BILL062(25)
Testimony

MISC. COMM. 534

*ZONING & PLANNING (ZON)

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

Meeting Date: Oct 16, 2025 @ 09:00 AM

Support: 0

Oppose: 11

I wish to comment: 2

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Zach Knysh	bestbeach@yahoo.com	96815
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 10:16 AM

Testimony:

This has personally been a burden on our family. Our property was being mismanaged and we had to change management companies because of their actions. This caused us the extra $1,000 cost at no fault of ours. The improper conduct of a company shouldn't cause an owner to burden the cost. As a family with a young child this is an unfairly imposed fee that doesn't account for the real life situations when we are already facing so many extra costs being imposed on our investment we worked so hard for making it hard to make ends meet.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kathie Schmid	kathie@captaincookresorts.com	96818
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Captain Cook Resorts	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 11:05 AM

Testimony:

Aloha 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 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. The city's new HNL Build system should allow owners to easily update this information without undergoing a full re-registration. 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 our 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,

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kelly Lee	kellyreports@gmail.com	96734
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
OSTRA	I wish to comment	Oct 10, 2025 @ 01:40 PM

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kathleen Funk-Linton	als.islandgirls@hawaiiantel.net	96744
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 01:57 PM

Testimony:

This is crazy. Not only the the amount you want to charge for making a change to management punitive you are just asking for non-compliance by making the amount so ridiculously high. The owners of property are not your ATM machine. I don't have a short term rental but feel compelled to speak out anyway because the people of Hawaii are getting screwed and charged to death. don't do this!!! A truly nominal fee----like $25 would cover an hour so clerical labor and should be the max needed to help you keep your records up to date.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Karen Luke	nahele@yahoo.com	96706
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 02:26 PM

Testimony:

Aloha Chair Kia'āina, VC Waters, and Members of the Committee,

Please removal of re-registration requirement.

Good help is hard to find and even harder to keep. The constant turnover burdens everyone and a new registration when an operator or on-island contact person is hired will burden operators and DPP unnecessarily.

The on-site person is a benefit to the traveler and is of no interest to DPP who communicates directly with the owner when necessary and not the employees. People are often hired on a 3-6 month trial and the time and expense to the owner to re-register so DPP can have information about employees is unwarranted.

Thank your for considering the removal of the re-registration requirement.

Mahalo,

Karen in Ewa Beach

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Debra Kenworthy	dkenworthy@comcast.net	96791
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	I wish to comment	Oct 10, 2025 @ 02:47 PM

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) CD1.

- 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 the operator or on-island contact person 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 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:
Michael Brant	michaeljbrant@hotmail.com	96815
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 03:48 PM

Testimony:

The proposal to require re-registration and $1000 fee for a simple change of contact person for STR operation is unfair and excessive. This is a simple administrative matter, no different than making a change to driver's license information, and the fee should reflect that. Mahalo.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Diana Ricciuti	diananovoselic@hawaiilife.com	96734

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Hawaii Life Real Estate Brokers	Oppose	Oct 10, 2025 @ 04:51 PM

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Marilyn Radzat	marilynradzat@gmail.com	96731

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 11, 2025 @ 04:42 AM

Testimony:

Subject: Comments on Bill 62(25) CD1

Introduction: 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) CD1.

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 the operator or on-island contact person 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 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:
Kikuchi Shirakawa	vivian7463271@gmail.com	96816

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 11, 2025 @ 12:49 PM

Testimony:

My name is Kikuchi Shirakawa, and I am writing to respectfully oppose the proposed re-registration requirement and associated $1,000 fee in Bill 62(25) CD1 for changes in the operator or on-island point of contact for a Transient Vacation Unit (TVU).

The recently adopted Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was intended to simplify the TVU registration and renewal process while improving compliance with TVU regulations. The proposed re-registration requirement directly contradicts these goals.

With the implementation of the new HNL Build system, property owners should be able to easily update operator or contact information without needing to complete a full re-registration process.

The owner is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the TVU's registration and compliance. Therefore, a routine administrative change—such as appointing a new manager or on-island contact—should not warrant a full re-registration nor a punitive $1,000 fee.

It is extremely common in business operations for owners to change managers or contacts. Charging a $1,000 fee for such a standard update imposes an unnecessary and unreasonable financial burden on responsible owners and small businesses.

Rather than encouraging compliance, this type of fee may discourage participation in the legal framework and incentivize some to operate outside of it. While we understand there may be minimal review required by DPP staff, it does not justify treating this as a brand-new registration.

This policy also creates additional and unnecessary administrative work for the DPP, BFS, the State Department of Taxation, as well as for resident owners and management companies like ours.

We urge the Council to consider the negative impact this proposal would have on residents and small business operators, and to remove the re-registration requirement and associated $1,000 fee from Bill 62(25) CD1.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Helena von Sydow	helenavonsydow@gmail.com	96731
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 11, 2025 @ 02:40 PM

Testimony:

Dear Chair and Councilmembers,

I respectfully urge the Council to remove the re-registration requirement and accompanying $1,000 fee for changes in operator or on-island point of contact under Bill 62 (2025).

When the Council adopted Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53), the intent was to simplify and modernize the TVU registration and renewal process—while strengthening compliance. Requiring a full re-registration and imposing this substantial fee directly undermines those goals.

With the launch of the HNL Build system, owners can now update contact or operator information easily and securely online. Since the property owner remains fully responsible for all other aspects of registration and compliance, such administrative changes should not trigger a complete re-registration or an additional $1,000 fee.

It is routine in this industry for owners to change property managers or on-island contacts. These updates are a normal part of doing business and should not be treated as violations or subject to penalties. Maintaining the current proposal would:

Create a financial barrier for owners seeking new management support.
Threaten local, living-wage jobs sustained by O‘ahu’s property management sector.
Place unfair costs on compliant residents and small businesses.
Discourage compliance by making simple administrative changes too expensive.

While a brief administrative review by DPP staff may be appropriate to verify updates, this does not warrant a full re-registration process. In fact, requiring one would unnecessarily add workload to DPP, BFS, the State Department of Taxation, and private stakeholders alike. Charging $1,000 for what should be a routine update is neither practical nor equitable.

Excessive fees and redundant processes discourage compliance, hurt small businesses, and destabilize an industry that provides essential mid-term and visitor housing while creating local employment opportunities.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Council to eliminate the re-registration requirement and associated $1,000 feefor operator or contact changes under Bill 62 (2025).

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

With Aloha,
Helena Von Sydow

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Harald von Sydow	nztrendshi@gmail.com	96731

Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Oppose	Oct 11, 2025 @ 02:42 PM

Testimony:

Dear Chair and Councilmembers,

Aloha and thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony.

I am writing as a local property owner and active participant in O‘ahu’s visitor-accommodation community to respectfully ask that the Council remove the re-registration requirement and $1,000 fee for changes in operator or on-island point of contact from Bill 62 (2025).

When the Council passed Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53), it was a positive step toward simplifying the registration and renewal process while encouraging compliance. Adding this new requirement and fee works against that intent.

Through the new HNL Build system, owners can already update contact or operator information easily. The owner remains fully responsible for compliance, taxes, and renewals — so there is no reason a simple update should force an expensive, time-consuming re-registration.

In our community, it’s common for owners to change property managers or on-island contacts. Life changes — people retire, relocate, or shift companies. That’s normal and healthy for any business. But charging $1,000 every time a manager changes makes it financially impossible for many small property owners to operate responsibly.

If this rule stays in place, it will:
Discourage owners from hiring new local managers and limit opportunities for small businesses.
Put good-faith operators — who already follow every rule — at a disadvantage.
Threaten hundreds of local jobs that support families across O‘ahu.
Encourage some to avoid updating records altogether because of the cost, which ultimately hurts compliance.

This is not about avoiding oversight; it’s about keeping regulations fair, functional, and in the spirit of community collaboration. A quick review by DPP staff is understandable — but asking for a full re-registration and a $1,000 payment for a basic administrative change is excessive and unnecessary.

O‘ahu’s property management and mid-term rental professionals are not just business owners — they are residents, parents, taxpayers, and neighbors. We want to work with the City to ensure transparency and compliance. But policies must also support the local families who depend on this work.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you remove the re-registration requirement and $1,000 fee for operator or contact changes. Doing so will make the process more efficient, fair, and aligned with the spirit of Ordinance 24-14.

Mahalo for your time and for listening to the voices of our local community.

With Aloha and Respect,

Harald Von Sydow

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Marcelo Vettorazzo	mvettor@gmail.com	96731
Representing:	**Position:**	**Submitted:**
Self	Oppose	Oct 13, 2025 @ 02:40 AM

Testimony:

Dear Sir/Madam,

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) CD1.

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 the operator or on-island contact person 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 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.

Kind Regards,

Marcelo Vettorazzo

OSTRA
O'AHU SHORT-TERM RENTAL ALLIANCE

The City Council of Honolulu
Committee on Zoning & Planning, October 16, 2025

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

Aloha Chair,Vice Chair and Zoning Committee Members,

The O'ahu Short Term Rental Alliance (OSTRA), which represents many residents and workers dedicated to the legal short-term rental industry, supports Bill 62(25) CD1. This measure is an important refinement of Ordinance 24-14, which successfully improved the registration process for both applicants and City departments.

While the current framework has been effective, we've identified one requirement that seems to be an unintended consequence of the original ordinance. The law currently mandates a completely new registration, including the $1,000 fee, every time there is a change in a property's operator or point of contact, even when the property owner remains the same.

In the operation of short-term rentals, switching operators or points of contact is a common business practice. However, under the current regulations, this normal administrative change triggers significant, unnecessary costs and delays for property owners. Furthermore, it creates duplicate and time-consuming work for City staff, as the Department of Planning and Permitting must re-review the same property documents repeatedly. Similarly, the Department of Budget and Fiscal Services and the state Tax Department are required to provide new clearances, often just months after they did so for the very same property. This cycle generates extra workload for all parties without any tangible improvement in compliance or enforcement.

We respectfully request that the Committee amend Section (2)(C)(y) of the bill to remove "change in operator" as a trigger for full re-registration. Registration should only be necessary for change in ownership or failing to renew.

A more efficient, modern approach—such as allowing property owners to simply update the operator information in HNL Build or by establishing a modest administrative fee for an operator change—would achieve the following:

- Ease the financial and procedural burden on compliant owners.
- Significantly reduce duplicate work for DPP and other City agencies.
- Incentivize more owners to remain registered and comply with the law.

We fully support Bill 62(25) CD1 with this amendment which will streamline the workload for the DPP and actively encourage more transient vacation unit owners to register and stay current. This legislation demonstrates a strong commitment to working with the community to build a more effective and fair regulatory system for all.

Mahalo,.

Kelly Lee

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

Date: October 10, 2025

RE: Testimony in Opposition to the Re-Registration Requirement and $1,000 Fee in Bill 62(25) CD1

Dear Chair and Members of the Council/Committee,

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 as proposed in Bill 62(25) CD1.

The recently enacted Ordinance 24-14 (formerly Bill 53) was designed to streamline the TVU (Transient Vacation Unit) registration and renewal process and promote increased compliance with existing regulations. Unfortunately, this new re-registration requirement and fee contradict that intent.

The City's updated HNL Build system now provides a modern, user-friendly platform where owners can update basic information, such as the operator or on-island contact, without undergoing a full re-registration. This kind of administrative change is routine in the course of business operations and does not fundamentally alter the TVU's status or compliance obligations.

It is important to emphasize that the property owner remains fully responsible for the unit's operation and compliance. A change in operator or on-island contact does not affect the integrity of the registration, nor does it warrant the administrative and financial burden of restarting the entire process.

Charging a $1,000 fee for what is essentially a clerical update not only creates a financial hardship for property owners — particularly resident owners and small businesses — but may also unintentionally discourage compliance with the TVU program. Rather than encouraging transparency and participation, such punitive fees may push some operators outside the formal system.

While we understand that some minimal staff review may be needed, it is not proportionate to require a full re-registration. In fact, this measure increases the workload for DPP, BFS, the state Department of Taxation, our resident owners, and our company staff — creating unnecessary inefficiencies for all parties involved.

We respectfully urge you to amend Bill 62(25) CD1 to remove this re-registration requirement and fee in the case of changes to the operator or on-island point of contact. Doing so would support the City's goals of efficiency, fairness, and enhanced compliance in the management of TVUs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Diana Ricciuti RB#20863

Hawaii Life Real Estate Brokers