

#32



EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

LATE DISTRIBUTION**Vacation House Rentals**

1 message

DATE

7/24/2018

BOS 7/24/2018

Allen, Leona <lallen@mail.ltcc.edu>

Mon, Jul 23, 2018 at 3:57 PM

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Cc: "Allen, Leona" <lallen@mail.ltcc.edu>

Honorary El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

As I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting, I wanted to submit my opinion regarding VHRs in general and the changes being considered regarding a cap on the numbers as well as anti-clustering formulas:

- 900 is NOT an acceptable cap number. This would ADD to the current problem and create even more turmoil in our neighborhoods.
- A **temporary halt** to any new permits should occur immediately to decrease the influx of problem VHRs and increase the desire of management companies and the Board of Supervisors to deal with the issue in a timely manner.
- A 500 foot limit between VHRs should be created. As permits expire, the business will only be given consideration again if there is not currently a permitted VHR within 500 feet.
- The possibility of a transitional ban in the City of South Lake Tahoe will impact us significantly and create more problems for our residents. Urgency should be considered regarding the issue before we are inundated, and must consider such an initiative ourselves.
- Frustrated Tahoe residents are growing in numbers, which will negatively impact the reputation of our area as a tourist destination. To maintain the strength of our economy, a stronger solution must be put in place.

Thank you for you attention to this matter.

Leona Allen
1897 Toppewetah Street
Meyers, CA



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 7/24/18 #32

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Vhr letter for board please forward

1 message

ERIN U WISEMAN <ewtahoe@yahoo.com>

Tue, Jul 24, 2018 at 11:37 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Please submit to El Dorado Board of Supervisors for upcoming VHR discussion.

Thank you

Erin Wiseman
County of El Dorado Resident
530-416-1367

 VHR 072418 EDC Erin Wiseman.pdf
29K

July 24, 2018

RE: El Dorado County Vacation Rentals (VHR's)

Dear El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

I wanted to let the Board of Supervisors of El Dorado County know that there are lots of people in favor of vacation rentals in the Tahoe Basin. I am very excited of the progress that has been made in the VHR ordinance establishing clearer rules and enforcement as well as moving enforcement out of the tax dept.. I'd like the county to continue in this direction and see how things are working before making additional restrictions. I've heard there is now discussion on VHR permit caps, tenant number caps, special use permitting requirements, etc. Please let the new rules be in effect for a year before considering these additional items. My job as well as my husband's job relies almost entirely on VHR's. Without that income I don't know if we could stay in Tahoe. Let your county planners use their expertise and determine each case separately for propriety & guest count.

I recently obtained a VHR permit for our personal residence as my elderly parents who live in San Diego are requiring more day to day care and thus we need to supplement income while we are away to cover our home expenses. Bringing them to Tahoe is not an option due to the altitude and snow. We already make monthly trips to SD and that will no doubt increase in time. This will be a temporary situation and I don't want to be forced to sell my house as this is the house we built, raised our children and hope to spend our golden years. We haven't rented our home yet, but that will change later this year I'm sure and so I wanted to be prepared. We will both need to be in Tahoe for our work regularly so a longterm rental is not an option. This merely points out the fact that VHR's are necessary for many things and may be a necessity for people at

various points in their life. Please don't add unnecessary rules in an ever increasingly difficult world to live in.

Also, Tahoe is a very special place and that is why we are here. But unfortunately the population of the world continues to grow significantly. Tahoe does not belong just to us. We just got lucky enough to get here. We have to be prepared for the onslaught of visitors each year – and at greater numbers each year. It is a reality! If we don't allow for additional accommodations we will price ourselves up so far that only the elite can visit. Shouldn't this be accessible by more than just the elite. By allowing for additional accommodations we can keep the prices more reasonable (supply and demand) and accommodate more visitors. Do we want to promote day trips only? No way – our roads, gas, traffic couldn't handle that. Plus, let's allow for a living wage in Tahoe just like everywhere else. So many jobs are created, and businesses sustained by allowing VHR's and visitors. Let's just learn to manage them.

Erin Wiseman

El Dorado County Resident, South Lake Tahoe

**LATE DISTRIBUTION**DATE 7/24/18 #32

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Deny Ad Hoc Recommendations

1 message

Zach <zachs300@gmail.com>

Tue, Jul 24, 2018 at 12:39 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear El Dorado Board of Supervisors,

I am strongly opposed to placing any additional restrictions on vacation home rentals and my property rights. Responsible homeowners should not have their property rights restricted due to unenforced existing VHR rules! Just like South Lake the next step will likely be a proposed ban or "phase out" of rentals which this opposition group is pushing for.

Do you want people to lose the financial ability to keep their homes in good condition, to pay for fire abatement, pay taxes, to improve their property, to provide jobs for cleaners, handymen, plumbers, and other jobs? Not to mention the tourist who bring their families and even pets to visit the Tahoe area. All these people, including the community as a whole, benefit from VHRs when it comes to financial resources. New laws will lead to unintended consequences.

The real issues here are minor. Noise, trash and parking are covered by existing laws. This California mentality of making a new law and restricting my rights for every little issue is ridiculous.

Regards,
Z. Ladner

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 7/24/18 #32

July 24, 2017

RE: El Dorado County Vacation Rentals (VHR's)

Dear El Dorado County Supervisors,

I have recently heard of some additional considerations for updating the Vacation Rental Ordinance for El Dorado County by the Board of Supervisors. I am in favor of VHR's in our county and in the Lake Tahoe area. I am happy with the changes to the county VHR ordinance so far including establishing clear and measurable rules, enhancing enforcement, updating the permitting process, and promoting Good Neighbor behavior. I understand there are a few significant changes that you are now considering; including a cap on the number of VHR's in the county; a limit on the maximum allowable people at a rental to 12; and the possible addition of a special use permit to allow increasing that maximum allowable number of people.

I am opposed to any caps, bans or moratoriums on VHR's. I understand there are county residents who are pushing hard for a ban and that you are considering these caps to address their concerns. However, I would like to see the county give the new clear and measurable rules a chance with stronger enforcement before more harsh steps are taken. If you do feel a cap is the only way, I feel that the number I've heard of 900 is too tight, plus any cap should only be considered if there is some room for growth; such as a percentage per year allowable increase to accommodate our growing county as well as the growing population and the always changing needs of our visitors. I believe the City of South Lake Tahoe put a cap of 1,400 – which is a much, much smaller area. The 900 cap in the county seems inappropriate.

I have also heard that you are considering capping the allowable number of renters at a VHR to 12. I have built many large homes that were purchased as Vacation Rentals. I work with the buyer to enhance each property to better serve as a Vacation Rental – These enhancements include upgraded windows to reduce sound; installation of Air Conditioning to allow for closed windows in the summertime when it is hot and thereby reduce the noise; provide landscaping to screen house and open area from neighbors; locate and screen decks and hot tubs to reduce noise; provide recreational facilities within the home such as indoor swimming pools, theaters,

and large kitchens and dining areas to allow for more in-home recreation and reduce the needs for tenants to be outdoors. I have worked directly with neighbors of the houses I build to add features they would like to see to mitigate noise, etc. On my own properties, we hire a local Management Company who also has a security officer on staff and monitors sound and parking via sensors and cameras that monitor 24/7 when there is a rental. Trash is disposed of directly at the Refuse Company rather than being placed at the curb. My point is that a cap of 12 is inappropriate as each home and location needs to be addressed individually through the permitting process. Some of the homes I build are very large, but are also located on large pieces of land, and some are remote. I feel that the permitting process currently in place can address how each house is used and permitted rather than requiring a special use permit. Unfortunately 'Special Use Permits' are extremely expensive potentially running \$7,000-\$10,000 and quite burdensome in nature in filing. We don't need more fees and paperwork when the new permitting process works. Land and Building costs are extremely expensive in the Lake Tahoe Basin and in California overall and simply adding more fees is not the answer. It is cost effective to build larger homes on lots that can accommodate larger homes. Building codes already address these issues with coverage limits, etc. Rather than a costly 'Special Use Permit', the permitting process should merely include a review that determines that a property is appropriate for the number of tenants to be allowed as the current ordinance states and the current procedures allow. I know that the county employs many 'City Planners' who are professional, educated individuals who should be more than capable of reviewing properties for appropriateness during the permitting process.

As the builder, I make a huge investment in these homes in our county, as does the buyer. Let's keep the investments in our county and not push them elsewhere. Plus, it is evident that renters want these larger homes. They want to all be together to socialize, make their meals, etc. Many of the renters are not just families but companies who use these homes for training sessions. This is a changing world and we need to be receptive and not push them away to other counties. If we stop letting larger homes be used as rentals we'll end up with the large group of renters renting many homes and merely spending more time on our roads getting together – whereas

we can reduce traffic by keeping people together at one location.
Let's not discourage large rentals!

In addition, the investors in our community like me need clear information before we make any financial commitments. I need to know in advance if there will be an issue getting a VHR permit for a specific house before I spend millions of dollars building it. I have large parcels where I'd like to build large homes, which may be sold ultimately for use as a VHR. I need to know before I buy that parcel, and before I build, what I can use that parcel/home for – can it be designed as a VHR? Or not. I'd like to update the ordinance/permitting to allow permitting prior to construction/purchase of a home – to ensure the investor (builder or buyer) knows exactly what he can use the house for. Currently with the City of South Lake Tahoe, a VHR permit can be obtained prior to construction once a building permit has been obtained, whereas the county VHR permit cannot be requested until a house is finalized from the Building Dept. But we need to go one step further and be able to get VHR permits prior to even construction permitting or property purchasing. By the time you have obtained a Building Permit, you have already spent hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The economic impact of VHR's in our community is considerable. The VHR's provide jobs for so many of our local residents including Construction, Janitorial, Property Management, Repair and maintenance, Law Enforcement and tourist based businesses like restaurants and retail to name a few.

I know that the County has come up with a better ordinance and better permitting procedures to eliminate Vacation Rentals problems. The potential income to our county government as well as our community greatly outweighs any quick and rash decisions. The potential for several new county positions to permit, monitor and enforce VHR's at the expense of these VHR's through TOT receipts and fees is compelling enough to continue the efforts in favor of VHR's.

Please vote to not cap VHR's, not cap number of renters, not require Special Use Permits and get VHR's permits in advance of investment.

Robert McIntyre

Resident of South Lake Tahoe



LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE 7/24/18 #32

Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>

Supervisors Meeting 07/24/2018

1 message

Josh Priou <jpriou@tahoeres.com>

Tue, Jul 24, 2018 at 9:37 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, Sue Novasel <bosfive@edcgov.us>, jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us

Hello El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

Unfortunately I am unable to make it to the Placerville meeting, I was planning on it but am no longer able to. I am hoping it's not too late to get this information recorded in today's public hearing. If possible, please present this information in the BOS meeting today and enter the info into public comment. Please let me know whether is possible. Either way I will attend the Ad Hoc meeting on Thursday.

I have attached 2 reports, one based on the City's noise complaints and one on the lost revenue in case the County decided to vote on lower occupancies.

1. City Stats - Just as I have been sending the County Supervisors weekly statistics on complaints and violations within the City, I put together an entire report of all the noise complaints and violations, including maximum occupancy for each of the properties with violations. The County somehow thinks that lowering maximum occupancy by 2 people and limiting the total # of occupants to 12 will somehow stop the noise complaints. This is not true according to my stats.

a. With a very intense enforcement program within the City and an average arrival time of 12 minutes from dispatch to the home, the Police have only served citations to 24% of the complaints. There were 215 total noise complaints and only 51 citations. As I have always said, this is a relatively small problem. With 1400 VHR's and an average 90 nights per year booked, that's a total of 126,000 potential problems. 126,000 potential problems, only 215 complaints and only 51 actual violations over a year period.

b. When looking at the statistics on the what houses have caused the complaints there is relatively no bearing on occupancy whatsoever.

- i. 8 maximum caused 20% of the citations
- ii. 10 max caused 27%
- iii. 12 max caused 24%
- iv. More than 12 max caused 24%

c. If you lower occupancy by 2 what does that actually accomplish? If you had a 10 maximum and you lowered it to 8, there will still be the same amount of complaints. It makes no difference and using the facts I have provided you can see that your thought of lowering occupancy only comes from the few of your constituents who don't like rentals. Their opinion is that lowering the occupancy will make a difference but the proof shows that it would not.

2. Transient Occupancy Taxes – By lowering the occupancy by 2 people per each rental, my analysis shows that 30% of all rentals would be required to lower the maximum occupancies. With 825 VHR's in the County 248 would have to lower them. This would decrease their daily pricing by an average \$65.00 per day. This would cause a total lost revenue to home owners of \$1,773,200 and a loss in TOT of \$177,320 to the County.

7/24/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Supervisors Meeting 07/24/2018

Please be careful in making your decision to lower occupancy by 2 people, not only would it make no difference in the amount of complaints but it would also cost home owners and El Dorado County a significant amount of money.

Joshua Priou

Director of Product Development

Lake Tahoe Accommodations

530-543-4129

800-255-6039

<http://www.tahoeaccommodations.com/>

2 attachments

 **07-23-18 City Noise Stas vs. Occ.xlsx**
23K

 **El Dorado County Meeting 07-24-18.docx**
22K

El Dorado County Meeting 07/24/2018

Lowering Occupancy from 2 per bedroom + 4 to 2 per bedroom + 2 would cause a significant decrease in revenue to home owners and El Dorado County.

- 30% of homes would have to lower their occupancy
- Of 825 total VHR's – 248 would be required to lower occupancy
- \$65.00 decrease in daily pricing to rent as often
- Average VHR rents 110 days per year
- \$7,150.00 decrease in revenue to each home owner
- $\$7,150.00 \times 248 \text{ units} = \$1,773,200$ total loss in revenue to home owners
- @10% TOT = \$177,320.00 loss in revenue to Douglas County

Plus, home owners outfitted their homes with the +4 in mind, buying sofa sleepers, bunk beds, etc. to maximize their occupancy. Now this furniture will be rendered useless.

Lake Tahoe Accommodations only allows guests to sleep in beds. We will not advertise a home with occupancy higher than the actual available bedding will allow.

Date	Address	Violation	No Violation	Actual # of People Present	Max Occupancy
07/01/2017	1466 Frontier		X	22	22
07/01/2017	745 Colorado	X		N/A?	14
07/01/2017	1872 Genevieve		X	10	12
07/01/2017	845 Merced		X	10	12
07/01/2017	921 Rainbow		X	6	10
07/02/2017	3714 Verdon		X	5	14
07/02/2017	544 Gardner		X	14	14
07/03/2017	1310 Omalley		X	12	12
07/03/2017	1406 Keller	X		30	10
07/03/2017	2299 Montana	X		13	10
07/03/2017	2707 Knox		X	7	8
07/03/2017	3293 Pinehill	X		15	12
07/03/2017	3384 Bruce		X	6	N/A
07/03/2017	3702 Verdon	X		20	12
07/03/2017	3800 Forest		X	12	10
07/03/2017	544 Gardner	X		14	14
07/03/2017	921 Rainbow		X	5	10
07/03/2017	940 Star Lake		x	7	10
07/04/2017	1200 Tata		x	7	12
07/04/2017	1291 Heather Lake		x	5	14
07/04/2017	1464 Glenwood		x	15	10
07/04/2017	2921 Freel Peak		x	N/A?	10
07/04/2017	544 Gardner		x	14	14
07/04/2017	639 Anita	x		11	11
07/04/2017	750 El Dorado	x		30	10
07/06/2017	1114 Fairway		x	7	10
07/06/2017	1323 Angora Lake	x		10	10
07/06/2017	1466 Frontier		x	0	22
07/06/2017	2299 Montana	x		9	10
07/07/2017	1390 Ski Run		x	0	6
07/07/2017	2111 Lukins		x	8	12
07/07/2017	3313 Marlette		x	8	8
07/07/2017	639 Anita		x	11	12
07/07/2017	801 Julie		x	0	16
07/08/2017	1130 Fairway		x	8	12
07/08/2017	3433 Warr		x	12	12
07/09/2017	1705 Venice		x	3	14
07/09/2017	2196 Venice		x	13	14
07/09/2017	766 Hazel		x	6	12
07/13/2017	2958 Oakland		x	0	12

07/12/2017	3789 Needle Peak		x	8	10
07/14/2017	1363 Wildwood	x		11	12
07/14/2017	3673 David	x		30	14
07/15/2017	2196 Venice		x	9	14
07/15/2017	2209 Dana		x	4	10
07/15/2017	2883 Springwood		x	8	12
07/15/2017	3852 Private Rd		x	8	8
07/15/2017	910 Council Rock		x	12	12
07/16/2017	716 Clement St		x	0	10
07/16/2017	716 Clement St		x	10	10
07/17/2017	3806 Steven Ln		x	3	10
07/21/2017	1112 Fairway		x	8	8
07/22/2017	1363 Wildwood	x		10	12
07/22/2017	420 Wedeln Ct		x	2	10
07/22/2017	840 Paloma Ave		x	1	12
07/23/2017	1336 Susie Lake		x	11	12
07/23/2017	936 Edgewood		x	6	12
07/23/2017	936 Edgewood		x	6	12
07/24/2017	801 Julie Ln		x	6	8
07/24/2017	839 Tata Ln		x	9	12
07/25/2017	3341 Pine Hill	x		11	10
07/25/2017	3542 Bobby Grey	x		15	10
07/26/2017	1466 Frontier		x	10	22
07/26/2017	639 Anita Dr		x	12	12
07/28/2017	3046 Bellevue		x	10	10
07/29/2017	1310 Omalley		x	10	12
07/29/2017	3789 Needle Peak		x	10	10
07/31/2017	1310 Omalley		x	9	12
08/03/2017	755 Tata Ln		x	12	12
08/04/2017	1871 Weir Way		x	6	12
08/04/2017	745 Los Angeles	x		8	12
08/05/2017	1117 Tata		x	14	14
08/05/2017	3633 Mackedie		x	14	14
08/05/2017	4077 Saddle		x	8	10
08/05/2017	576 Alpine Dr		x	2	18
08/05/2017	750 Stanford		x	4	7
08/05/2017	812 South Shore		x	4	8
08/06/2017	1053 Shepherds		x	5	8
08/06/2017	1310 Omalley		x	4	10
08/06/2017	2806 Springwood		x	9	11
08/08/2017	1310 Omalley		x	8	10

08/10/2017	2730 Bertha		x	6	12
08/11/2017	1665 Venice		x	11	12
08/11/2017	729 Sand Harbor		x	5	11
08/12/2017	1310 Omalley		x	3	10
08/12/2017	2730 Bertha		x	8	12
08/15/2017	3315 Deer Park		x	4	8
08/18/2017	1310 Omalley		x	3	10
08/18/2017	3692 Verdon	x		12	8
08/18/2017	845 Merced		x	11	12
08/19/2017	1337 Wildwood		x	12	12
08/19/2017	1391 Wildwood		x	0	16
08/19/2017	1519 Walkup		x	8	10
08/19/2017	1965 Dagget		x	0	10
08/19/2017	3170 Pasadena		x	8	8
08/19/2017	3491 April		x	10	12
08/20/2017	1310 Omalley		x	4	12
08/20/2017	2130 Monterey		x	10	12
08/20/2017	3633 Mackedie Way		x	11	14
08/20/2017	3790 Needle Peak	x		10	12
08/21/2017	2612 Osbourne		x	12	12
08/22/2017	3433 Warr Rd		x	12	12
08/24/2017	936 Edgewood Cir		x	9	12
08/25/2017	2030 Garmish		x	9	12
08/25/2017	2158 Harvard		x	11	14
08/26/2017	1336 Susie Lake		x	12	12
08/26/2017	2030 Garmish		x	9	12
08/26/2017	2730 Bertha		x	10	12
08/26/2017	2920 Sacramento		x	8	12
08/29/2017	721 Los Angeles	x		50	10
08/26/2017	729 Sand Harbor		x	12	12
08/26/2017	766 Hazel		x	4	12
08/26/2017	880 Tahoe Island Dr		x	4	8
08/27/2017	544 Gardner	x		5	14
08/27/2017	839 Tata Ln		x	6	12
09/01/2017	1363 Wildwood		x	8	12
09/01/2017	1964 Marconi		x	14	14
09/01/2017	544 Gardner	x		13	14
09/01/2017	920 San Francisco		x	8	10
09/02/2017	2033 Garmish		x	8	12
09/02/2017	630 Tahoe Island	x		6	12
09/02/2017	921 Rainbow		x	10	10

09/03/2017	721 Los Angeles		x	7	10
09/03/2017	839 Tata Ln		x	12	12
09/07/2017	1468 June Way		x	2	16
09/08/2017	1466 Frontier		x	10	22
09/08/2017	2158 Harvard		x	12	14
09/22/2017	2649 Pinter		x	9	12
09/29/2017	2158 Harvard	x		10	14
10/29/2017	2212 Tahoe Vista		x	11	12
10/29/2017	3333 Pine Hill Rd	x		50	10
11/18/2017	767 Lassen	x		6	8
11/20/2017	769 Patricia	x		7	10
11/22/2017	2111 Lukins		x	8	12
12/02/2017	1357 Gilmore Lake		x	2	12
12/08/2017	3471 April		x	2	10
12/16/2017	2649 Pinter		x	2	12
12/18/2017	1468 Ski Rn		x	22	24
12/19/2017	1321 Ski Run	x		15	18
12/19/2017	1468 Ski Run		x	22	22
12/20/2017	1468 Ski Run		x	22	24
12/20/2017	3639 Saddle	x		23	20
12/30/2017	2331 Sky Meadows		x	4	8
12/30/2017	489 Tahoe Keys #49		x	3	4
12/30/2017	770 Wentworth		x	3	4
12/30/2017	920 Rainbow	x		2	10
12/31/2017	2699 Elwood		x	2	8
12/31/2017	2699 Elwood	x		3	8
12/31/2017	870 Paloma		x	0	10
01/01/2018	839 Tata Ln	x		6	12
01/03/2018	1088 Charles		x	8	8
01/04/2018	1117 Tata		x	6	12
01/05/2018	2107 Lukins		x	0	12
01/06/2017	801 Julie Ln	x		7	3
01/09/2018	766 Hazel		x	12	12
01/10/2018	936 Edgewood		x	4	12
01/11/2018	962 Los Angeles		x	4	16
01/12/2018	1032 Lodi		x	2	8
01/13/2018	1337 Wildwood		x	4	12
01/13/2018	769 Patricia	x		3	10
01/14/2018	796 Alameda		x	2	10
01/14/2018	801 Julie	x		8	8
01/15/2018	1388 Tata Ln	x		6	6

01/18/2018	2462 Pinter		x	4	8
01/27/2018	3792 Osgood		x	3	10
01/28/2018	721 Los Angeles		x	1	8
01/28/2018	738 Colorado		x	7	8
02/03/2018	1144 Stockton	x		6	10
02/03/2018	2684 William		x	5	8
02/03/2018	3692 Verdon	x		6	8
02/04/2018	1160 Herbert		x	0	8
02/09/2018	802 San Jose		x	5	12
02/10/2018	682 Clement		x	9	10
02/11/2018	722 Gardner	x		7	12
02/11/2018	827 South Shore		x	2	8
02/16/2018	868 Tahoe Island		x	7	12
02/16/2018	877 Tahoe Island		x	2	12
02/18/2018	1921 Cathedral	x		7	12
03/15/2018	1200 Wildwood #2	x		4	4
03/24/2018	870 Paloma		x	2	10
03/24/2018	1273 Gilmore Lake		x	0	12
04/01/2018	3533 Rocky Point	x		5	8
04/01/2018	682 Clement		x	0	10
04/02/2018	703 Roger		x	13	16
04/04/2018	2107 Lukins		x	4	12
04/06/2018	769 Patricia	x		5	10
04/07/2018	1157 Glenwood	x		6	8
04/20/2018	801 Julie Ln	x		3	8
04/21/2018	844 El Dorado	x		30	8
04/22/2018	1117 Tata	x		4	12
04/28/2018	745 Colorado	x		1	14
05/05/2018	3692 Verdon		x	8	8
05/12/2018	3635 Mackedie	x		10	14
05/14/2018	679 Clement		x	0	8
05/17/2018	766 Hazel		x	8	12
05/19/2018	801 Julie	x		3	8
05/19/2018	426 Emerald		x	4	16
05/19/2018	4081 Manzanita		x	0	12
05/27/2018	2111 Lukins		x	4	12
06/02/2018	3854 Regina	x		6	14
06/03/2018	2111 Lukins		x	12	12
06/09/2018	3714 Verdon	x		20	16
06/15/2018	815 South Shore		x	7	12
06/15/2018	766 Hazel		x	4	12

06/16/2018	766 Hazel	x	0	12
06/22/2018	1933 13th St	x	0	10
06/22/2018	3847 Saddle	x	5	10
06/23/2018	1322 Angora Lake	x	1	8
06/23/2017	729 Sand Harbor	x	8	12
06/23/2018	1363 Wildwood	x	10	12
06/23/2018	2111 Lukins	x	4	12
06/23/2018	3599 Spruce Ave	x	3	8
06/24/2018	1135 Fairway	x	4	10
06/30/2018	1363 Wildwood	x	8	12
06/30/2018	802 San Jose	x	0	12

215 Total Noise Complaints

51 Total Noise Violations

24% Verified

1400 total rentals x 90 days = 126,000 potential problems with only 51 complaints

Of Violatons Based on the # of Maximum Occupants

4 Max - 2 Violations - 3%

6 Max - 1 Violation - 2%

8 Max - 10 Violations - 20%

10 Max - 14 Violations - 27%

12 Max - 12 Violations - 24%

12 Or More Max - 12 Violations - 24%

Average Percantage of Occupancy

4 Sleeper - 1%

6 Sleeper - 18%

8 Sleeper - 28%

10 Sleeper - 28%

12 Sleeper - 14%

12+ Sleeper - 11%