The fees for everything is getting so high. the strs provide an economic boos tot the area with spending. Unfortunately the proposed increased rooms with new adjacent hotels in IV will hurt the STRs and the shift towards global travel versus US due to the economy in the US we are really hurting. Esp those in HOAs who have also been

- 1 hit with new fees for STRs by their HOAs The reason it costs so much is that your system is crazy bureaucratic. You should simplify your processes to reduce
- 2 bureaucracy, not increase fees to feed that bureaucracy.
- 3 How are the fees administered and why doesn't it cover expenses AirBnb booking are off 50% for me & the company lost money as Globally reported June 2023, punchcard passes have less on each card 2023-2024 from \$ 156.00 to \$ 91.00. The globally supplu chain still in progress as the world
- 4 is on fire....this is NOT the year to chrage more if anything charge less.
 Can you be more efficient so the large costs you have already imposed can be converd without a raise in fee? This is
- 5 especially hard for people who did not rent last year due to repairs, etc.
 13% is already too much. I get input from guests all the time complaining of the fee. This program should be funded
 6 by the 13% tax and current app fees.
- Please take into account the additional revenue the STR brings to the community ie: restaurants, retail, recreation, 7 which helps sustain and drive the local economy.
 - I pay a large amount in annual transient fees occupancy taxes (I think it is 10-15% of mr gross revenues). Where does that money go? Is it unreasonable that some of that money can be used to fund STR administration. Also, why do management companies get a discount? Is it not discriminating against individual landlords? You seem to be
- 8 incentivising a big corporate system. Whereas individual landlords truly care about and know neighbors etc.
- 9 I cannot believe the current fees do not cover the costs of administration. Please provide documentation

The STR program requirements are complicated and cumbersome. Reduce the complexity and maybe you won't need so much staff to administer it and it won't cost so much. Or if you do raise rates, how about providing some relaxation on the requirements for those STRs who have been permitted for the last 2 years and are in good standing? For example, remove the requirement for 24/7 local contact if no complaints received about STR in last 2

- 10 years. Let owner be contact even if not local in those cases. Local contact costs me \$900 a year. Besides the application fee you are also making money on the quarterly taxes that are collected on each str. So I do not think the application should be the only money be evaluated in the cost for the str.
- 11

The permitting scheme also benefits non-STR owners. As such they should share in a portion of the cost in 12 maintaining this regulatory scheme.

Should some of the tax revenue the county receives cover the cost. Not just the permits. It seems unfair with all the 13 tax revenue STRs bring in to not allocate some dollars from there to the administration costs.

14 The 13% RSCVA tax restricts our ability to charge guests more. That should subsidize the administration costs.

I don't believe that we currently get what we pay for - you can only file complaints online 24/7, you live person is only available M-F from 9-4pm I believe. Also, I live in a Condo complex and it seems many of our issues/complaints are out of scope for the handling violations. Parking, Noise, etc. - we're told to go to our HOA so why pay Washoe County more \$? I also don't believe that you are cracking down on non permitted STR's - I've files complaints on several in my complex. I had to do all of the log work, maybe you should be paying mol.

- 15 my complex I had to do all of the leg work, maybe you should be paying me!
- 16 Cancel this wasteful STR program.

If the cost to administer this administrative burden is too much, the solution should be to reduce the administrative burden, not to increase fees. Government does best what it does least. Reduce the size, scope, and power of these 17 administrative activites, or abolish them altogether.

The local governments seem to have a strong funding source coming from the bed taxes. I think there should be already plenty of money to fund administration of the program and have money left over. If the set up costs are too high, there could be a reluctance to proceed. More simply put, too many fees could strangle the goose before the first

18 egg is laid.

Where is the supporting evidence that current fees do not cover the program? When homeowners are required to participate in a program that fees are increasing for, there must be irrefutable documentation to support. There are countless fees that homeowners incur to offer their home as a short term rental & instituting a program that does not benefit the homeowner and further increasing those fees further reducing any benefit to the homeowner) is in place to only serve local government. The whole program should be reevaluated and homeowners should have a full understanding of how this program actually benefits them, from what I can tell, it is unnecessary and quite literally

- 19 unconstitutional.
- 20 The specific increases were not provided, so it's difficult to offer an opinion without those details.
- Please describe the full flow of STR income that the county receives (including any income received directly from 21 bookings through the major platforms)
- I would like the permit fees to be even higher to discourage all the STR's which are growing too guickly and making 22 local housing more difficult.
- Why do we even need permits. Everything seemed to be just fine before the program existed. I don't mind paying the 23 fees but I don't think we need the permits.
- What do you receive for fees. There is inflation and the fee increase will just be past to guests which could make 24 enjoying Lake Tahoe beauty of of reach
- 25 Washoe county collects taxes on each reservation. why don't they contribute those funds toward str administrationb.

We have a 1440 sq. ft. ,3 bedroom, 2 bath ,condo in Incline Village , at 999 Lakeshore Blvd, that we vacation rent using Sunbear Realty as our property manager. It has beds to sleep 6 people. We have one designated parking space and one guest space for our unit. Our complaint is that we are only allowed to advertise that it sleeps 4 as we only have 1 assigned (and numbered)parking space . Apparently, the 40+ guest spaces ,in our 60 unit complex, aren't taken into consideration. We feel that this makes no sense. And, that it is discriminatory : we lose rentals as we have to FALSELY advertise that it only sleeps 4 when, in reality, it sleeps 6. There is plenty of guest parking, in our opinion. We have never not been able to find guest parking -even during holidays when our families have had 3 cars visiting. We ask Washoe County to rescind this restrictive rule and take GUEST parking spaces into considerationeven if it has to be done on an individual basis. Best regards, Barbara Sundahl and Jeanette Petek, owners of 999

- 26 Lakeshore #18.
- 27 A small one bedroom rental seems excessive as to fees.

A full accounting of financials should be provided as I believe there is a lack of trust from STR owners on how funds are actually being used (and if funds are being used for services outside of the STR program). Remember- there 28 used to be zero fees to run a STR in unincorporated Washor County.

29 Why is STR program needed ? I should be able to rent my property without it as in other areas in the US

How much additional tax revenue is generated by the County from short term rentals (outside of the STR fees). This should include all taxes, including sales tax generated by the additional visitors, as well as any occupancy taxes or 30 fees.

Our STR, while in Washoe County, is 4 hours north of Reno. We reside in the rural ranching community of Vya, Nevada (OTHER in your drop down menu below as we're 90 miles north of Gerlach/Empire) and we should not have the same STR requirements of heavily populated areas in Washoe County. We do not have protection by Truckee Meadows or North Lake Tahoe fire districts and in looking at the Development Code (Washoe County Code Chapter 110) Short-Term Rental (STR) Applications document, a rural category should be established to cover our situation. At this point, it is felt that our annual STR licensing costs are excessive and unnecessary and are subsidizing STR owners who live in the Truckee Meadows and North Lake Tahoe fire districts. If STR price increases are approved, please consider a rural waiver for those of us who are already paying property taxes equivalent to those in the Reno/Tahoe areas but are not receiving the same Washoe County benefits (we have no schools or waste disposal services here, as examples, but are still required to pay for them). It is understood that there are costs to provide the 31 initial permit but please consider giving us a pass with annual renewal fees. Thank you.

- 32 The benefits of STR administration go far beyond regulating STR owners. As such, costs should be shared.
- 33 Do away with the STR program altogether, for many years it wasn't necessary, why now?

Your statement says that current rates do not cover the current expenses. Can you share where or how the monies currently collected are spent and show how much is unfunded. Can you share how much the proposed increase will

- 34 close the gap. I guess I'm basically asking for the current budget, and the projected budget. Is that possible? You do nothing to facilitate homeowners in managing their properties. Why should you be charging fees to these
- 35 homeowner? It seems that you want to support the property managers rather than the homeowners. I believe some amount of subsidization from the General Fund is acceptable and appropriate given that responsiblyoperated and permitted-STRs, like other forms of tourism hospitality, have a net positive economic impact for
- 36 Washoe County.

The well organized and professional STR Permit office should receive funds from local businesses because the quests of STR's make or break these local businesses. One more time: The MAIN BENEFICIARYS OF STR'S ARE THE LOCAL BUSINESSES!!!!!!!!!! THE LOCAL BUSINESSES SHOULD PAY THEIR SHAIR OF THE STR PERMIT

- **37 AND ENFORCEMENT OFFICE.**
- 38 I think there should be enforcement officers for the public to call after 5 pm on Friday -Sunday.
- Would like to better understanding where the money is going too. Fees seems to be high for the service that is being 39 offered. Now that STR program has been around for a couple of years. What has the result.

This service is overstepping any necessary need and is becoming another bureaucratic overkill. Go back to basics and do not try to do more than is necessary to balance actual value added needs of owners, guests and other 40 residents!

- 41 I don't think there even needs to be a permit
- 42 The self-report renewal permit should not be increased more than \$100.

We feel there should be a distinction in fees between full-time STR owners and those like us that use it primarily for our own family and friends and only rent it out on a limited basis as an STR to help cover increasing costs of living and maintaining our home in Incline Village. Those that have purchased or converted their real estate into a full time business renting it as an STR have more resources to dedicate to an increased fee than those that only rent it out part time. Therefore, there should be different rates of fees for owners based on how they rent. This could also be 43 based on a percentage of the number of days rented (similar to the RSCVA occupancy fee).

How often is the hotlline called? What is taking up staff time, that is the reason for proposing the fee changes? 44 What is the number for owners to call with questions?

#1 - The fees are quite high to begin with. #2 For properties that are only rented a small portion of the year(example: less than 5 weeks total), shouldn't we consider something different (less fees or no STR license). Full time rentals

45 are a very different consideration, yet are treated the same as part time(sub 4 week) rentals Short term rentals remove precious inventory from the already gaunt housing market and should be taxed

- 46 accordingly.
- 47 Need to re apply for permit after sale of house.

Can the program administration budget shortfall be made up from occupancy taxes levied against STRs? Why does the fee increase proposal not include a scenario where the 10% discount for STRs managed by property managers 48 be abolished?

- 49 Short term rentals are important for home owners, renters, and the area economy.
- This is unlawful and lawsuits will be filed. You cannot just keep increasing fees when you want and attempt to justify 50 it. This is more likely out of spite. Greedy. Corrupt.
- The current Host Compliance software does not detect differences between STR permit occupancy numbers versus what STR owners advertise, which is often a higher occupancy than their permit. I have reported this several times to county staff.

There is currently no staffed STR enforcement. The community needs an STR code enforcement to cover the 51 weekends, when most STR violations occur.

Your continued encouragement of STR proliferation in unincorporated Washoe County is against the constituants will 52 and inordinately disproportionately pro-business expansion.

We need more than higher STR fees than are proposed. STRs pack more people into single family dwellings than they were ever designed for, with resulting increased traffic on county roads, increased use and costs of our water and sewer systems, parking of boats, campers and trailers on public streets for months on end, increased need for more law enforcement, and a multi-fold increase in population in an environmentally sensitive and an already peoplepressured Tahoe basin. There is good reason why Fodor's travel guide advised tourists to avoid Tahoe, and STRs are a large part of the root cause. Unfortunately, if you see who benefits from STRs, follow the money; it's STR landlords and non-resident corporations; real estate agents; and the Washoe County Treasury. Benefits to actual residents who live here and form the heart of the community are less obvious. Incline Village is a money-maker primarily for these three groups/entities and create more costs than the costs of simply "administering the STR program". STRs are OK to a certain reasonable degree, they patronize "local"businesses (although many of these businesses employ people who can't afford to live in Incline Village/Crystal Bay) but Washoe County needs to do a better job of insuring that the Tahoe basin and Incline Village/Crystal Bay isn't over-run with STRs, and put some controls on "how many" and "where" as other communities have successfully done, because our village is turning into a commercial enterprise with a heart and soul made primarily of dollar signs. Increasing fees by \$350-\$500 is a drop in the bucket when compared to the true social and environmental costs to our community and region. Even the National Park Service has found a way to manage excess demand over supply to allow for a better user experience while helping protect an environmental treasure. Surely Washoe County can do the same, and increasing the STR 53 fee isn't anywhere near enough to cover the true costs of this money printing machine.

1. The program should be primarily funded by the STR's that have complaints against them/enforcement actions

54 2. STR's that cause no issues should pay a substantially lesser amount

I live in an str nightmare, as to so many other people I know. I think it should cost them thousands of dollars to rent their places. I also think there need to be way more rules about density.

Incline Village and Lake Tahoe are resort areas and making it more difficult for existing and aspiring owners to purchase and hold a second home is only going to hurt businesses and property values of responsible owners who take care of their properties responsibly anyway. The county added regulations in 2021 that were already excessively onerous and assigning even the permit fee that currently exists hurts owners. As an alternative, consider relaxing the conditions that are causing those excess costs. Not to mention many of the properties already have HOA's with penalties in place for the exact same policies. Excess costs for things like administration are caused by the level of energy burgaustreev that the county implemented as it is

- 56 onerous bureaucracy that the county implemented as it is.
- 57 I think you should increase further
- 58 Charge more! Str's are raping our neighborhoods with noisy, intrusive, trashy strangers every day

Have you considered limiting the number of STR permits to ensure the fees you collect can actually cover the expenses the county incurs? Almost 1/10th of the homes in IV are STRs, which seems excessive. I am curious why the county thought about when issuing all these? Was there any consideration to the overall impact of the community? I live 3 minutes from our STR and manage it tightly, we have an exceptional record, abide by all the guidelines, are highly rated on AirBnB, and take great care to limit the impact of our guests to the community. It seems unreasonable to increase the fees significantly when the issue is really the number of licenses you have 59 issued and the time it requires to manage it all.

- Who has ultimate oversight of the program? Are you certain they are completing the task of managing the STR program as efficiently as possible? What documentation can you provide to explain this? Where in the program are the short falls of revenue occurring specifically? How can you ensure that the increased permit fees will be sufficient to manage the program? I do believe that there have been improvements in the community since the STR oversight
- 60 program began. Thank you for that.
 The fees are too low. Suggest increasing them enough to increase program oversight, which is seriously lacking

61 today.

Recommend a combination of increased fees and cap on permits to ensure manageable workload and proper enforcement. Suggest Washoe or Incline town publish a list of STR enforcement actions to show progress

- 63 Please take me off your list as we do NOT rent our condo
- 64 Would help to see a breakdown of costs to understand why more money is needed.

Would like to see a breakdown of the contributing fee/taxable entities - sources for services referenced (i.e. fire

65 services)

STR'S Should most definitely pay for all costs associated to operating a business. The County does not subsidize my business in anyway. It is time we take a look at the whole picture. As someone who owns a home in an HOA: we all, as owners, collectively pay a portion of expenses to operate STR'S through higher water, trash, and road usage. However, we all don't benefit monetarily. Our HOA currently has 2 NRED cases, 2 BOD recalls recalling all 5 board

66 members by 24 STR owners who are unhappy with the parking allocations. Its exhausting! The proposed 50% or more increase (for STR renewal) is extremely excessive. The program should be selfsustaining; however, cutting costs rather than excessive rate increases should be the goal. Eg: expand selfinspection program; change to an bi-annual renewal; don't fund other ancillary agencies such as Clean Tahoe with

67 STR fees.

Program was put in place to control residence. Fine - However, as expected - it was going to be a buracratic inefficient program. Many owners rent extensively and others periodic. As one who rents maybe 5 to 7 times for 20 days a year, this process is quite extensive. Does it help on safety and yard cleaning - sure. But watching a neighbors yard not comply in any shape or form next to an STR property - it nixes the benefits. Overall the cost and buracracy is too expensive. To put a >\$1,000 price for the permit - unreasonable. If nothing else - should be tiered or a broader base of permits to cover it. Again, expected this increase, based on the major extent for the program to cover so many aspects. Unreasonable increase, as I would expect an additional increas every year to the point of

68 ridiculouness. The permit requirements and follow-up are too extensive. Fees need to be high enough to cover 24/7 enforcement of violations. Most problems occur at night or on weekends when the current STR enforcement staff is not available. The county needs to police these units which disturb the of

69 our community.

There should be comprehensive, effective code enforcement available on weekend and holidays in addition to weekday service. Tax payers should not be asked to continue to subsidize these nuisance businesses in residential neighborhoods. The increase in permit fees should be even higher than proposed as these business make 10s of

- 70 thousands of dollars per year and contribute very little to the community. We hold STR to help deflate the cost of maintaining a second home in Washoe county. We pay property taxes and
- 71 other cost to maintain the home.

72 I think the fees should be even higher to cover trash and parking issues, sheriff visits for noise control and the like.

73 Why doesn't the hotel tax revenue generated by STRs get reinvested into the community to build work force house? Is there a plan to work to actively reduce costs, as opposed to just passing them along? In non-government scenarios, when program costs rise, there is an all-out effort to find creative ways to REDUCE costs and improve efficiency. Would like to hear more about what steps are/will be taken to reduce admin costs, rather than just pass 74 them along.

75 I do not own a STR. I am a home owner.

76 Why do Prop Mgmt companies get a discount? They already make money on the rental fees paid by owners

Shouldn't the cost of administering complaints be attached to the affected properties? i.e. \$X,xx per complaint? Permittees may be more likely to take the actions required to decrease complaints if this were a policy, i.e. they may better vet renters and provide stronger notification of rules.

What changed to cause the county to propose such a massive increase? We recently renewed our permit. I do not think the time involved by the County on our renewal (as nothing changed or was questioned) could have been more than 10-15 minutes (to simply read our submission and hit "renew"). Surely the initial estimates would have accounted for a reasonable amount of time for this task. Also, the time spent on initial processing of applications, which is far greater, should have significantly decreased after the first year.

Most STR owners are not full-time Washoe county residents, thus we cannot vote for our commissioners. We do, however, pay property taxes at the same level as full-time residents. Thus, we should be represented equally. When it comes to STRs, the voices heard are mainly those of full-time residents (many of whom are powerful, vocal people opposed to STRs). It is also important to recognize that we "silent" STR constituents subsidize these full-time residents. As our properties are only occupied part-time. we help reduce overall county costs (as opposed to what they would be if more properties were occupied full-time). Even being a highly rated STR, our property has never been occupied more than 4 months per year--yet we pay as much tax as a full-time resident.

Lastly, the number of AirBNB rentals in Incline Village has tanked. COVID caused rentals to increase for a while, but the situation has dramatically changed. In 2021 we had 25 AirBNB rental days and in 2022 we had 22 days (for the April-July period). This year we have had only one rental for three days. Our property is not even rented on July 4. I expect lower numbers to remain in Incline Village as renters have now essentially been prohibited from from using the Incline beaches. Why would anyone pay higher rents in Incline when they have to travel to King's Beach anyway? If current rental numbers continue, many STR owners will will not find it cost effective to renew their permits for onlyl a few rentals. Now is not the time to increase staff as the time needed to process applications and renewals will likely

77 decrease with the current realities.

I think the administration costs could be reduced by improved efficiency in the software application used and in the personnel's handling of questions and changes. Nearly every change request I make has to be done multiple times because the personnel make errors or omissions that I catch and send back for correction.

What little automation there is in the system is not programmed correctly or has other "glitches". This causes the staff there to have to offer extensions. For instance, it is renewal time right now on many of the properties for which I am the LRP but the 30 day reminders were not sent. We were told on the front-end that this would be a self-sustaining program. Greater efficiency would reduce costs and make it so.

The fire fees seem unreasonably high. I think there should be a higher fee for a private home operating as an STR because an individual inspection is required. All of the STRs that I host are in condo complexes where the entire complex has to meet defensible space requirements and there is no inspection needed for each individual condo so why should each condo owner have to pay this high fire fee?

The county foisted this permit requirement on STR owners so I think it is appropriate for the county to pay some of the costs associated with their required program.

Unit overcrowding, parties, parking, trash are all potential problems that exist with all homes regardless of primary, part-time or short term use. Enforcement should be accross the board and not all charged to STR's

the administration costs could be reduced by improved efficiency in the software application used and in the personnel's handling of questions and changes. Nearly every change change I request I make has to be done multiple times because the personnel make errors or omissions that I catch and send back for correction.

What little automation there is in the system is not programmed correctly or has other "glitches". This causes the staff there to have to offer extensions. For instance. It is renewal time right now on many of the properties for which I am the LRP but the 30 day reminders were not sent. We were told on the front end that this would be a selfsustaining program. Greater efficiency would reduce costs and make it so.

The county foisted this on STR owners so I think it is appropriate for them to pay some of the costs associated with 80 their required program.

I think the administration costs could be reduced by improved efficiency in the software application used and in the personnel's handling of questions and changes. Nearly every change change I request I make has to be done multiple times because the personnel make errors or omissions that I catch and send back for correction. What little automation there is in the system is not programmed correctly or has other "glitches". This causes the staff there to have to offer extensions. For instance. It is renewal time right now on many of the properties for which I am the LRP but the 30 day reminders were not sent. We were told on the front end that this would be a selfsustaining program. Greater efficiency would reduce costs and make it so.

The county foisted this on STR owners so I think it is appropriate for them to pay some of the costs associated with their required program.

81

Since the county decided to require short term rental permits and all this extra work I think they should have to cover some of the costs in requiring it. To renew permits there needs to be an easier way which will not require so much time on the part of the owner as well as the county. It just does not seem to be efficient and there is so much back and forth before finally getting the renewed permit. There must be an easier way!!

Can this all be done more efficiently requiring less time on both ends and thus saving money too?

82

83 It would appear like a lot of bureaucracy for very limited number significant problems or concerns in Incline Village. Washoe County needs to enforce and abide by their own STR rules. STRs are destroying communities. Asking neighbors to enforce rules on neighbors is a source of conflict. It's even resulted in threats of violence from STR

84 owners and guests.

Improving the efficiency of the administrative process. It seemed initially that people in the office did not understand the process since it was brand new. This caused extra work for the staff and delays for the residence. I think that the

85 process could be improved rather than the price increased.

Wondering how much of a gap there is between what the County makes via the STR program and how much they need to cover the cost of the administration. What items popped up within the last two years that were not planned for?

Would you also increase the cost for Tier II permits?

Would increasing the cost of the permit increase the responsiveness of the staff and tighter turnarounds once submitted?

This portion also caught my eye: Additional new fees are proposed for changing the local responsible party/agent (\$45), and changing the maximum occupancy for Tier 1 permits (\$180 if an inspection is required; \$90 if it isn't).

Are you anticipating on charging the Property Manager \$45 per home they manage or \$45 total? Is this an annual or one time only fee?

Also what would you change the Tier 1 maximum occupancy to? Would you also add an additional tier to cover that 86 gap?

STRs are a toxic force in our community negatively impacting the economy because it costs residents time and money and enforcement is a joke. It also results in increased insurance fees and increased cost of living. Danger and pollution are also increased and so are vehicle miles traveled. I fully support increasing fees to the moon to cover the

87 burden on society.

It is very hard to assess if the rate increase is reasonable or not without having access to the budget and operational expenses details. I would be willing to support a rate increase if we can see a detailed report of the STR program

88 operation

Stop trying to hotelify our neighborhoods! STRs cause housing shortages for long-term renters. Since STRs are 89 businesses NOT residential use, keep STRs (aka hotels) in the commercial areas where they below.

STRs are more often, in my experience, investment/commercial for-profit properties with out-of-state owners and do 90 not belong within NV residential neighborhoods.

We went thru the STR process (Very painful). It costs us approx \$5,000, including defensible tree removal, multiple inspections, including sprinkler system, alarm, etc. We have LOST MONEY. Ever since STR was invoked, we have had 1/2 of the rentals. The costs have been exorbinant. We are very close to discontinuing STR. It makes ZERO 91 financial sense. If there is an increase in the costs, we will discontinue STR and you will receive ZERO.

I would like to see STR permits eliminated or at minimum restricted to once a month per property. Adherence to rules can be monitored if there are fewer renters with whom to deal. The additional parking, noise, excess occupants, and interference with the permanent residents' right to peace and quiet should not have to be tolerated every weekend. These renters are usually on vacation and do not comply with the posted rules of behavior, and the permanent residents suffer because of their disregarding them. We live in neighborhoods planned for permanent residents that were not designed to accommodate extra vehicle parking, higher weekend occupancy and/or loud parties late into the night. BBQs are often left unattended and/or glowing charcoal left unattended or incorrectly disposed of, pose potential fire hazards. The County has not designed a system of monitoring compliance to the rules they have published. A system that is easily monitored needs to be designed - and fines for non-compliance issued. A list of

92 renters who disregard the rules should be kept and those who don't comply should not be allowed to rent again.

Increase is justified mainly by compliance and enforcement. A system of penalty can be put in place to incentive STR hosts to be more careful on the guests behaviours. If your guests behave badly, you pay for the enforcement service. if your guests behave well in the respect of the neighbours and the environment, you keep paying the admin fees but no penalty fees.

STR is a great way too bring tourism economy to our town. It has to be monitored to keep our neighbourhood safe and calm. I believe that the STR fees is the perfect opportunity to put in place a positive incentive for good host with no complains for years and a negative incentive for hosts with complains. By setting a flat STR increase, we miss the chance educate the hosts.

It feels unfair to ask Host without complain to pay admin fees for enforcement service they don't use. Just like you go don't want to have non-host paying for a service they don't use.

Fees must fund enforcement. Otherwise, this policy is toothless. Bad STR actors ultimately lead to the banning of 94 STRs.

95 The fees should be adequate as they are. Costs should be reduceable with improved automation and efficiency.

The program was not clear, I did not receive the 10% discount even though I had a licensed property manager, and since STRs are a reality in our current society, the county should allocate funds as they would normally to investigate or maintain business licenses, and allow hotels and restaurants and other hospitality to operate. The staff who are part of the STR program have been very helpful, but the entire program is still unclear, and it was hard to understand what was required, optional and how to schedule inspections, who is inspecting, and how things get approved. It isn't just the cost, but also the complexity to navigate the system that is on the home owners as well in addition to the fees that are already quite substantial in themselves.

In the end, STRs offer a great option for both locals and tourists who cannot often times pay \$399-\$599 a night for a single hotel room in the area just to enjoy the beauty of the lake for a weekend. it's a better way to bring revenue to 96 the county and allows for a diverse set of individuals not just those who are wealthy to engage in nature.

How come the money raised from FINES are not considered as part of the revenue to offset the costs to administer Washoe County's STR Program? The presentations that I have seen, and this survey, are only considering permit 97 application fees and not the revenue from fines.

Washoe County services related to STR are horrible. Abandon the program. There is no value added with this overbearing government regulation. The STR program does nothing. The STR program is a failure.

- 99 Make the costs of administering the STR permit a public document so that all can see how permit fees are spent. What are the alternative solutions? Can the additional costs be covered by the significant 13% transient lodging tax
- 100 we already pay? Are there other sources of revenue where the needed fees could be obtained such as a tax on the renters who are
- 101 using the STRs? This was a community request, hence the community should help pay the administrative costs for it. It also appears
- 102 the county is over spending on this program.
- 103 Easier reporting and bigger fines for nuisance needed. Perhaps cap the number of days allowed for rentals?

Lake Tahoe fees should NOT be increased as they've been the ONLY STR's that required permitting - and it's rigorous and extensive. I think permit fees should go to ALL other areas of Washoe county to cover your costs.

Is there anyway that a property which is currently allowed to have short term rentals may continue that priviledge 105 even if the ownership changes?

I have several comments: 1. Of immediate concern to me is that I went to the expense of getting an STR permit even though I haven't used it and don't intend to use it while my husband and I are alive. We are in our 80's and have lived at permanently since 1995 --and in Washoe County since 198. We got the permit to insure our son who grew up and graduated from high school in Incline could hold onto our McCloud unit and use it for vacations even though he and his family live and work in Seattle.

I would like to see some accommodation financially in terms of permit fees for this type of situation. Perhaps a fee should only be charged if a unit is actually rented in a given year -- or at least a very minimal fee since everything could be done online and require no staff time. I have additional comments but this form won't save them. I will try to submit them in another way to add to those here. Thank you for asking

The real problems with STRs appear to be in the Incline. Those outside this area should pay no more than \$100 a year because the impacts to neighborhoods are minimal to zero. My STR is in Juniper Hills, which is pretty much a forgotten peninsula of county surrounded by Reno. We've been renting short term since 2012 and never, ever had a complaint from a neighbor. You really should concentrate enforcement and regulation where the impacts are highest

107 and from where you receive the most complaints.

Rather than increase fees, Washoe County's STR process needs to be revamped to reduce administrative requirements (which in turn would reduce costs to the County). The amount of steps to secure an STR permit is unnecessarily bureaucratic (Washoe County seems to be determined to "out regulate" California in this case). It is burdensome for any owner that is not a corporation or property management company (AKA: "mom and pops", retirees, single parents) who are just trying to supplement income rather than make a fortune from STRs. The current permitting process takes many hours for the applicant to complete and requires several complex steps (including preparing floor plans with measurements of each room). Above all, it does not take into consideration the high permitting cost for a individual property owner that is either just renting a room or is only renting their home part time. The current costs are already prohibitive and appear to be intended to dissuade individual property owners from even starting down the path of securing STR income. It seems unusual that an individual property owner can rent out a room or their entire home on a long-term basis without any of these administrative processes or fees, yet renting short term is treated as if they were running a large hotel or adding an accessory dwelling (see the currently mandated floor plan requirements). It appears that the current process, including the high cost of entry into the STR market, is meant to strictly limit the number of regular people from using their home as an STR. This also appears to be yielding to and strongly benefiting big corporations such as multi-unit property management companies and hotel lobbyists. Instead of increasing the costs to further dissuade individual property owners from being able to supplement retirement or other limited income, Washoe County should reduce the administrative burden (i.e. reduce the steps for securing STR approval) and help the "mom and pop" property owners by restructuring current fees and

108 processes to be more realistic and attainable.

_		
From:	Philip GilanFarr	
То:	Mullin, Kelly D.	
Cc:	Hill, Alexis; Lloyd, Trevor; Oakley, Katherine	
Subject:	Washoe County STR Ordinance	
Date:	Sunday, June 11, 2023 4:03:52 PM	
Attachments:	image002.png	

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Kelly,

There is a value in the Short Term Rental (STR) ordinance. Although many of us were unsure at first, after implementation we can see that it is working in most cases. Those with active STR permits are more conscientious about parking, trash, maintaining the occupancy limits, and controlling noise levels including preventing parties.

I see several areas that need to be addressed as this ordinance is revisited which I am outlining here.

- There is an inordinate amount of negative press. People who show up for the meetings provide negative comments to the commissioners, it is traditionally complainers who come to meetings.
- People who are pleased with the program rarely attend. There is no one explaining the benefits of how well it is working now. The increase in tourism dollars has benefited local businesses, tourists
- who would otherwise have no place to stay. The majority of STR guests are respectful and go unnoticed by the neighbors. We need to find a way to get positive press. We need to work as a
- community to encourage people to use the program. There are 1000s of unregistered units in the community, hurting those who comply with regulations. If there is a meeting regarding STRs, an email should go out automatically to all STR property owners. It would also be helpful to notice the local business owners as well.
- One of the biggest misconceptions is that STRs eliminate Long Term Rentals (LTR). This is rarely the case. With just over 700 permits in Washoe County for STR, the majority of them are in Incline
- Village. We were recently informed by staff that only 11 people have been displaced by those property owners who converted from LTR to STR. Of the 11 displaced people, did the owners decide
- to use their property more often? We do not know why they were converted, only that it occurred. In order to maintain the cost of second homeownership some owners place their property in a STR
- program. Without the ability for STR, the property would be vacant the majority of the time and the number of tourists would decrease. The majority of STR would never be LTR because owners still want to use their property.

Parking has been the number one complaint at the meeting level. Due to this complaint, Washoe County has made the ordinance more restrictive in the Lake Tahoe Basin portion of Washoe County. TRPA does not have an ordinance regarding parking. The current Washoe County ordinance

- 110.319.15B parking standards place undue hardship on those STRs within the jurisdictional boundaries of TRPA. It limits the unit to 4 occupants for every parking space. Outside the TRPA
- jurisdiction they do not have this restriction. Properties were purchased with the understanding that

they would have the right to utilize bedrooms for two occupants in each room whether or not they were lived in full-time, part time, or rented short-term or long-term. By adjusting the parking standards Washoe County has essentially taken away the rights of a homeowner to utilize the property as outlined by the CC&R's for a condominium or the original permit for a single-family home. The standard should be equal for all of Washoe County, setting in place the parking standards adopted at the time the original building permit was approved for the residence or condo complex. Last summer I drove though several of the complexes with STRs on multiple occasions and counted cars on Friday evening and Sunday morning. None of the complexes I monitored were over full. In many cases only 50% of the parking spaces were used.

There are other smaller issues. (1) The cost of a STR permit in Washoe County is higher than elsewhere in the nation. (2) It is impossible for any one person to be available 24/7 although having a go-to person who can answer calls and get to the property quickly is reasonable.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the above. I look forward to working with Washoe County to make the STR ordinance fair and equitable for all concerned.

Best,

Caroline Hickson P.O. Box 1005 Colfax, CA 95713

potterhickson@gmail.com

TO: Kelly Mullin Washoe Co. Planning and Building Div. Director 1001 9th Street Reno, NV 89512

RE: STR program fees feedback from July 5 IV-CAB meeting

I am the owner of a condominium at Crystal Shores West, 525 Lakeshore Blvd #43, Incline Village, and we have an STR permit (WSTR21-0157) because we don't use our condominium in the winter.

1. As a resident of California, I am unfamiliar with goings on in Washoe County, and learned at the recent CAB meeting that there are bonds to be repaid out of our STR fees? Is that correct? If this is correct, **can you tell me what the bonds are for**?

I have no problem paying an annual fee to cover administering the STR program, but I do have a problem if those fees, which didn't exist three years ago, cover some other county costs that existed prior to the STR program. **Proposed permit cost increases seem excessive for our property.**

2. We have an average occupancy of nights per year or 29, approximately 1 month/year total.

Our condominium, is an apartment within a complex of 44 units. Around half of those units are owned by second or third generation family members of the original owners, including us. I bring this up because there is a great incentive to self police the property by us to avoid disturbing neighbors, blocking existing parking spaces, and generally being nuisances. We have a set of CCandRs (which I included with the original application) that cover these concerns. We rely on our board to take action should there be repeated, significant problems.

Since our unit has been renting (2018), there have been no complaints about our renters, at all, from any party. We are therefore not an enforcement burden to the STR team. I assume there are other STR properties in a similar situation. We do not compare in square footage nor in parking capacity to single homes with 2-4x the square footage and undefined street parking.

I propose that in determining annual STR fees, you break down the costs by some sort of category that reflects our costs to the program. Since you already have two categories (self managed, professionally managed), this seems like a reasonable consideration. Condominiums in our situation attract quite a different clientele than large, stand-alone buildings designed for lots of people.

Thank you for all of your time and efforts. In my many phone calls to staff when first being licensed they were each VERY helpful, polite, and didn't show exasperation with this new program. You are all to be commended on your efforts.

Caroline Hickson, owner