BILL062(25)
Testimony

MISC. COMM. 480

*ZONING & PLANNING (ZON)

***ZONING & PLANNING (ZON) Meeting**

Meeting Date: Sep 23, 2025 @ 01:00 PM

Support: 1

Oppose: 6

I wish to comment: 9

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Yoh Kuwano	yohkuwano@hawaiiproperty.com	96816
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Sep 18, 2025 @ 09:49 AM

Testimony:

Comments on Bill 62(25)

I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement, including the associated $1,000 fee, for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended not only to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process but also to increase compliance with TVU regulations. This new re-registration fee goes against that goal.

The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without having to undergo a full re-registration.

The owner is ultimately responsible for all other aspects of the TVU registration and renewal, so a change in your role as the operator should not necessitate a brand new registration.

It is a very common and normal part of business for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and this administrative change should not carry a punitive fee.

This requirement will directly impede the growth of my business by making it cost-prohibitive for owners to hire a new property manager.

Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, enabling residents to afford to live here. This requirement will unfairly hinder business growth and threaten these jobs.

This proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, potentially encouraging some to operate outside of the established framework.

We understand there may be minimal review required by the DPP staff for this change, but it should not require a new registration. This creates extra work for the DPP, BFS, state Department of Taxation, our resident owners and our company's staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine change is unreasonable.
Punitive fees are a hindrance to compliance and unfairly burden our residents and small businesses.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kristin Tani	kristint@marinahawaiivacations.com	96815

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Marina Hawaii Vacations	I wish to comment	Sep 18, 2025 @ 09:50 AM

Testimony:

Aloha, I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement and the associated $1,000 fee for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25). The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was designed to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process while increasing compliance with TVU regulations. However, this new re-registration fee undermines that goal. The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without undergoing a full re-registration process. Since the owner is ultimately responsible for all aspects of TVU registration and renewal, a change in operator should not require a brand-new registration. Furthermore, it is common and normal for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and such administrative changes should not come with a punitive fee. This requirement will directly hinder the growth of businesses by making it cost-prohibitive for owners to hire new property managers. Additionally, Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, helping residents afford to live here, and this fee will unfairly threaten these jobs and impede business growth. The proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, which could encourage some to operate outside of the established framework. While we understand there may be minimal review required by DPP staff for this change, it should not necessitate a new registration, as it creates unnecessary work for DPP, BFS, the state Department of Taxation, resident owners, and company staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine administrative change is unreasonable. Mahalo for taking the time to read this and for allowing me to provide comment.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Joyce Whitegon	seajoycego@gmail.com	96731

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 18, 2025 @ 11:59 AM

Testimony:

The portion of this bill relating to the $!,000.00 fee to change a manager is not in the best interest of the City and County as it will force the people who have not registered away from the registration process, and possibly drive people who have registered away because of this continuous fiscal punishment of TVU and NUC operators.

It is a very small change to the permit and should not result in massive labor costs.

Sincerely David and Joyce Whitegon

57-068 Eleku Kuilima Place 147East

Kahuku HI 96731

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kathie Schmid	kathie@captaincookresorts.com	96816

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Captain Cook Resorts	I wish to comment	Sep 18, 2025 @ 12:04 PM

Testimony:

Captain Cook

RESORTS

Vacation Rentals Property Management Sales Rentals

Subject: Comments on Bill 62(25)

I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement, including the associated $1,000 fee, for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process and increase compliance with TVU regulations, which we as Property Managers supported. This new re-registration fee goes against that goal. Previously, operator changes were simple and cost-free under Ordinance 22-7. The inclusion of "Operator" in the new language of Ordinance 24-14, should only apply to property ownership changes and "Operator" should be removed. The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update Operator information without undergoing a full re-registration as the Ownership of the property is not changing. The owner is ultimately responsible for all other aspects of TVU registration and renewal, so a change in the operator's role should not necessitate a brand-new registration.

It is a common and normal part of business for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and this administrative change should not carry a punitive fee. This requirement will directly impede the growth of my business by making it cost-prohibitive for owners to hire a new property manager. We have new clients that have had to re-register and pay the $1,000 fee and start all over again as a new applicant, even though they had just done so or renewed previously only two months prior. Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, enabling residents to afford to live here. This requirement will unfairly hinder business growth and threaten these jobs.

This proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, potentially encouraging some to operate outside of the established framework. While we understand there may be minimal review required by the DPP staff for this change, it should not require a new registration. This creates extra work for the DPP, BFS, state Department of Taxation, our resident owners, and our company's staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine change is unreasonable. Punitive fees are a hindrance to compliance and unfairly burden our residents and small businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kathie Schmid

Director of Business Development/Client Success , Captain Cook Resorts

1012 Kapahulu Ave Suite 110, Honolulu, HI 96816

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Michael Heh	mikeheh100@gmail.com	96731
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 21, 2025 @ 07:58 PM

Testimony:

Aloha City Council Members -

I am writing to request the removal of the re-registration requirement and the associated $1,000 fee, for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended not only to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process but also to increase compliance with TVU regulations. This new re-registration fee goes against that goal.

The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without having to undergo a full re-registration.

The owner is ultimately responsible for all other aspects of the TVU registration and renewal, so a change in your role as the operator should not necessitate a brand new registration.

It is a very common and normal part of business for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and this administrative change should not carry a punitive fee.

Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, enabling residents to afford to live here. This requirement will unfairly hinder business growth and threaten these jobs.

This proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, potentially encouraging some to operate outside of the established framework.

We understand there may be minimal review required by the DPP staff for this change, but it should not require a new registration. This creates extra work for the DPP, BFS, state Department of Taxation, our resident owners and our company's staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine change is unreasonable.

Punitive fees are a hindrance to compliance and unfairly burden our residents and small businesses.

Mike Heh

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Ben Bennett	benrbennett1219@gmail.com	84117
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Sep 22, 2025 @ 06:37 AM

Testimony:

Dear Committee Members - I ask that you remove the $1,000 re-registration requirement in Bill 62(25) for a change in operator or on-island contact.

Ordinance 24-14 was just passed to simplify the TVU process and improve compliance. This new fee does the opposite.

The HNL Build system already lets owners update information — there’s no reason a routine manager change should

require a full re-registration.

Owners are still responsible for everything else. Switching managers or on-island contacts is common and should not be treated like a violation. Adding a $1,000 fee punishes responsible operators, creates more work for DPP and BFS, and threatens local jobs that property managers support.

This type of penalty discourages compliance instead of encouraging it. Please remove this requirement from the bill.

Mahalo and aloha,

Ben Bennett

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kelly Lee	kellyreports@gmail.com	96734
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
OSTRA	Support	Sep 22, 2025 @ 08:02 AM

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Thuy Huynh	drthuyhuynh@gmail.com	96817
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Sep 22, 2025 @ 11:32 AM

Testimony:

I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement, including the associated $1,000 fee, for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended not only to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process but also to increase compliance with TVU regulations. This new re-registration fee goes against that goal. The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without having to undergo a full re-registration.

The owner is ultimately responsible for all other aspects of the TVU registration and renewal, so a change in your role as the operator should not necessitate a brand new registration.

It is a very common and normal part of business for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and this administrative change should not carry a punitive fee.

Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, enabling residents to afford to live here. This requirement will unfairly hinder business growth and threaten these jobs.

This proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, potentially encouraging some to operate outside of the established framework.

We understand there may be minimal review required by the DPP staff for this change, but it should not require a new registration. This creates extra work for the DPP, BFS, state Department of Taxation, our resident owners and our company's staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine change is unreasonable.

Punitive fees are a hindrance to compliance and unfairly burden our residents and small businesses.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Aaron Kaplan	akaplan@hawaii.edu	96817
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 22, 2025 @ 11:48 AM

Testimony:

I am writing in opposition to the re-registration requirement and associated $1,000 fee for changes in operator or on-island point of contact under Bill 62(25).

Key Points of Concern:

**Contradicts Legislative Intent

Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was enacted to streamline TVU registration and renewal and to improve compliance.

This new requirement creates additional barriers rather than simplifying the process.

**Administrative Nature of the Change

Updating an operator or on-island contact does not alter ownership responsibilities.

The City's HNL Build system is designed to accommodate such updates without a full re-registration.

**Economic and Workforce Impacts

Property managers provide thousands of local, living-wage jobs that support O'ahu families.

Penalizing routine business changes with a $1,000 fee threatens business stability and local employment.

**Unintended Consequences

The fee adds unnecessary financial strain on owners and management companies.

It risks discouraging compliance and incentivizing unregulated operations outside the established framework.

**Operational Inefficiency

While minimal staff review may be necessary, requiring full re-registration creates excess workload for DPP, BFS, the Department of Taxation, owners, and management companies.

Conclusion

This provision imposes an unreasonable and punitive burden on residents and small businesses. I respectfully urge the Council to remove the re-registration requirement and associated fee from Bill 62(25) to ensure fair, efficient, and effective regulation of TVUs in line with the goals of Ordinance 24-14.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron Kaplan, PhD

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Theresa Harden	th@invest808.com	96815
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 22, 2025 @ 11:53 AM

Testimony:

I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement, including the associated $1,000 fee,

for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended not only to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process but also to increase compliance with TVU regulations. This new re-registration fee goes against that goal.

The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without having to undergo a full re-registration.

The owner is ultimately responsible for all other aspects of the TVU registration and renewal, so a change in your role as the operator should not necessitate a brand new registration.

It is a very common and normal part of business for owners to change managers or on-island contacts, and this administrative change should not carry a punitive fee.

This requirement will directly impede the growth of my business by making it cost-prohibitive for owners to hire a new property manager.

Oahu's property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, enabling residents to afford to live here. This requirement will unfairly hinder business growth and threaten these jobs.

This proposed fee adds an unnecessary financial burden to operate a TVU, potentially encouraging some to operate outside of the established framework.

We understand there may be minimal review required by the DPP staff for this change, but it should not require a new registration. This creates extra work for the DPP, BFS, state Department of Taxation, our resident owners and our company's staff. Charging $1,000 for a routine change is unreasonable.
Punitive fees are a hindrance to compliance and unfairly burden our residents and small businesses.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Zuriel Kaplan	zurielpop@gmail.com	96817
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 22, 2025 @ 11:54 AM

Testimony:
I respectfully oppose the $1,000 re-registration requirement for a change in operator or on-island contact.
This fee contradicts the intent of Ordinance 24-14, which was meant to streamline TVU registration and strengthen compliance. Updating an operator or contact is a routine administrative matter — it does not change ownership responsibilities and should not require starting over with a full re-registration.
Imposing such a fee unfairly penalizes normal business operations, creates unnecessary workload for city agencies, and

places a heavy burden on residents and small businesses. Property managers support thousands of local, living-wage jobs, and this policy threatens both compliance and livelihoods.

Punitive fees discourage cooperation, not encourage it. I urge you to remove this requirement from Bill 62(25) so the system remains fair, efficient, and aligned with its original purpose.

Mahalo for your consideration.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Noah Ray Shah	noahrayshah@gmail.com	96815
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Sep 22, 2025 @ 12:06 PM

Testimony:

Subject: Comments on Bill 62(25)

Dear Committee,

Let's be blunt: charging $1,000 every time a property owner changes a manager or on-island contact is absurd. Ordinance 24-14 was supposed to make the TVU system easier and get more people to comply, not slap them with a fine disguised as a "fee" for making a routine update. The city built the HNL Build system precisely so information like this could be updated without a bureaucratic circus.

Owners are already responsible for everything else tied to their registration. Swapping managers or local contacts is as normal as changing plumbers, and it shouldn't trigger a full re-registration like we're filing for a new birth certificate. This isn't fraud, it's admin. And treating it like a criminal offense with a four-figure penalty isn't just overkill — it actively discourages compliance.

Here's the real-world effect: it strangles small businesses, it makes it harder for owners to hire or replace managers, and it threatens the local, living-wage jobs that property management companies provide. You say you want regulation and compliance, but what you're really creating is an incentive to go around the system altogether. That helps no one.

Yes, I get that DPP staff may have to review a form. But that's not worth $1,000. That's worth... a cup of coffee. A fee that high isn't a cost-recovery measure — it's a punishment. And punitive fees are the worst kind of policy: they breed resentment, kill cooperation, and make the government look like it's shaking down residents for cash.

If you want compliance, don't turn clerical updates into extortion. Cut the re-registration requirement and the $1,000 fee from Bill 62(25).

Respectfully (and a little exasperated),

Noah Ray Shah

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Edward Jones	kostro@paradiseip.com	96825
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
KOSTRO	Oppose	Sep 22, 2025 @ 12:07 PM

Name:	Email:	Zip:
helena von sydow	helenavonsydow@gmail.com	96731
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Sep 22, 2025 @ 12:14 PM

Testimony:

Subject: Comments on Bill 62(25)

Dear Chair and Council members,

I am writing to respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement, including the associated $1,000 fee, for a change in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62(25).

The recently passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended to streamline the TVU registration and renewal process while increasing compliance with TVU regulations. Requiring a full re-registration and imposing this fee runs counter to that goal.

With the city's new HNL Build system, owners should be able to update operator or contact information efficiently without undergoing a full re-registration. The owner remains ultimately responsible for all other aspects of the TVU registration and renewal; therefore, a change in operator or point of contact should not necessitate starting the process over.

It is both common and expected that owners may change property managers or on-island contacts. This is a normal part of doing business, and such an administrative update should not trigger a punitive $1,000 fee. If left in place, this requirement will:

Make it cost-prohibitive for owners to hire a new property manager, directly impeding business growth.

Threaten thousands of local, living-wage jobs supported by O'ahu's property management industry.

Place an unfair financial burden on residents and small businesses already complying with TVU regulations.

Encourage some operators to avoid compliance altogether due to the high cost of simple administrative changes.

While we understand DPP staff may need to perform a minimal review of these updates, that does not justify a full re-registration process. In fact, this creates more unnecessary work for DPP, BFS, the State Department of Taxation, property owners, and company staff. Charging $1,000 for what should be a routine change is unreasonable.

Punitive fees discourage compliance, overburden small businesses, and risk destabilizing an industry that provides essential housing options for visitors while creating jobs for local residents.
For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to remove the re-registration requirement and fee for changes in operator or on-island point of contact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Helena von Sydow

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Harald von Sydow	nztrendshi@gmail.com	96731
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Sep 22, 2025 @ 12:17 PM

Testimony:
Subject: Comments on Bill 62(25)

Dear Chair and Council members,

I respectfully request the removal of the re-registration requirement and $1,000 fee for changes in operator or on-island contact in Bill 62(25).

This fee is unnecessary and punitive. Ordinance 24-14 was designed to streamline TVU registration and improve compliance, yet requiring a full re-registration for a simple administrative update does the opposite. Owners remain responsible for their registration, and the HNL Build system should allow for efficient updates without restarting the process.

Changes in property managers or on-island contacts are common in business and should not create a $1,000 burden. This requirement will hinder business growth, discourage compliance, and put local jobs at risk. Minimal staff review may be needed, but it does not justify a costly and duplicative process.

I urge you to remove this requirement to support fairness, compliance, and the sustainability of small businesses on Oʻahu.

Sincerely,
Harald von Sydow

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Bradley Ramos	brad@captaincookresorts.com	96816

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Captain Cook Resorts/OSTRA	I wish to comment	Sep 22, 2025 @ 02:14 PM

OSTRA
O'AHU SHORT-TERM RENTAL ALLIANCE

The City Council of Honolulu
Committee on Zoning & Planning, September 23, 2025

Re: **Support and Comments for Bill 62(25)**

Aloha Chair and Vice Chair of the Zoning Committee,

The O'ahu Short Term Rental Alliance (OSTRA), representing thousands of residents and workers in the legal short-term rental industry, strongly supports Bill 62(25). This legislation is a significant step forward, building on the success of Ordinance 24-14, which has effectively streamlined the registration process for both applicants and city departments.

However, we have identified one key issue that we believe was an unintended consequence of the original ordinance. The current law requires a new registration ($1,000) whenever a property's operator or point of contact changes, even if the owner remains the same.

In our industry, changing operators or points of contact is a normal occurrence. But under the current rules, owners face unnecessary costs and delays, while DPP staff must re-review the same documents over and over again. BFS and the state Tax Department are also required to conduct time-consuming clearances when they may have just done this months prior for the same property. This creates extra work for everyone without improving compliance.

We respectfully ask that you amend Section (2)(C)(y) to remove "change in operator" as a trigger for re-registration. A simpler approach—such as allowing updates in HNL Build or creating a modest operator change fee—would ease the burden on owners, reduce duplicate work for DPP, and encourage more owners to stay registered.

We fully support this bill as these changes ease the workload for the DPP and encourage more transient vacation unit owners to register. This legislation demonstrates a strong commitment to working with the community for the benefit of all.

Mahalo,

_____

Kelly Lee, President
O'ahu Short Term Rental Alliance (OSTRA)

KOSTRO

Kama'āina Occupied Short-Term Rentals O'ahu

Defending short-term rental rights of kama'āina whose rental property is their primary residence.

September 23, 2025 ZONING & PLANNING COMMITTEE

Aloha Chair Kia'āina, Vice Chair Waters, and members of the Zoning & Planning Committee,

IN OPPOSITION PROPOSAL ATTACHED

Re: Bill 2025-62 https://hnldoc.ehawaii.gov/hnldoc/document-download?id=25922

KOSTRO asks that Bill 2025-62 be held in this committee to:

1. Codify MTRs (30-179 day) grandfathering as discussed in this committee on June 26, 2025
2. Clarify that registrations will run with the property in the event the property changes ownership.
3. Clarify that STRs (1-29 days) are allowed in situations where the residential property to be rented is on the same zoning lot as the primary residence of the landlord to any tenant.
4. Apply the changes to Rooming (Exhibit A) LUO § 21-5.50-3 and definition LUO § 29-1.2.

Rooming is renting governed by state law HRS § 521, The Residential Landlord Tenant Code. Disputes between parties are heard by the state judiciary. There is considerable accountability. Councilmember Tupola's Bill 41 CD1 comments are here 5:28 "The current state Landlord Tenant Code allows for month to month…". HRS § 521-22 has the phrase "any period".

The standards LUO § 21-5.50-3 (d) (Page 29), the title "Accessory Residential" defines rooming as conforming to the Residential Use, except for the time period of 90 days. This accessory use is incidental and inseparable from the residential use. Rooming is a conforming use as it conforms to the standards in LUO § 21-5.50-3 (d).

The 90 day time period provision has already been established by the federal court as a phase out of a residential use and exceeds the authority given to the counties in HRS §46. Act 17 does not allow for the phasing out of a residential use for existing single family and duplex units. To bring LUO § 21-5.50-3 (d) into compliance, we ask that the time period provision be removed.

At the June 26 DPP presentation, the DPP Director confirmed that the department shares enforcement related data with state and city tax authorities. This ensures compliance with both tax laws and city ordinances. A GET account is required for room renting for compensation. Simplicity could be achieved by using The GET account number as the registration number for rooming.

On June 26, DPP Director Apuna made a 30 day grandfathering recommendation with clear justification. In response to a federal court order, enforcing at 30 days when the ordinance says 90 days is needed and also not sustainable. Zoning ordinances must be mechanical. The text of the ordinance and enforcement must match.

Chair Kia'āina stated concerns about public sentiment toward STRs. Only a few of the most militant in opposition to short-term renting hold the position that residents shouldn't have property rights. A clear framework for owner-occupied renting is well articulated at two town halls conversations between Mayor Blangiardi and Henny Wasson. The videos in order are here and here.

We are not aware of any public sentiment in support of economically exiling Hawaiians from their 'aina.

Most City and County of Honolulu constituents are shocked and appalled when told about current restrictions and excessive fines facing kupuna hosts who live on their rental property.

Mayor Blangiardi describes owner-occupied as a small group of residents. His position is that we are 'not the target'. The reasoning is that:

1. Renting is supervised mostly by kūpuna. There isn't partying and parking abuse.
2. Doesn't impact island-wide housing inventory.
3. Not a significantly large enough group to negatively impact hotel room inventory.
4. Is not available for long-term renting. Rental space on residential lots is also used for family vacations and holidays.
5. Eligibility is simple to determine. Hosted renting properties will have the same TMK for owner/host's residence and the property to be rented and will have a homestead exemption for purposes of property tax.
6. Does not threaten union jobs. Union wages are around $31 per hour. A small business charges around $50/hour for services. Considering union benefits, compensation is par.

KOSTRO opposes relitigating decisions. Our requests do not open any new conversations. We ask instead that the LUO be made legal respecting federal court orders and conforming to state law and the constitutions.

A legislative body must narrowly tailor regulations to the specific government objective and without unnecessarily infringing on individual rights. Banning owner-occupied renting on behalf of a militant few is lashing out at residents by depriving them of their vested property rights.

Mahalo for your consideration of this testimony,

“My personal belief is that we should enact legislation that is a lot like what we did in New York state, which is that you have to be on the premises or in the region therefore you are a local family. We support local families to do short term rentals if they are doing them legally but we don’t support mainland folks making a ton of money . . . “ (that is not spent in O’ahu.) – Governor Josh Green, MD Video link here	

Mahalo for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted for KOSTRO,

Margaret L.H. Aurand

P: 808-498-1560
E: kostro@paradiseip.com

Ed Jones

P:808-292-7512

EXHIBIT A

PROPOSED AMENDMENT - HOSTED ROOMS

Proposed changes are in bold:

LUO § 21-5.50-3 Accessory residential. (d) Rooming — standards (Page 29)

From:
(2) Overnight accommodations provided for compensation must be for periods of 90 consecutive days or more in the same dwelling unit as that occupied by an owner, lessee, operator, or proprietor.

To:
(2) Overnight accommodations provided for compensation **may be for any rental period** in the same dwelling unit as that occupied by an owner, lessee, operator, or proprietor **who is physically located within the City and County of Honolulu unless there is an emergency that requires owner's presence off-island and provided further that rental agreements for the dwelling or portion thereof are in writing.**

LUO § 29-1.2 Definitions. Rooming (Page 217)

From:
Providing accessory overnight living accommodations to persons other than transient occupants, for compensation, for periods of 90 consecutive days or more, in the same dwelling unit occupied by an owner or occupant of the dwelling unit. The term does not include bed and breakfast homes (see bed and breakfast home).

To:
Providing accessory overnight living accommodations to persons ~~other than transient occupants,~~ for compensation, for **any period**, in the same dwelling unit occupied by an owner or occupant of the dwelling unit. The term does not include bed and breakfast homes (**accommodations offering breakfast)** (see bed and breakfast home).

EXHIBIT B

MAYOR BLANGIARDI'S STATEMENTS SUPPORTING KAMA'ĀINA HOSTED STRS

Mayor Blangiardi, agreeing that this issue is "*urgent,"* held a policy meeting with his staff on June 30, 2025. As action, he forwarded resident hosting proposal to Corporation Counsel. KOSTRO trusts that council members now have sufficient information from the Mayor's office to proceed with public review of proposed Bill 25-62 in order to protect kama'āina property rights.

Representative Gene Ward 'Beer Summit' House District 18 Community Meeting 8/2/24

This is the KOSTRO questions start at 44 minute 20 second

Ed: https://youtu.be/SWXSAyNLt98?t=2662

Peggy: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SWXSAyNLt98&t=4035s

Historic Hale'iwa Gym Town Hall April 10, 2025

https://youtu.be/nRS0Wue5lFo?t=5795 Henny Wasson

Kahuku High School Townhall May 1, 2025

https://youtu.be/gouVkrAVJ5Q?t=3622 Jojo Chang

https://youtu.be/gouVkrAVJ5Q?t=4379 Henny Wasson

Kalani High School Mayor's Hawaii Kai Town Hall 6/5/25

Peggy: My name is Margaret (Peggy) Aurand. Thank you for being here and allowing us to voice our concerns so that you can timely act on them. I appreciate everyone sitting here tonight. I'm sure you'd rather be home, sipping on a beer.

Mayor: So you're not going to read that whole paper, are you? Right?

Peggy: No, no, no!!

A year ago, you said that you were in favor of and supported kupuna who live on their rental properties. M: yes to do short term renting M: yes. so they can stay in business so they can make a living.

We have been anxiously waiting for action that would give us that chance to make a living and not get priced out of paradise. I have friends who had mortgages and were forced to sell and

leave our beloved islands forever. To stay in business, I could re-set my minimum stay to less than 30 days but, considering the total lack of due process of law, I am afraid to incur a $10,000 fine. This situation is threatening my health. I have just recovered from pneumonia and who knows what's next. I'm 82 and my chances for getting another job are minimal. Um, so, um, I paid off my mortgage long ago but I am now living on savings. We need an immediate executive order—or something—from you or I, and many others like me, may be forced out of the islands we love. This is urgent.

Mayor: [inaudible]. An executive order. Dawn (director of DPP) is there anything you want to say about that? Let me just say on the STRs that was totally out of control. We passed a piece of legislation that was probably **overreach.** We don't think it's a bad experience because it's in the minority versus majority for people living in their homes to rent out a room. I'm not opposed [inaudible]

Inaudible Totally out of control. Trying to overtake what became an insidious impact on housing in neighborhoods for all illegal [inaudible] economics just the how to on that

DAWN Aupuna (dir DPP) It would take legislation; There are a lot of competing interests that we're looking at. You could rent long term to a local family long term. It would be a win-win situation. People need housing. People wanna keep their housing but There's a lot of discussion that needs to be had**.**

Mayor: Mike tells me you have the legislation on your desk now to try to get that done.

[Inaudible] good visitor experience, too.

On the short-term vacation rentals (P hands M the exec order) M: Thank you. That was totally out of control. We passed a piece of legislation that probably overreached. Because we don't think it is a bad [inaudible]

We have to fix the other things We have gone through a lot on that thing – software, enforcement. Quite honestly has been kicked down the road forever. We have to change a lot. Things we fought hard to get. It's unnecessary.

We have to fix the other things. We have gone through a lot on that thing—software, enforcement. Quite honestly [inaudible] Collateral damage your friends and concerns. We have to fix the other thing. We're honestly been kicking this down the road forever. What you describe is unnecessary. We've going to get __ change

25k on Oahu. 50% are owned by non-residents. 27% of those own 20 or more homes. They are in all neighborhoods, not just the North Shore. This is big business. This is not you in your circumstances.

On any given night, there are 11k room/nights available. That's the equivalent of twenty-eight 400 room hotels.

Unchecked in many neighborhoods it drove up housing costs. Took long term rentals to local families off the market. Because human nature being what it is, people are going to look to make a multiple of what they typically can get. Out of control business. We got really aggressive on it. People want to rent the back room. I get it.

Peggy: A lot of us went the STR route. I long term rented for 33 years when I was still working. I'd fly out from the mainland, roll paint and turn screws and repair. That was the only time I got to enjoy my house.

And I thought, "I'm in my golden years. Why can't I have my family come out and enjoy this beautiful house that has been in the family for 52 years?

Mayor: That's not going to stop you from bringing your family over here.

Peggy: Not when you have a long-term rental.

Mayor: Oh, I see what you're saying.

Peggy: This is the flexibility you need.

Mayor: OK, I see what you're saying. OK, I promise you . . .

[Ed gets up, goes to mic]

Ed: Thank you, Mayor, for coming to Rep Ward's beer summit. You laid out the solution here. And, I appreciate that for –my question really is for the chair

Mayor: and your good friend [inaudible]

Ed: [looking at Tommy Waters] How quickly, Chair, can we get a bill through? We testify and we testify (I'm probably very familiar to you, ok?) and we get ignored and we get ignored and it's been many, many years.

Mayor: But I hear you on that I promise . . . Mike says there is legislation on his desk. We have to change a law? Lot? That we fought hard to get and things don't move as quickly as one would think [looking at Peggy] especially for somebody like you. I don't want to create that kind of hardship—especially for someone like you.

Peggy: It's urgent.

Mayor: It's urgent.

Captain Cook
RESORTS

1012 Kapahulu Avenue
Honolulu, HI 96816 USA
+1 (808) 738-5507
www.captaincookresorts.com

COMMITTEE ON ZONING & PLANNING

September 22, 2025

Aloha Committee on Zoning & Planning,

My name is Bradley Ramos, Reservations Manager at Captain Cook Resorts, testifying on behalf of my company and the Oʻahu Short-Term Rental Alliance. I strongly support Bill 62(25), which builds on the success of Ordinance 24-14 and makes registration more efficient, with one important caveat.

The ordinance includes a requirement for full new registration with a $1,000 fee every time an STR's operator or on-island point of contact changes, even when the owner of the property remains the same. These small, routine changes currently result in unnecessary, prohibitive costs to owners and duplicate work for DPP, BFS, and the tax department—all without any appreciable improvement in compliance, which should be the ultimate goal. All this serves to do is create an unnecessary burden for owners who are already in full compliance with the law, and an unreasonable $1,000 cash grab for what basically amounts to a simple change of name, address, phone number, and email.

I respectfully ask that you amend Section (2)(C)(y) to remove "change in operator" as a trigger for re-registration, or at the very least replace it with a simpler contact info update process with an accordingly modest fee in line with the minor nature of the changes to an owner's existing approved short-term rental registration.

Sincerely,

Bradley Ramos

Bradley Ramos
Reservations Manager
Captain Cook Resorts