

From: [Andrew PERERO](#)
To: [Planning WPC Testimony](#)
Subject: Written Testimony for Upcoming Hawai'i County Council Meeting on STVR Regulation
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 4:05:37 PM

Aloha Chair, Councilmembers, and County Staff,

My name is Andrew Perero, and I am a Hawai'i Island resident, homeowner, and local short-term rental operator. I support balanced short-term rental regulation that addresses housing and neighborhood concerns while recognizing the difference between absentee investors and responsible local owner-operators.

My family and I live on island, and our rental income helps sustain our household, maintain our properties, support local workers and vendors, and contribute to the local economy. We have operated responsibly for more than five years, paying taxes, maintaining our properties, responding promptly to issues, and remaining accountable to our neighbors. During that time, we have had zero neighbor complaints.

I understand that the County is trying to address real concerns around housing, neighborhood impacts, and unmanaged rentals. I also understand the County's goal of encouraging more affordable housing and preventing newly created housing from immediately being converted into short-term rentals. Those are valid concerns.

However, I strongly urge the Council to be very careful about applying a broad, one-size-fits-all approach that treats all short-term rental operators the same.

There is a major difference between absentee investors running unmanaged rentals and local owner-operators who live here, manage responsibly, pay taxes, maintain their properties, and have a proven track record of complaint and peaceful operation.

The County's own commissioned Hunden Partners study supports this distinction. That study found that more than 75 percent of STVR owners operate only one rental unit, 54 percent rely on the income to cover housing-related costs, and only 20 percent view their property as a pure investment. In other words, the majority of operators are not large-scale investors. They are individual households with a direct personal and

financial stake in the property and community.

The same study also found that if STVRs were restricted, only 4 percent of owners and operators said they would definitely convert their units to long-term rentals, while 68 percent said they would not. The study specifically concluded that the likelihood of STVRs converting into long-term resident housing is minimal.

That finding is extremely important. If the goal is to create more housing, the County should be very cautious about harming local families and responsible operators in exchange for a housing benefit that its own study suggests may be very limited.

To me, the more logical solution is much simpler: if the County is concerned that future affordable housing, future additions, or newly created units could be converted into short-term rentals, then restrict that future use clearly — especially for non-primary-residence and non-owner-occupied situations.

That approach would directly address the concern without punishing local residents who have already built a compliant, responsible, tax-paying operation around their primary residence and property.

This is consistent with the basic principle already present in the County's earlier short-term rental framework: distinguish between existing uses, future uses, hosted/owner-occupied situations, and nonconforming or unhosted vacation rentals. The County does not need to treat every situation as if it carries the same risk.

I am also asking the County to recognize the real anxiety that uncertainty creates for compliant operators. For more than a year, many local families have been trying to understand what exactly will be required of them. There have been major discussions, proposed rules, deadlines, penalties, and fees — but the practical implementation guidance has not been clear enough for the people who are actually eager to comply.

For those of us who are already operating responsibly, paying taxes, maintaining our properties, and trying to follow the rules, unclear implementation does not help the community. It creates stress and uncertainty for households who depend on this income and who want to remain in good standing.

The visitor economy is part of the backbone of Hawai‘i Island. The vast majority of local owner-operators I know are not trying to avoid responsibility. They are trying to do things correctly. They are respectful of neighbors, responsive to problems, and dependent on this income to keep their households stable.

That type of operator should be rewarded, not punished.

In my opinion, the County should create clear preferential treatment, protection, a fast-track compliance pathway, or grandfathering protection for:

- Primary-residence and owner-occupied properties
- Local owner-operators who live on island
- Operators with a clean complaint history
- Hosts with documented tax compliance
- Longstanding responsible operators who have already proven they can coexist peacefully with their neighborhoods

After over five years of hosting, contributing to the community, maintaining our properties, paying taxes, and operating without neighborhood complaints, it feels deeply unfair and illogical for responsible local hosts to be placed at risk by rules intended to address a different problem.

The County’s own study recommends continuing to enable STVRs while improving monitoring, achieving full registration compliance, and balancing economic benefits with community well-being and neighborhood integrity. That is exactly the kind of balanced approach I am asking the Council to follow.

Please do not design policy around the worst operators while ignoring the local families who have already proven that responsible hosting can work. Regulation should raise the standard, not punish the people already meeting it.

Mahalo for your time and consideration.

Andrew Perero & Ohana

Hawai‘i Island Resident and Local Host