

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE VACATION HOME RENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT



April 25, 2024

24-0567 C 1 of 58

Summary of Public Comments Received on VHR Advisory Committee Report

This report summarizes comments received on the *“Report of the Vacation Home Rental Advisory Committee: Recommendations to El Dorado County Supervisor Brooke Laine”* (the Report) posted publicly in early March 2024 and presented at an open meeting sponsored by El Dorado County staff on March 12, 2024. During the public comment period that ended April 5, 2024, 219 respondents submitted responses to three Questions: What do you like (192 responses); What don't you like (192 responses); and What else do you want the County to know (203 responses)?

Themes from comments received are summarized here. **The complete and verbatim comments received are attached as Appendices** to this summary report of public comments on the Advisory Committee's Report. All comment details are not captured in this summary but can be reviewed in the attached Appendices.

As is common with the highly polarized topic of vacation home rentals, the comments break down into widely divided viewpoints. At either end of the spectrum, comments are bookended with a tranche of commenters who said they liked everything about the recommendations, and changes if adopted would move County VHR management in the right direction. At the other end of the spectrum is a tranche of commenters stating that the recommendations are government overreach that treads on private property rights and market fundamentals. This group often notes it likes nothing about the recommendations. At these polarized ends, a few say the recommendations don't go far enough and the County should be sunsetting VHRs entirely. Others worry openly that VHR ownership, operation, and management is a necessary livelihood for many and should not be jeopardized by more regulation.

I. Summary of Comments on Question 1: WHAT DO YOU LIKE?

Many comments appreciated the approach of working across the divided points of view and lauded the affected parties for working together productively on the problems to seek and find consensus solutions to difficult VHR issues ("we are finally working together as a community," "affected parties are talking and trying to find solutions").

County Enforcement Programs: A large number of comments supported the Report recommendations emphasizing greater and more effective enforcement, and frequently supported a newly dedicated VHR enforcement unit and not having to look to law enforcement for VHR violations. Many commenters also noted support for a streamlined central reporting and complaint management system, including shifting away from having a designated local contact be the first point of contact. Also often supported is strengthened tracking and data-based enforcement decision making.

A very highly supported recommendation was to first **focus on illegal unpermitted rentals**. Many believe that illegal rentals are a source of many of the problems.

Hosted Rentals: Comments also generally support establishing a hosted rental program oriented to income generation opportunity for on-site resident homeowners. Other comments offer changes to the details of the Hosted Rental program recommendations, including: allowing tenants with owner permission to operate a hosted rental (like the City of SLT), allowing greater occupancy for hosted rentals than recommended, allowing rental of up to two bedrooms, rejecting the "no separate kitchen" recommendation, and allowing advertisement on multiple listing sites. Also included are a few fundamentally opposite comments, on one hand to "leave HRs alone" making no change to the existing approach and on the other to treat hosted rentals fully as VHRs requiring a VHR permit and compliance with all VHR standards.

The most frequently supported proposals from the Report include:

- Fire safety and elimination of outdoor fire pits. Responses to question 2 oppose eliminating outdoor gas/propane units;
- Occupancy limits and changes, including the congruency between day and night occupancy;
- Stiffer penalties for VHR permit and compliance violations;
- Closing the TOT payment loophole through online rental listing services like AirBnB;
- Continuation of a VHR oversight committee.

Not as frequently mentioned, but also supported in comments:

- Noise monitoring outdoors, particularly for hot tub/Jacuzzi.
- Lowering the cap to 600 VHR permits
- Strengthened compliance standards, including fire safety, parking, signage, and occupancy limits.

There are also a handful of comments supporting ideas neither proposed nor recommended:

- Tiered VHR fees (using size of the rental house)
- Penalize those who submit frivolous complaints.

II. Summary of Comments on Question 2: WHAT DON'T YOU LIKE?

Many of the comments in response to question 2 suggest different compromises or line drawing on the issues addressed in the Report recommendations. In many instances, comments about what elements are undesirable are diametrically opposed.

A few general themes on the Report recommendations emerge from responses to question 2:

AC Report Recommendations are excessive and one-sided: Many comments state that the recommendations seem excessive and one sided; far too favorable to residents and anti-VHR proponents. These commenters say the County should focus on enforcement first before adopting any further regulation. Many question whether there is data and research to define the problems and support new rules.

Enforcement Programs: A number of commenters note that there was not enough detail about enforcement plans against illegal VHR operations or on how to fund these enforcement efforts. Another group of comments prefers to keep their existing Local Contact because they are reliable, known, and close to the VHR home. The concern raised is that remote complaint reporting will not be as responsive or accountable as the existing local contact. Comments also note the host or owner should be given a chance to correct the violation before the complaint is registered.

The cap on permits: Comments note concerns about reducing the cap to 600. Some state the County will lose revenue, businesses, and jobs. Many of these comments mention the concern that if the cap is reduced, it will lead to revoking permits from owner/operators of existing VHRs that are in good standing with good past track record, and permit revocation would be unfair. Some mention the reduction would be arbitrary and punish those with no track record of VHR violation. A number of comments note that the County's clustering rules achieve the same result as lowering the cap.

Dissonant voices about occupancy limits: By far, the most comment on question 2 was on occupancy limits, with no clear agreements. Many comments suggest not to eliminate "+2;" others say the age limit for exemption should match Placer County's rule (age 13). Some would count all bodies regardless of age, and still others would set the age exemption for occupancy determinations differently (age 5, 18, under 2 or 3, etc). A few comments note that recommended occupancy changes would stymie the rental of large homes designed for big groups, multiple families, and special events. Some of these comments note that VHRs are the preferred option for family and group travel, and more stringent occupancy and compliance standards are forcing these groups out of opportunities to rent homes in the County. A few of these comments suggest a tiered permit system with different occupancy standards based on the size of the home.

Compliance standards for VHR operation: Many commenters express concern about additional or more stringent compliance standards for VHR operation for reasons including added cost to permit holders, unfairly punishes those VHR permit holders who have a good past track record, and VHR rules should be no different than rules applicable to residents and neighbors.

- Noise monitoring is critiqued as costly, unfair, invasive, and impractical.
- Some disagreed with parking standards being on site and said parking should be allowed according to County Code and include on street parking the same as local residents.
- Cameras for driveway monitoring are noted as invasive of privacy, impractical to maintain, and possibly illegal.

- A few mentioned the septic recommendation and criminal misdemeanor categorization as government overreach.
- Opposition to the fire safety recommendation was generally to say don't extend the prohibition to gas/propane outdoor fire units.

Fines and Penalties: Comments about the recommended changes to VHR fines vary. Some commented that the changes are excessive and too harsh, notably the provisions and triggers to be barred from future VHR permits. Other comments said the provisions recommended are too lenient and should be higher. Some comments say fines should be passed through to guests so as not to penalize the VHR owner who has taken all possible precautions.

Hosted Rentals: The comments here on hosted rentals generally suggest adoption of some different standards than the Advisory Committee recommended. Most often mentioned was to allow tenants to operate a hosted rental, similar to the City of South Lake Tahoe's rule. Other comments mention that recommended occupancy for hosted rentals is too restrictive. Other comments run the gamut ("leave hosted rentals alone" and hosted rentals should be permitted the same as VHRs).

Other themes noted in responses to Question 2:

- The recommendations interfere with fundamental property rights, market fundamentals, and amount to improper government overreach. Don't move the needle again with new and more stringent regulations.
- The recommendations are oriented to South Shore problems. The entire County should not have to live by City of South Lake Tahoe rules for City problems.
- No provision has been made for abuse of the complaint system. These comments say VHR complaints can be purposefully false.
- A few say the recommendations do not go far enough and the County should be sunseting VHRs. On the other side, commenters note that VHRs are their livelihood or necessary to afford their home and please don't jeopardize them.
- A handful of comments say that guests should be the responsible party for violations. A few said there should be better guest education.
- One comment notes that provision should be made for removing bad VHR management companies.
- A handful of comments raise questions and suggestions about the source and responsible use of funds to pay for new VHR enforcement and compliance programs and rules.

III. Summary of Comments on Question 3: What else do you want the County to know?

VHRs are a critical component of the local tourism dominated economy in Tahoe and provide necessary jobs; VHRs are also the preferred way for families and groups to travel. These were the most often mentioned comments in responses to question 3. These comments also often say that neighborhoods in Tahoe have always been transient, very few homes are VHRs, very few complaints are received, and therefore lack of enforcement is the problem and should be the focus of action. They note that more restrictions on VHR will damage the Tahoe economy and contribute to its further distress. Other comments add that VHRs have been unfairly targeted by proposals that are overly solicitous to a small and vocal group of complainers. "VHR owners are not the enemy," "each side needs the other," and a few bad apples should not cause all this new regulation because it will harm the little guy, price locals out of the VHR market, and the County should support well run VHRs. They say the problem is not the VHR but a few bad actors; focus there and do not penalize good VHR operators. Others comment that banning or further restricting VHRs will not turn them into long-term rentals or more housing for locals. It will only hurt the economy, businesses, and jobs. Furthermore, VHRs are often the only way some can afford to keep their homes in Tahoe.

Some strongly oppose VHRs in residentially neighborhoods ("R-1 Zones are for homes, not hotels") **and others want no or little government intervention** (These commenters say the recommendations are government overreach and property owners should have full rights to use their property as they wish.)

Focus County efforts on illegal vacation rentals.

Address clusters and buffers: Although the Report makes no recommendations on clustering, comments offer varied suggestions including reconsidering the County's adopted 500 foot buffer, replacing it with a percentage based cap, reducing it to a distance less than 500 feet, and please to continue working on breaking up existing clusters.

Funding Questions and Comments: Commenters ask how the County will fund the enforcement recommendations. A number of comments support using or dedicating TOT to fund VHR enforcement. Commenters want to know more about how County TOT is used and ask the County to be transparent about the financial benefits of VHR to the County including potential losses if VHRs would be banned or restricted.

Data Requests: A few comments question the data supporting further regulation of VHRs and ask the County to share data about complaints.

Limits or not on number of VHRs: The comments are split, one side saying limit VHRs, the other side saying reducing the cap is bad policy.

The VHR problem is primarily on the South Shore in Tahoe; the County should not treat the rest of the County or the West Shore the same as South Tahoe.

Comments noting the negative outfall from the City's Measure T on VHRs.

The County should have sent notifications to all VHR owners.

Other suggestions from comments include:

- Regulate and/or enforce outdoor lighting standards
- Expand exemption requests for rentals greater than 14 occupants
- Move VHR zones closer to or into commercial and mixed use zones
- End permits for those not actively paying TOT
- New VHR permits should have an expiration date (3-5 years)
- Require evidence of IRS reporting of VHR income
- The County should create web-based education to inform guests of VHR rules and requirements
- Guests' barking dogs should be addressed in the VHR regulations
- The snow removal requirement may be difficult to achieve because snow removal companies can be unreliable
- Require VHR management by professional "local" management companies; no more mom and pop oversight
- Guests who cause the violation should be made responsible for paying fines and penalties
- Suggestions about housing policy and how to create more affordable housing
- Incentivize hosted rentals owners to rent full time to residents.

Q1 What do you like about these recommendations?

Answered: 198 Skipped: 21

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Greater enforcement	4/6/2024 9:46 AM
2	That affected parties are talking and trying to find solutions to the VHR issues. I find them thoughtful and thorough	4/6/2024 9:00 AM
3	A more streamlined management process.	4/6/2024 12:24 AM
4	1. Law enforcement resources should not be wasted on VHR "violations" Everything else is punitive and goes against the spirit of Tahoe being a tourist destination and a huge driver of the local economy.	4/5/2024 9:54 PM
5	Dedicated enforcement and reporting directly to central place is good.	4/5/2024 9:08 PM
6	I like all of section A. As a resident who's frequently reported issues, having a central dispatch service that will facilitate the collection of operational metrics will go a long way to weeding out bad actors.	4/5/2024 7:53 PM
7	Emphasis on enforcement · Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data · Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement · Shutting down unpermitted operators · Establish a hosted rental program · Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb · Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy	4/5/2024 7:50 PM
8	Most seem headed I right direction	4/5/2024 6:56 PM
9	The ideas I like most are dedicated enforcement and the tracking of data. If violations are actually enforced in a reasonable way there should be less complaints. And if the actual complaints are documented then it will be easy to see where things can improve.....as long as violation reporting is not abused by the locals.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
10	That they are a start to working towards sustainable solutions.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
11	Emphasis on enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb	4/5/2024 5:17 PM
12	Occupancy in VHR.	4/5/2024 5:15 PM
13	Our economy relies on tourism whether city or county.	4/5/2024 5:05 PM
14	Reporting system, stiffer penalties	4/5/2024 4:42 PM
15	Noise monitoring for outside.. if people are loud inside a house it rarely affects the neighbors.. outside hot tubs are incredibly loud and people stay in them for hours. Also that is where most people drink and listen to music is outside.	4/5/2024 4:34 PM
16	No fire pits outdoors	4/5/2024 2:59 PM
17	Overall, the recommendations are well thought-out and if enforced properly should alleviate most of the issues with VHRs.	4/5/2024 2:12 PM
18	My family has owned a Tahoe cabin for four generations. We like reasonable and enforceable regulations. Over reaction by unreasonable people will hurt everyone.	4/5/2024 2:10 PM
19	I like Emphasis on enforcement, however I feel the County is going after the wrong people. I would sincerely like to know why you are not going after the actual people breaking the rules (ie the guests?) If a host such as myself goes above and beyond trying to vet my potential guests why are we the ones being punished? I don't allow instant booking, all the rules are on my listing, we discuss them prior to booking, they are in my rental agreement that they have to complete, sign and return to me, it's discussed in the welcome email and posted inside the house. Literally what else can I do? If you go after the people breaking the rules then they will go home and spread the words to their friends and family. Additionally, you don't enforce fines	4/5/2024 2:00 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

to guests when you do go after them, you hold the permit hostage for the host to pay. Where's the deterrent? How does that create better behaved guests when you go after the wrong people? I would also like to know why are there one set of rules (hot tub use, garbage, noise, cars) for rentals and not for residents? If that behavior is being a bad neighbor than why is not for a local resident? This entire discussion is one sided by a small community that has a very unrealistic expectation of communal living. Everyone state-wide is dealing with a shortage of affordable housing, not just the Tahoe Basin. In almost every other desirable area most people have to commute (SF, LA, Monterey, insert any beautiful location). Additionally most have to occasionally hear noise from their neighbors. D2. I love this idea. No open fire pits or fireplaces outside, but now allowing charcoal is not reasonable. Please site the number of fires caused by charcoal fires. There is no data to substantiate this restriction.

20	I appreciate the emphasis on enforcement and commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data. Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement is great. I support shutting down unpermitted operators. I support removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and going through central system / team first. It's good to establish a hosted rental program. It's great to close TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb. It's smart to eliminate allowance of outside firepits, thus reducing chance of forrest fire. It makes sense to require daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy.	4/5/2024 1:53 PM
21	1) minimize police involvement	4/5/2024 1:40 PM
22	I honestly just love the fact that we are finally working together as a community in which positive progress and compromise on both side are being made, nice work to everyone involved. Getting rid of the illegal VHR's is the largest step in working together and creating a more positive community. That is the focus and educating current VHR's on how to work together with neighbors. In placer county their compliance department will call the VHR home owner as a human and just say "hey, are you aware that a few negative disruptions have happened from your property, ". 95% of people will hear that as a human and want to change it to make it better. Simple conversations as people can work through 95% of all issues.	4/5/2024 1:31 PM
23	E.4 - I don't like illegal rentals and would like those to be enforced So Something I like: enforcement of illegal rentals.	4/5/2024 1:26 PM
24	E.4 Illegal Rentals - ther is no enforcement. I have a vactaion rental accross the street from me that is "owner occupied" and is rented out as such. This is not the case. The owner does not live there (I know I live accross the street and so do all my local neighbors). There own snow removal workers told the code enforcement agent this winter that they know the owner very well and know the owner does not live there. How is this still allowed to operate. There is no enforcement. The "owner occupied" loophole in VHRs is just rediculous.	4/5/2024 12:59 PM
25	Removing the illegal rentals.	4/5/2024 11:31 AM
26	· Emphasis on enforcement · Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data · Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement · Shutting down unpermitted operators · Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first · Establish a hosted rental program · Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb · Eliminating allowance of outside firepits · Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy · County collaborating with community / ongoing committee	4/5/2024 11:29 AM
27	Increased complaint management. Enforcing and shutting down illegal rentals.	4/5/2024 11:24 AM
28	I like that they are not allowing unpermitted homes to use AirBNB and that they are collecting data.	4/5/2024 11:14 AM
29	I like stricter enforcement and larger fines.	4/5/2024 11:05 AM
30	ALL that are listed plus. Support collaboration with locals, merchants and the VHR's. Most importantly, communicating the importance of tourism with guidelines for the strength and well-being for Lake Tahoe.	4/5/2024 10:27 AM
31	I like the enforcement of rules and regulations, as it is good for the communities and the rental home owners that abide by the regulations. Shutting down the unpermitted renters helps everyone, residents and legal rental property owners alike.	4/5/2024 10:06 AM
32	Emphasis on enforcement. Shutting down illegal operators. Closing the TOT loophole that allows unpermitted operators to rent.	4/5/2024 9:50 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

33	Everything. Thank you!	4/5/2024 9:23 AM
34	Illegal rentals are common even advertised. 2nd homeowners rent to “friends, people from church, friends from work, neighbors where they live ect.” They don’t charge tax or pay the permit costs have inspections. Some do not follow rules.	4/5/2024 8:50 AM
35	II. A. 3. We very much support the effort to crack down on all bad actors. We agree that those who frequently violate the ordinances should be penalized. This should also apply to residents, who harass guests and property owners by calling in multiple frivolous complaints in an attempt to terminate a VHR permit.	4/5/2024 8:43 AM
36	I like the proposals about enforcement, increasing penalties for illegal VHRs and for repeated violations.	4/5/2024 8:36 AM
37	Everything is going in the right direction, especially formal, 3rd party enforcement.	4/5/2024 7:39 AM
38	The individual owner should be enforced for their own violation, not all other owners. If the individual problem vhr's violations were enforced, it should take care of any problem that comes up regarding vhr's. We have a vhr right across the street from us. It is a large house, but we never have any problems, so it is not an issue. If an individual owner has violations, it should be enforced, not the vhr that does not have violations.	4/5/2024 7:32 AM
39	E.4	4/5/2024 7:24 AM
40	The county should not impose any more restrictions on property rights	4/5/2024 7:21 AM
41	E.4. Illegal rentals I agree that unpermitted VHRs should be shut down, and outside firepits should not be allowed. It is important for city collaboration with compliant VHR hosts. This will ensure communication, and provide the best experience for everyone, while keeping South Lake Tahoe a desirable and appealing vacation destination.	4/5/2024 6:38 AM
42	VHR's are a vital part of our economy.	4/5/2024 6:35 AM
43	I firmly believe that if there had been earlier enforcement of the VHR rules in South Lake Tahoe, Measure T would never have happened.	4/5/2024 6:34 AM
44	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data. Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement, Shutting down unpermitted operators. Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first. Establish a hosted rental program. Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb. Eliminating allowance of outside firepits. Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy. County collaborating with community / on going committee.	4/5/2024 6:30 AM
45	1- Investing in an enforcement unit is a great idea. We need to regulate the short term rentals that we have to keep our neighborhoods quiet and to reduce illegal short term rentals so that we can increase our much needed TOT tax. Learn from the city's mistakes and regulate, do not eliminate.	4/5/2024 5:56 AM
46	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establish a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/5/2024 5:25 AM
47	None of them I like.	4/5/2024 1:06 AM
48	I am sick to death of tax money being wasted on bureaucratic and burdensome rules and regulations and enforcements. It's becoming impossible to make any move without violating some strict rule. It's ridiculous and I don't want good tax money that could build facilities and solve real problems going tongestapo policing of neighborhoods. Shameful.	4/5/2024 12:19 AM
49	Like? That this issue is being brought to my attention and I am being given the opportunity to share my input.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
50	Well I currently work for VHR company in South Lake Tahoe and it would be very unfortunate for me to lose my job. I depende on tourism in order to pay all my bills rents gas and food. Jobs in Lake Tahoe are very difficult to find I would have to relocate if there is no more VHR .	4/4/2024 11:01 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

51	Well I currently work for a VHR company in south lake tahoe and it would be very unfortunate for me to lose my job. I depend on tourism in order to pay all my bills rent gas and food.Jobs in Lake Tahoe are very difficult to find.I would have to relocate if there is no more VHR.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
52	I think limiting the number of rentals is a great idea. This will open up more housing for people who want to live here full time.	4/4/2024 10:14 PM
53	emphasis on enforcement	4/4/2024 9:50 PM
54	Nothing	4/4/2024 9:30 PM
55	Nothing	4/4/2024 9:24 PM
56	What VHR Managers like about the report: Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establish a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / ongoing committee	4/4/2024 9:12 PM
57	Since we pay alot of money to obtain and keep our legit permits, and had a 40% increase on TOT taxes, i think they should really put their efforts on unpermitted operators. there are alot of homes doing this and getting away with it.	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
58	Getting rid of illegal rentals	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
59	Closing loopholes and mitigating unpermitted/illegal rentals. Adding a hosted rental program. Effort toward community collaboration and communication vs just haphazardly implementing bans or changes like SLT did.	4/4/2024 7:31 PM
60	Leave hosted vacation rentals alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	4/4/2024 7:26 PM
61	Hosted rentals are very helpful for home buyers that might struggle to constant increase in utility costs and insurance- these costs seems to go up 20-80 percent annually-	4/4/2024 7:25 PM
62	legal regulations	4/4/2024 7:04 PM
63	We like the focus on enforcement of existing rules, collection of data to support decision making, and cracking down on unpermitted VHRs.	4/4/2024 6:22 PM
64	central complaint/response system. Also getting rid of illigal vhrs in certain areas, alot of neighborhoods are considered very safe, but adding outside tourists to airbnb's can possibly create theft and/or poor livibility having random neighbors every week/month.	4/4/2024 6:01 PM
65	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establish a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/4/2024 5:34 PM
66	Emphasis on enforcement	4/4/2024 5:29 PM
67	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establish a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/4/2024 5:28 PM
68	I really like a lot of the recommendations in this report and big support to Brooke Laine for taking initiative and EDC staff participating. I apologize in advance my responses do not have a report chapter and section reference. I like the prioritization of a dedicated, local enforcement unit and using TOT program income to pay for it. Long overdue. Police should not be the County's VHR enforcement and response team. Complaints should all go through a central contact system then dispatch appropriate response, like the Local Contact ensuring comprehensive data collection is transpiring. Data should drive decision making and first there must be a commitment to collecting it appropriately. I love the suggestions to close loopholes like Airbnb collecting and remitting illegal operators' TOT, as well as creating a Hosted Rental	4/4/2024 5:28 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

program. Congruency in day time and night time occupancy makes sense. I also like the recommendation for on-going community participation and engagement in the program.

69	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establish a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/4/2024 3:59 PM
70	- "Invest in a dedicated VHR enforcement unit" (emphasis on stronger enforcement) - "Develop a central complaint tracking and response system" (fantastic) - Find and shut down illegal no-permit rentals / operators. - Hosted rentals need a program similiar to VHR program (guidelines, fines, etc) - Yes, please prohibit outdoor firepits (wood, charcoal, gas)	4/4/2024 3:33 PM
71	Very little. The only idea I see here that could be positive is the tiered system. I own a small older cabin that accommodates 6 max, and it's usually just a couple or family of four. I am not making money, just trying to cover some expenses in hope of retiring at this cabin someday. I like to think that I give guests a good deal on their rental fees, so they have money to spend on activities and eating out. My VHR renewal fee is going up sharply next year, and it will be equal to someone with a home that is rented to 8 to 12 people for substantially more money. So I suppose a tiered system would be helpful in my case (as long as the minimum renewal fee doesn't again shoot up).	4/4/2024 12:44 PM
72	Reducing the maximum occupancy to two per bedroom, we already enforce that limit in our VHR.	4/4/2024 12:23 AM
73	That the county would consider a dedicated enforcement unit. Many of the issues are from unpermitted or shady operators.	4/3/2024 6:55 PM
74	I appreciate several aspects of these recommendations. Firstly, I'm particularly pleased with the emphasis on enhancing illegal rental enforcement. This is crucial for maintaining community standards and ensuring that rental properties comply with regulations, contributing to a safer and more orderly environment. Secondly, the decision to eliminate the allowance of outside firepits, gas, or otherwise, reflects a commitment to fire safety and environmental protection. By mitigating the risk of outdoor fires, we can safeguard our neighborhoods and natural surroundings from potential harm. Lastly, I commend the commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data. Informed decision-making is essential for effective governance, and by relying on data-driven insights, we can ensure that our policies and initiatives are both evidence-based and responsive to the needs of our community.	4/2/2024 6:01 PM
75	I like the community involvement.	4/2/2024 5:13 PM
76	C1, simplified and reduced cost process for hosted rentals: we support this.	4/2/2024 2:04 PM
77	Emphasis on enforcement. Shutting down unpermitted operators. Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb. Requiring daytime occupancy same as overnight occupancy.	4/2/2024 12:43 PM
78	I think that county should invest in more enforcement for the community by having full time enforcement staff in Tahoe on the weekends.	4/2/2024 9:49 AM
79	Section A - (4) Require all VHR rental agencies and or owners to physically be present on the property when guests check in and do a head count for occupancy and vehicles count. They must also explain the rules and compliance with noise restrictions at that time. Section B - Immediately implement a drop dead date and restriction to reduce the VHR Cap to 600 VHR's (including hosted, air B&B's etc). As a matter of reference – The Tahoe Residents Group established ten years ago the incidents of nuisance complaints rose exponentially when VHR's exceeded 600 in the South Tahoe California Basin. This was presented to the BOS at that time along with the 500 foot radius rule proposal. Section D - (3,4,5) Demand El Dorado County Sheriff's Department resume enforcing VHR neighborhood noise/nuisance violation compliance, parking and occupancy limitations. The Sheriff's Department has abruptly refused to do their job in enforcing the law regarding VHR violations. Guest violations are the liability of the property owner with citations and mandatory strikes against the owner and owner's permit. Section D - (2) Prohibit all outdoor comfort fireplaces, fire rings or open flame comfort fires of any kind. Section 111 - Clustering - The 500 foot radius rule must include all VHR's and hosted rentals immediately. Clustered VHR's must comply withing a maximum of three years. The Clustered VHR's not in compliance must immediately be subject a lottery which ends their	4/2/2024 8:28 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

permits duration within three years. Clustered VHR Owners and all VHR Owners must be treated in the same manner.

80	1. Emphasis on enforcement 2. Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data 3. Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators 4. Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first 5. Establishing a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb 6. Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise 7. Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy 8. County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/1/2024 10:34 PM
81	they are more stringent.	4/1/2024 10:04 PM
82	D.3. We should allow vhr's to not count children 13 and younger to the total occupancy.	4/1/2024 7:51 PM
83	They seem to highlight the fact that a few bad operators or properties are responsible for the majority of the problems. The county should focus on those operating rentals illegally rather than making life more difficult for property owners who are trying to be good neighbors and are complying with all of the rules.	4/1/2024 4:21 PM
84	9. Signage: HR must have exterior signage same as VHR	4/1/2024 2:10 PM
85	Eliminating local contact Go after non permitted rentals.	4/1/2024 12:53 PM
86	II. A 1-4 I strongly agree that the county should be using resources from TOT revenue to properly respond to complaints and track all data so good decisions can be made. Not every complaint is legitimate and no one deserves to be consistently disturbed by a badly managed VHR. II D 5 The noise monitors are great and very effective. On the rare occasion that ours alerts us a quick phone call has been 100% effective. They should be required in all properties, its just as easy for 4 people in a small house to be disruptive. They are cheap and easy, and any good property manager should be glad to have them	4/1/2024 12:44 PM
87	* Shutting down unpermitted operators * Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first * Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb * Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise * County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/1/2024 9:02 AM
88	Trying to limit/reduce what private home owners can do with their homes a direct violation and nothing short of government controlling private citizens.	4/1/2024 8:29 AM
89	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establishing a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	4/1/2024 7:00 AM
90	1. I like the idea of: "dismantling 'clusters'" of VHRs. This is a good idea. It allows for equal and fair opportunity for homeowners to rent their properties but without an arbitrary boundary. Clustering considerations should be removed from the VHR program. 2. I like: "Dedicate TOT to funds to basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing - for example, snow removal in a timely manner as VHR guests that pay taxes and stay, need clear roads in the winter to enter or leave neighborhoods. All these VHR taxes are paid, but no benefits/amenities seem to arrive to the communities in the form of services to guests. I also like the idea of using ToT funds to build more housing in the basin. 3. I like: "Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County" - I think remaining competitive with surrounding communities is positive to keep the VHR economy competitive in El Dorado County.	3/31/2024 10:04 PM
91	I like the emphasis on rule enforcement and shutting down unpermitted operators as it seems there are some of those and they give a bad rep to VHRs that follow the rules. Also, priority should be given to local owners and managers of VHRs including hosted rentals as they have a vested interest, better knowledge and availability to manage their rentals well.	3/31/2024 3:15 PM
92	Enforcement of illegal rentals Accounting for Hosted Rentals	3/31/2024 2:52 PM
93	They seemed biased against VHR. Everything recommended are more restrictive and will ultimately increase VHR permitted.	3/31/2024 2:14 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

94	I don't like any of it	3/31/2024 2:01 PM
95	The recommendations are based on an unproven assumption: that VHRs are bad for the community. I see not facts to back this up. The weekly police and sheriff's blotters report few VHR complaints compared to other problems, and even fewer of those complaints turn out to be real,	3/31/2024 9:17 AM
96	that they included a diversity of viewpoints.	3/30/2024 6:26 PM
97	The focus on data and recordings to tracking and verify issues.	3/30/2024 3:32 PM
98	I don't believe any of these regulations are based on the area where I live and operate a VHR, and they may be unnecessary for our area which is far removed from the LT basin and rural.	3/30/2024 1:11 PM
99	Enhance Illegal Enforcement Daytime occupancy same as nighttime. A balanced VHR commission VHRs support the local economy and the job market including trades to maintain and improve the home which benefits everyone in the neighborhood.	3/30/2024 12:42 PM
100	3.a Rentals need to be compliant	3/30/2024 12:13 PM
101	I think having an age cut off at 13 is good. I think having regulations that target regions like West side vs South Lake.	3/30/2024 11:50 AM
102	Overall - the progress is good ... leveling the playing field and improving enforcement is critical to making sure that this is a fair system for all involved (full time residents and rentals). Bringing the Hosted-Rental program more in-line with the requirements of the VHR program feels appropriate as well.	3/30/2024 9:27 AM
103	Emphasis on enforcement, Shutting down unpermitted operators, Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy	3/30/2024 9:19 AM
104	Finally some Support for owners of VHRs	3/30/2024 8:26 AM
105	There are no illegal rental. Every time the gov't gets involved, they mess it up. What is it about MY property that you don't understand.??	3/30/2024 8:02 AM
106	1. Shutting down unpermitted operators 2. Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise 3. Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy	3/29/2024 9:11 PM
107	A3. Better enforcement makes sense to prevent illegal operators. However, implementing a lien on properties to collect guest fines like parking fines seems unfair. Parking fines should be levied again those visitors car registration or drivers license. This is especially true because a lot of VHR owners would love to call law enforcement on their own guests who violate rules after being informed in multiple channels about the local regulation. This makes it impossible. A4. There should be clearer, improved requirements for Local Contacts. However, disagree with the changes proposed. Dispatching law enforcement whenever someone submits a complaint online is vulnerable to abuse and misuse of law enforcement time.	3/29/2024 6:34 PM
108	It appears that a diverse group of stakeholders participated, and invested much time and thought into the process to develop these recommendations. Doubling penalties, in general is beneficial, as long as those funds go back into vhr engorcement programs and costs.vhr commission to aid county.i agree that eliminating vhr is not desirable, as it would impact local economies thru out the basin. It would also impact revenues at the county level and regional programs like fire dept staffing. Enforcement is the key to successfully managing this. If a NIMBY approach is taken, the county will lose the benefits of the responsible guest, property owners and property managers.	3/29/2024 5:49 PM
109	I do like that stricter VHR violation requirements and enforcement is being brought to attention.	3/29/2024 5:18 PM
110	Crack down on unpermitted rentals	3/29/2024 4:52 PM
111	Central System/Tracking is great Emphasis on enforcement is great Minimizing Police involvement is great Eliminating outdoor firepits etc is great for potential fire risk reduction Daytime occupancy/nighttime being the same is great A collaborative approach is great	3/29/2024 4:04 PM
112	The focus on enforcement and oversight of vacation home rentals.	3/29/2024 3:38 PM
113	Shutting down unpermitted operators, Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy	3/29/2024 3:36 PM
114	That there is a focus on enforcement.	3/29/2024 3:24 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

115	Thanks for taking the time to review and make suggested changes.	3/29/2024 3:10 PM
116	I like the idea of a central complaint system, however I hope to see some protection against frivolous complaints.	3/29/2024 2:45 PM
117	Enforcement without Police, TOT changes, County and community collaboration.	3/29/2024 2:43 PM
118	E.4- illegal rentals- yes. We should find these as it's currently inequitable that some owners pay by the rules and others do not. IIA1- enforcement unit. I think we've made so many changes in the past few years that we should attempt to let those work rather than micromanaging and continuing to change things so no one can keep up with what's current when it comes to enforcement.	3/29/2024 2:39 PM
119	Minimizing police enforcement in VHR's. Eliminating allowance of fire pits.	3/29/2024 1:58 PM
120	Most of the recommendations are fine, 1,2,3,4-A,4-C,4-D,4-E,4-F.	3/29/2024 1:31 PM
121	Getting rid of illegal rentals and providing a local liaison so that an owner knows right away if there is a complaint	3/29/2024 1:29 PM
122	D.4...adequately enforce regulations and do not relicense any VHR that has more than a couple violations.	3/29/2024 12:51 PM
123	Focus on illegal rentals, problem VHRs, and enforcement only.	3/29/2024 12:29 PM
124	None, I think all of this is extreme. Take a look around town and see many vacant buildings. South lake tahoe IS and ALWAYS will be a tourist destination. That Is the infrastructure of this town. Most locals have no money to even properly maintain their own properties. The problem is not the tourists. It is the locals who do not want them there. Tourism drives the economy ,restaurants have recently closed because of lack of customers. the place will be a ghost town if a group of locals can make radical changes . Just watch, it is already happening.	3/29/2024 12:26 PM
125	The are focused on finding middle ground between outright bans and complete chaos. As a VHR owner, I want to respect neighbors, offer an incredible experience for my renters, and contribute economically to such an amazing place.	3/29/2024 12:12 PM
126	I like that they are bringing up enforcing illegal renting. this gives VHR a bad reputation because the homes are rented by owners looking for a quick buck and not focused on the health of the community and respecting neighbors.	3/29/2024 11:51 AM
127	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establishing a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	3/29/2024 11:39 AM
128	Removing the local contact and using a centralized system for enforcement and issues makes absolute sense and is in line with how management companies can effectively run operations for multiple homes.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
129	Emphasis on enforcement. Don't ding the people who are playing by the rules and supporting the local economy.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
130	I really like the idea of better enforcement and restricting the overall number of permits.	3/29/2024 11:21 AM
131	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first Establishing a hosted rental program Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	3/29/2024 11:16 AM
132	I like that law enforcement wouldn't be the first call, hopefully giving owners a chance to address any issues first.	3/29/2024 11:15 AM
133	Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb	3/29/2024 11:12 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

134	Central complaint agency that then contacts the local contact.	3/29/2024 11:12 AM
135	I like the reduction of the cluster ratio from 500 to 350 ft.	3/29/2024 11:07 AM
136	Regardless of the outcome, at least a civil attempt to reach consensus is underway. Best feature is enforcement. I have called the "hotline" on several occasions or sent an email with minimal response. Also please start to dedicate the tot funds to the vhr issue and not bank in general funds or other non vhr uses.	3/29/2024 11:06 AM
137	Enforcement and accountability first.	3/29/2024 11:03 AM
138	Enforcement needs to be better, with an improved reporting and tracking system to weed out the bad actors in vacation rentals (single phone number to track complaints, fines to guests and owners for violation, dedicated enforcement team, Require noise monitors and driveway cameras). Lower cap to 600 VHR's and leave grandfathered permits alone.	3/28/2024 6:20 PM
139	unruly vacation guests should not be tolerated.	3/28/2024 1:40 PM
140	Everything. The report outlines a full suite of recommendations that are needed to get control of the VHRs. Very well thought out and comprehensive.	3/26/2024 11:17 AM
141	I do not like them	3/26/2024 10:39 AM
142	A.2.I am amazed a central complaint tracking system doesn't already exist. I strongly support not only a centralized tracking system as well as notification and enforcement. B I support a reduction in capping overall number of permits to 600 D.2. higher fines are appropriate	3/24/2024 12:45 PM
143	1. A dedicated enforcement unit. Enforcement personnel needs to be available during peak days and hours. Thurs-Sun pm when people are checking in and in the home. Enhance illegal rental enforcement. 2. Everything proposed about Hosted rentals and better enforcement for penalizing illegal rentals. Remove the bad actors. 3. Local contact requirements	3/24/2024 9:59 AM
144	Not much. Keep it Simple please!	3/23/2024 9:32 PM
145	I like that the county is being proactive in making VHRs easier to live with.	3/23/2024 11:23 AM
146	Everything!!!!	3/23/2024 8:50 AM
147	I understand the need to create solutions that take all viewpoints into consideration. In my view, no matter how many rules and regulations are put into place, there will continue to be violations and unhappy full-time residents. Hopefully, some of the recommendations made by this committee will help.	3/22/2024 12:48 PM
148	I like the tough stance on illegally operated VHR's.	3/22/2024 10:19 AM
149	Reducing the cap on VHRs in EDC.	3/22/2024 8:54 AM
150	Increase fines.	3/22/2024 7:41 AM
151	Where is the report	3/22/2024 6:15 AM
152	The recommendations are reasonable.	3/21/2024 6:36 PM
153	I like that regulations might actually be enforced. I think strong enforcement is key to success.	3/21/2024 5:49 PM
154	I live next to illegal VHR. They are advertising on AIRBNB and have been for months. I have been filing complaints but I'm tired of county doing nothing. Strong enforcement of penalties need to happen now!	3/21/2024 11:19 AM
155	Better enforcement, reduce VHR's in SLT.	3/21/2024 11:17 AM
156	As a responsible VHR owner, I like the following recommendations: A3; This is overdue. Illegal rentals are out there and unfair to us that play by the rules. A4; Modifying the local contact signs is good and bad. There is so much animosity among neighbors not wanting a VHR in their neighborhood, they will call the number and complain with no reason. A central complaint number is good. BUT, how will you field fraudulent complaints from those neighbors that just don't want you there?? If you are going to punish the VHR owner due to complaints, then you must ensure the complaint is legitimate. If I get a call because my number is on the sign as local contact, and no one is staying in my rental, then I know the complaint is from a disgruntled neighbor. AD1, No special events aside from those renting is a good enforcement. AD3 enforcing maximum occupancy is overdue.	3/21/2024 10:31 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

157	The collaborative approach, community input and thoughtful recommendations.	3/21/2024 9:57 AM
158	These recommendations are very clear answers to the VHR current problems, well done!	3/21/2024 9:40 AM
159	We strongly support and endorse all the proposed recommendations. We are full time residents and rarely see current VHRs in our neighborhood following the rules (minor to major issues)	3/21/2024 9:17 AM
160	A.1. I like the idea of investing in a dedicated committee to manage complaints A.2. I like the idea of efficiency with any project such as this A.3.a. I like the focus on unpermitted rentals and finding ways to identify those C.1. I like the idea of simplification D.2. Absolutely! Unfortunately this is the reality of the state we live in. F. I like it as long as it truly is made up of diverse voices and not a group of people with the same agenda that may not reflect the greater community.	3/21/2024 9:15 AM
161	Nothing	3/21/2024 7:06 AM
162	Invest in dedicated VHR enforcement to patrol neighborhoods to enforce rules so locals can live peacefully among renters	3/21/2024 4:13 AM
163	Enforcement of the existing regulation is important and supportes	3/20/2024 5:34 PM
164	I think the recommendations will help mitigate concerns of those living around VHRs	3/20/2024 5:04 PM
165	A1. Dedicated VHR enforcement team. -there has to be unit that would take complaints in and respond accordingly. A2. Tracking and response system. -there has to be efficient management system solely for VHRs. 4. no need for local contact to respond/remediate the issue, let the unit/system do it. C. Hosted Rentals. -Having sworn and notarized proof of hosted rental is the only way to prove whether its hosted. D6. Signage. - SPOT ON! F. request for establishment of VHR commission. - this is definitely Yes!	3/20/2024 3:10 PM
166	4C. Bringing greater accountability to hosted rentals makes sense as this is a channel that can currently be exploited by bad actors that are not actually 'hosting'.	3/20/2024 1:06 PM
167	II.A&II.C I am happy to see there is acknowledgement of the hosted rentals being operated inappropriately. I have lived across the street from one such rental and I would like to see their permit revoked. A 9 bedroom house should not be eligible for a hosted rental permit. A taskforce would take one look at the situation and be able to see what's really going on. The owners of these must be held accountable and pay the correct TOT, not lie about 4 people staying when there are actually 10-16 people.	3/20/2024 12:58 PM
168	I am extremely disappointed in former county supervisors for allowing what amounts to a zoning change in the first place. However, I think the recommendations have merit.	3/20/2024 12:52 PM
169	I like everything about item A.	3/20/2024 10:42 AM
170	New reduced cap	3/20/2024 10:20 AM
171	Any action taken against illegal rentals and owners/managers that do not abide to ordinance.	3/20/2024 9:27 AM
172	1. HR Permit: Develop a parallel but simplified "registration" or "permitting" process for hosted rentals – Application fees, inspections, and requirements may be reduced and simplified for hosted rentals. - This is how you control VHRs. Fire inspections, permitting, etc. Makes the home safe for our renters and we are better able to control any issues if neighbors complain.	3/20/2024 8:53 AM
173	I appreciate that the committee is trying to find common ground and implement modifications that can appease parties on both sides of this issue. I fully support ensuring that those that operate a VHR are following the rules and that their renters are not causing a nuisance in the neighborhood. We operate a VHR in a very quiet, family oriented neighborhood, and we also like to come up to stay there frequently. We are friendly with all of our neighbors and definitely do not want our VHR causing them undo stress and aggravation.	3/20/2024 4:16 AM
174	II.A.1.Invest in Dedicated VHR Enforcement Unit-I think this will help identify bad renters and owner/rental management companies. Also it would help to eliminate illegal VHR. II.C.-Hosted Rentals-Allows locals to off set cost of living. II.F-Establish VHR Commission - It would allow the community to come together and ensure that all views are heard and considered. Reaching common ground is always beneficial for all sides.	3/19/2024 9:22 PM
175	I like the proposal to actually increase enforcement. It has ALWAYS been the case that a few bad eggs reflect poorly on the whole, even though the vast majority of VHR operators take great care to follow the rules and ensure their guests do too. EDC has consistently raised	3/19/2024 4:13 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

permit rates and increased the TOT taxes to increase enforcement and snow removal service. Neither promise has come true yet the taxes are still collected which is disingenuous and unfair.

176	E.4 We jump through hoops, wait on waiting list, pay lots of money to be a rental. When somebody comes in and does it illegally it's frustrating and it gives us legal renters potentially more rules and regulations.	3/19/2024 4:07 PM
177	C9, A1, A2, D2, D5 - D8 are reasonable. C2, C11 and E3 are absolutely ridiculous. F sounds horrible and will create animosity between renters and residents.	3/19/2024 3:30 PM
178	II. I like the improvement of the enforcement and management	3/19/2024 3:06 PM
179	nothing, it is only more controls... our lake and community need tourism... this is pushing people to sell homes and not helping the economy	3/19/2024 1:39 PM
180	Seem to be thoroughly discussed, vetted among various stakeholders.	3/19/2024 1:33 PM
181	I like that the opposing side are trying to reach consensus. 5.56.090 7-1 Fire safety. I like and agree with this.	3/19/2024 12:42 PM
182	Thanks for the opportunity to provide commentary. Our rental will at some point become our primary residence as we intend to move to Tahoe once we retire. As such we care a lot about good relationships with neighbors and good practices for vacation rental units. Hopefully my comments are balanced... Agree effective enforcement is essential. Dedicated unit seems like a reasonable approach. Bad actors...those with combination of poor management/ownership processes...and those that continuously offend...should be held accountable...but seems to me that the data to do that already exists and all would benefit from retrospective enforcement vs. just making things even more difficult for all properties.	3/19/2024 12:26 PM
183	I appreciate that the committee is trying to find common ground and implement modifications that can appease parties on both sides of this issue. I fully support ensuring that those that operate a VHR are following the rules and that their renters are not causing a nuisance in the neighborhood. We operate a VHR in a very quiet, family oriented neighborhood, and we also like to come up to stay there frequently. We are friendly with all of our neighbors and definitely do not want our VHR causing them undo stress and aggravation.	3/19/2024 10:38 AM
184	I appreciate that the recommendation penalize bad VHR or illegal VHRs which I believe is much of the problem. As a VHR owner who plays by the rules and cares about their neighbors and community, I support stronger enforcement.	3/19/2024 8:26 AM
185	Using technology like the central reporting system is a smart, cost-effective and scalable way to enable enforcement, and it will give the county better data on VHR problems. However, 'confidential' reporting will definitely lead to a higher percentage of false or antagonistic reports. People behave better online and everywhere if they are not anonymous. Reports should be public or made public after a short period of time. Owners should also be subscribed to any reporting system so they get the same notification as their local contacts and enforcement officers do.	3/19/2024 6:41 AM
186	Noise monitoring requirement Stronger enforcement of illegal airbnbs	3/18/2024 3:06 PM
187	I am in total agreement that enforcement must be stronger, the reporting process needs to be easier, with feedback on any complaint filed. That would require a dedicated staff to handle complaints, investigations, and enforcement.	3/18/2024 11:37 AM
188	Nothing, No caps are needed just proper inspections and enforcement. everyone that wants a permit should be able to get one	3/18/2024 8:58 AM
189	Because it's more family welcoming	3/18/2024 12:04 AM
190	I like that the county has not voted to ban vhrs. As a renter who brought my family to Tahoe twice a year for while raising three kids, two with special needs, I couldn't stay in hotels (hotels only allowed 4 to a room and special needs kids needed their own space too) and vhrs allowed us to travel and enjoy the area and share the beauty with my children. We love providing that for other families now too. We love our local neighbors and they love that we preemptively vet guests and prevent problems so they do not arise. If the county could do vhr education for hosts/owners, this could be the solution.	3/17/2024 9:44 PM
191	I agree that improving enforcement will help reduce the bad experiences for both Tahoe	3/17/2024 9:28 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

residents and guests		
192	None.	3/17/2024 8:36 PM
193	All recommendations are good except section E.	3/17/2024 8:47 AM
194	I like that the report was developed by a committee that are on both sides of the table. It's about time that we look more closely at these issues brought up by the committee. I'm 100% in agreement with all the recommendations. I feel like there is finally attention being paid to this important problem. In Particular I support: more oversight of VHRs and hiring a resource dedicated to this, additional and higher fines for breaking the rules, limitations on how many people can occupy a VHR, and limitations on how many VHRs can be in a neighborhood or community. I live in South Lake Tahoe, and I have 4 VHR's next to our home- across the street, next door and behind our house. There are so many times the noise from the VHRs keep us awake at night. We feel helpless in terms of what can be done. The police or sheriff might come by, but then the VHR starts the noise again.	3/17/2024 7:34 AM
195	Greater, more proactive enforcement on offenders.	3/16/2024 2:49 PM
196	I appreciate the work of the committee members and facilitators to come up with consensus based solutions around a challenging issue.	3/16/2024 1:46 PM
197	'nothing I am very skeptical that any of the things recommended will be carried out. These were supposed to be in place before.	3/16/2024 1:08 PM
198	Reduction in the number and concentration, no separate kitchen, better enforcement of occupancies and parking.	3/16/2024 12:40 PM

Q2 What don't you like about these recommendations and why?

Answered: 192 Skipped: 27

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The continued interference in market fundamentals of supply and demand. Stop over regulating. If the amount of VHR were to be completely uncapped, most VHR owners would be unable to continue owning their properties due to declines in revenue and would be sold back on the open market at a discount to local families. By interfering in this market you're artificially inflating the value of homes for owners with a VHR permit to the detriment of locals. It's completely counterproductive.	4/6/2024 9:46 AM
2	I see no accommodation or direct consideration to the residents affected by VHRs. In other words, monitoring, enforcement, and vigilance falls on the neighbors who are in proximity to VHRs. We as residents are doing the work of the management companies (enforcement monitoring) and receive zero benefit (inherit all the problems and no benefit of the VHR).	4/6/2024 9:00 AM
3	It doesn't seem fair to withdraw permits from VHRs who have been following all the rules.	4/6/2024 12:24 AM
4	2. Enforcement system - residents in our neighborhood often call the cops about really basic things. They are purposely trying to close the VHR system and make false reports. This system will surely encourage more of these types of shenanigans. 4B - why would you want to limit the number of VHRs? When my Dad built our house in 1983, the only way he could pay the mortgage was to rent it out during ski season and boat season. My Dad planned to retire there, but died before he was able to. Tourism has always been the main source of economic stability in Tahoe. VHRs allow for diverse populations to vacation and spend their money at local restaurants, bars and shops. Platforms like air BnB and VRBO help meet the demand and at more affordable prices than the hotels which really grows the tourism. The empty lot my dad bought almost 40 years ago was sold to him as an "investment" in a tourist economy. It has grown in ways we could not have imagined back then, but the principle is the same: we own the property and we should be able to share it, rent it out, visit it, decorate it , etc. If there are "bad actors" in party neighborhoods, then they should be addressed in the ways that are common in California, including ordinance violation fines. The rest of us shouldn't be bullied by folx that just don't like the concept and will sabotage it by Any means necessary.	4/5/2024 9:54 PM
5	Reducing the cap - just further limits property owners' rights.	4/5/2024 9:08 PM
6	They don't include a sunset clause that would eventually do away with them entirely. While it's necessary, the creation of a regulatory regime is frustrating for an issue that never should have arisen in the first place.	4/5/2024 7:53 PM
7	Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem	4/5/2024 7:50 PM
8	Don't resolve clusters soon enough to return neighborhoods to residential in a reasonable timeframe	4/5/2024 6:56 PM
9	I do not like the idea of lowering the cap, or reducing clustering, and not honoring the grandfathered permits. Also, I don't like reducing occupancy unless there's an amendment to the child age exemption to allow for all accompanied minors.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
10	E4- Illegal Rentals. This problem needs to be addressed immediately with a sustainable solution. Investigating and enforcement plans need to be easy to understand without any loopholes. Funding is a significant factor in the sustainability of the plan. I would like to see more details discussed than listed in the report.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
11	-Dismantling clusters would/could not be done fairly or could possibly cause a law suit. Let the extra permits fall off over time. How would they decide length of permit held, amount of tot collected, complaints?? Too many grey areas. -Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first.....We just need enforcement for illegal rentals and violation breakers... that is the first step. My point of contact is better than any system or team.	4/5/2024 5:17 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

12	Need to keep current local contact in place in that they are performing well in their response to issues. Taking this away would create a new field of hired managers when VHR homeowners already pay the current local contacts. Hosted rentals should be verified and followed up for permitting purposes. Guests should be instructed on parking, noise and issues that would give rise to violations and the guests should be held responsible for violating the rules.	4/5/2024 5:15 PM
13	No real enforcement for following the rules. Policing is not uniform - categorizing majority of issues as "a civil matter" TOT should pay for enforcement of uniform compliance.	4/5/2024 5:05 PM
14	Concerned addressing the existing clusters hasn't reached agreement	4/5/2024 4:42 PM
15	Doesn't address high fines for illegal VHRs Or Increases in permits fees to pay for an ordinance compliance officer.	4/5/2024 4:34 PM
16	Children are people who make messes worse than adults. Occupancy should count everyone. Don't care about age. It's a body in the house.	4/5/2024 2:59 PM
17	1. Section 5.56.140, paragraph B. I think the recommended fines should be hire. Maybe double the recommended amounts.	4/5/2024 2:12 PM
18	???	4/5/2024 2:10 PM
19	A4a is unfair. you are not giving the host a chance to make corrections if not allowed to contact the local contact prior to the complaint center. B- Reducing the cap. How are you going to go about that? I have a newer VHR next to me, we have been in good standing for 10yrs. Doesn't seem fair to loose mine before theirs. Measure T has showed to be a detriment for Tahoe losing TOT tax money. This is a tourist destination, people don't want to stay in hotels, they want to hang out as a family in a home which has been done for decades. D3 What is the reasoning behind eliminating the occupancy but allowing a ton of 5yr and under children ? Where does this age play a factor when children are considered minors until the age of 18. Can we find a middle ground such as 15 since you are trying to eliminate the 2 person buffer in the occupancy. Let's be transparent and logical here	4/5/2024 2:00 PM
20	Currently, there is still a lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes. They feel excessive, and one-sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem. We should be consistent with Placer County and exempt kids age 13 and under. Under 5 is very extreme, especially if reducing adults at the same time. Reducing +2 adults feels far too dramatic. Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental, just like in the City. Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested. Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' seems unprincipled and overbearing, especially since there is also no evidence that doing so will actually resolve neighborhood concerns.	4/5/2024 1:53 PM
21	1) feels excessive and one sided 2) Lack of research	4/5/2024 1:40 PM
22	I would increase the age of children occupancy exemption from 5 to maybe 12? We want families up here to enjoy and less party goers. Who the first enforcement is is always tricky but I like keeping the local contact person so that neighbors and local contact can work together as humans instead of a corporate fell. Keep it personal as most humans want to do the right things together when they understand a problem. It also keeps the vigilantes in check from both side as they are very disruptive to everyone.	4/5/2024 1:31 PM
23	D.3 - Something I really don't like. Limiting max occupancy to 14. That limits us as property owners and rental owners.. please do not limit this occupancy to only 14.. that will hinder our rental business for sure..	4/5/2024 1:26 PM
24	Measure T did nothing to help with affordable housing. It has been a complete failure and should just be reversed.	4/5/2024 12:59 PM
25	Not enough emphasis on removing the bad management companies like Grand Welcome or Vacasa.	4/5/2024 11:31 AM
26	Don't cap occupancy at 14, you are only punishing 8br and above homeowners. Dont reduce permits to 600.	4/5/2024 11:24 AM
27	I am concerned about the lack of research into the pros and cons on vacation rentals. I feel as if it is excessive and one sided. I do not see a problem with clusters. We have a home in SLT surrounded by VHR's and the issues that we have seen came from the residents teenagers	4/5/2024 11:14 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

that were on the opposite side of us. Most vacationer's are respectful and I feel like they spend more time and money visiting the Tahoe areas and businesses than the residents do.

28	We wish the offer was larger than 500 feet. There are still large clusters of grandfathered in VHRs. We want 1000 feet to space them out to around 1 per block.	4/5/2024 11:05 AM
29	I support ALL the recommendations.	4/5/2024 10:27 AM
30	D3 - Reducing the +2 hurts potential rental opportunities and the data doesn't seem to exist to support this reduction suggestion D3 - Reducing the age to 5 from 13 also doesn't seem grounded in any real data. Why is it being considered?	4/5/2024 10:06 AM
31	Exempt kids should be 13 and under, not 5.	4/5/2024 9:50 AM
32	Dedicate tot for rentals first. Then recreation, t p park trails.	4/5/2024 8:50 AM
33	<p>II.A.1. Who will pay for a dedicated VHR enforcement unit and where is the data supporting the violations committed by permitted VHR owners, necessitating the need for such a unit? Is this really going to help? If there is an Enforcement Unit, it should be equipped to offload the workload of the Sheriff. Many guests don't realize how voices carry on a quiet summer night. Please give the local contact an opportunity to resolve minor infractions with the guest before dispatching the Sheriff. This would save valuable public safety resources and more quickly resolve the issue. II.4.a, b, c The increased fines for VHR holders, and lower threshold period (only 2 complaints allowed over 36 months), is fundamentally unfair and will not help to solve problems. If a VHR permit holder is doing everything right (by the book) to reduce the probability of a problematic guest booking, but via AirB&B or VRBO for example, a loud guest is booked (which should be rare), the VHR holder should not be fined nor should it be considered a strike. Fining the guest or the company that booked the guest could help here, but it is very unfair to levy a huge fine on the permit holder who has done everything correctly. This proposal overly empowers the anti-VHR neighborhood advocate to terminate a VHR in their neighborhood. II. C. 6. Additionally, we think that if you are doing away with the +2 occupancy limit, that you should exempt children older than the age of 5. If enacted at least make the age under 12 or 14 years. Many vacationing families would be negatively impacted. II. D. 3. PLEASE DO NOT eliminate the +2 VHR occupancy per bedroom! II.D.5. Noise violations for "loud" behavior are very subjective. Noise monitors are helpful, but Sheriffs are too often called for minor infractions. We were told by the El Dorado County Sheriff that if they can hear talking from the street after 10pm, approximately 50 feet away from the front deck at our home, this results in a citation. In our neighborhood, normal talking voices can often be heard from many houses away (100 meters or more) depending on the direction of the wind. Any noise infraction should be documented with a decibel meter by the sheriff or some other objective measure. VHR owners should be able to respond with their own decibel meter data, if available. II.E. 1. Raising fines for compliant VHR owners who have followed all permit requirements, but still have occasional loud guests despite maximum efforts is UNFAIR! Please find a way to fine the offenders (GUESTS violating the ordinances). Fining those who have followed the rules won't solve the problem, no matter how high the cost of the fine. IT'S ALSO JUST WRONG AND GROSSLY UNFAIR!! II.E.2.Three violations in 36 months resulting in the revocation of a permit, when owners have minimal control is also unfair. 11.E. 3. Two strikes and out forcing owners to change management is also unreasonable. Too many variables. II.F. Although we support the idea of establishing a VHR Commission we would first like more data comparing types and numbers of infractions committed by compliant VHR owners, illegal VHRs, local residents and long term residents. It's not right to punish legal VHR permit holders while others who potentially have more infractions are not fined or subject to losing their income property.</p>	4/5/2024 8:43 AM
34	I don't like the idea of reducing the cap on VHR rentals.	4/5/2024 8:36 AM
35	Doesn't address light pollution from all the porch, deck, yard, decorative outside lighting	4/5/2024 7:39 AM
36	Do not lower cap to 600. Exempt kids should be 13 and under, not 5 and under.	4/5/2024 7:32 AM
37	Is bad is bad because it removes people property rights to be able to rent their property as they see fit.	4/5/2024 7:24 AM
38	More homes Les restrictions	4/5/2024 7:21 AM
39	D.3. Maximum occupancy The occupancy for rentals that are hosted shouldn't be reduced. Especially because a lot of families and people visiting Tahoe often rent in groups. I have personally talked to many first-time visitors to South Lake Tahoe this year that are multiple	4/5/2024 6:38 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

families or friend groups renting together. Reducing occupancy for hosted rentals would discourage these people from visiting Tahoe, especially when other vacation destinations allow this type of rental. These larger group rentals also make South Lake Tahoe accessible to people looking for a more budget friendly option for their family vacation, family reunion, etc. All of the groups renting these VHRs are made aware of local neighborhood ordinances well before arrival. The vast majority of the time there isn't any problem, but if an issue arises, I have always seen it quickly addressed.

40	Police involvement is paramount, NOT to be minimized.	4/5/2024 6:35 AM
41	I think this was very well thought out and planned. GREAT JOB!	4/5/2024 6:34 AM
42	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes. Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem. Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults. Do not like reducing +2 adults. Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City). Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested. Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/5/2024 6:30 AM
43	4B- Reducing the cap of allowable rental permits would hurt our economy and reduce the need for an enforcement unit. This makes no sense at all.	4/5/2024 5:56 AM
44	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Do not like reducing +2 adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/5/2024 5:25 AM
45	Too much oversight and government interference into private property.	4/5/2024 1:06 AM
46	See above!!!	4/5/2024 12:19 AM
47	Homeowners should be allowed to rent their homes, with reasonable ordinances in place that are enforced. Each homeowner has personal reasons for renting "their" homes. It's the biggest investment a person makes in their life and not a decision they make without due diligence. Allow homeowners to rent their homes if it helps them meet their financial obligations. Bring these measures to all homeowner's attention weeks/months in advance, before voting. I have lived here since 1977 and I was first introduced to this beautiful place when I was a child. Our family's good friends owned a cabin here and allowed our family to experience mountain/lake living for a weekend for a moderate exchange of services. I am very grateful for the introduction to mountain/lake resort living over the big city environment. My children have managed to come home to Lake Tahoe and raise their children in this beautiful community. I am so very grateful! Even though it has changed over 47 years but it is still a beautiful place to raise a family.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
48	I understand there is a lot of different challenges with VHR. I just pray and hope I don't lose my job because of the county's decisions. I depend on VHR for me and my family to have a roof over our heads and dinner every night.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
49	I understand there is a lot of different challenges with VHR. I just pray and hope I don't lose my job because of the county's decisions. I depend on VHR for me and my family to have a roof over our heads and dinner every night.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
50	N/a	4/4/2024 10:14 PM
51	cluster radius should be smaller than 500 feet	4/4/2024 9:50 PM
52	I don't like the recommendations at all.	4/4/2024 9:30 PM
53	I don't understand why there needs to be continuous rules changes. It seems each time there is a meeting there is a significant change. The public should be able to have more transparency about the rules for VHR and instead it's more convoluted and still there is no enforcement of the existing rules.	4/4/2024 9:24 PM
54	Concerns VHR Managers have, and why: Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central	4/4/2024 9:12 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

enforcement effort and validating the problem Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing number of adults allowed Do not like reducing +2 adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems What else VHR Managers would like the County to know and consider: VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's is a preferred way for group and family travel Tahoe's economy relies on tourism Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy VHR managers asked for a reduction in clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet Bad VHR's, bad complaint management and lack of enforcement is the problem Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy

55	i dont understand what a "hosted" rental program is and it soounds like they want to creat a committee. I dont want to pay more to manage my property I also dont think kids should be exempt at any age (except under 1). Kids are a liability and parents dont watch thier kids on vacation. Kids are messy and break things. i count them in my occupancy	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
56	Central system of management/contact	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
57	Dont like the Daytime Occupancy limit to be the same as the night time. Yes there could be a daytime limit, maybe double the night time but the way it's written wouldn't allow "any" daytime guest that aren't sleeping there.	4/4/2024 7:46 PM
58	- Many of the changes seem arbitrary with no data or proof points of other counties. Overall suggest not making changes that data doesn't support. - For example, eliminating the +2 persons for # bedrooms seems arbitrary. The +2 is a very modest use of space in most houses and is a common guideline for VHRs nationwide. How is 8 people in a 2500 4BR house better/quieter/safer than 10? Other arbitrary changes -- Why limit exempt kid ages from 13 down to 5? You now force families with slightly older kids to HAVE to get a larger, more expensive house. If Hotels don't do this why is it a VHR rule. Seems almost discriminatory. Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems. It also randomly punishes hosts who may be great and have never had an infraction.	4/4/2024 7:31 PM
59	Leave hosted vacation rentals alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	4/4/2024 7:26 PM
60	Reducing the number of adults is too harsh. The child age exemption makes no sense and should be older than 5. Please focus on bad actors and enforcement of existing rules, do not punish those who follow the rules, pay our taxes and contribute to the local economy.	4/4/2024 6:22 PM
61	limiting total number of vacation rentals. Alot of locals also depend on paychecks from vhr companies, taking away established vhrs can create problems for companies and take jobs away from locals.	4/4/2024 6:01 PM
62	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Do not like reducing +2 adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/4/2024 5:34 PM
63	Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults	4/4/2024 5:29 PM
64	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Do not like reducing +2 adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/4/2024 5:28 PM
65	This seems like hundreds of recommendations against VHR's, and none for them, which	4/4/2024 5:28 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

doesn't feel balanced. I don't like that another major round of revisions further restricting VHR's is happening without first assessing and confirming the actual problem. Is there any data to support these changes? Exempt children aged 5 seems odd, and should be older. I suggest the exempt age for children should be at least 10, preferably 13. I don't like discussion of proactively eliminating clusters. You could cut out clusters, leaving the bad actors next door, only causing significant harm to the local economy and individual owners doing things right, and doing nothing to the disrupted local resident. I think tenants, with owner approval, should be able to do hosted rentals as a means to help afford living here, whereas proposal says must be the owner. City program allows tenants to host and suggest County consider the same.

66	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort and validating the problem Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Do not like reducing +2 adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary consideration and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/4/2024 3:59 PM
67	- 3. Maximum occupancy (5.56.090) o Eliminate "+2" when calculating maximum occupancy. [Disagree; keep this] o Children under 5 years of age do not count toward maximum occupancy. [Disagree with under 5; Placer County states children under 13 years of age don't count towards max occupancy - I vote for following Placer County on this] - Hosted rentals should not be reduced to 1 bedroom; I grew up with a single parent and a sibling... and to make ends meet, rented. To imagine the safety of a hosted rental denied because of a 1 bedroom limit sounds horrible. Keep it at 2 bedroom. - Indiscriminately revoking permits to break up "clusters" is horrible. From your report "... allowed by the 500-foot buffer. This group began to compare strategies for the revocation or non-renewal of VHR permits to actively dissolve clusters." As your report stated, better management properties and local contacts combined with enhanced enforcement (and establish a better complaint process) can weed out the "bad apples." Some of the VHRs and hosted rentals are absolutely *needed* for an income source.	4/4/2024 3:33 PM
68	I dislike that overarching rules are being made regardless of how long you've had a VHR, how clean your record is, or how small/big your home is. I have a small VHR, an extremely responsible local contact I've known for a dozen years, and no violations. Why should I be punished with more restrictions and limitations when I have been playing by the rules? I believe that the county needs to "grandfather in" those of us who've already had permits and no problems. Maintain the system that's in place for us (the needle has already been moved enough). Items I don't like in particular: Under A.4 Modify local contacts I have a great local contact. A close neighbor who cares about me and the neighborhood. She has eyes on my house and is the best person to report a problem if one should arise. My guests also know that she lives nearby, in case they need help with something (locking themselves out, for instance). Perhaps it's even a deterrent if they were considering having additional guests? Under D.3 Maximum occupancy I think the +2 is important to keep. And occupancy requirements 24/7?? What?! So a guest of mine could not have dinner at my cabin with another family also staying in the neighborhood? Perhaps I'm misunderstanding this. It sounds a little too "big brother."	4/4/2024 12:44 PM
69	Raising the fines to \$1000, \$2000 and \$3000 is excessive, also the proactive elimination of VHR clusters is unfair to the owners that rely on VHR income to pay the mortgage.	4/4/2024 12:23 AM
70	The noise monitoring device is not practical. Also implemented after one noise complaint? Recommend after two complaints in same year - with a rolling calendar.	4/3/2024 6:55 PM
71	A1. Invest in a dedicated VHR enforcement unit: Have you investigated the cost of establishing and maintaining this unit for the county? It's easy to set up bureaucracy, but sustaining or dismantling it can be more challenging. D3. Why should only children under 5 years old be exempt from maximum occupancy regulations? A child aged 6 or 7 is still very much a child. It would be more reasonable to raise the exemption age to 13 or 15 years old. D4. Prohibiting on-street parking doesn't seem fair. Residents of vacation rentals should have the same parking privileges as other houses in the Tahoe area. They shouldn't be treated differently from anyone else. D5. If noise monitors are not required for all Tahoe households with four or more bedrooms, then they shouldn't be required for vacation rentals either. Vacation home renters or hosts should be treated the same as everyone else. E1. I wonder how we know the current fines and penalties are insufficient to deter violations. A fine of \$1000 is a significant amount for anyone!	4/2/2024 6:01 PM
72	Where is the data that supports more regulations? I was disappointed that no data about complaints filed or fines issued. Without the data that supports more regulations, it appears	4/2/2024 5:13 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

that the county is making decisions based on the loud voices of a very small group of people. This is a mistake. If the data supports more restrictions - great. But if the data does not support more restrictions - please do not make emotional, subjective changes. If you do, this is where problems arise and lawsuits start. If you can support your changes with hard data - you are in a good place. If you cannot support these changes with objective data, the country will spend hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of dollars defending itself. Please be transparent and share the data about complaints, fines, permits revoked, etc.. You don't want to impose county-wide or basin-wide restrictions based on a few neighborhoods or a small group of people experiencing problems.

73	C6 and C7, bedroom occupancy and separate kitchen restrictions, are too intrusive and fail to take the variety of housing setups into account. Exempt children should be age 13 and under, not 5 and under. Section 5 Noise, we are strongly opposed to the mandated installation of noise monitors. We understand noise is an issue, but this proposed solution is highly invasive, unlikely to deter inconsiderate guests, and adds unnecessary cost and burden to owners/managers.	4/2/2024 2:04 PM
74	Lack of research, data and validation to support the changes. Not sure about dismantling clusters. I like the 500' cluster range not reducing it to 350'	4/2/2024 12:43 PM
75	These recommendations seem like the County is very Anti VHR. Tahoe has always been a tourist town. Don't the tourists generate income for the County and small business owners? More restrictions will make it harder for business owners to stay in Tahoe. - Caping max occupancy to 14 seems excessive for homes that are large enough to accommodate more. Family gatherings need more space for older children / adult children, grandparents. Utilization of larger homes and more bedrooms - are these properties problems? Maybe more restrictions on the property manager for vetting guests would be a better idea than limiting occupancy. - The cap should be removed from the ordinance all together since the buffer is doing what it was meant to do. - Current VHR permit holders should be grandfathered in if any changes to the ordinance take place.	4/2/2024 9:49 AM
76	1. Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes 2. Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort 3. Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults 4. Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/1/2024 10:34 PM
77	they are more stringent. too stringent may cause decrease the type of outcome we are looking for.	4/1/2024 10:04 PM
78	D.3. E.4. I dont think we need more strict regulations, i have two vhr's and the only thing affecting us is the occupancy for children. The process works. I feel like the county has done a good job.	4/1/2024 7:51 PM
79	A.4.b - "Cite owners for local contacts.." This is probably illegal and will be highly contentious. A better approach would be to revoke the local contact's authorization to act as a local contact. B- Lower the VHR cap to 600 - Who gets to decide which 300 properties lose their permit? Maybe this could be addressed on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis rather than the whole basin. D.3 - "Eliminate the +2 when calculating maximum occupancy" . This should be looked at on a case by case basis. Many homes have sleeping capacity beyond just 2 persons per permitted bedroom. For example a bedroom with four full sized bunk beds designed for teenagers would have 8 mattresses, but only permitted for 2 adults. This makes no sense and would penalize property owners who have designed their propertys to accomodate large gatherings for special occasions. D4 - Cameras. This recommendation is probably illegal. Recently AirBnb announced they would no longer allow properties with ANY cameras to list their properties on the site. D5 - Noise monitoring devices. - This is an unnecessary burden and expense for properties that have had no noise issues and those that are situated in isolated areas where high levels of noise inside don't impace anyone outside the structure. 7. Snow Removal - This is an excessive burden and requirement for those property owners who do not rent their properties during the winter, or only occasionally do so. Seems like this was pushed by someone who has a plowing business.	4/1/2024 4:21 PM
80	2. Develop a central complaint tracking and response system ISN'T THE CURRENT SYSTEM WORKING? HAS ANY CONSIDERATION BEEN GIVEN TO THE COST AND HOW THIS WILL BE PAID FOR AND SUSTAINED? IS THERE A SYSTEM IN PLACE FOR VHR OWNERS TO VOICE THEIR ISSUES IN NEIGHBORHOODS? MAYBE A SIMILAR SYSTEM OF STICKS FOR NEIGHBORS WHO TRESPASS, CALL IN COMPLAINTS THAT ARE NOT	4/1/2024 2:10 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

WARRENTED, ALLOW THEIR PETS TO USE OTHER PROPERTIES AS A LITTER BOX, APPROACH RENTERS WITH MISINFORAMTION, ETC. B. REDUCE THE CAP FOR VHR PERMITS IN THE TAHOE BASIN WHY CHANGE THE CURRENT CAP - THIS CAP ALREADY HURTS VACATION RENTAL OWNERS 3. Maximum occupancy (5.56.090) VHR occupancy is limited to 2 persons per bedroom. o Eliminate "+2" when calculating maximum occupancy. THIS DISCRIMATES AGAINST FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN. WE ALREADY SEE THIS AS A PROBLEM FOR LARGE FAMILIES AND NOW YOU ARE FORCING RENTERS WITH LARGER FAMILIES TO LIE SO THAT THEY CAN RENT. 4. Parking All vehicles must be parked off street on pavement according to the approved parking diagram within the boundaries of the rental property. THEN NO ONE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO PARK ON THE STREET. WHY DON'T VACATION HOME OWNERS HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS FULL TIME OWNERS. IT IS DISCRIMINATION. THIS TYPE OF RULE JUST DRIVES ANOTHER WEDGE BETWEEN NEIGHBORS AS THE FULL TIME RESIDENTS THINK IT TO BE THEIR PLACE TO MONITOR EVERYTHING ASSOCIATED WITH VACATION RENTALS. Functioning cameras shall be required to make the driveway and number of cars visible by remote monitoring. CAMERAS SHOULD BE A HOME OWNER DECISSION. MAYBE MANDATORY IF THERE HAVE BEEN ISSUES. A noise monitoring system is required for VHRs with 4 or more bedrooms, anoutdoor operative hot tub, or any VHR with one or more verified noise complaints. (Consider NoiseAware partnership for discounts to VHR owners.) AGAIN, SHOULD ONLY BE MANITORY IF THERE ARE COMPLAINTS OR ISSUES. THERE ARE LOCALS THAT CREATE MORE NOISE THAN SOME OF THE VHR. 6. Signage (5.56.105) INTERIOR SIGNAGE: THIS IS YOUR LIST o As with exterior signage, the County must provide standard educational materials for VHR renters to be posted by VHR owners or operators in a designated prominent location inside the VHR unit. o The standard content for interior VHR educational signage should include the following (Note: existing materials from the City of South Lake Tahoe can serve as a model). ▪ being a good visitor and neighbor, ▪ avoiding fines and eviction, ▪ managing noise, ▪ proper disposal of trash, ▪ parking, ▪ snow removal, ▪ bear and wildlife guidelines, ▪ fire safety and awareness, including dangers of smoking in the forest, ▪ leave no trace PROPERTIES MAY NOT HAVE THE ROOM FOR ALL OF THESE THINGS TO BE "POSTED". THERE SHOULD BE A POSTER DEVELOPED AND PAID FOR WITH THE VHR FEES THAT PROVIDES ALL OF THIS INFORMATION. MAYBE REQUIRING A "HOUSE INFORMATION BINDER" IS MORE APPROPRIATE. THE HANDBOOK COULD ALSO INCLUDE GENERAL INFORMATION PROVIDED TO ALL VHR OWNERS.

81	Make 5&under that eliminates adults . Make it 10 and under	4/1/2024 12:53 PM
82	<p>II. B I disagree with the need to lower the limit. The buffer will already reduce permit numbers by attrition over time. Why deny the one or two properties that may become available over time that meet the buffer requirement. Its taking away someones ability to use their property as a VHR, taking away TOT income and if its managed well, subject to all the regulations and enforcement and further than 500' from neighbors it should have no detrimental effect. II. D 2 Have there been any incidences with gas firepits? If they are legal for regular, residents, renters and visitors, why not for VHR guests. Who will have proper instructions and fire extinguishers on site as per the current regulations. II. D 3 I think 2 adults per room is reasonable, but children being exempted at 5 is ridiculous. So a family with a 3 and 5 year old can rent on year (be great guests) but the next year when the kids are 4 and 6, they cant rent that home again. To my mind any minor that is accompanied by a parent or guardian represents the same impact. (Key word accompanied) The child exemption should be 16 or 18. I like that occupancy limits don't apply during the day. If there is a problem with huge gatherings then allow some percentage of the car and occupancy limit extra during the day. We had issues in the City with local residents visiting their family in our rental during the day. A completely reasonable thing to do, it shouldn't be banned. The noise and disruption aspects should take precedence over a pure head count. II. D 4 They City tried this and was unable to enforce it. Cant ban parking on a public street that is legal parking. If the parking spaces are available per the permit application and guests are encouraged to use them, that's enough. No need to criminalize legal, reasonable and normal behavior. II D 5 Why 90 days, that's ridiculous. If enforcement is good any noise issue should be dealt with immediately while the guest is still there. II D 7 Why?! Im sure they all do anyway, why does this need to be a thing? III. Very strongly opposed to taking any grandfathered permits away! How could this ever be achieved fairly or legally? If there is an issue with in a cluster its from a badly managed VHR and that should be dealt with through proper enforcement.</p>	4/1/2024 12:44 PM
83	<p>* Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes * Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems</p>	4/1/2024 9:02 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

84	Nothing. You are essentially telling me what I can cannot do with my home	4/1/2024 8:29 AM
85	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Tenants, with homeowner approval, should be allowed to operate a hosted rental (like in the City) Hosted rentals should be allowed more occupancy than suggested Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	4/1/2024 7:00 AM
86	1. I do not like: "Removing Local Contact as a primary point of contact, and go through central system / team first. " a. I do not like the above proposal as, not only does it remove the owner/manager from the immediate communication loop, but removes the owner/manager's ability to resolve situations on their own in a timely manner. This seems overreaching, parental, and more bloated government. I don't think El Dorado County needs to fund a position that would strictly serve as a switchboard for complaints, which are typically from overbearing individuals who repeatedly pick on VHRs. Funds would be better spent on affordable housing or providing more services that benefit VHR renters.	3/31/2024 10:04 PM
87	Lowering a 3bdrm from 8 person occupancy to 6 person occupancy doesn't help the community. We have had an 8 person occupancy and have been perfectly capable of ensuring county rules are enforced and maintaining good neighbor relationships. The reduction suggestion is only there to further hurt VHR businesses not to help the community. Also the noise monitors on the exterior do not make a lot of sense because they will be destroyed by the snow, elements and will be set off my trucks, snow removal vehicles etc.	3/31/2024 3:38 PM
88	Before making the rules stricter, we should prioritize enforcing the current rules. Requiring cameras, noise monitoring systems and potentially a contract for snow removal are excessive, costly and unnecessary for proper management. Having stricter rules for visitors than for residents - no firepits, no noise after 10pm, no parking on the street is tricky to justify and enforce. In general, rules should be made easy to understand and enforceable. Close the loopholes such as hosted VHRs with no host. Find the unpermitted VHRs and fine them then keep checking on them. Check on existing VHRs to ensure compliance before making stricter rules. Do not make it too complicated or costly for VHR owners to obey the rules as that can have unintended consequences.	3/31/2024 3:15 PM
89	A.2. Most enforcement actions seem slanted towards neighbors with little room for owners / guests to dispute 3.e. Liens on property for guest fines is not reasonable to owners 4.B. the change to a cap of 600 seems arbitrary and not taking enough factors into account 3 (5.56.090) Make exempt kids 13 and under instead of 5 to be consistent with Placer County.	3/31/2024 2:52 PM
90	Disagree that the VHR cap should be lowered to 600 and the +2 occupancy would be taken away.	3/31/2024 2:14 PM
91	It's one sided and in favor of the city and the work force that cones and goes with the tide.	3/31/2024 2:01 PM
92	Section 2, on t complaint tracking makes no provision to assess whether complaints are real or spurious. I have had police come to my door based on complaint on four separate occasions while visiting my own home. None of these involved and noise or parking violation on my behalf (no warning or citation issued). All of these complaints were spurious, made by a neighbor allowed to remain anonymous, the system should ensure compliant ants are known, and that there are consequences for repeated, knowingly false complaints. The cap on licenses does not appear to be based on real data. No problem is established by the report and no solution created by a reduction to 600. It appears designed to force owners to sell to longer-term residents at a reduced price.	3/31/2024 9:17 AM
93	How much space am I allowed to respond? From your "cluster" maps I couldn't identify the area, however, let me go out on a limb and guess they are all in South Lake Tahoe, an area that has experienced a great deal of complaints and unruly renters. El Dorado County has taken a few incidents in SLT and made the entire county subject to rules and regulations designed for behavior problems in SLT that don't exist in other towns. You have over stepped your bounds and should confine your rules and regulations to areas that might benefit them and leave the rest of the county alone. I have lived in my town of Tahoma and there are hardly any permanent residents to complain, and there is nothing to complain about if they were there.	3/30/2024 6:26 PM
94	three violation limit in 36 months is way too strict. A violation can be issued for many reasons, especially noise which is subjective. The current 18 months should remain and it the three	3/30/2024 3:32 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

strikes should be for repeat of the same violation only.

95	They are geared toward the Lake Tahoe Basin but I live and operate a VHR very far from there, in a rural area with very different conditions. It's so unfortunate that the issues that LT has create the regulations that the entire county must abide by.	3/30/2024 1:11 PM
96	A.1 Enforcement violations should penalize repeat substantiated complainers to deter frivolous complaints and reduce investigation costs. Repeat violators should also be subject to fines in Section 5.56.140 Paragraph B to be fair. A database tracking complaints and outcomes is suggested. 4.B The cap limit change to 600 seems arbitrary; it should reflect the ratio of permanent residents to second homes in a neighborhood, adjusting caps based on neighborhood density and primary usage. For example, west shore McKinney Estates/Tahoma has relatively few permanent residents and is primarily second vacation homes so more VHRs would be consistent with the primary vacation usage of the neighborhood. Other neighborhoods have higher density of full-time residents so lower caps would be set. Historical data on substantiated VHR violations per neighborhood permanent resident density should also inform the cap level. 3 (5.56.090) Make exempt kids 13 and under instead of 5 to be consistent with Placer County. E.1 Section 5.56.140 paragraph B Violations should be placed on the RENTERS who committed the act not the owners. The owner is not personally committing these violations. \$1000 for first violation is excessive and will be challenged in court. Legally you cannot penalize one party for the actions taken by another – especially if owners were not personally causing the violation and there is no proof that owners were derelict in providing rules and applying commercially reasonable best practices to screen renters. Some instances such as accidental bear box and home break-in should carry the same penalties as permanent residents who suffer bear break-ins. Warning first then fines if repeated. No one wants a bear break-in. E.4 Section 5.56.170 Illegal Rentals. A criminal misdemeanor? We are in favor of eliminating illegal rentals but this is overreach and won't hold up in court. 4.0 Implementing cameras and parking monitors for every STVR is costly and impractical.	3/30/2024 12:42 PM
97	4.a Local contact can respond and resolve issues quicker 4.b Stress compliance, not limitations 4.c.6 Occupancy should be based on safe usage for both for rental and non-rental properties. Compliance, not punitive and unequal regulations 4.d.3 Same as above 4.d.4 Parking ordinances should be the same for rental and non-rental properties. Monitoring should be the same. 4.d.5 Noise ordinances should be the same for rental and non-rental properties. Monitoring should be the same. 4.E Penalties for code violations should be the same for rental and non-rental properties. Violations should be equal.	3/30/2024 12:13 PM
98	Making regulations based on county wide approach and not region based.	3/30/2024 11:50 AM
99	1. The new requirement that children are defined as "under 5 years old" (thus, meaning that 6-10yo children are counted as adults) seems unreasonable. We cater our home towards families - and families enjoy traveling with each other ... the proposed restrictions would make a simple 3-bedroom home unable to support 2 families (4 adults, 4 "children"). Even our own family would not fit in our own home according to the new restrictions. Please keep children as under-13 as is the standard in other counties. 2. Please maintain the "+2" when calculating occupancy - or more carefully define the definition of a "bedroom." Taking this "+2" away is taking the decision making out of the hands of the owners and renters and makes it harder for families to travel together, especially in conjunction with the above requirements change around the definition of a child.	3/30/2024 9:27 AM
100	Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' It is unfair for owners who rely on this income to be negatively impacted if they are operating their VHR responsibly and complying to current laws.	3/30/2024 9:19 AM
101	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes	3/29/2024 9:11 PM
102	A1. Not opposed to a VHR enforcement unit but I'm wondering how much it will cost. Does it make sense if we're reducing the number of VHR permits? A2. A public tracking system is something that can be wildly abused, not to mention hackers and security concerns with people taking photos of others in a public place and submitting them. I'm wondering if we're willing to invade people's privacy and relative freedom to enforce this? This just seems crazy to me. Imagine staying at a hotel where there were links everywhere where random people can take photos and report on you? This is not downtown near the casinos. I strongly question what better training, especially for local contacts, and documentation requirements (universal VHR agreement template) wouldn't solve. D3. Enforcing maximum occupancy 24/7 is not just silly but unenforceable. I support enforcing that during the day, a guest cannot have more than 50% over max occupancy at the property, or maybe a flat number like 5. For example, if max occupancy is 10, they can't have more than 5 additional people during the day. I wouldn't	3/29/2024 6:34 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

eliminate the +2. Children between 5 and 17 count in that number. Limiting occupancy to 2 people per room seems awkward. Some rooms are larger and that doesn't allow occupancy based on the size of the space.

103	Some of the recommended changes to vhr permitting are too restrictive: daytime occupancy to be the same as overnight occupancy doesn't allow for a vhr guest yo invite a neighboring family over for lunch snd a game of horseshoes or badminton. Daytime occupancy might allow for double nighttime occupancy (D3 occupancy). In addition to citing/fining the property owner for a local contact's lack of responsiveness to complaints, the local contact must be held responsible with same fines, as well as being blocked to function in that role in future. Property owners have a contractual agreement with these professionals to meet this county regulation, so it is important that they be held responsible as well. The motivation trigger to them is gines, citations and nlocking this job option yo them.(A4). A cap reduction may not be necessary in all areas of county. Consider assessment of possible differences when comparing diferent regions of the county (B). HR permitting should be consistent with vhr permitting, including fee levels, health and safety inspections, TOT, etc. the burden of supporting the ebforcement and infrastructure needed to manage vhr and hr should be equally shared by all property owners. (C).	3/29/2024 5:49 PM
104	Many recommendations are vague. Write in plain English.	3/29/2024 4:52 PM
105	Take a data-driven approach by first implementing the Central system. This will allow you to address gross violators and make better recommendations in the future. The existing recommendations seem extremely aggressive and excessive without the data to back them up. A Central System and tracking are a must. Considerations like eliminating clustering and reducing to 600 VHR from 900 should be evaluated only after the proper data has been collected. This will arbitrarily punish people like ourselves who have had no violations Alternatively, I would initially support reducing clustering to 350ft until data on its effectiveness is collected. The grandfathering discussion is interesting and difficult to navigate, but as indicated, it will start to address itself over time with home sales, etc.	3/29/2024 4:04 PM
106	Some of the requirements for owners who are responsible renters seem over wrought. For example, requiring noise meters in indoor and outdoor spaces. Those of us who have relationships with our neighbors rely on the people rather than technology.	3/29/2024 3:38 PM
107	Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County. Discriminates against families with children. Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort	3/29/2024 3:36 PM
108	I do not like reducing the number of permits with the goal of reducing clustering. This will adversely impact all clusters - even those that are being run and managed responsibly.	3/29/2024 3:24 PM
109	This seems to be focused exclusively on SLT. What about the rest of the County??	3/29/2024 3:10 PM
110	3. Maximum occupancy (5.56.090) I completely disagree on the age limit. It should be 14 yrs and under. Day time limits should allow for family gatherings to exceed nightly limits after curfew. For example, my VHR has a limit of 6 people. They are in the area for their daughters wedding. They would like to invite the other 4 family members to a brunch at the home. The other four should be allowed to attend the brunch, however they are not allowed to remain on the property after curfew. 3. Maximum occupancy (5.56.090) I disagree with the requirement of pavement. Some unique and desirable properties outside of SLT are rural and pavement may not be an option. Stop including the rest of EDC with SLT! 8. Septic Systems Absolutely disagree with this oversight. No clarity on how often, and yet ANOTHER FEE to inspect by county. YET another way for the county have their fingers in my business. Do regular rentals have to show septic conditions? NOPE! Most full time rentals will tax a septic system far more than my weekend guests. TOO MUCH OVERREACH! Let us care for our own properties. Next thing you know the county will be telling us what color is allowed to paint our homes and there will be a permit and fee for application to change the color of our home.	3/29/2024 2:45 PM
111	Where is the data and research for these changes? It seems like it is coming from pure pressure groups to make VHRs more inconvenient. Where is the Exempt age dropping to 5 coming from? No one else does that. Dismantling clusters is just wrong and frightening how this came about and could be enforced.	3/29/2024 2:43 PM
112	They seem rather one-sided and more against VHRs. Local residents tend to forget that occupancy taxes and spending by tourists really fuels our SLT economy. Their spending supports or stores and restaurants yet we continue to try to force them out. Reducing the	3/29/2024 2:39 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

geographic cap is punitive. As it is, we have already made it tougher and more difficult to get VHR permits but it has only been a couple of years, so we should give those measures some time to actually work, without rushing to change them yet again. Setting up another

113	3 violations of code in 36 months will result in losing permit. Feels excessive and too harsh. Make it 18 months.	3/29/2024 1:58 PM
114	4-B, the 350-foot buffer is plenty. Most lots in SLT are less the 100 feet wide and deep. 4-D-7, we do not rent our home in the winter, so a one size fits all snow removal requirement is not fair. There needs to be some exceptions.	3/29/2024 1:31 PM
115	D.3 We have a 3 bedroom licensed house and do not agree with the age limit of 5 for kids...families should be able to bring their up to 18 year old teens. Does not sound like there is adequate information with actual data to confirm neighbor's complaints. We know trouble can happen in a rental and it behooves the owners to have good management to refuse to rent to problem renters. We believe that an arbitrary limit of 2 per bedroom does not consider that some larger rooms are set up for up to 4 persons. We believe 2 is too small a limit	3/29/2024 12:51 PM
116	<p>Brooke, These new regulations are onerous and will destroy my ability to rent my vacation home. Stop penalizing owners like myself who have rented for 16 years without complaints. Focus on problem owners, not good owners. This is a taking of my property rights. Put onerous requirements on the problem owners/renters. You have only few problem renters NIMBY's complaining so this total over reaction. Reducing income by reducing guests. I started with 12 guests , then you reduced it to 10 now you want to reduce it to 8. You raised the tax to 14% the highest tax in California and yet I get no services other than a snow plow comes through 2 days after it snows. My snow removal service often can't get to my house cause the road is not plowed. Cameras on the property are invasion of privacy and prohibited. I am opposed this huge increase in regulations by El Dorado County and am surprised that you support. Start with enforcement of the bad people instead attacking the 99% who have no complaints. Opposed to all these new requirements. It is not broken so don't try fix what is not broken. Go after the problem people. Opposed D. STRENGTHEN COMPLIANCE STANDARDS IN THE VHR ORDINANCE Visitors can be uninformed and unprepared for common alpine environment challenges. To better address the most negative nuisance effects on neighbors of VHR operators and renters, the Advisory Committee reviewed key elements of the VHR regulations and recommends the following priority adjustments to the codes and requirements for VHR permit eligibility and operation so that the standards of operation and visitor behavior are clearer and can be consistently enforced. Therefore, the Advisory Committee recommends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Any updates to the ordinance will apply to all permit holders and be subject to VHR complaint management and enforcement. o Eliminate conditional use permit eligibility: Prohibit VHR owners or guests from getting conditional or special use permits for events or uses other than lodging. o Consider a tiered system of VHR permitting according to size/number of bedrooms and characteristics (see Douglas County as an example). 2. Fire Safety (5.56.090 7-I) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prohibit the use of all outdoor fire pits and outdoor fireplaces; no wood burning or charcoal use outside. 8 Opposed 3. Maximum occupancy (5.56.090) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o VHR occupancy is limited to 2 persons per bedroom. o Eliminate "+2" when calculating maximum occupancy. o Children under 5 years of age do not count toward maximum occupancy. o Occupancy greater than 14 people is prohibited, unless approved through an Occupancy Exemption Request based on showing of special circumstances of the home. o Occupancy requirements to be in effect 24/7. Opposed 4. Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All permit applicants must submit a parking diagram for approval with the VHR permit application. o All vehicles must be parked off street on pavement according to the approved parking diagram within the boundaries of the rental property. o Parking requirements for VHRs shall be enforced under the VHR ordinance, codes, and enforcement system. o Functioning cameras shall be required to make the driveway and number of cars visible by remote monitoring. Opposed 5. Noise (5.56.120) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A noise monitoring system is required for VHRs with 4 or more bedrooms, an outdoor operative hot tub, or any VHR with one or more verified noise complaints. (Consider NoiseAware partnership for discounts to VHR owners.) When a noise monitoring system is required, it must meet the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All common indoor gathering areas, including converted garages, and active outdoor areas must have noise sensors that record decibel levels, but do not capture conversations or activities. ▪ Each VHR rental unit will require calibration and adjustment which is the responsibility of the owner and/or local contact. ▪ Noise records must be kept by local contacts and/or owners for 90 days and must be produced upon request by County enforcement representatives. ▪ Exceedance of noise thresholds must be reported to or maintained by the local contact, who must comply with response times and protocols. o In addition to stipulated "quiet hours", guests must avoid and be subject to noise violation compliance and enforcement for loud and disruptive behavior 24/7. 6. Signage (5.56.105) o 	3/29/2024 12:29 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

EXTERIOR SIGNAGE: o All exterior signs must be consistent in design; issued by the County (paid for by the applicant); have standard content; and be readable from the road. o The standard content of the sign must include at a minimum: ▪ maximum allowed occupancy, Don't turn El Dorado County into progressive city of South Lake Tahoe.

117	A group of locals coming up with all of this is ridiculous. It is hard enough to be in business in Tahoe. All of these items are going to make home prices drop, businesses to go out of business, many restaurants and other things have already closed. The ordinances that are already in place work just fine . Leave it alone and dont waste any more money on this. Tourism drives the economy in Tahoe .Always has. Most locals have no money to properly maintain their property. I think All these recommendations are a terrible idea. I have lived here for 22 years now and this place has changed to the worst because of the locals. People just need to mind their own business. Hiring outside companies to handle things is A ridiculous idea. The thing about LLC's that any educated person knows is that house's and properties can be put into a trust or an LLC for insurance purpose's. So, are they going to tell people how they can hold title on their own property? I do not think so.....With measure T in place in the city, the City has lost millions of dollars from TOT tax and you can tell because more businesses are leaving and buildings are vacant and the roads are awful now. The town never use to be like this. Very disheartening.	3/29/2024 12:26 PM
118	I don't like eliminating the +2 for occupancy. Many parties have couples that occupy the bedrooms and the +2 are often kids that cannot sleep in the bedroom and need to sleep on a pull out couch.	3/29/2024 11:51 AM
119	Lack of research, data, and validation to support these changes Feels excessive, and one sided, especially without first prioritizing a central enforcement effort Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary and no indication doing so will appease neighborhood problems	3/29/2024 11:39 AM
120	Sect D.3- Max Occupancy: The committee should have considered changing the maximum age for exempting a child from occupancy count. If the +2 count was removed, a 2 bedroom property could not even legally accommodate a family of 5 with 2 adults and 3 children over the age of 5. This seems quite unreasonable. The +2 count currently alleviates this, while maintaining the exemption at the age of 5. Our ultimate recommendation/ preference would still be for the +2 rule to remain in effect, even if the age was increased (say to 13 as in Placer county)- as this would still impact a family of 5 where the 3 kids were above the age of 13 in a 2 bedroom property. The 24/7 occupancy requirement could also have a significant negative impact on rental experiences for families. In that situation, two families of 5, that are each renting 2 bedroom properties in Tahoma (for example) could not legally gather for dinner in one of the properties before going back to their own rental to sleep. Sect B- VHR Cap: The recommendation should be clear that the grandfathered exemption of the 500ft buffer and renewal of permits shall be maintained for owners in good standing even if the total number of rentals exceeds the cap.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
121	The dismantling of "clusters" can occur because of a few squeaky wheels who are just anti-VHR and feels arbitrary. And this is almost certainly not constitutional.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
122	D4 - Available parking should not need to be paved as long as there is sufficient room to park...and snow removal is not impeded.	3/29/2024 11:23 AM
123	I don't like that even gas fire pits would be banned. I don't think there's ever been an issue with gas. Wood fire pit ban makes sense, but not really gas.	3/29/2024 11:21 AM
124	Emphasis on enforcement Commitment to collecting data and making decisions supported by data Minimizing police involvement in VHR enforcement Shutting down unpermitted operators Closing TOT loophole allowing unpermitted homes to rent on Airbnb Eliminating allowance of outside firepits, gas or otherwise Requiring daytime occupancy to be same as overnight occupancy County collaborating with community / on going committee	3/29/2024 11:16 AM
125	You are making current vhr permit holders jump through more and more hoops. By adding more restrictions you encourage people to cheat/avoid the system making it even more unfair for those of us paying our tot's and getting our fire inspections and our business licenses and permits etc.	3/29/2024 11:15 AM
126	-Exempt kids should be age 13 and under, like Placer County, not 5 - especially if reducing adults -Arbitrarily dismantling 'clusters' is scary and no indication doing so will appease	3/29/2024 11:12 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

neighborhood problems -Change clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet. This is more realistic.

127	Removing the plus 2 occupants to the maximum occupancy.	3/29/2024 11:12 AM
128	These regulation feel as if they are overly restrictive on homeowners who should have a right to use threere properties as they choose.	3/29/2024 11:07 AM
129	No mention of fees. Latest charge is fire inspection. This is a rip off and being done to subsidize the fire districts. A 5 minute walk through looking for alarms and monitors for the fees charged is criminal.	3/29/2024 11:06 AM
130	Taking away property rights of an owner. Don't we still live in a free country?	3/29/2024 11:03 AM
131	I am AGAINST the Vacancy Tax. I don't believe I should be penalized for owning property and whether I can/cannot occupy it, especially when I pay property taxes and respect the peace and privacy of my neighbors.	3/28/2024 6:20 PM
132	government over-reach is concerning.	3/28/2024 1:40 PM
133	Did not find any recommendations that were not immediately necessary.	3/26/2024 11:17 AM
134	They are a another erosion of Property Rights	3/26/2024 10:39 AM
135	Monitoring Cabins via Cameras and Noise reduction monitoring seems very problematic. There are logistical and privacy issues with these types of monitoring. It also seems to be punitive to those rentals which have never had any violations. Please reconsider using these means to monitor Vacation Rentals. Thank you.	3/25/2024 8:45 PM
136	D.4. Parking diagrams are a good start but need to go farther by requiring all parking to be done on a solid (paved or pavers) surface. Too many rentals still have not met BMP's and this is a chance to recitify that which has been missed. D.3 It seems too harsh to apply the 24/7 occupancy rule. How does this allow for gatherings (ex. Bridal shower, birthday party, etc). If there actually will be increased enforcement I feel D.3 should allow for higher occupancy between 10 am and 10 pm	3/24/2024 12:45 PM
137	1. Reducing the cap. It was already reduced. The T.O.T. and jobs provided to locals that come in from these rentals is important to our community. Reducing the number will further impact our economy in a negative way. 2. Reducing occupancy to 2 per bedroom. I think this is overkill and often parents may want to sleep in a bedroom with their children, or have more than 2 children in a room. I liked the 4 per car. Keep occupancy as is but have a cap based on parking.	3/24/2024 9:59 AM
138	Too much fighting. Keep it super simple. Too much government oversight. It's a big headache to navigate.	3/23/2024 9:32 PM
139	The Recommendations are a good start to tightening up VHR problems.	3/23/2024 11:23 AM
140	All logical with my years of dealing with a dense number of VHRs in my neighborhood in Montgomery Estates.	3/23/2024 8:50 AM
141	A.4.C. Modify "Local Contact" Requirements. Requiring owners to designate a new local contact if their property receives two violations within 18 months. This seems unfair and unrealistic. The local contact is not there to babysit the VHR guests. Their job is to respond to problems. In almost all cases, the local contact cannot (nor should they) control the actions of VHR guests. I have a very competent (and proactive) local contact, but in spite of that, complaints will inevitably occur. That is not the local contact's fault. D.3. Maximum Occupancy. The current ordinance states that "children 5 and under" don't count toward maximum occupancy. I don't understand the reason for changing it to "children under 5 years of age." Also, I feel occupancy requirements being in effect 24/7 is too restrictive. This means that guests can have no visitors during the day. Maybe limit the daytime occupancy to a certain number. I also believe this is unenforceable. D.5. Noise. Why is a noise monitoring system only required for VHRs with 4 or more bedrooms (or with an outdoor hot tub)? Shouldn't every VHR be required to have one? If outdoor noise is an issue, more bedrooms, or occupants doesn't always equate to more noise. Also, what is the definition of "common indoor gathering areas?" Under this requirement, would I need a noise monitoring device in the living room? If so, what indoor noise level would be considered a violation? I'm just not sure I understand the purpose of this.	3/22/2024 12:48 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

142	I've seen residents having more say over VHR rules than 2nd home owners, visitors, business owners. These other groups (and full time residents) will be as affected, if not more, than full time residents are currently. Oxford economics recently published a report assessing actual data on the impact of VHR's, finding many benefits to communities. I think 2nd home property owners should have the same rights and say in this decision as full time residents. I don't like two strikes and a local contact is out suggestion. Same with loosing a permit with 3 citations in 36 months. This puts unbalanced power in hands of anti VHR persons. It would not be hard to continue to call in complaints and have a permit revoked if desired. If these revocations criteria are enacted, I hope an approach to disincentives abuse of the system is created. e.g. the threat of misdemeanor charges for false reports and / or abuse of the system. There would have to be a way of tracking who is reporting complaints, and public awareness of each reviewed and possible charges for abuse of the system. I think an appeal process for revocations to challenge the accusers and revocation of a local contact certificate and permit revocation would be needed, and for it to be fair. There was an appeal for VHR citations previously, and they felt very one sided to those making the accusation. I don't like the idea of eliminating previously awarded VHR permits to create the 500' gap. That's not fair to VHR property owners. I don't think maximum occupancy rules are fair. Some homes with 4 bedrooms are 4,500 sq feet, with multiple common places for sleeping and can easily host larger family and multi family groups. Then there are 1,200 sq ft homes. Why are both limited to the same number of people? This could work if the there was an objective approach for obtaining occupancy exceptions.	3/22/2024 10:19 AM
143	Any creation of and funding of the private industry being VHRs. Any public policing of this private industry. All enforcement and co must come from the industry and not from EDC.	3/22/2024 8:54 AM
144	We voted for Prop T. Don't go changing it.	3/22/2024 7:41 AM
145	How do you find the recommendations	3/22/2024 6:15 AM
146	If vhrs are reduced to 600 for all of Lake Tahoe the reduction of revenue will cripple Lake Tahoe. The locals don't support enough to the local merchants which means higher taxes to all homeowners that will effect renters as well. The merchants will take a huge hit as well.	3/22/2024 6:00 AM
147	A2; who will pay for all of the upgraded enforcement computer and systems? We continually have costs passed on to us as owners in the permitting process. If the upgrades are necessary, then the cost needs to be mitigated. Paid by new VHR applicants. Paid by those with violations. Paid by communities. Those of us that play by the rules should not continually be punished. AC; Hosted rentals is a HUGE loophole. Hosted rentals should be required to be licensed and permitted in the same manner a non hosted rental is. A VHR is a VHR hosted or not. And most are truly not hosted anyway. Get rid of all exceptions for hosted rentals. This will help bear the cost of all of the regulations.	3/21/2024 10:31 AM
148	Increased oversight, requirements and regulations that have the potential to create an enforcement and expensive nightmare.	3/21/2024 9:57 AM
149	Nothing, as a local contact this gives me clear direction	3/21/2024 9:40 AM
150	The proposed 500 permit cap is still way too high, suggest somewhere in the 200-400 range	3/21/2024 9:17 AM
151	A.3.d. I don't like the idea that an owner is forever barred. I think you have to give the option for redemption. A.3.e. It feels like the lien should be on the owner not the guest/renter as they may not even be aware of the situation. B. If the committee's focus is on compliance success, the idea of reducing the number of permits would not be necessary. C.2. and 4. This reads like the "owner" must be a resident or occupant of the County. I think an owner should have the right to designate a property manager who meets the requirements. C.8. Most neighborhoods in our country allow residents, guests to park on the street, As owners and renters, we pay taxes for street repair/maintenance if as such should have the right to use those streets to drive and park on. C.10. Seems a little comical to require to pass a test like they are children. Rather maybe require them to signed a contract that must be notarized and is contractually binding. D.4. Again don't agree with saying people can't park on the street. And to ask them to install cameras for remote monitoring feels feels very communistic/big brother. D.5. Absolutely not! You're going to ask owners to put noise monitoring systems in their homes?? California is one of 11 states that has a law about audio monitoring within a home and requires consent. You are setting yourself up for lawsuits. E.4. A criminal misdemeanor seems aggressive and am not sure you have the right to even establish that as a law?	3/21/2024 9:15 AM
152	You not only reduce income into the community, you spend additional funds the city doesn't	3/21/2024 7:06 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

	have for enforcement.	
153	A whole heap of oversight with little consequence for breaking the rules. Tons of expense for a small fine for non compliant homeowners. Once created, these gov entities may never go away costing taxpayers millions.	3/21/2024 5:34 AM
154	Capping # of VHR's. Owners should decide how they use their own property	3/21/2024 4:13 AM
155	I don't like that hosted rentals will face costly regulations. Hosted rentals are already "chaperoned" rentals (safe, quiet) and help locals offset the cost of living. Fire inspections for vhrs cost \$325 plus the cost of signage and fire extinguishers, upwards of \$400. Locals who host travelers in single bedrooms should not have to pay for this.	3/20/2024 5:37 PM
156	Further restrictions on the overall cap and occupancy seem excessive. Enforcement of regulation is the key.	3/20/2024 5:34 PM
157	A2 - Complaint Management: Not sure the complaint & compliance staff would be able to determine if a complaint submitted has the underlying motive of shutting down a particular VHR or all VHRs. Perhaps those submitting a false or annoyance complaint should be fined for wasting the staffs time as well as the local contact and owner. B-Reduce Cap: it seems the 500ft buffer may keep some properties from every being able to get a permit, and seems excessively far. If the 500 buffer is keeping permits well under 900 already, why also lower the cap? D1 - Considering Tiered System (Like Douglas) - - what would this apply to? Fees only? D3 - Max Occupancy: Is there any "impact" calculation based on the number of people? Seems we are just reducing the # of people yet again by eliminating the "+2", and also dropping the children's age down for those excluded. Have we determined the young children are always quieter?.....perhaps outlaw alcohol at VHRs. And maybe at the Casinos also. D5: Noise monitors should be required at all VHRs that have a noise complaint. And not sure makes sense to only apply to 4+ bedroom VHRs, you can have 1 bedroom and only 2 guests that can be a disturbance. This help everyone owner, managers, and neighbors to have monitoring systems.	3/20/2024 5:04 PM
158	3d. To bar illegal renters from ever obtaining a VHR permit. -I would recommend to bar illegal renters only after 1-2 notices. Some people genuinely would not know that permit is required. B. Reduce the cap. - I would calculate how many households we have in Tahoe Basin and mark the cap to reflect approximately 10%- whatever # that would be. C6. Occupancy. Owner/host bedrooms cannot be rented. - we need clear definition what bedrooms is, loft/living room? etc. C8. Parking. it will be very difficult to prove whose cars are parked on the streets. I would leave the street parking up to sheriff's office to enforce. C11. Advertisement. -one advertised listing, does it mean only advertising on one website? - I dont see any issues if listing is on multiple websites. D7. Snow removal. - VHR unit should not enforce snow removal. It should be owners' responsibility to make sure that renters can get in and out. Same as inside the house, owner's responsibility to make it pleasant experience for renters. D8. Septic systems. same as D7. E2. a, b. - waitlist should be abolished, - since we have buffer zones and caps, it should be first come first serve basis. This would motivate citizens to comply, make contact with county, etc. Applications for a renewal should not be adhered to 500-foot buffer zone. -Does not seem ethnically correct. I would implement higher renewal fees instead. E3. if local contact is not reporting, - fines should be imposed accordingly, there is no need for disqualification. E4. Illegal Rentals. criminal misdemeanor most likely won't be prosecuted. Also, we cannot bar a person from applying for VHR permit after violations.	3/20/2024 3:10 PM
159	2B. Reduce the Cap for VHRs in Tahoe Basin to 600 (from 900). This seems like BAD policy when all other recommendations are about increasing the cost of monitoring and regulating VHRs. Cutting revenue by 1/3 while increasing costs is just poor policy. The inference that 500 foot minimum means 600 VHRs is not good logic. Current cap is not a problem.	3/20/2024 1:06 PM
160	I don't like the decrease of the rental cap, the total number of allowable permits. I believe it should remain the same as rentals have decreased overall since the buffer zone was enacted.	3/20/2024 12:58 PM
161	The inclusion of the neighborhood VHR cluster maps infers that other homeowners are not affected to the same extent. Be assured that if a homeowner is surrounded they are affected whether in one of those neighborhoods or not.	3/20/2024 12:52 PM
162	Doesn't enforce light pollution regulations from all the porch and deck lights	3/20/2024 10:20 AM
163	Anything that hurts people involved with VHRs as a professional and makes it more difficult for them to stay afloat with constant new regulations designed to reduce the VHR industry.	3/20/2024 9:27 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

164	City and County need more code enforcement staff to prevent illegal Vacation rentals.	3/20/2024 9:25 AM
165	Reduce the cap for VHR permits in the Tahoe Basin—If we reduce this cap, we will take jobs away from residents and our local small businesses will suffer significant losses! You can clearly see the loss of business by just driving around town, closed and empty store fronts, restaurants closing, etc. It looks terrible driving around seeing this and the buildings are now looking run down since they are vacant. The focus should be on updating our store fronts and not a focus on VHRs.	3/20/2024 8:53 AM
166	I am curious how some of these suggestions will be paid for; I fear that the costs will be passed on to the home owners that operate a VHR. I also do not like the suggestion of reducing the 900 permit limit; I don't feel that it is fair to take away a permit from someone who followed the process and obtained one of the 900 permits. I also am curious about this requirement for functioning cameras to assess parking. Who is supposed to be reviewing that camera footage and how will it be used?	3/20/2024 4:16 AM
167	I do not agree with a total ban on VHRs. I know this was not a specific recommendation, but a total ban is not beneficial to the health of the local economy.	3/19/2024 9:22 PM
168	D.2 Fire Safety Although we can all appreciate the extreme dangers that can come with outdoor fires - there has to be a reasonable solution for guests coming to a mountain climate, expecting to enjoy a fire rather than to not be able to offer this amenity at all. Are you going to ban fire pits from every home owner in Tahoe, are you just assuming a renter has no clue how to use a fire pit properly? Did the committee consider the use of propane burning fire pits as a safer option rather than a complete ban? No sparks will be flying from these. Our rental property is located within a multi complex facility and part of the recent upgrades was the installation of large commercial grade gas fire pits on the patio overlooking the lake and mountains. Is this rule stating that no one on property whether they rent their home or reside permanently would now ever be able to use the fire pits? D.4 Parking - requiring a homeowner to install cameras at their driveways that other people can monitor at any given time? This may turn into borderline privacy issues - If my rental were my personal home, I would not agree with this at all. If there is a complaint at a property, then it is the job of the dedicated enforcement team to investigate the complaint in person / on site.	3/19/2024 4:26 PM
169	Overreach. Particularly the proposed elimination of the +2 for occupancy. My home has a very large, private downstairs living room with a King-sized Murphy bed which is heavily used by our guests and their family's. What benefit does this bring to the community to make this change? Recommend keeping existing occupancy guidelines which are already in alignment with the rest of the Counties in the Tahoe Basin.	3/19/2024 4:13 PM
170	Every year things change more rules more regulations, more we have comply with just to keep our properties as rentals. We already pay more for electricity, our property taxes go towards schools that we don't use. We don't get a vote on any new taxes. We contribute a lot to the economy of El Dorado county I have a very hard time understanding why we continuously have to battle to be able to be a vacation home. In short I don't like that we follow all the rules, our property management company vets our renters, and are always just a phone call away. We have no problems but we are constantly getting pushed against a wall with nonstop requests to jump through another hoop all because a few people think they are untitled and can force ridiculous rules and regulations.	3/19/2024 4:07 PM
171	The current regulations surrounding STR is backwards and is hurting the local economy. There are not enough beds in hotels to host the amount of tourists that come to do business and spend their money in SLT. The more penalties are placed on homeowners that use that income to help pay mortgages, the more impossible it will be to have people investing in real estate in SLT.	3/19/2024 3:30 PM
172	4B. Reduce the VHR permits to 600. How do you make that fair for throw ego have not had complaints and have been permitted since the rule went into effect.	3/19/2024 3:06 PM
173	same as above... more controls.... we are losing the essence of south lake... giving all of the revenue to the huge hotels and casinos!	3/19/2024 1:39 PM
174	All seems reasonable as discussed with the exception of the 2 strikes, switch contact (this needs more thought)	3/19/2024 1:33 PM
175	5.56.090 Maximum Occupancy. I disagree with this. My 4 bedroom cabin comfortably sleeps 10. 5.56.120 Noise. A noise monitoring system should ONLY be required on a VHR with verified complaints.	3/19/2024 12:42 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

176	<p>D3 Max Occupancy +2 seems already reasonable/down from +4. At least in our house, which is 2400 sq ft and has 2 large family room areas in addition to 4 bedrooms. Consider adding sq ft as a factor in deciding occupancy limits? If we reduce occupancy limit from 10 adults to 8 adults we will likely lose a lot of our repeat customers who have all been absolutely excellent in terms of taking care of the house and showing respect for neighbors. Also, thinking about it, seems likely to me that in cases where noise is an issue, occupancy is most likely also an issue. If you have a group of guests going up that are going to be noisy I'm not sure why 8 would be a lot better than 10...especially since I would imagine that guests that ignore noise considerations would also likely ignore any occupancy rules. D5.noise monitoring. I have one. I'm not sure it is as effective as the committee thinks it is, also I'm not aware of any capability to save and keep noise records. If such a capability does exist I'm fine to use it but would say that for owner managed properties it should be sufficient for the owner to keep the noise records. Perhaps it could be stated owner/LC instead of just LC... E1. raising fines...let's try enforcement of current fines before raising them. Can we focus fines on the guests vs. the owners...provided of course the owner can furnish clear proof that guests have been informed and agree to key rules. I agree that owners also need to be involved and care about violations...perhaps a more robust list/set of templates or something the owner can do to ensure guest understanding and compliance? Then if owner can show they have done everything within their power perhaps owner fine can be less or zero while guest fine is at max? As an owner I'm just thinking what can I do if some bad actor books a weekend stay for their family and instead throws a bachelor party? Same for my LC...both owner and LC are only in a position to act after a complaint or notification...assuming we've done all we can upfront and a group of guests just basically lie to us..</p>	3/19/2024 12:26 PM
177	<p>I am curious how some of these suggestions will be paid for; I fear that the costs will be passed on to the home owners that operate a VHR. I also do not like the suggestion of reducing the 900 permit limit; I dont feel that it is fair to take away a permit from someone who followed the process and obtained one of the 900 permits. I also am curious about this requirement for functioning cameras to assess parking. Who is supposed to be reviewing that camera footage and how will it be used?</p>	3/19/2024 10:38 AM
178	<p>I have concerns about density plan as I would hate to see good standing VHR owners lose their permits simply due to their location in proximity to other good standing VHRs. I think by enforcing 500 ft buffer with new permits and having stronger enforcement on illegal VHRs, overtime the density issue will be addressed but I would not support any recommendations that pulls good standing permits.</p>	3/19/2024 8:26 AM
179	<p>D3: Reducing occupancy limits to 2 persons per bedroom is overly punitive and really attacks the core value proposition of home rentals: people chose VHRs over hotels because they want to stay together as families. A four bedroom house with a couple bunk beds can very comfortably sleep 10 people. If families are peacefully obeying noise, parking, etc ordinances, what are we solving by limiting occupancy to two people per bedroom? D6: Requiring noise monitoring, especially inside a home, is overly invasive. Why are we monitoring what happens inside a private residence? Isn't the peace and quiet of the neighborhood the objective of the noise ordinance? Any noise monitoring/measurement should be from outside or at the property line. A4c:"Require owners to designate a new local contact if their property receives two violations within 18-months" I hope this is just poorly worded. It is unreasonable to punish a local contact for something a visitor has done that the local contact has no control over. Later in the document (E3a) has this worded correctly.... "two instances of non-reporting of and/or non-response to a verified complaint". This is something that a local contact can actually control.</p>	3/19/2024 6:41 AM
180	<p>Eliminating the "+2" when determining maximum occupancy</p>	3/18/2024 3:06 PM
181	<p>Geographical Concerns: Firstly, I want to highlight the broad sweep of the committee's recommendations, which are primarily driven by issues within the Tahoe basin. While I understand the necessity to address those concerns, my property is located outside this area, and it seems disproportionate to apply the same stringent measures to regions with differing circumstances. Local Contact Requirement (from Section 1, 4, C): The recommendation to require owners to designate a new local contact after two violations within 18 months could be easily exploited. A more reasonable approach would be to necessitate a new local contact only if the existing one fails to respond appropriately to complaints. This adjustment would safeguard owners against potential abuse from frequent complainants and ensure that the focus remains on effectively resolving issues. Maximum Occupancy Changes (from Section D, 3): The proposed elimination of the "+2" in the occupancy calculation reduces flexibility</p>	3/18/2024 10:12 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

without a clear justification. My property, for example, has three bedrooms plus a large bonus room, perfectly accommodating larger family groups while still adhering to noise, fire, and parking regulations. The communal aspect of VHRs, where families can stay together, is a significant advantage over traditional hotel accommodations and should not be undermined without compelling reasons. Noise Monitors: Implementing noise monitors for properties like mine, which is situated on several acres without close neighbors, seems excessive. The absence of clear noise thresholds further complicates this requirement. Indoor noise regulation, in particular, feels invasive, especially when the property's secluded nature already mitigates the potential for noise disturbance. Snow Removal (from Section 7): My property is at a lower elevation with less frequent snowfall, making a mandatory snow removal contract impractical and economically unsound. A more nuanced approach, considering geographical and elevation differences within the county, would be more appropriate. Furthermore, I have neighbors who assist me in clearing snow when it does fall. Rather than specifying how snow gets removed, perhaps the regulations should simply state that the home must be made as accessible as practically possible during periods of snow. Septic Systems (from Section 8): While I agree with the importance of adequate septic systems, the blanket requirement for permits and inspections across all VHRs seems to be an overreach, particularly for properties like mine with minimal occupancy rates.

182	Nothing, Our community relies on tourism and we should support that. Permitting and inspections are a good thing	3/18/2024 8:58 AM
183	I do like because can increase the economy. I don't like how some visitors don't follow the safety rules	3/18/2024 12:04 AM
184	It sounds expensive. I actually think if you offer permits to those who are doing it illegally they may follow the rules more, and bring more revenue to the county and be held more accountable. Those of us who have always followed the rules and have never had a violation and vet guests well already do everything being asked. I think a smaller cap will only cause less revenue for the county and reduce jobs for those servicing the vhrs. Measure T has not helped the city at all in any way, only caused more illegal vhrs and less jobs, less revenue, I'd hate to see that happen in the county with more restrictions. Are there issues with vhr violations and neighborhood problems? I only know about positive experiences with vhrs in the county. I'm saddened that my local neighbors who are nearing retirement will not be able to rent out their home short term while they spend part of the year caring for elderly parents out of town to help cover costs. There should be allowance for locals to do so for locals. Who is going to pay for extra costs in the proposal? Where will you get the money that the reduced vhrs due to a lower cap will create?	3/17/2024 9:44 PM
185	I don't agree with reducing the number of VHR permits. These are essential and part of Tahoe economy which generates income both for the county and locals. Instead of reducing the number of permits, we should look into how to make sure all the permits are being fully utilized and based on the demand maybe increase the cap in small batches	3/17/2024 9:28 PM
186	The recommendations are pretty drastic. None of it highlights the importance of short-term rentals. Short-term rentals are critical to regional economies, offering affordable experiences to visitors, generating significant tax revenue to support local governments, and providing hosts families additional income. We are a middle class family who has worked very hard. We took an old cabin, restored it and now others get to enjoy it. We are very proud of the work we did and ours neighbors are very appreciative since we turned an eyesore into a beautiful cabin. In addition, we are happy that our little cabin provides jobs to others from the management company team, to the cleaning crew, to the person who plows our driveway, and to the handyman who gets to make a living when something breaks. Vacation home rentals bring in tourism dollars that support local businesses such as restaurants, and shops. Everyone wins!	3/17/2024 8:36 PM
187	- B. Reduce cap for VHR rentals. If the issue is "clustering", then the number of VHRs seems irrelevant. The number of VHRs will eventually be determined as current VHRs are sold or change ownership who live in "clustered" areas. - D.4. Parking. Cameras should not be required to monitor any part of a VHR property due to privacy issues. Additionally, cameras tend to be unreliable due to power and internet outages or other maintenance issues. This is also an undue burden for the VHR owner. - D.5. Noise (5.56.120) This is unclear. Does this mean that if a VHR has a Hot Tub it is required to have "noise monitoring"? - Strategy Set 1: Reduce the number of permits in neighborhoods with clusters of VHRs. Those who find it difficult to build community in these areas may not be considering the existence of homes owned by those who have their primary residence in another location.	3/17/2024 6:13 PM
188	Section E. Three violations within 3 years is way too lenient. It Should be more like 2 years	3/17/2024 8:47 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

and violations should be recorded per parcel, not per ownership so they can't change owners names on the permit. Perhaps it should be disclosed to title company to effect resale value if a property is a problem it has a waiting period of 2 years before the property qualifies for another permit by new owners.

189	Frankly, I don't think the recommendations go far enough, but I understand the compromise.	3/17/2024 7:34 AM
190	I don't think we should reduce the number of VHR permits. South Lake Tahoe needs tourists to support the economy and local businesses. We have lost enough businesses already!	3/16/2024 2:49 PM
191	The 500 foot buffer is a terrible way to manage VHR limits. A % based cap would better serve the community and future change of ownership issues with homes. For example: a homeowner who lives next to a large 4 bedroom vacation rental will never be able to rent their home out seasonally even when their situation changes (kids go to college, etc.) yet if there was a % cap on the same street, then it would allow more flexibility, all while still keeping the overall cap in place and a reduced number of vacation rentals allowed per street. Santa Cruz does this and it allows flexibility in neighborhoods, but does not overwhelm the street. It could be 10% for example, so on a street with only 10 homes, that would allow for only 1 vacation rental for example. On a street with 20, 2 - and gives sellers and buyers more opportunity than the current system.	3/16/2024 1:46 PM
192	My neighbor lied and never followed the rules and rented to a lot more people than allowed. They allowed large wedding and parties and the people where ll over my property. They were in hot tub after hours. We called the Keys security and the police and both were slow to react.	3/16/2024 1:08 PM

Q3 What else would you like the county to know or consider?

Answered: 203 Skipped: 16

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Government over reach in this region is seriously startling. Please stop	4/6/2024 9:46 AM
2	Consideration of residents being compensated for VHR presence and revenue sharing for having to do what the management companies should be doing. I suggest that managers actively seek to have a conversation with affected residents to discuss specific issues in each neighborhood. I did not see any mention in the report regarding late night Uber and food delivery disruption with horns honking, or in general, workers, taxis, repairs, and the many, many other noise and traffic issues supporting VHRs. Perhaps as a start, managers need to physically be present at check-in to assess occupancy and discuss parking and property lines. Again, as of now, all of this is up to neighbors to take the time to monitor and file complaints with no personal benefit.	4/6/2024 9:00 AM
3	Some VHR residents may intent to become residence of SLT, but are currently renting the house because their job requires them to be else where.	4/6/2024 12:24 AM
4	The system for renewing the VHR permit should be simplified. If we are paying our taxes, complying with fire codes, keeping the house in good order and without incident, why should we have to jump through all of these hoops every year? Will there be any consequence for people making false reports? What type and level Of evidence will be required? Can't we just be neighborly?	4/5/2024 9:54 PM
5	The 500 foot limit implemented without enough notice resulted in a brand new vhr across the street from me and the destruction of my retirement plans. Because of this I will be leaving the area.	4/5/2024 9:08 PM
6	R-1 zones are for homes not hotels.	4/5/2024 7:53 PM
7	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market · VHR's is a preferred way for group and family travel · Tahoe's economy relies on tourism	4/5/2024 7:50 PM
8	Consider eliminating clusters through phasing out, rather than attrition. My home is surrounded by 4 and feels like a business district rather than a residential neighborhood.	4/5/2024 6:56 PM
9	That VHRs have been in this community for a very long time. And there's many positive things about them. Please try to find a way to not listen to the same people who complain about this issue all the time whether it directly affects them or not. I'd like you to consider that these bugs in your ear are not going away. They will move onto another issue and continue to infest our local government simply because you always listen to them. The rest of us are too busy working and raising our children here to be constantly bothering you.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
10	That a lot of locals work in the vacation rental industry. I think we should come up with a solution to manage the illegal business that is currently taking place locally while continuing to establish new standards/rules for the legal VR businesses.	4/5/2024 6:33 PM
11	Me and my husband are locals/full time residents and we rent our home over 3 days weekends and some holidays to offset some of our bills. We stay at my moms house 10 minutes away and all our neighbors (that are friend's) know how much we control and watch over the guests we rent to. Everyone is totally fine with it. Especially because it was a 2nd home for 50yrs prior to us buying it and it was shabby and uncared for until we bought it. If we were to lose our permit due to cluster enforcement and had to sell, most likely it would be an empty 2nd home that does not support the community at all except very occasionally. I grew up in the bijou neighborhood and most of homes were empty 2nd homes so to me seeing families enjoying a vhr rental in my neighborhood now is pleasant as our neighborhood is still very peaceful. Get rid of vhr's and all that will happen is more of the emptiness in neighborhoods and more struggles for small businesses that are not at Stateline. I really think some people are against them so badly because they want that completely quiet and empty neighborhood. I understand the affordable housing struggles as thats how my younger years here was....always had multiple roommates and found rentals threw word of mouth. It was never easy to find housing.	4/5/2024 5:17 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

Like every other mountain town housing is hard but South Lake actually has many more apts for rent and single families that could actually be bought under \$500 of which most mountain towns do not have at all. So sure we have problems with housing but honestly Tahoe seems to be in a much better spot then most tourist destination spots. Banning/restricting vhr's even more is not going to turn these homes into rentals but just another investment for 2nd home owners..Please just add some enforcement for the first step, don't put the hammer down and then try to back peddle.

12	Guests should be responsible for excessive noise, parking issues, property damage, etc and should be responsible for paying fines, etc. Validation of complaints needs to be accomplished before a violation is recorded.	4/5/2024 5:15 PM
13	Get rid of airbnb loophole for illegal property owners, what's that about? Property owners should have the right to use their properties any way they wish, including leaving it vacant and for personal use without being penalized. Per the Constitution we all have rights with regards to homeownership.	4/5/2024 5:05 PM
14	trying to phase them out by attrition would take a very long time, especially for residents currently surrounded on multiple sides. New permits should have expiration, and 3-5 year expiration to phase-in existing permits.	4/5/2024 4:42 PM
15	Blacklist visitors from all VHRs on tracking system. Multilanguage messages (eg. use of bear boxes). Permit durations (eg. 6 month permit) and phase out renewals. Moratorium on issuing permits and no waitlist. Move VHR use into commercial or mixed use. The fines are too low. Children should count towards occupancy or under 3 years old. Submit license plates, make, and model of vehicles.	4/5/2024 4:35 PM
16	And ordinance compliance officer that patrols neighborhoods to catch and stop noise nuisances and bad behavior as it is starting instead of neighbors being in charge of calling in. Residents shouldn't be involved in monitoring VHRs. Raise permit fee to pay for compliance officers to patrol.	4/5/2024 4:34 PM
17	All commercial rentals (air b and b) should be permitted so they are safe for people to occupy. Current ones are already unsafe	4/5/2024 2:59 PM
18	The way the current enforcement works is a joke. To make this VHR code work you must hire people who actually care about the county's residents and want to make a difference.	4/5/2024 2:12 PM
19	More affordable options for local workers. Restrictions / regulations on spec houses and development. Contractors and corporations build very large and very expensive residences that only very rich people can afford. A million dollar plus speck house makes the local housing market unaffordable for locals. Local contractors are usually the ones.	4/5/2024 2:10 PM
20	Where is the data that supports more regulations? I was disappointed that no data about complaints filed or fines issued. Without the data that supports more regulations, it appears that the county is making decisions based on the loud voices of a very small group of people. This is a mistake. If the data supports more restrictions - great. But if the data does not support more restrictions - please do not make emotional, subjective changes. If you do, this is where problems arise and lawsuits start. If you can support your changes with hard data - you are in a good place. If you cannot support these changes with objective data, the country will spend hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of dollars defending itself. Please be transparent and share the data about complaints, fines, permits revoked, etc.. You don't want to impose county-wide or basin-wide restrictions based on a few neighborhoods or a small group of people experiencing problems.	4/5/2024 2:00 PM
21	VHRs form a critical component of local economy and job market. All the people I work with for my rental property, from cleaning crew to gardeners, are kind and hardworking locals from Tahoe basin. As it is, a lot of them need two jobs a year to make a living. Their livelihood depend on such needs on the market. VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. I travel with my 1 year old all the time with my extended family. I can't imagine being trapped in a small hotel room that doesn't allow family time or has a kitchen to cook for my baby. Tahoe's economy IS tourism, nothing else. Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy. With the change in short term rental permitting, there are already very few homes in the county that are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are truly from VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet feels much more reasonable from a common sense perspective. Bad VHR's and bad complaint management are indeed problematic and the good ones shouldn't be penalized together. Dedicating TOT to fund	4/5/2024 1:53 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing will bring much higher benefits to the community. Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances. Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy.

22	1) I would like the county to know that this industry helps the workers be able to receive income flow coming in to help support household needs 2) Tahoe economy is tourism 3) VHR PREFERRED way for groups and family travel	4/5/2024 1:40 PM
23	Put together an educational media outlet (email distribution or in the paper) showcasing the benefits from vacation rentals and where the finances from TOT's are being distributed. Placer county does this monthly and it helps everyone understand how integrated both sides are and actually beneficial to everyone when working together.	4/5/2024 1:31 PM
24	Something I would want to change: move the buffer from 500 feet down to 300 feet	4/5/2024 1:26 PM
25	The problem with affordable housing is that fact that we have a limited supply of housing and a high demand. This has only increased with Covid with more people being able to live and work from Tahoe. Affordable housing should focus on making more housing available. This is a simple supply and demand economics. A huge missed opportunity is letting the motel 6 be bought by Tahoe Conservancy and converted back into meadow. If this was bought by the city or even an investor and was allowed to be developed this property could have created 100+ affordable housing units. Let the city or investors develop more affordable housing. That is the only way to get out of the affordable housing crisis. The number of units have not increased in Tahoe compared to the number of locals. We need more housing. Make building and developing easier to provide more affordable housing. Other cities allow developing but require a % of that new development to be for affordable housing. Lets do the same.	4/5/2024 12:59 PM
26	I would like to see VHR's looked upon in a more positive light as they contribute positively to our local economy.	4/5/2024 11:31 AM
27	· VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market · VHR's is a preferred way for group and family travel · Tahoe's economy relies on tourism · Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy · VHR managers asked for a reduction in clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet · Bad VHR's, bad complaint management and lack of enforcement is the problem · Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing · Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances · Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy	4/5/2024 11:29 AM
28	Reduce the VHR buffers from 500 feet down to 250 feet.	4/5/2024 11:24 AM
29	Instead of this, I think that there should be more focus on which VHR's are problematic and putting restrictions on them instead of all VHR's. I do not think that over regulating things is the best idea. People who visit Tahoe spend a ton of money and they contribute to a great economy. Start cracking down on the visitors who are being a problem but don't discourage everyone. We have 3 kids and when we do go on vacations we love to use AirBNB because it allows us to have a nice place where the whole family can hangout together, cook and usually go out in the backyard for good family time!! We don't get that in hotels and usually we have to rent 2 rooms for our family which ruins that family vacation vibe. Thank You for hearing my input.	4/5/2024 11:14 AM
30	Please enforce defensible space and fire code violations. We are all doing our best and everyone needs to be on board for fire safe neighborhoods.	4/5/2024 11:05 AM
31	I would like to see the moratorium preventing an owner from increasing occupancy by legally updating a room to a bedroom lifted. I don't understand this and if anything suggest capping an increase to 2 additional adults before having to re-permit the house. This would be a nice gesture, although small, to permit holders otherwise taking considerable blows in this committee proposal.	4/5/2024 10:59 AM
32	Emphasize that VHR's are a critical component. That locals should be educated the difference between Air n B and VHR's. I feel when the locals didn't win to end air n b the VHR's are getting the hit. Reducing VHR's has proven it's been a huge loss to Lake Tahoe city and county. VHR's revenues support locals, merchants. There are too many businesses closing. VHR's guest average 2 meals per day dining and shopping for souvenirs. Locals have complained for a long period of time and Tahoe city is paying a huge financial loss. County	4/5/2024 10:27 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

consider data of revenue losses provide to the county with actual data of how important it is to keep VHR's with guidelines and accountability their importance for the future of Lake Tahoe.

33	I would like to see rules established for outdoor lighting when VHR's are vacant. Frequently all outdoor lights are illuminated for weeks when there are no guests. These lights shine into our bedrooms requiring blackout curtains and shades. None of my permanent neighbors leave their lights on all night, I'd like to be able to see the stars.	4/5/2024 10:25 AM
34	Tahoe's economy relies on tourism. Including residents visiting from the Bay Area!	4/5/2024 9:50 AM
35	Please continue to work on breaking up the clusters. The fairest solution I've heard is to issue permits for only a certain time (two or three years) on a rotating basis when the VHR is closer than 500' to another one.	4/5/2024 9:23 AM
36	Vacation rentals employ local residents. Cleaning plowing snow removal yard maintenance painting repairs improvements. Most vacation rentals are families who do not want hotels. Over eight people gets loud. The mc mansion's have too many bedrooms and dens to allow large groups of people. I feel # of people should be limited to 8-10 even if the house is larger. I feel all people including children should be counted in the total. Many renters have family in the area that come over to visit or have dinner for that reason occupancy should be considered for daytime and night.	4/5/2024 8:50 AM
37	We appreciate that the Advisory Committee and Board of Supervisors are coming together to make improvements in the quality of life for residents, VHR owners, tourists and businesses. Please reconsider some of the points we've made above. We very much respect and love our Tahoe neighbors, however Tahoe is a national treasure that should be enjoyed by all, not just the full-time residents. Thank you!	4/5/2024 8:43 AM
38	I do not like the buffer zone of 500 feet. If we focus on enforcement and there are no complaints, what difference does it make if there are 2 VHRs next to each other or a street full of them. If neighbors complain, they can call enforcement. I don't like the idea of having fewer VHRs in the county. I think it's negatively affecting property values.	4/5/2024 8:36 AM
39	address light pollution from all the porch, deck, yard, decorative outside lighting not just spot lights Thank you	4/5/2024 7:39 AM
40	Tahoe's economy relies on tourism. VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market. The 500 ft radius is too far, it should be reduced to 350 ft. The 500 ft goes way out to a whole different street and neighborhood, so does not make sense. The clustering should be the distance on one individual street, not on a whole different street, in a different neighborhood.	4/5/2024 7:32 AM
41	Quite taking away peoples property rights. The 500 foot radius is ridiculous. I know someone waiting for 2 years for a permit, it's just not right.	4/5/2024 7:24 AM
42	The county should provide pathways to promote construction of more housing. Not imposing restrictions on existing housing	4/5/2024 7:21 AM
43	Our local economy is almost completely tourism dependant. I have seen many friends and families move out of South Lake Tahoe over the last couple of years because they couldn't afford to live here anymore. I truly believe that being over-restrictive for compliant, permitted VHRs would shrink the businesses that depend on tourism, and cause more local people that work in the tourism industry to be priced out of living here. This workforce also supports local small businesses, restaurants, etc, which invests in our local economy. I think there is a balance that can be struck. Keeping neighborhoods happy while allowing South Lake Tahoe to be accessible to a variety of visitors, and promoting this beautiful area to people that are returning or vacationing here for the first time. The focus should be on supporting the good VHR hosts and companies that work hard to keep things positive for both neighbors and vacationers. These companies are the ones that take pride in providing good experiences for both locals and visitors alike, and employ workforces that also share these values. We all earn and spend locally, even in a tight economy. Another way to support the local workforce would be to allocate some of the fees and taxes collected from VHR rentals to support programs that fund affordable housing.	4/5/2024 6:38 AM
44	Allow VHR's, use the TOT proceeds to reinforce the police department with additional personnel specifically for maximum VHR enforcement.	4/5/2024 6:35 AM
45	I don't know what the future of the Measure T litigation is, but if we are able to allow VHRs in	4/5/2024 6:34 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

South Lake Tahoe again, I would hope these guidelines and enforcement would make this important economic element possible again.

46	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market. VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. Tahoe's economy is tourism, nothing else. Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy. Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet. Bad VHR's and bad complaint management is the problem. Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances. Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy.	4/5/2024 6:30 AM
47	The 500 foot buffer should be reduced to 350 and the cap should remain at 900. Our local economy relies on tourism and TOT tax. Regulating the short term rentals is a must to keep our neighborhoods quiet and this will help maintain our home values.	4/5/2024 5:56 AM
48	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel Tahoe's economy is tourism, nothing else Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet Bad VHR's and bad complaint management is the problem Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy	4/5/2024 5:25 AM
49	Allow owners to freely rent out their properties without any permits.	4/5/2024 1:06 AM
50	The times of communist gestapo rules will come to an end. I just don't know how far it will go before people revolt. Or the tourism does. Tourists have other options too you know. Also tot tax should be set at 19 percent and there is no reason to ever raise it. As prices go up the tax income will naturally go up but stop gouging people with percentage increases. Brooke sine thinks she speaks for people but she does not. Let's get back to making Tahoe great by allowing and encouraging prosperity. Enough is enough. I am sickened when I see these overeager rule makers who get drunk on their power. If you want a [REDACTED] life go life it but let people who want to make money and house tourists and bring dollars to Tahoe help out community.	4/5/2024 12:19 AM
51	Most of these suggestions appear to me as controlling homeowner's lives! I live in the County and we are just learning about this and have less than 24 hrs to submit this survey? It's looking and sounding all too familiar with what happened in the City Limits. Homeowners should be allowed to rent their homes. Bring the substantial financial gain from taxes owed from short term/long term rentals in our community instead of increasing the tax of those homeowners who are not living in their homes less than half a year. Again, I emphasize, you have no idea why a homeowner chooses to rent their home. It could be medical, financial, career reasons, etc. Bring the millions of dollars, businesses, tourism and jobs back to Lake Tahoe, allowing homeowners to rent their homes.	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
52	Please help VHR employees because I need to keep my job in order to keep living in South Lake Tahoe	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
53	Please help VHR employees because I need to keep my job in order to keep living in south lake tahoe	4/4/2024 11:01 PM
54	There are a lot of homes renting without permits. I found 5 in less than 5 minutes on air bnb this week off of North Upper Truckee area.	4/4/2024 10:14 PM
55	VHR's provide many jobs for locals	4/4/2024 9:50 PM
56	The VHR's have been unfairly decimated in this community beyond measure.	4/4/2024 9:30 PM
57	I would consider any permit holder who isn't actively paying TOT tax on rental income to be given 6 months or end their permit. There are many homes not even being rented but have a permit.	4/4/2024 9:24 PM
58	see #2 above., Sorry I've not written original content but truly I don't think I could have stated the concerns any better. Prior to Measure T I lived in a vastly popular VHR neighborhood and	4/4/2024 9:12 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

knew so when I chose to build and move there. The VHRs were for the most part well managed and with the newer constraints I doubt there would be much if any concerns from the residents such as myself. I do hope the City residents will return to allowing a manageable # of VHRs for the good of the economy and get back to encouraging families to return to visiting Tahoe!

59	i work hard to check on my guests before renting to them to insure i dont have problems. Its my home first, a rental second. i dont want problems at my property.	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
60	An entire cottage industry was eliminated and local workers suffered financially- realtors, mortgage, escrow, cleaners, handyman services as well as tax base	4/4/2024 7:51 PM
61	It's frustrating to me after 11 years of following EDC VHR rules and NEVER having a complaint or violation, the rules keep getting tighter and more ridiculous. We already pay higher occupancy taxes than large hotels and are constrained by tighter regulations. Why not treat us the way you treat and value small businesses and entrepreneurs in the community vs keep making it tougher and tougher for us to survive. Instead of coming up with more and more regulations that restrict all, focus on the illegal hosts or the ones who mess up -- establish and enforce a 3 strikes rule. Owners, renters and non VHR residents will thank you. I started coming to Tahoe 25 years ago, almost always renting a lovely vacation home for me and my family. It's the reason I decided to buy a vacation home to both enjoy myself and share with others. It makes me sad that tighter and tighter controls mean that future visitors may be forced to only use a traditional, expensive hotel and not create the memories we have over the past 2 decades. Eddie Ranchigoda [REDACTED].com	4/4/2024 7:31 PM
62	Leave hosted vacation rentals alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	4/4/2024 7:26 PM
63	The county is so slow to process new permits and do a horrible job on communication on new permits- should be updated weekly on the website and the 500 Foot buffer map is hard to read	4/4/2024 7:25 PM
64	VHRs employ a lot of locals and are good for the community if well managed. They bring families to Tahoe because families prefer homes not hotels. This is the tourism we should be encouraging.	4/4/2024 6:22 PM
65	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel Tahoe's economy is tourism, nothing else Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet Bad VHR's and bad complaint management is the problem Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy	4/4/2024 5:34 PM
66	Tahoes neighoods have always been transiet,and with lots of vacancy	4/4/2024 5:29 PM
67	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel Tahoe's economy is tourism, nothing else Tahoe's neighborhoods have always been transient, and with lots of vacancy Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet	4/4/2024 5:28 PM
68	VHR's are a lifeline for thousands of locals directly and indirectly in this tourism economy. I don't believe VHR's are as bad as some people are tirelessly trying to say they are. Bad actors, and negligent managers are the problem which can be rectified! This is a destination location, with transient neighborhoods, with mostly absentee homeowners, and how it's always been. VHR's are not out of character for this long standing history of this town, nor do I believe they are the problem specifically. I venture to believe the most common local is one who understands we need tourism, and that VHR's are an important part of it. They simply want to know if they are being disturbed, they can call a number, and someone does something about it and that isn't happening evidently. Must be discretion considering unfair, unreasonable, and vindictive neighbors trying to go out of their way to harm neighbor permits. People talking on porch should not be a violation.	4/4/2024 5:28 PM
69	All our of town managers should have to have a local contact who lives 30 minutes from house	4/4/2024 5:20 PM
70	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel Tahoe's economy is tourism, nothing else Tahoe's neighborhoods have	4/4/2024 3:59 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

always been transient, and with lots of vacancy Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet Bad VHR's and bad complaint management is the problem Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy

71	TOT funds should go towards helping fund local enforcement units, rather than a pool (source: https://www.mtdemocrat.com/news/tot-dominates-budget-discussion/article_c8ed4e04-6187-11ee-9de4-1b2cd9bcc729.html)	4/4/2024 3:33 PM
72	There needs to be balance. These overarching rules are killing the little guy. The increased policing and higher fees will chase out the families who have small VHRs and aren't "making" money. Those quaint, simple homes will be sold to people who'll then build giant homes in their place. The county will end up with more giant houses (potentially owned by people with means who don't need to rent, yet can still host large groups with many cars and people) sitting empty most of the time and not contributing to the local economy. Meanwhile, everyone in Tahoe is facing skyrocketing insurance costs. And, last, I am wondering if there is any data to back up these recommendations?	4/4/2024 12:44 PM
73	There is a group of local residents that want VHR's completely banned, no matter what restrictions the County adopts or what results those restrictions bring, this group will never be silenced. The other comment is that all VHR owners or managers should have been notified of VHR advisory committee, not everybody checks the County website on a regular basis. I receive an email reminder every quarter that I need to pay TOT taxes. If the county wanted to be truly transparent, they would have sent an email blast to all registered VHR's	4/4/2024 10:18 AM
74	We have allowed pets in our VHR for over 20 years, and our rent has always been below market. This allows families with pets and modest resources to come up and enjoy Tahoe. Many of the proposed changes will likely push rental prices even higher which only wealthy families or groups will be able to afford.	4/4/2024 12:23 AM
75	We work with a legitimate rental agency LTA, and work hard to keep our home nice and vacationers respectful. We've had two complaints in four years and in both instances requested that the vacationers be banned from our home and frankly any home in our rental agency's portfolio. Keep in mind the more pressure you put to reduce or eliminate VHR's the bigger budget hole you will have - look at the budget cuts SLT have had to their fire and police.	4/3/2024 6:55 PM
76	Tourism is an important part of Tahoe economy. Vacation homes are not just nuisances. In addition to making direct contribution to the county by paying ToT, they offer convenience to travelers and generate employment opportunities. In recent years, we've seen wave after wave of actions restricting vacation rentals, increasing onus on hosts/guests, and raising operating costs. Have there really been so many complaints against them? Are there any data supporting all these measures? Global warming is already threatening Tahoe's status as a winter vacation spot. I really don't want to see that we take actions ourselves that could potentially damage the delicate balance in Tahoe's economic ecosystem and contribute to its collapse. Please be very careful in making drastic changes. Let's go slowly and take more inputs into consideration.	4/2/2024 6:01 PM
77	Data. Share the data that you are responding to. Save yourself time, money, and headaches. You have the names and emails of every VHR owner in the basin. Have you contacted them and asked for their feedback?	4/2/2024 5:13 PM
78	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market Very few homes in the county are VHRs, and very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. 500 ft clustering radius is too far.	4/2/2024 2:04 PM
79	In residential neighborhoods, where there are TOTs, Please do not implement or expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy.	4/2/2024 12:43 PM
80	Consider that Tahoe's economy is derived primarily by TOURISTS. If the County continues to push people out of Tahoe by implementing more restrictions the fiscal impact will be felt by future generations. Consider the future of the area before making decisions based on the old liberal people that grew up in the Bay Area and cashed in their retirement to live in Tahoe and try to change the landscape of the community and what it has always been. Shame on you if that is what you choose.	4/2/2024 9:49 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

81	VHR's and STR's are technically commercial lodging businesses and because they "employ outside maintenance services" tax law requires them to be reported to State and Federal Tax agencies as such. VHR permittees need to be required to provide a Tax Identification Number (TIN) and evidence they are reporting their rental income in that manner before being permitted or renewing their permit.	4/2/2024 8:28 AM
82	1. VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market 2. VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. 3. Tahoe's economy is tourism	4/1/2024 10:34 PM
83	consider the newer demographic, life style, and needs of the person living in tahoe and the ones that want to visit.	4/1/2024 10:04 PM
84	The taxes are outrageous, I have full time job and work 60-90 hours a week and somehow manage two str's. I'm just trying to not pay taxes by having a short term rental. This is basically theft for people that are trying to get ahead.	4/1/2024 7:51 PM
85	The public needs to know what the county currently does with the money it receives from VHR permit fees AND the TOT funds generated by the VHRs. I assume that with 900 VHR permits in the basin the County is collecting millions of dollars in TOT revenue. VHRs improve the economy of the County by allowing more visitors to come to the area and spend their money on local businesses. The 14% TOT tax currently charged is a disincentive for visitors coming to the area.	4/1/2024 4:21 PM
86	The committee should consider costs to owners that are associated with each new/revised requirement and give an indication as to where those funds will come from. To follow all of your guidelines is has become a time consuming, continuous process. It seems as though with all of the rules and fees that have already been implemented, VHR should be functioning well within the current standards, but instead all the new requirements suggest the contrary. Where will the money to enforce all of these new standards come from? and are they really necessary? and will this be a continuous yearly process? Please consider making printable information available to include in VHR owners handbooks. Please consider that VHR owners need an avenue to file complaints about neighbors as well. Some neighbors are acting as though it is their right to police a vacation rental property and the owners need a way to communicate that as well.	4/1/2024 2:10 PM
87	Make it easier to renew permit and less costly.	4/1/2024 12:53 PM
88	I am a 25 year local resident raising a family here. I have lived amongst VHRs that whole time and have found that to be a fine experience. I have had far more disruption and annoyance from permanent neighbors over the years than I ever had from VHRs. I am sure that there are a very small minority of VHRs that are regularly disruptive (likely a lot of these are unpermitted). I am all for good management practices , regulation and enforcement to reduce these impacts. But at the end of the day a neighbor is a neighbor. I get the feeling that the strongest voices on the anti VHR side just want the 95% vacant second home next to them. I have always loved that I live in a place that people like to come and visit. Sometimes there are impacts, but they always just remind me of how lucky I am to call this place home. The anti tourist sentiment just doesn't work in Tahoe. People who want to live in a quiet, rural town are just in the wrong place. Tahoe has always been and will always be a busy tourist destination and that's great! VHRs have provided a means for me to earn a good income and raise my family here. We have also provided hundreds of thousands in taxes and payment for local workers and services over the years. Any new regulation should be tailored to efficiently fix a known and documented problem. This is where proper tracking and enforcement needs to come first. Enforcement should always be discretionary on well trained officers. Some of the citations written in the City when they went to zero tolerance were ridiculous. And bad permanent neighbors were able to weaponize them against well meaning and reasonable managers and guests. VHRs are the perfect family vacation option, that should be encouraged. The county should carefully consider how a dwindling number of VHRs will effect their TOT income. The 500 foot buffer is already too restrictive and will lead to a huge reduction over time. A smaller radius of some sort of petition and approval process should be considered to maintain something similar to the status quo. Spending big money and wasting fire department time on biannual inspections is a total waste, do it once and use those resources in a more productive manner. VHRs are not the enemy. They are an important and productive component of our town. No new restrictions or regulations unless to effectively address a real and documented issue. Instead use the TOT we provide to address other environmental, infrastructure, social and demographic issues. We can help. Thanks Duggan Smith	4/1/2024 12:44 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

89	* VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market * Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. * Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing	4/1/2024 9:02 AM
90	Consider that the ONLY viable economy you possess is travel/hospitality. You have severely limited it and the few firms you have handling rentals is horrible. As if this wasn't enough- you "create" rules - a landline that is VOIP -which is worse than cell phone service and your people even said this! You now require a safe barrier and trees must be removed and nothing near the foundation. Then an occupancy tax for those don't live in their rental home. Some of us aren't wealthy and are keeping our homes for when we retire! Go after the massive SF home owned by the wealthy and leave us alone!	4/1/2024 8:29 AM
91	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. Tahoe's economy is tourism Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet. Bad VHR's and bad complaint management is the problem Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances Allow exemption request for other situations, like moratorium preventing VHR owner from increasing occupancy	4/1/2024 7:00 AM
92	Most of the remaining suggestions seem reasonable, but I think VHR continues to receive an inordinate amount of attention. Today's regulations seem to be working fine in most communities. If there are violations of existing codes, they should just be enforced.	3/31/2024 10:04 PM
93	how has the 500ft buffer AND the 900 VHR cap helped the Tahoe Basin vs the removal of short term rentals in the Tahoe city area? VHRs serve has a vital affordable solution for families to have vacations. If county laws are enforced, why is the buffer or cap on rentals so important? Arguably, the majority of vacation homes would sit vacant vs being used as a long term rental because the local economy cannot support the high price in rents that would be necessary to even break even on monthly expenses for these owners. Given the local wages, the majority of locals would not be able to rent a \$4000/m rent which is what would cover the typical mortgage at today's interest rates and average home prices. This cap is ONLY to benefit hotels and most hotels are very highly priced or completely run down and do not offer the same opportunities for guests to have an affordable family vacation which will impact tourism in Tahoe.	3/31/2024 3:38 PM
94	We would like to know where the TOT funds are going. Roads? Affordable housing?	3/31/2024 3:15 PM
95	Should be a way to deal with local neighbors who just are trying to cause trouble because they don't like the concept Noise monitors sound costly and intrusive Some full time residents can be just as noisy (or more so)	3/31/2024 2:52 PM
96	VHR allows many homeowners to be able to keep their cabins. With further restrictions you end up having to sell those cabins to wealthy people who scrape them and build megastructures. You lose diversity at Tahoe not to mention old world charm.	3/31/2024 2:14 PM
97	I think the county should take into account home owners like my family. Our cabin has been in the family scene 1975. It has family history and decades of memories. We rented long term for over a decade and had nothing but trouble with so called local residents. Always a hassle collecting rent and some were rude and just didn't care a dam about our Cherished family home. Not to mention twice having to hire a lawyer to get renters out. I have been paying taxes and contributing to Lake Tahoe's tourists industry for over 35 years. The last couple years we have been doing VHR with our cabin. The amount of money I have to pay for the privilege of renting my cabin is very high. My clients also contribute to the tax and tourist revenue base and now you want to slap me down and try to force me to rent my house to more long term losers that contribute very little in the way of making Tahoe the great place it is. Shane, shame, shame!!!	3/31/2024 2:01 PM
98	The country should consider real data here, not the voices of the few who come to board meetings and make a fuss. The sheer if's blotter doesn't lie: VHR complaints are few and rarely based on fact. People who come to VHRs are an overall good for the area, with increased tax and business revenue. Yes, local workers need a place to live, but they also need a place to work. The county should carefully consider the damage the city of South Lake Tahoe had done to itself with its VHR ban. Restaurants and businesses- many locally owned- are going bankrupt. Even the Denny's has closed. Our economy is driven by tourism, and we are in competition globally. We are not competing with the next country over, but rather with	3/31/2024 9:17 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

other world famous destinations, such as the French Alps. Hawaii, Bali, etc. The decisions we make now will have far-reaching consequences. With such competition we need to get the most expert advice possible, and not leave things in the hands of those who seek to keep this beautiful place to themselves. I serve my country overseas in hard places. For many years, my home in Tahoe has been a refuge for me and my family, but if I cannot rent it while I am away then I cannot keep it. I comply with every regulation. My management company takes every precaution, including noise detectors and meeting guests on arrival. There has never been a substantial complaint. But complaints - often phony- come anyway from neighbors who flaunt county regulations such as pine needle clearing and parking RVs and boats on the street with no consequences.

99	<p>First, ending rentals is UnAmerican. Second, lets start from the clean slate of the county can get out of the "VHR" business and do something productive and allow citizens who own property use their property as they see fit under the law, without government involvement. That's our baseline. If there are problems with safety, lawlessness, that we must address, then maybe some minimum oversight is allowable. A house that meets standards for occupancy meets standards for rental. The taxes you charge citizens that rent out their properties (in addition to the state taxes we pay on the income) is excessive. Hotels are in the business of making money. Renting out your second property is a matter of trying to eke out an improvement of our financial standing for the average citizen. Every dollar you take away from us comes away from our families and our ability to improve our lives. We should not be paying the same as a casino occupancy tax. We should not have limited permits (go ahead and forbid it and see how far you get in court). We should not have excessive fees or any unnecessary regulations. If you have a problem in South Lake Tahoe, South Lake Tahoe should be dealing with it, not EDC. Leave the rest of the county alone and let cities deal with unruly renters.</p>	3/30/2024 6:26 PM
100	<p>Dont close off Tahoe to visitors that want to stay in the area. The proposed violation structure is too strict and will force VHR to close. The tightening of the regulations is just another way to choke off VHRs. Enforcement will always favor the full-time resident who is complaining.</p>	3/30/2024 3:32 PM
101	<p>I hope the advisory committee and the county recognize that the LT area is very different from most of the rest of the county, and adjusts the regulations in different areas some way. Perhaps dividing the county into regions and giving each region regulations appropriate to their situations? Please think on this and how LT affects a significant amount of El Dorado County disproportionately.</p>	3/30/2024 1:11 PM
102	<p>What if the VHR homeowner is using the property temporarily for personal use acting as a second homeowner? Second homeowners and residents are not subject to any of these constraints AFAIK. Where is the research and data to support these changes? How prevalent is this issue compared to other county issues such as crime? What are the percentage of substantiated VHR complaints to justify these changes? What is the density of permanent resident complaints to VHR ratio by neighborhood? How does this differ in second / vacation home dense neighborhoods? What are the proposed costs associated with these recommendations and how will the county pay for this? This should not fall entirely on VHR owners and TOT renters.</p>	3/30/2024 12:42 PM
103	<p>Residential Property rights should be the same for all. No such property should be discriminated against or adversely affected by majority rule. Property Rights, like Human Rights are fundamental in this country. All code violations for rental and non-rental properties should be dealt with the same. I believe that most rentals are good and responsible neighbors like most non-rental property owners. Enforce the laws and our community will be enjoyed by all. Many owners have bought their homes based on the knowledge that they could rent their homes. There is a long history of precedents here. To unfairly treat these property owners or suggest that rentals would be prohibited would cause major significant financial harm to many homeowners. Code enforcement applies to all and equal property rights belong to all as well. These matters should not be decided on the basis of popularity or majority vs. minority. Please enforce our laws and ordinances.</p>	3/30/2024 12:13 PM
104	<p>See number 2</p>	3/30/2024 11:50 AM
105	<p>Some of the proposed changes feel squarely aimed at prohibiting "party houses" - something I fully support. In our own home, we are permitted for 8 adults, but we explicitly limit our rentals to 6 adults for this exact reason. So I applaud this work, but I have suggestion. Some of the changes (like removing the "+2" rule), are going to be painful for smaller houses to absorb, while only minimally impacting larger homes. A home with 5 or 6 bedrooms will still be able to host large groups... and those homes likely can convert other "extra spaces" into "bedrooms" to further increase their permitting allowance. Meanwhile, small family homes (2/3-bedroom,</p>	3/30/2024 9:27 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

without "extra rooms") may be unfairly penalized with the new limitations. Perhaps a tiered system of rules would make sense to look into ... where the larger the home is, the lower the "human density" allowance is?

106	We live in High Meadow neighborhood and are surrounded by three VHRs that are very active. It really isn't that bad. It is fun and right to share our community with visitors. Our economy needs it. Enforcement and education are the answer.	3/30/2024 9:19 AM
107	Consider making one permit and one fee, not so many different steps as well as changing TOT process. The tax is paid by Airbnb why do we need to submit these annoying forms?	3/30/2024 8:26 AM
108	1. VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market 2. VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. Tahoe's economy is tourism 3. Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs.	3/29/2024 9:11 PM
109	I'm not sure making regulations more punitive for VHR owners are going to address the issues we're trying to solve. Is tourism not the main source of revenue for our county? I have a few suggestions: Does VHR owner require their guests to sign a VHR agreement that communicates important local regulations? Can we start with a common required format that we can customize? What would make it even better and formal is having a place (El Dorado Hosted Landing Page) for guests to view local regulations in an easy-to-read way that welcomes them and also lets them know that they have responsibilities renting a VHR in El Dorado County. Something that I bet a lot of VHR owners run into are guests not taking them seriously because their rental agreements don't look official. Having something official and formal-looking, that clarifies regulations and fines, will motivate visitors to our area to comply.	3/29/2024 6:34 PM
110	I have been vacationing at tahoe since 1955, when my grandfather completed a small summer cabin in tahoma. In my experience, over the past 20 years, there are fewer bad actors in my neighborhood than there were during the 20 years previous to that. Those previous bad actors were typically long term renters or owners. Their bad acts included public drunkenness, drug abuse and selling, trashing their property and their neighbor's properties, hoarding of broken down junk in yards and road shoulders, public fights and prostitution. In the most recent 2 decades, I have observed a significant reduction in noise, negative behaviors, cleaner properties, responsible behaviors.	3/29/2024 5:49 PM
111	I am concerned that the county did not enforce their own protocols and rules regarding VHR violations and it cost me being able to apply for my own VHR permit. The house two doors down from us was operating a VHR illegally without permit, and instead of imposing the waiting period before they were able to reapply, the county allowed the owner to obtain a VHR permit. Because the county did not enforce their waiting period, we were unable to obtain a permit for our property.	3/29/2024 5:18 PM
112	As a VHR owner, these are changes I would like to see. 1. Remove outdoor signage...it's an open invitation to crime 2. Management keep a list of clients who do damage 3. Visual check of clients	3/29/2024 4:52 PM
113	I would like to see the central system in place before such excessive additional recommendations are implemented. Some of the ideas are great, but they are not data-driven, and, in some cases, they will not eliminate the concerns being addressed. The tracking system will provide data on gross offenders, and those VHR hosts should lose their VHR privilege if they meet a defined threshold of violations. This, in itself, will achieve many of the committee's/residents goals in itself For ourselves, we only rent to friends, family, and individuals over the age of 35 with good rental backgrounds; thus, we've had no issues. We want to be good stewards of the community and do so by validating our renters.	3/29/2024 4:04 PM
114	Vacation home rentals are a needed source of revenue and tourism in the Lake Tahoe basin. Vilifying owners and renters will not solve the problems for those in the very vocal minority	3/29/2024 3:38 PM
115	Lake Tahoe is a vacation destination and tourism is the primary industry. Arbitrary rules that discriminate against home owners and guests will have a negative impact on the community. People will go elsewhere rather than risk being fined a yet to be determined ridiculous amount of money.	3/29/2024 3:36 PM
116	I think the county should take a closer look at the rental property management businesses. Today all the rules seem to be geared towards renters and owners when very often the owners aren't very involved. When a property is being managed by a company, and there is an incident against a property that is being managed - the rental management company doesn't seem to get dinged at all. Even worse, if the property gets banned from being a VHR - its permit goes	3/29/2024 3:24 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

to someone else who might hire this same property management company continuing to rent out irresponsibly.

117	How does this impact the VHRs in the rest of the County (on the west slope). The 500 ft buffer makes sense for small parcels that are common in SLT. However, they do not make sense where parcel size is large. The 500 ft buffer should be from the VHR structure itself and NOT the property line. If someone had a 40-acre parcel with a centrally located VHR, no one within 500 feet of that persons property line could have another VHR even though the VHR (home) is much more than 500 feet from the owner's property line, let alone a neighbor's residence or VHR. This gets even more absurd as the parcel sizes increase. Please reconsider this buffer determination.	3/29/2024 3:10 PM
118	First of all, I am sick and tired of feeling like "the enemy" as a VHR host. VHR hosts bring families and other guests to my area where they spend money for weddings, family events, outings, food at restaurants and local stores, tourism, skiing and many more venues and income streams for the local economy. If they have no place to stay they will go elsewhere. I would like to see some SUPPORT to VHRs to increase the input to the economy instead of constant stream of constraints and money grabbing. I also would like to see the rest of the county to separate the rules and regs to VHRs outside of South Lake Tahoe as the conditions are drastically different where density and guest type is quite different. It time to acknowledge the BENEFIT VHRs can bring to El Dorado County outside of South Lake Tahoe. Stop including the rest of the county with the troubles of SLT. If the county continues to limit and make VHRs a miserable pursuit you will end up like other cities where properties will just sit empty because its simply less of a hassle because long term renting and VHRs will become a losing business venture. I am very concerned that the recommendations do not adequately represent VHRs outside of South Lake Tahoe.	3/29/2024 2:45 PM
119	Tahoe is a huge tourist economy - anyone that lives there benefits. Home prices rise, stores do more business. This is all going to reduce that. VHRs allow FAMILIES to visit tahoe, and not just people staying in hotels and casinos all concentrated in downtown. There are some good reasons for permits and locations - but ultimately we all know the corrupt forces that are pushing for this - keep pushing the limits and you'll have homeowners and residents revolt and take serious action against the entire thing. I know I will.	3/29/2024 2:43 PM
120	Let's implement a surcharge/fee on rentals (paid by the renter) that is called a Clean Tahoe fee and it goes to support Keep Tahoe Blue cleanup efforts. locals complain that tourists leave a mess behind - regardless of whether or not this has any basis - why not add a \$20 fee to each rental which goes directly to great local organizations. Or make a donation to a local environmental non profit part of the permit renewal process.	3/29/2024 2:39 PM
121	VHR's are an essential part of Tahoe economy and job market. With all of these rules and regulations it only helps VHR's to operate at the highest level. They are the preferred way for family travel and will continue to make Tahoe a major vacation destination.	3/29/2024 1:58 PM
122	As a VHR owner in SLT for 10 years, I agree with most of the recommendations. I believe all rental properties should be subject to the same inspections as the VHR's.	3/29/2024 1:31 PM
123	To stop allowing existing VHR's would significantly impact the economy in Tahoe and hurt owners. It would be unfair to decide to limit licensing of existing VHR's. It might even force a family to sell before it made financial sense and limit their access to Tahoe as well.	3/29/2024 12:51 PM
124	This an outrageous over strong arm regulation by El Dorado County and I am very disappointed in Brooke Laine for proposing this. You are destroying the El Dorado County like the City of South Lake Tahoe has done to the city.	3/29/2024 12:29 PM
125	Nothing, Leave all of this alone and try to revitalize tourism. Lake tahoe has travelers from all over the world visit. Don't allow negativity with this. This place has relied on tourism for over 100 years. The locals need to realize that concept. No money to pay for things means the town will and is suffering. People will always complain about anything. That is a fact. However, The \$2,000.00 fine was working in the city and was only in force for a short period of time. Then everything ended. and look what has happened. Roads are terrible, business's gone, vacant buildings, less money coming in, no fund's to pay for improvements, Everything mentioned from the 8 people is totally backwards. Not one person is saying revitalize tourism. That is the economy in South lake Tahoe. Tourism. Check the record books, The tourism industry has been going on for well over 100 years here in Tahoe. Stopping it will turn Tahoe into a ghost town. As the world population is going up, people need somewhere to go, As opposed to fighting it, Embrace all the possibilities of it. The possibilities of a vibrant economy,	3/29/2024 12:26 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

and a great looking town are endless. The negativity with the locals needs to go away like the dinosaurs did. Tourism is Good business and Good for the economy in Tahoe. It Keeps everything flowing.....

126	If VHRs were outright banned, families simply wouldn't come to the area at the same rate they do due to inadequate capacity to meet demand. Additionally, the County members should recognize that the steep price increased and home affordability is not unique to Tahoe or VHRs. The facts are that the average cost of a home is increasing across the nation so it is important not to conflate the two issues.	3/29/2024 12:12 PM
127	I think banning fire pits and jacuzzis will help alot with noise. we don't need people partying in jacuzzies all night. if they want to do that go stay at the hotels.	3/29/2024 11:51 AM
128	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. Tahoe's economy is tourism Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet. Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances	3/29/2024 11:39 AM
129	My wife and I own a property in Tahoma that we purchased in 2021 from her grandfathers estate (which they purchased in 1991). We were the only people in the family with the means to be able to keep it in the family, and we were only realistically able to do that with the additional income generated from renting it short term. We continue to use it multiple times throughout the year and have good relationships with our neighbors. We work diligently with them, and with our management company to ensure that renters respect the rules, the property and the community as a whole. We happen to be a grandfathered exemption to the 500ft rule as there are additional VHRs in the same neighborhood, so arbitrary removal of our permit because of an unclear concern about clustering would likely result in our forced sale of the property and removal of a multigenerational connection to our Tahoe community.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
130	My wife and I live here almost full time and rent our home only during the summer. Losing our rental income would force us to sell--to some wealthy tech bro, and that won't help the county overall.	3/29/2024 11:38 AM
131	n/a	3/29/2024 11:21 AM
132	VHR owners contributed a lot to the local economy and local job market.	3/29/2024 11:17 AM
133	VHRs are critical component of local economy and job market VHR's are the preferred way for group and family travel. Tahoe's economy is tourism Very few homes in the county are VHRs. Very few local complaints and neighborhood problems are VHRs. Reduce clustering radius from 500 feet to 350 feet. Dedicate TOT to fund local enforcement unit and other basin initiatives like roads and affordable housing Implement and expand exemption requests for max 14 occupancy and other occupancy circumstances	3/29/2024 11:16 AM
134	Tourism is a huge part of Tahoe's economy. It is a beautiful area that should be shared. Reducing home rentals hurts the local businesses as well as those renting.	3/29/2024 11:15 AM
135	I do not have a VHR permit in the Tahoe Basin, but rather in the Strawberry neighborhood. It is a third generation cabin that my family is trying to keep in our family. I only rent to families with young children or groups that have prior 5 Star ratings on short term rental platforms. Please continue to make this possible for our family. By removing the plus 2 occupants, we will have to reduce our nightly rate and it will make it nearly impossible to cover our costs, especially with losing our fire insurance and now paying outrageous fees through CA Fair Plan. Thank you for your consideration!	3/29/2024 11:12 AM
136	Homeowners should have the right to help pay the exorbitant costs of owning a South Lake Tahoe property through short term rental income.	3/29/2024 11:07 AM
137	As a past planning commissioner, clusters can be an affective way to keep vacation rentals together, not apart. Why cap? Why not enforce?	3/29/2024 11:03 AM
138	Don't let these decisions be EMOTIONALLY driven by protesters without DATA or real evidence of damage to the community or property.	3/28/2024 6:20 PM
139	County needs to reconsider the 500 ft barrier, or at lease reduce it for Non Tahoe areas. If a property is large , the 500 feet may not be appropriate as the rental could be much further than	3/28/2024 1:40 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

500 feet to a neighbor rental but a large property boundary may make it impossible for a neighbor to legally offer rental / VHR due to proximity to the boundary line...not actual rental building.

140	A. 2. – Complaint Tracking and Response - Consider recording and considering all complaints even those that are not substantiated by an officer. A complaint may be valid, but the officer may not arrive in time to observe the violation. Or as we have observed, the noisy renters see the Sheriff's vehicle arriving and scamper out of the hot tub, run inside, turn out the lights and get very quiet to avoid a violation. C. 11. Hosted Rental Advertising and D. 6. Signage (5.56.105) – Hosted rentals should be required to state on posted exterior and interior signs and on all advertising that the rental is a "Hosted Rental" that requires that a "local resident owner must be present on-site during nighttime hours when guests are renting". Renters should know that the owner must be in residence during their stay. D. 5. Noise (5.56.120) - Barking dogs should be specifically called out in the ordinance. Many of the VHRs advertise as "pet friendly". Some VHRs have fenced yards & doggy doors to accommodate pets. Renters toss the dogs outside and allow them to bark. All barking dog noise should be prohibited at any time no matter how brief. Renters should not be allowed to leave dogs unattended inside or outside. Animal Control is not equipped to handle this problem. E. Penalties – The County should also fine Airbnb, VRBO or any other entity that allows unpermitted VHRs to advertise, list, offer or use their services in any way. Rental agents should require proof of permit before allowing owner to use their services.	3/26/2024 11:17 AM
141	Stop being so Marxist with regards to private property	3/26/2024 10:39 AM
142	There are many very conscientious Vacation Rental owners that want to see the South Lake Tahoe region prosper. Vacation Rentals bring revenue to the County and region, and provide a valuable service to tourists.	3/25/2024 8:45 PM
143	As a Tahoma resident I am wary of enforcement persons as a substitute for local contacts. There has to be a way for both to work together as the distance Tahoma is from "the rest of El Dorado County" has proven that we get LESS of services not equal. If an enforcement person lived in Tahoma and could be a recognized face I'd support this but this sort of plan hasn't even worked for the (well funded) sheriff department. Local contacts must remain a first line of defense and I don't read the language of the committee report in support of what I feel is necessary element. Perhaps consider that any out of state or out of county local contact is not acceptable. My thanks to the citizens who are on the committee and looking into the future to better our relationship with short term occupancy struggles.	3/24/2024 12:45 PM
144	Please be forthcoming and transparent about the amount of economic upside VHRs bring to our community. Not just in TOT but in dollars spent at local businesses. If that is reduced, more small business will need to close. Housing prices will continue to rise forcing more locals out of the area. Enforcement is key and better education about what economic upside of VHRs can do for our community.	3/24/2024 9:59 AM
145	VHR's are not the problem. Chase this all you want, but eliminating VHRs will not solve the housing problem. Ordinary working families are not going to be able to afford to live in most of the VHRs. The problem is vacant or mostly vacant properties. Get them filled with bodies!	3/23/2024 9:32 PM
146	Work on reducing clusters!!	3/23/2024 11:23 AM
147	Since the monitoring systems will take time to implement, endorse and initiate the 600 permit cap so it prevents worsening of the current system.	3/23/2024 8:50 AM
148	A.1. Invest in a dedicated VHR enforcement unit. I understand the desire for this but what is the funding source? The TOT was just raised to 14% so I hope that will cover it. Also, are there any other counties or municipalities that EDC can use as a benchmark? I'm sure this concept has already been implemented in other locations. C. Develop Regulations for Accountability of Hosted Rentals. I agree that hosted rentals provide full-time residents financial assistance by helping offset the high cost of housing. However, what they don't do is help provide additional housing for other full-time residents. Although not a function of this committee, maybe there could be some incentive put in place for full-time residents to rent out their "hosted rental" to other full-time residents. There would still be a financial benefit for the full-time resident while providing additional housing for other full-time residents, which we all know is a critical need. Thank you, Gary Gutowsky 618-407-5150	3/22/2024 12:48 PM
149	EDC already spends over 50% of the general fund on law enforcement. It is irresponsible to propose more public funding from the county when all monies are being decreased by the state	3/22/2024 8:54 AM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

and VHR occupancy is down. It is a losing industry and the public insists we not pay for overseeing their product.

150	Keep VHR's out. Let people manage their own property. Increase fines and enforcement for violations. VHR's are the problem, not the homeowners.	3/22/2024 7:41 AM
151	Please communicate directly with all str permit holders. There has been zero sent.	3/22/2024 6:15 AM
152	The winter renters should be made aware of the fact that with heavy snowfall they may not be able to get out and snow removal may not be possible. Renters need to be aware of the fact that 4 and all wheel drive may still not be enough to get around and when there are chain controls all cars need to at least carry chains.	3/21/2024 6:36 PM
153	A lot of people rely on vacation rentals to make a living in Tahoe. I'm a housecleaner. I would never have been able to buy a house here if I hadn't cleaned vacation rentals.	3/21/2024 5:49 PM
154	Larger fines and lose permit after 3 offenses.	3/21/2024 11:17 AM
155	AD: Snow removal companies are scalping. If you are going to require snow removal services for VHR's then the following should be considered. This has always been a problem in Tahoe no matter what the service is. I have to hire contractors off the hill for honesty and better pricing. Local snow removal companies charge up front for contracts they cannot honor. Most don't answer the phones on their ads. Their prices are punishing due to lack of competition. I recommend that all snow removal companies apply to the county to be on an approved list of contractors. They must commit to honest pricing and fulfill their contracts. This was helpful when I needed to clear my roof last year. The locals wanted to charge upwards of \$10,000. I called someone on the county approved list and hired a company from Placerville that charged me \$2,000. Please consider snow removal companies to apply and compete, and be on an approved county list. Also, something needs to be done for the county plows creating berms at the end of the driveways. Snow removal companies cannot do their jobs if they cannot conquer the huge berm that freezes over and is non destructible.	3/21/2024 10:31 AM
156	A ban on VHRs or limited numbers. We have a VHR and I can also see the concerns from both sides. Thank you for doing this.	3/21/2024 9:57 AM
157	all has been addressed, thank you!	3/21/2024 9:40 AM
158	Lower the current VHR permit cap ASAP!	3/21/2024 9:17 AM
159	I like the idea of creating process, making community guidelines clear and EASY to understand. I think it's important to know the line between trying to preserve a community while not creating a police state. These things can get out of control very quickly and escalate into even more big brother tactics.	3/21/2024 9:15 AM
160	You are taking away the city's largest source of income by reducing tourism.	3/21/2024 7:06 AM
161	Audit the VHR companies. Actually look at the addresses they are renting to. Hold them accountable for renting in authorized locations.	3/21/2024 5:34 AM
162	Tourists are bread and butter of local economy. Driving them out of town is not the answer	3/21/2024 4:13 AM
163	I don't like the concept of hr signage. It's unnecessary and an eyesore.	3/20/2024 5:37 PM
164	Consider how much TOT you get from VHRs, and continue manage this like it is your owner business. Invest in compliance...keep this available for owners, and use the TOT money wisely. Thanks for working with us on this!	3/20/2024 5:04 PM
165	I like the idea for uniformed signage made by county and paid by applicant during application process. In addition to the signage, applicant upon approval should be receiving few booklets, - kind of like welcome to El Dorado County VHR. Booklets would have information about the county, what we do, what we have... leisure wise... important information, ph#s, emergency contacts, and of course important rules, etc.	3/20/2024 3:10 PM
166	Reducing the Cap will only mean a smaller number of property owners get to charge higher prices for a smaller supply (esp. with SLT ban). Keep VHRs prices reasonable and not gouging! Again BAD policy.	3/20/2024 1:06 PM
167	I would like to see the 500 foot buffer zone decrease to 300 feet.	3/20/2024 12:58 PM
168	VHR's require a significant amount of additional contractor traffic such as housekeeping, snow	3/20/2024 12:52 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

removal, house maintenance and repair. These contractors should be required to abide by the rules as well. They regularly contribute to noise, unauthorized parking, use of neighboring house trash bins, litter etc. For example, contractor parking or turn-around in neighboring driveways should not be allowed. Chains, snow cables and heavy trucks cause significant damage to decorative stone pavers and asphalt aprons.

169	Item B doesn't have enough context for me to understand it, but NOT increasing the number of permits seems important. Lowering the cap sounds good.	3/20/2024 10:42 AM
170	Get code enforcement to enforce exiting El Dorado light pollution ordinance from all the (existing and FUTURE) porch and deck lights. They currently won't even take a written complaint and they never enforce on new construction violating the code.	3/20/2024 10:20 AM
171	Please keep in mind that thousands of people make a living working with VHRs. It's already been a struggle to stay in business with all the new regulations (Measure T in City of SLT, 500 foot buffer)	3/20/2024 9:27 AM
172	Vacation Home rentals provide economic income that supports the local Lake Tahoe region by bringing visitors who spend their money on local businesses. Banning VHRs would significantly negatively impact our town's economy and cause undue hardship on the health of local businesses.	3/20/2024 9:25 AM
173	VHRs should be hosted by professional "local" management companies. No more mom and pop running these VHRs as many times they DO NOT live close enough to take care of issues when neighbors complain. I for one make it a point to have my team members meet and greet neighbors - we give our local phone numbers and tell them to call us anytime day or night if something is happening! We can control any type of compliant within minutes if a neighbor calls us! In fact, many of our team members live in the neighborhoods that VHRs are located!	3/20/2024 8:53 AM
174	We had issues with the snow removal company we had hired last year. I understand it was an unusual year for snow, however I also know that our neighbors had to help out renters from time to time because of lack of good snow removal. I do not want this added burden placed on our neighbors. I would love to see something done about the snow removal vendors to ensure that we are 'getting what we pay for'. Most of the vendors require you pay for the season up front, and I imagine that because we are not always on site to assess their work, they have the opportunity to not uphold their end of the contract because "we will never know". There were also times where the city did not plow our street in a timely fashion, which added to the issue. Our home in Tahoe was actually our first home that we purchased together as a family; we are only able to have that home because we can supplement paying our mortgage with rental income - we do not view our house as a source of income and we only just break even on covering our costs. We are just starting our family with two kids under 2, and Tahoe is a place that we want to share with our children for years to come. Eventually we would like to be able to fully cover the mortgage without rental income; however we also see the value in being able to provide additional housing for visitors. Before we purchased that home, we had a hard time finding places to come up to visit Tahoe with our dog.	3/20/2024 4:16 AM
175	I do understand and agree that bad VHR renters are not good for any neighborhood or any community on the whole. I think responsible professional management companies deter this bad behavior by informing renters and reminding renters that they are visitors to any community and must abide by good behavior. Professional property managers take the care and time and effort to screen guests and to let them know to always abide by the be a good neighbor policy. The company can ensure occupancy limits be it as it pertains to guests and vehicles. Also visitors provide great economic benefit to the local community by way of creating jobs and patronizing local businesses. We use RNR to manage our property, and they employ a large staff of employees full-time all year with good paying wages. Without a healthy VHR industry, a lot of jobs would be lost. Also when visitors come up, they enjoy all the delicious restaurants and eateries that the area has to offer. By eliminating VHRs would sharply decrease the number of visitors coming to the area. VHRs offer families and groups of friends to come up to this beautiful area and spend time together in one house and not spread out in different hotel rooms. Visitors love to be able to have quality time together under one roof and enjoy all that Tahoe has to offer as a collective unit.	3/19/2024 9:22 PM
176	We strongly oppose any attempts to take away existing VHR permits from owners and managers who are operating the rentals with integrity and respect for the community. Our home in Tahoe is the only residence that we own -- we live in the home half the year and rent elsewhere the rest of the year due to work obligations. We have a VHR permit in order to provide us with necessary income during the periods when we have to be away. Simply put, we	3/19/2024 5:14 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

would not be able to afford our rent elsewhere without this income. We have an excellent, extremely well reviewed and responsible property management company that thoroughly vets guests and deals with any issues immediately. Furthermore, the management fee that we pay to our property manager as well as myriad other local companies (snow removal, defensible space clean-up, electricians, etc.) is a direct economic infusion into the Tahoe community. We support efforts to crack down on illegal operators and repeat offenders; however, homeowners with existing VHR permits that depend on this source of rental income and engage with responsible, local property managers should not be penalized for the transgressions of these parties.

177	I would like to assume that the majority of complaints are coming from properties either operating illegally, or repeat offenders from a management company that most likely should not be in business. Was any data collected on where the majority of the complaints are coming from? I honestly can't imagine that the property management company I use would ever NOT address a complaint immediately. My point being - are we creating all of these rules for a few bad apples who should all have their permits pulled / be banned from renting. There will always be the one offs who will do everything they can to circumvent the system and not play by the rules - no matter how extensive the list of rules becomes.	3/19/2024 4:26 PM
178	Do not eliminate the +2 occupancy allowance. There's no clear benefit or justification and will only increase overhead for otherwise good VHR operators.	3/19/2024 4:13 PM
179	I would you to consider how much we as owners contribute to your economy as well as the renters that come to visit. I think everyone thinks that as a vacation home owner we are rolling in cash which is not the case we decided to purchase a home as a way to be able to visit one of our favorite places for more often but the only way we can afford to make this dream happen is by renting it out. We love the Tahoe area and are so blessed to enjoy it. I wish there was away to make the "locals" understand that the county needs us so it might be in the best interest to think about that things they are willing to stop funding if we are pushed out. Every rental lost is a loss for El Dorado county.	3/19/2024 4:07 PM
180	Long term rentals can and do in my neighborhood create problems of noise, parking, trash etc same as a VHR might. In my neighborhood the long term renters are way worse than the short term VHRs that I have on three sides of my property. As a homeowner, I know my neighbors who operate VHRs and their management companies. Communication is key for all of us to live side by side in a meaningful way. It works well if the effort is made.	3/19/2024 4:05 PM
181	This is a community composed of both residents and tourists. Neither can survive without the other since it is a symbiotic relationship. Please stop trying to overly penalize one side so the other can live as if the other doesn't exist. The ones who choose to live in a tourism focused area need to be aware that there are consequences to it.	3/19/2024 3:30 PM
182	Two person per bedroom maximum occupancy should take lofts into account, and include them as a "bedroom".	3/19/2024 2:10 PM
183	Something needs to stop... we need to take care of the lake and environment and add more enforcement of that, but not take more from rentals!	3/19/2024 1:39 PM
184	VHRs are an important economic component of El Dorado County. The only attention that has truly ever been given to this program is Administrative rather than behavior enforcement. As outlined and discussed - mirrored after the SLT program prior to Measure T - there would be more guest and owner compliance.	3/19/2024 1:33 PM
185	I really disagree with the arbitrariness of the 500 foot rule. If the cap is lowered, it should only be applied to the dense cluster/problem areas.	3/19/2024 12:42 PM
186	Consider if owner does their job and has documentation from guest on guest list/EDC rules/fines/etc...focus remediation on the offending guests and not the owner or LC. Personally I do a call to booking responsible guest for each booking and emphasize key points like occupancy, noise, parking, trash mgmt, and more. I also require them to send me a guest list and a signed doc saying they understand the rules. I've also done things like require 3 night stays (min) to hopefully avoid weekend partiers. I also have a noise monitoring system...although I am unfamiliar with any feature that would allow me to save records and store them with my LC. Anyway I have had zero complaints in 8 years and do my best to ensure it stays that way. Having said that I think we all realize there is only so much an owner can do to ensure the behavior of guests. I'm up for taking whatever steps are recommended as an owner...but I think it's unreasonable to fine the owner if they have taken those steps...and	3/19/2024 12:26 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

not fair to pull someone's permit if they have a run of bad luck with undesirable guests. Another thing to consider perhaps is expectations from booking platforms like VRBO or AirBnB. Not sure what if any leverage exists but the platforms themselves do almost nothing to weed out bad guests and do almost everything to ensure owners accept bookings and generate revenue. For example if I refuse a guest...which I've done from time to time ... my search position ranking drops significantly. Also VRBO has eliminated the ability of owners to require security deposits.....which was another thing I'd done in the past to try and weed out potential party groups ... I was requiring a substantial security deposit. Beyond the short feedback here I would be glad to further discuss, consider or be involved in the process if it would be of any help. Owning and managing a VHR is not particularly easy. We honestly do our best...and so far at least that has been very good. For what it's worth, our property at least has never turned a profit. The idea of potentially getting hit with a big fine for something completely out of my control is somewhat frustrating. We don't fine the forest service if visitors start a fire....we don't fine the police if criminals steal or worsei've not heard of hotels being fined for unruly guests ...i'm hoping we can keep the focus on the offending parties and have a balanced implementation. Thanks...

187	We had issues with the snow removal company we had hired last year. I understand it was an unusual year for snow, however I also know that our neighbors had to help out renters from time to time because of lack of good snow removal. I do not want this added burden placed on our neighbors. I would love to see something done about the snow removal vendors to ensure that we are 'getting what we pay for'. Most of the vendors require you pay for the season up front, and I imagine that because we are not always on site to assess their work, they have the opportunity to not uphold their end of the contract because "we will never know". There were also times where the city did not plow our street in a timely fashion, which added to the issue. Our home in Tahoe was actually our first home that we purchased together as a family; we are only able to have that home because we can supplement paying our mortgage with rental income - we do not view our house as a source of income and we only just break even on covering our costs. We are just starting our family with two kids under 2, and Tahoe is a place that we want to share with our children for years to come. Eventually we would like to be able to fully cover the mortgage without rental income; however we also see the value in being able to provide additional housing for visitors. Before we purchased that home, we had a hard time finding places to come up to visit Tahoe with our dog.	3/19/2024 10:38 AM
188	VHR owners are not all bad. Many of us have a VHR to help fund our property now so we can retire in South Lake Tahoe later, so we care about the community and our neighbors. VHRs also can boost the local community by supporting local businesses	3/19/2024 8:26 AM
189	While the incidences of poor visitor behavior are frustrating and disappointing, considering the hundreds of peaceful, respectful VHR rentals that occur every weekend, VHR problems are a highly visible but small minority. Tourism is our main economic engine. We should design rules and compliance enforcement to be as lightweight and cost efficient as possible. Unnecessarily reducing occupancy and requiring indoor noise monitoring is punitive and is setting a much higher standard for visitors than for long term renters or owner/residents.	3/19/2024 6:41 AM
190	There must be a limit to businesses operating out of homes in residential neighborhoods. Within my immediate area, Koru St., there is a massage business, a HR, this one legal, another HR, not legal. There has actually been a parking area created at the end of the cul-de-sac for these businesses. Traffic has increased substantially.	3/18/2024 11:37 AM
191	While I support the Committee's intent to regulate and improve the VHR program, I believe that some recommendations may not fully consider the diverse nature of properties and regions within El Dorado County. I respectfully request that these concerns be taken into account to ensure fair and effective regulation that recognizes the varying circumstances of VHR properties.	3/18/2024 10:12 AM
192	No caps on the amount of permits	3/18/2024 8:58 AM
193	Please consider that we all need this to have more tourists and make stronger our economy.	3/18/2024 12:04 AM
194	Vhrs bring revenue, local business, jobs for those servicing vhrs, and less will vhrs will ultimately benefit the remaining permit holders but not the county as a whole.	3/17/2024 9:44 PM
195	There's a giant piece missing from the puzzle. AIRBNB. Airbnb collects gigantic profits and has zero accountability. They rent to anyone, dont enforce the rules, and are completely unaccountable. When there is a complaint that requires a fine, airbnb shld be fined. Airbnb should be put on notice, enforce the rules or get kicked out of Tahoe. The same goes for other	3/17/2024 9:02 PM

VHR Advisory Committee Recommendations

booking sites. Kick them out and booking sites that take the rules seriously will replace them. The problem starts at booking, at the booking site. Fine and revoke booking sites and 85% of the issues go away. The word needs to go to the renters way b4 they arrive at Tahoe. Dont play by the rules dont come. Its like boat inspections for invasive species, do it when the boats arent near the water. Same with guests, dont wait till they show up and become a problem and hold Airbnb accountable for renting to them if they do.

196	Consider the thousands of people who will lose their jobs because of stricter ordinances like the ones that are being proposed.	3/17/2024 8:36 PM
197	These recommendations fail to consider the cost of administering the suggested changes. Will this be funded solely by fines? Will TOT funds be needed to enforce these regulations? Will non VHR generated funds be needed? If so, where will the money come from?	3/17/2024 6:13 PM
198	It appears a lot of thought has been given and I appreciate the efforts.	3/17/2024 8:47 AM
199	Although, I don't think these recommendations go far enough to control VHRs, I think implementing these recommendations would be a great start to getting South Lake Tahoe VHRs under control. Thank you to Brooke Laine for bringing this committee together! I just hope the real estate and VHR Management companies don't get in the way of these important recommendations getting implemented.	3/17/2024 7:34 AM
200	I am a full time resident who lives next to a VHR and I am fine with it. We have helped unprepared visitors to the VHR who have had trouble with access in high snow conditions.	3/16/2024 2:49 PM
201	Please reconsider the buffer of 500 feet and look to Santa Cruz and other communities that have issued a % based cap instead. You could even adjust the % by homes that are closer into town centers - maybe they get 15% and homes farther away are 10% to encourage visitors to locate closer to town centers.	3/16/2024 1:46 PM
202	The position of the houses is far to close to allow vacation rentals not fair to residents.	3/16/2024 1:08 PM
203	Limit the VHRs and we reduce the impacts of traffic and overcrowding to the lake. By limiting the numbers of VHRs we will limit the weekend spikes we see. Visitors need to start coming midweek, spread out the impact. Thank you.	3/16/2024 12:40 PM