

CLAIMS	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limiting Vacation Rentals (called VRs from here on out) will result in affordable housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> False. The documented average price of current VRs is \$750k, not “affordable” if sold as non VR homes. If turned into a long term rental instead, mortgage calculator shows the monthly rent would have to be \$3,500 a month to meet mortgage, taxes, insurance, etc. According to WA State Low Income Housing Coalition a low income individual could afford \$1500.00/month in expenses. No one can make the argument that VRs are stealing from the low income housing inventory. We do have a need for affordable rentals and purchases. A moratorium or even a cap on VR permits does nothing to increase that inventory. VR owners support efforts to increase affordable housing as workers who help us all survive depend upon them.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we don’t stop them now, the number of VRs will grow greatly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> False. Compliant VRs actually make up only 3% of the housing inventory. The 7% figure originally cited by the council included non compliant and inactive permits. The net number of future permits is unlikely to increase. Each year, 8-10% of active permits drop and become non VR properties. The number of new permit applications, in current conditions, is falling and there will likely be a loss of 4-5% in 6 months time as COVID has brought some owners here to live full time.s Permit applications are falling also consequent to the 2018 regulations which place greater demands and costs on VR owners. Already, the loss in permitted VRS has created less demand for housecleaners and maintenance workers. Additionally, this is causing a loss of sales and lodging tax dollars. HOA’s currently restrict VRs in many areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VRs impact the sense of community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some may long for a disappearing way of life. This is understandable. We all love our charming rural communities. But VRs are not the cause of the change as they are, by far, quaint, well maintained, charming cottages.

CLAIMS	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current moratorium hurts no one. It's wise to keep it in effect while we study the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> False Anecdotally, several at the council meeting Feb. 23, told the story of having scrimped and saved, purchased property with the assurance they could rent it part time as a VR in order to pay the mortgage, spent thousands to comply with the 2018 regulations to apply for a permit, and faced financial ruin when the moratorium was suddenly put into place, in some cases only days before the moratorium. The substantial harm suffered by these individuals alone is reason enough to repeal this moratorium immediately. VR owners who live off island have come forward in great numbers to report, they too have been hurt. They own a home on the island and off island and rent the on island home seasonally in order to pay mortgage, insurance, taxes, and more in order to one day live here. They give to the community arts, businesses, and environment and hoped to become full time residents one day. The VR income is the one way, maybe the only way, these individuals would make these homes affordable to the non wealthy. The moratorium killed those dreams and cost us the benefits of their eventually joining us. Businesses and real estate agents report an impact already felt during a time when the pandemic already has them threatened. The rhetoric of the current moratorium has created divisiveness in the community. The threat that the moratorium should become permanent, that permits should not "run with the land," that permits will face renewals. all create fear and division.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VR rental guests are generally noisy, destructive, disrespectful, and undesirable and destroy neighborhoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> False Sheriff Krebs reports he has <i>rarely</i> received a complaint of disturbance and noise from any VR. Rather, <i>the vast majority of</i> complaints are about locals having parties or causing a disturbance or nuisance. VR owners are required by 2018 regulations to stipulate guests observe quiet hours, to post property lines and to prohibit trespassing on neighbors' property, to limit the number of people allowed on the property, to properly restraint pets when allowed at all. VR owners are required by 2018 regulations to be on island or to appoint someone who is to enforce said rules. VR owners <i>en mass</i> report their guests are delightful, often return year after year, love the islands and are much better neighbors than in other settings.

CLAIMS	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRs owned by corporations or businesses or people who have no connection to the islands and only want to make a profit are the problem. Further, this will become more of a problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • False • A close examination of the VR permits held by off island property owners found the following: not one is a corporation. 90% of them own only 1 rental. Of the remaining 10%, 1 property management owns only 6, 4 are trusts or individuals who own 3 each, 4 are trusts that own 2 each, and 7 LLCs own 2 each. (LLCs are generally for insurance protection, not a corporation.) •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRs place an unsustainable demand on water and sewer resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsubstantiated by accurate data. • VR renters are seasonal and are generally here for two or three days at a time, resulting in less use than full time residents. • VRs are often vacant in between renters resulting in no overall use during vacancy. • VRs, by 2018 regulations, are required to cap the number of occupants per bedroom. LTRs and private residents have no such regulation and density per home can grow without restriction.
<p>VRs increase traffic problems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsubstantiated • Campers, hotel occupants, friends, relatives, day tourists, the increase in local population all contribute to traffic
<p>VRs strain roads.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsubstantiated. • Increased numbers of permanent residents use roads. • The friends and relatives of permanent residents use roads. • A visit to the areas where there are VRs showed no evidence of impact
<p>VR owners are resisting restrictions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • False • VR owners asked repeatedly to be included in the discussions with the VRWG but were flatly denied a voice • VR owners realized some caps would increase revenue stream • VR owners believe the 2018 regulations are working and believed the council would allow them time to work.

CLAIMS	RESPONSE
There are over 3,000 signatories supporting the moratorium	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Misleading• An examination of the IP generated addresses of the signatories reveals only 25% of the signatories are from San Juan County.• At the recent council meeting, 70 people called in. 10 were in favor of the moratorium. 60 were opposed and advocated for an immediate appeal.