

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 12:39 PM  
**To:** Fritzie, Martha; Hughes, Jennifer; Boderman, Nathan; Rozzell, Matthew; Amend, Michelle  
**Subject:** FW: Short-term rental regulations update

More on the "guest" issue. This has already been sent to the BCC.

**Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist**

503-742-4274

Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday

**From:** Rob Bruce <rrbruce@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 12:30 PM  
**To:** Frances <franmazzara@gmail.com>; Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** gracehumberston@yahoo.com; Cowan, Danielle <Danielle@mthoodterritory.com>; BCCMail <BCCMail@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: Short-term rental regulations update

Hi Ellen,

I'm glad Fran and Joe responded before I did, they were much nicer than I was going to be.

This has hit the out of control point. This has now drug on for YEARS. We have participated, supported where allowed or were able. We have done all that has been asked of us.

Next time we have an "Event" make sure I have your number and I will call you and you can call the Sheriffs office and you can place the call and get yelled at. Please forward your home phone asap so I can call you between 2am and 3am and keep you up for a few hours. This email is fine to send that # to. Ohh, you are not willing to do that?.....but its ok for us to be forced to. No.

Give the Sheriff some teeth or force them to handle it, set some reasonable laws, that's all we are asking and get this done before we all are forced to take further action against the county. Because its coming sooner than you think.

Questions?

Rob Bruce 503-502-1821 [rrbruce@outlook.com](mailto:rrbruce@outlook.com)

Not so patiently waiting your response.

**From:** Frances <franmazzara@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 11:49 AM  
**To:** 'Rogalin, Ellen' <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** [rrbruce@outlook.com](mailto:rrbruce@outlook.com); [gracehumberston@yahoo.com](mailto:gracehumberston@yahoo.com); [danielle@mthoodterritory.com](mailto:danielle@mthoodterritory.com); [BCC@clackamas.us](mailto:BCC@clackamas.us)  
**Subject:** RE: Short-term rental regulations update

No where in the proposed regulations or suggested changes do the regulations address the issue of someone renting the STR and then using the premise to invite excessive numbers of people to utilize the facility as THEIR GUESTS. This was brought up by more than one person testifying at the meeting on Jan. 30.

As I and others have stated... the owner rents to a couple who in turn invite 25, 50, 75 guests to come party in their rented home. The only County ordinance that applies addresses "noise levels", an issue the police do not have time or equipment to address, get's ignored as soon as the police leave and is like using a fly swatter to deal with a cougar attack. A one-time party...a neighbor hosts a 4<sup>th</sup> of July party, and anniversary, their daughter's Sweet 16...could be annoying with cars and noise. But we are discussing a weekly event with up to 4 house in our neighborhood.

Often these parties run all night and the partiers are gone by the next day. The registered guests may stay another day..., but they to leave never to be seen again. The management companies declare to the absentee owner who hires them that they checked the home out after a complaint and swear it was only the renters and 1 other couple, yet we have pictures and statements it was a wedding, celebration etc. with over 50 invited. Often we are cursed at and physically threatened.

THESE ARE WEEKLY ....what protects the homeowners who live there? What recourse do we have? We did not knowingly move onto the set of "Animal House". Is our only recourse a lawsuit against the County for causing a depreciation in our property values due to their actions. I know a precedence has been set on this issue. I hate to get nasty..., but we can no longer enjoy our property, especially during the summer months. We no longer have unfettered access to our homes. Emergency vehicles can not safely access our road. Public services such as snow plows, delivery trucks and garbage trucks cannot access our road, denying us the services we pay for. Our sleep is constantly disturbed by the noise and actions of the partiers having a good time (sometimes inebriated, physically ill or fighting). Trash is strewn into our yards and woods.

PLEASE..., we are asking for your understanding and help. So far the remedies offered do not address this issue, *Abuse of the privilege of a short-term rental....* The Sheriff's Dept. tell us there is nothing they can do, yet we are told to call them. The Zoning Dept. is the same. By granting the privilege of Short Term Rentals you are giving rights to only one side in this situation and ignoring the effects it has on the rest of us. This is our home, in a residential neighborhood not an area zoned for business, yet we are now surrounded by businesses under the guise of *innocent people renting their vacation home out temporarily when they are not using it.*

**We need a tool to be able to stop these abuses and the "noise" ordinance is not that tool.** We realize this is not an easy problem.... many jurisdiction resolve it by banning STR's. (Miami, Oahu, Barcelona, Rome, Paris, London... to name a few of the better known jurisdictions). But the abuses must stop.

Thank You  
FRAN & JOE MAZZARA

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 9:50 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha <MFritzie@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Short-term rental regulations update

Good morning,

On January 30, the County Board of Commissioners held its first public hearing on the proposed new regulations on short-term/vacation rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County. Before the meeting the commissioners received the results of the online questionnaire and additional public comments submitted by email.

After hearing testimony from 16 people, the board decided to extend the first public hearing until Thursday, Feb. 13, and asked to meet with staff to discuss the issues at a policy session.

That policy session was held yesterday afternoon. After much discussion, the Board of Commissioners continued to support the draft regulations, but did ask staff to make the following changes:

- Allow guest houses to be used as short-term rentals. (Current county code prohibits guest houses – defined as an adjacent sleeping area without a kitchen or laundry – from being rented.)
- Increase the maximum occupancy per short-term rental to two people multiplied by the number of sleeping areas plus four additional people. (For example, a two-bedroom home would have a

maximum occupancy of eight people.) The total maximum occupancy for any short-term rental, even one with six or more sleeping areas, would remain at 15 people.

- Allow owners of short-term rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County inside the Portland urban growth boundary (UGB) to use a dwelling or guest house on a lot adjacent to their primary residence to be used as a short-term rental. (The current proposed language requires a short-term rental in the UGB to be the owner's primary residence or located on the same lot as the owner's primary residence.)
- Set fines for violation of short-term rental regulations similar to those for many other code enforcement violations -- \$250 for first citation, \$500 for second citation, \$75/month administrative fee while the case is open, and additional charges for each day the violation continues.

The updated draft regulations will be available online at [www.clackamas.us/planning/str](http://www.clackamas.us/planning/str) later this week. As before, people who wish to comment are invited to send an email to Senior Planner Martha Fritzie at [mfritzie@clackamas.us](mailto:mfritzie@clackamas.us) or testify in person at the continuation of the first hearing or the second hearing. Both hearings will be in the Board Meeting Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City.

- Continuation of first public hearing: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 13**
- Second public hearing and Board action: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 27**

Thank you for your continued interest.

***Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist***

Clackamas County Public & Government Affairs

*Transportation & Development | Business & Community Services*

503-742-4274 | 150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

*Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday*

---

Spam Email

Phishing Email

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 12:16 PM  
**To:** Boderman, Nathan; Hughes, Jennifer; Fritzie, Martha; Rozzell, Matthew; Amend, Michelle  
**Subject:** STR folks who invite guests?  
**Expires:** Monday, August 3, 2020 12:00 AM

Just got the email below from Fran Mazzara. She brings up the point, which I don't think we've discussed, of guests – see below. I don't know that there's anything we can do about this, but thought we should consider it.

Thoughts?

***Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist***

503-742-4274

*Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday*

**From:** Frances <franmazzara@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 11:49 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** rrbruce@outlook.com; gracehumberston@yahoo.com; Cowan, Danielle <Danielle@mthoodterritory.com>; BCCMail <BCCMail@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: Short-term rental regulations update

No where in the proposed regulations or suggested changes do the regulations address the issue of someone renting the STR and then using the premise to invite excessive numbers of people to utilize the facility as THEIR GUESTS. This was brought up by more than one person testifying at the meeting on Jan. 30.

As I and others have stated... the owner rents to a couple who in turn invite 25, 50, 75 guests to come party in their rented home. The only County ordinance that applies addresses "noise levels", an issue the police do not have time or equipment to address, get's ignored as soon as the police leave and is like using a fly swatter to deal with a cougar attack. A one-time party...a neighbor hosts a 4<sup>th</sup> of July party, and anniversary, their daughter's Sweet 16...could be annoying with cars and noise. But we are discussing a weekly event with up to 4 house in our neighborhood.

Often these parties run all night and the partiers are gone by the next day. The registered guests may stay another day..., but they to leave never to be seen again. The management companies declare to the absentee owner who hires them that they checked the home out after a complaint and swear it was only the renters and 1 other couple, yet we have pictures and statements it was a wedding, celebration etc. with over 50 invited. Often we are cursed at and physically threatened.

THESE ARE WEEKLY ....what protects the homeowners who live there? What recourse do we have? We did not knowingly move onto the set of "Animal House". Is our only recourse a lawsuit against the County for causing a depreciation in our property values due to their actions. I know a precedence has been set on this issue. I hate to get nasty..., but we can no longer enjoy our property, especially during the summer months. We no longer have unfettered access to our homes. Emergency vehicles can not safely access our road. Public services such as snow plows, delivery trucks and garbage trucks cannot access our road, denying us the services we pay for. Our sleep is constantly disturbed by the noise and actions of the partiers having a good time (sometimes inebriated, physically ill or fighting). Trash is strewn into our yards and woods.

PLEASE..., we are asking for your understanding and help. So far the remedies offered do not address this issue, *Abuse of the privilege of a short-term rental....* The Sheriff's Dept. tell us there is nothing they can do, yet we are told to call them. The Zoning Dept. is the same. By granting the privilege of Short Term Rentals you are giving rights to only one side in this situation and ignoring the effects it has on the rest of us. This is our home, in a residential neighborhood not an area zoned for business, yet we are now surrounded by businesses under the guise of *innocent people renting their vacation home out temporarily when they are not using it.*

**We need a tool to be able to stop these abuses and the "noise" ordinance is not that tool.** We realize this is not an easy problem.... many jurisdiction resolve it by banning STR's. (Miami, Oahu, Barcelona, Rome, Paris, London... to name a few of the better known jurisdictions). But the abuses must stop.

Thank You  
FRAN & JOE MAZZARA

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 9:50 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha <MFritzie@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Short-term rental regulations update

Good morning,

On January 30, the County Board of Commissioners held its first public hearing on the proposed new regulations on short-term/vacation rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County. Before the meeting the commissioners received the results of the online questionnaire and additional public comments submitted by email.

After hearing testimony from 16 people, the board decided to extend the first public hearing until Thursday, Feb. 13, and asked to meet with staff to discuss the Issues at a policy session.

That policy session was held yesterday afternoon. After much discussion, the Board of Commissioners continued to support the draft regulations, but did ask staff to make the following changes:

- Allow guest houses to be used as short-term rentals. (Current county code prohibits guest houses – defined as an adjacent sleeping area without a kitchen or laundry – from being rented.)
- Increase the maximum occupancy per short-term rental to two people multiplied by the number of sleeping areas plus four additional people. (For example, a two-bedroom home would have a maximum occupancy of eight people.) The total maximum occupancy for any short-term rental, even one with six or more sleeping areas, would remain at 15 people.
- Allow owners of short-term rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County inside the Portland urban growth boundary (UGB) to use a dwelling or guest house on a lot adjacent to their primary residence to be used as a short-term rental. (The current proposed language requires a short-term rental in the UGB to be the owner's primary residence or located on the same lot as the owner's primary residence.)
- Set fines for violation of short-term rental regulations similar to those for many other code enforcement violations -- \$250 for first citation, \$500 for second citation, \$75/month administrative fee while the case is open, and additional charges for each day the violation continues.

The updated draft regulations will be available online at [www.clackamas.us/planning/str](http://www.clackamas.us/planning/str) later this week. As before, people who wish to comment are invited to send an email to Senior Planner Martha Fritzie at [mfritzie@clackamas.us](mailto:mfritzie@clackamas.us) or testify in person at the continuation of the first hearing or the second hearing. Both hearings will be in the Board Meeting Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City.

- Continuation of first public hearing: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 13**
- Second public hearing and Board action: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 27**

Thank you for your continued interest.

***Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist***

Clackamas County Public & Government Affairs

*Transportation & Development | Business & Community Services*

503-742-4274 | 150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

*Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday*

---

Spam Email

Phishing Email

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Mac Barger <MacB@richardsonsports.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 11:24 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha  
**Subject:** RE: Short-term rental regulations update

Thanks so much here Ellen,

I appreciate the communication and overall effort to make this work for all residents and owners ☺

While I am *against* capping the number of maximum occupants I think the old language is better than the new language below with reference to the calculation of max occupancy. Right now real-estate values on Mt. Hood are being driven by the rental value and number of occupants. This supersedes traditional valuations like dollar per square foot etc. Yes, these STR rules the county are going to have a MAJOR impact on real-estate values and thus taxation. See Hood River and Gearhart where poor STR decisions made home values plummet and micro business economies take major blows.

That said, if we **MUST** have a max number of occupants the new language is going to create an environment where almost all of the current STR's (on Airbnb/VRBO) will make a claim of 12+ occupants. We all know some of these cabins are NOT equipped to hold that number of guests. There are all kinds of cabins with sleeping areas not up to code (window egress etc.) and that cannot accommodate parking, water usage, etc. Take a 1,200 sq foot cabin in Govey for example. They will claim they have two bedrooms and three "additional sleeping areas." They will make a claim to then have max occupancy of 14. On the other end of the spectrum if you have a 6k sq foot home with 7 bedrooms they will be capped with 15 occupants. This will confuse potential renters when marketed on the big sites. Part of the county responsibility (from a health perspective) should be helping travelers correctly identify what places can accommodate the given group size.

- Increase the maximum occupancy per short-term rental to two people multiplied by the number of sleeping areas plus four additional people. (For example, a two-bedroom home would have a maximum occupancy of eight people.) The total maximum occupancy for any short-term rental, even one with six or more sleeping areas, would remain at 15 people.

Thanks again for all your efforts,

Mac Barger  
 Sales Director | Captuer  
 Ext. 130



**RICHARDSON**

T: 541-687-1818  
 F: 541-687-1130

RichardsonSports.com  
 WEAR THE BEST

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 9:50 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha <MFritzie@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Short-term rental regulations update

Good morning,

On January 30, the County Board of Commissioners held its first public hearing on the proposed new regulations on short-term/vacation rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County. Before the meeting the commissioners received the results of the online questionnaire and additional public comments submitted by email.

After hearing testimony from 16 people, the board decided to extend the first public hearing until Thursday, Feb. 13, and asked to meet with staff to discuss the issues at a policy session.

That policy session was held yesterday afternoon. After much discussion, the Board of Commissioners continued to support the draft regulations, but did ask staff to make the following changes:

- Allow guest houses to be used as short-term rentals. (Current county code prohibits guest houses – defined as an adjacent sleeping area without a kitchen or laundry – from being rented.)
- Increase the maximum occupancy per short-term rental to two people multiplied by the number of sleeping areas plus four additional people. (For example, a two-bedroom home would have a maximum occupancy of eight people.) The total maximum occupancy for any short-term rental, even one with six or more sleeping areas, would remain at 15 people.
- Allow owners of short-term rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County inside the Portland urban growth boundary (UGB) to use a dwelling or guest house on a lot adjacent to their primary residence to be used as a short-term rental. (The current proposed language requires a short-term rental in the UGB to be the owner's primary residence or located on the same lot as the owner's primary residence.)
- Set fines for violation of short-term rental regulations similar to those for many other code enforcement violations -- \$250 for first citation, \$500 for second citation, \$75/month administrative fee while the case is open, and additional charges for each day the violation continues.

The updated draft regulations will be available online at [www.clackamas.us/planning/str](http://www.clackamas.us/planning/str) later this week. As before, people who wish to comment are invited to send an email to Senior Planner Martha Fritzie at [mfritzie@clackamas.us](mailto:mfritzie@clackamas.us) or testify in person at the continuation of the first hearing or the second hearing. Both hearings will be in the Board Meeting Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City.

- Continuation of first public hearing: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 13**
- Second public hearing and Board action: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 27**

Thank you for your continued interest.

***Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist***

Clackamas County Public & Government Affairs

*Transportation & Development | Business & Community Services*

503-742-4274 | 150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

*Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday*

---

Spam Email

Phishing Email



**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 11:18 AM  
**To:** Fritzie, Martha  
**Subject:** FW: Short-term rental regulations update

Comments to share with the BCC...

**Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist**

503-742-4274

Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday

**From:** rickseven007@gmail.com <rickseven007@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 10:20 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** RE: Short-term rental regulations update

Thank you for the update Ellen. I continue to be in harsh disagreement of any such regulations. What a person wants and needs to do with their home should not rest in the hands of people who do not pay the bills of the homeowner. In addition, fines levied against any American when there is no witness of that person damaging the person or the property of another is a violation of the "Law of the Land" in this country. This wrecks of tyranny and as an American I just don't like it at all.

I don't have skin in this game as I don't own a short term rental but am really disgusted at this entire code creation.

I hope my opinion is considered.

Sincerely,

Rick Seven

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 9:50 AM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen <EllenRog@clackamas.us>  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha <MFritzie@clackamas.us>  
**Subject:** Short-term rental regulations update

Good morning,

On January 30, the County Board of Commissioners held its first public hearing on the proposed new regulations on short-term/vacation rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County. Before the meeting the commissioners received the results of the online questionnaire and additional public comments submitted by email.

After hearing testimony from 16 people, the board decided to extend the first public hearing until Thursday, Feb. 13, and asked to meet with staff to discuss the issues at a policy session.

That policy session was held yesterday afternoon. After much discussion, the Board of Commissioners continued to support the draft regulations, but did ask staff to make the following changes:

- Allow guest houses to be used as short-term rentals. (Current county code prohibits guest houses – defined as an adjacent sleeping area without a kitchen or laundry – from being rented.)
- Increase the maximum occupancy per short-term rental to two people multiplied by the number of sleeping areas plus four additional people. (For example, a two-bedroom home would have a maximum occupancy of eight people.) The total maximum occupancy for any short-term rental, even one with six or more sleeping areas, would remain at 15 people.
- Allow owners of short-term rentals in unincorporated Clackamas County inside the Portland urban growth boundary (UGB) to use a dwelling or guest house on a lot adjacent to their primary residence to be used as a short-term rental. (The current proposed language requires a short-term rental in the UGB to be the owner's primary residence or located on the same lot as the owner's primary residence.)
- Set fines for violation of short-term rental regulations similar to those for many other code enforcement violations -- \$250 for first citation, \$500 for second citation, \$75/month administrative fee while the case is open, and additional charges for each day the violation continues.

The updated draft regulations will be available online at [www.clackamas.us/planning/str](http://www.clackamas.us/planning/str) later this week. As before, people who wish to comment are invited to send an email to Senior Planner Martha Fritzie at [mfritzie@clackamas.us](mailto:mfritzie@clackamas.us) or testify in person at the continuation of the first hearing or the second hearing. Both hearings will be in the Board Meeting Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City.

- Continuation of first public hearing: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 13**
- Second public hearing and Board action: Board of Commissioners Business Meeting, **10 a.m., Thursday, Feb. 27**

Thank you for your continued interest.

***Ellen Rogalin, Community Relations Specialist***

Clackamas County Public & Government Affairs

*Transportation & Development | Business & Community Services*

503-742-4274 | 150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

*Office hours: 9 am – 6 pm, Monday-Friday*

---

Spam Email

Phishing Email

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** FScott Farleigh <fscottfarleigh@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 4, 2020 11:43 AM  
**To:** Fritzie, Martha  
**Cc:** Milt Johnson; Ed Rogers  
**Subject:** Pending Regulations for Short-Term Rental Regulations

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Martha: I have left you two voice mails requesting the status of the proposed Short-Term Rental regulations and the public hearing on January 30. I am President of the Alpenglade Park HOA in Government Camp, Oregon, and we generally support the proposed regulations to the extent they are consistent with our own rental regulations which have been duly recorded with Clackamas County for many years. We have an owners meeting coming up this month; and therefore, I would greatly appreciate a status report on the County's proposed regulations. Thanks for your help. My cell number is 503-680-5838.

---

NOTE: This message was trained as non-spam. If this is wrong, please correct the training as soon as possible.

[Spam Email](#)

[Phishing Email](#)

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Ben McCune <benamccune@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 3, 2020 11:23 AM  
**To:** Fritzie, Martha  
**Cc:** Karin McCune  
**Subject:** Short Term Rental Housing Unincorporated Clackamas EFU

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Martha. Ben and Karin McCune here. It was nice to briefly meet you after the public hearing Thursday evening. First off, we would like to thank you for your thoughtful diligence in these difficult and potentially divisive planning matters. I would also like to introduce ourselves and our situation: We are newlyweds living on an EFU 80 zoned farm just outside of Oregon City in unincorporated Clackamas County. Our farm is home to a menagerie of critters from pigs, to sheep, chickens, cattle and horses. We have, in our opinion, a lovely piece of land which we love sharing with our friends and family. Our city friends love to learn about the animals; how to care for them and how we raise them. We often take them on walks through the fields, forests and riparian areas sharing our constantly evolving understanding of these environments. There are substantial stands of old Oregon White Oak and Doug Fir. The old homestead is surrounded by several historic outbuildings. In short, the place is considered by some as idyllic. Unfortunately, it's difficult to make ends meet as a farmer these days and we are searching for ways to supplement our farming income. Which is what brought us to your public hearing on Thursday.

My wife and I would like to sustainably and on a small scale, offer short term rentals in our farmhouse (possibly in historic outbuildings if that's ever an option). We are concerned that the regulations as currently written paint all properties with the same brush. We are quite isolated from our neighbors, have ample parking, and plenty of room in our home for large families. As such, we would request a higher occupancy rating per bedroom be considered especially for larger properties away from neighbors. In addition, please consider a farmstay option on EFU zoned properties as you include agritourism regulations as part of the Clackamas County economy. We love our property and sharing it and our knowledge with folks whom are no longer connected to this way of life or the countryside.

All in all we are very pleased with you efforts and would like to thank you for your diligence in these difficult matters.

Sincerely,

Ben & Karin McCune

---

Spam Email  
Phishing Email

Fritzie, Martha

**From:** Colleen Hankins <colleenhaha1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2020 3:50 PM  
**To:** Alltitude Chalet, LLC  
**Cc:** Fritzie, Martha; Callie Elliott; Anderson566@gmail.com; Anderson, Violet (Tokareff) (VJTO); Peter Dodd; Sally Neidermeyer; Kris Deane; komorebihouse515@gmail.com; Eastlake1888@yahoo.com; Brian Bogatin  
**Subject:** Re: Letter To County Commissioners For 01/30/2020 Public Hearing on The Regulations Impacting Short-Term Rental In Rural Clackamas County

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am Colleen Cook and a short term renter in Government Camp and support the opinions written in this letter. If these fees are implemented, this will cause rental fees to elevate to unreasonable amounts. We do spend time cleaning up after others, hand carry our trash off the mountain and hand shovel in order to fit our cars in our parking area. Please review the data and reconsider your decision. Sincerely, Colleen Cook

On Thu, Jan 30, 2020, 2:58 PM Alltitude Chalet, LLC <[alltitudeskichalet@gmail.com](mailto:alltitudeskichalet@gmail.com)> wrote:  
 Alltitude Ski Chalet LLC (Physical Address)  
 30765 East Meldrum Street  
 Government Camp, Oregon 97028  
 January 30, 2020

Good Evening County Commissioners:

This letter is to be read at the meeting note for The Board of Commissioners will hold for a public hearing on the regulations at the Board business meeting at 6 p.m., Thursday, Jan. 30, on the 4th floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City. It has been written in response to the proposed regulations at <https://www.clackamas.us/planning/str>

My wife and I have many concerns about the proposed regulations for the Vacation Rentals in Government Camp, Oregon (unincorporated Clackamas County). We have owned and ran Alltitude Ski Chalet LLC since 2007 and have a Five-Star rating on Vacation Rental By Owner <https://www.vrbo.com/194606>. We have regularly utilized services from Carol's Cleaning, Extreme Cleaning LLC, Jenna McClure, and Callie Elliot to provide cleaning and property management services to our property and thus, have a strong local presence. And, we regularly maintain and service our property in person and address issues promptly as they arise. We have a 12-1/2 year history of obtaining garbage and plowing services from the only providers in Government Camp. We provide written rules to both our Long-Term Leases and Short-Term Vacation Rental Guests.

We are of the opinion that a few less involved landlords and/or short-term vacation rental owners who may NOT be: properly screening guests, charging low damage waivers, part of the CCTRT system, etc. are at the heart of this issue. The draft regulations and the proposed actions to address this issue are unfair to actively involved and responsible owners. The regulations do not take into account historical precedents in unincorporated Clackamas County and appear to be an attempt to generate county income based on urban Portland standards.

If there is a problem with some landlords, then why has Clackamas county not examined what the owners have done on an annual basis? For example, collecting graduated fees in arrears vs a flat fee based on the following, and subjecting non-complying landlords to further inspection based on:

- Proof of an operating plan for the home (ie Guestbook, Operating Agreement, EIN, etc...)
- Proof of "Courtesy Home Inspection" by Scott Klein Hoodland Fire (This could be fee based to subsidize the current inadequacies and local fire department)

- Proof of receipt for fire extinguisher maintenance services (Annual inspection is required)
- Proof of short term days rented, long term days rented and empty days (CCRT, Leases, VRBO Reports)
- Proof of payment for plowing, garbage, and utility services
- Proof of payment for CCRT

We find fault with the way the current proposed Clackamas regulations are written in the following areas and are requesting further analysis, coordination with other County Agencies, and more Community Planning Organization discussions:

**1) Enforcement of number of spaces and garbage pickup in a snow zone is difficult at best.**

The proposed regulations do nothing to address issues with Bliss Sanitary Service. This company acts like a monopoly and provides service at certain times of the year and not at others. Bliss has refused to service our home on East Meldrum during the winter. It was not until recently, the last 7 years, that they would even come down Meldrum to pick up trash at a cost \$207.00 a month. The worst problem we have with garbage is picking up trash generated by winter-spring day trip visitors who don't stay overnight. We have to pick up debris in snow or melting snow piles, up and down our street. They leave broken sleds, trash and debris everywhere. We once picked up 5 full garbage bags of plastic sled parts. Our seasonal renters and most of our short term folks are not the cause of that problem.

We have one plowing Service in Government Camp and that is Government Camp Snow Removal. I have room for 6 cars in front of my home, and what I would consider the best parking situation in Government Camp. However, it is a struggle for them to keep up being the only business in town when the snow hits. When that happens I am in contact with both the neighbors and tenants to communicate and address parking concerns.

The County could also request proof of garbage service receipts and payment for plowing as a part of tax report so you could examine who is paying and who is not paying for necessary services. In fact, there are many Long-Term residents who do not pay and benefit from plowing generated by Short-Term rentals.

**2) Lack of "Grandfather Clauses" for previous purchases/owner investment on items the county has previously collected tax on and benefited from.**

As Small Business Owner, I am obliged to complete and pay Oregon Confidential Personal Property Tax which the State of Oregon has the ability to collect funds on equipment used to house 12 persons in my 5 bedroom home. For example, in our bunk room, we have sleeping capacity for up to 4 unrelated persons and on the very rare occasion it is needed, the room could sleep 7. I do not believe it has ever slept 7, and I certainly would not ever allow it any routine basis. Other homes in Government Camp have dormitory style bunk rooms and spaces. The proposed plans eliminate placing people in these rooms and provides no "Grandfather Clause" allowing use for equipment bedding, furniture, and architecture that promotes intended use for Ski Camps and International Teams. The County and State are the very institutions who have collected tax on these items. The proposed rules lack consideration for historical use, abuse our time and monetary investment in the community, and make the investment in property on Mt. Hood a questionable venture.

Additionally, the Fire Marshall has set policy and historically fire code has dictated policy on occupancy. Homes that have dormitory style sleeping arrangements typically have invested thousands of dollars in Sprinkler Systems and can sleep more than 15. These homes must have a "Grandfather Clause," because they have already made the investment. Homes that have paid additional Sewer Development Charges would also be negatively impacted by the proposed rules. Charging homeowners and additional \$500 - \$900 for something they are already doing and then taking away the ability to use their investment to generate that income is not in anyone's best interest. It is worth consideration that many homeowners have over \$500,000 invested in these properties, significant time investments, and the ROI may be better spent outside something that is exposed to diminished returns. We have 12 years worth of records on what we spend on meals, maintenance, housecleaning, plowing, and investing in the skiing community and it is significant. Plus, we have a mortgage and have never made a profit due to all the costs to own and run this 1 property. Thus, more fees and restrictions are not what we need.

**3) Inappropriate fee structure not based on graduated tax system.**

The proposed fee structure to implement the plan is flawed. We already pay Clackamas County Transient Room Tax on our Short-Term Rental which generates X number of days or approximately 60 of days. We also have a large number of days where we rent to the same responsible Winter Tenants for up to Y days (typically, 180 days under a lease). Then we have a large number of completely vacant days Z in the low mud season (September, October, and November). The suggested flat rate of \$500 to \$900 every two years is unfair, especially given all our other expenses and mortgage! It does nothing to address the fact that most of the year, we do not fall under the Short-Term rental mode of operation. It is extremely unfair and puts a huge tax burden on me and my business all for the "benefit" of renting in a Short-Term mode. I would strongly suggest it is the responsibility of Clackamas County revisit their fee structure and

graduate it using an equation that includes number of days rented in Short-Term mode X, number of Long-Term Days rented mode Y, and number of Empty Days Z, to create a more fair, proportional, and graduated fee structure.

In conclusion, as a small business owner, we want to provide a Five-Star service that benefits the community and supports the local economy. The proposed rules do not support landlords ability to provide that service. We suggest the county table the current implementation date of July 2020 and revisit their proposal to address these concerns mentioned.

Respectfully,

Jeff and Brenda Ackerson, Owners  
Allitude Ski Chalet LLC  
23294 Chisholm Trail  
Bend, Oregon 97702

---

Spam Email

Phishing Email

**Fritzie, Martha**

---

**From:** Allitude Chalet, LLC <allitudeskichalet@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 30, 2020 2:58 PM  
**To:** Fritzie, Martha; Callie Elliott; Anderson566@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Anderson, Violet (Tokareff) (VJTO); Peter Dodd; Sally Neidermeyer; Kris Deane; komorebihouse515@gmail.com; Eastlake1888@yahoo.com; Brian Bogatin  
**Subject:** Letter To County Commissioners For 01/30/2020 Public Hearing on The Regulations Impacting Short-Term Rental In Rural Clackamas County

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Allitude Ski Chalet LLC (Physical Address)  
 30765 East Meldrum Street  
 Government Camp, Oregon 97028  
 January 30, 2020

Good Evening County Commissioners:

This letter is to be read at the meeting note for The Board of Commissioners will hold for a public hearing on the regulations at the Board business meeting at 6 p.m., Thursday, Jan. 30, on the 4th floor of the Public Services Building, 2051 Kaen Road, Oregon City. It has been written in response to the proposed regulations at <https://www.clackamas.us/planning/str>

My wife and I have many concerns about the proposed regulations for the Vacation Rentals in Government Camp, Oregon (unincorporated Clackamas County). We have owned and ran Allitude Ski Chalet LLC since 2007 and have a Five-Star rating on Vacation Rental By Owner <https://www.vrbo.com/194606>. We have regularly utilized services from Carol's Cleaning, Extreme Cleaning LLC, Jenna McClure, and Callie Elliot to provide cleaning and property management services to our property and thus, have a strong local presence. And, we regularly maintain and service our property in person and address issues promptly as they arise. We have a 12-1/2 year history of obtaining garbage and plowing services from the only providers in Government Camp. We provide written rules to both our Long-Term Leases and Short-Term Vacation Rental Guests.

We are of the opinion that a few less involved landlords and/or short-term vacation rental owners who may NOT be: properly screening guests, charging low damage waivers, part of the CCTRT system, etc. are at the heart of this issue. The draft regulations and the proposed actions to address this issue are unfair to actively involved and responsible owners. The regulations do not take into account historical precedents in unincorporated Clackamas County and appear to be an attempt to generate county income based on urban Portland standards.

If there is a problem with some landlords, then why has Clackamas county not examined what the owners have done on an annual basis? For example, collecting graduated fees in arrears vs a flat fee based on the following, and subjecting non-complying landlords to further inspection based on:

- Proof of an operating plan for the home (ie Guestbook, Operating Agreement, EIN, etc...)
- Proof of "Courtesy Home Inspection" by Scott Klein Hoodland Fire (This could be fee based to subsidize the current inadequacies and local fire department)
- Proof of receipt for fire extinguisher maintenance services (Annual inspection is required)
- Proof of short term days rented, long term days rented and empty days (CCRT, Leases, VRBO Reports)
- Proof of payment for plowing, garbage, and utility services
- Proof of payment for CCTRT

We find fault with the way the current proposed Clackamas regulations are written in the following areas and are requesting further analysis, coordination with other County Agencies, and more Community Planning Organization discussions:



**1) Enforcement of number of spaces and garbage pickup in a snow zone is difficult at best.**

The proposed regulations do nothing to address issues with Bliss Sanitary Service. This company acts like a monopoly and provides service at certain times of the year and not at others. Bliss has refused to service our home on East Meldrum during the winter. It was not until recently, the last 7 years, that they would even come down Meldrum to pick up trash at a cost \$207.00 a month. The worst problem we have with garbage is picking up trash generated by winter-spring day trip visitors who don't stay overnight. We have to pick up debris in snow or melting snow piles, up and down our street. They leave broken sleds, trash and debris everywhere. We once picked up 5 full garbage bags of plastic sled parts. Our seasonal renters and most of our short term folks are not the cause of that problem.

We have one plowing Service in Government Camp and that is Government Camp Snow Removal. I have room for 6 cars in front of my home, and what I would consider the best parking situation in Government Camp. However, it is a struggle for them to keep up being the only business in town when the snow hits. When that happens I am in contact with both the neighbors and tenants to communicate and address parking concerns.

The County could also request proof of garbage service receipts and payment for plowing as a part of tax report so you could examine who is paying and who is not paying for necessary services. In fact, there are many Long-Term residents who do not pay and benefit from plowing generated by Short-Term rentals.

**2) Lack of "Grandfather Clauses" for previous purchases/owner investment on items the county has previously collected tax on and benefited from.**

As Small Business Owner, I am obliged to complete and pay Oregon Confidential Personal Property Tax which the State of Oregon has the ability to collect funds on equipment used to house 12 persons in my 5 bedroom home. For example, in our bunk room, we have sleeping capacity for up to 4 unrelated persons and on the very rare occasion it is needed, the room could sleep 7. I do not believe it has ever slept 7, and I certainly would not ever allow it any routine basis. Other homes in Government Camp have dormitory style bunk rooms and spaces. The proposed plans eliminate placing people in these rooms and provides no "Grandfather Clause" allowing use for equipment bedding, furniture, and architecture that promotes intended use for Ski Camps and International Teams. The County and State are the very institutions who have collected tax on these items. The proposed rules lack consideration for historical use, abuse our time and monetary investment in the community, and make the investment in property on Mt. Hood a questionable venture.

Additionally, the Fire Marshall has set policy and historically fire code has dictated policy on occupancy. Homes that have dormitory style sleeping arrangements typically have invested thousands of dollars in Sprinkler Systems and can sleep more than 15. These homes must have a "Grandfather Clause," because they have already made the investment. Homes that have paid additional Sewer Development Charges would also be negatively impacted by the proposed rules. Charging homeowners and additional \$500 - \$900 for something they are already doing and then taking away the ability to use their investment to generate that income is not in anyone's best interest. It is worth consideration that many homeowners have over \$500,000 invested in these properties, significant time investments, and the ROI may be better spent outside something that is exposed to diminished returns. We have 12 years worth of records on what we spend on meals, maintenance, housecleaning, plowing, and investing in the skiing community and it is significant. Plus, we have a mortgage and have never made a profit due to all the costs to own and run this 1 property. Thus, more fees and restrictions are not what we need.

**3) Inappropriate fee structure not based on graduated tax system.**

The proposed fee structure to implement the plan is flawed. We already pay Clackamas County Transient Room Tax on our Short-Term Rental which generates X number of days or approximately 60 of days. We also have a large number of days where we rent to the same responsible Winter Tenants for up to Y days (typically, 180 days under a lease). Then we have a large number of completely vacant days Z in the low mud season (September, October, and November). The suggested flat rate of \$500 to \$900 every two years is unfair, especially given all our other expenses and mortgage! It does nothing to address the fact that most of the year, we do not fall under the Short-Term rental mode of operation. It is extremely unfair and puts a huge tax burden on me and my business all for the "benefit" of renting in a Short-Term mode. I would strongly suggest it is the responsibility of Clackamas County revisit their fee structure and graduate it using an equation that includes number of days rented in Short-Term mode X, number of Long-Term Days rented mode Y, and number of Empty Days Z, to create a more fair, proportional, and graduated fee structure.

In conclusion, as a small business owner, we want to provide a Five-Star service that benefits the community and supports the local economy. The proposed rules do not support landlords ability to provide that service. We suggest the county table the current implementation date of July 2020 and revisit their proposal to address these concerns mentioned.

Respectfully,

Jeff and Brenda Ackerson, Owners  
Allitude Ski Chalet LLC  
23294 Chisholm Trail  
Bend, Oregon 97702

---

Spam Email  
Phishing Email

who get cited put that in their online reviews and create an incentive for owners to improve their behavior. **If the Sheriff has access to the full database of STR properties they can tailor their behavior appropriately on their callouts.**

- iii. **24 hours seems like a long time to wait for a response from the responsible person** ("In the event that the listed representative does not respond within 24 hours or does not adequately remedy the issue, the Code Enforcement Division of the Department of Transportation and Development should be notified"). I mean, if "guests" are out making a racket at 2 in the morning what good is a call back the next day going to do? Seems like similar sets of regulations specify a *much* shorter response time; Palm Springs enforces **a 30 minute response time** to bring the responsible person to the property to correct the violation.
  1. Noise is a big issue. With a 24 hour response time there is no way to address it except to call the sheriff.
  2. An **on-call code enforcement official would be beneficial** when problems arise, and specifying that that **manager/responsible person has to arrive at the property to correct each violation within 30 minutes** is desirable.
- d. Violations:
  - i. I agree with some of the commissioners that **stiff fines (8.10.100 B.) will improve behavior**; it has to hurt or it's meaningless. Some of these guys are getting \$500/night for their units; small fines will just be the cost of doing business.
    1. Three violations in two years for cancelation seems like too many but if fines are levied early and often that's probably ok. Good operators won't have any violations, and the bad ones don't care so let's start taking their money and using it to pay for the program as soon as possible. Let's say there's a violation. I would think the first one, unless egregious or committed by a known serial offender, would be free. First fines should start at \$500 (this has precedence in California), and double it for the nest and any subsequent violations in each registration period.
      - a. Can you please write into the regs that the first fine in each registration period will be \$500, and all subsequent fines \$1000?
  - e. **There should be a provision for banning the worst operators**, permanently. Otherwise they will turn into zombies and they will never go away.
    - i. Make people register. Palm Springs fines unregistered operators \$5,000 and bans them forever, and if they keep doing it it's \$10,000. Compliance in Palm Springs is extremely high, which leads to a great program and adequate county funding. Great idea, let's do it.

Always happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your help!

Best,

Mark

Mark W. Skinner, Ph.D.  
Skinner and Associates  
1275 SE River Forest Rd.  
Milwaukie, OR 97267  
971-337-7132

---

Spam Email  
Phishing Email