

RPTR Committee

From: Tcroly <tcroly@maui.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 11:48 AM
To: Alice L. Lee; Keani N. Rawlins; Gabe Johnson; Tasha A. Kama; Yukilei Sugimura; Thomas M. Cook; Shane M. Sinenci; Tamara A. Paltin; Nohe M. Uu-Hodgins
Cc: RPTR Committee
Subject: RPT reform committee

RPT reform committee testimony

This testimony was intended as an ecomment, but the ecomment link is closed.

Bill 110

Ending the eligibility to qualify for this program is fiscally sound, but this measure should be examined in consideration of the objectives of this program.

Bill 111

I love the goal of the Circuit Breaker ordinance, to make certain that real property tax will not cause someone who is income challenged from losing their home to an excessive Real Property tax burden. The key is making sure this program is serving those intended and is not allowed to be abused by those who could manipulate their annual income to make use of it when they are actually not in need. I think the director's proposal is warranted because it can be challenging for some seniors to even meet the statutory documentation needed to qualify and this would unburden them, and the staff in many cases. However, I would suggest putting in an additional restriction besides age to qualify for this simplified application process, and that would be the amount of the Circuit breaker credit.

Since the average circuit breaker credit is less than \$1000, I might suggest adding a requirement that the credit be less than \$2000 to qualify for this simplified application process. For the 2025/26 fiscal year, additional provision would exclude 18 properties from this simplified application process.

Bill 113

This measure is an attempt to address the larger problem of incorrect classification suffering as much as an 18 month delay in being rectified either because of missing a filing deadline or because of a change of use during the tax year. I believe this measure fails in addressing these issues and makes things even more complicated. While these issues deserve the greatest consideration by this committee, I do not support this approach and would like the committee to explore other solutions to addressing these issues

The tax amounts shown below show how much difference in tax bill there can be between the same valued property being classified in the various classifications. And some properties are miss-classified for up to your 18 months.

\$600,000 assessment

Owner occupied w/Long term rental \$330

Owner Occupied(\$300k exemption) \$495

Long Term Rental(\$200k Exemption) \$1,180

Non Owner Occupied. \$3,522

STR/TVR. \$7,500

\$1,000,000 assessment

Owner occupied w/Long term rental \$990

Owner Occupied(\$300k exemption) \$1,155

Long Term Rental(\$200k Exemption) \$2,360

Non Owner Occupied. \$5,870

STR/TVR. \$12,500

\$2,000,000 assessment

Owner occupied w/Long term rental \$2,685

Owner Occupied(\$300k exemption) \$2,865

Long Term Rental(\$200k Exemption) \$6335

Non Owner Occupied. \$14,470

STR/TVR. \$26,500

\$5,000,000 assessment

Owner occupied w/Long term rental \$8,480

Owner Occupied(\$300k exemption) \$9,055

Long Term Rental(\$200k Exemption) \$11,450

Non Owner Occupied. \$57,070

STR/TVR. \$71,600

Bill114

I support this measure to provide clarity in the code as to the taxation of these leased lands

Tom Croly

Sent from my iPad that has a mind of its own