Prepared for the Association of Idaho Cities
Generated: 09/10/2026 04:19PM
Briefer ID: #ID2026-2617

AIC BILL BRIEFER - 2026 SESSION

H0583 - SHORT-TERM RENTALS

Amends existing law to revise provisions regarding limitations on the regulation of and limiting the tax duties of short-term rentals.

---

1. Bill Snapshot

Bill Number	H0583
Bill Title (Official)	Amends existing law to revise provisions regarding limitations on the regulation of and limiting the tax duties of short-term rentals.
Jurisdiction / Session	ID Legislature - 2026 Session
Status / Last Action	2026-03-17 - Reported Signed by Governor on March 16, 2026 Session Law Chapter 22 Effective: 07/01/2026
AIC position	Strong Oppose, -5.
Likely Sponsor	Rep. Jordan Redman (R, LD3) - Probable *(See Section 9 Notes)*
Topics	SHORT-TERM RENTALS
Link	https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2026/legislation/H0583/

---

2. Plain-Language Summary

House Bill 583 amends two sections of Idaho Code to revise the state's existing framework governing local regulation of short-term rentals. The bill is sponsored by the House Business Committee; the Statement of Purpose lists contacts: Rep. Mike Moyle, Rep. Jordan Redman, Sen. Kelly Arthur Anthon, and Sen. Todd M. Lakey. Section 1 amends Idaho Code § 67-6539 to prohibit local governments from imposing any regulation on short-term rentals that is not also imposed on comparable single-family dwellings, enumerates seventeen specific regulatory requirements that are now prohibited, establishes a narrow set of permissible public health and safety requirements, eliminates local licensing and permitting authority, and classifies short-term rentals as non-transient residential uses for zoning and building code purposes. Section 2 amends Idaho Code § 63-1804 to extend marketplace tax-collection obligations to property owners who rent directly to guests without using a marketplace platform. The sponsor's Statement of Purpose characterizes the bill as clarifying existing property rights protections and limiting local regulation to public health and safety purposes; the fiscal note states no fiscal impact at the state or local level. The bill was signed by the Governor and takes effect July 1, 2026.

2A. City Impact

Attention: High

Authority effect: Preempts.

Section 1, new 67-6539(1),(4),(5),(7) bar cities from prohibiting short-term rentals, imposing 'different restrictions' than on single-family dwellings, requiring licenses/fees/permits, or regulating marketplaces.

Applies to: All cities.
Section 1 states "Neither a county nor a city shall enact or enforce" the listed restrictions, applying uniformly to all cities and counties.

City budgets: Reduces city revenue.
Section 1(5) prohibits any county or city from requiring a license, fee, permit, certification, or registration to operate a short-term rental, though the fiscal note claims no fiscal impact.

Domains: planning zoning, housing, revenue budget tax, public safety police fire

What cities must or may do:

Cities may not ban short-term rentals, must classify them as residential uses subject only to state building codes, and can only impose a narrow list of safety requirements (smoke alarms, extinguishers, escape ladders, occupancy limits, informational handouts). Cities are barred from licensing, fees, permits, registration, or regulating marketplaces, but may still enforce generally applicable noise, parking, nuisance, curfew, and traffic ordinances.

Note: Facts drawn only from the bill text, statement of purpose and fiscal note; each call cites its source. Attention is computed from those facts (binding on cities, unfunded duty, or neither), not judged by the AI. Details of AIC's position, if any, are on the AIC Bill Tracker.

---

3. What the Bill Does

Key Changes in Law/Policy

- Section 1 rewrites Idaho Code § 67-6539 to prohibit counties and cities from imposing any regulation on short-term rentals that differs from what is imposed on single-family dwellings or similar structures not used as short-term rentals, unless the regulation is expressly permitted elsewhere in the section.
- Section 1 enumerates seventeen categories of requirements that now constitute prohibited 'different restrictions or obligations,' including owner-occupation mandates, professional property management requirements, additional insurance, use reporting, additional fire sprinklers, parking requirements, conditional use permits in residential zones, rental-day limits, proximity restrictions, and caps on the number of short-term rentals in a jurisdiction.
- Section 1 creates a permissible list of five specific public health and safety requirements that counties and cities may still impose by ordinance: functioning smoke alarms in all sleeping areas; a functioning fire extinguisher and a functioning carbon monoxide detector on each floor; removable escape ladders in all sleeping areas with a window that are located above the ground floor; occupancy limits consistent with international building code standards as adopted by the Idaho Building Code Board; and an informational handout for tenants.
- Section 1 prohibits counties and cities from requiring any license, fee, permit, certification, or registration to operate a short-term rental, and from enforcing any covenant, condition, restriction, or contract that regulates short-term rentals beyond what the section allows.
- Section 1 classifies short-term rentals as 'non-transient residential' uses for both zoning and building code purposes, limiting applicable building codes to those adopted by the Idaho Building Code Board, while preserving local authority to enforce generally applicable ordinances - such as noise, parking, nuisance, curfew, and traffic rules - against short-term rental properties and their occupants.
- Section 2 amends Idaho Code § 63-1804 to add a new subsection (5) requiring owners who rent directly to guests without using a marketplace platform to comply with all marketplace obligations under § 63-1804, including registration with the State Tax Commission and collection, reporting, and payment of applicable taxes.

- The bill was signed by the Governor and takes effect July 1, 2026, under the emergency clause in Section 3.

---

4. Who / What Is Affected

- City councils and county commissioners: Authority to regulate short-term rental operations through local ordinance is substantially narrowed. The seventeen prohibited regulatory categories and the elimination of local licensing and permitting authority remove tools that many Idaho municipalities have used or considered to manage short-term rental activity in residential areas.
- City planning and zoning departments: Must assess existing short-term rental ordinances for conformity with the bill's requirements. Conflicting local ordinances become unenforceable as a matter of preemption on the bill's effective date of July 1, 2026; the bill does not establish a separate compliance deadline requiring local governments to affirmatively amend their codes by that date, but ordinances imposing conditional use permits in residential zones, proximity restrictions, rental-day caps, or any of the other seventeen enumerated prohibitions will be unenforceable from that date forward. Staff will need to audit current code and advise councils on compliance.
- City attorneys: Must review existing short-term rental ordinances, any city-administered covenants or contracts touching short-term rental use, and local licensing schemes for conformity with the new statutory framework.
- Short-term rental property owners: Are relieved of any local licensing, permitting, or registration requirements and of any local regulations that impose conditions beyond those applicable to single-family dwellings, subject only to the five permissible health-and-safety requirements and generally applicable ordinances.
- Short-term rental owners who rent directly without a marketplace platform: A new obligation under Section 2 requires these owners to comply with all marketplace obligations under § 63-1804, including registration with the State Tax Commission and collection, reporting, and payment of applicable taxes.
- Short-term rental marketplace platforms (e.g., Airbnb, Vrbo): Existing obligations under Idaho Code § 63-1804 are unchanged. Local governments are still prohibited from levying sales, use, franchise, receipts, or other similar tax or fee on the business of operating a marketplace.
- Neighboring property owners and residential neighborhood residents: Local governments may no longer impose requirements specific to short-term rentals - such as neighbor-notification mandates or proximity restrictions - but generally applicable nuisance, noise, parking, and traffic ordinances remain enforceable against short-term rental occupants.
- Idaho Building Code Board: Short-term rentals are now explicitly subject only to building codes adopted by the Board, which may affect how local fire marshals and building officials apply code requirements to these properties.

---

5. Policy Considerations

Potential Benefits

- Uniform statewide standard: Property owners in every Idaho county and city face the same baseline rules, removing the patchwork of local short-term rental ordinances that varied significantly across jurisdictions and created uncertainty for owners who operate in multiple markets.
- Elimination of local licensing fees: Section 1's prohibition on local license, fee, permit, certification, or registration requirements removes a recurring cost of entry for short-term rental operators and reduces administrative overhead for local governments no longer required to administer those programs.

- Codified safety floor: Section 1(3) establishes a defined, statewide minimum set of health-and-safety requirements - smoke alarms, functioning fire extinguishers, functioning carbon monoxide detectors, escape ladders, occupancy limits, and tenant information handouts - that apply uniformly regardless of whether a local government had previously enacted any safety rules.
- Tax parity for direct-rental owners: Section 2's new subsection (5) closes the gap under which owners renting directly to guests without a marketplace platform were not expressly subject to the same obligations as marketplace platforms - including registration with the State Tax Commission and collection, reporting, and payment of applicable taxes - creating more consistent treatment across rental arrangements.
- Preservation of generally applicable ordinances: Section 1(6) explicitly preserves local authority to enforce noise, parking, nuisance, curfew, and traffic regulations against short-term rental properties and occupants on the same basis as other residential uses, maintaining tools for addressing neighbor complaints without STR-specific regulation.

Potential Concerns

- Elimination of local licensing removes the primary mechanism cities have used to identify and track short-term rental properties. Without a registration or permit requirement, local governments will have no systematic way to know which properties are operating as short-term rentals, complicating enforcement of even the permissible health-and-safety requirements under Section 1(3).
- The prohibition on 'different restrictions or obligations' in Section 1 removes local authority to require STR-specific insurance, owner-occupation minimums, or professional management - tools some cities have used to assign accountability when guest-related incidents occur in residential neighborhoods. The bill does not establish an alternative mechanism for identifying a responsible party in such situations.
- The classification of short-term rentals as 'non-transient residential' uses under Section 1 may conflict with local comprehensive plans and zoning frameworks that treat transient lodging differently from permanent residential use, potentially requiring cities to revise land-use plans that took years to develop.
- Section 1's prohibition on conditional use permits in residential zones removes a tool local governments have used to evaluate individual short-term rental applications in neighborhoods with particular density, infrastructure, or character concerns, and replaces it with a statewide rule that does not account for local conditions.
- The new direct-rental owner obligations in Section 2(5) - including registration with the State Tax Commission and collection, reporting, and payment of applicable taxes - place compliance responsibilities on individual property owners who may lack the administrative infrastructure that marketplace platforms have. The bill provides no grace period or simplified process specifically for already-operating direct-rental owners; the 45-day window in subsection (6) is written for marketplace platforms completing their first Idaho transaction and does not by its terms apply to direct-rental owners.

Key Unknowns / Data Needed

- Section 1(1) permits regulations that 'do not impose different restrictions or obligations on short-term rentals than are imposed on single-family dwellings,' but the bill does not define 'single-family dwelling' or 'similar structures,' leaving open how local governments and courts should classify multi-unit residential properties, condominiums, or accessory dwelling units for purposes of this comparison.
- Section 1(2)(a) defines 'different restrictions or obligations' as any requirement 'that would not be imposed but for a property's use as a short-term rental,' but the bill does not specify which entity - the local government, property owner, or a court - makes this determination in a contested case, nor does it establish an administrative review or appeal process.
- Section 1(3)(d) caps occupancy limits at 'non-transient residential limits as contained in the international building codes as adopted by the Idaho Building Code Board,' but the bill does not specify which edition of the international building codes is the reference point, and the Idaho Building Code Board may have adopted versions with differing occupancy standards.

- Section 1(4) prohibits counties and cities from enacting or enforcing 'any covenant, condition, restriction, or contract that regulates a short-term rental,' but covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) are typically private instruments created by homeowners associations or developers, not governmental entities - the bill does not clarify whether this subsection applies only to governmental contracts or whether it extends to publicly recorded instruments involving city or county land.
- Section 1(5) prohibits any 'license, fee, permit, certification, or registration to operate a short-term rental' but does not address whether local governments may continue to collect existing business license fees of general applicability that happen to cover short-term rental operators alongside all other businesses.
- Section 2(5) requires direct-rental owners to 'comply with all the requirements provided in this section applicable to a short-term rental marketplace,' but the bill does not address whether the 45-day compliance window in subsection (6) - written for marketplace platforms completing their first Idaho transaction - applies to direct-rental owners who are already operating at the time the bill takes effect on July 1, 2026.

---

6. Debate Prep

Pro Argument (Sample Statement):

House Bill 583, enacted and effective July 1, 2026, gives Idaho property owners a clear, statewide standard for short-term rentals instead of a patchwork of local rules that vary from one city limit to the next. Under Section 1's rewrite of Idaho Code 67-6539, a city or county may still require, by ordinance, only these five specific things: working smoke alarms, fire extinguishers and carbon monoxide detectors, escape ladders for upper-floor sleeping rooms, occupancy limits tied to the building code board's standards, and an emergency information handout for guests. What it loses is the authority to single out short-term rentals for owner-occupancy mandates, professional management requirements, rental-day caps, proximity restrictions, or arbitrary caps on the number of units allowed in a jurisdiction - restrictions that are not applied to any other single-family home in the same neighborhood.

This bill also closes a real gap in the tax code. Section 2's amendment to 63-1804 makes sure that an owner who rents directly to a guest, without going through a marketplace platform like Airbnb or Vrbo, owes the same registration and tax collection duties as those platforms already do. That is a matter of basic tax fairness between competitors in the same lodging market.

Cities keep every generally applicable ordinance - noise, parking, nuisance, curfew, traffic - enforceable against these properties. What they give up is the ability to treat a homeowner differently solely because of how that home is rented.

Con Argument (Sample Statement):

House Bill 583, now enacted and effective July 1, 2026, removes tools that city planning and code enforcement staff currently use to manage short-term rental impacts in residential neighborhoods, and it does so through a very specific mechanism: it defines seventeen categories of "different restrictions or obligations" that no city or county may impose on a short-term rental if that requirement would not also apply to an ordinary single-family home. That list includes conditional use permits in residential zones, limits on rental days, proximity spacing between units, and caps on the total number of short-term rentals in a jurisdiction - tools that a number of Idaho cities have adopted specifically because short-term rentals generate different traffic, parking, and turnover patterns than an owner-occupied home.

The bill also eliminates local licensing, permitting, registration, and fee authority outright under new subsection (5). That means cities lose the basic administrative mechanism they currently use to know how many short-term rentals exist within city limits, where they are located, and whether they meet even the five permissible health and safety requirements listed in subsection (3). Enforcement of smoke alarm and occupancy standards becomes complaint-driven rather than proactive, because there is no registry to inspect against.

Finally, classifying short-term rentals as "non-transient residential" for zoning and building code purposes under subsection (1) may create friction with local comprehensive plans that already distinguish those uses. Cities retain noise, parking, and nuisance enforcement, but the loss of licensing data makes it harder to apply those tools before problems arise rather than after neighbors have already complained.

Talking Points FOR (what supporters may argue):

- Section 1 of the amended 67-6539 permits a city or county to require, by ordinance, only five specific public health and safety items - smoke alarms, fire extinguishers, carbon monoxide detectors, escape ladders, and occupancy limits tied to the building code board's standards - while removing regulations that single out short-term rentals without a safety justification.
- The seventeen enumerated prohibitions in subsection (2)(a) target specific local practices, such as owner-occupancy mandates and caps on the total number of rentals in a jurisdiction, that apply to short-term rentals but not to comparable single-family homes in the same neighborhood.
- Subsection (6) explicitly preserves city authority to enforce noise, parking, nuisance, curfew, and traffic ordinances against short-term rental properties and their occupants, so neighborhood impact tools remain available.
- Section 2's amendment to 63-1804 extends marketplace tax registration and collection duties to owners who rent directly to guests, closing a gap that currently lets non-platform rentals avoid the same tax obligations as marketplace-facilitated rentals.
- The fiscal note reports no fiscal impact at the state or local level, meaning the bill accomplishes this standardization without imposing new costs on city budgets.
- House Bill 583 has been enacted and signed into law, taking effect July 1, 2026.

Talking Points AGAINST (what critics may argue):

- Subsection (5) eliminates all local licensing, permitting, fee, and registration authority over short-term rentals, removing the administrative mechanism cities currently use to track how many units exist and whether they comply with the five permissible safety requirements in subsection (3).
- The seventeen categories listed in subsection (2)(a), including conditional use permits, rental-day limits, and caps on the number of short-term rentals per jurisdiction, remove zoning tools that some cities have adopted to manage density and neighborhood turnover in residential areas.
- Without a registration requirement, code enforcement for smoke alarms, carbon monoxide detectors, and occupancy limits under subsection (3) becomes complaint-driven rather than proactive, shifting the practical cost of monitoring compliance onto neighbors and city code enforcement staff after problems occur.
- Classifying short-term rentals as a non-transient residential use for both zoning and building code purposes under subsection (1) may conflict with existing local comprehensive plans and building code applications that currently distinguish transient lodging uses from owner-occupied homes.
- Section 2's extension of marketplace tax duties to individual direct-rental owners under new subsection (5) of 63-1804 adds registration and reporting obligations for property owners who previously had no direct relationship with the State Tax Commission, and the bill does not specify how the Commission will identify or enforce compliance among this newly covered group.
- House Bill 583 has been enacted and signed into law, taking effect July 1, 2026, so these changes are now in force rather than merely proposed.

Note: These arguments represent positions supporters and critics may take. They are provided to help you prepare, not to advocate for either position.

7. Key Questions

Q: Section 1 eliminates all local licensing, permitting, fee, and registration authority for short-term rentals under new subsection (5). How will cities identify which properties in their jurisdiction are operating as short-term rentals in order to enforce even the limited public health and safety requirements that remain permissible under subsection (3), and to enforce generally applicable ordinances under subsection (6)?

> *Supportive:* Cities do not need a registration system to enforce noise, nuisance, or parking violations under subsection (6); those ordinances already apply based on complaints or observed conditions rather than a master list of properties. As for the affirmative safety-equipment requirements in subsection (3) - smoke alarms, fire extinguishers, carbon monoxide detectors, escape ladders, occupancy limits, and informational handouts - eliminating licensing removes an unnecessary paperwork burden on homeowners exercising their property rights while preserving the city's ability to respond to actual problems as they arise through complaints. Complaint-driven enforcement is a legitimate and common model for other residential uses that don't require registration.

> *Skeptical:* Without a registry, code enforcement staff have no reliable way to know a property is a short-term rental until a complaint is filed, meaning the affirmative safety requirements in subsection (3) - smoke alarms, carbon monoxide detectors, fire extinguishers, escape ladders, occupancy limits, and informational handouts - become nearly impossible to verify proactively, since there is no permit or inspection trigger. This is different from ordinary nuisance, noise, or parking enforcement under subsection (6), which can rely on complaints; here, the bill imposes affirmative equipment and handout mandates but gives cities no registration or inspection mechanism to confirm compliance before an incident occurs. This shifts enforcement entirely to a reactive, complaint-based model that is more costly per case and slower to catch violations, particularly in fast-growing tourist-adjacent communities.

Q: The seventeen prohibited categories in subsection (2)(a) include bans on requiring additional parking, sewer or utility capacity, and conditional use permits in residential zones. How are cities expected to manage neighborhood infrastructure and traffic impacts in areas with high concentrations of short-term rentals if these tools are now off-limits?

> *Supportive:* Short-term rentals are classified as non-transient residential uses precisely because they occupy dwellings the same way any family would, so imposing extra parking or utility requirements singles them out unfairly compared to a large family or long-term renters. Cities retain authority under subsection (6) to enforce generally applicable parking, traffic, and nuisance ordinances against any resident, including short-term rental occupants, which is sufficient to address genuine impacts. This approach protects property owners from arbitrary, rental-specific burdens while still allowing cities to address actual problems through neutral, generally applicable rules.

> *Skeptical:* General parking and traffic ordinances written for typical single-family occupancy may not anticipate the turnover and higher average occupancy patterns some short-term rentals generate, and cities can no longer tailor requirements to that reality through conditional use permits or added parking standards. In neighborhoods with concentrated short-term rental activity, this could strain existing utility capacity and street parking without any tool to require mitigation before problems occur. Public works and planning departments would need to rely solely on after-the-fact nuisance enforcement rather than proactive capacity planning that a permit process would normally allow.

Q: Section 1's new subsection (4) prohibits counties and cities from enforcing any covenant, condition, restriction, or contract that regulates short-term rentals except as allowed in the section. Does this provision preempt homeowners' association agreements and existing local development

agreements that restricted short-term rentals, and if so, what happens to properties that were developed or purchased in reliance on those restrictions?

> *Supportive:* This provision closes a loophole where local governments could indirectly regulate short-term rentals through enforcement of private covenants, ensuring the statute's protections for property owners' rental rights cannot be circumvented by a different enforcement mechanism. Homeowners who purchased property expecting to rent it short-term should not have that right undermined by local governments stepping in to enforce restrictive covenants against them. This creates clarity and consistency across the state rather than allowing enforcement to vary based on which covenants a local government chooses to uphold.

> *Skeptical:* Cities and counties often incorporate covenant compliance into their code enforcement and often rely on those private agreements when negotiating development agreements with subdivisions that specifically restricted short-term rentals as a condition of approval. If cities can no longer enforce those restrictions, developers and subdivisions that negotiated in good faith lose an enforcement partner, and disputes will likely shift entirely into private civil litigation between homeowners, straining relationships the city previously helped mediate through code enforcement. This raises unresolved questions about how existing development agreements tied to city approvals are affected going forward.

Q: Section 2 adds subsection (5) to Idaho Code 63-1804, requiring owners who rent directly without a marketplace platform to register with the State Tax Commission and independently handle tax collection, reporting, and payment. What administrative capacity exists at the city level, if any, to verify compliance by these independent operators, and does the fiscal note's claim of no local fiscal impact account for any city role in identifying non-compliant owners?

> *Supportive:* This provision shifts tax administration entirely to the State Tax Commission, which already has registration and enforcement infrastructure for lodging and sales taxes, so cities have no new administrative role and the fiscal note's no-impact finding is accurate. Extending marketplace-equivalent obligations to direct-rental owners closes a tax gap that previously let some owners avoid registration simply by not using a platform. Centralizing this at the state level, rather than asking cities to independently verify compliance, is actually the more efficient and consistent approach.

> *Skeptical:* While the state commission handles registration, cities that levy local option lodging or resort taxes still depend on accurate identification of all operators within their boundaries to ensure they receive their full share of local tax revenue distributed under subsection (4). If direct-rental owners under-register or fail to comply, cities have no independent enforcement mechanism to identify those properties, since local licensing was eliminated by Section 1, creating a potential revenue leakage that the no-fiscal-impact conclusion does not appear to have examined.

---

8. Uncertainties to Watch

- Cities and counties with existing STR ordinances may face legal challenges from property owners on July 1, 2026, before local governments have had opportunity to audit and revise their codes. The bill does not establish a separate compliance deadline requiring local governments to affirmatively amend their codes, and local provisions that conflict with the new statute become unenforceable on the effective date regardless of whether the jurisdiction has taken corrective action.

- Without any local registration or permitting mechanism - now prohibited by Section 1(5) - local code enforcement officers will have no systematic inventory of which properties are operating as short-term rentals. Enforcing even the permissible Section 1(3) health-and-safety requirements depends on identifying which properties are subject to them, and cities may find practical enforcement of the smoke alarm, fire extinguisher, and carbon monoxide detector provisions difficult without a registration baseline.
- The bill's equal-treatment framework - prohibiting any requirement that would not be imposed 'but for' short-term rental use - may generate litigation over whether specific local regulations meet that standard. Courts will need to interpret the 'but for' causation test in Section 1(2)(a) and the scope of the seventeen enumerated prohibited categories, producing a period of legal uncertainty for both local governments and property owners until case law develops.

---

9. Legislative Activity

Likely Sponsor

- Rep. Jordan Redman (R, LD3) - Probable

How we identified this: Bill Briefer deduces the likely sponsor from public records - the Statement of Purpose contact, committee minutes, and floor reading calendars. For this bill, Redman presented the bill in committee; was designated as floor sponsor in committee minutes (2 of 3 available records agree).

Caution - not all records agree. Also appearing in this bill's records: Representative Mike Moyle (SOP contact).

Confidence labels: Corroborated = 3 or more records agree | Probable = 2 records agree | Possible = only 1 record available | Inconclusive = records name different people, the strongest is shown | Unidentified = no usable records.

Bill History/Actions (most recent first)

- 2026-03-17: Reported Signed by Governor on March 16, 2026 Session Law Chapter 22 Effective: 07/01/2026
- 2026-03-12: Delivered to Governor at 3:13 p.m. on March 12, 2026
- 2026-03-12: Returned Signed by the President; Ordered Transmitted to Governor
- 2026-03-11: Signed by President; returned to House
- 2026-03-11: Received from the House enrolled/signed by Speaker
- 2026-03-10: Reported Enrolled; Signed by Speaker; Transmitted to Senate
- 2026-03-10: Returned from Senate Passed; to JRA for Enrolling
- 2026-03-09: Read third time in full - PASSED - 23-12-0 (Floor Sponsor: Lakey)
- 2026-03-02: Read second time; filed for Third Reading
- 2026-02-27: Reported out of Committee with Do Pass Recommendation; Filed for second reading
- 2026-02-13: Introduced, read first time; referred to: Commerce & Human Resources
- 2026-02-13: Received from the House passed; filed for first reading
- 2026-02-12: Read Third Time in Full - PASSED - 54-16-0 (Floor Sponsor: Redman)
- 2026-02-11: Read second time; Filed for Third Reading
- 2026-02-10: Reported out of Committee with Do Pass Recommendation, Filed for Second Reading
- 2026-02-05: Reported Printed and Referred to Business
- 2026-02-04: Introduced, read first time, referred to JRA for Printing

Roll Calls

- 2026-03-09: Senate roll call - Passed (Yea 23, Nay 12, NV 0, Absent 0)
- 2026-02-12: House roll call - Passed (Yea 54, Nay 16, NV 0, Absent 0)

Vote Record

HOUSE (54-16-0)

J Alfieri (R) - Y
V Barbieri (R) - Y
R Beiswenger (R) - Y
S Berch (D) - N
E Bingham (R) - N
J Boyle (R) - Y
C Bruce (R) - Y
T Burgoyne (R) - Y
D Cannon (R) - Y
L Cayler (R) - Y
R Cheatum (R) - Y
M Church (D) - N
J Cornilles (R) - Y
B Crane (R) - Y
J Crane (R) - Y
S Dygert (R) - Y
M Egbert (D) - Y
B Ehardt (R) - Y
J Ehlers (R) - Y
M Erickson (R) - Y
B Fuhriman (R) - Y
R Furniss (R) - N
S Galaviz (D) - Y
J Gannon (D) - N
D Garner (R) - Y
B Green (D) - Y
D Hall (R) - Y
C Handy (R) - Y
K Harris (R) - Y
D Hawkins (R) - Y
A Haws (D) - N
D Healey (R) - Y
T Hill (R) - Y
J Holtzclaw (R) - Y
C Hostetler (R) - Y
D Leavitt (R) - Y
D Manwaring (R) - Y
K Marmon (R) - Y
C Mathias (D) - Y
L McCann (R) - N
R Mendive (R) - Y
S Mickelsen (R) - N
S Miller (R) - Y
B Mitchell (R) - Y
J Monks (R) - Y
M Moyle (R) - Y
J Nelsen (R) - N
J Palmer (R) - Y
J Petzke (R) - N
D Pickett (R) - Y
M Pohanka (R) - N
E Price (R) - Y
C Rasor (R) - Y
B Raybould (R) - N
J Raymond (R) - N
J Redman (R) - Y
I Rubel (D) - N
M Sauter (R) - N
H Scott (R) - Y
C Shepherd (R) - Y
J Shirts (R) - Y
B Skaug (R) - Y
J Tanner (R) - Y
S Tanner (R) - Y
F Thompson (R) - Y
M Veile (R) - Y
J Weber (R) - N
J Wheeler (R) - Y
T Wisniewski (R) - Y
J Woude (R) - Y

SENATE (23-12-0)

B Adams (R) - Y
K Anthon (R) - Y
T Bernt (R) - Y
C Bjerke (R) - Y
C Blaylock (R) - Y
V Burtenshaw (R) - N
Coho* (for Lenney) (R) - Y
K Cook (R) - N
D Foreman (R) - Y
C Galloway (R) - Y
C Grow (R) - Y
J Guthrie (R) - N
M Harris (R) - N
P Hart (R) - Y
L Hartog (R) - Y
J Keyser (R) - Y
J Kohl (R) - Y
T Lakey (R) - Y
D Lent (R) - N
T Nichols (R) - Y
D Okuniewicz (R) - Y
A Rabe (D) - N
D Ricks (R) - Y
J Ruchti (D) - N
Rundhaug* (for Carlson) (R) - Y
C Semmelroth (D) - N
B Shippy (R) - Y
R Taylor (D) - N
B Toews (R) - Y
J VanOrden (R) - Y
J Ward-Engelking (D) - N
M Wintrow (D) - N
J Woodward (R) - N
C Zito (R) - Y
G Zuiderveld (R) - Y

*Note: * Substitute legislator, sworn in to vote in place of the absent member named.*

10. Advocacy & Interest Group Positions

- AIC: Strong Oppose, -5.
- CAI: tracking, Due Process
- IFF: support, +1

Note: Positions are drawn from each organization's own public bill tracker, as last checked on 2026-05-22. Inclusion reflects only that the organization has published a position - it is not an endorsement, and organizations may revise positions as bills change.

Key: AIC = Association of Idaho Cities | CAI = Citizens Alliance of Idaho | IFF = Idaho Freedom Foundation.

---

11. National Context - Similar Legislation in Other States

At least two states - Arizona and Kentucky - have bills in their current sessions addressing the regulation of short-term rentals in ways closely comparable to Idaho H0583. In Arizona, HB2430 (short-term rentals and online lodging marketplaces) and HB2566 (vacation rental regulation) were both read a second time in the House in January 2026, while HB2429 (short-term rental occupancy) advanced further and received a Senate reading in March 2026. Kentucky SB112, which directly addresses short-term rentals, was referred to the Committee on Committees in January 2026 and has not advanced since. Overall, these companion measures appear to be in early to mid-stage consideration, with none yet enacted in those states.

- AZ HB2430: Short-term rentals; online lodging marketplace - 2026-01-21: House read second time
- AZ HB2566: Vacation rentals; short-term rentals; regulation - 2026-01-21: House read second time
- KY SB112: AN ACT relating to short-term rentals. - 2026-01-21: to Committee on Committees (S)
- AZ HB2429: Short-term rentals; vacation rentals; occupancy - 2026-03-18: Senate read second time

Note: Found by legislative text search (LegiScan) across other states, then reviewed for subject match. The date shown is each bill's most recent recorded action. These indicate comparable subject matter, not identical text, and not a shared origin or coordinated effort.

ABOUT THIS BRIEFER

This analysis combines official legislative documents, fiscal data, and demographic information with artificial intelligence to produce a structured briefing. All source data comes from verified government sources. AI is used to analyze, summarize, and identify policy considerations - not to generate facts, statistics, or quotes.

Data Sources

Idaho Legislature, LegiScan (multi-state legislation), and advocacy organizations' public bill trackers

Disclaimer

This briefer is an informational time-saver, not a replacement for personal judgment. It is not legal advice or a voting recommendation. Please verify any details you plan to cite by reviewing official sources at legislature.idaho.gov.

AIC Bill Briefer - from Quiet Impact • info@billbriefer.com

Informed city officials make better decisions. Better decisions serve everyone.