From:	joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent:	Sunday, October 27, 2019 2:01 PM
To:	Erika Shook; Comp Plan Update; DL - Council
Cc:	Lynnette Wood; Yonatan Aldort; Lisa Byers
Subject:	Vacasa pitch letter
Attachments:	Vacasa pitch documents.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I received the attached 2 page, 2 sided document in the mail yesterday.

They are from a vacation rental service organization called "Vacasa."

I have marked in red oval circles two areas that concern me about possible mis-use of public records.

The first circle highlights my name and the first sentence of the letter. The second circle is in a footnote at the bottom of the 4th page.

From the first circled text, I wonder: How does this organization know that I have a second home in Olga?

From the second circled text, I gather that the pitch materials were sent to properties "that are currently operating, or can operate, as legal vacation rentals pursuant to cityu/county ordinance…"

It would not be difficult for a organization that promotes itself as software smart to download SJC's vacation rental permit data, marry it to the parcel's dataset, and hoover up the legal address of the owner of a vacation rental permit. (Note: the Parcels dataset was modified on 28

August 2019. SJC does not indicate what the modifications were. Earlier versions of this dataset included considerably more information, including name and address of the parcel owner. Those fields no longer exist in the current version of the Parcels dataset. However, a workaround would be to look up the TPN from the vacation rental dataset on the Assessor's interactive web site to get this information. This process can be scripted to run automatically, thus bypassing the requirement to file a public records request and associated requirement to sign an affidavit that the information gathered would not be used for commercial purposes.) It would be simple enough to scan the parcels dataset to determine if a particular individual owned more than one parcel, and that at least one parcel had a VR Permit.

Having done that, Vacasa could then spit out a mail merge letter with an VRP owner's name and the town the owner's VR Permit is in, as they did to/for me. I have no way of knowing whether this pitch package was sent to out of county owners. It is simple enough to filter the owner's contact info by zip code and only send these pitches to in-county VR permit holders. Diving a bit deeper, over half of the VR Permit data in the dataset shows no local address for the VR Permit. This challenge can be easily overcome by downloading the "Address" dataset and marrying it to the VR Permit dataset, thus confirming which address, and thus town, the VR Permit is located in. An alternate approach is to use the "X, Y" fields (which would more properly be identified as Longitude and Latitude) and ask Dr. Google, or SJC Polaris Search, to pinpoint the VR Permit location. All of this could be scripted.

This process, tho inferred, strikes me as a deliberate attempt to bypass the requirement that county information not be used for commercial purposes. I bring this to the attention of DCD. I don't know what enforcement action could be triggered by this apparent abuse of public information.

Joe Symons