

Overcrowding cancels EDC supes' VHR meeting



Hundreds of people came out for the Feb. 1 El Dorado County Board of Supervisors meeting. Photo/Kathryn Reed

By Kathryn Reed

Thursday night's El Dorado County Board of Supervisors' meeting in South Lake Tahoe was canceled because the venue was too small to accommodate all the people who turned out.

The meeting was in the South Lake Tahoe City Council chambers at Lake Tahoe Airport. Fire officials said there were too many people in the room. In addition to that, the county had no way of operating the city's audio/visual equipment so the screen in the lobby could not be turned on for the overflow crowd to watch the proceedings.

The lone item on the Feb. 1 agenda was vacation home rentals.

The meeting will most likely be rescheduled at a facility owned by Lake Tahoe Unified School District, which can house

more people. Per state law the date has to be disclosed a minimum of 72 hours before it would start.

Originally just the supervisors' ad hoc committee made up of Sue Novasel and Mike Ranalli was to convene. It became a full board meeting when an anonymous complaint was filed against Novasel alleging she had a conflict of interest when it came to VHRs because of her husband's business.

It was determined this week by the Fair Political Practices Commission that Novasel has no conflict. This means she can participate in all discussions and votes pertaining to VHRs, whether it's at the county level or the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, of which she is a board member.

This also means when the meeting is rescheduled it's possible the county will choose for it to revert back to a meeting of the ad hoc committee and not the entire board. The board usually only meets once a year in Tahoe, and that is in August.

Prior to being told the meeting was canceled people had the opportunity to place dots on boards indicating what they like and don't like about the short-term rentals.

Under problems the choices were:

- Unfamiliar people in the neighborhood
- Strain on law enforcement
- Decrease in property values
- Parking
- Noise
- Unpermitted/unregulated units
- Loss of long-term residents

- Decrease in long-term housing/increase in rents
- Safety, such as wildland fires.

The choices for benefits of VHRS included:

- Increase in transient occupancy tax
- Encourages maintenance, upkeep of property
- Local jobs
- Increase in property values
- Supplemental income
- Expands tourism market.

This is a **link to the Feb. 1 agenda item**, with supporting material. It is likely to look the same whenever the meeting actually happens.