes, and stores where law-abiding residents go and when. The Supreme Court has already warned that this kind of aggregated tracking is different in kind from an officer's ordinary observation; in *Carpenter v. United States* (2018), the Court held that a person does not lose all Fourth Amendment protection simply by driving in public.

The reason I raise the "benchmark" concern specifically: the legal and technical line keeps moving. In January 2026, a federal judge upheld Norfolk, Virginia's 176-camera Flock network but explicitly cautioned that the system could become unconstitutional as it grows - lawful for now, in his words, but not necessarily later (WHRO; Courthouse News, Jan. 2026). During that litigation it emerged that one plaintiff's car had been logged 526 times in four months.

Meanwhile the technology itself is expanding: a vendor (Leonardo) has patented and begun marketing an add-on that ties the phones, earbuds, and smartwatches a person carries to their license plate, turning a car-tracker into a people-tracker (404 Media, June 2026). Once the infrastructure and the public's tolerance for it are in place, each expansion looks like a small step from the last. The way to avoid that ratchet is not to start down it.

2. There is little evidence this actually increases safety.

The core justification for these cameras is deterrence and crime reduction, and that claim deserves scrutiny. When Denver's city-run Flock network went dark for roughly a month in early 2026 during a contract gap, auto theft still fell about 29% year-over-year, according to 9NEWS reporting on city public-records data. That single month is not proof on its own - and I'll say so plainly - but Colorado's own Auto Theft Prevention Authority attributed the broader decline to a combination of factors and a 2023 change in state law, not to cameras. If a county-wide surveillance system cannot clearly show it is the thing keeping us safe, then it is asking us to give up a great deal in exchange for very little demonstrated benefit. The burden of proof should sit with the program, not with the residents being

recorded.

3. This is not who Idaho is.

Idaho has a deep tradition of limited government, personal liberty, and skepticism of distant institutions collecting data on ordinary people. A private, out-of-state corporation building a standing database of Idahoans' movements - and deciding who else can search it - runs against that grain. Our own Legislature recognized the risk when it acted in 2025 to restrict ALPR data access to authorized law enforcement.

Reporting around the country has documented federal and out-of-state agencies searching local Flock networks that residents and councils never approved - including immigration-related queries run through local cameras (404 Media) and one California city that terminated its contract after learning its data had been searched hundreds of thousands of times by agencies it had never authorized. As of early 2026, at least 30 U.S. localities have deactivated Flock cameras or canceled contracts, according to NPR - many citing exactly these data-sharing concerns. Idaho should not import a system whose data can flow to hands we did not choose.

I'd also ask your respective councils and boards to consider how part of this network came to exist, because in a valley this small the line between towns means little in practice. Five of Sun Valley's Flock cameras were donated in 2025 by Allen & Company, the New York firm behind the invitation-only Sun Valley Conference each July, which also paid the initial two-year contract before the city took over the cost. One of them sits on Highway 75, the road nearly all of us in the county use. I understand the security concerns that attend a gathering of that profile. But that is the point: *if a permanent surveillance network on our public roads is being justified, even in part, by the private security needs of a private annual event - especially for individuals who do not live here - the burden and the cost belong with that private beneficiary, not the public.* Cameras installed for such a purpose should be treated as exactly that, temporary: sponsored, installed, and removed by the beneficiary around the event, confirmed down when it ends, with each installation and removal on the public record. A private firm's convenience should not become a standing dragnet that residents fund and live under the other fifty-one weeks of the year.

4. This damages the important relationship between law enforcement and the people they serve.

Good policing in a place like Blaine County depends on trust - on residents seeing deputies and officers as neighbors, not as a system tracking them. A dragnet that records everyone quietly reverses that, treating every resident as a suspect to be logged by default. And the tool has repeatedly been turned to personal misuse: officers in Kansas and Wisconsin have been criminally charged or resigned after using Flock or similar systems to track ex-partners, and here in Idaho a neighboring county's sheriff reportedly used ALPR cameras to look up his own wife's vehicle. When a system is that easy to abuse, "trust us not to" is not a safeguard.

Errors erode trust just as badly. In other jurisdictions, misread plates have put innocent people - including children - at gunpoint during high-risk stops, and in one documented

Colorado case an officer accused a resident of a crime based on a Flock hit and refused to look at the dashcam footage that cleared her. I recognize that Sheriff Ballis and local police leadership have expressed intentions to verify plates before acting on alerts, and I credit that commitment. But departments elsewhere made the same promises, and the failures above happened anyway. Every wrongful stop, and every resident who feels watched, spends down the community goodwill that keeps this county safe - the opposite of what the program is meant to do.

What I am asking

I respectfully ask your respective boards and councils to end your regional Flock contracts and remove the cameras, and to decline any renewal or expansion.

If you are not prepared to do that today, I ask at minimum that you:

1. Publicly release the network audit log - the full record of who has searched our data, including any federal or out-of-state queries;
2. Disclose the data-sharing configuration and retention period, and who approved them;
3. Allow no camera to remain or be added without a public vote, a published and enforceable access policy, and independent audits with public results;
4. Require that any camera installed for the security of a private event be sponsored and removed by that private beneficiary, taken down once the event ends, and documented in a public record of each installation and removal.

Thank you for your time and for your service to this community.

Respectfully,
Claire Gadd

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? Yes

Comment Fences should be repaired on Reheimer ranch as were taken down by road work

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 Chiyo

Email chiyoparten@gmail.com

Phone Number

Response to Ordinance 1279

From Tim Lalley <tim.lalley@live.com>

Date Thu 8/6/2026 2:41 PM

To Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.gov>

Cc Sarah Geisler <sgeisler41@gmail.com>; Rachel Lalley <rachellalley73@gmail.com>

 1 attachment (39 KB)

Ordinance 1279 P&Z Letter.pdf;

Dear Members of the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council,

We are writing as the owners of two residential properties within the City of Ketchum to express our concerns regarding proposed Ordinance 1279.

While we appreciate the City's efforts to plan for thoughtful growth and preserve the character of our community, we believe several aspects of this ordinance warrant additional consideration before moving forward.

The proposed reduction of the maximum building height from 35 feet to 27 feet in most residential and Mountain Overlay districts is a significant policy change that could have lasting consequences. In our view, limiting building height in this manner will reduce the development potential of many residential properties, which may negatively affect property values. This impacts not only individual property owners but could also have broader financial implications for the City.

Additionally, reducing allowable building heights limits the feasibility of under-structure parking in many residential projects. Given Ketchum's existing parking challenges, this change could unintentionally increase pressure on street parking and further exacerbate downtown parking shortages.

We also encourage the Council to evaluate the potential fiscal impacts of this proposal. If reduced development potential leads to lower property values, has the City considered how this may affect future property tax revenues that help fund essential public services?

Beyond the substance of the ordinance, we are concerned about the process. It appears that Ordinance 1279 is advancing through the committee process with limited opportunity for meaningful community input. The proposed changes are broad in scope and affect property owners throughout the community. Changes of this magnitude deserve careful analysis, robust public discussion, and sufficient time for residents, property owners, and stakeholders to understand the implications and provide thoughtful feedback.

Implementing multiple significant changes on an accelerated timeline increases the likelihood of unintended consequences and unforeseen errors. A more deliberate process would allow the City to identify and address these issues before adopting permanent regulations.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council to reconsider the proposed residential height restrictions and to extend the public review process. Allowing additional time for community engagement and careful evaluation will help ensure that any adopted regulations reflect the interests of the entire Ketchum community and achieve the City's long-term planning goals without creating unnecessary negative impacts.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the City of Ketchum. We appreciate your willingness to listen to the concerns of residents and property owners as you evaluate this important ordinance.

Sincerely,

Sarah Geisler, Tim and Rachel Lalley